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## Introductory Note

Friends of Premier Debate,

This is Premier’s March-April brief, and the topic is “Resolved: The United States ought to provide a universal basic income.”

We’re always looking for ways to make the briefs better, so please, let us know what you think! If you use these briefs please help us and direct other debaters to PremierDebate.com/Briefs where we will continue uploading .DOC versions of the briefs.

**This edition is compiled in large part from camp research and casing, so thank you to faculty and students at the 2017 Premier Debate Los Angeles** for their efforts toward this communal resource. Led by top lab leaders Tim Alderete, Chase Hamilton, John Overing, and Parker Whitfill, everyone worked hard to provide some of the best evidence you’ll see on the topic. Send them a thank you for their hard work, **and if you want to learn how to cut cards like these, visit** [**www.premierdebate.com**](http://www.premierdebate.com/) **and register for camp today!** Everyone who attends camp will receive compiled camp files that are even more robust and formatted into ready-to-read cases.

Lastly, we want to remind the readers about standard brief practice to get the most out of this file. Best practice for brief use is to use it as a guide for further research. Find the articles and citations and cut them for your own personal knowledge. You’ll find even better cards that way. If you want to use the evidence in here in a pinch, you should at least re-tag and highlight the evidence yourself so you know exactly what it says and how you’re going to use it. Remember, briefs can be a tremendous resource but you need to familiarize yourself with the underlying material first.

Good luck everyone. See you ‘round!

Bob Overing & John Scoggin

Directors | Premier Debate

# Affirmative – Consequentialism

## Economy

### Inherency – Automation

#### Automation is on the rise now and will cause massive unemployment - this collapse the economy because it will eliminate consumer spending and cause mass poverty

Worrall 15 - Writer for National Geographic (Simon Worrall –6/3/15,“Will the Rise of The Robots Implode the World Economy?”, http://news.nationalgeographic.com/2015/06/150603-science-technology-robots-economics-unemployment-automation-ngbooktalk/, EmmieeM) [Premier]

From the invention of the steam engine to the Internet, technology has helped drive human progress. But Martin Ford, author of *Rise Of The Robots: Technology and The Threat Of A Jobless Future*, suggests we are now at a tipping point where robotics, if not handled right, may trigger mass unemployment and economic collapse. Talking from his office in Sunnyvale, California, he explains how 3-D printing may revolutionize the construction industry; why the Japanese like having robots as pets; and how robots may make it even harder to halt climate change. Earlier this year, Stephen Hawking said that “artificial intelligence could spell the end of the human race.” Surely, this is sci-fi? I’d agree, that’s definitely science fiction. Some very smart, high profile people like Stephen Hawking and Elon Musk  have warned about this. In the very long term they may have a point. But, based on what I know from talking to people who are actually working in artificial intelligence (AI), we are not anywhere close to that. An Oxford University survey suggested that 47 per cent of the world’s jobs will be taken by robots in the coming decades. What’s involved and which jobs are most at risk? This is a big issue that is not science fiction and is happening already. It involves what we call narrow artificial intelligence, which can do relatively routine, predictable things. By predictable, I mean you can predict what a person doing a job is going to be doing based on that they’ve done in the past. **L**ike flipping burgers? It could be flipping burgers or a lot of factory and warehouse jobs like stocking shelves. One of the most dramatic impacts isn’t going to involve actual robots. It’s going to involve software. Some of the people most threatened are what we might call office drones: people who sit in front of computers doing relatively routine, formulaic things. If your job is to produce the same kinds of reports again and again, software is getting smarter and better at doing that. We already have lots of examples, even in journalism. There’s smart software that is able to write basic news stories. Lots of white-collar jobs held by college graduates are going to be threatened. What will the effect on the world economy be? In the long run, it could have a dramatic impact and I think we are already beginning to see that. As you eliminate workers and people become unemployed or their wages fall, consumers will have less purchasing power to buy the products and services produced by the economy. As a result, there will be less and less demand. Economists all over the world are talking about this issue. In Europe, for example, there are concerns about inflation because there is not enough demand for products and services. If you project this forward, there are going to be a lot of people who are either unemployed, underemployed, or struggling financially, who simply won’t have discretionary income to spend. How does your work in Silicon Valley inform your writing about robots. Was there an ‘Aha’ moment? I got my start here in the early 1990s, when I founded a small software company in my home. This was the era when Microsoft Windows was just becoming important. Software was a pretty labor-intensive business to run. We would ship our software on CD ROMs, with a printed manual. All of that had to be manufactured and then physically shipped to the customer. As my business grew, I ended up outsourcing that to another little company in Berkeley, California, which hired people from different backgrounds. But within a few years, that company went out of business. Now, software is either shipped directly over the Internet or it’s hosted in the cloud. It had a dramatic impact on small businesses in terms of jobs. And that’s what started me thinking about this issue. Off-shoring jobs to China and other places has been going on for decades. How will it potentially connect with artificial intelligence?Off-shoring is the intersection of globalization and technology. What we’re seeing now is that as automation gets better, a lot of jobs that were once off-shored to low wage countries, especially in areas of repetitive customer service, are being replaced by things like digital voice systems. As a result, a lot of those jobs may evaporate in the Third World. Countries like India will also try to climb up the skills ladder and go after much higher value type professional jobs. You could take a young, relatively inexperienced, but very smart worker in India or China and combine them with these very powerful artificial intelligence-enabled tools; and together they would be able to compete with a much more experienced worker in the US. Qualities like judgement and experience, which we associate with people, are more and more being encapsulated into artificial intelligence and algorithmic approaches. In many cases, they’re doing it better [than humans]. The movie, *Her*, with Scarlett Johanssen imagined a future where we even have emotional relationships with AI companions. Is that possible? Absolutely. There’s already research into building emotional robots and many people predict that companion robots and robots that provide sex and things like that are not too far in the future. There already have been isolated cases, typically in Japan, where people have developed very close relationships with robots. Many people here see robots as threatening, as in the Terminator movies. In Japan, robots are perceived much more positively. They’re much more likely, for example, to be used as pets. A neuroscientist I interviewed for Book Talk told me that, for the foreseeable future, AI would be good for “cleaning toilets”, but not much else. Is he wrong**?** I think he’s got it backwards. To build a robot that can clean toilets or do the things a housekeeper might do is a tremendous technical challenge. To build a software system that can automate a job held by someone with a college degree is much easier. Robots can already do all kinds of remarkable things, like land airplanes or trade on Wall Street. It’s certainly way beyond cleaning toilets. 3-D printers can now create human organs. In what other fields may they reshape the future**?** 3-D printing is primarily applicable in areas where you want customization. One of the areas that has dramatic potential to be transformative is in construction, when you take the idea of a 3-D venture and scale it up so it becomes this huge, construction-level machine. That would enable us to very rapidly construct houses and other buildings in an almost completely automated fashion. It would also potentially threaten millions of construction jobs. Surely, total automation is a good thing; Karl Marx said, people will have more free time, which will “redound to the benefit of emancipated labor.” He’s right, isn’t he?There are two ways this can go. The idea that robots are going to take over all the unpleasant work is pretty attractive. The problem is distributional. In the world that exists today and has always existed, jobs and incomes are coupled together. If you don’t have a job, you don’t have an income. It could be a utopian outcome if you had an income independently from a job. You wouldn’t have to work at something you didn’t enjoy, but you would still have income to participate in the economy and help drive economic growth and all those things that we need people to do. Unfortunately, that’s not the world we live in today. Right now if you don’t have a job and you don’t have an income, you’ll soon be homeless and living on the street, at least in the U.S. where our social safety net is not at the level of other industrialized countries. That’s the real problem. How do we decouple work from income? I think that’s ultimately what we are going to have to. It’s very simple to say that. But, politically, it’s extraordinarily difficult to make that happen. A guaranteed income for all citizens, regardless of whether they work, sounds like universal, socialist welfare, doesn’t it?It will sound like that to a lot of people. But, if you look at the history of that idea, a guaranteed income was supported by some iconic figures on the conservative side, like Frederick Hayek. True socialism means the government taking over the means of production and nationalizing businesses. That’s one path we can take, but I think it would be a very bad outcome. The alternative is a more free market approach, which would give everyone a minimal income so that they have the means to go out in the market and participate. If they need housing, they’ll go and look for housing in the private market and they’ll have the money to spend on it. How does the rise of robots connect with other challenges we face, like climate change? Climate change is a huge challenge and politically we’re having a difficult time solving it. A lot of people don’t believe in it or give it priority, because they’re more concerned with economic issues. When people are worried about paying their rent or putting food on the table, it’s hard for them to focus on something that’s going to impact them decades from now. This is especially true in poor countries. People in those countries are the ones that are going to suffer the most from climate change, but they don’t have the ability to worry about it because they’re focused on surviving economically. The trend toward automation will make people even more economically insecure, which will in turn make it harder, politically, to make anything happen on climate change. Industries opposed to policies that could address climate change will just say, “If you do this we’re going to lose even more jobs.” And that’s going to kill it. These two things are going to unfold roughly in parallel and they could create a perfect storm where increased unemployment and the impact from automation will make it even harder to address climate change. **Are you an optimist or a pessimist about the future?** In the near term, I’m a pessimist. In the long term, an optimist. I’m a strong believer in technology. My whole career has been in technology. So, I’m definitely not someone who wants to shut down technology or limit it in some way. I think that would be a terrible idea. We’re dramatically better off than we were 100 years ago and that’s largely because of technology. The problem is that things are becoming less simple than they were. Technology has reached what you might call “an inflection point.” On the one hand, technology is giving us all this great stuff, like medical discoveries or free information on the Internet. At the same time, technology may take away access to the basics, like a house and food. The extreme example of that is the homeless person who has a smart phone and can go to Starbucks and access all the digital abundance that is out there but has nowhere to live. If we can address these issues, so everyone has access to a reasonable standard of living while enjoying the fruits of technology, we could have a very optimistic, almost utopian, future. If we don’t, for lots of people who are not economically at the top, it’s going to be pretty dystopian. Many people may lose their anchor to the middle class and get into trouble in terms of the necessities of life.

#### Automation will replace jobs - Technology is growing too fast – low wage workers cannot compete

**Davidow and Malone, 2014 – High technology industry executive and columnist for ABC News** [Bill, Michael, What Happens to Society When Robots Replace Workers?”, Harvard Business Review. https://hbr.org/2014/12/what-happens-to-society-when-robots-replace-workers. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

Estimates of general rates of technological progress are always imprecise, but it is fair to say that, in the past, progress came more slowly. Henry Adams, the historian, measured technological progress by the power generated from coal, and estimated that power output doubled every ten years between 1840 and 1900, a compounded rate of progress of about 7% per year. The reality was probably much less. For example, in 1848, the world record for rail speed reached 60 miles per hour. A century later, commercial aircraft could carry passengers at speeds approaching 600 miles per hour, a rate of progress of only about 2% per year. By contrast, progress today comes rapidly. Consider the numbers for information storage density in computer memory. Between 1960 and 2003, those densities increased by a factor of five million, at times progressing at a rate of 60% per year. At the same time, true to Moore’s Law, semiconductor technology has been progressing at a 40% rate for more than 50 years. These rates of progress are embedded in the creation of intelligent machines, from robots to automobiles to drones, that will soon dominate the global economy – and in the process drive down the value of human labor with astonishing speed.∂ This is why we will soon be looking at hordes of citizens of zero economic value. Figuring out how to deal with the impacts of this development will be the greatest challenge facing free market economies in this century.∂ If you doubt the march of worker-replacing technology, look at Foxconn, the world’s largest contract manufacturer. It employs more than one million workers in China. In 2011, the company installed 10,000 robots, called Foxbots. Today, the company is installing them at a rate of 30,000 per year. Each robot costs about $20,000 and is used to perform routine jobs such as spraying, welding, and assembly. On June 26, 2013, Terry Gou, Foxconn’s CEO, told his annual meeting that “We have over one million workers. In the future we will add one million robotic workers.” This means, of course, that the company will avoid hiring those next million human workers.∂ Just imagine what a Foxbot will soon be able to do if Moore’s Law holds steady and we continue to see performance leaps of 40% per year. Baxter, a $22,000 robot that just got a software upgrade, is being produced in quantities of 500 per year. A few years from now, a much smarter Baxter produced in quantities of 10,000 might cost less than $5,000. At that price, even the lowest-paid workers in the least developed countries might not be able to compete.

#### Automation will not create enough new jobs to compensate for the ones it replaces – computer to computer business transactions prove.

**Davidow and Malone, 2014 – High technology industry executive and columnist for ABC News** [Bill, Michael, What Happens to Society When Robots Replace Workers?”, Harvard Business Review. https://hbr.org/2014/12/what-happens-to-society-when-robots-replace-workers. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

To be sure, technological progress has always displaced workers. But it also has created new opportunities for human employment, at an even a faster rate. This time, things may be very different – especially as the Internet of Things takes the human factor out of so many transactions and decisions. The “Second Economy” (the term used by economist Brian Arthur to describe the portion of the economy where computers transact business only with other computers) is upon us. It is, quite simply, the virtual economy, and one of its main byproducts is the replacement of workers with intelligent machines powered by sophisticated code. This booming Second Economy is brimming with optimistic entrepreneurs, and already spawning a new generation of billionaires. In fact, the booming Second Economy will probably drive much of the economic growth in the coming decades.∂ And here is the even more sobering news: Arthur speculates that in a little more than ten years, 2025, this Second Economy may be as large as the original “first” economy was in 1995 – about $7.6 trillion. If the Second Economy does achieve that rate of growth, it will be replacing the work of approximately 100 million workers. To put that number in perspective, the current total employed civilian labor force today is 146 million. A sizeable fraction of those replaced jobs will be made up by new ones in the Second Economy. But not all of them. Left behind may be as many as 40 million citizens of no economic value in the U.S alone. The dislocations will be profound.

#### Automation will not create enough jobs to compensate for the ones it replaces

**Darrow, 2017 – Senior writer at *Fortune*** [Barb, Senior writer at *Fortune* with a focus on technology, Automation, Robots, and Job Losses Could Make Universal Income a Reality, *Fortune*, May 24, 2017, http://fortune.com/2017/05/24/automation-job-loss-universal-income/. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

The notion that robots or automation will take on the jobs of millions of people is a nagging source of anxiety for many people. As has been reported, workers ranging from truck drivers—of which there are an estimated 1.8 million in the U.S.— to airline pilots to paralegals to surgeons are already being affected by automation.∂ Optimists say that while robotics and automation will subsume lower-end jobs, people will migrate to higher-level, more skilled work. Several speakers mentioned the need for people with expertise in their jobs to train robots and to program artificial intelligence tools. But is that really a long-term solution?∂ Ryan Gariepy, co-founder of OTTO Motors a specialist in automated driving, doesn't think so. (This company, based in Kitchener, Ontario, is not the same as OTTO, the self-driving car specialist purchased by Uber.)∂ "People who move materials around may become robot maintainers or fleet managers, but I don't think we'll see net new job creation," Gariepy said. His view is that fewer workers will be needed to keep the world moving, and thus, there will be a real need for a boost from social programs.∂ "Sure, some people who move materials around will become robot maintainers or fleet managers, but I don't think we'll see net new job creation," Gariepy said." Technology, in his view, will make more jobs obsolete faster and faster as time goes by.∂ "Truck drivers cannot afford to go back to school. It's reasonable to assume that 90% of those jobs will disappear within a generation," Gariepy said.That could mean 1.6 million truck drivers may need universal basic income in relatively short order.

### Econ Impact – Decline -> Nuke War

*[Ed Note: Harris is a classic, but you would probably want a newer, Trump-ier impact card, and given the state of political reporting, that shouldn’t be hard to find]*

**An economic decline triggers nuclear war**

**Harris 2009**  - **counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC)** (Mathew, PhD European History at Cambridge,and Jennifer, Burrows member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” <http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f_0016178_13952.pdf>, AM) [Premier]

Increased Potential for Global Conflict Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks\_and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises. 36 Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.

### Poverty Impact – Numbers

#### Poverty is a form of structural oppression and the biggest impact

**Gilligan 96** professor of Psychiatry at the Harvard Medical School [James, , Director of the Center for the Study of Violence, and a member of the Academic Advisory Council of the National Campaign Against Youth Violence, Violence: Our Deadly Epidemic and its Causes, p 191-196] [Premier]

The deadliest form of violence is poverty. You cannot work for one day with the violent people who fill our prisons and mental hospitals for the criminally insane without being forcible and constantly reminded of the extreme poverty and discrimination that characterizes their lives. Hearing about their lives, and about their families and friends, you are forced to recognize the truth in Gandhi’s observation that the deadliest form of violence is poverty. Not a day goes by without realizing that trying to understand them and their violent behavior in purely individual terms is impossible and wrong-headed. Any theory of violence, especially a psychological theory, that evolves from the experience of men in maximum security prisons and hospitals for the criminally insane must begin with the recognition that these institutions are only microcosms. They are not where the major violence in our society takes place, and the perpetrators who fill them are far from being the main causes of most violent deaths. Any approach to a theory of violence needs to begin with a look at the structural violence in this country. Focusing merely on those relatively few men who commit what we define as murder could distract us from examining and learning from those structural causes of violent death that are far more significant from a numerical or public health, or human, standpoint. By “structural violence” I mean the increased rates of death, and disability suffered by those who occupy the bottom rungs of society, as contrasted with the relatively lower death rates experienced by those who are above them. Those excess deaths (or at least a demonstrably large proportion of them) are a function of class structure; and that structure is itself a product of society’s collective human choices, concerning how to distribute the collective wealth of the society. These are not acts of God. I am contrasting “structural” with “behavioral violence,” by which I mean the non-natural deaths and injuries that are caused by specific behavioral actions of individuals against individuals, such as the deaths we attribute to homicide, suicide, soldiers in warfare, capital punishment, and so on. Structural violence differs from behavioral violence in at least three major respects. \*The lethal effects of structural violence operate continuously, rather than sporadically, whereas murders, suicides, executions, wars, and other forms of behavioral violence occur one at a time. \*Structural violence operates more or less independently of individual acts; independent of individuals and groups (politicians, political parties, voters) whose decisions may nevertheless have lethal consequences for others. \*Structural violence is normally invisible, because it may appear to have had other (natural or violent) causes. The finding that structural violence causes far more deaths than behavioral violence does is not limited to this country. Kohler and Alcock attempted to arrive at the number of excess deaths caused by socioeconomic inequities on a worldwide basis. Sweden was their model of the nation that had come closes to eliminating structural violence. It had the least inequity in income and living standards, and the lowest discrepancies in death rates and life expectancy; and the highest overall life expectancy in the world. When they compared the life expectancies of those living in the other socioeconomic systems against Sweden, they found that 18 million deaths a year could be attributed to the “structural violence” to which the citizens of all the other nations were being subjected. During the past decade, the discrepancies between the rich and poor nations have increased dramatically and alarmingly. The 14 to 18 million deaths a year caused by structural violence compare with about 100,000 deaths per year from armed conflict. Comparing this frequency of deaths from structural violence to the frequency of those caused by major military and political violence, such as World War II (an estimated 49 million military and civilian deaths, including those by genocide—or about eight million per year, 1939-1945), the Indonesian massacre of 1965-66 (perhaps 575,000) deaths), the Vietnam war (possibly two million, 1954-1973), and even a hypothetical nuclear exchange between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. (232 million), it was clear that even war cannot begin to compare with structural violence, which continues year after year. In other words, every fifteen years, on the average, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period. This is, in effect, the equivalent of an ongoing, unending, in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war, or genocide, perpetrated on the weak and poor every year of every decade, throughout the world. Structural violence is also the main cause of behavioral violence on a socially and epidemiologically significant scale (from homicide and suicide to war and genocide). The question as to which of the two forms of violence—structural or behavioral—is more important, dangerous, or lethal is moot, for they are inextricably related to each other, as cause to effect.

### Poverty Impact – War

#### Minimizing structural violence is essential to preventing conflict – focusing only on international conflicts ignores the root cause of violence

**Barash 2000** - **Professor of Psychology, University of Washington** (David P. “Approaches to Peace: A Reader in Peace Studies”, 2000, http://www.questia.com/read/111756263?title=Approaches%20to%20Peace%3a%20%20A%20Reader%20in%20Peace%20Studies, AD: 7/9/9) [Premier]

The pursuit of positive peace nonetheless leads to certain agreed principles, one of which is a minimization of violence, not only the overt violence of war, but also what has been called “structural violence,” a condition that is typically built into many social and cultural institutions. A slave-holding society may be at “peace” in that it is not literally at war, but it is also rife with structural violence. Structural violence has the effects of denying people important rights such as economic opportunity, social and political equality, a sense of fulfillment and self-worth, and access to a healthy natural environment. When people starve to death, or even go hungry, a kind of violence is taking place. Similarly, when human beings suffer from diseases that are preventable, when they are denied a decent education, housing, an opportunity to play, to grow, to work, to raise a family, to express themselves freely, to organize peacefully, or to participate in their own governance, a kind of violence is occurring, even if bullets or clubs are not being used. Society visits violence on human rights and dignity when it forcibly stunts the optimum development of each human being, whether because of race, religion, sex, sexual preference, age, ideology, and so on. In short, structural violence is another way of identifying oppression, and positive peace would be a situation in which structural violence and oppression are minimized. In addition, social injustice is important not only in its contribution to structural violence, but also as a major contributor to war, often in unexpected ways. For many citizens of the United States and Europe, as well as privileged people worldwide, current lifestyles are fundamentally acceptable. Hence, peace for them has come to mean the continuation of things as they are, with the additional hope that overt violence will be prevented. For others – perhaps the majority of our planet – change of one sort or another is desired. And for a small minority, peace is something to fight for! A Central American peasant was quoted in the New York Times as saying “I am for peace, but not peace with hunger.” There is a long tradition suggesting that injustice is a primary cause of war. The French philosopher Denis Diderot, for example, was convinced that a world of justice and plenty would mean a world free of tyranny and war. Hence, in his 18th-century treatise, the *Encyclopedia,* Diderot sought to establish peace by disseminating all the world’s technical information, from bee-keeping to iron forging. And, of course, similar efforts continue today, although few advocates of economic and social development claim that the problem of violence can be solved simply by spreading knowledge or even by keeping everyone’s belly full.

### Impact – Unemployment

#### Unemployment will cause mass poverty – only a UBI can give the poor enough money to participate in society – pilot programs prove

Siegel 2017 - President of Rain Mountain LLC an independent product development group [RP, Feb 14th, 2017 Could Donald Trump Deliver a Universal Basic Income? <http://www.triplepundit.com/2017/02/trump-universal-basic-income/> Acc 6/29/17 [Premier]

While conservatives seem to be more concerned about the rich feeling put upon, liberal supporters tend to focus more on the benefits to the poor. UBI can help reduce inequality and provide a safety net for all Americans, they argue. Plus, being a fixed amount, it would proportionately help the poorest among us the most. Another advantage, proponents say, is that since a UBI could mean that no one is starving, our leaders might be less willing to sacrifice everything under the sun in the name of jobs. It would also fit perfectly with today’s growing gig economy. How would a universal basic income work? Writing in the Huffington Post, UBI advocate Scott Santens says the policy will make the market more efficient by allowing the poor to vote with their dollars, something they could not do before. The stipend would initially be small: He estimates around $1,000 per adult, per month, which would at least be enough to avoid starvation. Santens cites a UBI pilot study conducted in Namibia in the wake of the financial crisis. The results after one year were quite remarkable. Child malnutrition dropped from 42 percent to 10 percent. School attendance increased while crime dropped by over 36 percent. Poverty declined from 97 percent to 43 percent. Even unemployment dropped.

### Solvency – Consumer Demand

#### A UBI is key to the economy – it is necessary to maintain consumer demand which is the key internal link to the economy

**Streithorst, 2015 – Evonomics Journalist** [Tom, “How Basic Income Solves Capitalism’s Fundamental Problem”, *Evonomics*, December 20, 2015, http://evonomics.com/how-universal-basic-income-solves/. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

Over the past 80 years, we have solved the problem of demand in three very different ways. The first is war. In 1938, US unemployment was almost 20%. In 1944 it was barely 1%. Everybody knows World War II ended the Great Depression: but it is worth remembering that it wasn’t the slaughter of civilians or the destructions of cities that reinvigorated the global economy, but rather the massive fiscal stimulus of government borrowing. Had we borrowed and spent as much on building schools, homes and roads as we did on defeating the Axis powers, the economic effect would have been even greater. The advantage of military Keynesianism is political: conservatives who loathe government spending are able to overcome their distaste when it comes to war. The second, during the post war Golden Age, was rising salaries. Between 1950 and 1970, the average American worker saw his real wages double: since then, they have barely gone up at all. Back then, productivity improvements translated almost immediately into wage gains. As workers’ wages went up, so did consumer spending. Productivity increases meant each worker was able to make more stuff. Wage increases meant he was able to afford to buy it. Advertising transformed luxuries into necessities. Productivity gains combined with wage hikes gave the Golden Age the greatest GDP growth the world has ever seen. In our most recent era, from 1982 until the financial crisis, the engine of economic expansion was ever increasing levels of private debt. After Reagan and Thatcher, median wages stopped going up, even as productivity maintained its inexorable rise. With wages stagnant, only by taking on more debt were consumers able to keep spending enough to buy all they produced. As long as banks were happy to lend, the economy managed to grow (albeit much more slowly than during the Golden Age) and the party could go on. But after the financial crisis, both household willingness to incur more debt and bank willingness to lend contracted, leaving us with the stagnant economy we are trapped in today. These three old methods of stimulating demand have passed their sell by dates. Global war would reinvigorate the economy, but at an unbearable cost. Rising wages, unfortunately, are unlikely, with more and more of us replaceable by robots, software or much cheaper foreign workers. And higher levels of debt not only increase inequality, they also engender financial instability. What is to be done? Every year, technological progress allows us to make more goods and services with fewer inputs of labour and capital. As consumers, this is wonderful. We can buy better and cheaper goods than ever before. As workers, however, productivity increases threaten our jobs. As we need fewer workers to make the same amount of stuff, more of us become redundant. And it is likely to get worse. The rise of the robots may eliminate 47% of existing jobs within the next two decades. Unfortunately, even though a robot can make an iPhone, it cannot buy one. If we are hurtling towards a post scarcity future, only a Basic Income Guarantee can ensure sufficient demand to keep the global economy ticking over. It is not just the poor that profit. The rich get exactly the same payment, in the form of a tax cut. Corporations also win. With more money in consumers’ pockets, sales increase, raising profits. And since firms no longer need provide a living wage, labour costs could go down, which would give employers reason to hire. Meanwhile, workers, with a guaranteed income, no matter what, will have the freedom to tell an unreasonable boss to “take this job and shove it.” These benefits suggest that a Basic Income Guarantee could command considerable support from diverse sectors. But these are all merely side benefits of the BIG. If technological progress continues to eliminate jobs, the Basic Income Guarantee may well be only way we will be able to maintain demand in a post-work future. By giving every citizen a monthly cheque, a Basic Income Guarantee will be as fiscally stimulative as World War II without requiring the murder of millions. The Basic Income Guarantee is economically sensible and politically practical. What then stands in its way?

#### A UBI helps the economy – income stimulates consumer demand in the economy, which counters economic downturns

**Carter, 2014 – Bay Area Legal Aid** [Timothy, The One Minute Case for a Basic Income, Montreal, 2014, <http://basicincome.org/bien/pdf/montreal2014/BIEN2014_Carter.pdf>, 6/28/17] JY [Premier]

The one minute Keynesian case for a basic income: Keynesian economics works when implemented correctly. But properly implementing Keynesian economics is politically very difficult. It requires politicians who are willing to spend a lot of money on stimulus when the government appears broke, and then turn around and become deficit hawks when the government is rolling in cash and everyone wants a piece of the pie. A basic income funded primarily from an income tax would become a massive institutionalized entitlement expected by the population whose cost would automatically increase and decrease in direct opposition to the economy. As unemployment rises, the number of net receivers goes up, and as unemployment falls, so will the number of net receivers. Keynes once famously said that the government should pay people to dig holes and fill them back up again. But why waste people's time? Anyone who sits on the couch and watches TV while living off of a basic income will contribute as much to society as the hole diggers. And anyone who does anything more productive will create a net good for society.

#### A consistent flow of consumer spending is necessary for economic stability

**Henry 14- Independent Researcher** [Malcom, Independent private researcher, Exact date of publication unknown, “How to Fund a Universal Basic Income”, Centre for Welfare Reform, Accessed on 6/27/17, http://www.centreforwelfarereform.org/library/by-date/how-to-fund-a-universal-basic-income.html] JC [Premier]

The things that we need for our survival – food, shelter, fuel – are wealth. The things that make us feel good – family, community, entertainment – are wealth. The things that help us to get what we need and what we enjoy – machinery, infrastructure, education – are wealth. Money is merely the tool that we use to facilitate the production and transfer of wealth. If we can accept this concept then funding a full UBI becomes not only possible, but economically desirable. So let’s forget about the idea of money sitting in a pile in the bank and think of it purely as cashflow. Every individual and every business in the land needs a reliable flow of money through their hands every month. Money flows from customers to businesses as we buy the things we need, and between businesses as they buy goods and services from each other. Some of the money flows back to customers in the form of wages and dividends. There are also flows of money from businesses and individuals to government in the form of taxes and government borrowing, and flows from government to individuals and businesses in the form of salaries, welfare payments, interest on government debt, and all the other government spending that goes on. All of these flows of money represent activity in the productive economy – activity that provides us with everything that we need for our security and comfort – the only bit of the economy that really matters. As long as money is available and mobile the productive economy thrives. If money becomes scarce and stagnant (e.g. if it’s being hoarded) the productive economy suffers. So, if we want to keep the productive economy productive, we have to find ways to keep money flowing through it. The pump that drives the economy is customer demand, but customers can only buy if they have money to spend, so the first thing we have to do is make sure there is a regular, reliable distribution of money to all the customers in the economy (i.e. everyone).

### Solvency – Automation/Employment

#### A UBI would solve unemployment from automation

Hines, 2016, writer for Inverse (Nickolaus Hines 7-5-2016 "Universal Basic Income Will Save People From Automation," Inverse, https://www.inverse.com/article/17895-universal-basic-income-will-solve-automation BS

Automation is going to make universal basic income a necessity sooner rather than later, a White House panel discussed today.¶ Technology entrepreneur and Zipcar founder Robin Chase and author Martin Ford (Rise of the Robots spoke today during a Facebook Live discussion with White House Chief of Staff Denis McDonough.¶ “We need to start thinking about universal basic income,” Chase said, referring to the concept of a base-level of income each person would get just for being alive. “If people had that platform, that basic minimum, we could be tapping this much larger number of people to do things that can’t be automated,” like relational and social problems on the community level.¶ The roundtable discussion, called “Automation: How Robots Will Change the Ways We Work and Live,” focused on the idea that technology will start to kill off huge numbers of routine jobs in the near future — think five to 10 years, not 50, Chase said — thanks to deep learning. The idea isn’t new, or even solely something out of science fiction. Switzerland recently voted down a monthly base income, and the owners of Y Combinator are working on an Oakland minimum income pilot program. And while Ford stood by a statement that better technology leads to a better life, and people “can never have too much technology,” the tone of the conversation overall trended toward bleak.¶ “For the last 100 years we’ve been chasing productivity,” Chase said. “Suddenly, these productivity improvements come without labor. So it’s not clear at all these productivity gains will result in the everyday person having a better life. If they don’t have a job, they don’t have a better life.”¶ Part of the reasoning behind the basic income is that technology doesn’t make everyone wealthy at the same pace. San Francisco and Silicon Valley is a prime example of how technology makes the leading edge very rich, very fast, while the rest of the population stagnates.¶ “If you look at the period after World War II, we had advancing technology and the benefits were widely distributed,” Ford said. “But that’s not happening anymore. The fruits of progress are being captured by a small number of people at the top.”¶ “If you look at these trends,” he continued, “there’s every indication that it’s going to continue.”¶ Enter the universal basic income. People will be able to focus on creative skills and passions that computers can’t do (ignore Google’s algorithms that can make art if people don’t have to worry about working dead-end jobs just to survive, Chase argues.¶ Automation is a job-killer, that’s no secret. A basic income could keep automation from destroying the economy and the entire way of human life. If, Chase says, climate doesn’t do it first.

#### A UBI increases employment – it increases consumer demand which fuels job growth and it enables people to work at jobs they like, which improves motivation

Siegel 2017 - President of Rain Mountain LLC an independent product development group [RP, Feb 14th, 2017 Could Donald Trump Deliver a Universal Basic Income? <http://www.triplepundit.com/2017/02/trump-universal-basic-income/> Acc 6/29/17 ] [Premier]

Although some conservatives seem to expect that UBI grants would lead to fewer people working, the converse turned out to be true in Namibia. Perhaps the increased amount of money in circulation helped the business climate. It turns out there’s another reason. Santens cleverly points out that when people choose to work, rather than having to work, they are far more motivated and may well end up more successful. Much has been written about the difference between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, intrinsic being far more powerful. He makes another great point here: “In the 21st century, as we continue quickly automating away half our jobs in the next 20 years   — jobs less cognitively-complex and more physically-laborious   — we need to enable ourselves to freely pursue our more creative and complex ventures. “Some of the best work happening right now, is the stuff being done in our free time  —  that is unpaid  —  like Wikipedia and our many other open-source community creations, not to mention all the care work performed for our young and elderly. “Basic income is a means of recognizing this unpaid work as having great societal value, and further enabling it.”

#### A UBI stimulates the economy without inflation – it increases labor market flexibility, which avoids wage pressure

**Pressman, 2005 – Prof of economics at Monmouth Univ** [Steven, with Michael Lewis and Karl Widerquist The Basic Income Guarantee and Social Economics. This article appeared in Review of Social Economy on December 2005. http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/29770341.pdf?refreqid=search%3A9330359b12bad0e394957e75c30d95e6] JN [Premier]

Conservative Case for a Basic Income The conservative case for a Basic Income centers on two economic propositions: (1) unemployment is caused by imperfections in the labor market; and (2) standard policies (Keynesian) designed to reduce poverty and promote full employment in- stead cause inflation. The best example of the first proposition is James Meade's work [1989]. His argument is as follows. Under the current system, wages are downwardly rigid during recessions. This downward rigidity prevents the labor market from reaching the market clearing price, thus causing mass unemployment. The sources of this rigidity are the rational choices of those who retain their jobs during the economic downturn and the lack of any mechanism for those without jobs to influence the labor market. By partially separating income from work, the incentive of workers to fight against wage reductions is considerably reduced, thus making labor markets more flexible.5 This allows wages, and hence labor costs, to adjust more readily to changing economic conditions. This increased efficiency in the labor market, particularly the responsiveness of wages to conditions of excess labor supply, would lead to full employment and greater economic growth. The second reason conservatives support Basic Income policies stems from Mil- ton Friedman's defense of a negative income tax. Friedman proposed a negative in- come tax as an alternative to Keynesian demand management policies. He argued that Keynesian policies cause inflation and large government bureaucracies, while a Basic Income policy would redistribute income directly to the poor without causing inflation or encouraging big government.6

#### A basic income will be necessary to support people who lose jobs to automation – Silicon Valley proves

**Kim, 2016 – Senior editor at KQED Public Radio** [Queena, Senior editor of Silicon Valley Bureau at KQED Public Radio, “As Our Jobs Are Automated, Some Say We’ll Need a Guaranteed Basic Income”, *NPR*, September 24, 2016, http://www.npr.org/2016/09/24/495186758/as-our-jobs-are-automated-some-say-well-need-a-guaranteed-basic-income. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

But advancements in artificial intelligence are intensifying this debate. In Silicon Valley, there are lots of experiments in automation. There's the robot at Lowe's home improvement store in Sunnyvale, Calif., that checks inventory. There's the "robot butler" working at a hotel in Cupertino. And then there's Uber, which is experimenting with driverless taxis and trucks.∂ "And that would affect 3.5 million truck drivers, another 5 million people who support the truck-driving industry," Chellam says. "And that's just one example of automation."∂ Chellam says software is eating white-collar jobs, too, and everyone from bookkeepers to doctors and lawyers will be affected.∂ Chellam criticizes politicians for not talking about this automated future. At best, he says, they talk about "retraining," which doesn't address the scope of the problem.∂ "Take the truck driver example," he says. "What are you going to retrain 3.5 million people to do in a short enough period of time?"∂ Chellam believes as technology replaces more workers, the traditional 40-hour-a-week job could become a thing of the past. If that happens, how will families get health insurance or save for retirement?∂ Some experts say the only answer is a government-guaranteed paycheck that would allow people to buy food and housing. That would not only help the individuals but would help keep economic wheels spinning and generate tax revenues.

#### UBI actually increases employment and productivity- Iran proves.

**Burke 17 – PhD from Saint Louis University** [Jason Burke, Study of Iran’s Basic Income shows it did not harm employment, June 7, 2017, http://basicincome.org/news/author/jason-burke-murphy/, June 27, 2017] CL [Premier]

An economic study of Iran’s Basic Income, which was implemented to make it easier to phase out expensive (and ecologically destructive) fuel subsidies, shows that there have been no negative effects on employment. In the first section, I will summarize the study. In the middle, there is a list of past contributions made by Basic Income News authors. In the final section, I will make a few observations. Iran’s Fuel Subsidy Reform and Employment The unconditional grant program was launched in 2011. The monthly grant amounted to 29% of median household income, or about $1.50 extra per head of household, per day. Around 90% of Iranians are funded through this program. (Wikipedia has a good summaryof the program at the time of this writing. It does not include the end of the universal cash grant program.) Most people in Iran and in the government came to believe that the grant discourages employment. One often hears anecdotes and assertions in national and local Iranian press. The Iranian Parliament called for cuts in the program. (See Tehran Times, April 19, 2016.) After some wrangling, cash subsidies were finally ended in 2016, with funding reserved now for low-income citizens. Costs were cited. It is important to note half of the cuts in fuel subsidies went to business grants and other government expenses. (See Kate McFarland in Basic Income News, “Iran: Parliament Slashes Cash Subsidies to Citizens”). What is frustrating here is the fact that the program did not undermine work participation at all. This study shows that some people in their twenties reduced work hours, often to go to school or improve their schoolwork. But this only averaged out to a matter of months (and is likely to yield medium- and long-term benefits.) Many people increased work time a little, especially in the service sector. The authors think that these businesses used the income to find more work opportunities. Empirical evidence contradicts a lot of presuppositions about the impact of an unconditional cash grant. The study, “Cash Transfers and Labor Supply: Evidence From a Large-Scale Program in Iran“, is put out by the Economic Research Forum and was authored by the economists Djavad Salehi-Isfahani and Mohammad H. Mostafavi-Dehzooei. The World Economic Forum posted a summary of the Economic Research Forum study here. Past Articles on Iran’s Basic Income Basic Income News has repeatedly covered Iran’s Fuel Subsidy Program to make sure it is regarded as a basic income policy. Here is a list of additional articles on the subject: Djavad Salehi-Isfahani wrote an earlier piece for the ERF. Josh Martin writes about it at Basic Income News here. Mathieu Ferry writes about Jacques Berthiller’s piece in Basic Income News here. The Citizens’s Income Trust, based in Britain, wrote this opinion piece for Basic Income News here. Karl Widerquist wrote four articles early in the program’s history. “Iran: Basic Income Might Become Means Tested” and “Iran: Basic Income Gets International Attention.” “Iran: On the Verge of Introducing the World’s First National Basic Income” and “Iran Might Be Moving Toward a BIG” Hamid Tabatabai wrote an article that, very early on, points out that a country that had not been debating a basic income implemented substantial basic income grant. III. Observations These are conclusions reached by the author, Jason Burke Murphy, after reading the ERF study and the other articles on Iran’s program. I wanted to separate them because the first section of this article is meant to review an important study and past contributions by BI News authors. (1) There was no point at which this program was embraced as a way to promote real freedom or to roll back poverty. Fuel subsidies were just unleashing such strong side effects that something needed to be done. It is amazing to know that a program that raises average income by 29% could be launched in order to solve a problem other than “lots of people would be better off with more money”. Had this been debated as a basic income guarantee, maybe things would turned out better. (2) The idea that some people who can work might not work seems to bother people so much that the government ended a program that raises income for a majority of its people and for its least-well-off. The idea is so powerful that the fact that people are NOT refusing to work can’t seem to overcome the fact that many people MIGHT or COULD refuse to work. There is a lot of work to be done here. (3) Everyone should ask the question: What sort of percentage of people not formally working is even a problem? Most of them will do work for their families, after all. Many will gain expertise with the idea of applying it to future. Some will do work for their communities or as entrepreneurs. (4) The impact of this grant was likely affected by the fact that it was never been presented as permanent. It also is not large enough to sustain most people at a standard of living that Iranians find decent. This may not serve as the rock-solid proof that a sizable grant won’t affect employment. (5) In the US, an equivalent percentage of support would be around $16,000 a year. Can we assert that the Iranian experience shows that this amount would not trigger a mass refusal to work? Hard to say. Would a small-to-medium dip in job seekers even be a problem? Probably not. Lots of places in the US have average income below $16,000. Can we really say that they would be worse off with this grant just because some of them quit their jobs? (6) All countries should take a good look at their subsidies, especially ones that benefit the already wealthy. They should cut them and fund an unconditional dividend. We get rid of something bad and replace it with something good. We see how high the dividend would be and think about the next step. (7) As Basic Income advocates, we need to list Iran alongside Alaska and Macau as regions with a Basic Income. This is difficult because only Alaska has described its dividend as “permanent” and only there have recipients come to believe it is dependable. In the US, it is a little unusual to say “let’s do what Iran did” but that is our fate as a truth-telling movement.

### Solvency – Labor Productivity

#### A UBI benefits the middle class – it prevents job loss and allows people to pursue better jobs.

**Latour, 2017 – Basic Income Earth News contributor** [Hilde, “Karl Widerquist: Universal Basic Income Is a Good Deal for People Who Like Capitalism”, *BIEN*, June 20, 2017, http://basicincome.org/news/2017/06/karl-widerquist-universal-basic-income-good-deal-people-like-capitalism/. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

“Employers currently have an incentive to pay very low wages because income starts at zero. You can work fulltime a whole year and still live in poverty.” In almost every country, there are conditional systems for people who do not work. Widerquist argues that these systems supervise recipients and create high overhead costs. “If you can show you can’t work or can’t find a job, then you are eligible for something. If not, you will get nothing. This means people have a negative incentive to work and will accept jobs with very low wages to prevent them from falling into [extreme] poverty.”∂ UBI is going to help people that are afraid of becoming poor when they lose their job for whatever reason. According to Widerquist, “UBI can free people from that anxiety.” Widerquist explains UBI is not just for the poor, but also for the middle class. It gives people a choice to leave their dead-end jobs and do something else they really want to do. If you are struggling to meet your basic needs, you will be miserable. If you have UBI that meets your basic needs, you will not be in misery. We will get a situation where money no longer buys happiness. Freedom is the power to say no.

#### A UBI improves the economy – it increases worker morale, productivity and reduces job turnover.

**Dunn 2015 - Writer for medium.com**, [Scott C, A basic guaranteed income in the context of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs, September 9 2015, <https://medium.com/basic-income/a-basic-guaranteed-income-in-the-context-of-maslow-s-hierarchy-of-needs-c0835b6b8900>, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

Back then I wanted to be a therapist, but then I learned about the abysmal pay of social workers, so I got into IT instead. Anyway, the chart shows where we start with meeting our needs. Throughout our lives, we are primarily focused on meeting the bottom two, physiological and safety needs. As we create a stable environment for ourselves for physical and emotional safety, we start looking for love and fellowship. That builds esteem and as we build esteem, we begin to think of who we really want to be and how we can contribute to our culture and society. When people are faced with the choice to work a dead end job just to keep things going or starve, they will invariably find work, even if they don’t like the work. But that way of life is a life of constant fear and self-loathing. “Hey, the money’s good, but I really hate my job.” Without that guaranteed income, it’s hard to take a break, step back and get a job to love rather than hate. Knowing that BIG is there means being able to invest time and effort into new skills. It also means being able to choose a job to love rather than just taking what comes next. When we’re doing what we love, that builds esteem to the point where we are self-actualized. What, exactly does that mean? There are some slightly differing opinions about what self-actualization is, but it is described in the opening paragraph of the Wikipedia article on the subject as follows: “Expressing one’s creativity, quest for spiritual enlightenment, pursuit of knowledge, and the desire to give to society are examples of self-actualization.” (emphasis mine) Think for a moment about what this means. If our basic needs are met, then we are more able pursue work we enjoy. I once had a video production teacher who said, “Love what you do for work and never work a day in your life”. People who love what they do work to give, not to receive. Look at every great actor, songwriter or artist. All of them do it because there is a drive, a force, that compels them to do it. It’s just not that easy to make a living as an artist unless you’re one of the best. That’s why for many centuries, artistic works were commissioned by the wealthiest alive throughout history. Anyone who has ever seen the J. Paul Getty Museum will know what I’m talking about. A basic income guaranteed would create a culture where more people are doing jobs they love rather than have to do for survival. They’re thinking about the work, not the money. That leads to more productive people, happier people, lower turnover. That would also make employers more accountable, maybe even more polite, for fear of turnover. Turnover is expensive. The current capitalist system reduces life to a fight over a sandwich. An eye for an eye and everyone is blind. But Darwin said that the fittest shall survive, not the strongest. A country filled with men and women who are doing what they love will outperform another country filled with men and women who have been foreclosed of every opportunity for advancement (where we’ve been headed for 35 years). A basic income guaranteed means we can let go of the basics and work on self-actualization. We can work to give rather than work to receive. We can think BIG.

### Solvency – Stimulus

#### A UBI would improve the economy during a recession – it is the most efficient stimulus, it encourages job retraining and increases productivity

**Painter, 15 – Leader of the RSA’s Policy Development** [Anthony, Creative citizen, creative state: the principled and pragmatic case for a Universal Basic Income, RSA, December 2015, <https://www.thersa.org/globalassets/reports/rsa_basic_income_20151216.pdf>, 6/27/17] JY [Premier]

Finally, there is the economic case for a Basic Income. On the macro-economic front, it becomes a very efficient means of stimulating the economy at times of heightened demand stress, ie deep recession. A simple way to increase demand is to top up the Basic Income for a period of time. Rather than quantitative easing supporting financial institutions, central banks can increase the money supply by funding government bonds to finance an increased Basic Income. So-called ‘overt monetary finance’ (OMF), which this would be a form of, has been advocated by Adair Turner and others, albeit with some provisos on management of banking credit to avoid unsustainable credit multipliers.59 This policy could have been very useful in 2008-09 (and something akin to it was attempted in the Australian ‘cash splash’).60 On the micro-economic front, there are grounds to believe that Basic Income could increase productivity. This mechanism would work in a number of ways. Firstly, rather than workers being forced into the first job that comes along as some conditional systems do, Basic Income enables a little more time to search for the right job. As an evaluation of a highly conditional Department for Work and Pensions scheme showed, hard conditionality does little to increase medium term employment rates and only increases number of days in work marginally in a two year period.61 So the benefits are minimal yet the UK suffers from endemic skills mismatch and this impacts productivity. For example, 58 percent of graduates are in non-graduate level jobs.62 The Basic Income would not resolve this issue, as there are strong structural factors, but 58 Erik Christensen, “Feminist Arguments in Favour of Welfare and Basic Income in Denmark,” in Basic Income European Network (BIEN) (Geneva, 2002), www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/ses/download/docs/chris.pdf. 59 Turner, Between Debt and the Devil: Money, Credit, and Fixing Global Finance. 60 Stephen Grenville, “Helicopter Money,” VOX, CEPR’s Policy Portal, 2013, www.bostonfed.org/economic/conf/conf30/conf30a.pdf. 61 Jonathan Portes, “The ‘Help to Work’ Pilots: Success, Failure or Somewhere in between?, National Institute of Economic and Social Research, accessed December 4, 2015, www.niesr.ac.uk/blog/help-work-pilots-success-failureor-somewhere-between. 62 CIPD, “Over-Qualification and Skills Mismatch in the Graduate Labour Market,” August (2015), www.cipd.co.uk/binaries/over-qualification-andskills-mismatch-graduate-labour-market.pdf. Creative citizen, creative state 38 POWER TO CREATE could mitigate it somewhat by giving more secure breathing space to individuals. Secondly, if workers have the ability to withdraw their labour, it provides more of an incentive for employers of low pay, low quality jobs to improve those jobs either by increasing pay, providing better conditions or additional support such as for training. Thirdly, there is a possible motivation effect. Workers would be in a particular workplace because they want to be, not simply because they feel coerced to be. This is a healthier basis on which to develop intra-firm productivity. Finally, the Basic Income facilitates short-term withdrawal from the labour market to improve formal skills and qualifications. This could increase potential productivity. Basic Income is not an economic magic bullet but it is possible to see significant potential macro and micro economic benefits.

### Political Violence

**Poverty causes political violence - across the world, employed and wealthy are less likely to want a revolt**

**MacCulloch 2005 – Professor of Economics, Imperial College London** [Robert, April 2005, “Income Inequality and the Taste for Revolution,” The Journal of Law & Economics, [http://www.jstor.org/stable/426881](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/426881), accessed 6/28/17] JPS [Premier]

First, the correlations between revolutionary preferences and personal characteristics have a similar structure across the different regions of the world (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], Asia, Africa, and South America). Men are more likely, on average, to desire revolt than women in each of these regions. For example, in Africa, they have a probability of wanting a revolution that is 4.4 percentage points higher. In every region, people who have higher incomes, are older, and are married are less likely, on average, to want a revolt. With the exception of Africa, unemployed people are more likely to want one. These patterns are also present in every country across Europe.22

**Revolutionary support is directly correlated with income inequality.**

**MacCulloch 2005 – Professor of Economics, Imperial College London** [Robert, April 2005, “Income Inequality and the Taste for Revolution,” The Journal of Law & Economics, [http://www.jstor.org/stable/426881](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/426881), accessed 6/28/17] JPS [Premier]

I begin in Table 7 by estimating how each individual’s preference for revolt varies with income inequality, his or her income, and other personal characteristics using cross-sectional evidence from the World Values Survey.35 Column 1 reports that Income Inequality, as measured by the Gini coefficient, has a positive effect on revolutionary support, significant at the 8 percent level. A 1-standard-deviation increase in inequality, equal to a 10- percentage-point increase in the Gini coefficient (on a 0–1 scale), explains 17 percent of the standard deviation in the average level of revolutionary support across these nations (p.10 # .12/.07). An increase in inequality from the lowest level in the sample (.25 in Spain) to the highest level (.62 in South Africa) is predicted to add 4.3 percentage points to the level of revolutionary support (p.37 # .12). Over the period of the surveys, the proportion of people wanting a revolt averaged 4.5 percent in Spain and 14.3 percent in South Africa, which explains up to 44 percent of the difference between those two countries. With respect to the other variables, Personal Income is negatively associated with wanting revolution, at the 1 percent level of significance. If a person with the average level of real income in the sample were to be given $1,000, then the probability that he or she would want revolt is expected to decrease by 1.9 percentage points (p ).36 .031 #log (14,703/13,703)/.115 From the two coefficients on Income Inequality and Personal Income, I am able to calculate the extra amount of real income that would be needed to buy off a greater taste for revolt due to a higher level of inequality. A 1- percentage-point increase in the Gini coefficient requires a 3.7 percent increase in an individual’s income to keep his or her support for revolt constant (≈.01 # .115/.031). For the other personal characteristics, being unemployed and male both have positive significant effects, increasing the probability that the respondent wants a revolt by about 1.5 percentage points. Being married or widowed lowers the chances. Older people are less likely to want one: a 60-year-old has a probability of having a revolutionary taste that is 4 percentage points lower than that of a 20-year-old. There appear to be no effects arising from more education. Columns 2–4 estimate the same specifications but using three different dependent variables to compare how the identical set of explanatory variables used in column 1 are associated with beliefs that the environment needs protection, that the country is being run for the benefit of the few, and that corruption is prevalent (see also Table 5). The idea is to see if the same sorts of characteristics that predict people’s revolutionary tastes also predict these other attitudes. If so, wanting revolt may be symptomatic of being a type of person who suffers from a general disaffection with society, which could mean that a self-reported taste for revolt is proxying for one of these other attitudes. Column 2 shows that wanting more protection for the environment (instead of being pro-growth even if it causes environmental problems) is not significantly correlated with a nation’s level of inequality but that people with higher incomes are more likely to hold this view. So the negative effects of a bad environment appear to be felt more by the rich than the poor. The unemployed also tend to be less concerned about environmental problems. Consequently, those people who are worried about having a bad environment tend not to be the same ones wanting a revolution, at least in terms of income and job status. In column 3, a belief that the country has been captured by the few is not significantly related to either inequality in the country or with personal income. Column 4 reports that believing that corruption is prevalent has no relationship with inequality and is negatively correlated with income.37 Those who are self-employed and retired perceive corruption to be more prevalent than do the employed, and men are less likely to think that it is widespread than women. By contrast, being male has the opposite effect on wanting a revolt (men are more likely to want one, at the 1 percent level), and neither self-employment nor retirement appear to have an effect (see column 1). B. Evidence from the Eurobarometer Survey Series Table 8 presents the results using the Eurobarometer Survey Series. Column 1 is estimated over the cross section. Inequality again has a positive effect on revolutionary support, at the 8 percent level. A 1-standard-deviation increase in the Gini coefficient (equal to .042) explains 20 percent of 1 standard deviation of the proportion of people wanting revolt, measured across all countries and years (p.042 # .125/.026). The effect of personal characteristics remains similar to the previous results using the World Values Survey (that is, the unemployed and men are more likely to want a revolt, whereas those who are married or widowed and those who are older are less likely). Personal Income has a negative and significant effect on revolutionary support, at the 1 percent level. If a person with the average level of real income in the sample were to be given $1,000, then the probability that he or she would want a revolt is expected to decrease by 2.4 percentage points. Using the coefficients on Income Inequality and Personal Income to calculate a marginal rate of substitution, a 1-percentage-point increase in the Gini coefficient would require a 3.3 percent increase in an individual’s income to keep his or her support for revolt constant (p.01 # .125/.038).

**Increasing income inequality increase revolutionary desire, prefer our evidence since it’s a meta-analysis of two different surveys totaling more than 100,000 people**

**MacCulloch 2005 – Professor of Economics, Imperial College London** [Robert, April 2005, “Income Inequality and the Taste for Revolution,” The Journal of Law & Economics, [http://www.jstor.org/stable/426881](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/426881), accessed 6/28/17] JPS [Premier]

An increase in income inequality is found to have a positive impact on the probability that an individual has a revolutionary preference. A 1-standarddeviation change of the Gini coefficient explains up to 38 percent of the standard deviation in the proportion of people having a preference for revolt. Since a higher level of real income is found to have a significant negative effect on revolutionary tastes, the results imply that either “going for growth” or implementing policies that reduce inequality can help buy nations out of revolt.

**Meta-analysis of best available studies indicate income inequality is associated with revolt.**

**MacCulloch 2005 – Professor of Economics, Imperial College London** [Robert, April 2005, “Income Inequality and the Taste for Revolution,” The Journal of Law & Economics, [http://www.jstor.org/stable/426881](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/426881), accessed 6/28/17] JPS [Premier]

This paper’s main objective is to identify the effect of income inequality on the taste for revolution. It uses direct evidence obtained from data from surveys in which people were asked if they want existing structures to be overturned by revolutionary action.3 I find that, controlling for the characteristics of people and countries, greater income inequality has marked and statistically robust effects on increasing the chance that an individual will support revolt. The paper also tests for the importance of noneconomic characteristics to check if, for example, societies with a surfeit of young males are more prone to support revolt.4

**Preferences for revolt are directly tied to protests**

**MacCulloch 2005 – Professor of Economics, Imperial College London** [Robert, April 2005, “Income Inequality and the Taste for Revolution,” The Journal of Law & Economics, [http://www.jstor.org/stable/426881](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/426881), accessed 6/28/17] JPS [Premier]

Second, surveyed preferences for revolt are significantly correlated with observable measures of conflict. The World Values Survey contains information on the rebellious actions that 130,278 individuals have undertaken, which include joining in boycotts, attending lawful demonstrations, joining unofficial strikes, occupying buildings or factories, and signing petitions. When these actions are represented by dummy variables, the Pearson correlation coefficients between them and an individual’s preference for revolt are reported in Table 4. All correlations are significant at the 1 percent level. One explanation as to why the mapping from preferences to these actions is far less than one to one is that the free-rider problem has meant that despite many people wanting a radical change of government, costly participation is not individually rational (particularly when the benefits from a revolt may not be excludable). The correlation coefficients between the measures of actual protest themselves are substantially higher. For example, the correlation between Unofficial Strikes and Occupied Building/Factory is .32. Each of these actions can also be regressed on the corresponding individual’s preference for revolt (controlling for country and year fixed effects). A declared preference for revolt is found to be a significant positive factor in determining the subversive actions of individuals at the 1 percent level across all measures of actual protest. People wanting a revolt have a 9-percentage-point higher probability of joining in boycotts, 12-percentage-point higher probability of demonstrating, 7-percentage-point higher probability of joining unofficial strikes, and 4-percentage-point higher probability of occupying buildings.23

**Prefer this data – the methodology is solid**

**MacCulloch 2005 – Professor of Economics, Imperial College London** [Robert, April 2005, “Income Inequality and the Taste for Revolution,” The Journal of Law & Economics, [http://www.jstor.org/stable/426881](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/426881), accessed 6/28/17] JPS [Premier]

I explain an individual’s preference for revolt by the level of income inequality that exists in his or her country. Revolutionary support may increase with income inequality because it becomes a source of grievance associated with a sense of unfairness in society.27 Alternatively, high levels of inequality may lead to more people wanting a revolt for rational economic motives, as a greater proportion may expect to gain from a redistribution of income.28 Appendix C outlines a simple model that captures the latter effect. The probit regressions that I estimate are of the form Preference for Revoltict ct p a # Income Inequality b # Personal Characteristicsict c # Macro Controls Country Year , ct c t ict where Preference for Revoltict is a dummy that takes the value of one when individual i, in country c, and year t believes that “[t]he entire way our society is organised must be radically changed by revolutionary action.” The main explanatory variable of interest, Income Inequality, is measured by the Gini coefficient, which is taken from the World Bank data set.29 The data used satisfy three minimum standards of quality: they are based on household surveys, the population covered is representative of the entire country, and the measure of income (or expenditure) used is comprehensive, including income from self-employment, nonwage earnings, and nonmonetary income. It is normally considered the best available for cross-country comparison.30 I also check the robustness of our results using a second measure of inequality, the 90/10 ratio from the Luxembourg Income Study,31 which is based on after-tax household disposable income (using an equivalence scale equal to the square root of the number of persons in the household). The vector Personal Characteristicsict includes respondents’ income (measured by the logarithm of real income in 1995 $US), employment status, age, sex, education, marital status and number of children.32 I also report specifications that control for whether respondents declare themselves to be religious. World Values Survey data on the above variables are available across 34 countries and contain a total of 45,889 people. Since only five of these countries have been followed for two waves of the survey (Canada, Britain, Japan, Sweden, and the United States), I report results where the effect of inequality on revolutionary support is identified on the cross section. In contrast, for the Eurobarometer Survey Series, there exists a complete set of data for 10 nations annually between 1976 and 1990, with a total of 148,319 people, so I am also able to exploit within-country variation by including a set of fixed effects. Consequently, specifications using this survey also include dummy variables for each country (Countryc) and year (Yeart ). The vector Macro Controlsct refers to a set of country-level variables that include unemployment and inflation rates, government consumption expenditures (as a fraction of GDP), and the generosity of the unemployment benefit system. The latter is an index that measures the parameters of each country’s benefit program (expressed as a fraction of wages).33 Tables B1 and B2 show the summary statistics. The error term is , and robust standard errors are computed to correct ict for heteroskedasticity. I also correct for potential correlation of the error term across observations contained within each cross-sectional unit that can occur, in particular, on account of the different levels of aggregation of the leftand right-hand-side variables.34

**Revolutionary tendencies decrease with income and employment, prefer my card, its sample is massive – over 130,000 people surveyed.**

**MacCulloch 2005 – Professor of Economics, Imperial College London** [Robert, April 2005, “Income Inequality and the Taste for Revolution,” The Journal of Law & Economics, [http://www.jstor.org/stable/426881](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/426881), accessed 6/28/17] JPS [Premier]

Table 1 shows the proportions of people who desire revolt versus those who do not (that is, who desire either gradual reforms or valiant defense of the present society) across 61 nations surveyed as part of the World Values Survey. Of the 130,278 people who answered the question, 9.8 percent of respondents declare a preference for revolt in their country. Of the unemployed, 14.1 percent prefer revolt. A higher proportion of divorced respondents are in favor of revolt compared to married ones. Of male respondents, 11.3 percent desire revolt compared to 9.1 percent of females. There is a monotonically declining proportion of people who want revolt as the income quintiles get higher. In the bottom, second, third, fourth, and top quintiles, 10.8, 10.4, 10.2, 9.3, and 6.9 percent, respectively, of respondents want a revolt. The highest level of revolutionary support in any particular country in the world was equal to 44.9 percent in Czechoslovakia in 1990, coinciding with the velvet revolution at the end of 1989.

**Direct payments decrease revolutionary support.**

**MacCulloch 2005 – Professor of Economics, Imperial College London** [Robert, April 2005, “Income Inequality and the Taste for Revolution,” The Journal of Law & Economics, [http://www.jstor.org/stable/426881](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/426881), accessed 6/28/17] JPS [Premier]

I begin in Table 7 by estimating how each individual’s preference for revolt varies with income inequality, his or her income, and other personal characteristics using cross-sectional evidence from the World Values Survey.35 Column 1 reports that Income Inequality, as measured by the Gini coefficient, has a positive effect on revolutionary support, significant at the 8 percent level. A 1-standard-deviation increase in inequality, equal to a 10- percentage-point increase in the Gini coefficient (on a 0–1 scale), explains 17 percent of the standard deviation in the average level of revolutionary support across these nations (p.10 # .12/.07). An increase in inequality from the lowest level in the sample (.25 in Spain) to the highest level (.62 in South Africa) is predicted to add 4.3 percentage points to the level of revolutionary support (p.37 # .12). Over the period of the surveys, the proportion of people wanting a revolt averaged 4.5 percent in Spain and 14.3 percent in South Africa, which explains up to 44 percent of the difference between those two countries. With respect to the other variables, Personal Income is negatively associated with wanting revolution, at the 1 percent level of significance. If a person with the average level of real income in the sample were to be given $1,000, then the probability that he or she would want revolt is expected to decrease by 1.9 percentage points (p ).36 .031 #log (14,703/13,703)/.115 From the two coefficients on Income Inequality and Personal Income, I am able to calculate the extra amount of real income that would be needed to buy off a greater taste for revolt due to a higher level of inequality. A 1- percentage-point increase in the Gini coefficient requires a 3.7 percent increase in an individual’s income to keep his or her support for revolt constant (≈.01 # .115/.031). For the other personal characteristics, being unemployed and male both have positive significant effects, increasing the probability that the respondent wants a revolt by about 1.5 percentage points. Being married or widowed lowers the chances. Older people are less likely to want one: a 60-year-old has a probability of having a revolutionary taste that is 4 percentage points lower than that of a 20-year-old. There appear to be no effects arising from more education. Columns 2–4 estimate the same specifications but using three different dependent variables to compare how the identical set of explanatory variables used in column 1 are associated with beliefs that the environment needs protection, that the country is being run for the benefit of the few, and that corruption is prevalent (see also Table 5). The idea is to see if the same sorts of characteristics that predict people’s revolutionary tastes also predict these other attitudes. If so, wanting revolt may be symptomatic of being a type of person who suffers from a general disaffection with society, which could mean that a self-reported taste for revolt is proxying for one of these other attitudes. Column 2 shows that wanting more protection for the environment (instead of being pro-growth even if it causes environmental problems) is not significantly correlated with a nation’s level of inequality but that people with higher incomes are more likely to hold this view. So the negative effects of a bad environment appear to be felt more by the rich than the poor. The unemployed also tend to be less concerned about environmental problems. Consequently, those people who are worried about having a bad environment tend not to be the same ones wanting a revolution, at least in terms of income and job status. In column 3, a belief that the country has been captured by the few is not significantly related to either inequality in the country or with personal income. Column 4 reports that believing that corruption is prevalent has no relationship with inequality and is negatively correlated with income.37 Those who are self-employed and retired perceive corruption to be more prevalent than do the employed, and men are less likely to think that it is widespread than women. By contrast, being male has the opposite effect on wanting a revolt (men are more likely to want one, at the 1 percent level), and neither self-employment nor retirement appear to have an effect (see column 1). B. Evidence from the Eurobarometer Survey Series Table 8 presents the results using the Eurobarometer Survey Series. Column 1 is estimated over the cross section. Inequality again has a positive effect on revolutionary support, at the 8 percent level. A 1-standard-deviation increase in the Gini coefficient (equal to .042) explains 20 percent of 1 standard deviation of the proportion of people wanting revolt, measured across all countries and years (p.042 # .125/.026). The effect of personal characteristics remains similar to the previous results using the World Values Survey (that is, the unemployed and men are more likely to want a revolt, whereas those who are married or widowed and those who are older are less likely). Personal Income has a negative and significant effect on revolutionary support, at the 1 percent level. If a person with the average level of real income in the sample were to be given $1,000, then the probability that he or she would want a revolt is expected to decrease by 2.4 percentage points. Using the coefficients on Income Inequality and Personal Income to calculate a marginal rate of substitution, a 1-percentage-point increase in the Gini coefficient would require a 3.3 percent increase in an individual’s income to keep his or her support for revolt constant (p.01 # .125/.038).

**Revolutionary tendencies decrease with income and employment, prefer my card – it’s specific to America**

**MacCulloch 2005 – Professor of Economics, Imperial College London** [Robert, April 2005, “Income Inequality and the Taste for Revolution,” The Journal of Law & Economics, [http://www.jstor.org/stable/426881](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/426881), accessed 6/28/17] JPS [Premier]

Table 2 shows the proportions of Americans who desire revolt (a subsample of observations from Table 1). Of this group, 5.1 percent desire a revolution, rising to 11.1 percent for the unemployed. Again there is a monotonically declining proportion desiring revolt as income increases. In the bottom, middle, and top income quintiles, 6.1, 5.4, and 2.9 percent, respectively, of people want one.

## Poverty

### Poverty FW – Standpoint Epistemology

#### Moral perspectives are determined by one’s relationship to power and society. Any conception of morality ought to take into account the standpoints of those oppressed by social structures.

Jaggar, 2000 – prof of Philosophy at Colorado Boulder [“Ethics Naturalized: Feminism’s Contribution To Moral Epistemology”. Metaphilosophy Vol. 31, No. 5. ] [Premier]

The dominant ideal of moral rationality as transcending all empirical points of view stands in stark opposition to naturalized approaches that regard moral philosophy as a situated discourse. Because the traditional ideal refuses to acknowledge that individuals’ moral understandings are influenced by their varying social identities and positions, it denies the philosophical relevance of investigations into the ways in which the central concepts, ideals, and methods of the Western ethical tradition have been affected by the gender, ethnic, and economic status of its most prominent interpreters. Margaret Walker observes that, from “the” moral point of view, the fact that Western philosophical ethics has until just recently been almost entirely a product of some men’s – and almost no women’s – thinking is a matter of only historical, not philosophical, interest (Walker 1998). In contemporary moral epistemology, the ideal of point-of-viewlessness discourages exploring ways in which dominant conceptions of moral rationality and justification are shaped by the social identities of philosophers who find it natural to speak of “rationality wars” and “the gladiator theory of truth.” By discrediting such explorations, Walker notes, this ideal insulates itself from any critical examination of its own social origins or functions. It denies that any philosophical significance attaches to the fact that relatively few persons have ever been sanctioned to define moral knowledge and so conceals the fact that Western ethics has functioned as a practice of authority that has often rationalized masculine privilege.

*[Ed Note: See the “Consequentialism – Economy” header for the bigger poverty impacts]*

### Inherency – Automation

#### Automation will replace jobs - Technology is growing too fast – low wage workers cannot compete

**Davidow and Malone, 2014 – High technology industry executive and columnist for ABC News** [Bill, Michael, What Happens to Society When Robots Replace Workers?”, Harvard Business Review. https://hbr.org/2014/12/what-happens-to-society-when-robots-replace-workers. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

Estimates of general rates of technological progress are always imprecise, but it is fair to say that, in the past, progress came more slowly. Henry Adams, the historian, measured technological progress by the power generated from coal, and estimated that power output doubled every ten years between 1840 and 1900, a compounded rate of progress of about 7% per year. The reality was probably much less. For example, in 1848, the world record for rail speed reached 60 miles per hour. A century later, commercial aircraft could carry passengers at speeds approaching 600 miles per hour, a rate of progress of only about 2% per year. By contrast, progress today comes rapidly. Consider the numbers for information storage density in computer memory. Between 1960 and 2003, those densities increased by a factor of five million, at times progressing at a rate of 60% per year. At the same time, true to Moore’s Law, semiconductor technology has been progressing at a 40% rate for more than 50 years. These rates of progress are embedded in the creation of intelligent machines, from robots to automobiles to drones, that will soon dominate the global economy – and in the process drive down the value of human labor with astonishing speed.∂ This is why we will soon be looking at hordes of citizens of zero economic value. Figuring out how to deal with the impacts of this development will be the greatest challenge facing free market economies in this century.∂ If you doubt the march of worker-replacing technology, look at Foxconn, the world’s largest contract manufacturer. It employs more than one million workers in China. In 2011, the company installed 10,000 robots, called Foxbots. Today, the company is installing them at a rate of 30,000 per year. Each robot costs about $20,000 and is used to perform routine jobs such as spraying, welding, and assembly. On June 26, 2013, Terry Gou, Foxconn’s CEO, told his annual meeting that “We have over one million workers. In the future we will add one million robotic workers.” This means, of course, that the company will avoid hiring those next million human workers.∂ Just imagine what a Foxbot will soon be able to do if Moore’s Law holds steady and we continue to see performance leaps of 40% per year. Baxter, a $22,000 robot that just got a software upgrade, is being produced in quantities of 500 per year. A few years from now, a much smarter Baxter produced in quantities of 10,000 might cost less than $5,000. At that price, even the lowest-paid workers in the least developed countries might not be able to compete.

### Inherency – Poverty Increasing Now

**Poverty and income inequality are rising – our economy has failed to provide adequate wages**

**Pressman, 2005 – Prof of economics at Monmouth Univ** [Steven, with Michael Lewis and Karl Widerquist The Basic Income Guarantee and Social Economics. This article appeared in Review of Social Economy on December 2005. http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/29770341.pdf?refreqid=search%3A9330359b12bad0e394957e75c30d95e6] JN [Premier]

In the General Theory, John Maynard Keynes wrote: "The outstanding faults of the economic society in which we live are its failure to provide for full employment and its arbitrary and inequitable distribution of wealth and incomes" [Keynes 1936, 372]. The hope of the Keynesian era was that demand management, with a comple- mentary monetary policy, would generate full employment and with this greater lev- els of income equality. While there were initial successes with this policy mix, as average unemployment levels and income inequality fell from the 1950s through the 1960s, the experience of the 1970s-1990s period is hardly encouraging. Sixty years after Keynes wrote these words, there are close to 35 million unemployed in the OECD, and income inequality is rising in many developed nations [Atkinson, Rain- water, and Smeeding 1995]. The conventional solution to society's economic ills is to generate economic growth. The standard assumption is that a rising tide will lift all boats. Yet, there is considerable evidence indicating that economic growth does not necessarily reduce either inequality or unemployment. Inequality in the United States has risen steadily since 1980, increasing both during the two recessions and during the economic ex- pansions [Clark 1995 and forthcoming]. Moreover, not only have fewer jobs been created per percentage point increases in income growth, but the jobs created are in- creasingly ones that pay poorly. Furthermore, there is increasing evidence that the main measure economists use to gauge the economy's performance (GDP) is a very poor indicator of social well-being. A large portion of what has been called eco- nomic growth in the past 20 years has been due to factors that harm our society's welfare, with crime, the breakdown of the family and pollution being three promi- nent examples [Cobb, Halstead, and Rowe 1995].

### Solvency – Poverty

*[Ed Note: See some of the consequentialism – economy header for more solvency]*

**A UBI solves poverty – income raises them out of poverty and increases the bargaining power in the workplace**

**Pressman, 2005 – Prof of economics at Monmouth Univ** [Steven, with Michael Lewis and Karl Widerquist The Basic Income Guarantee and Social Economics. This article appeared in Review of Social Economy on December 2005. http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/29770341.pdf?refreqid=search%3A9330359b12bad0e394957e75c30d95e6] JN [Premier]

Liberal Case for a Basic Income The liberal case for a Basic Income policy stems from the fact it allows those in poverty more opportunities to raise themselves out of poverty, in large part because of the elimination of the poverty and employment traps. Furthermore, liberals see the universality of Basic Income policies as a means of preventing individuals from slipping through the social safety net. Additionally, a Basic Income would change the power relations in the labor market [Purdy 1988] by strengthening the bargaining power of workers. Liberals who argue for a Basic Income also note that it would empower women who are outside of the labor force as well as promote communitarian values and citizenship [Walter 1989] and equality [Baker 1987].

**A UBI solves poverty – it raises income, prevents the stigmatization of welfare, and ends the employment trap**

**Pressman, 2005 – Prof of economics at Monmouth Univ** [Steven, with Michael Lewis and Karl Widerquist The Basic Income Guarantee and Social Economics. This article appeared in Review of Social Economy on December 2005. http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/29770341.pdf?refreqid=search%3A9330359b12bad0e394957e75c30d95e6] JN [Premier]

It should be readily apparent that a basic income would have certain benefits over and above those that exist in the current social welfare system in the United States. First, it would provide universal coverage so that no individual would fall through the cracks (which are rather large in our system) of the "social safety net." Second, it would eliminate the "dual welfare state" and its unfair and arbitrary approach to providing social assistance [Peterson and Peterson 1994].3 Third, as long as the basic income is set at an adequate level, it would bring everyone up to the poverty level, thus eliminating most, if not all, of the worst poverty in the United States. Increasing the income of the working poor is another objective of a Basic In- come policy. A Basic Income plan guarantees low-income earners a minimum after- tax income. In this way, the policy provides income security to the working poor. Furthermore, a Basic Income plan eliminates, or at least greatly reduces, the "unemployment trap" and the "poverty trap" that are common features of many welfare systems. The unemployment trap occurs when relatively high unemployment bene- fits combined with high rates of income tax (or rates of lost benefits due to in- creased earned income) remove the incentive to accept a job because it results in a net loss in income. Poverty traps occur when net income actually falls as gross in- come rises, again due to high marginal tax and benefit loss rates. The objective of eliminating these traps is to stop penalizing welfare recipients who wish to increase their net earnings but are only able to find jobs whose wage package is worth less than the welfare package. A final objective of a Basic Income plan is to improve labor market flexibility.

#### A UBI would solve poverty – empirically proven in Alaska

**Latour, 2017 – Basic Income Earth News contributor** [Hilde, “Karl Widerquist: Universal Basic Income Is a Good Deal for People Who Like Capitalism”, *BIEN*, June 20, 2017, http://basicincome.org/news/2017/06/karl-widerquist-universal-basic-income-good-deal-people-like-capitalism/. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

“It is feasible; the only thing we need is the will to do it. It has not been attempted before on a large scale, but there is a first time for everything”.∂ On the topic of the “Alaska permanent fund dividend”, which started in 1982, Widerquist argues, “In Alaska they have a very small basic income of one thousand US dollars a year for every resident (man, woman, and child) and even that very small amount has made Alaska one of the most equal states with very low poverty rates. It has been going strong for 35 years now. It makes a huge difference when you realise that a single mother with four kids will get 5000 US dollars a year. In a good year even 10000 US dollars a year.”∂ UBI can be popular across the political spectrum once it is in place, because the benefits are diverse. “We are tired of inequality growing and poverty staying where it is. The middle class needs a pay raise. Nothing else has worked for the middle class. Let’s try UBI”.

#### A UBI cuts poverty in half – Native American studies prove.

Santens 2017- Founder of the BIG Patreon(Scott, March 29 2017, “Evidence Indicates That Universal Basic Income Improves Human Health”, Accessed on 6/29/17, https://futurism.com/evidence-indicates-that-universal-basic-income-improves-human-health/) [Premier]

In 1992, the Great Smoky Mountains Study of Youth began with the goal of studying the youth in North Carolina to determine the possible risk factors of developing emotional and behavioral disorders. Because Native Americans tend to be underrepresented in mental health research, researchers made the point of including 349 child members of the Eastern Band of the Cherokee Nation. About halfway into the ten-year study, something that is the dream of practically any researcher happened as a matter of pure serendipity. All tribal members began receiving a share of casino profits. By 2001 those dividends had grown to $6,000 per year. By 2006, they were $9,000 per year. The results were nothing short of incredible. The number of Cherokee living in poverty declined by 50%. Behavioral problems declined by 40%. Crime rates decreased. High school graduation rates increased. Grades improved. Home environments were transformed. Drug and alcohol use declined. Additionally, the lower the age the children were freed of poverty, the greater the effects as they grew up, to the point the youngest ended up being a third less likely to develop substance abuse or psychiatric problems as teens.Randall Akee, an economist, later even calculated that the savings generated through all the societal improvements actually exceeded the amounts of the dividends themselves.

**A UBI solves poverty better than our current welfare system – existing programs are too expensive and bureaucratic and stigmatize the poor.**

**Zwolinski 2014 – Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego** [Matt, The Pragmatic Libertarian Case for a Basic Income Guarantee. the Cato Institute on August 4, 2014. https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/04/matt-zwolinski/pragmatic-libertarian-case-basic-income-guarantee] JN [Premier]

From the perspective of anyone concerned with limiting government and encouraging individual responsibility, the contemporary American welfare state is a disaster. According to a report by the Cato Institute’s Michael Tanner, welfare programs at the federal level alone cost more than $668 billion annually, spread across at least 126 different programs. Add another $284 of welfare spending at the state and local level, and you’ve got almost $1 trillion dollars of government spending on welfare - over $20,000 for every poor person in the United States. Not only does the U.S. welfare state spend a lot; it spends it badly. Poor Americans receiving assistance face a bewildering variety of phase-outs and benefit cliffs that combine to create extremely high effective marginal tax rates on their labor. As a result, poor families often find that working more (or having a second adult work) simply doesn’t pay. And still, despite massive expenditures by the welfare state, some 16% of Americans are left living in poverty. Wouldn’t it be better just to scrap the whole system and write the poor a check? In what follows, I will make the case for a Basic Income Guarantee (BIG) as a replacement for the current welfare state. There are a number of distinct ways of arguing from libertarian premises to a BIG, some of which I have discussed in the past. In this essay, however, I will focus on what I take to be the strongest and most persuasive libertarian argument. I will argue that a BIG, even if it is not ideal from a libertarian perspective, is significantly better on libertarian grounds than our current welfare state, and has a much higher likelihood of being achieved in a world in which most people reject libertarian views.

### Solvency – Poverty (Health)

**UBI improves standards of living by improving health and nutrition -empirically proven around the world**

**Painter, 15 – Leader of the RSA’s Policy Development** [Anthony, Creative citizen, creative state: the principled and pragmatic case for a Universal Basic Income, RSA, December 2015, <https://www.thersa.org/globalassets/reports/rsa_basic_income_20151216.pdf>, 6/27/17] JY [Premier]

Thus, many different perspectives provide support for considering the introduction of a Basic Income. There is also a body of practical knowledge which, whilst not complete, provides some useful pointers. Basic Income in practice Between 1968 and 1980, the US and Canadian Governments conducted five experiments into negative income tax. These pilots have some significant limitations. The data was not always of high quality.63 They were designed to separate control and treatment groups in areas so the impact on demand for labour is impossible to measure (if there was withdrawal of some labour, economic theory suggests that wages may be increased). Finally, the pilots were far more generous than the then existing Assistance for Families with Dependent Children programme so its impact was to introduce an additional scheme as opposed to a scheme that embodied a different set of principles. Evidence suggests the pilots had a generally positive impact on health, school performance, home ownership, and low birthweight. However, there was some reduction in 63 Alicia H. Munnell, “Lessons from the Income Maintenance Experiments: An Overview,” in Lessons from the Income Maintenance Experiments (Boston: Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, 1986), www.bostonfed.org/ economic/conf/conf30/conf30a.pdf. Creative citizen, creative state 39 POWER TO CREATE employment hours. Marginal withdrawal rates of the benefit were up to 80 percent which is likely to create a high disincentive to earn at the margins (in this regard the impacts of many of the pilots were more akin to Universal Credit than Basic Income). Despite this, there was absolutely no evidence that individuals withdraw from the labour market completely. The experiments found that men worked between 0.5 hours and four hours less per week. However, given the system design and their limited size (so negligible labour market impacts on the demand side through, for example, increased wages), it’s impossible to draw any conclusion. Impacts on wives and single mothers were larger, potentially up to 166 hours per year.64 Some women were choosing to spend more time with their families or in a period of maternity. Is that something that should greatly concern us? The experiments compare the effects of having any system of social security with no system rather than comparing one system with another. The data should be treated with significant caveats though, nonetheless, it is still of interest. There were positive results in the Canadian town of Dauphin in Manitoba province. A guaranteed income was provided to those who had fallen out of work with a 50 percent marginal withdrawal rate per C$1 earned on returning to work. It ran from 1974 to 1979. A recent survey of the data as it related to other services in Dauphin came to the conclusion: “We found a significant reduction in hospitalization, especially for admissions related to mental health and to accidents and injuries, relative to the matched comparison group. Physician contacts for mental health diagnoses fell relative to the comparison group. A greater proportion of high school students continued on to grade 12. We found no increase in fertility, no increase in family dissolution rates and no improvement in birth outcomes.”65 64 Karl Widerquist, “A Failure to Communicate: What (if Anything) Can We Learn from the Negative Income Tax Experiments?,” The Journal of SocioEconomics 34, no. 1 (2005): 49–81. 65 Evelyn L. Forget, “The Town with No Poverty: The Health Effects of a Canadian Guaranteed Annual Income Field Experiment,” Canadian Public Policy 37, no. 3 (2011): 283–305. Creative citizen, creative state 40 POWER TO CREATE A set of randomised control trials in Madhya Pradesh state in India from 2011 to 2013, also produced positive results. In the three year period 5,850 individuals received payments for more than a year. Whilst there are limitations in reading across from the different institutional environment in India, the outcomes are worth reporting nonetheless. Investment in housing increased. There was improved nutrition, partly as purchases shifted from ration shops to markets. School attendance and performance increased. There were positive equity effects as marginalised people had improved their bargaining position. The Basic Income grants led to small-scale investments – more and better seeds, sewing machines, establishment of little shops, repairs to equipment, and so on. This was associated with more production, and thus higher incomes. The grants led to more labour and work. Women gained more than men. Debt declined.66 Similar results were seen in Namibia. The percentage of those falling below the food poverty line (N$152 per month; the Basic Income Guarantee (BIG) was N$100 per month) dropped from 76 percent to 37 percent. The percentage of those being able to get a job or become successfully self employed increased from 44 percent to 55 percent, and the amount of non-BIG income per capita rose from N$118 to N$152 indicating a virtuous economic growth cycle. 67 Today, the US provides the most applicable Basic Income scheme in operation - the Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend. It is funded from oil and gas returns and pays out, on an annual basis, between $878 and $3,269 for each Alaskan. There is no reason why the funding basis of a scheme has to be oil and gas – it could equally be land or simply funded out of general taxation. Alaska is the tenth wealthiest US state so it is not unusually wealthy. There are number of notable impacts of the dividend. Firstly, it has enormous political support. It has been described as the ‘third rail of Alaskan politics’ – any politician who touches this electrified rail will die (it enjoys 80 percent support). Secondly, Alaska has one of the lowest poverty rates in the US, it is one of the most equal states and inequality actually decreased during the 1990s and 2000s (the Fund was 66 S Davala et al., Basic Income: A Transformative Policy for India (New Delhi: Bloomsbury Publishing India, 2015). 67 Robeyns, Ingrid http://crookedtimber.org/2009/06/02/the-basic-incomegrant-experiment-in-namibia/ (2009). Creative citizen, creative state 41 POWER TO CREATE introduced in 1982) – the only state where this was the case.68 What do these case studies tell us? Given institutional differences, data issues, comparability factors, none of these case studies is conclusive. We can say that where Basic Incomes or similar have been introduced they have had notably positive social effects overall. The impact on work incentives is inconclusive. Where some small negative labour market impacts have been observed, they are counter-balanced by social benefits such as mothers taking slightly extended periods of maternity leave. But neutral and positive work incentive impacts have also been reported. The knock-on impact on entrepreneurial activity in Madhya Pradesh is noteworthy from a freedom and creativity perspective. This is the best real world data we have available to us. It is all useful and indeed suggests a social policy that is likely to be positive on balance. At least, a robust and positive hypothesis can be formed on that basis.

**A UBI decreases stress and increases health, motivation, and social supports, Alaska proves**

Santens 2017- Founder of the BIG Patreon(Scott, March 29 2017, “Evidence Indicates That Universal Basic Income Improves Human Health”, Accessed on 6/29/17, https://futurism.com/evidence-indicates-that-universal-basic-income-improves-human-health/) [Premier]

Creating a less unequal society is step one. There exists in the world today, and has since 1982, something as close to a fully universal basic income as anything yet devised. It’s the annual Alaska dividend where thanks to every resident receiving a check for on average around $1,000 per year for nothing but residing in Alaska, inequality is consistently among the lowest of all states. Not only that, but we see what we’d expect to see in lower stress populations, where Alaska is also consistently among the happiest states. In Gallup’s 2015 ranking of states by “well-being,” Alaska was second only to Hawaii. This annual ranking is a combined measure of five separate rankings: purpose (liking what you do each day and being motivated to achieve your goals), social (having supportive relationships and love in your life), financial (managing your economic life to reduce stress and increase security), community (liking where you live, feeling safe and having pride in your community), and physical (having good health and enough energy to get things done daily). Alaska scored 5th, 5th, 1st, 7th, and 6th respectively in each of these measures. In other words, in the only state in the U.S. to provide a minimum amount of income to all residents every year, such that no one ever need worry about having nothing, they feel the greatest amount of basic economic security and the least amount of stress than any other state. As a result they’re also among the most motivated, the healthiest, and have strong family, friend, and community social supports. Alaska is essentially a glimpse at Human Park, but only a glimpse because even the $2,100 they all received in 2015 is not enough to cover a year’s worth of basic human needs.

**A UBI improves a societies health and equality, India proves**

**Standing 2017 – prof of development at the School of Oriental and African Studies, Univ of London** [Guy, Universal Basic Income Is Our Best Weapon Against The Rising Far Right. This article appeared in the Huffington Post on January 6, 2017. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/universal-basic-income\_us\_586d0ce3e4b0eb58648b5349] JN [Premier]

1. Basic income is transformative. The evidence shows that a basic income transforms lives. The pilots in India showed several positive results. First, welfare improved, with better sanitation, child nutrition, health and schooling. Meanwhile the consumption of private vices (in this case, usually tobacco and alcohol) declined. Second, the equity effects were positive. Those with disabilities, the elderly, women and those from lower castes, all benefited more than their counterparts. Third, the economic effects were positive: people did more work, productivity increased and income inequality declined. Of course, India is not the U.S. or the U.K. But the human condition is similar across the world. People in general want to improve their lives and the lives of their children and other loved ones. The claim that if people had a basic income they would become lazy is prejudiced and has been refuted many times in many places

### Solvency – Poverty (Rights)

**Ending poverty is a human right – a Basic income ends the oppression of poverty**

**Carter, 2014 – Bay Area Legal Aid** [Timothy, The One Minute Case for a Basic Income, Montreal, 2014, <http://basicincome.org/bien/pdf/montreal2014/BIEN2014_Carter.pdf>, 6/28/17] JY [Premier]

The one minute human rights case for a basic income: Poverty is not a natural tragedy like cancer or earthquakes. Poverty is a human caused tragedy like slavery or government oppression. Slavery is caused by societal recognition of humans as property. Government oppression is caused by governments punishing people for their beliefs or characteristics, and without due process of law. Poverty is caused by property laws that deny some people access to necessities. These types of tragedies can be ended by recognizing that humans have the right not to be subjected to tortuous conditions imposed by other humans. Humans have a right not to live in slavery. Humans have a right to be free of government oppression. And humans have a right not to live in poverty. A basic income is not a strategy for dealing with poverty; it is the elimination of poverty. The campaign for a basic income is a campaign for the abolition of poverty. It is the abolitionist movement of the 21st century.

**A UBI empowers those in poverty – all parts of it are necessary for it to be emancipatory**

**van Parijs, 2012 – Professor of Economic and Social Ethics at the University of Leuven** [Philippe, Yannick Vanderborght, Basic Income in a Globalised Economy, Social Justice Ireland, 7/13/12, https://www.socialjustice.ie/sites/default/files/file/2012-07-03%20-%20Book%20FULL%20TEXT%20-%20FINAL%20-%20Does%20the%20European%20Social%20Model%20Have%20a%20Future.pdf#page=40, 6/28/17] JY [Premier]

Its being individual matters because of the difference it makes to intrahousehold relationships, because it makes intrusion into living arrangements unnecessary and because it avoids any penalty for communal living. Its being universal matters, because it guarantees a high rate of take up, because it avoids stigmatization of the beneficiaries 9 Earlier versions of parts of this text were presented at the founding congress of the South Korean Basic Income Network (Seoul, January 2010), at the annual meeting of the September Group (Oxford, June 2010), at the 13th Congress of the Basic Income Earth Network (Sao Paulo, July 2010), and at international workshops on “Basic income and income redistribution” (University of Luxembourg, April 2011) and on “Anti-Poverty Programmes in a Global perspective” (Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin, June 2011). 10 University of Louvain, Chaire Hoover d’éthique économique et sociale 11 This is the definition adopted by the Basic Income Earth Network (BIEN), www.basicincome.org. Does the European Social Model Have a Future? 31 and because it prevents the income guarantee from creating an unemployment trap. And its being free of counterpart matters because of the bargaining power it affords to the weakest in their relationship with bosses, spouses and officials and the contribution thereby made, not just to their purchasing power but to the quality of the various dimensions of their lives. Because of the combination of these features, a basic income has been advocated as the most emancipatory way of fighting unemployment without perpetuating poverty or of fighting poverty without generating unemployment.

### Solvency – Poverty (Automation)

**A UBI is key to preventing income inequality due to automation**

**Standing 2017 – prof of development at the School of Oriental and African Studies, Univ of London** [Guy, Universal Basic Income Is Our Best Weapon Against The Rising Far Right. This article appeared in the Huffington Post on January 6, 2017. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/universal-basic-income\_us\_586d0ce3e4b0eb58648b5349] JN [Premier]

The above fourfold rationale and evidence constitute the most important grounds for supporting basic income. Yet today, advocacy is coming mainly from another direction. Many prominent people, including in Silicon Valley, are convinced that the march of the robots and artificial intelligence will generate mass unemployment and impoverishment. As a result, they see a basic income as essential. What we can say with confidence is that the technological revolution is worsening inequality, due mostly to mechanisms that limit free markets. It is also bringing about disruptive change that is intensifying insecurity and may indeed lead to large-scale labor displacement. As such, a basic income system could be a preparatory defense system and an automatic economic stabilizer, with basic income amounts rising in recessions and falling in booms.

### Advantage – Stigma / Stereotypes

**Current US welfare policy stigmatizes poverty as a pathology. This entrenches paternalism and exclusion**

**Zelleke 2005 – associate professor of practice of political science** [Almaz, December 2005, “Basic Income in the United States: Redefining Citizenship in the Liberal State,” Review of Social Economy, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29770344>, accessed 6/28/17] AO [Premier]

The Paternalistic Argument for Work Requirements The paternalistic view of welfare and entitlements for the poor dominates the debates about welfare in the US and is embodied in current American welfare policy. It is characterized by its belief in the power of paid work to address what it views as the "pathology" of poverty. Its different strains vary as to whether they locate that "pathology" in the character of the poor, their environment, or in the system of benefits, incentives, and disincentives of the pre-PRWORA welfare system, but they share the emphasis on paid work as the way to address it. In the US, Lawrence Mead is the strongest advocate for conditioning welfare benefits on work, and one of those who advances an explicitly work centered notion of citizenship. Mead argues that the entitlement theory of citizenship?the one he claims was embedded in the pre-PRWORA welfare system?is harmful to the poor, and to the greater society. Without the discipline imposed by social obligations, he says, the poor cannot exercise the self-government that is the foundation of freedom (1986: 88-89). The social obligation that concerns Mead most is the obligation to work, at least in return for monetary benefits like welfare payments. Mead focuses his attention on work for three reasons. First, he believes steady work to be the best reliable means of escaping dependence on the government for subsistence, if not for escaping poverty itself (1992: 60). Second, he argues that sufficient work is available for the unskilled unemployed, who are able to reject undesirable low-wage jobs when benefits are not contingent on their acceptance (1986: 70-76, 1992: 12). Third, he believes that there is a national interest in enforcing low-wage work (1986: 153-154). Mead refers to work as a means to "integration" of the poor, and he means it in both a racial and a social sense. Mead suggests that the poor, especially poor blacks, have different values from the mainstream of American society. Enforced work requirements achieve physical integration by bringing poor blacks into contact with the working (white) majority, and cultural integration by enforcing dominant values (1986: 254-256). Mead's views on work requirements are filtered by his understanding of the ends of democratic government. While we privilege freedom in our political culture, he says, true freedom requires an underlying order and the government's willingness to be authoritative rather than permissive, where necessary; social policy is one means of achieving this order (1986: 6-7). Mead argues that a consensus around a "new paternalism" has emerged, and the American government no longer shies away from imposing paternalistic programs on welfare recipients, teenage mothers, drug abusers, the homeless, and other social "outsiders," nor from the need to inculcate among its citizens the values that used to be fostered by the family (1997, 1998, 1992: 181-184). While Mead's policy recommendations target poor and disadvantaged members of society, his political theory has a broader focus and purpose. His vision of democratic society as a unified, homogeneous, and disciplined citizenry working toward a common set of goals chosen, or at least ratified by the majority, puts him firmly in the conservative tradition of paternalism. His commitment to the integration of the mostly minority poor into mainstream society is bounded by his unwillingness to address the structural explanations for contemporary poverty in America, including racism, gender inequality, or the organization of the economy, or indeed to contemplate a genuinely pluralist vision of American society. What he advocates is a paternalistic integration, rather than an egalitarian one, with equal respect earned only by those who prove themselves through hard work and obedience to dominant norms. The paternalistic argument depends in large part on the idea of economic "independence." Mead endorses continued economic "dependence" on government benefits for those who work but are still poor, calling into question the value of the independence ostensibly conferred by paid employment (1992: 60). Furthermore, economic independence can be achieved through one's own efforts, the efforts of a spouse or partner, or the efforts of a forebear or other benefactor. Because this independence can derive from gifts or inheritance it bears no necessary relation to the character of the individual. In the case of marriage, this "independence" relies on the dependence of one spouse or partner on the other, shifting the locus of independence from the individual to the household, and the object of dependence from the community to an individual partner. Nancy Fraser and Linda Gordon, in their article "A Genealogy of 'Dependency'" (1997), trace the shifting connotations of the term from its description of the normal state of most of the pre-industrial population, through the revolutionary valorization of independence and its adoption by wage earners to distinguish themselves from dependent slaves, paupers, and women despite their own economic dependence on employers, to the rise of its current pejorative sense as an individual pathology rather than a structural social condition. Fraser and Gordon argue that "unreflective uses of this keyword serve to enshrine certain interpretations of social life as authoritative and to delegitimate or obscure others, generally to the advantage of dominant groups in society and to the disadvantage of subordinate ones" (1997: 123). This is clearly the case in the arguments of paternalists like Mead who, forced to acknowledge that even full-time work cannot guarantee a level of economic independence sufficient to obviate supplementation from the state, claims that some residual dependency on welfare benefits is allowed for those who play by society's rules by working for below subsistence wages. But how can we endorse economic indepen? dence as an essential quality of citizenship if it remains out of reach not only of those who choose not to work or who are unable to work but of some who work full-time? Work requirements for the poor do not lead to a genuine independence, but only to a form of ideologized independence that obscures their structural subordination in the contemporary economy. Furthermore paternalism, by valorizing the ideologized independence of the wage earner, gives insufficient consideration not only to alternative lifestyles that fall outside of society's dominant norms, but to important ways of life that fall within them. It is not only the poor single parent, deemed deviant from the norm by the lack of a partner, who suffers in comparison to the "independent" wage earner, but also the married parent who withdraws from paid employment to care for children and depends economically on her or his spouse. The caregiving spouse's "independence" is even more tenuous than the wage earner's, dependent both on the wage earner's employer and the wage earner's affections (see Moller Okin 1989: 134-169). The paternalist model fails adequately to address either of these important dependencies or to reconcile them to the ideal of independence it seeks to advance.

#### These stigmas shape policy outcomes, ensuring endless scapegoating, dehumanization, and destroys value to life. These representations in policymaking have empirically had direct profound effects on policy.

Lister, 2004 - Professor of Social Policy at Loughborough University (Ruth, “Poverty”, Ch: Discourses of Poverty: From Othering to Respect, p. 100-103, Pub: Polity Press, TH) [Premier]

The notion of ‘the poor’ as Other is used here to signify the many ways in which ‘the poor’ are treated as different from the rest of society. The capital ‘O’ denotes its symbolic weight. The notion of ‘Othering’ conveys how this is not an inherent state but an ongoing process animated by the ‘non-poor’. It is a dualistic process of differentiation and demarcation, by which the line is drawn between ‘us’ and ‘them’ – between the more and the less powerful – and through which social distance is established and maintained (Beresford and Croft, 1995; Riggins, 1997). It is not a neutral line, for it is imbued with negative value judgements that construct ‘the poor’ variously as a source of moral contamination, a threat, an ‘undeserving’ economic burden, an object of pity or even as an exotic species. It is a process that takes place at different levels and in different fora: from everyday social relations through interaction with welfare officials and professionals to research, the media the legal system and policy-making (Schram, 1997). Valerie Polakow, for example, describes how, in the US, schools, teacher training institutions and research institutes are all ‘implicated in the framing of poor children as other, and in institutionalizing the legitimacy of their otherness status’ (1993: 150, emphasis in original). Othering is closely associated with, and reinforced by, a number of related social processes such as stereotyping, stigmatization and the more neutral categorization. Stereotyping is a discriminatory form of labeling, which attains a taken-for-granted quality and serves to portray particular social groups as homogenous. It is a discursive strategy that magnifies and distorts difference (Riggins, 1997). Michael Pickering writes that ‘stereotypes operate as socially exorcistic rituals in maintaining the boundaries of normality and legitimacy’ (2001: 45). He suggests that normally ‘stereotyping attempts to translate cultural difference into Otherness, in the interests of order, power and control’ (2001: 204). In contrast, in the case of ‘the poor’. Stereotyping functions to create cultural difference and thereby the Other. At the same time, as we saw in chapter 3, those groups who are more likely to be poor – women, racialized minorities and disabled people – are themselves groups that are frequently Othered. Processes of classification and categorization effected by governmental and legal institutions, the media and social scientists, although analytically distinct from stereotyping, can draw on stereotypes and thereby reinforce them. These processes can have implications for how ‘the poor’ are treated by fellow citizens as well as by powerful classificatory institutions (Edelman, 1977). As we shall see, the bifurcation of ‘the poor’ into ‘deserving’ and ‘undeserving’, each with their associated stereotypes, has had a profound impact on their treatment by the welfare state and its antecedents. The label of ‘undeserving’ poor has been negatively charged by the process of stigmatization, which, historically and today, has had implications for how society sees ‘the poor’, how they see themselves and how they are treated by welfare institutions. Erving Goffman’s classic text referred to stigma as ‘an attribute that is deeply discrediting’ and to the belief that ‘the person with stigma is not quite human’ (1968: 13, 15). In this way, stigma contributes to the dehumanization involved in Othering (Oliver, 2001). Othering and associated processes such as stigmatization have various effects on ‘us’ and ‘them’ and the relations between the two. With regard to ‘us’, Othering helps to define the self and to affirm identity (Sibley, 1995). In contrast, it divests ‘them’ of ‘their social and cultural identities by diminishing them to their stereotyped characteristics’ and by casting them as silent objects (Pickering, 2001: 73; Oliver, 2001). In doing so, it denies them their complex humanity and subjectivity. Othering operates as ‘a strategy of symbolic exclusion’, which makes it easier for people to blame the Other for their own and society’s problems (Pickering, 2001: 48). The Othering of ‘the poor’ also acts as a warning to others; poverty thereby represents a ‘spectre – a socially constituted object of wholesome horror’ (Dean with Melrose, 1999: 48). As regards the relationship between ‘us’ and ‘them’, Othering legitimates ‘our’ privilege – rooted in superiority – and ‘their’ exploitation and oppression – rooted in inferiority – together with the socio-economic inequalities that underlie poverty (Riggins, 1997; Young, 1999). This underlines the ways in which power relationships are inscribed in the process of Othering. It suggests that Othering may be most marked where inequality is sharpest. An additional effect of Othering is that it denies the Other the 'right to name and define themselves' (Pickering, 2001: 73). The power 'to name one's Self' has been described as 'a fundamental human right' (Riggins, 1997: 8) and as a key 'political resource' (Silver, 1996: 135). Naming 'the poor' is an exercise in power, for 'we' invariably name 'them', even when sympathetically (Polakow, 1993). Naming or labelling of the Other has symbolic, cultural, psychological and material effects. 'How we name things affects how we behave towards them. The name, or label, carries with it expectations' (Clarke and Cochrane, 1998: 26). Likewise 'we' create images of 'them - the poor', which have a similarly powerful effect on attitudes and actions. 'The politics of representation' is therefore a crucial element in the politics of poverty (hooks, 1994: 169). As we shall see, it has taken on greater salience today as some groups of people in poverty, following the disabled people's movement, are resisting the ways they are represented by the wider society, in recognition of the power of language and images. It is through language and images that the discourses that frame how we perceive and act in the social world are articulated. Othering can thus be understood as a discursive practice, which shapes how the 'non-poor' think and talk about and act towards 'the poor' at both an interpersonal and an institutional level. Although it does not represent the only available poverty discourse, its impact on policy and the practice of officials and professionals has been profound in some countries, notably the UK and US. Moreover, welfare policy and administration can themselves be understood as a discursive and symbolic practice, which constructs 'the poor' and the nature of the problem of poverty in various ways (Schram, 1995; Saraceno, 2002). A focus on discourse thus helps to illuminate the relationship between the material and relational/symbolic dimensions of poverty and the ways in which the fibres of power are interwoven through them.

#### A UBI solves for welfare stigma because it is automatic and universal – current programs have degrading criteria and label people as undeserving

Calnitsky 2016 - Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) of Canada [David, Postdoctoral Fellow at the University of Manitoba. Basic income: social assistance without the stigma, May 30 2016, <https://www.thestar.com/opinion/commentary/2016/05/30/basic-income-social-assistance-without-the-stigma.html>, June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

There are two main reasons why basic income undercuts social stigma. First, it is automatic: instead of the often degrading and invasive caseworker discretion that characterizes social assistance, a basic income is not unlike the unstigmatizing benefits that come at tax time. To participate you need not stand up and self-identify as poor.∂ Second, basic income treats typically separated people in a similar manner. It blurs the lines of demarcation between low-wage workers, the disabled, unemployed workers, and social assistance recipients. It blurs the lines between those who cannot find paid employment and those who choose to commit to other activities, education, care-work, or even leisure. As more people are folded into a program, quality improves and austerity becomes harder to pull off. Medicare, a program that is both well liked and near-impossible to dismantle, illustrates the case. Social assistance is the opposite: without a powerful political constituency, unfriendly politicians have been able to make eligibility increasingly difficult. This is the logic behind the maxim, “programs for the poor become poor programs.”∂ Swedish sociologist Walter Korpi called this the paradox of redistribution. Targeting appears to leave more room for generous redistribution, but it in fact makes for frail, and ultimately less redistributive programs. Conversely, the more universal a program, the more resilient it becomes. This is one of the difficulties with a pilot, as is being proposed in Canada. It won’t benefit from the popularity effect. If we managed to implement a generous basic income its popularity could lock it in place. All the pilot will have on its side is mere scientific evidence. Had we experimented with Medicare before implementing it, it might have never developed the base of political support that made it robust. A social policy that destigmatizes, one that erases the bright lines between the “deserving” and “undeserving” poor is an end in its own right. The added benefit is that erasing those lines makes for popular and robust programs.

-**Current welfare programs are stigmatizing because they impose discriminatory criteria**

**Mckay 2002 – prof of economics at Glascow Univ** [Ailsa with Jo Vanevery independent writer, Social Politics, Gender, Gender, Family, and Income Maintenance: A Feminist Case for Citizens Basic Income, Summer 2002, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

Income Maintenance in Western Industrialized Countries There are currently three principles that determine the nature of citizens income claims against the state: contributory, safety net, and universal citizenship rights. These in turn determine the nature of delivery and finance of cash transfers. The contributory principle is the basis of social insurance-type schemes. The safety net or minimum income guarantee is the basis of means-tested benefits. Universal citizenship rights are the basis of categorical, conditional or unconditional universal benefits (Rainwater, Rein, and Schwartz 1986, 126). Social insurance rests on the principle that benefits are a form of return for contributions paid while in paid work. Workers are protected against contingencies, such as sickness, old age, or unemployment which might interrupt their income. Benefits can be either wage-related (Bismarkian) or flat rate and uniform (Beveridgian). Although often claimed as a universal benefit, social insurance is limited in coverage and only promotes the citizenship rights of those with access to the labor market. Means-tested benefits often exist alongside social insurance programs as a form of safety net provision, providing a minimum income guarantee which no one should fall below. This type of benefit attempts to provide for those citizens not covered by contributory benefits to a certain extent, but often imposes other, potentially discriminatory criteria. It may also be stigmatizing and may not effectively reach the intended target group. Reliance on either mechanism, or a combination of both, will not automatically ensure comprehensive coverage and hence will advance the citizenship rights of some but deny those of others.

**A UBI eliminates the stigma of welfare – the Mincome experiment in Canada proves**

**Calnitsky 2016 - Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) of Canada** [David, Postdoctoral Fellow at the University of Manitoba. Basic income: social assistance without the stigma, May 30 2016, <https://www.thestar.com/opinion/commentary/2016/05/30/basic-income-social-assistance-without-the-stigma.html>, June 27, 2017] LA [Premier]

By now the Mincome experiment is well known. In the 1970s, every resident of Dauphin, a small Manitoba town, was given the option to collect substantial cash payments without work requirements. Economist Evelyn Forget’s findings about Mincome’s positive effects on health and education helped to resuscitate the concept of a basic income in Canada. With basic income pilots on the horizon, it is worth considering new lessons from an old experiment. One of the most important, but overlooked, virtues of basic income is the absence of social stigma. The routine humiliation of the poor, an enduring feature of highly conditional social assistance systems, melts away in a universally available basic income regime. As one Dauphin participant wrote midway through the experiment, “It trusts the Canadian people and leaves a man or woman, their pride.” Mincome collected data on an extraordinary range of issues, most of which sat in boxes for decades. I have been digitizing a number of those lost surveys, and I recently reported on findings related to social stigma during the Mincome years. When you compare people’s views of Mincome to welfare what stands out is that people took ardent, moralistic positions about welfare, but were pragmatic when asked about Mincome. In fact, the social meaning of Mincome was powerful enough that even participants who opposed welfare on moral grounds and believed strongly in the principle of earning one’s own living felt able to collect government payments without a sense of contradiction. One person refused welfare, writing, “I feel that [welfare] is more for disabled or people which are too lazy to work. It doesn’t include us, we’re both able and willing to work but can’t get a job due to the low employment rate.” They joined Mincome for pragmatic reasons: they were “short of money.” The design of our social policies has an important but under-appreciated effect: To increase rather than decrease social cleavages among the country’s poor and working people. If you’re older and need a steady income stream we have one set of policies for you. If you can’t find work, and meet certain criteria, we have another policy. And if you can’t find work, but don’t meet that criteria, we have another still. Together, the policies place recipients on a gradient of deservingness.

**A UBI solves the stigmatization of the poor because it is universal and unconditional.**

**Srnicek and Williams 2015 - lecturer at City University and editor in chief of The New Stack** [Nick and Alex, Inventing the Future: Post capitalism and a World Without Work. November 17 2015, https://s3.amazonaws.com/arena-attachments/576840/68a4032cf0d4b1ffc2564332ad7c9e36.pdf,June 27, 2017] LA [Premier]

The demand for a UBI, however, is subject to competing hegemonic forces. It is just as open to being mobilised for a libertarian dystopia as for a post-work society – an ambiguity that has led many to mistakenly conflate the two poles. In demanding a UBI, therefore, three key factors must be articulated in order to make it meaningful: it must provide a sufficient amount of income to live on; it must be universal, provided to everyone unconditionally; and it must be a supplement to the welfare state rather than a replacement of it. The first point is obvious enough: a UBI must provide a materially adequate income. The exact amount will vary between countries and regions, but it can be relatively easily arrived at with existing data. The risk is that, if set too low, UBI becomes just a government subsidy to businesses. In addition, UBI must be universal and given to everyone unconditionally. As there would be no means-testing or other measures required to receive the UBI, it would break free of the disciplinary nature of welfare capitalism. 103 Moreover, a universal grant avoids the stigmatisation of welfare, since everyone receives it. As we argued in Chapter 4, the invocation of ‘universalism’ also obliges the continual subversion of any restricted application of a basic income (in terms of individuals’ status as citizens, immigrants or prisoners). The demand for universality provides the basis for a continued struggle to expand the scope and scale of the basic income. Lastly, the UBI must be a supplement to the welfare state. The conservative argument for a basic income – which must be avoided at all costs – is that it should simply replace the welfare state by providing a lump sum of money to every individual. In this scenario, the UBI would just become a vector of increased marketisation, transforming social services into private markets. Rather than being some aberration of neoliberalism, it would simply extend its essential gesture by creating new markets. By contrast, the demand made here is for UBI as a supplement to a revived welfare state. 104

**A UBI would end stigmatization of the poor – current programs create resentment against people who need welfare.**

**Bidadanure 2017 - Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Stanford** [Juliana, Interviewed by Vivan Malkani, Stanford Politics Understanding Universal Basic Income, March 17 2017, https://stanfordpolitics.com/understanding-universal-basic-income-178032e6090f , June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

JB: I don’t think that we should frame this issue as an either-or scenario. Basic Income is necessary, but insufficient on its own to address poverty, precariousness, joblessness and growing inequalities. People who believe in basic income do so from differing political standpoints. Social democrats believe that what we owe each other is not just cash; we owe each other good institutions. In Europe, the basic income debate has been framed as a further enhancement of the welfare state. I grew up in France; there are many things that I think are done right there. We have universal healthcare, free higher education, but we also have a benefit system that is archaic and abusive. People who are out of work get only between 400 and 500 euros a month to survive, they are stigmatized and demonized as burdens, and some groups in society are excluded from the scheme, like young adults below the age of 25. The reasons for such restrictive and low benefits are ideological: that people should be taught the right values, or they can’t be trusted with cash,. In the UK, the benefit system creates an unemployment trap. If you receive cash on the condition that you are not working, and if you find a job, you lose the benefits straight away. That means that, if the job doesn’t work out after a month or so (as is the case with many precarious jobs), you may end up having to spend weeks without access to public assistance. The idea behind basic income is that you would not have to worry about that; that base is secure. You can then try different things like internships, trainings, volunteering, etc. because of your security. The existing benefits system also gives too much control to street level bureaucrats; people who are meant to deliver public assistance have too much control over the lives of the people receiving those benefits. This is particularly bad in the UK, where the system is intrusive and requires you to prove that you are applying to jobs, demanding that you send dozens of applications per week. This is punitive. The system is built on the view that you are responsible for being unemployed and that you must prove to society that you are not a parasite. This allows for and encourages divisive rhetoric that is detrimental to democracy. Political parties can use resentment towards “welfare queens” and “benefit scroungers” to create a spirit of resentment against those who are most reliant on society, which is very detrimental to social cohesion. I believe in basic income as a reformation and further enhancement of that benefit system. But I don’t think that UBI is just for developed welfare states. If we think that the people should be above a certain threshold, they are going to need a lot of cash, but also a lot more than just cash. Both in the US and India, the question of the development package is very important. But the case for cash can and should be made there too. There is a traditional school of thought in development that does not trust individuals with cash, and I think this mistrust must be challenged.

**UBI’s unconditionality eliminates stigmatization against the poor and fundamentally improves the otherwise paternalistic welfare state in the status quo.**

**Zwolinski, 2014 – Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego** [Matt, “The Pragmatic Libertarian Case for a Basic Income Guarantee” Cato Institute, August 4 2014, accessed on June 28 2017 https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/04/matt-zwolinski/pragmatic-libertarian-case-basic-income-guarantee] NJT [Premier]

One of the main differences between a BIG and the current welfare state is the unconditionality of the former. Under a BIG, everybody gets a check. Under the current welfare state, only people who meet the various stipulated qualifications are eligible for assistance. The precise nature of those qualifications varies from program to program, but can include not earning too much, not earning too little, not being on drugs, not having won the lottery, making an earnest effort to find work, and so on.∂ Conditions are put on welfare in order to ensure that assistance goes to the deserving poor, and not to the undeserving. But distinguishing between the deserving and undeserving is difficult business, and requires a variety of invasive, demoralizing, and degrading inspections into the intimate details of applicants’ lives. “Fill out this form, tell us about that man you live with, pee in this cup, and submit to spot inspections of your home by our social workers, or else.”∂ Maybe the state shouldn’t be in the business of giving out welfare at all. Maybe it shouldn’t be running schools, or highways either. But, as Jacob Levy notes, since it does do these things, libertarians have good reason to demand that it does so in a way that is as “more rather than less compatible with Hayek’s rule of law, with freedom from supervision and surveillance by the bureaucracy, with the ability to get on with living their lives rather than having to waste them proving their innocence.”∂ The conditional welfare state is not only invasive, it is heavily paternalistic. Restrictions on eligibility are imposed in order to encourage welfare recipients to live their lives in a way that the state thinks is good for them: don’t have kids out of wedlock, don’t do drugs, and get (or stay) married. And benefits are often given in-kind rather than in cash precisely because the state doesn’t trust welfare recipients to make what it regards as wise choices about how to spend their money. This, despite the fact that both economic theory and a growing body of empirical evidence suggest that individuals are better off with the freedom of choice that a cash grant brings. In-kind grant programs like SNAP (food stamps) persist in their present form not because they are effective but because they are the product of a classic Bootleggers-and-Baptists coalition: well-meaning members of the public like the idea that welfare recipients have to use their vouchers on food rather than alcohol and cigarettes, and the farm lobby likes that beneficiaries are forced to buy its own products. Poor people, meanwhile, are deprived of the opportunity to save that a cash grant would give them, and they are forced to waste time and effort trading what SNAP allows them to buy for what they really want.

### AT S’quo Solves

**There are systematic inequalities only alleviated by a universal income.**

**Zelleke 2005 – associate professor of practice of political science** [Almaz, December 2005, “Basic Income in the United States: Redefining Citizenship in the Liberal State,” Review of Social Economy, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29770344>, accessed 6/28/17] AO [Premier]

Both the paternalistic and civic republican arguments for work-conditioned welfare benefits attempt to justify selective work requirements in return for welfare benefits in order to support and advance dominant social norms, while conceding that these norms are not universally adhered to, nor can they be universally enforced. By focusing on poverty, its advocates are able to endorse work as a solution to the problem of poverty without affecting the lifestyle choices of more affluent citizens, or the underlying inequalities of a system that allows some to choose work or leisure and others to have no choice. The civic republican argument for selective work requirements is more attractive than the paternalistic argument because the ideal of reciprocity seems to treat all citizens as worthy of respect and care, and it avoids the illusion of an ideologized independence in favor of recognizing our mutual dependence across society. But reciprocity is too general a principle to specify particular obligations like paid employment in return for welfare benefits. It falls victim to two criticisms in particular. First, those who do unpaid work in the home or in the community certainly participate in the scheme of social cooperation and contribute to society's prosperity, whether the contributors are part of a household with a paid worker or not. And second, all members of society receive benefits from that membership; it is unclear why work requirements should be restricted to recipients of one particular kind of benefit only. The first objection can be answered by the substitution of participation requirements for work requirements. Advocates of participation requirements want to recognize the contributions to society made by some of those who choose not to work. Thus, they endorse the notion of enforcing, or at least promoting, reciprocity for society's benefits, but wish to expand the range of activities that count towards a social contribution beyond paid employment. Anthony Atkinson, a British economist, proposes abandoning welfare programs in favor of a participation income, a basic income conditional on a "social contribution" broadly defined to include care giving, studying, volunteer work, and looking for work, in addition to working in paid or self-employment, or being excused due to illness, disability, or reaching retirement age (1995b, 1998, 1995a: 302-303). Atkinson views the participation income as a compromise between basic income and means tested benefits because he believes that an unconditional basic income is politically unfeasible. He sees the conditionality of the participation income as much less objectionable than welfare means-testing because the definition of participation is so broad that most would qualify, and the positive connotation of qualifying for benefits would encourage all to seek them, as is not currently the case for Britain's welfare programs, which do not reach all who qualify (1996: 94, 1998: 146). Advocates of participation requirements succeed in resolving one objection to the civic republican model, by expanding the definition of social contribution to include forms of socially useful activities other than paid employment. But they fail to resolve the second objection, the problem of selectivity. All members of contemporary society with earned or unearned (e.g. interest) income receive monetary benefits in the form of tax credits and exemptions for certain kinds of income or expenses. If the recipients of welfare must work to reciprocate for their monetary benefits, why not the recipients of other tax system benefits, like the mortgage interest deduction, which can benefit those with only interest income, or Social Security spousal benefits, that benefit households in which only one spouse works, or those who send their children to public schools? Individuals who are able to claim such benefits without having earned income might give them up before submitting to a work or participation requirement, but the fact remains that society engages in many forms of economic distribution that benefit classes of individuals without submitting each to a work or participation test. If reciprocity is the guiding principle, why should the work test be reserved for only one class of beneficiaries?

## Other Advantages

### Authoritarianism

**A UBI stops a right wing take over because it reduces income inequality that breeds support for demagogues**

**Standing 2017 – prof of development at the School of Oriental and African Studies, Univ of London** [Guy, Universal Basic Income Is Our Best Weapon Against The Rising Far Right. This article appeared in the Huffington Post on January 6, 2017. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/universal-basic-income\_us\_586d0ce3e4b0eb58648b5349] JN [Premier]

Basic income ― also known as universal basic income and basic minimum income ― is a modest amount paid individually and equally to citizens, without behavioral conditions. It has proven to reduce inequality and enhance economic and social freedom. And its time has come. In the old 20th-century income distribution system, the shares of income going to capital, mainly in profits, and labor, in wages and non-wage benefits, were roughly stable. But that system is no more. Now, growing inequality is threatening democracy and breeding anxiety, alienation, anomie and anger among the losers. That mix leads to support for unsavory characters who promise to turn the clock back to some imaginary golden age. The collapse of the old income distribution system is evident in a dramatic rise in the income share going to rentiers ― that is, to those receiving income from financial, physical and intellectual property. Meanwhile, we are witnessing a rapidly growing social class that I call the “precariat,” consisting of millions of people experiencing declining wages, volatile earnings and no occupational identity or security. The political establishment ignored the precariat and is now paying a heavy price. The response to these darkening times must be to devise and then rally support for a new income distribution system. The political near future is gloomy but not everything is. As the American poet Theodore Roethke wrote, “In a dark time, the eye begins to see.” The response to these darkening times must be to devise and then rally support for a new income distribution system. Remarkably, a host of ethical and pragmatic reasons for moving [towards a UBI] have come to the fore at the same time. It is now a political imperative. Unless this is on the table, the drift to the far right will only grow. The fundamental justification for a basic income is ethical. It is a means of enhancing freedom and a means of providing basic security without which it is unfair to expect people to behave altruistically or vote responsibly.

### Environment

**The environment cannot be cleaned without a UBI –**

**Carter, 2014 – Bay Area Legal Aid** [Timothy, The One Minute Case for a Basic Income, Montreal, 2014, <http://basicincome.org/bien/pdf/montreal2014/BIEN2014_Carter.pdf>, 6/28/17] JY [Premier]

The one minute environmentalist case for a basic income: The global economy is dependent on industries and consumption that erode natural habitats and pollute the environment. The poor are dependent upon jobs in these industries for their very survival. Middle class consumption is needed to produce the demand that fuels these industries, and the middle class buys into the system out of fear of becoming poor. The rich are able to clean up their own environment, even if that means stopping wind turbines that might be an eyesore on their private beaches, while the powerless live next to literal dumps. The changes necessary to significantly clean the environment will produce massive disruptions laying off millions and raising prices of life necessities. The poor and middle classes will never accept this to clean the planet for the rich, nor should they. We cannot begin the work of healing Earth until we divorce survival from work and compensate everyone for the costs of the cleanup. A basic income will not by itself fix the environment, but it is necessary to begin the work.

**A UBI reduces the need for jobs that damage the environment.**

**Dolan 14- prof of economics at Dartmouth College** [Ed, August 18th 2014, “A Universal Basic Income and Work Incentives”, Econo Monitor, Accessed on 6/27/17, http://www.economonitor.com/dolanecon/2014/08/18/a-universal-basic-income-and-work-incentives-part-1-theory/] JC [Premier]

A guaranteed livable income would prevent the destruction of the environment due to the attempt to grow the world’s economy to create full employment. The loss of clean air, clean water, forests, arable soil, all forms of “wild” life cannot be measured. . . GLI is the quickest way to say “no” to environmentally harmful and wasteful practices and to put an end to over-consumption.Millions of jobs depend on war. . . Historically, when people lose jobs and income and they demand their governments do anything, including build their military, to give them jobs. Only with a guaranteed income could we afford to end the war industries. With a guaranteed livable income, people will no longer be forced to ‘make a living’ regardless of the harm to themselves, others, or the environment. It also creates a way to for people to do beneficial (and essential) activities that are currently financially penalized for being ‘unproductive.’ For example: work done by volunteers and unpaid caregivers: people who take care of other people; who take care of their own health (for some that is a full time task); or who take care of their neighborhood, community or environment.

**A UBI prevents the need for economic growth to solve poverty, and too much growth harms the environment**

**Pressman, 2005 – Prof of economics at Monmouth Univ** [Steven, with Michael Lewis and Karl Widerquist The Basic Income Guarantee and Social Economics. This article appeared in Review of Social Economy on December 2005. http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/29770341.pdf?refreqid=search%3A9330359b12bad0e394957e75c30d95e6] JN [Premier]

Green Case for a Basic Income The Green case for a Basic Income stems from the separation between economic growth and the well-being of the poor that it would provide. The typical policy response to poverty (as mentioned above) is to increase economic output. This increase in output is usually at the expense of the environment. However, the redistribution of income that is brought about by a Basic Income policy reduces the necessity for further damage to the environment. Once the well-being of the neediest is divorced from the question of economic growth, and with it the moral justification of economic expansion, society can begin to concentrate on questions of sustainability.

### Reparations

**UBI can be reparation for the government’s past harms to the impoverished.**

**Zwolinski, 2013 – Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego** [Matt, , “The Libertarian Case for a Basic Income” Libertarianism.org, August 4 2014, June 28 2017 https://www.libertarianism.org/columns/libertarian-case-basic-income] NJT [Premier]

But Nozick’s entitlement theory of justice is a historical one, and an important component of that theory is a “principle of rectification” to deal with past injustice. Nozick himself provided almost no details at all regarding the nature or proper application of this principle (though others have speculated). But in one fascinating passage, Nozick suggests that we might regard patterned principles of justice (like Rawls’ Difference Principle) as “rough rules of thumb” for approximating the result of a detailed application of the principle of rectification. Here’s what Nozick has to say:∂ Perhaps it is best to view some patterned principles of distributive justice as rough rules of thumb meant to approximate the general results of applying the principle of rectification of injustice. For example, lacking much historical information, and assuming (1) that victims of injustice generally do worse than they otherwise would and (2) that those from the least well-off group in the society have the highest probabilities of being the (descendants of) victims of the most serious injustice who are owed compensation by those who benefited from the injustices (assumed to be those better off, though sometimes the perpetrators will be others in the worst-off group), then a rough rule of thumb for rectifying injustices might seem to be the following: organize society so as to maximize the position of whatever group ends up least well-off in the society (p. 231).∂ In a world in which all property was acquired by peaceful processes of labor-mixing and voluntary trade, a tax-funded Basic Income Guarantee might plausibly be held to violate libertarian rights. But our world is not that world. And since we do not have the information that would be necessary to engage in a precise rectification of past injustices, and since simply ignoring those injustices seems unfair, perhaps something like a Basic Income Guarantee can be justified as an approximate rectification?

**UBI is good as reparations for caregivers—it recognizes that society has benefited from their thankless work**

**Shulevitz 16- editor for the New York Times** [Judith, Jan 8th 2016, “It’s Payback Time for Women”, New York Times, Accessed on 6/27/17, https://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/10/opinion/sunday/payback-time-for-women.html] JC [Premier]

A COUNTRY that gives every citizen enough cash to live on whether she needs it or not: It’s got to be either a fool’s paradise or a profligate Northern European nation. And lo, in November, the Finnish government proposed paying every adult 800 euros or about $870 a month. Fits of this seemingly irrational generosity, called a universal basic income or U.B.I., are becoming surprisingly common. The Swiss will vote in a referendum on basic income this year. The Dutch city of Utrecht will soon start a basic-income pilot program. Canada’s ruling Liberal Party recently adopted a resolution calling for a similar experiment. Still, it couldn’t happen here. Or could it? Over the past few years, a case for the U.B.I. has emerged that could make it appealing not just to the poor, who don’t vote in great numbers, but to women, who do. The feminist argument for a U.B.I. is that it’s a way to reimburse mothers and other caregivers for the heavy lifting they now do free of charge. Roughly one-fifth of Americans have children 18 or under. Many also attend to ill or elderly relatives. They perform these labors out of love or a sense of duty, but still, at some point during the diaper-changing or bedpan cleaning, they have to wonder why their efforts aren’t seen as “work.” They may even ask why they have to pay for the privilege of doing it, by cutting back on their hours or quitting jobs to stay home. Disproportionately, of course, these caregivers are women. Notwithstanding the advent of the stay-at-home dad, it’s still mothers who do most of the invisible labor of cleaning, schlepping, scheduling and listening. To the extent that mainstream feminism has paid attention to pocketbook issues over the past few decades, it has focused on the workplace: the wage gap, absence of family leave and weak “infrastructure of care,” to use Anne-Marie Slaughter’s phrase. These family-unfriendly facts of life on the job do yank success further out of the reach of women who combine career and children. But the problem is not that employers hate women and children. It’s that they make a common assumption about motherhood: It’s a lifestyle choice, not a wage-worthy job, and no one other than parents should pay for it. Wages for child rearing and housework? When one feminist collective took up that cry in the 1970s, it was more or less drummed out of the second-wave feminist movement, which aimed to get women into the work force, not pay them to stay out of it. 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. Politically, the U.B.I. looks a lot more plausible than a subsidy aimed only at mothers, because, as Social Security and Medicare make clear, policies have more staying power when perceived as general entitlements rather than free cash for free riders. Critics on the right would dismiss a mothers’ annuity as a handout to welfare queens. Critics on the left might see it as enshrining traditional gender norms. A universal basic income would sidestep both of these objections. I do not want to create the impression that feminists dominate this debate. On the contrary: They’re an overlooked part of a much larger conversation that has been going on for centuries. In 1797, Thomas Paine declared that nations should give every 21-year-old a lump sum because those who inherit land have an unfair advantage over those who don’t. By the middle of the last century, economists and leaders on both sides of the political spectrum were proposing minimum incomes. The libertarian hero Friedrich A. Hayek supported “a sort of floor below which nobody need fall.” Milton Friedman called for a negative income tax in which, if you reported less than a certain amount, the Internal Revenue Service would pay you. (Our current earned-income tax credit resembles Friedman’s plan, but only for people who, well, earn income. The negative income tax would have gone to the unemployed as well.) In 1969, President Richard Nixon proposed the Family Assistance Plan, a small annual stipend in lieu of welfare — $1,600 and some $800 in food stamps for a family of four. His bill was passed by the House of Representatives but died in the Senate Finance Committee. Basic income proposals are sprouting up again, from the right as well as the left. Charles Murray of the American Enterprise Institute thinks a guaranteed income could replace the welfare state. Libertarians want to get the government out of the private lives of the poor. Andy Stern, the former head of the Service Employees International Union, who has a book coming out soon on universal basic income, argues that it would offer the economic stability that the labor movement won’t be able to provide as jobs disappear — though not, he says, if Social Security and Medicare are also cut. It’s easy to see why basic income proposals are gaining steam right now. For one thing, the gap between rich and poor Americans is the widest on record. For another, smart machines and the “gig economy” seem poised to throw millions out of work. A 2013 Oxford University study concluded that computers would replace humans in nearly half of all occupations in the United States within as little as two decades. We’re not just talking about blue-collar jobs. Computers able to perform nonroutine cognitive tasks could wipe out middle-management positions such as accountant or transportation inspector, as well as many skilled service jobs, some of them typically associated with women. The Oxford study lists restaurant hostess and legal secretary, among others. That’s why some members of the Silicon Valley elite, better known for their contempt for government, advocate all-inclusive, no-strings-attached cash grants. In November, Robin Chase, the co-founder and former chief executive of Zipcar, called for a basic income. Venture capitalists like Albert Wenger of Union Square Ventures and John Lilly of Greylock Partners, which invests in LinkedIn and Airbnb, have said that it’s time to starting thinking about a U.B.I. The founder of HowStuffWorks.com, Marshall Brain, even wrote a basic-income novel called “Manna.” It contrasts a nightmare world in which robots are managers and workers slaves with a utopian settlement in the Australian desert in which citizens receive a guaranteed share of the wealth created by such robots and devote themselves to dreaming up innovative new technologies. It’s the Silicon Valley version of heaven.

# Affirmative – Kritik

## Feminism

### Fem FW – Critical Feminist Discourse

#### In order to break down existing gender relations we must examine how language and discourses operate to reinforce power structures in society. Only a critical feminist approach can reverse oppressions.

Elshtain, 1982 [Jean Berthke Elshtain, writer of the Feminist Discourse and it’s discontents: Language, Power and Meaning, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3173857?seq=1>, 1982] [Premier]

The feminist thinker who wishes to tackle the puzzles of power and take up questions of meaning must consider the nature of language itself. There are several reasons for this. First, debates over whether or not discourse is inevitably or necessarily domination, a form of "power over" others, provides much of the exciting interplay of diatribe and dialectic, polemic and philosophical argumentation, that characterize contemporary debates in social and political theory. Some writers on the text as power are feminists; others are not.' But all who explore these issues are intrigued by the peculiar relationship between author-text-reader along some vector of power. A mild version of the thesis that power infuses discourse is stated by Paul Foss: "Discourse has become the arena for the generation and propagation of historically specified norms and socially adequate forms of power."2 Sheila Rowbotham puts the case more urgently: "Language conveys a certain power. It is one of the instruments of domination. . . . The language of theory—removed language—only expresses a reality experienced by the oppressors. It speaks only for their world, from their point of view. Ultimately a revolutionary movement has to break the hold of the dominant group over theory, it has to structure its own connections. Language is part of the political and ideological power of rulers.... We can't just occupy existing words. We have to change the meanings of words even before we take them over."3 And a poem by Margaret Atwood gives a bleakly cynical feminist view of the relationship of language to power: We hear nothing these days from the ones in power

### Fem FW – Key to UBI / Poverty

#### Discussing a basic income without considering gender reinforces patriarchy – a UBI can provide women with economic independence if we rethink our framework first

Pateman, 2004 – prof of Political Science at UCLA [Carole, Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income. Politics and Society on March 1, 2004. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0032329203261100>] [Premier]

Now is the time to ask the second question. The conditions under which the institution of employment and the Anglo-American social insurance system were constructed have now crumbled. “Old economy” male breadwinner jobs are being swept away in global economic restructuring and “downsizing.” New jobs have been created but many are low paid, lacking benefits, and temporary, and economic insecurity is widespread. Views about femininity, masculinity, and marriage are changing too, but since we are still in the midst of all these changes it is hard to know what the eventual outcome will be. Still, times of rapid change provide opportunities to investigate new ideas and look critically at old arrangements—including the moral hazard of institutions that give incentives to men to avoid their fair share of the unpaid work of caring for others. It has now become possible to rethink the connections between income and paid employment; between marriage, employment, and citizenship; between the private and public division of labor; and between caring work and other work—and to reconsider the meaning of “work.” But such rethinking requires a different approach from that taken by many participants in the debate about stakeholding and basic income. This is crucial if proper account is to be taken of women’s freedom, which has received rather short shrift in discussions of a basic income. As early as 1792, Mary Wollstonecraft argued in A Vindication of the Rights of Woman that rights, citizenship, and full standing for women required economic independence, whether a woman was married or single.33 As Ackerman and Alstott emphasize, a capital grant would be a step in this direction, but a basic income would for the first time provide all women with lifelong economic independence. Thus feminists might be expected strongly to support the introduction of a basic income.34

#### Framework is key to this debate – advocating a basic income by incorporating a feminist perspective is critical to changing patriarchal norms and avoiding the negative solvency turns.

Pateman, 2004 – prof of Political Science at UCLA [Carole, Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income. Politics and Society on March 1, 2004. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0032329203261100>] [Premier]

Thus feminists might be expected strongly to support the introduction of a basic income.34 Yet this is not the case. Some feminists are critical of the idea because they fear a basic income would reinforce the existing sexual division of labor and women’s lesser citizenship. They argue that the provision of an income without having to engage in paid employment would, in light of women’s position in the labor market combined with lingering beliefs about the proper place and tasks of women and men, give women an even greater incentive to undertake more unpaid caring work in the household, and, conversely, men would have another incentive to freeride. A basic income, that is, would reinforce existing limitations on women’s freedom.35 This objection illustrates the importance of the reasons advanced for supporting a basic income. The probability of feminist fears being borne out is higher, for example, when the argument is made that to avoid weakening the “incentive to work” a basic income should be below subsistence level. This “incentive” is promoted with men and paid employment in mind. A basic income at this level provides no incentive for wives to “work” (i.e., enter paid employment); rather, it would encourage them to do more unpaid caring work. Again, to support basic income on the grounds that it would improve the living standards of the poorest sectors of the population does not promote consideration of the structural connections between marriage, employment, and citizenship, and the private and public sexual division of labor. Without the debates about basic income being informed by feminist arguments, and a concern for democratization (and genuine democratization necessarily includes women’s freedom and standing as citizens), the discussion will revolve around ways of tinkering with the existing system rather than encouraging thinking about how it might be made more democratic. Putting democratization at the center requires attention to institutional structures, especially the institutions of marriage and employment. For instance, Ackerman and Alstott remark in The Stakeholder Society that the “case for stakeholding does not ultimately rest on its effects on employment, marriage, or crime. It rests on each American’s claim to respect as a free and equal citizen.”36 However (leaving crime aside), the respect accorded to women and men as free and equal citizens has a great deal to do with the institutions of marriage and employment. It is not possible to understand women’s lesser citizenship, as Ackerman and Alstott show in their discussion of social security, without understanding the relationship between their position as wives and men’s position as workers.

**A feminist framework identifies masculinist biases in our discourse about a basic income – this is key to ending gender inequality**

**Mckay 2002 – prof of economics at Glascow Univ** [Ailsa with Jo Vanevery independent writer, Social Politics, Gender, Gender, Family, and Income Maintenance: A Feminist Case for Citizens Basic Income, Summer 2002, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

Developing a feminist perspective on the nature of state supported income maintenance policies facilitates the identification of androcentric bias inherent within the current basic income debate. Social security mechanisms, which are intrinsically linked to the labor market, are criticized for generating and sustaining gender inequalities. This is due in part to the invisibility of various forms of work, particularly care work, provided outside of the labor market. The family is a key institution providing care in contemporary societies. The family is also a deeply gendered institution, often criticized for its inequalities. In addition, radical changes in family forms have occurred which contribute to the "welfare crisis." It is argued that although a basic income provides an opportunity to redefine the basis of citizenship beyond the productivist ethic focused on labor market participation, and is thus an ideal policy for the "postfamilial" society, the current literature does not do this in any sustained way. By examining the relationship between gender, family, and the state, we draw attention to the potential a citizens basic income has for providing the foundations of a new gender-neutral conceptualization of social justice.

**This framework is key – the arguments made in favor of a UBI must account for a feminist perspective...**

**Mckay 2002 – prof of economics at Glascow Univ** [Ailsa with Jo Vanevery independent writer, Social Politics, Gender, Gender, Family, and Income Maintenance: A Feminist Case for Citizens Basic Income, Summer 2002, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

Establishing a right to a basic income independent of employment would have major consequences for women in determining their life choices and would provide the foundations for a rethinking of the relationships between men and women in families. However, the formal establishment of equal rights does not necessarily lead to equal outcomes. Although income security is a powerful tool by which to influence any individual's choices, it is not a unique factor in determining those choices. Therefore, although the advantages a CBI would have for women, listed above, may indeed be realized, they follow from generalized assumptions about patterns of men's behavior. The androcentric bias implicit within those assumptions results from a failure to take into account the structures that constrain women's choices. More convincing arguments could be made for a CBI on the grounds of gender justice by providing insights into the nature of women's lives and work.

#### We must adopt a feminist perspective in discussing a UBI – key to avoid ignoring the coercive free riding in traditional family structures

Danaher 14 – lecturer at National University of Ireland, Galway. [John, “Feminism and the Basic Income (Part Two),” 15/7/14, <http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/feminism-and-basic-income-part-two.html> , 6/27/17] AO [Premier]

4. The Importance of the Feminist Perspective in Debates about the UBI The relative ineffectiveness of the basic income in the face entrenched gendered norms and beliefs is something that should be kept in mind when it comes to political debates about its introduction. Assuming we embrace the goal of de-gendering work roles, we need to be conscious of ways in which political reforms could simply serve to perpetuate the gendered system. This suggests that a critical and questioning mindset will be needed when such reforms are being debated, even in purely philosophical terms. To this extent, Carole Pateman’s article “Free-riding and the Household” is a useful corrective. She encourages participants in the debate about the basic income to shift perspectives. One telling example of this is the attention she draws to the debate about free-riding and reciprocity. As highlighted in earlier posts, one of the most common objections to the basic income is that it allows people to drop out of paid employment and free-ride on the hard work of others. This is thought to be exploitative because the people who remain in paid employment finance the system and the drop outs consequently don’t do their “fair share”. This is where the image of hippie surfers and beach bums find their foothold. But as Pateman points out, this understanding of exploitation and free-riding focuses on the ethics of paid work and the virtues of the (male) breadwinner. It ignores the huge problem of exploitation and free-riding within the traditional family structure. Within that structure men free-ride on the unpaid work done by their partners and consequently don’t do their fair share. Yet it is telling that it is the relationship between the idle surfer and the paid worker that dominates the literature, not the relationship between, say, the idle husband and the hard-working wife. To address this oversight we need to ensure that the debate about the basic income works with a larger concept of reciprocity what it means to do one’s fair share. As I say, I think this is a useful corrective.

#### Feminist voices are excluded from basic income discussions – this limits democratic potential – incorporating women’s perspective breaks social stereotypes about work and wages

Pateman, 2004 – prof of Political Science at UCLA [Carole, Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income. Politics and Society on March 1, 2004. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0032329203261100>] [Premier]

Little attention has been paid in recent academic debates to the democratic significance of a stake or a basic income. Participants have tended to focus on such questions as social justice, relief of poverty, equality of opportunity, or promotion of flexible labor markets, rather than democracy. I do not want to downplay the importance of these questions, or suggest that they are irrelevant to democracy, but they involve different concerns and arguments than explicit attention to democratization. Academic discussion today is too often conducted in a series of separate compartments, each with its own frame of reference. In political theory, for instance, discussion of social justice has usually been undertaken by one set of theorists and democratic theory by others, with the two discussions seldom inter- secting. The terms of the debate about stakeholding have tended to be confined within the framework provided by republicanism, libertarianism, utilitarianism, and liberalism. And, rather oddly in ostensibly “political” theory (though in keeping with the times), political argument is being displaced by neo-classical economic concepts and theories. The narrowness of the debate is exacerbated by the striking absence of the arguments and insights provided by feminist scholars. Some feminists are opposed to a basic income but their arguments are absent too. Many years of scholarship about marriage, employment, and citizenship are virtually ignored in debates about basic income and stakeholding, and women’s freedom (self government) and its implications for a democratic social transformation have hardly been mentioned. Now that the nostrums of neo-classical economics enshrined in national and international policy making have begun to look a little tattered, the way is being opened for some new ideas. The idea of a basic income is not, strictly speaking, new; advocates usually trace it back to Tom Paine, and I have mentioned one of its earlier incarnations as a state bonus. But it is now being more widely discussed, and current circumstances (as I shall discuss below) offer a much more favorable environment than in years past. A basic income offers not just an alternative to highly bureaucratized public provision, and to the less eligibility doctrines that have been resurrected in recent years, but an opportunity to move out of the very well-worn ruts of current discussions of welfare policy. As Brian Barry has stated, “Basic income is not just another idea for rejigging the existing system.” Rather, it has the potential to lead to “a different way of relating individual and society.”4 Or, at least, it has that potential if it is argued for in terms of democratization and women’s freedom.

### Fem FW – Root Cause / Violence

#### The ideology of domination over women manifests itself into unending violence and environmental destruction

Warren and Cady, 1994 [Warren is the Chair of the Philosophy Department at Macalester College and Cady is Professor of Philosophy at Hamline University (Karen and Duane, “Feminism and Peace: Seeing Connections”, p. 16, JSTOR, http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/3810167.pdf] [Premier]

Operationalized, the evidence of patriarchy as a dysfunctional system is found in the behaviors to which it gives rise, (c), and the unmanageability, (d), which results. For example, in the United States, current estimates are that one out of every three or four women will be raped by someone she knows; globally, rape, sexual harassment, spouse-beating, and sado-masochistic pornography are examples of behaviors practiced, sanctioned, or tolerated within patriarchy. In the realm of environmentally destructive behaviors, strip-mining, factory farming, and pollution of the air, water, and soil are instances of behaviors maintained and sanctioned within patriarchy. They, too, rest on the faulty beliefs that it is okay to "rape the earth," that it is "man's God-given right" to have dominion (that is, domination) over the earth, that nature has only instrumental value, that environmental destruction is the acceptable price we pay for "progress."And the presumption of warism, that war is a natural, righteous, and ordinary way to impose dominion on a people or nation, goes hand in hand with patriarchy and leads to dysfunctional behaviors of nations and ultimately to international unmanageability. Much of the current" unmanageability" of contemporary life in patriarchal societies, (d), is then viewed as a consequence of a patriarchal preoccupation with activities, events, and experiences that reflect historically male-gender identified beliefs, values, attitudes, and assumptions. Included among these real-life consequences are precisely those concerns with nuclear proliferation, war, environmental destruction, and violence toward women, which many feminists see as the logica[is the]outgrowth of patriarchal thinking. In fact, it is often only through observing these dysfunctional behaviors-the symptoms of dysfunctionality that one can truly see that and how patriarchy serves to maintain and perpetuate them. When patriarchy is understood as a dysfunctional system, this "unmanageability" can be seen for what it is-as a predictable and thus logical consequence of patriarchy.'1 The theme that global environmental crises, war, and violence generally are predictable and logical consequences of sexism and patriarchal culture is pervasive in ecofeminist literature (see Russell 1989, 2). Ecofeminist Charlene Spretnak, for instance, argues that "militarism and warfare are continual features of a patriarchal society because they reflect and instill patriarchal values and fulfill needs of such a system. Acknowledging the context of patriarchal conceptualizations that feed militarism is a first step toward reducing their impact and preserving life on Earth" (Spretnak 1989, 54). Stated in terms of the foregoing model of patriarchy as a dysfunctional social system, the claims by Spretnak and other feminists take on a clearer meaning: Patriarchal conceptual frameworks legitimate impaired thinking (about women, national and regional conflict, the environment) which is manifested in behaviors which, if continued, will make life on earth difficult, if not impossible. It is a stark message, but it is plausible. Its plausibility lies in understanding the conceptual roots of various woman-nature-peace connections in regional, national, and global contexts.

### Fem FW – Ideal Theory Bad

**Ideal theories are inadequate to solve gender inequality because their neutrality prevents them from recognizing their masculinist biases.**

**Zelleke 2011 - prof of political science at The New School** [Almaz, January 2011, [http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/tpp/pap/2011/00000039/00000001/art00004 June 27](http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/tpp/pap/2011/00000039/00000001/art00004%20June%2027), 2017] LA [Premier]

The feminist critique of political theory. The contemporary feminist critique of traditional political theory in general, and theories of justice in particular, has taken place in two stages (Barrett and Phillips, 1992; Tong, 2009). It began with a critique of the idea of ‘separate spheres’ for men and women, and the demand for gender neutrality in employment and before the law as the means to the elimination of gender inequality. The second stage began from the recognition that gender neutrality was insufficient on its own to eliminate gender inequality, and called for a recognition of gender ‘difference’. Traditional theories of justice have been challenged to incorporate gender differences into their assumptions about the subject of justice, and to recognise principles of responsibility and care in addition to rights and obligations. Separate spheres The separation of social life into public and private, or domestic, spheres1 is a construct that has enabled philosophers to limit their theories to the former and virtually to ignore the latter. Justice, rights and the rule of law are meant to govern the public sphere, while love, altruism and privacy are thought to govern the domestic sphere. Feminists have critiqued the separate spheres model for several reasons (Elshtain, 1981; Okin, 1989; Young, 1995; Kymlicka, 2002). First, the idea of a private domestic sphere allows injustice to flourish within the family – including family violence and the unequal and gendered distribution of power, labour and income. Second, the gendered inequality of the domestic sphere necessarily spills over into the public sphere, where women’s disproportionate domestic responsibilities prevent them from competing fairly with men for jobs, income, political power and other forms of influence, and often relegates women to providing most of society’s lowpaid care as well. But the third reason is one that would hold no matter who was primarily responsible for care work in the domestic sphere: the primacy in our moral imaginations and our social institutions of the model of competent, ‘independent’ adults responsible for their ends and actions fails to recognise the enormous amount of work that goes on in the domestic sphere to make the public sphere possible, and ignores the constraints that those who are primarily responsible for unpaid care confront when they enter the public sphere and are unable to leave the domestic sphere fully behind (Fraser, 1997). Thus, the question of what paid work responsibilities adult citizens have – one of the questions at issue in theories of justice and citizenship – can only take place upon the foundation of the enormous amount of unpaid work that transforms dependent infants into ‘independent’ adults (Okin, 1989; Tronto, 1993; Kittay, 1999).

**Ideal theories fail because they are gender neutral, which leaves in place existing advantages for men and fails to problematize differences.**

**Zelleke 2011 - prof of political science at The New School** [Almaz, January 2011, [http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/tpp/pap/2011/00000039/00000001/art00004 June 27](http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/tpp/pap/2011/00000039/00000001/art00004%20June%2027), 2017] LA [Premier]

The feminist challenge to the model of separate spheres requires not necessarily the rejection of the idea of two spheres, but a rejection of their rigid separation and of the implicit or explicit relegation of men to one sphere and women to the other. Gender equality depends on the recognition of their interdependence and the restructuring of social institutions to allow fluidity between both spheres for both men and women. The limits of gender neutrality ‘Gender neutrality’ in the legal, educational and political spheres removes formal barriers to women’s access to education, occupations, suffrage and political office, and grants women standing before the law independent from fathers, brothers or husbands. Despite the vast opportunities opened to women by gender neutrality, three significant problems nevertheless remain after its widespread institutionalisation. The first problem can be characterised as the ‘stacked deck’. When gender neutrality is institutionalised after generations of gender exclusivity, even seemingly neutral and ostensibly relevant requirements or constraints can have unnecessarily discriminatory effects. Greater rewards in the workplace for full-time and continuous employment, for example, is on its face neutral between genders, but necessarily works against the interests of those – primarily women – who are less able to commit to full-time, continuous work due to care responsibilities (Kymlicka, 2002). Similarly, union-negotiated rewards for seniority, and ‘up or out’ policies in professional fields such as academia or law, work against the advancement of women of childbearing age who take leaves to bear children and to care for them, or of any adult whose care responsibilities place inescapable limits on the intensity of their work commitments (Bergmann, 2005). A second problem with gender neutrality is that it does little to promote pay equity between traditionally male and female occupations. Gender neutrality may mandate that the occupations of sanitation worker and daycare worker both be open to men and women without bias, for example, but does nothing to rectify the large imbalance in pay and benefits between the largely male occupation of sanitation worker and the largely female occupation of daycare worker, despite the similar educational and training level requirements for both positions, and the similarly low-skilled, somewhat physical and dirty nature of the jobs performed by both.2 Third, the doctrine of gender neutrality cannot address the problem of how to recognise and accommodate the gender differences that remain as a result of biology, socialisation and the gendered distribution of care work. If employers or the state offered equivalent, gender-neutral parental leave to mothers and fathers, it might contribute to gender equality, if it inclined fathers to perform more of the care work required by a newborn than they traditionally have; but such evenhanded neutrality fails to account for the fact that it is the mother’s body that has gone through the extra burden of pregnancy and childbirth, and that only mothers can breastfeed their babies.

### Fem Inherency – Gender Disparities

**Women face higher levels of economic disparity than ever, UK empirics prove**

**Schulz 17- Director of Federal Office for Gender Equality** [Patricia, , “Universal Basic Income in a feminist perspective and gender analysis”, Accessed on 6/28/17, <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1468018116686503>] [Premier]

Although the normative framework has improved in many countries of the North and South, and women’s education is now higher than men’s in a number of countries, in average, women still face de facto unequal chances of political, economic and social participation. Their educational efforts are not rewarded the same: the higher their education, the greater the gender pay gap – one of the most depressing statistics one can consider. A recent study on the discrimination experienced by women due to preg-nancy and maternity in the United Kingdom shows how deeply discrimination is embed-ded in society and how it prevents an equal access to the world of work and equal chances in this world, even after decades of efforts, legal and practical, in one of the most advanced economies, to implement gender equality in this field.

### Fem Advantage – Gender Roles

#### The labor market subordinate women by reinforcing the “Breadwinner” model, where men work to support their families. This portrays women as dependent on their husbands and devalues domestic work, which reinforces the patriarchy

Pateman, 2004 – prof of Political Science at UCLA [Carole, Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income. Politics and Society on March 1, 2004. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0032329203261100>] [Premier]

The freedom not to be employed runs counter to the direction of much recent public policy and political rhetoric (especially in Anglo-American countries, though the policies are international), and this makes stakeholding more palatable than basic income in the current political climate. The effect of such policies and rhetoric is to draw even tighter the long-standing link between employment and citizenship, at the very time when a reassessment has been made possible by changing circumstances. The institution of employment is a barrier to democratic freedom and citizenship in two ways. First, economic enterprises have an undemocratic structure, a point that I shall not pursue here.23 Second, as feminist scholars have demonstrated, the relationship between the institutions of marriage, employment, and citizenship has meant that the standing of wives as citizens has always been, and remains, problematic. The Anglo-American social insurance system was constructed on the assumption that wives not only were their husbands’economic dependents but lesser citizens whose entitlement to benefits depended on their private status, not on their citizenship. Male “breadwinners,” who made a contribution from their earnings to “insure” that they received benefits in the event of unemployment or sickness, and in their old age, were the primary citizens. Their employment was treated as the contribution that a citizen could make to the well-being of the community. Ackerman and Alstott acknowledge this in their criticism of “workplace justice,”24 and their recognition that unconditional retirement pensions would be particularly important for the many older women whose benefits still largely derive from their husbands’ employment record.25 That is to say, only paid employment has been seen as “work,” as involving the tasks that are the mark of a productive citizen and contributor to the polity. Other contributions, notably all the work required to reproduce and maintain a healthy population and care for infants, the elderly, the sick, and infirm—the caring tasks, most of which are not paid for and are undertaken by women—have been seen as irrelevant to citizenship.

**Welfare policies must move away from a focus on the family to promote women’s autonomy – otherwise they reinforce a subordinate role for women in the family.**

**Mckay 2002 – prof of economics at Glascow Univ** [Ailsa with Jo Vanevery independent writer, Social Politics, Gender, Gender, Family, and Income Maintenance: A Feminist Case for Citizens Basic Income, Summer 2002, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

In liberal democracies a woman's relationship to the state is mediated by her husband, who is seen to contribute directly to society through his paid work. Despite recognition at the level of discourse of women's "vital unpaid service" to the nation, this service is still treated as if it were but a personal one to her husband. A new model of citizenship needs to explicitly recognize the importance of the "sexual contract." In addition, it must recognize the social changes in personal relationships and intimate/sexual lives. Janet Finch (1989) points out that historical evidence shows that when the state's notion of family obligation is out of line with individual ideas of appropriateness, policies can have the opposite effect to that intended. Both Finch (1989) and Weston (1991) emphasize that individuals tend to see family as a last resort for assistance. This is in direct contrast to the state's assumptions, enshrined in social security policies, that the (nuclear) family should be a first resort. Several authors have proposed concepts that attempt to account for this. Julia O'Connor's insistence on the importance of personal autonomy, as "insulation from personal and public dependence," seems to us a promising direction (O'Connor 1993, 515). Lister's concept of "defamilialization" performs a similar role (1994; see also the discussion in Lister 1995, 29-30). In our opinion, welfare policies need to be disengaged from a particular model of the family— worker-citizen + wife-mother + children—if women are to achieve personal autonomy and a direct relationship to the state. The implications of family change and sexual citizenship for policy are that policies should be based on personal autonomy and enable a variety of supportive relationships. This involves a radical rethinking of the relationship between family and citizenship, a relationship with significant implications for the construction of gender. In an apparently paradoxical fashion, the best way to support families may be to treat people as individuals in social security policies. The privileging of marriage (even if broadened to include cohabiting heterosexual couples and even lesbian or gay couples) is part and parcel of constituting women as "second-class" citizens. Equal citizenship rights involve recognizing the dependence of the "social contract" on the "sexual contract" and devising new ways of organizing the various types of work that need to be done. As Judith Stacey has argued: "The family" is not "here to stay." Nor should we wish it were. On the contrary, I believe that all democratic people, whatever their kinship preferences, should work to hasten its demise. An ideological concept that imposes mythical homogeneity on the diverse means by which people organize their intimate relationships, "the family" distorts and devalues this rich variety of kinship stories.

#### A UBI would improve women’s position in the family – it emancipates women because it values care work, and it increases women’s morale and bargaining power

Danaher, 2014 - a lecturer at the National University of Ireland, [John July 14, 2014 Feminism and the Basic Income (Part One) http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/feminism-and-basic-income-part-one.html [Premier]

It could lead to a re-valuation of unpaid and care work: At the moment, the kinds of unpaid and care work that women have traditionally engaged in are undervalued and under-appreciated in society. Paid employment and the moralisation of paid work have taken care of that. By decoupling work from income, one hope for the UBI would be that it would lead to the revaluation of unpaid and care work. This is, however, open to doubt. If it is also paid to children, it could have a beneficial impact on mothers: If children are also recipients of a basic income (perhaps at a reduced rate), mothers are likely to benefit. First, by having their care work recognised and rewarded. Second, by weakening the poverty trap experienced by many single parent families. (I don’t fully follow this point from Robeyns. The assumption seems to be that parents will control the income granted to their child, which is a fair assumption, but it makes me wonder how this differs from childcare allowances that are granted in many European countries.) It could have a positive psychological effect on housewives: It would give them a feeling of contributing to the incomes of their families, and would grant them a recognition for the value of their work. Robeyns cites studies from the UK on the positive psychological impact of child allowances on mothers in support of this. It could improve women’s bargaining position within the home: Amartya Sen argues that households should be viewed as cooperative conflicts. The people within them typically cooperate for gains, but those gains are not distributed equally. Oftentimes women are the losers. By increasing women’s financial independence (thereby granting them an improved exit option), the UBI could help to improve their bargaining position in the home.

**Current welfare policies favor men over women because they link benefits to work, and while women are pressured to stay home with families – a UBI solves.**

**Mckay 2002 – prof of economics at Glascow Univ** [Ailsa with Jo Vanevery independent writer, Social Politics, Gender, Gender, Family, and Income Maintenance: A Feminist Case for Citizens Basic Income, Summer 2002, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

Formal social security arrangements have traditionally served men more favorably than women. This is due in part to the direct relationship between insurance-based benefits and the labor market, but has more to do with the indirect consequences of policies that fail to recognize the diverse roles of women as wives, mothers, workers, and caregivers. Women's historically limited access to the labor market and their lower earnings relative to their male counterparts is well documented. Thus women are disadvantaged in terms of rights to benefits within a system based on paid contributions while in employment. The economic position of women leads to inequalities in access to benefits which results in unequal resource distribution outcomes. Legislation promoting the removal of discriminatory policies has served to enhance women's formal position as claimants and to establish their rights to benefits. However, various social and demographic factors, such as the increase in single-parent households (predominately female headed); women's longer life expectancy, and the unpaid work undertaken primarily by women in providing welfare within the household, further contribute to gender bias in the operation of social security systems. References made to women within the basic income literature have primarily focused on the advantages an unconditional income guarantee offers through promoting equal treatment between the sexes; recognizing the value of unpaid work; providing income security without the traditional labor market, thereby strengthening family life; improving work incentives and incentives to invest in human capital; securing financial independence within families; and providing the basis for a more equal sharing of domestic responsibilities between men and women (see, e.g., Jordan 1988, 118-19; 1992, 171-72; Parker 1993; Walter 1989, 116-27). All of these perceived outcomes can be equally applied in an analysis of the benefits a CBI would have for men. This implies that the advantages of the policy which are particular to the situation of women have not been fully understood. The limited feminist critiques of CBI contest some of these claims. In particular, it is argued that CBI could entrench existing exploitative domestic divisions of labor (see, e.g., Lister 1995). However, these critiques are often cursory, and little rigorous analysis of either case has been undertaken.

**The welfare state is premised on sexist ideologies. Radical change necessary to alleviate gender discrimination**

**Fraser 94 – professor of philosophy at The New School in New York City** [Nancy, After the Family Wage: Gender Equity and the Welfare State, Nov., 1994, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/192041.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A153d27b49d89b6f05a20d2a26280b80c>, 28 June 2017] CL [Premier]

THE CURRENT CRISIS OF THE WELFARE STATE has many roots- global economic trends, massive movements of refugees and immigrants, popular hostility to taxes, the weakening of trade unions and labor parties, the rise of national and "racial"-ethnic antagonisms, the decline of solidaristic ideologies, and the collapse of state socialism. One absolutely crucial factor, however, is the crumbling of the old gender order. Existing welfare states are premised on assumptions about gender that are increasingly out of phase with many people's lives and self-understandings. They therefore do not provide adequate social protections, especially for women and children. The gender order that is now disappearing descends from the industrial era of capitalism and reflects the social world of its origin. It was centered on the ideal of the family wage. In this world, people were supposed to be organized into heterosexual, male-headed nuclear families, which lived principally from the man's labor market earnings. The male head of the household would be paid a family wage, sufficient to support children and a wife and mother, who performed domestic labor without pay. Of course, countless lives never fit this pattern. Still, it provided the normative picture of a proper family. The family-wage ideal was inscribed in the structure of most industrial-era welfare states.' That structure had three tiers, with social-insurance programs occupying the first rank. Designed to protect people from the vagaries of the AUTHOR'S NOTE: Research for this article was supported by the Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research, Northwestern University. For helpful comments, I am indebted to Rebecca Blank Joshua Cohen, Fay Cook Barbara Hobson, Axel Honneth, Jenny Mansbridge, Linda Nicholson, Ann Shola Orloff, John Roemer, Ian Schapiro, Tracy Strong, Peter Taylor-Gooby, Judy Wittner, Eli Zaretsky, and the members of the Feminist Public Policy Work Group of the Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research, Northwestern University. POLITICAL THEORY, Vol. 22 No. 4, November 1994 591-618 C) 1994 Sage Publications, Inc. 591 This content downloaded from 130.166.220.254 on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 23:04:19 UTC All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms 592 POLITICAL THEORY / November 1994 labor market (and to protect the economy from shortages of demand), these programs replaced the breadwinner's wage in case of sickness, disability, unemployment, or old age. Many countries also featured a second tier of programs, providing direct support for full-time female homemaking and mothering. A third tier served the "residuum." Largely a holdover from traditional poor relief, these programs provided paltry, stigmatized, means- tested aid to needy people who had no claim to honorable support because they did not fit the family-wage scenario.2 Today, however, the family-wage assumption is no longer tenable-either empirically or normatively. We are currently experiencing the death throes of the old, industrial gender order with the transition to new, postindustrial phase of capitalism. The crisis of the welfare state is bound up with these epochal changes. It is rooted in part in the collapse of the world of the family wage, and of its central assumptions about labor markets and families. In the labor markets of postindustrial capitalism, few jobs pay wages sufficient to support a family single-handedly; many, in fact, are temporary or part-time and do not carry standard benefits.3 Women's employment is increasingly common, moreover-although far less well-paid than men's.4 Postindustrial families, meanwhile, are less conventional and more diverse.5 Heterosexuals are marrying less and later, and divorcing more and sooner. And gays and lesbians are pioneering new kinds of domestic arrangements.' Gender norms and family forms are highly contested, finally. Thanks in part to the feminist and gay and lesbian liberation movements, many people no longer prefer the male breadwinner/female homemaker model. As a result of these trends, growing numbers of women, both divorced and never married, are struggling to support themselves and their families without access to a male breadwinner's wage.7 In short, a new world of economic production and social reproduction is emerging-a world of less stable employment and more diverse families. Although no one can be certain about its ultimate shape, this much seems clear: the emerging world, no less than the world of the family wage, will require a welfare state that effectively insures people against uncertainties. If anything, the need for such protection is increased. It is clear, too, that the old forms of welfare state, built on assumptions of male-headed families and relatively stable jobs, are no longer suited to providing this protection. We need something new, a postindustrial welfare state suited to radically new conditions of employment and reproduction. What then should a postindustrial welfare state look like? Conservatives have lately had a lot to say about "restructuring the welfare state," but their vision is counterhistorical and contradictory; they seek to reinstate the male breadwinner/female homemaker family for the middle class, while demandThis content downloaded from 130.166.220.254 on Tue, 27 Jun 2017 23:04:19 UTC All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms Fraser / GENDER EQUITY AND THE WELFARE STATE 593 ing that poor single mothers work. Neoliberal proposals have recently emerged in the United States, but they too are inadequate in the current context. Punitive, androcentric, and obsessed with employment despite the absence of good jobs, they are unable to provide security in a postindustrial world.8 Both of these approaches ignore one crucial thing: apostindustrial welfare state, like its industrial predecessor, must support a gender order. But the only kind of gender order that can be acceptable today is one premised on gender equity

**Conceptions of work center on the production of commodities for the market ignoring the nature of household work**

**McKay, 01 – Professor of Economics at Glasgow Caledonian University** [Alisa, a Scottish economist, government policy adviser, a leading feminist economist and Professor of Economics at Glasgow Caledonian University, RETHINKING WORK AND INCOME MAINTENANCE POLICY: PROMOTING GENDER EQUALITY T HROUGH A CITIZENS ’ BASIC INCOME, Feminist Economics, 3/1/01, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-923X.2004.00611.x/abstract, 6/27/] JY [Premier]

Conceptually work is usually distinguished from leisure. The implication is that the cost of time spent engaging in activities clearly defined as work can be measured by the associated sacrifice of leisure time. This is not to say that all of those activities we deem enjoyable are categorized as “leisure” and activities involving pain, toil, or a sacrifice of enjoyment as “work.” Work may be something we enjoy, but it is distinct from leisure in that it is not done solely for its own sake but must also be purposeful. Any activity that displays “the characteristic of using up time and energy for an extrinsic purpose” can be defined as work, in that desirable end results are created through a process that involves an opportunity cost of lost leisure time (Susan Himmelweit 1995: 3). These end results are not only produced for the enjoyment or satisfaction of the individual carrying out the activity, but also have a use-value that can be shared by others. It is therefore the productive, purposeful aspect of any activity that defines it as work. For André Gorz (1994: 53), conceptualizing work in this way is a feature of modern industrial capitalism: So long as commodity production remained marginal and the great majority of needs were covered by domestic production and the village economy, the notion of “work” as such . . . could not take hold. People “produced”, “constructed” and “prepared” things; they “laboured”, “toiled”, “drudged” and “attended to” a wide variety of specific “occupations” which had no common measure between them within the framework of the domestic community. And responsibility for the various activities was assumed by the husband, the wife, the children or the older members of the family according to an immutable division of labour. These activities were gendered . . . and thus there was no common denominator between them. They were not interchangeable, and could not be compared and evaluated in terms of a single yardstick. The term “work” referred not to a creative or productive act but to the activity in so far as it entailed pain, annoyance and fatigue. The dominance of commodity production and consumption over subsistence production brought about by the development of capitalist modes of production results in the depersonalization of work activities. This leads Gorz to assert that the modern notion of work refers to: the name of an activity fundamentally different from the activities of subsistence, reproduction, maintenance and care performed within the household. This is not so much because “work” is a paid activity, but because it is done in the public domain and appears there as a measurable, exchangeable and interchangeable performance; as a performance which possesses a use-value for others, not simply for the members of the household community carrying it out; for others in general, without distinction or restriction, not for a particular, private person. (Ibid.: 53) This socialization of productive activities means that the worker becomes separable from the resulting output. Producing goods and services for exchange in the public domain renders irrelevant the direct relationship between the person carrying out the task and their economic output. Activities are interchangeable between workers, and outputs become measurable in terms of their use-value to others. In modern terms the concept of work is associated with any impersonal activity that results in output that can be measured and presented as a commodity, or service, for sale or exchange in an impersonal public marketplace. Many of the activities frequently performed by women are “invisible,” in the sense that there is either no tangible output, or the actual nature, and therefore value, of the output is not transparent. Consequently these activities do not meet the conventional criteria that would allow them to be labeled ‘“work.” Although much progress has been made in valuing domestic work to illustrate the signifi cance of women’s productive contribution to the economy (see, for example, the Human Development Report 1995) little has been done to quantify “provisioning” functions within the family. That is, the label domestic work is generally assigned to a range of “physical” tasks, considered essential ingredients in the effi cient functioning of the household economy. Such tasks can either be undertaken by a person(s) employed for that specifi c purpose or can be performed by an individual member of the household who receives no formal remuneration for doing so. The latter I refer to as “internalized unpaid domestic work,” which serves to draw the distinction between work done by the “hired help” and work done by wives and mothers themselves. As noted above, attempts at recognizing the value of internalized unpaid domestic work have at least got under way. However, in addition to internalized unpaid domestic work, many nonphysical exchanges or services performed in the household contribute positively to individual welfare, which prove even more difficult to quantify. Examples of “provisioning functions within the family” include the transfer of knowledge or skills, providing a safe and loving environment, expressing and acting from concern for the health and emotional needs of other family members, and organizing the distribution and allocation of resources within the family unit. Many of these activities are essential for human survival, particularly those concerned with the care of children ( Julie Nelson 1993: 32). Nonmaterial sources of human satisfaction influence intra-family power structures and directly affect the economic position of women. That they remain in the periphery of the economics discipline is possibly because quantifying them would be a technically difficult thing to do. However, it more likely stems from the fact that such activities are not viewed as “important” simply because they are performed by women; Humans are born of women, nurtured and cared for as dependent children, socialized into family and community groups, and are perpetually dependent on nourishment and shelter to sustain their lives. These aspects of human life, whose neglect is often justified by the argument that they are unimportant or intellectually uninteresting or merely “natural”, are, not just coincidentally, the areas of life thought of as “women’s work”. (Nelson 1996: 31)

**The market erodes women’s importance in the family**

**McKay, 01 – Professor of Economics at Glasgow Caledonian University** [Alisa, a Scottish economist, government policy adviser, a leading feminist economist and Professor of Economics at Glasgow Caledonian University, RETHINKING WORK AND INCOME MAINTENANCE POLICY: PROMOTING GENDER EQUALITY T HROUGH A CITIZENS ’ BASIC INCOME, Feminist Economics, 3/1/01, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-923X.2004.00611.x/abstract, 6/27/] JY

As marketed substitutes become available for more and more of those domestic activities that count as “work,” the apparent importance of the needs they satisfy increase relative to those remaining needs which are not perceived to be so readily met by the market. These tend to be the needs whose satisfaction requires activities which are inseparable from the person performing them, including caring and self fulfilling activities. These are the needs that remain invisible, of apparent marginal significance to the economy, and thus their importance to the actors within it easily ignored. (Himmelweit 1995: 10) The redistribution of work from the domestic realm to the market has indirectly resulted in the devaluing of the time and effort women spend fulfilling both their own and others’ affiliation needs; that is, “the need of human beings to belong and to be loved” (Nelson 1996: 73). Individual needs and desires are therefore socially constructed via the process of commodification. The principles of production and consumption dominate, and those activities that do not fit neatly into the economists’ model of price theory become undervalued by society in general. Individuals who exhibit a preference for pursuing nonmarketable provisioning activities are labeled as nonworkers or “idlers,” suffering from the negative connotations this implies. A witty but apt retort would draw upon the old adage, “relationships are hard work”! As Nelson suggests in her above observations on the provisioning aspects of human life, it is clear that the undervaluing of “uncommodifiable” needs does not render them less important in terms of their contribution to individual welfare. However, in a male/work-dominated society, women continue to shoulder a disproportionate share of these “nonwork” activities, and their position has been undermined by the process of commodification.

#### The breadwinner model reinforces patriarchy – social norms interact to stereotype women as dependent on their husbands and to devalue women’s domestic work

Pateman, 2004 – prof of Political Science at UCLA [Carole, Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income. Politics and Society on March 1, 2004. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0032329203261100>] [Premier]

The freedom not to be employed runs counter to the direction of much recent public policy and political rhetoric (especially in Anglo-American countries, though the policies are international), and this makes stakeholding more palatable than basic income in the current political climate. The effect of such policies and rhetoric is to draw even tighter the long-standing link between employment and citizenship, at the very time when a reassessment has been made possible by changing circumstances. The institution of employment is a barrier to democratic freedom and citizenship in two ways. First, economic enterprises have an undemocratic structure, a point that I shall not pursue here.23 Second, as feminist scholars have demonstrated, the relationship between the institutions of marriage, employment, and citizenship has meant that the standing of wives as citizens has always been, and remains, problematic. The Anglo-American social insurance system was constructed on the assumption that wives not only were their husbands’economic dependents but lesser citizens whose entitlement to benefits depended on their private status, not on their citizenship. Male “breadwinners,” who made a contribution from their earnings to “insure” that they received benefits in the event of unemployment or sickness, and in their old age, were the primary citizens. Their employment was treated as the contribution that a citizen could make to the well-being of the community. Ackerman and Alstott acknowledge this in their criticism of “workplace justice,”24 and their recognition that unconditional retirement pensions would be particularly important for the many older women whose benefits still largely derive from their husbands’ employment record.25 That is to say, only paid employment has been seen as “work,” as involving the tasks that are the mark of a productive citizen and contributor to the polity. Other contributions, notably all the work required to reproduce and maintain a healthy population and care for infants, the elderly, the sick, and infirm—the caring tasks, most of which are not paid for and are undertaken by women—have been seen as irrelevant to citizenship.

#### A Basic Income would eliminate the gendered discourse of welfare policy.

Pateman 2004 - Professor of Government at the University of Sydney [ CAROLE Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income POLITICS & SOCIETY, Vol. 32 No. 1, March 89-105 <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/polisci/faculty/pateman/Democratizing.pdf> [Premier]

Little attention has been paid in recent academic debates to the democratic significance of a stake or a basic income. Participants have tended to focus on such questions as social justice, relief of poverty, equality of opportunity, or promotion of flexible labor markets, rather than democracy. I do not want to downplay the importance of these questions, or suggest that they are irrelevant to democracy, but they involve different concerns and arguments than explicit attention to democratization. Academic discussion today is too often conducted in a series of separate compartments, each with its own frame of reference. In political theory, for instance, discussion of social justice has usually been undertaken by one set of theorists and democratic theory by others, with the two discussions seldom inter- secting. The terms of the debate about stakeholding have tended to be confined within the framework provided by republicanism, libertarianism, utilitarianism, and liberalism. And, rather oddly in ostensibly “political” theory (though in keeping with the times), political argument is being displaced by neo-classical economic concepts and theories. The narrowness of the debate is exacerbated by the striking absence of the arguments and insights provided by feminist scholars. Some feminists are opposed to a basic income but their arguments are absent too. Many years of scholarship about marriage, employment, and citizenship are virtually ignored in debates about basic income and stakeholding, and women’s freedom (self government) and its implications for a democratic social transformation have hardly been mentioned. Now that the nostrums of neo-classical economics enshrined in national and international policy making have begun to look a little tattered, the way is being opened for some new ideas. The idea of a basic income is not, strictly speaking, new; advocates usually trace it back to Tom Paine, and I have mentioned one of its earlier incarnations as a state bonus. But it is now being more widely discussed, and current circumstances (as I shall discuss below) offer a much more favorable environment than in years past. A basic income offers not just an alternative to highly bureaucratized public provision, and to the less eligibility doctrines that have been resurrected in recent years, but an opportunity to move out of the very well-worn ruts of current discussions of welfare policy. As Brian Barry has stated, “Basic income is not just another idea for rejigging the existing system.” Rather, it has the potential to lead to “a different way of relating individual and society.”4 Or, at least, it has that potential if it is argued for in terms of democratization and women’s freedom.

**A basic income increases women’s bargaining power in the family**

**Zelleke 2011 - prof of political science at The New School** [Almaz, January 2011, [http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/tpp/pap/2011/00000039/00000001/art00004 June 27](http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/tpp/pap/2011/00000039/00000001/art00004%20June%2027), 2017] LA [Premier]

None of these changes would guarantee on their own that men would scale back time spent in paid employment, or that if they did they would increase their time spent in care work. But they would decrease the costs to men of doing so, and would increase their opportunities to break out of the gendered distribution that confines men to paid employment-centric models of contributory citizenship just as women are constrained in other ways (Roebyns, 2000, 2001). An unconditional basic income and the reduction of the dependency of the caregiving partner on the employed partner for income, benefits and status should encourage both men and women to combine both roles either simultaneously or in turn. Finally, while an unconditional basic income and the associated institutional changes a feminist theory of distributive justice implies would increase the bargaining power of women vis-à-vis men over determining the distribution of labour within any particular family, the gains for women in traditional male–female partnerships are not accomplished at the expense of the exclusion of single parents from any benefits or the exploitation of the low-income women who carry the burden of care work when more affluent women work in paid employment.

### Fem Advantage/Impact – IPV

**Women are vulnerable to violence and exploitation because the labor market does not value ‘domestic’ work**

**Mckay 2002 – prof of economics at Glascow Univ** [Ailsa with Jo Vanevery independent writer, Social Politics, Gender, Gender, Family, and Income Maintenance: A Feminist Case for Citizens Basic Income, Summer 2002, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

Key feminist concerns regarding relationships within families have included violence, resource distribution, and the division of labor. Independent access to the means of subsistence (in a market economy, an income) is argued to be necessary to provide women with the means to negotiate as equals within a relationship and, in extreme situations, to exit unsatisfactory relationships. Although modern welfare states provide an alternative to the labor market as a source of this income, income maintenance policies are designed to be supportive of the labor market rather than provide a real alternative to it as a source of income. In addition, as shown above, modern welfare states are based on a particular form of family on which they rely for much of the caring work necessary for the smooth functioning of society. Feminist arguments which stress the importance of women's participation in the labor market are often perceived as themselves devaluing the affiliative work valued by many women (even those in the labor market). A more accurate interpretation of these feminist positions would be that, in a society that already -undervalues this work,8 women are at an unacceptable risk for violence, poverty, and other forms of exploitation if they have no relationship to the labor market. The tendency to commodify all human activity in order to give it value in a market-based economy results in unduly restrictive social citizenship rights, particularly those related to income security. Thus policies aiming to achieve gender equality must account for genderbased social structures of constraint and explicitly recognize the positive welfare contribution of "nonwork" activities. The administrative costs (if not impossibility) of measuring such contributions seem prohibitive. It is much more logical to assume that all citizens make a positive contribution to society (through participation in the market, participation in affiliative activities, caring, etc.) and thus deserve an income capable of meeting their basic subsistence needs. This income, lets call it a citizens basic income, would then provide the basis for individuals to make choices about the extent of their participation in the labor market and the types of personal relationships they will enter into. We suspect that the number of people who will do neither of these things is so small as to be insignificant.

**Feminists support UBI – improves outcomes for those who leave abusive relationships and promotes the importance of unpaid work, undermining the gender binary.**

**Katada 12- Assistant Professor Saitama Prefectural University** [Kaori, Basic Income and Feminism: in terms of “the gender division of labor”, 2012, http://basicincome.org/bien/pdf/munich2012/katada.pdf, June 28, 2017] CL [Premier]

BI is the concept of an income that is paid unconditionally to all citizens as a personal right based on citizenship (e.g., Fitzpatrick 1999). It is said to be a social concept calling for turning away from a labor-centric view of society in order to break the strong linkage between labor and income. This is because entitlement to BI is completely decoupled from differences in labor. In this sense, it can be interpreted as a sort of critique of the welfare state based on the insurance/assistance benefits model, where paid-work continues to play a central role. On the other hand, the modern welfare state has long been criticized by minorities, who tend to be marginalized within the welfare state. Objections from feminists are thought to be particularly important. Feminist critiques of the welfare state have been directed firstly at the family model (male breadwinner/female housekeeper model) assumed by the welfare state, and the androcentric concept of citizenship built on top of it. These have extended to critiques of institutions based on such citizenship, and gender division of public and private spheres. In this manner, proponents of BI and feminists have critiqued the conventional welfare state in their respective contexts. Unfortunately, however, the intersection of the two has seldom been discussed so far. This is probably the reason that the debate on BI, which has started to become more active in recent years, has been criticized for being largely gender blind (Pateman 2006). On the other hand, feminism has tended to view BI critically, trivializing it as "payment for housework" without much further consideration. Due perhaps to such circumstances, there has been hardly any productive cross-fertilization between the two camps. However, if gender equity is thought to be an indispensable policy norm, studying its treatment 1 katadakaori@gmail.com 2 within the new policy concept of BI ought to be important when considering feminist social policy. The present paper thus aims to analytically discuss the "intersection" of these two perspectives. Below, I will begin by organizing and reexamining the connotations of BI in feminism, as well as the two differing arguments surrounding it—the assertion that BI is “Emancipation Fee” paid to promote women’s liberation, and the one that holds it is “hush money” for the oppression of women. I will illustrate that those who assert either of these arguments for or against BI recognize it as “payment for household and care labor;” however perspectives on the impact BI has on the gender division of roles and of the labor market. In order to illustrate this dynamic, I will attempt to illuminate first whether BI can become “payment for household and care labor” by comparing the two guaranteed income policies which are similar to Basic Income: Caretaker benefit and Participation Income. Secondly, I will assess and in the end offer some insight into “the impact BI has on the gender division of roles and of the labor market”. 2. Basic Income and Feminism 2-1 What is Basic Income? BI is a scheme to ensure that income is unconditionally paid to all citizens as an individual right based on citizenship. The main features of BI in comparison to existing income support schemes under the welfare state are that it is paid to the (1) individual (2) unconditionally. These features are discussed in turn below. Firstly, BI is paid to the individual rather than the household. For this reason, it may alleviate unequal distribution within the household. Secondly, it is paid unconditionally. Unconditionality in this case means not to question work status, employment record, willingness to work, marriage status, etc. Thus, there is no requirement to take a test such as a means test, work test, behavior test, or the like. It was mentioned above regarding (2) that BI liberates people from being forced to work in order to survive by decoupling work from income (Van Parijs 1995). However, this orientation of BI has often been criticized with the claim that "BI just gives rise to free riders.” Needless to say, such criticisms are based on reproach towards not working (specifically, not engaging in paid-work in the public sphere or labor market). In response to such criticisms, feminists have asserted that there are more free riders in the private sphere of the home (Pateman 2006; Fraser 1996). They point out that it is the husbands that have been free riding on the multifaceted unpaid work of women in the home. Unfortunately, however, such free riding by the husband seldom appears on the agenda in discourse about BI when the issue of free riding is raised. This reflects the circumstances that conventional discourse on BI has been gender blind and that feminists have not contributed much to BI theory. However, 3 feminist analyses of BI have at last started to appear in recent years2 . BI is discussed below from the perspective of feminism on the basis of these analyses. 2-2

**A UBI is key to women’s liberation – it breaks down Gender Stereotypes and allows women to leave abusive relationships**

**Srnicek and Williams 2015 - lecturer at City University and editor in chief of The New Stack** [Nick and Alex, Inventing the Future: Post capitalism and a World Without Work. November 17 2015, https://s3.amazonaws.com/arena-attachments/576840/68a4032cf0d4b1ffc2564332ad7c9e36.pdf,June 27, 2017] LA [Premier]

Finally, a basic income is a fundamentally feminist proposal. Its disregard for the gendered division of labour overcomes some of the biases of the traditional welfare state predicated upon a male breadwinner. 118 Equally, it recognises the contributions of unwaged domestic labourers to the reproduction of society and provides them with an income accordingly. The financial independence that comes with a basic income is also crucial to developing the synthetic freedom of women. It enables experimentation with different forms of family and community structure that are no longer bound to the model of the privatised nuclear family. 119 And financial independence can reconfigure intimate relationships as well: one of the more unexpected findings of experiments with UBI has been that the divorce rate tended to rise. 120 Conservative commentators jumped on this as proof of the demand’s immorality, but higher divorce rates are easily explained as women gaining the financial means to leave dysfunctional relationships. 121 A basic income can therefore enable easier experimentation with the family structure, more possibilities for the provision of childcare and an easier transformation of the gendered division of labour. Moreover, unlike the demand for ‘wages for housework’ in the 1970s, the demand for UBI promises to break out of the wage relation rather than reinforce it.

**A UBI liberates women by giving them financial independence from domestic oppression and gender roles**

**Carter, 2014 – Bay Area Legal Aid** [Timothy, The One Minute Case for a Basic Income, Montreal, 2014, <http://basicincome.org/bien/pdf/montreal2014/BIEN2014_Carter.pdf>, 6/28/17] JY [Premier]

The one minute feminist case for a basic income: Patriarchy has put the world's wealth in the hands of men, prevented women from being professionals and entreprenuers, forced poor women into dead-end second-class labor jobs, and forced all women to become unpaid domestic servants and caretakers of the young, elderly, and disabled of their families. Women have been forced to be financially dependent on fathers or husbands who are often abusive. A basic income would change all of this. A basic income would be a massive transfer of wealth from men to women. Women would be free of financial dependence on any man, and the young, elderly, and disabled would all be fully supported. Women could afford to leave abusive husbands, those who chose to be caretakers would be fully compensated, and no woman would be forced into a dead-end job, and would instead be able to pursue her own financial goals as she saw fit.

### Fem Advantage – Welfare Queen Stereotype

#### Current welfare policies labels women as “Welfare Queens”; a UBI challenges gender roles in welfare by eliminating the stigma and desegregates the labor market by valuing non-waged work

Danaher, 2014 - a lecturer at the National University of Ireland, [John July 14, 2014 Feminism and the Basic Income (Part One) http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/feminism-and-basic-income-part-one.html [Premier]

The second argument holds that feminists should embrace the UBI because of its potential to reduce the sexual division of labour. The traditional division of labour is that of the male breadwinner and the female caregiver. If UBI has the potential to raise the status of non-waged work, then it could also, potentially, encourage more men to engage in that type of work. This might allow for some de-gendering of work roles. The mechanisms for this are likely to be indirect. The UBI wouldn’t actively reward unpaid work, it would simply make it a more viable option. I’ll be talking about this more in part two. The third argument holds that feminists should embrace the UBI because it could reduce existing labour market segregation. This is essentially just the flip-side of the previous argument. One of the problems with the sexual division of labour is that it impairs women’s access to paid employment. If women are forced, demanded or expected to engage in unpaid work within the home — and if men are not — then the opportunities for women to access paid employment are limited. So if the UBI can reduce the sexual division of labour, it could also increase the access to paid employment. This would also represent an improvement over existing welfare systems where entitlements are dependent on total household income. In support of this, Fitzpatrick gives the example of systems in which the benefits payable to an unemployed man are actually reduced if his spouse/partner is working. This can encourage women in low-pay work to give up that work. The fourth argument holds that feminists should embrace the UBI because it will reduce the burden placed upon women by the welfare state. The idea here is that women are often the chief “victims” of the bureaucracy of the traditional welfare system. Due to social panics about “welfare queens” and the like, women often experience intrusive means-testing and enquiries into their personal lives in order to prove eligibility for welfare. The unconditional nature of the basic income cuts out those intrusions.

#### The “Welfare Queen” label reinforces racism, sexism, poverty and other forms of social injustice.

Sparks, 2003 [Holloway Sparks, Schram et al, Bryn Mawr College Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research social theory and policy instructor; Joe Soss, American University School of Public Affairs Government Associate Professor; Richard Fording, University of Kentucky Political Science Associate Professor, Race and the Politics of Welfare Reform, P. 175-177] [Premier]

One particularly powerful way that discourses enter public sphere discussions is through stereotypes, or what Patricia Hill Collins has theorized as “controlling images” (2000, chap. 4; see also Lubiano 1992). Controlling images, Collins suggests, are socially constructed images “designed to make racism, sexism, poverty, and other forms of social injustice appear to be natural, normal, and inevitable parts of everyday life” (2000, 69). The examples Collins discusses—mammies, matriarchs, welfare queens, and hoochies—objectify and subordinate black women. These images serve as a kind of shorthand for interpreting, shaping, stigmatizing—and thereby controlling—the actions of marginalized groups. For example, Collins notes that single black women who work outside the home to support their families are called “matriarchs,” and instead of being praised as good providers are blamed for driving their men away and for not being home to supervise their children adequately. Single black women who do stay home to supervise their children are stigmatized as “welfare queens” and are viewed as lazy rather than as good parents. In both cases, the controlling image constructs the woman as the problem, which draws attention away from structural reasons for poverty, and from the gender, race, and class discrimination that hinders the ability of black women to support and care for themselves and their families in the first place (2000, 72–84).6 Controlling images and stereotypes are used in turn to reinforce larger, overarching narratives about social and political issues. For example, as I discuss in the next section, controlling images of welfare recipients as loafers and drug addicts have supported a narrative that portrays poverty as the result of individuals’ bad decision-making and learned “dependency.” This narrative in turn supports policy programs that sanction participants for failures of “personal responsibility.” If a controlling image is widely taken as true, then opponents will have more difficulty challenging either the discourse or the policy prescription that has been constructed to solve the “problem” posed by the stereotyped group (Naples 1997). For democratic theorists concerned about citizen participation, attending to the discourses and controlling images used in the context of public sphere discussions clearly augments approaches that attend to more obvious practices of exclusion. The power to construct potent con- trolling images and discourses about other citizens, if unchallenged, not only shapes the way those citizens’ speech is heard, but also affects whether they even try to speak in the first place. Such power can thus significantly affect who participates and how in public sphere discussions. While some advantaged citizens have an easy time both with gaining access to political discussions and being heard as authoritative once there, others face nearly insurmountable challenges on both fronts. The result is a public sphere in which some citizens have a far more powerful voice than they should.

### Fem Advantage – Prostitution

Poverty forces many women into prostitution. Economic structures present many with no real choice – prostitution or starvation. A UBI decreases sexual exploitation,

Story, 2017 – writer for Basic Income.org [Rae Breaking the Vicious Circle: Basic Income and Sexual Exploitation March 18, <http://basicincome.org/news/2017/03/breaking-the-vicious-circle-basic-income-and-sexual-exploitation/> Acc 6/29/17] [Premier]

I had an abusive boyfriend once. He lured me in with promises of provision and vindication. But he was a perfidious son of a gun, because the initial half of his Janus face was insidiously torn aside, to reveal his deft capacity for creating insecurity, isolation and intellectual dissonance. My boyfriend, my great, devastating, intoxicating love, was prostitution. Yes, like any other lover of an abuser, I was hooked in by his exaggerated claims of support and potential for actualisation — “I will empower you! I will make you free!” — smoke screening an undercurrent of exploitative tendencies. For me, for others, by the time we understand this, we have become trapped. Some people may wince at my comparing prostitution to abuse. I have been usefully informed, on a number of occasions, that it is a simply a job as any other. That it is not sexual exploitation, because women choose to enter into it freely. But even if that were so, what if the same women can’t manage to leave when they decide they have had enough? How many times, after that point, must they be utilised for sex effectively against their true will, before it becomes a violation? Being trapped in prostitution, relationship violence and cycles of survival sex can indeed be crushing to a person’s sense of capacity and the “outside” world can look increasingly hostile and difficult to negotiate. Coercive control, which often operates in these situations, is manipulative and extremely sophisticated. It tells you that you are not capable of surviving — let alone thriving — in any other way, just as it depletes you. It is like living with a blade at your throat, but being told it is for your own protection. What does all this have to do with Universal Basic Income (UBI)? Because as with all of the most effective manipulations, it contains a kernel of truth. If a woman is told by her abuser or her pimp — or by the propaganda of living in prostitution — that she could not survive without them, that voice is solidified by the material experience of structural inequality that poor women suffer. The crossroads between class and sex-based oppression is, indeed, best exemplified by a woman having to make a daily decision between sexual or domestic abuse, and poverty. So if our toxic situation has been the source of our “income” — in exchange for domestic, reproductive or sexual labour — what do we do if we want to leave? Refuge recommends that women escaping abusive or exploitative situations should seek out emergency accommodation from friends or family, but often abuse victims have been systematically disenfranchised from such social support and, as with high numbers of women in prostitution, have come through the care system, many didn’t have it in the first place. Women’s refuges are suffering from closures and on average 155 women are turned away each day, according to Women’s Aid. Shockingly, women escaping domestic violence are not automatically considered in priority need for social housing. That is even before you even get to prostitutes; an even less likely group to be considered a “worthy” cause. Indeed, our current welfare system is based on nebulous arbitrations of “need” and “worthiness,” which are often further gunned through the dubious prism of abstract bureaucracy. The Conservative government has seemingly decided that it cannot trust the word of doctors in assessing someone’s capacity for work and so subject often extremely vulnerable people to further “assessments.” Women who have been in prostitution or domestic violence often suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and other psychological fragilities. For them these processes can be intimidating, due to the fear of being judged, blamed and dismissed as “undeserving.” This is even before we even get to the trials of unemployment benefit, not available to anyone whose partner works more than 24 hours per week — not much good if said partner has a predilection for controlling every aspect of your life. And if you’re under 35 and have no children you cannot suddenly decide to no longer submit to unwanted sex with men you don’t know, because you are not eligible for housing benefit contributions for your apartment. Or because you cannot find another job, due to your lack of experience or your anxiety, or both. Yes, I’ve seen many a woman make her Great Escape from abuse only to find her road blocked at every turn. Back she goes, to her hard fisted boyfriend or her brothel pimp — now more vulnerable and more convinced of the absolutenesses of her “destiny.” What is the first thing a woman escaping violence needs? To not have to “explain herself” to society — to beg even — to get the ticket out of her situation. Because asking such people to make the case for their right to freedom from abuse is an extension of that abuse. She has already had to try to explain to her “lover” why he should allow her to sleep safe that night, or to her pimp why she cannot work because her vagina has become torn and bruised. The idea behind UBI is that every member of society gets a basic monthly amount, irrespective of their social circumstances or their assumed worthiness. I am not going to make a more general case for UBI, as those arguments can be found elsewhere. However, it has instigated the twitching of my feminist ear because as a policy it has, under the right conditions, the potential to give victims of domestic violence and sexual exploitation a slightly easier out. In the 1970s there were a lot of debates about whether or not women should receive wages for housework, but many feminists felt that this would crystallise the idea that domesticity was women’s work. UBI on the other hand is a basic economic sustenance that is paid to a woman by virtue of her humanity, not her femininity, which is in any case a social imposition demanding of her submissive agreeableness. Of course UBI is not the full answer to the question of women’s exploitation. But because it does not require women to be the perfect victims, it is at least starting to ask the right questions.

#### A UBI gives the option to avoid prostitution and exploitation

Danaher, 2014 – prof of law Keele Univ [John, Sex Work, Technological Unemployment and the Basic Income Guarantee <http://jetpress.org/v24/danaher.htm> Journal of Evolution and Technology - Vol. 24 Issue 1 – February 2014 - pgs 113-130 Acc 6/29/17] [Premier]

Assume, in the first instance, that the displacement hypothesis is true, i.e. that Levy and the others are right and that human prostitutes are vulnerable to technological unemployment. In that case we have further evidence for an increased capital-labour income inequality, which strengthens the egalitarian argument for a basic income. Similarly, human prostitutes are already a particularly vulnerable and precarious sector of the working population, with many people driven into it through economic desperation. It may be right and proper for us to be especially concerned about the effects of technological unemployment on them, and to do our utmost to minimise the suffering they may be forced to endure. But, of course, many prostitutes are unwilling to publicly disclose their participation in the sex work industry and it is consequently difficult to target those who may be affected. A basic income guarantee may be the most effective way to protect their well-being. Assume, in the second instance, that the resiliency hypothesis is true, i.e. that human sexual labour will be preferred to robot sexual labour, and that we can expect the supply of the former to increase thanks to other forms of technological unemployment. In that case, two possibilities present themselves, depending on the ethical mood with which we approach prostitution. If we think prostitution is ethically problematic, and that on the whole it would be better if people didn’t supply sexual labour, then we have an obvious argument for the basic income guarantee. The increased supply of sexual labour will be driven primarily by the economic needs of the workers. If we can meet those needs via an income grant, we should be able to discourage people from supplying sexual labour. A basic income guarantee would be the preferred method for doing this because, again, it would be difficult to identify those who may be inclined to supply sexual labour before the event.

### Fem Solvency – UBI Emancipates

**UBI allows financial independence and frees women from the empirical stigmatization of poverty**

**Schulz 17- Director of Federal Office for Gender Equality** [Patricia, , “Universal Basic Income in a feminist perspective and gender analysis”, Accessed on 6/28/17, <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1468018116686503>] [Premier]

As women, especially heads of households, are exposed to a far higher degree than men to poverty, they also are more exposed to the stigmatization and marginalization provoked by poverty. An unconditional UBI would contribute to freeing them from this vulnerability and would respect their dignity. It could also help balance unequal power relationships with (male) relatives and/or partners. A UBI would help social security systems to keep up with the challenges they face: increase of inequality and persistence of gender inequality, recurring economic and financial crises, technological change and globalization and their effects on jobs (number and quality) and social protection. demographic evolution and migration patterns.

#### A basic income promotes democratic freedom for women by undermining patriarchal institutions.

Pateman, 2004 – prof of Political Science at UCLA [Carole, Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income. Politics and Society on March 1, 2004. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0032329203261100>] [Premier]

I became interested in the idea of a basic income some years ago for two main reasons. First, because of the part that basic income could play in furthering democratization, that is, the creation of a more democratic society in which individual freedom and citizenship are of equal worth for everyone. The second, and closely related, reason is because of its potential in advancing women’s freedom. My argument is that in light of these reasons a basic income is preferable to a stake. A basic income is a crucial part of any strategy for democratic social change because, unlike a capital grant, it could help break the long-standing link between income and employment and end the mutual reinforcement of the institutions of marriage, employment, and citizenship. In the early twentieth century, Bertram Pickard declared that a state bonus (a forerunner of a basic income) “must be deemed the monetary equivalent of the right to land, of the right to life and liberty.”2 My conception of the democratic significance of a basic income is in the spirit of Pickard’s statement. I will begin with some general arguments about why, if democratization is the goal, a basic income should be preferred to stakeholding, and then discuss the institution of employment and some questions about free-riding and the household.

**A UBI is key to women’s freedom because it reduces domination, India proves.**

**Standing 2017 – prof of development at the School of Oriental and African Studies, Univ of London** [Guy, Universal Basic Income Is Our Best Weapon Against The Rising Far Right. This article appeared in the Huffington Post on January 6, 2017. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/universal-basic-income\_us\_586d0ce3e4b0eb58648b5349] JN [Premier]

1. Basic income is transformative. The evidence shows that a basic income transforms lives. The pilots in India showed several positive results. First, welfare improved, with better sanitation, child nutrition, health and schooling. Meanwhile the consumption of private vices (in this case, usually tobacco and alcohol) declined. Second, the equity effects were positive. Those with disabilities, the elderly, women and those from lower castes, all benefited more than their counterparts. Third, the economic effects were positive: people did more work, productivity increased and income inequality declined. Of course, India is not the U.S. or the U.K. But the human condition is similar across the world. People in general want to improve their lives and the lives of their children and other loved ones. The claim that if people had a basic income they would become lazy is prejudiced and has been refuted many times in many places. 2. Basic income enhances freedom. The basic income pilot programs in India had strong emancipatory effects, particularly for women, who gained a greater say and control over their lives. The incidence of bonded labor also declined. Basic income enhances freedom from figures and mechanisms of unaccountable domination, particularly for women. It aids the precariat in their unedifying and undignified struggle with bureaucrats, in whose shadow they tremble. Targeted, conditional benefits erode freedom.

**A basic income would enhance gender equity because it would eliminate the stigma of domestic work and would protect those most vulnerable in our society**

**Zelleke 2011 - prof of political science at The New School** [Almaz, January 2011, [http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/tpp/pap/2011/00000039/00000001/art00004 June 27](http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/tpp/pap/2011/00000039/00000001/art00004%20June%2027), 2017] LA [Premier]

The liberal egalitarian tradition suggests a different foundation for a gender egalitarian society: an unconditional basic income, which, I argue, supports care work in accordance with the principles of a feminist theory of distributive justice and the universal caregiver model of citizenship. First, a basic income derived from a feminist theory of justice would provide every child and adult a guaranteed minimum income sufficient for basic needs, fulfilling the feminist reciprocity principle; this is in contrast to basic income proposals justified on other grounds, which often limit the basic income to adults, or tie the amount of the benefit to reductions in inequality rather than provision of basic needs. Second, basic income provides caregivers with resources to use as they prefer: as a personal caregiving stipend, to pay for care provided by others, or indeed, for any other purpose, thereby supporting care and supporting the autonomy of caregivers. Third, by redistributing income to those with the least, basic income redistributes power to society’s most vulnerable members. For those in need of care, it reduces the power imbalance between care recipients and caregivers by guaranteeing recipients of care at least minimal resources, thereby fostering equality of respect. It reduces power imbalances within the family, where it provides a caregiver financial resources and a citizenship status independent of paid employment, and it provides a wage supplement and some bargaining power to low-paid workers. Finally, an unconditional and universal basic income triggered by no condition other than low income, and recouped through the tax system from recipients with higher incomes, has the potential to eliminate poverty more effectively than any other scheme of redistribution. Most importantly, basic income indirectly compensates care and society’s other unpaid work without reinforcing the existing gendered distribution of labour or the primacy of the public sphere by equating care with work. Although basic income is often characterised as allowing people not to work, its most radical feature in comparison to current forms of welfare state redistribution is that it allows people to work without losing benefits immediately at a punitively high effective rate of taxation, which they do in the ‘poverty trap’ effect of conditional or means-tested benefits. Because of its universality and its unconditionality, basic income preserves work incentives; at low levels of income it is not a substitute for earned income, but a complement, and operates as a wage subsidy (Van Parijs, 2001). This means that low-wage jobs, or the volunteer work that can provide some of the non-financial benefits of paid employment, for both the individual and society, can become feasible in a way they are not under conditional or means-tested forms of redistribution. Together with other strategies to increase the flexibility of paid employment, basic income promotes the ability of individuals to choose the mix of paid work, care and leisure that best meets their needs at any given time (Roebyns, 2000).Because no one – man or woman – has to choose between being a ‘worker’ or a ‘caregiver’ to receive income, basic income has the most potential of any redistributive scheme to transform over time the relation of both men and women to the provision of care and to the world of paid employment.

**A feminist framework requires a universal basic income – it problematizes the breadwinner model and prevents the punishment of women who go against the model.**

**Zelleke 2011 - prof of political science at The New School** [Almaz, January 2011, [http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/tpp/pap/2011/00000039/00000001/art00004 June 27](http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/tpp/pap/2011/00000039/00000001/art00004%20June%2027), 2017] LA [Premier]

Conclusion Feminist political theory has in many ways moved on from critiques of theories of justice, by moving beyond the focus on questions of economic inequality to questioning the value or legitimacy of such comprehensive theories altogether. While much recent work has indeed extended feminism’s critical project into important new areas, it is crucial that our attention not shift entirely before the insights gained in the realm of economic inequality are institutionalised in policy. The Scandinavian version of the universal breadwinner model of citizenship – a generous welfare state with policies designed to induce men to take caregiving leaves from paid employment – offers one model of a gender-egalitarian society, but one that continues the prioritisation of the male-dominated public sphere of paid employment over the sphere of care. The feminist version of the liberal egalitarian tradition that has as its foundation a universal, unconditional basic income at a level to meet basic needs, on the other hand prioritises the emerging norm of combined care work and paid employment throughout adulthood. The latter attempts not so much to mould individual behaviour to a socially dominant norm, but to allow for the emergence of alternative norms of behaviour beyond the dominant universal breadwinner norm. By socialising the cost of supporting care – not only among fathers, but also among all those whose high earnings suggest protection from the burdens of care – a basic income promotes reciprocity not only within families but also between those with care responsibilities and those without. Finally, by providing an unconditional floor of income to low-skilled workers, basic income provides bargaining power for those who might prefer to stay home and take care of their own children or parents over working as low-paid caregivers for higher-paid women and men, or for women and men of all classes to demand workplaces more accommodating of universal care responsibilities. A universal, unconditional basic income does not promise a gender-symmetrical society – an unreachable goal anyway, until men can bear and breastfeed babies. But it may lead to a society in which remaining, and perhaps essential gender differences do not penalise women (or men) who choose not to pursue androcentric ideals of citizenship by relegating them to poverty, dependence on their spouses or employers, and second-class citizenship.

**A UBI would undermine family patriarchy by recognizing women as citizens, not subordinates in the family.**

**Mckay 2002 – prof of economics at Glascow Univ** [Ailsa with Jo Vanevery independent writer, Social Politics, Gender, Gender, Family, and Income Maintenance: A Feminist Case for Citizens Basic Income, Summer 2002, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

Conclusion We believe, based on the evidence presented here, that welfare policies are one way in which paid "productive" work is valued over other kinds of work and that they discriminate in favor of a particular family structure that is often exploitative of women. Although one of the primary objections to CBI is that it would reward "free riders," the pro-CBI refutations of this are cast in masculinist terms which ignore the implicit relegation of family carers to this category. Feminist debates about conceptualizing welfare regimes need to be incorporated into debates about CBI, and the important issue of who is responsible for care must be made central to all debates about welfare policy. A CBI could provide a basis for a truly universal citizenship. It would entail not only a universal right to a basic income but also an implicit recognition that all citizens contribute to society in a variety of ways. Thus in contrast to contributory mechanisms, in which citizens duties are narrowly defined as productive work that contributes to economic growth and has a (taxable) monetary value, a citizen's income allows for a variety of contributions that may or may not have monetary value or even be measurable (though their effects are evident). Given the importance of a particular family form to the construction of women as second-class citizens, a citizen's income also has the advantage of not discriminating (positively or negatively) between family and household forms. In an increasingly "postfamilial" society it also has the advantage of enabling a variety of supportive personal relationships and meets the demands for sexual citizenship which are increasingly coming to the fore.

**A UBI allows workers to challenge gender norms by choosing the work that they want to do—this disrupts decades of sexism**

**Gershon 16- Freelance reporter** [Livia, Freelance reporter February 26 2016, “Bring Back Women’s Lib”, Accessed on 6/28/17, <https://aeon.co/essays/feminists-should-not-be-content-with-mere-equality>] [Premier]

The goal of equality with men was also easier to explain and publicise than a comprehensive overhaul of society that took on sexism, racism and economic inequality all at once. The Liberation Ethic did not disappear entirely. Many academics and activists have continued to frame the status of women within broad economic and racial structures. But you can’t go far reading popular feminist books and websites today without being bludgeoned by the insistence that Feminism Just Means Equality with Men – Which No One Should Find Threatening. Of course, the Egalitarian Ethic has brought us a long way: reducing hiring discrimination, curbing sexual harassment, and improving women’s chances for promotions and decent wages. Women have begun to transform male-dominated industries, from law enforcement to entertainment. And the fight continues. For many working-class women today, full equality with their male peers would still mean stagnant wages and unstable jobs with erratic hours Most recently, the biggest conversation around workplace equality was sparked by Sheryl Sandberg’s call for women to ‘lean in’. Sandberg wants professional women to be more ambitious and for government and corporate policies to support them in their ambition, with flexible schedules and good childcare. Leaning In means embracing the economic and psychological ‘independence’ that upper-class men have enjoyed for centuries. The trouble is, for both men and women, this actually entails depending on someone else to do what Women’s Liberation called the shit work. Dual-income professional couples only hold things together (sometimes tenuously) thanks to cheap house-cleaning services, cheap childcare and fast restaurants. Meanwhile, for many working-class women today, full equality with their male peers would still mean stagnant wages and unstable jobs with erratic hours. Besides, while most working-class men and women hold jobs and take pride in earning money, they don’t typically put their careers at the centre of their lives. Even for the highly educated women to whom Sandberg’s book Lean In (2013) does speak – and even for their husbands – work is often precisely the opposite of liberating. A lot of the time, it’s a soul-deadening swamp of conference calls, confusing dictates from management, and furtive texting to kill time so you can be seen to leave after your boss. Even with a flexible schedule and great childcare, schlepping through years of this in hopes of a big bonus and promotion looks – as some 1970s feminists might put it – like a kind of psychosis created by a male view of the world. Meanwhile, now as ever, many of the jobs that are actually useful in the world – daycare worker, teacher, home health aide – are still disproportionately held by women, and disproportionately low paid and disrespected. When women drop out of the corporate world, social conservatives often take it as a vindication of their belief in motherhood as the primary vocation for women. Some feminists respond that women aren’t really choosing to leave but are forced out – by discrimination and a lack of flexibility. Others say that feminism should just encourage women to make their own choices to work or stay home, without considering whether those choices have a larger social impact in reinforcing a patriarchal division of labour. Any notion that maybe it’s the men whose life choices need an adjustment seems to be incomprehensible. Which brings us back to the Liberation Ethic. What would it look like to focus less on how women can catch up with men and more on how all women can have better lives? In her 2011 book The Problem with Work, the feminist scholar Kathi Weeks suggested two major reforms: implement a modern version of Wages for Housework in the form of a universal basic income for everyone, and shorten the standard work day to six hours without reducing pay. The argument lines up with a growing movement to update our economy for an era in which most industrial work can be done by robots, while the jobs human beings are best at – caring work and intellectual labour – are hard to monetise. The crucial point is that these reforms would help men, too. Right now, most men do not feel particularly powerful or fulfilled in their jobs. Most fathers are stressed by the competing demands of work and family. And, just as with women, the worst effects fall on the poor. As Katheryn Edin and Timothy J Nelson reveal in Doing the Best I Can (2013), their ground-breaking study of the lives of poor fathers in parts of urban America, low-income men often find their greatest sense of purpose in their children, but are tormented by their inability to fill the role of provider, and by gendered norms that keep them from focusing their energies on caregiving. Of course, feminists continue to lament that men still fail to do their share of housework. But if we’re talking about unpaid, disrespected work that women are fleeing in droves, why would they? If men could do paid work for 30 hours a week, take care of their share of housework and childcare, and spend the rest of the time hanging out with friends and working on their own creative projects – without falling into poverty or feeling like a stigmatised dependent – maybe they’d sign right up. And if they didn’t, well, that would be their loss. As Weeks argues, a universal basic income coupled with shorter working hours would give us not just more freedom to choose the work we want, but also a chance to organise our lives in satisfying ways. ‘Beyond creating time for people to fulfill their duties to the family as it is presently conceived, a feminist time movement should also enable them to imagine and explore alternatives to the dominant ideals of family form, function, and division of labour,’ she writes. From a modern egalitarian feminist perspective, new family forms or lifestyles might seem like an odd political goal. After all, we’ve already remodelled the ideal nuclear family to be more equal and opened it up to same-sex couples, while 1970s-style visions of children raised in communes and cooperative homes have long since faded away. And yet, outside the realm of traditional politics, many people – especially young ones – are seeking entirely different ways of seeing relationships, gender, and sex. Growing numbers of people identify as neither male nor female, upending not just gender roles but gender itself. Polyamorous triads and quads and more exotic geometries are reconfiguring romance. BDSM (bondage, dominance, sado-masochism etc) players are dragging unspoken assumptions about sexual dominance and submission out into the light and then reworking them in novel ways. These movements are often framed as simply a matter of individual choice, but they owe their existence to a Liberation Ethic, and they have the potential to cut to the core of centuries-old assumptions about women and men. A feminism based on the Liberation Ethic would question the very foundations of our work and family lives Kate Bornstein, a prominent gender theorist and transgender activist, argues that challenging assumptions about gender is part of a broader campaign against all sorts of power structures. ‘The value of breaking the gender binary will be to use what we’ve learned to help break down the false binaries masking hierarchical vectors of oppression – namely age, race, class, religion, looks, ability, language, citizenship, family, and reproductive status and sexuality,’ Bornstein said in a 2011 interview with the magazine Herizons. The truth is, the traditional heart of gendered identity, the standard-issue nuclear family, really doesn’t seem to be working for a lot of people – particularly those who don’t have the income to outsource the shit work. As The New York Times reported in 2012, there has been a huge decline in the percentage of working-class children with married parents over the past three decades. A lot of mothers have also escaped traditional dependence on husbands. But the available alternatives – like solo parenting, serial monogamy, or forming joint households with friends or siblings – are deeply stigmatised and don’t offer much financial stability. A feminism based on the Liberation Ethic would question the very foundations of our work and family lives. It would attack the ‘masculine’ obsession with narrowly defined profit and productivity. It would demand generous social welfare programmes and part-time jobs with good pay, interesting work, and room for advancement. It would help people transform marriage to work for them – or create different kinds of relationships that suit them better. It would ditch the false dichotomy of dependence and independence and acknowledge that, in a complex human society, we are all necessarily interdependent. Above all, it would argue not that women should live more like men, but that everyone, regardless of gender, should live more like they want to. Real equality won’t come from cajoling men or women into doing work we’d rather not do – at home or at the office. It will come from offering us all better lives.

### AT K – Doesn’t Solve Root Cause

**Even if a UBI alone will not solve all gender problems, it is the best solution to increase autonomy as citizens and to give choices to avoid exploitation**

**Mckay 2002 – prof of economics at Glascow Univ** [Ailsa with Jo Vanevery independent writer, Social Politics, Gender, Gender, Family, and Income Maintenance: A Feminist Case for Citizens Basic Income, Summer 2002, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

The ability of a CBI to value the unpaid work largely performed by women is a key issue in the limited literature about women and CBI. We find the arguments that CBI would have this effect unconvincing (e.g., Parker 1993). It does not follow that because a CBI would be paid regardless of labor market participation that other forms of work are valued. Similarly, those scholars who reject CBI as potentially entrenching exploitative divisions of labor (e.g., Lister 1995; Mclntosh 1981) exaggerate the effect of the policy. Certainly it could act as a justification for men to continue to participate only minimally in caring activities presently overwhelmingly undertaken by women. However, the exploitative nature of a particular division of labor is not inherent in the fact that the labor is divided, but rather in the conditions under which it is divided. An exploitative division of labor is one in which one party appropriates the labor of another. Despite a rhetoric of partnership and even equality, numerous studies have shown that marriage, and the division of labor usually associated with it, is based on a relationship of dominance and subordination, and it is this to which feminists object (see, e.g., Berk 1985). The granting of a citizens basic income to individuals regardless of family structure would not abolish marriage or, necessarily, inequality. However, the provision of an independent income to women would make one's involvement in a particular division of labor more realistically a choice, relatively free from economic constraint. The point of a CBI, in our view, is precisely that it is not conditional on any criteria of eligibility other than citizenship. Like Lewis, we are wary of policies that "recognize female 'difference' with respect to the disproportionate amount of caregiving work they do" (1997, 170) and see decommodification and defamilialization as important issues. If, as Lewis claims, "The aim of social policy must be to promote choice" (1997, 173), then a citizens basic income seems to be ideal. A CBI model that emphasizes the recognition of equal rights of citizenship has the potential to reorient socially constructed preferences. This will only be the case if it is understood in terms of its potential in providing a basis to reconceptualize work and ultimately address gender imbalances in the distribution of family duties. Citizens basic income alone will not bring about the changes we desire. That will take a lot of political work on other fronts—to reorganize the labor market, to socially value a range of family and household choices, to socially value nonparticipation in the labor market, etc. But it has the advantage of not impeding those political projects.

### AT Free Riding

#### The free riding argument relies on patriarchal assumptions – it ignores that the institution of marriage disproportionately allows husbands to free ride on unpaid domestic work by women – only my framework solves

Pateman, 2004 – prof of Political Science at UCLA [Carole, Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income. Politics and Society on March 1, 2004. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0032329203261100>] [Premier]

FREE-RIDING AND THE HOUSEHOLD The debates about basic income also center on the figure of a man in—or avoiding—paid employment. This is very clear in one of the major criticisms of, and apprehensions about, the idea of a basic income; that is, that it would encourage free-riding and idleness. Free-riders breach the principle of reciprocity by obtaining the fruits of the efforts of others and contributing nothing themselves in return; a basic income, it is charged, would “inspire a segment of the able population . . . to abjure work for a life of idle fun.”26 But who is being seen as so prone to idleness and fun? The assumption guiding the discussion of basic income is that the problem is about men and employment.27 A much greater problem about male free-riding to which a basic income is directly relevant, but a problem about the household, not employment, is therefore ignored. Van Parijs appears to be an exception to the prevailing view of free-riding. Unlike most other participants in discussions of basic income he has noticed that free-riding exists “on a massive scale” in household interactions.28 But who are the free-riders in the household? Barry notes that full-time housewives can be seen as free-riders.29 But they can only be seen in that way if “work” is taken to mean paid employment.30 As feminist scholars have emphasized for a very long time, housewives are working (unpaid) by undertaking the necessary caring work. Given the major contribution they already make for no monetary return at 98 POLITICS & SOCIETY all, wives (women) are hardly likely to be the target of the objection that a basic income would lead to idleness and fun. The majority of wives are now in some form of paid employment, but their labor force participation is usually different from that of men. This reflects the legacy of a wage-system that enshrined the belief that husbands (men) not wives (women) are “breadwinners.”31 Many more women than men work part-time, and women earn less than men. The private and public sexual division of labor, that is to say, continues to be structured so that men monopolize full-time, higher paying, and more prestigious paid employment, and wives do a disproportionate share of unpaid work in the home. Given the structure of institutions and social beliefs, this appears as a “rational” arrangement. The mutual reinforcement of marriage and employment explains why husbands can take advantage of the unpaid work of wives and avoid doing their fair share of the caring work. That is why there is massive free-riding in the household—by husbands. Neither free-riding by husbands nor its scale is usually acknowledged in discussions of basic income and stakeholding. This is because marriage and the household rarely enter the argument. The narrow parameters of discussion and the influence of the assumptions of neo-classical economics preclude attention to institutional structures and their interrelationships. Van Parijs is an exception in recognizing that a problem of free-riding exists in households, but his neoclassical theoretical apparatus leaves him unable to acknowledge that the problem is one of men (husbands) and the work of caring for household members. His argument is that free-riding arises merely because of differences in individual tastes or preferences. Free-riding, Van Parijs states, occurs when benefits enjoyed by both partners in a household are produced by only one of them, the partner who happens to care most about the particular benefit. His example is that the partner who most strongly prefers tidiness will make sure that the home is tidy.

#### The free riding argument reinforces racist and sexist stereotypes – only a basic income that recognizes social position can solve

Pateman, 2004 – prof of Political Science at UCLA [Carole, Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income. Politics and Society on March 1, 2004. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0032329203261100>] [Premier]

Similarly, Van Parijs argues that while “a defensible long-term vision” of an unconditional basic income at the highest sustainable level is vital, nevertheless more limited and politically feasible proposals are also essential. He states that a household-based guaranteed minimum income “would definitely be a major change in the right direction”37—but the right direction according to which reasons? Household-based schemes disregard not only all the problems about the sexual division of labor, and the fact that women earn less than men, but also income distribution within households. Can it be confidently assumed that income would be distributed equally between husband and wife? A basic income is important for feminism and democratization precisely because it is paid not to households but individuals as citizens. A focus on individuals does not imply resort to the atomistic individualism of neo-classical economics. The problem of women’s self-government and full standing as citizens is visible only when individuals are conceptualized within the context of social relations and institutions. A household-based basic income allows the problem of marriage, employment, and citizenship to be avoided since wives (women) disappear into the category of “the family” or “household.” To treat a basic income as a payment to households rather than individuals ignores the question of who performs the work of caring for household members. That is, it is tacitly assumed that reciprocity exists and that free-riding is only a problem about men avoiding employment. This assumption is nicely illustrated by the picture of a male surfer on the cover of Real Freedom for All. In academic discussions the surfer is used to represent non-contributors. But in the popular political imagination and the media other symbols of free-riding are present, such as the African American “welfare queen” or, more recently, the “illegal immigrant” or the “asylum seeker.”38 The figure of the surfer not only obscures the problem for democratization of popular attitudes embodied in these other symbols but also obliterates the systematic avoidance of one form of contribution, the vital caring work, by men who are in employment. Nor do the numerous suggestions for conditions to be placed on payment of a basic income as a solution to free-riding—Atkinson’s “participation income” is a well-known example39—get to grips with free-riding by men in the household. While the notion of a “contribution” may be broadened to include, for example, the work of caring for others, as in Atkinson’s proposal, this is insufficient to focus attention on the structural problem of the connections between marriage, employment, and free-riding by husbands. While payment of a basic income to a husband for his “contribution” through employment and to his wife for her “contribution” in the home is to recognize that she does indeed make a socially valuable contribution, this does little to calm the fears of some feminists that a basic income will merely reinforce women’s lesser standing and the idleness of husbands in the household.

## Automation/Transhumanism

**Inherency – Automation**

**Technology makes humanity obsolete and will result in mass unemployment**

**Macarov 96 – Professor emeritus at Hebrew University** [David, founder of Israeli chapter of the World Future Society and of Society for the Reduction of Human Labor, March 1996, “The Employment of New Ends: Planning for Permanent Unemployment,” The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/1047973.pdf>, accessed 6/28/17] AO [Premier]

The vain search for full **employment is bolstered by three myths.** **One** **is** that **technology** **creates new jobs**. And indeed **it does-in the short run**. **In the long run**, **it** **more than eliminates the jobs** thus **created**. Take, **for example**, the enormous need for **punchcard operators** postu- lated at the advent of computers as well as the assumption that almost every computer user would need the services of a programmer. It was pre- dicted that punchcard operators and computer programmers would con- stitute a large sector of the workforce. However, **most people using comput- ers** today **have never seen a punch- card** and would not recognize a punchcard if shown one. Similarly, computer programs for almost every need are now sold over the counter by the millions through innumerable outlets. The fact is that **technology** **is symbiotic-in creating new products and services, it also creates the tech- nology** to produce them, thus **reduc- ing** **the need for human labor**. Then there is **the** facile **assump- tion** **that** **unemployment** **could** **be wiped out** **by** **rebuilding** the **infra- structure** if the finances wouldjust be made available. This view **rests** **on** **a** **nostalgic** and romantic **notion** **of** **swarms** **of** **men** (**usually few women**) spreading out over the countryside **with tools in their hands** to rebuild roads, viaducts, and so on. Unfortu- nately for this view, **physical con- struction** **is now** largely **the province of** huge **mechanized** pieces of **equip- ment**, **controlled** **by** a **few** people us- ing high technology. Studies con- ducted in a number of countries, as well as on a worldwide basis, indicate that **the** **number** of people **employed** in these endeavors **would** **hardly** **make** **a** **dent** in the unemployment figures. For example, a committee of the House of Lords in **Britain estimated that to insulate every home** in Great Britain **would require only 30,000** workers and that **to rebuild every sewer, tunnel, bridge, and so forth** that needed it would require **68,000** workers. **These jobs would have** al- most **no appreciable effect** **on** **the** **3 million unemployed in Britain**."4 Similarly, it has been estimated that it would require 8 million workers to build a house for every family in the Third World,15 while in India alone there are tens of millions of unem- ployed workers. Thus it would not be wise to overestimate the number of jobs that rebuilding the infrastruc- ture would create.

### Advantage – Transhumanism

**A UBI allows humans to embrace automation as the next step in transhumanism**

**Hughes 2002 - Executive Director of the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies** [James, The Politics of Transhumanism 2.0, March 1, 2002, <https://ieet.org/index.php/IEET2/more/1385>, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

**Another strain of left techno-utopianism that could be incorporated into a democratic transhumanist worldview is promotion of a society in which most people do not have to work for a living because of automation and a universal guaranteed income.** For instance, Andre **Gorz** (1980,2000) has been promoting a political program for twenty-five years that **embraces automation, and the expansion of the “social wage**.” **The movement for universal basic income** (Lerner, 1994) **has been growing in** Europe[6][6] and **the U**nited **S**tates[7][7]. One transhumanist who is promoting the automation/guaranteed minimum income vision is Australian science fiction writer Damien Broderick. Broderick has participated in the extropian mailing list for most of its existence, and in 1997 published The Spike, a non-fiction treatment of the extropian ideas about the Singularity (Broderick, 2001). The Spike is for the most part a review of the various technological advances and their permutations. However, in the middle of his text he reveals a distinctly non-libertarian worldview when he projects that **automation and nanotechnology will create widespread unemployment, which will in turn require the provision of a universal guaranteed income**. **A corporation that downsizes its work-force today, in favor of robots, is surviving as a beneficiary of the human investment of the past**. Its **current productivity**, after all, **are the outcome of every erg of accumulated human effort that went into creating the** economy and **technological culture that made** those **robots** possible. So **let's not look at a guaranteed income as a `natural right'**, like the supposed innate rights to freedom of speech and liberty. **Rather, it is an inheritance, something owed** to all the children of a society whose ancestors for generations have together built, **and purchased** through the work of their minds and hands, the resource base sustaining today's cornucopia. (Broderick, 2001: 254)

**Welfare programs are necessary for the transhumanist movement – they create democratic participation, which is a precondition for the Transhumanist left.**

**Hughes 2002 - Executive Director of the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies** [James, The Politics of Transhumanism 2.0, March 1, 2002, <https://ieet.org/index.php/IEET2/more/1385>, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

By contrast, there is a much broader ideological spectrum of thought expressed in the World Transhumanist Association and to its left. **For the transhumanists to emerge as a broad ideological movement, capable of inspiring activists and organizing a resistance to neo-Luddism, it must embrace the full range of liberal democratic and social democratic permutations. By making political equality and solidarity** among the various species of post-humanity **a core value, transhumanists can reassure publics scared by post-human possibilities.** In the process of defining a positive, democratic political program for transhumanism the movement must also create boundaries which exclude the elitism and totalitarianism with which it has been associated. Setting aside libertarian blinkers, the only way to reassure skittish publics about the consequences of new technology is publicly accountable state regulation. Rather than uncritically defending every new corporate-sponsored technology, while dismissing concerns about safety and equity with Panglossian assurances that all will work itself out in the Singularity, a democratic transhumanism could embrace the need for government action to ensure that transhuman technologies are safe, effective and equitably distributed. For instance, trade unions are less likely to oppose automation in industry when they are assured that their workers will be retrained and have a social safety net to fall back on. Citizen groups are less likely to oppose the building of new industrial sites, power plants and waste dumps when they are assured that government agencies are ensuring public safety. Public acceptance of expensive new life extension technologies will be far more likely if there is some provision that they will be subsidized and equitably available. Democratic politics and public policy can address and ameliorate public concerns, slowing innovation in the short term, but facilitating it in the long term. One model for a transhumanist social policy is proposed in Warren Wagar’s (1989) A Short History of the Future, which projected a speculative global history of the next two centuries based on H.G. Wells and Immanuel Wallerstein’s world system theory. Although the future history was made quickly obsolete by the collapse of the Soviet Union, Wagar’s thoughts on policies towards genetics were far more programmatic and prescient. Wagar’s future world socialist government weighed the costs and benefits of allowing, subsidizing or banning various genetic enhancements and therapies, with an eye toward balancing individual liberty, general welfare of humanity, the equality of the enhanced and the non-enhanced. Access to genetic enhancements were introduced at a pace so that the majority of humanity could move forward together. Since September 11, Americans have set aside their deep suspicion of government and begun to celebrate public sector employees and the state agencies which are the only feasible means to respond to terrorism. Rather than defining the majority of the citizens in the liberal democracies as the enemies of transhumanism, **transhumanists could benefit from seeing their common cause with liberal and social democratic citizenries** against the majority of the world which still lives under authoritarian rule. **The empirical evidence is that Western liberal and social democracies,** with mixed economies with **public welfare systems, have the highest standard of living, and the strongest traditions of citizen participation and publicly accountable governme**nt, of any social form ever known. If transhumanists are conscerned about the persecution of transhuman minorities, such as disabled cyborgs or transsexuals, they should embrace the liberal and social democracies in which these minorities have been accorded the most rights and respect. Joining in the defense of Western liberal democracy against authoritarian and fundamentalist threats, transhumanists can begin to overcome their alienation from “normals.”

**Prefer my evidence: the Finnish experiment is the most comprehensive,**

**Hughes, 2015 – Research Associate at Cato Institute** [Charles, , Finland to Break New Ground with Basic Income Experiment, CATO Institute, December 9 2015, June 28 2017 https://www.cato.org/blog/finland-break-new-ground-basic-income-experiment ] NJT [Premier]

**Finnish politicians may decide to test multiple models, so the experiments could give a better understanding of how the effects of a basic income differ from a negative income tax**, for example. Kela has also expressed interest in conducting not only a national experiment, where randomly selected Finns around the country are given the basic income to examine its effects on work effort and well-being, but also county level and local experiments where larger proportions of the target population get the benefit. **These local and county experiments would help the researchers analyze the effects of a basic income beyond the individual. At the community level, they may see how businesses, neighborhoods, and other government programs are affected.∂ Even with these studies, some uncertainty will remain.** **We won’t know how these results would translate to other countries that have different economies, fiscal situations, and welfare systems.** The **studies only last two years, so longer-term effects over the course of a person’s life or subsequent generations will not be understood.** **Even with these limitations**, **this would be the largest and most comprehensive basic income experiment to date.**∂ Some aspects of a basic income are intriguing. **The current system is deeply flawed, so doing away with the dozens of different government programs and bureaucracies has some appeal. But too many questions remain regarding cost and impact on work incentives.** My colleague Michael Tanner explored these issues in depth in his paper earlier this year, and an issue of Cato Unbound allowed proponents and skeptics to suss out the topic. The Finnish experiments, and similar developments in Switzerland and cities like Utrecht, could help answer some of the many questions raised by a basic income proposal. Stay tuned.

**A UBI is necessary to transition to a post labor society because it allows people liveable means**

**Srnicek and Williams 2015 - lecturer at City University and editor in chief of The New Stack** [Nick and Alex, Inventing the Future: Post capitalism and a World Without Work. November 17 2015, https://s3.amazonaws.com/arena-attachments/576840/68a4032cf0d4b1ffc2564332ad7c9e36.pdf,June 27, 2017] LA [Premier]

These first two proposals equate to the reduction of labour demand through full **automation**, **and the reduction of labour supply** through the shortening of the working week. 89 The combined outcome of these measures would be **the liberation of a significant amount of free time without a reduction in economic output or a significant increase in unemployment**. **Yet this free time will be of little value if people continue struggling to make ends meet**. As Paul Mattick puts it, ‘the leisure of the starving, or the needy, is no leisure at all but a relentless activity aimed at staying alive or improving their situation’. 90 The underemployed, for instance, have plenty of free time but lack the means to enjoy it. **Underemployed, it turns out, is really just a euphemism for under-waged**. This is why **an essential demand in a post-work society is for a universal basic income (UBI), giving every citizen a liveable amount of money without any means-testing.** 91 It is an idea that has periodically popped up throughout history. 92 In the early 1940s, a version of it was advanced as an alternative to the Beveridge Report that eventually shaped the UK welfare state. 93 In a now largely forgotten period during the 1960s and 1970s, the basic income was central to proposals for US welfare reform. Economists, NGOs and policymakers explored the idea in detail, 94 and a number of small-scale experiments were set up in Canada and the United States. 95 Such was the influence of UBI that over 1,300 economists signed a petition pushing the US Congress to enact a ‘national system of income guarantees’. 96 Three separate administrations gave serious consideration to the proposal, and two presidents – Nixon and Carter – attempted to pass legislation to achieve it. 97 In other words, UBI very nearly became a reality in the 1970s. 98 While Alaska eventually implemented a basic income funded by its oil wealth, the idea largely disappeared from debate in the wake of neoliberal hegemony. 99 But recent years have seen the idea undergo a resurgence in popularity. In both mainstream and critical media, **it has gained traction, being taken up by** Paul Krugman, Martin Wolf, **the New York Times, the Financial Times and the Economist.** 100 The Swiss are holding a referendum on UBI in 2016, the proposal has been recommended by parliamentary committees in other countries, various political parties have adopted it in their manifestos, and there have been new experiments with it in Namibia and India. 101 The idea has global scope, having been promoted forcefully by groups in Brazil, South Africa, Italy and Germany, and by an international network involving over twenty countries. 102 The movement for a UBI is thus once again resurgent in the wake of the 2008 crisis and the austerity regimes put in place after it.

**UBI key to transhumanist development-employment is being made obsolete**

**Carter, 2014 – Bay Area Legal Aid** [Timothy, The One Minute Case for a Basic Income, Montreal, 2014, <http://basicincome.org/bien/pdf/montreal2014/BIEN2014_Carter.pdf>, 6/28/17] JY [Premier]

The one minute transhumanist case for a basic income: **Two hundred thousand years ago humans lived in hunter-gather societies. About 10 thousand years ago, humans began to live in agricultural societies, and then about 300 years ago, humans began to live in industrial societies. Since** 30 to **50 years ago, we have lived in a service society**. Theoretically, **the last economic stage of society is a leisure society, where most people either work in the artistic or scientific fields**, **or do not work at all.** So far, each phase has lasted only a small fraction of the time of the previous phase. If that pattern holds, service societies should last less than two generations, a time period nearing its end. Right now, **worker productivity is advancing faster than the need for workers**, **robots are taking** manufacturing **jobs** from the Chinese, and Google cars are about to make professional drivers obsolete. **It is time to prepare for a society in which we simply do not need everyone to work**. **A basic income will be needed to provide a living for people, and to provide customers for business.**

**UBIs are key to transition humans into a postwork future.**

**Lowrey, 2017 – reporter on politics and economic policy for New York magazine** [Annie, The Future of Not Working. The New York Times on February 23, 2017. https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/23/magazine/universal-income-global-inequality.html] [Premier]

**Silicon Valley has** recently **become obsessed with basic income for reasons simultaneously generous and self-interested**, as a palliative for the societal turbulence its inventions might unleash. Many technologists believe **we are living at the precipice of an artificial-intelligence revolution that could vault humanity into a postwork future**. In the past few years, **a**rtificially **i**ntelligent systems **have become proficient at a startling number of tasks**, from reading cancer scans to piloting a car to summarizing a sports game to translating prose. **Any job that can be broken down into discrete, repeatable tasks** — financial analytics, marketing, legal work — **could be automated out of existence.** In this vision of the future, **our economy could turn into a funhouse-mirror version of itself: extreme income and wealth inequality, rising poverty, mass unemployment, a shrinking prime-age labor force**. It would be more George Saunders than George Jetson. But what does this all have to do with a small village in Kenya?

**Impact – Transhumanism Good**

**Transhumanism enables technological progress to benefit the poor – combined with redistribution policies, it is a positive sum cycle to solve scarcity**

**Hughes 2002 - Executive Director of the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies** [James, The Politics of Transhumanism 2.0, March 1, 2002, <https://ieet.org/index.php/IEET2/more/1385>, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

The WTA FAQ asks the question “**Won’t new technologies only benefit the rich and powerful?** What happens to the rest?” Instead of suggesting that some form of social subsidy might facilitate access to the poor, the FAQ **falls back on a trickle-down theory of technological innovation, noting that the lives of the relatively poor today are enriched by technologies previously only available to the wealthy.** However, the FAQ then makes the startling acknowledgement: **One can speculate that some technologies may cause social inequalities to widen**. For example, **if some form of intelligence amplification becomes available, it may at first be so expensive that only the richest can afford i**t. The same could happen when we learn how to genetically augment our children. Wealthy people would become smarter and make even more money… Trying to ban technological innovations on these grounds would be misguided. **If a society judges these inequalities to be unacceptable, it would be wiser for that society to increase wealth redistribution**, for example by means of taxation and the provision of free services (education vouchers, IT access in public libraries, genetic enhancements covered by social security etc.). **For economical and technological progress is not a zero sum game. It’s a positive sum game. It doesn’t solve the old political problem of what degree of income redistribution is desirable, but it can make the pie that is to be divided enormously much greater**. (Bostrom et al., 1999)

**Transhumanism improves our ability to respond to global problems by making more solutions available**

**Hughes 2002 - Executive Director of the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies** [James, The Politics of Transhumanism 2.0, March 1, 2002, <https://ieet.org/index.php/IEET2/more/1385>, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

Similarly **when addressing whether transhumanism is simply a distraction from the pressing problems of poverty and conflict in the world today, the FAQ argues that transhumanists should work on both these immediate problems and futurist concerns**. In fact, the FAQ argues, **transhuman technologies can make the solution of poverty and conflict easier, improving health care, amplifying intelligence, and expanding communication and prosperity. Conversely, working for a better world is both an essential transhumanist goal**, given the utilitarian ethic of Principle 7, **and also is essential for establishing the peaceful liberal democratic social orders in which transhuman experimentation can take place**.

**Transhumanism solves racism and sexism –**

**Hughes 2002 - Executive Director of the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies** [James, The Politics of Transhumanism 2.0, March 1, 2002, <https://ieet.org/index.php/IEET2/more/1385>, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

In response to the outing of the site and its contents (by me), the Transhuman webring and its affiliated list were thrown into vigorous debate. Some participants were clearly sympathetic to Eugenicus’ iconoclastic attacks on political correctness, although most abhorred his Nazism. The list was split on two questions: whether neo-Nazism could be “transhumanist,” and whether the Nazi site should be excluded from the webring. Some discussants argued that the humanist, cosmopolitan and liberal roots of transhumanism were incompatible with racism and totalitarianism, while transhumanism’s commitment to reason and science were incompatible with the irrationality and pseudo-science of eugenics. The issue had actually been anticipated and addressed in the World Transhumanist Association’s FAQ: “…**transhumanism advocates the well-being of all sentience, whether in artificial intellects, humans, non-human animals or possible extraterrestrial species. Racism, sexism, speciesism, belligerent nationalism and religious intolerance are unacceptable. In addition to the usual grounds for finding such practices morally objectionable, there is an additional specifically transhumanist motivation for this. In order to prepare a time when the human species may start branching out in various directions, we need to start now to strongly encourage the development of moral sentiments that are broad enough encompass within the sphere of moral concern sentiences that are different from current selves. We can go beyond mere tolerance to actively encouraging people who experiment with nonstandard life-styles, because by facing up to prejudices they ultimately expand the range of choices available to others.** And we may all delight in the richness and diversity of life to which such individuals disproportionately contribute simply by being who they are.” (Bostrom, 2001)

**Advantage – Civic Participation / Leisure**

**Decreasing the need to work increases civic participation**

**Noguchi, 2004 – Associate Professor of the Columbia School of Social Work** [Eri , Michael A Lewis, , In Defense of Lazy: An Argument for Less Work, More Community, USBIG, August 2004, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265744874\_In\_Defense\_of\_Lazy\_An\_Argument\_for\_Less\_Work\_More\_Community, 6/28/17] JY [Premier]

In recent years, in both Europe and the United States, there has been increasing interest in the basic income (Lewis, 1998; Van Parijs, 1995; and Widerquist, 1999). This policy, if implemented, could assume many different forms but the common feature of them all is that they would stipulate that government grant a universal minimum income one would not have to sell her labor to receive. The lack of a requirement to supply labor to receive the grant is **a key concern of critics** and some of those sympathetic **to the basic income** (Phelps, 1997). The concern **is that without a work requirement the basic income would lead to a huge decrease in the supply of labor** and, consequently, a decline in our standard of living. Proponents of a basic income, having been put on the defensive, are forced to explain why, even with such a policy in place, the vast majority of individuals would still work. We address this concern about the impact of the basic income on labor supply in a different way. **We agree that a basic income is likely to reduce labor supply and, thereby, increase leisure. But we don’t think this is necessarily a bad thing.** This paper focuses on **the possible benefits of increased leisure.** Specifically, we think **a basic income might lead to greater civic participation and, consequently, various positive externalities**. **Any analysis of the effects of the basic income that only focuses on the negative consequences of an increase in leisure is incomplete because these effects might be outweighed by the more positive ones** we intend to emphasize.

**American leisure time is falling, leisure time key to civic participation – polls prove**

**Noguchi, 2004 – Associate Professor of the Columbia School of Social Work** [Eri , Michael A Lewis, , In Defense of Lazy: An Argument for Less Work, More Community, USBIG, August 2004, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265744874\_In\_Defense\_of\_Lazy\_An\_Argument\_for\_Less\_Work\_More\_Community, 6/28/17] JY [Premier]

**A**nother **poll asking respondents whether they had more or less leisure time** than they had in previous years **found the majority reporting having less** (Schor, 1991, p. 22). Since the various **activities associated with civic participation**, like taking part in local political clubs, parents’ associations, etc., **all take time** (and energy, for that matter), **the amount of time individuals are** willing and/or **able to allocate to such endeavors is likely to decline in proportion** to the overall amount of leisure time they have. It is also important to point out that the nature of the leisure time that does exist is such that it does not facilitate sustained commitment to civic affairs. First, much of the disposable time available to individuals today does not come in solid blocks that could facilitate getting to and attending a substantive meeting, organizing and staffing an event, or even spending some concerted time on the phone organizing a project. Rather, they come in a vast series of small moments just long enough to catch one’s breath or run a quick errand. Secondly, **civic involvement is a collective endeavor that cannot be carried out by individuals acting alone**, and thus, requires not just that individuals have available to them leisure time within which to get involved, but shared leisure time – meaning on similarly coordinated schedules. With more and more Americans working non-traditional hours, with more and more jobs structured outside of the traditional Monday through Friday 9am to 5pm workweek, leisure time that coincides with other people’s leisure time has also become a less frequently occurring phenomenon (Putnam, 2000).

**A UBI is key to establish a post-industrial society because it would recognize the worth of all citizens regardless of employment**

**Pressman, 2005 – Prof of economics at Monmouth Univ** [Steven, with Michael Lewis and Karl Widerquist The Basic Income Guarantee and Social Economics. This article appeared in Review of Social Economy on December 2005. http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/29770341.pdf?refreqid=search%3A9330359b12bad0e394957e75c30d95e6] JN [Premier]

**A Basic Income policy would also be an important first step toward a post-industrial society**. **The realization that fewer and fewer workers are required in order to produce socially necessary levels of output forces us to rethink the mechanisms by which we distribute the benefits of the social product. By linking income exclusively to those with paid employment, society excludes a growing proportion of the population from benefiting from society's increasing affluence**. **This also excludes their full participation as citizens**. **A Basic Income would encourage those forms of work that do not receive a pay- check but which are essential to a healthy society and which are currently inadequately supported (child care being the best example**). A Basic Income policy would go a long way toward encouraging family values (much more so than censoring movies and art) for **it recognizes the important role of everyone in the family and not just those who yield an income from market participation**.

**A UBI reduces the need to work which increases leisure time, public health and civic participation**

**Noguchi, 2004 – Associate Professor of the Columbia School of Social Work** [Eri , Michael A Lewis, , In Defense of Lazy: An Argument for Less Work, More Community, USBIG, August 2004, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265744874\_In\_Defense\_of\_Lazy\_An\_Argument\_for\_Less\_Work\_More\_Community, 6/28/17] JY [Premier]

Basic Income as a Subsidy for Leisure If **civic participation helps promote the beneficial effects on child welfare, health,** etc. discussed earlier in the paper, and if **leisure varies positively with civic participation**, an economic argument can be made for providing an incentive for people to “buy” more leisure. In mainstream economic theory the concept of “positive externality” is discussed. It refers to “spillover” benefits that result from a given individual’s choice that she does not take into effect when making the choice. Also, these spillover effects are not reflected in market prices (Mas-Collel, Whinston, and Green, 1995). For example, suppose Henry has tuberculosis and decides to purchase treatment. Although Henry doesn’t consider it when deciding to buy treatment not only will it benefit him but also others in the form of reduced likelihood of contracting the illness. Economists frequently argue that when faced with positive externalities we can make some better off without making anyone else worse off (a so called Pareto improvement) by subsidizing the cost of the good that generates the externality (Mas-Collel, Whinston, and Green, 1995). At the beginning of this paper, we mentioned that i**ncreasing attention has been paid to the basic income and that a frequent criticism of this policy is that it would lead to too much of a decrease in labor supply.** Considering our findings, discussed above, and our comments in the previous paragraph, it may be time to reconsider this criticism. Perhaps **the decrease in labor supply will lead to an increase in civic involvement and a host of positive externalities having to do with crime, health, etc. That is, perhaps a basic income, by “subsidizing” leisure, would lead to a net gain in efficiency instead of a net decrease** as is so often argued.

**Advantage – Robo-Human Relations**

**Human society will have to change with the advancement of robots--the relationship between human and robot must be mutual**

**Szollosy, 17 – a research fellow at Sheffield Robotics, at the University of Sheffield** [Michael, Michael Szollosy is attached to the Department of Psychology at the University of Sheffield. His research is focussed primarily on robots (VR, AI, teleoperation.) as they are in the cultural imagination, and the social implications of new technologies, EPSRC Principles of Robotics: defending an obsolete human(ism)?, Taylor & Francis Online, 19 April 2017, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09540091.2017.1279126>, 6/27/17] JY [Premier]

In the absence of a clearly defined subject, the **Principles offer the usual, familiar humanist conception** of the human, and versions **of that human that are conceived only in and necessitated by a narrowly-defined capitalist economy.** **These static, homogenous human beings will** very soon **be made obsolete**, if they are not already, **by** the very **technological advances** that the Principles seek to control. **There is** in the Principles **an overly-simplistic conception of the relationship between human beings and their tools**: **a one-way relationship whereby tools are always the servants of their human masters** (e.g. Principle 1, “Robots are multi-use tools”) and always under the control of an independent human agent (e.g. Principle 2, “Humans, not robots, are responsible agents”). **Such a relationship** between subject and object, active agent and passive article **would always have been naïve**, in any era, even before the invention of robots. **We must consider the ways in which our tools transform humans**, **not only when that cave-dweller first grabbed a stick but how our new technologies demand fundamental reorganisation of our entire way of life**, and insist that we re-conceive our entire social structure.

**Solvency – Embrace Automation w/ UBI**

**Only a UBI allows humans to reach their full potential by eliminating the stress of economic insecurity and technological obsolescence.**

**Santens 2017- Founder of the BIG Patreon** (Scott, March 29 2017, “Evidence Indicates That Universal Basic Income Improves Human Health”, Accessed on 6/29/17, https://futurism.com/evidence-indicates-that-universal-basic-income-improves-human-health/) [Premier]

REACHING OUR POTENTIAL **We as humans have incredible potential to create and form communities, and realize world-changing feats of imagination, and this mostly untapped potential mostly just requires less stress and more time**. **If all we’re doing is just trying to get by, and our lives are becoming increasingly stressful, it becomes increasingly difficult to think and to connect with each other.** It’s the taxation of the human mind and social bonds. Studies even show the burden of poverty on the mind depletes the amount of mental bandwidth available for everything else to the tune of about 14 IQ points, or the loss of an entire night’s sleep. Basically, scarcity begets scarcity. On the other hand, **if we free ourselves to focus on everything else other than survival, if we remove the limitations of highly unequal and impoverished environments, then we’re increasingly able to connect with each other, and we minimize learned helplessness.** As a result, our health improves. Crime is reduced. Self-motivation goes up. **Teamwork overtakes dog-eat-dog, and long-term planning overtakes short-term thinking.** Presumably, many an IQ jumps the equivalent of 14 points. **A greater sense of security has even been shown to reduce bias against “out” groups**, from immigrants to the obese. And if we take into account the importance of security in people deciding to invest their time and resources in bold new ventures, innovation also has the chance of skyrocketing in a society where everyone always has enough to feel comfortable in taking risks without fear of failure. Basically, abundance begets abundance. If what we seek is a better environment for the thriving of humans — a “Human Park” full of greater health and happiness — then what we seek should be the implementation of basic income, in nation after nation, all over the world. There is no real feeling of control without the ability to say no. **Because UBI is unconditional, it provides that lever to everyone for the first time in history. No other policy has the transformative potential of reducing anywhere near as much stress in society than the lifelong guaranteeing of basic economic security with a fully unconditional basic income.** Plus, with that guarantee achieved, **the fear of technological unemployment becomes the goal of technological unemployment. Why stress about automation, when we could embrace it?** No more fight-or-flight. It’s time for live long and prosper.

### Right Not to Work, Work Bad

**The right to not work is critical to responding to unemployment from automation.**

**Danaher, 2014 – Lecturer at the National University of Ireland, Galway** [John, “Should we have a right not to work?”, Philosophical Disquisitions, July 17, 2014, http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/should-we-have-right-not-to-work.html, June 27 NJT] [Premier]

But the historical rationale for this resentment may no longer be present. **We now live in pretty affluent societies, which often overproduce essential goods like food and housing. There are still material scarcities, of course, but they are largely due to failures to distribute the abundant gains in an equitable manner.** **This increasing affluence — particularly if it can be achieved through machine rather than human labour — reduces the need for everyone to do their “fair share”**. As Levine puts it:∂ … **it is no longer a reasonable functional adaptation to real world conditions to demand that everyone do their “fair share” in the face of scarcity.** Increasing affluence diminishes, without extinguishing, the moral urgency of reciprocity. At the same time, it enhances the importance of doing what it required to implement genuine neutrality. ∂ (Levine, 2013, 111)∂ In other words, **as we become better and better at meeting our material needs without human labour, it becomes more and more important to ensure that our society meets the other requirements of justice, which in this case means recognising, respecting and facilitating the right not to work.**

**The concept of work is pervasive in society—it conditions us to ignore the importance of freedom and keeps us from questioning whether or not it is really necessary.**

**Macarov 96 – Professor emeritus at Hebrew University** [David, founder of Israeli chapter of the World Future Society and of Society for the Reduction of Human Labor, March 1996, “The Employment of New Ends: Planning for Permanent Unemployment,” The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/1047973.pdf>, accessed 6/28/17] AO [Premier]

THE MORALITY OF WORK Despite historical and repeated proof of the ineffectiveness of the search for full employment, the at- tempts continue because human la- bor continues to be seen as both nec- essary and desirable for the individual and for society. Since Martin Luther held that working was a method of serving God, work has been seen not only as an economic activity but also as one that is mor- ally required. Further, **political**, **so- cial**, **and** **economic** **programs** **are** all **based** **on** **the** **assumption** **that** **people** **need** **and** **want** **to** **work** **and** that **soci-** **ety** **needs** all **the** **work** that everyone capable of laboring can produce. **Work as a prerequisite of existence is** **the** **cornerstone** **of**most **modern** **civilization**. On an individual basis, **people** **are** **judged** not only **by the work** **they** **do** but also by the manner in which they do it. **People** **who do not or cannot work are viewed as** somehow **outside** **the** **mainstream** **of** **life**. **Work struc- tures time, determines attitudes, shapes self- and other-images**, and **permeates** every aspect of **life includ- ing education, family, religion, and** even **peripheral** **areas** **such as the prison system**. Therefore, the need to provide jobs is one of the most pressing problems facing governments and is the reason why they propose and use various schemes and subterfuges to try to reduce or conceal unemployment. Enormous efforts are made to find jobs, create jobs, divide jobs, main- tain unnecessary jobs, and give the illusion ofjobs by ruling people out of the labor force by various means as well as obscuring the actual extent of unemployment by definitional devi- ousness, statistical sleight of hand, and junk jobs. Were such efforts merely useless, they could be tolerated, if not con- doned. However, full employment is a classic example of a solution worse than the problem given that **efforts** **to** **achieve** full **employment** **not** **only** **end** **in** **frustration** **but** inevitably **lead** **to personal degradation**, **societal corrup- tion, economic disaster, and global danger.**

**People hate work—they waste decades of their lives and are kept from being creative**

**Macarov 96 – Professor emeritus at Hebrew University** [David, founder of Israeli chapter of the World Future Society and of Society for the Reduction of Human Labor, March 1996, “The Employment of New Ends: Planning for Permanent Unemployment,” The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/1047973.pdf>, accessed 6/28/17] AO [Premier]

PERSONAL DEGRADATION Full **employment** increasingly **re- quires the creation of jobs with little concern for the** work actually done, **workplace conditions**, the **features of the job**, **or** the **salary** paid. Such de- liberately created or maintained jobs contain little to attract or to satisfy the **workers**, who **are driven to accept them only by inability** **to** **secure in- come** in any other way. It should be noted that many peo- ple in ego-satisfying, power-wielding, influential, and challenging jobs re- ally love their work and do not believe it when told that **the** **overwhelming** **majority** **of** **people**, who do the mun- dane, banal jobs of society, **get no satisfaction from** their **work**, **wish** **they did not have to work**, and use many devices to avoid work. An ex- ample of this lack of congruence is the fact that while 93 percent of univer- sity professors would choose the same job again, only 16 percent of unskilled autoworkers would.20 **Ironically**, and even tragically, **those who get satisfaction** **from** their **work** **make** **the** **employment** and social **policies** **that** **govern** **those** **who** **do** **not**, and often do so by projecting their own feelings concerning work onto the others. **Surveys**, **interviews**, participant observation, **and workers' behavior** all **bear** **witness** **to** **widespread** **un- happiness** at work.21 Satisfaction with work has been declining for the last 15 years, with the rate of decline precipitous in the last few years. De- spite constant declarations concern- ing people's physical and psychologi- cal necessity for work and even work's morality, we indicate in many ways that we understand and share the real feelings of doubt, ambiva- lence, and reluctance regarding work that most people have. For example**, take all the admoni- tions to work hard with which people have been bombarded** since biblical days-the **proverbs, fables, mottos, sayings, stories, songs**, and even nursery rhymes, such as "Jack shall get but a penny a day because he can't work any faster." **Their** very **exis- tence is proof of an underlying disin- clination to work**. **If people** wanted to work or **enjoyed working**, such **mas- sive socialization efforts would not** **be necessary**. Nowhere do we find such pressure to engage in sex, for exam- ple, or to eat or play. Obviously, peo- ple do not have to be persuaded to do what they like. The constant persua- sion and coercion to work to which we are all subject is tacit admission of what our real attitudes toward work are. **One** clear **recognition** of these atti- tudes **regarding work** **is** the fact **that** **almost** **every social welfare program** in the world **has a wage stop built into it**, **limiting** **benefits** to a proportion-- often a small proportion-of what the recipient could make from working.22 **The** underlying **reasoning** is quite clear, and most people agree with it and accept it: **if people can get from any other source what they could get from work, they would choose not to work**. Take, for example, the fact that males in the United States may retire at age 62 instead of 65, but to do so they give up three years' salary and 20 percent of their retirement income for life. Since this possibility became available in 1961, the proportion tak- ing up this option rose to 36 percent by 1970 and to 70 percent in 1994.23 Currently, more than 90 percent of male retirees are retiring early,24 and it is predicted that this trend will not only continue through the 1990s but accelerate between 2000 and 2005.25 In Holland, 75 percent of males be- tween the ages 55 and 65 were in the workforce in 1972, but in the 1980s early retirement became available, and the proportion has since dropped to 35 percent.26 Nor should the bulk of such retire- ment be seen as forced; since passage of the Age Discrimination Act in the United States, which forbids firings based on age, the number of early retirees has not dropped-it has, in fact, increased.27 Early retirement is also not taken primarily for health reasons; 62 percent of retirees report themselves as healthy.2 Further, take **the reduction of the workweek, from six days, to five and a half days, to five days, to four and a half days, and in some places to even less**; the more numerous non- working holidays; and the increased length of vacations. **In 1900**, **the av- erage workweek in the United States was 53.0 hours**; in 1979, it was 35.5 hours; in 1987, it was 34.8 hours; and **in 1990, it was 34.4** hours.29 That such reductions in work hours have not been achieved against workers' desires is obvious. All of **this speaks of our** real underlying **attitudes to- ward work**, despite the continuous brainwashing that requires us to re- port work as positive. **Who knows how much stress and strain, and how many emotional and behavioral problems, arise from** the need to **work** when one would rather be playing tennis or golf, parenting one's children, indulging in hobbies, or simply enjoying oneself? Who knows **how much creativity has been stifled by the need to work**, how many great works of art, literature, science, or philosophy have been lost to the world because of the time constraints imposed by work schedules? The an- cient **Athenians**, **relieved by conquest and by slave labor of the need to work, laid the basis of civilization as we know it today through their crea- tions in literature, mathematics, drama, sports, art, sculpture, and much more**. Are we any less talented than they were? Further, our widespread endeav- ors to redefine, redivide, artificially create, and spread jobs result in an understanding on the part of many workers that the kind and amount of work they do is not really impor- tant-not to themselves, not to oth- ers, and certainly not to the economy as a whole. They understand that they are to pretend to like their work and to give the impression that they see it as important but that they are not expected to exert themselves or to use all their skills and abilities. An elemental **dishonesty is thus re- quired** **of** many **workers** **who** **must** **appear** **busy** all the time, **while in truth** **their work** **could** **be** **done** in much less time and often more cheaply, **better, and faster by a ma- chine-and they know it.**

**Work is the root cause of most stigmatization against poor people and racial minorities.**

**Macarov 96 – Professor emeritus at Hebrew University** [David, founder of Israeli chapter of the World Future Society and of Society for the Reduction of Human Labor, March 1996, “The Employment of New Ends: Planning for Permanent Unemployment,” The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/1047973.pdf>, accessed 6/28/17] AO [Premier]

SOCIETAL CORRUPTION The artificial creation of jobs, the insistence that people work when their productivity is not needed, the tacit acceptance of informal work- **regulating norms, the condoned re- sistance to new machinery and meth- ods, and contractual legitimation of various forms of featherbedding all amount to moral corruption** on the part of society. The **corruption** inher- ent **in such a system inevitably com- municates itself and spreads to the individuals concerned**. Workers who sign in and then go out to take care of personal matters; those who have others insert their cards in the time clock in their own absence; those who deliberately or unconsciously stretch their work to fill in the assigned time; those who dawdle, gossip, play games, or simply idle; those who do not come in or come in late every Monday-all of these are the products of nonserious work, not its causes. Schumacher has written that **peo- ple are destroyed by an inner convic- tion of uselessness**,30 while Lebow is more direct in an article entitled "**No Man Can Live with the Terrible Knowledge that He Is Not Needed**."31 **This** is what **results from a system** **that** **artificially inflates** **the amount of human** **labor** **needed** to provide everyone with a job. The myths that are necessary to maintain a full- employment system, the cheating by society and by individuals that is ac- cepted as normal, and the self- and other-images that are **thereby** cre- ated **constitute** **a socially sanctioned** **delusional system that is both cor- rupt and corrupting**. Just as laws that are obviously unenforced eventually create con- tempt for law in general, so **unneces- sary work** **and artificially created and maintained jobs** **lead** **to other cons on** and by **society**. The results of wide- spread societal hypocrisy regarding jobs-that they are necessary, impor- tant, and fulfilling-counterpoised with the feeling of many jobholders that what they do is basically unim- portant, unnecessary, and boring, are spreading cynicism, dishonesty, im- morality, and societal structures based on fraud rather than on friendships. Not incidentally, **the heavy em- phasis on work that marks our soci- ety causes the unemployed to be both stigmatized and penalized even when they know, and others know, that the situation is not of their doing**.

**Work as central to life inevitably results in the spread of smaller and smaller jobs, which raises prices and lowers quality.**

**Macarov 96 – Professor emeritus at Hebrew University** [David, founder of Israeli chapter of the World Future Society and of Society for the Reduction of Human Labor, March 1996, “The Employment of New Ends: Planning for Permanent Unemployment,” The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/1047973.pdf>, accessed 6/28/17] AO [Premier]

ECONOMIC DISASTER In addition to the effects on indi- viduals and the social world, there are the economic aspects to consider. **As jobs must be divided into smaller and smaller portions to increase** their **numbers**, the **growth** **of** **part-time work and temporary jobs accelerates**. In 1980, there were 400,000 part- time workers, but by 1987 this num- ber had more than doubled, to 900,000.32 **These jobs pay less** in all occupational groups, **offer fewer benefits**, and **escape accountability**, including unionization.33 The work it- self becomes less interesting as the focus becomes more narrow. Such **segmentation**, as Durkheim pointed out long ago, **leads** **to** **alienation and anomie on the part of the worker**.34 Perhaps more important, **from an economic point of view**, is the fact that **the need to provide jobs leads** to a bias **toward labor-intensive indus- tries**. For example, governmental help on all levels is certainly more easily available to a prospective em- ployer of several hundred people than it is for the purchase of sophis- ticated machinery that reduces the need for workers. **Thus the move to- ward more and better goods and ser-** **vices at lower prices, available through technology, is slowed in favor of a search for more and better jobs**. **The** ultimate **result** **is higher prices** **and** **lower quality** because machines work faster, more cheaply, and more precisely than do human beings. It has been noted that 75-90 per- cent of changes in productivity are achievable through changes in meth- ods, machines, and materials, leav- ing only 10-25 percent to changes in human work patterns.35 Human la- bor is very inefficient as compared to machines, and **an economy that de- pends on human labor as its base will soon find itself falling behind other, more technologically inclined economies.** Further, labor-intensive indus- tries can succeed only if they can com- pete with other labor-rich countries such as India, Taiwan, China, and- increasingly-African countries. To do this, they must pay competitively low wages, or, in other words, keep the workers' standard of living down to the level of that in the competing countries. That higher wages hurt exports is an important component in current efforts to achieve a protec- tionist foreign trade policy.

**The need for jobs will result in increasing threats to humanity—munitions plants stay in operation and guns proliferate.**

**Macarov 96 – Professor emeritus at Hebrew University** [David, founder of Israeli chapter of the World Future Society and of Society for the Reduction of Human Labor, March 1996, “The Employment of New Ends: Planning for Permanent Unemployment,” The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/1047973.pdf>, accessed 6/28/17] AO [Premier]

GLOBAL DANGER **The need to provide jobs for every- one blunts distinctions between nec- essary and unnecessary work**, **and**- more important-**between socially desirable activities and those** **that** **are** **polluting**, **dangerous**, **and coun- terindicated**. The most general ra- tionale for overlooking dangerous leaks, structural deficiencies, and ecologically damaging activities is to point out how many jobs will be lost if the enterprise is moved or closed. A trade-off is sought--explicitly or im- plicitly-between the amounts of physical damage being caused and the economic damage expected to en- sue from correction or elimination. Finally, **there is the foreboding pos**- **sibility that the blind commitment to** full **employment** **will threaten the peace of the world**. **Munitions** **manu- facture, including planning, develop- ment, testing**, **production, distribu- tion, sales**, and so forth, **makes** **up** **a** **relatively large portion of many na- tions' economies**. Many jobs are de- pendent, directly or indirectly, on the munitions industry, including the whole area of satellites and their ramifications. Reduction in arms manufacture is heavily influenced by the expected impact on the unem- ployment picture. **When a manufacturing** **plant**-in- cluding a munitions plant-**is threat- ened with closure**, the possibility of **job loss plays a large part in** **the** po- litical **decision** whether or not **to keep the plant open**. As two examples, President Bush was reported as op- posing higher-mileage cars, and thus less pollution, because they would have resulted in fewer jobs, and the **Connecticut** legislature **refused to ban cheap handguns and automatic weapons because it would result in job losses** at the Hartford Colt factory36

# Affirmative – Morals/Framework

## Libertarianism

### FW – Freedom/Libertarianism

#### Freedom in society has three requirements – a structure of rights, self-ownership, and leximin opportunity – this is a departure from egalitarianism and util

**Van Parijs 92 – Political Philosopher and Economist** [Philippe, April 1992, “Basic Income Capitalism,” Ethics, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2381835>, accessed 6/27/17] AO [Premier]

What is a just society? It is nothing, I propose, but a free society, understood as a society whose members are all as really free as possible. More precisely, it is a society that satisfies the following three conditions: (a) There is some well enforced structure of rights (security condition). (b) This structure is such that each person owns herself (self-ownership condition). (c) This structure is such that each person has the greatest possible opportunity to do whatever she might want to do (leximin [or lexicographic maximin] opportunity condition). In a fuller exposition, each of these three conditions would require a great deal of clarification. Let me just spell out somewhat the third one, which will matter most for our purposes. In a free society, so the third condition asserts, the person with least opportunities has opportunities that are no smaller than those enjoyed by the person with least opportunities under any other feasible arrangement; in case there exists another feasible ar- rangement that is just as good for the person with least opportunities, then the next person up the scale in a free society must have oppor- tunities no smaller than the second person up the scale of opportunities under this arrangement; and so on. This so-called leximin (or lexi- cographic maximin) formulation is no doubt better than either a purely aggregative formula (e.g., in terms of the opportunities of society's average member) or a more egalitarian formula (e.g., in terms of maximum equal opportunities) to express the idea that the members of a (maximally) free society are all as free as possible. A full characterization of this ideal of a free society would require, in addition, a specification of the standards by which conflicts between the three conditions should be settled. Giving some thought to these conflicts will help to perceive more concretely what each of the conditions asserts. If one is to prevent most effectively the violation of rights, for example, one may have to restrict severely the self-ownership of some persons-for example by arresting those suspected of having violated some rights, by imprisoning or even executing the convicted-and/ or to restrict more mildly the freedom of all-for example, by limiting freedom of association in order to forestall the formation of terrorist gangs or by imposing conscription in order to ward off external threats. In other cases, such as compulsory vaccination against infectious diseases or the obligation to help a person in danger when the risk to oneself is small, there is a direct conflict between self-ownership and the pro- tection or expansion of opportunity sets. In other cases again, the conflict between self-ownership and leximin opportunity is less direct and contingent upon specific empirical assumptions. Suppose, for example, that in the absence of a legal obligation to vote, the proportion of comparatively poor people who vote is considerably less than if there were such an obligation. Political platforms would then tend to display less concern for the opportunities of the worst off, and the outcome of the political process would systematically diverge from what the leximinning of opportunities would require. As they have only little bearing on the argument of this article- mostly concerned with the opportunity dimension of freedom- I shall not discuss the complex issues raised by such conflicts. As a rough guideline, let me just state that a free society should give a priority to the security condition over self-ownership, and to the latter over leximin opportunity. But this priority need not amount to a rigid lexicographic priority. In other words, mild disturbances of law and order can be tolerated if getting rid of them would require major restrictions of self-ownership or major departures from leximin opportunity.4 And mild restrictions of self-ownership can be incorporated into the insti- tutional framework of a free society, if a good case can be made to the effect that a significant improvement would result in terms of leximin opportunity.5 Nonetheless, for the sake of simplicity, I shall summarize the three conditions and the priority relations among them by stating that they amount to requiring the leximinning of people's opportunities subject to the protection of their formal freedom, that is, the respect of a structure of rights that incorporates self-ownership. This, in turn, I shall further abbreviate by saying that a free society as characterized by the three conditions and their articulation, is one that leximins real freedom. And I shall call real libertarian the position that consists in asserting that ajust society is a free society in this sense. Where can this real libertarianism be located on the map of existing theories ofjustice? If the Right/Left axis is to be defined by the degree to which a position caters for the interests of the least advantaged, it is hard to think of a position that could unquestionably be located to the Left of real libertarianism. Yet, the latter falls far short of plain egalitarianism, for three distinct reasons. First, it imposes formal freedom as a constraint on any substantive equalization. Second, it focuses on opportunities, on feasible sets, rather than on the outcomes of people's choices among the options open to them, as measured, for example, by the welfare levels they actually reach. Finally, by opting for a leximin criterion, it does not demand that the least advantaged should be given a worse deal for the sake of more equality. Real libertarianism is not satisfied as long as any member of society can point to another (formal- freedom-respecting) possible arrangement in which she would have greater opportunities, while no one would have opportunities as bad as hers currently are. This indicates in which sense any remaining inequality must be justifiable, on a real libertarian view, to those who feel they are getting a worse deal. But howeverjustifiable in this sense, undeserved inequalities of opportunities will remain. Each of these three features describes a major departure from unqualified egalitarianism (as well as from unqualified utilitarianism). Their conjunction also points to a close family resemblance between real libertarianism and the positions defended by Left liberals and justice-minded radicals.6 It further shares with these positions (as well as with standard libertarianism and modern utilitarianism) a general postulate of neutrality, that is, the demand that what counts as a just society should not be determined on the basis of a particular conception of the good life. Along with these positions, real libertarianism can therefore be presented as a meaningful way of articulating the im- portance we ascribe to liberty, equality, and efficiency. Liberty comes in through this neutrality postulate, through the constraint of self- ownership, and through a concern, not directly with people's happiness itself, but with the means required to pursue it. Equality and efficiency are combined in the selection of a leximin criterion. Though the latter cannot be correctly described-as it sometimes is-as the most egal- itarian criterion compatible with efficiency, it does constitute, among all criteria compatible with efficiency, the one that is most heavily biased in favor of the victims of whatever inequalities are allowed to subsist. Thus, "real freedom for all" can make at least a prima facie plausible claim, along with the other positions which share these features, to capturing the importance we intuitively attach, notjust to freedom, but also to equality and efficiency. Whether one can sustain this general claim, as well as the more specific claim that real libertarianism should be preferred to the other members of the family, can only be assessed by spelling out and assessing its institutional implications.

#### Libertarian freedom goes beyond non-domination—you need the freedom to lead one’s own life without any restriction.

**Van Parijs 92 – Political Philosopher and Economist** [Philippe, April 1992, “Basic Income Capitalism,” Ethics, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2381835>, accessed 6/27/17] AO [Premier]

What, then, is the best institutional expression of the ideal captured by the slogan "Real Freedom for All," as explicated by the conjunction of conditions a-b? One is really free, as opposed to just formally free, to the extent that one possesses the "means," not just the "right," to do whatever one might want to do. But how is this to be understood in concrete terms? When arguing against this "real" conception of freedom, Hayek and Buchanan are more specific: by abandoning their own ("formal") definition of freedom, they claim, one is bound to slip into equating the latter with wealth or the budget set] This prompts the suggestion that the ideal of real freedom for all requires us to leximin people's incomes, subject of course to respecting everyone's formal freedom. Somewhat more concretely, but less exactly, our ideal would require us to raise the lowest incomes as much as is compatible with a ban on forced labor.8 But let us be very careful here. The real freedom we need to be concerned with is not just the real freedom to choose among alternative bundles of consumption goods. It is the real freedom to lead one's life as one pleases. Obviously, this does not deprive income, or the budget set, of its importance. But it makes it crucially important that the income should be given unconditionally, no strings attached, without any constraint on the conduct of the person concerned, without any restriction, in particular, to those who make themselves available for paid work. Hence the following far more radical suggestion: If we are at all serious about pursuing real freedom for all-and if we are willing to abstract for the moment from both dynamic considerations and interpersonal differences in abilities-what we have to go for is the highest unconditional income for all consistent with security and self- ownership.

#### Libertarianism permits a tax on natural resources per the Lockean proviso

**Vallentyne 2012 – Professor of Philosophy at the** **University of Missouri at Columbia** [Peter, 1/19/12, “Libertarianism and the Justice of a Basic Income,”, <http://klinechair.missouri.edu/docs/libertarianism_and_basic_income.pdf>, accessed 6/28/17] AO [Premier]

All forms of libertarianism endorse full self-ownership and full ownership of the products of one’s labor (suitably understood). Non-consensual wealth taxes, income taxes, or use taxes on artifacts or on personal internal endowments are deemed unjust. Thus, this way of financing a basic income is rejected by libertarianism. In addition to self-owning agents and the artifacts they produce, however, there are natural resources. 3 These are those things that have no moral standing and that have not been transformed (e.g., improved) by any (non-divine) agent. Thus, land, seas, air, minerals, etc. in their original (unimproved) states are natural resources, whereas such things as chairs, buildings, and land cleared for farming are artifacts (composed partly of natural resources). Many forms of libertarianism, we shall see, hold that those who appropriate more than their fair share of natural resources owe a payment to others for their excess share. We shall examine whether this required payment could justly finance a basic income.4 Different versions of libertarianism result from different views about the moral powers that agents have to appropriate natural resources. Radical right libertarianism—such as that of Rothbard (1978, 1982) and Narveson (1988, pp. 79-93; 1999)—holds that there are no fair share constraints on use or appropriation. The first person to stake a claim in the appropriate manner (e.g., with labor mixing) over specified natural resources fully owns them. This view rejects any duty to compensate others for any resulting disadvantage or to share with others the benefits that appropriation brings. There is thus no basis for the just financing of a basic income (or anything else!). All other versions of libertarianism accept that there is some kind of fair share condition on appropriation and subsequent ownership of natural resources. After all, no human agent created natural resources, and there is no reason that the lucky person who first claims rights over a natural resource, and the inheritors of those rights, should reap all the benefits that the resource provides. The standard fair share condition is the Lockean proviso, which requires that “enough and as good be left for others”. Indeed, as long as this clause is allowed to be interpreted loosely (as we shall), the Lockean proviso simply is the requirement that some kind of fair share condition be satisfied. Throughout, we’ll interpret the Lockean proviso (following Nozick) to allow that individuals may appropriate and own more than their fair share of natural resources as long as they compensate others for their loss from the excess ownership. The Lockean proviso, that is, is a requirement that a fair share of the value of natural resources be left for others. It thus provides the basis for an enforceable duty to make payments to others. Although the proviso is usually interpreted as a proviso on appropriation, it is most plausibly understood, I believe, as a proviso on ownership of natural resources generally. It imposes restrictions, not merely on the initial act of appropriation, but also on, on-going ownership. Indeed, this is Nozick’s own view (see Vallentyne 2011 for discussion). Thus, it may require on-going payments and not merely an initial payment at the time of appropriation. In any case, I shall assume this below.5 Whether this provides the basis for a basic income depends on whether an equal payment is owed to all citizens unconditionally. Let us turn to that issue.

#### Taxation for UBI is not immoral, limiting coercion justifies coercion if the policy is clear

**Zwolinski 13 - Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego** [Matt, Why did Hayek Support a Basic Income?, December 23, 2013, https://www.libertarianism.org/columns/why-did-hayek-support-basic-income June 28 2017] LA [Premier]

Of course, a basic income would need to be funded by taxation (or would it?), and so would seem to involve the imposition its own kind of coercion. Hayek recognized this fact, but like most in the classical liberal tradition, Hayek did not believe that all taxation was incompatible with freedom. What makes the coercion of the slavemaster, or the monopolist, so worrisome for Hayek is that it involves the arbitrary imposition of one person’s will on another. By contrast, a tax system that is clearly and publicly defined in advance, that imposes only reasonable rates for genuinely public purposes, that is imposed equally upon all, and that is constrained by democratic procedures and the rule of law, might still be constitute interference, but not arbitrary interference. In a perfect world, Hayek thought, we would be able to eliminate coercion altogether, including even the relatively mild kind of coercion that a modest form of taxation involves. But in our world, coercion can only be minimized, not eliminated, and the coercion of some individuals by others can often be held in check only by the use of coercion itself (CL, p. 59). For Hayek, then, and for those who follow in his footsteps, a basic income is motivated not by an allegedly misguided commitment to egalitarianism or to positive liberty. It is motivated instead by the value that libertarians prize above all others – freedom. And it is motivated by an understanding of freedom that libertarians ought to find highly attractive. The point of a basic income isn’t to give everyone the same amount of wealth. It is to ensure that everyone has enough access to material wealth to render them immune to the coercive power of others. That’s an understanding of freedom that appears to have been good enough for John Locke. It ought to be good enough for his contemporary followers as well.

### Paternalism

#### UBIs break down the current paternalistic welfare state because it is unconditional and applies to all people.

**Zwolinski 2014 – Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego** [Matt, The Pragmatic Libertarian Case for a Basic Income Guarantee. the Cato Institute on August 4, 2014. https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/04/matt-zwolinski/pragmatic-libertarian-case-basic-income-guarantee] JN [Premier]

Less Invasive / Paternalistic One of the main differences between a BIG and the current welfare state is the unconditionality of the former. Under a BIG, everybody gets a check. Under the current welfare state, only people who meet the various stipulated qualifications are eligible for assistance. The precise nature of those qualifications varies from program to program, but can include not earning too much, not earning too little, not being on drugs, not having won the lottery, making an earnest effort to find work, and so on. Conditions are put on welfare in order to ensure that assistance goes to the deserving poor, and not to the undeserving. But distinguishing between the deserving and undeserving is difficult business, and requires a variety of invasive, demoralizing, and degrading inspections into the intimate details of applicants’ lives. “Fill out this form, tell us about that man you live with, pee in this cup, and submit to spot inspections of your home by our social workers, or else.” Maybe the state shouldn’t be in the business of giving out welfare at all. Maybe it shouldn’t be running schools, or highways either. But, as Jacob Levy notes, since it does do these things, libertarians have good reason to demand that it does so in a way that is as “more rather than less compatible with Hayek’s rule of law, with freedom from supervision and surveillance by the bureaucracy, with the ability to get on with living their lives rather than having to waste them proving their innocence.” The conditional welfare state is not only invasive, it is heavily paternalistic. Restrictions on eligibility are imposed in order to encourage welfare recipients to live their lives in a way that the state thinks is good for them: don’t have kids out of wedlock, don’t do drugs, and get (or stay) married. And benefits are often given in-kind rather than in cash precisely because the state doesn’t trust welfare recipients to make what it regards as wise choices about how to spend their money. This, despite the fact that both economic theory and a growing body of empirical evidence suggest that individuals are better off with the freedom of choice that a cash grant brings. In-kind grant programs like SNAP (food stamps) persist in their present form not because they are effective but because they are the product of a classic Bootleggers-and-Baptists coalition: well-meaning members of the public like the idea that welfare recipients have to use their vouchers on food rather than alcohol and cigarettes, and the farm lobby likes that beneficiaries are forced to buy its own products. Poor people, meanwhile, are deprived of the opportunity to save that a cash grant would give them, and they are forced to waste time and effort trading what SNAP allows them to buy for what they really want.

#### UBI enhances freedom - unconditional income breaks the bonds of economic dependence

Danaher, 2014 - a lecturer at the National University of Ireland, Galway [John Danaher, Widerquist on Freedom and the Basic Income, Sunday, July 13, 2014, <http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/widerquist-on-freedom-and-basic-income.html>, June 27, 2017] [Premier]

Given these two problems, Widerquist thinks an alternative justification for the UBI is in order. This is what he hopes to provide. 2. Freedom as Effective Control Self-Ownership (ECSO) Widerquist’s defence of the UBI replaces Parijs’s concept of real freedom with an alternative concept: freedom as effective control self-ownership. This is a bit of a mouthful and Widerquist helpfully abbreviates it to ECSO. ECSO is a non-scalar concept of freedom that appeals to the notion of self-ownership, but is both broader and narrower than traditional theories of self-ownership. Let’s try to unpack this in some more detail. First off, what does it mean to say that ECSO is a non-scalar concept of freedom? The idea is that some theories of freedom think that there is no fundamental distinction between the free and and the unfree. Instead, freedom is something that exists along a spectrum: some people have more of it, some people have less. Theories of this sort appeal to scalar freedom. Parijs’s real freedom is one such concept. He clearly thinks that freedom is something that exists in different levels or degrees and that the UBI could help to increase those levels. That’s why Widerquist criticised him for failing to provide a measurement of freedom. The ECSO concept is different. It doesn’t view freedom as something that exists along a spectrum. Instead, freedom is an either/or concept: you either have it or you don’t. There is, consequently, a fundamental distinction between the free and the unfree. Widerquist’s belief is that the UBI can help move people out of the category of the “unfree” and into that of the “free”. Second, what is this notion of “effective control self-ownership”? Let’s break it down into its constituent components. The self-ownership component is negative in nature. It does not propose that we should have some type of property interest in ourselves (though I guess it could go that way); rather, it proposes that no one else should have such a right in or over us. This is then fleshed out by the notion of effective control: we should have control over the course of our own lives, no one else should have that control. The use of the word “effective” is critical here. For Widerquist, it is not simply enough for us to have the nominal right to control self-ownership; we must also have the power to effectively exercise that right. The problem nowadays is that many people only have the nominal right. As a matter of practice, they are beholden to and controlled by someone else, e.g. their husband, their boss, their parents and so on. This is what makes ECSO broader and narrower than self-ownership theories of freedom. It is narrower in that it only focuses on the control aspects of self-ownership, but it is broader in that it focuses on effective, not merely nominal, control. Widerquist holds that there are two crucial conditions for ECSO: ECSO I: A free person can interact with willing others as and when they choose (i.e. they can choose when to cooperate and work with willing others). ECSO II: A free person cannot be directly or indirectly forced to serve the interests of others. Only if these two conditions are satisfied does the person transition out of the category of “unfree” and into the category of “free”. (FWIW, I think that this conception of freedom, particularly in its second condition, is close to the republican conception of freedom as non-domination. I covered the latter as a possible justification for the UBI before). 3. Widerquist’s Argument for the UBI With his preferred concept of freedom outlined, Widerquist can proceed to provide his own argument for the UBI. The argument follows the structure of Parijs’s: (4) We ought to help people attain ECSO (i.e. help them become free). (5) In the absence of a UBI people do not attain ECSO; with a UBI they can. (6) Therefore, we ought to introduce a UBI. We could, of course, criticise the ECSO concept of freedom, but I won’t do so here. Instead, I’ll focus on premise (5) and Widerquist’s defence of it. The initial groundwork for this defence has already been laid. Widerquist’s belief is that in the contemporary world people only have a nominal right to control self-ownership. In practice, they are economically dependent on others. They need these others to meet the basic needs of their existence and forced to serve their interests. The others in question can include employers or family members or patrons of some kind. It is only if we can break these ties of economic dependence that we can help people attain ECSO. This is exactly what the UBI aims to do. By providing everyone with the income necessary to meet their basic needs, it prevents others from forcing them into relationships of economic dependence. Widerquist thinks that this argument for UBI addresses the two problems inherent in Parijs’s argument. It explains why UBI is to be preferred over other forms of welfare. An unconditional payment to all people, regardless of other income or ability, is the only thing that will help all people attain ECSO. It gives them the “exit options” they need to escape relationships of economic dependency and does not force them to satisfy other conditions for receipt of income (which would be contrary to ECSO II). Furthermore, it suggests that the reciprocity objection is misplaced. The problem with society as it is currently organised is that the means for securing ECSO are controlled by others. The UBI simply gives people what they should be entitled to anyway (ironically, I suggested that Parijs’s defence of the UBI made an identical point, so I think Widerquist is wrong to suppose his argument has an advantage over Parijs’s on this score).

#### A UBI drastically reduces political rent-seeking and opportunism because it treats all citizens the same.

**Zwolinski 2014 – Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego** [Matt, The Pragmatic Libertarian Case for a Basic Income Guarantee. the Cato Institute on August 4, 2014. https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/04/matt-zwolinski/pragmatic-libertarian-case-basic-income-guarantee] JN [Premier]

Less Rent-Seeking Whenever there exists a bureaucracy with the power and discretion to take from some in order to benefit others, there will also exist powerful incentives for individuals to manipulate that bureaucracy in order to better serve their own private interests. Agents of the bureaucracy itself will seek to expand its scope and budget regardless of whether such expansion serves the interests of its clients. And special interest groups will use various political mechanisms to channel the organization’s resources into their own pockets. In theory, the welfare state doles out money and other resources on the basis of such factors as need and desert. But need and desert are both philosophically contested and impossible to measure objectively. And so, in practice, resources are doled out to those who can make the best political case that they need or deserve it. And this is a contest in which the genuine poor are at a serious disadvantage relative to the better educated, wealthier, and more politically engaged middle class. A BIG, in contrast, allows virtually no room for bureaucratic discretion, and thus minimizes the opportunities for political rent-seeking and opportunism. It is, as the late James Buchanan once noted, a perfectly general policy that treats all citizens the same. It is thus entirely ill-suited for use as a method of political exploitation. We should therefore expect to see much less rent-seeking and opportunism with a BIG than we do with the present welfare state, and therefore a more effective transfer of resources toward the genuinely needy as opposed to the politically well-connected. Of course, no policy is perfectly immune to rent-seeking or political manipulation, and others have expressed what seem to me to be some entirely reasonable concerns about a BIG in this respect. But nothing that I have seen has yet convinced me that the problems with a BIG would be worse than those we have now, and there still seems to me to be good reason to think those problems would be considerably diminished.

#### UBIs break down the current paternalistic welfare state because it is unconditional and applies to all people.

**Zwolinski 2014 – Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego** [Matt, The Pragmatic Libertarian Case for a Basic Income Guarantee. the Cato Institute on August 4, 2014. https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/04/matt-zwolinski/pragmatic-libertarian-case-basic-income-guarantee] JN [Premier]

Less Invasive / Paternalistic One of the main differences between a BIG and the current welfare state is the unconditionality of the former. Under a BIG, everybody gets a check. Under the current welfare state, only people who meet the various stipulated qualifications are eligible for assistance. The precise nature of those qualifications varies from program to program, but can include not earning too much, not earning too little, not being on drugs, not having won the lottery, making an earnest effort to find work, and so on. Conditions are put on welfare in order to ensure that assistance goes to the deserving poor, and not to the undeserving. But distinguishing between the deserving and undeserving is difficult business, and requires a variety of invasive, demoralizing, and degrading inspections into the intimate details of applicants’ lives. “Fill out this form, tell us about that man you live with, pee in this cup, and submit to spot inspections of your home by our social workers, or else.” Maybe the state shouldn’t be in the business of giving out welfare at all. Maybe it shouldn’t be running schools, or highways either. But, as Jacob Levy notes, since it does do these things, libertarians have good reason to demand that it does so in a way that is as “more rather than less compatible with Hayek’s rule of law, with freedom from supervision and surveillance by the bureaucracy, with the ability to get on with living their lives rather than having to waste them proving their innocence.” The conditional welfare state is not only invasive, it is heavily paternalistic. Restrictions on eligibility are imposed in order to encourage welfare recipients to live their lives in a way that the state thinks is good for them: don’t have kids out of wedlock, don’t do drugs, and get (or stay) married. And benefits are often given in-kind rather than in cash precisely because the state doesn’t trust welfare recipients to make what it regards as wise choices about how to spend their money. This, despite the fact that both economic theory and a growing body of empirical evidence suggest that individuals are better off with the freedom of choice that a cash grant brings. In-kind grant programs like SNAP (food stamps) persist in their present form not because they are effective but because they are the product of a classic Bootleggers-and-Baptists coalition: well-meaning members of the public like the idea that welfare recipients have to use their vouchers on food rather than alcohol and cigarettes, and the farm lobby likes that beneficiaries are forced to buy its own products. Poor people, meanwhile, are deprived of the opportunity to save that a cash grant would give them, and they are forced to waste time and effort trading what SNAP allows them to buy for what they really want.

#### UBI creates the necessary conditions for freedom by allowing people to gain options of exiting the labor market

**Zwolinski 13 - Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego** [Matt, Why did Hayek Support a Basic Income?, December 23, 2013, https://www.libertarianism.org/columns/why-did-hayek-support-basic-income June 28 2017] LA [Premier]

If libertarians are concerned to protect the freedom of all, and not just the freedom of most, we will want some mechanism that catches those who fall through the cracks left by imperfect market competition. We will want, too some mechanism for protecting individuals whose economic vulnerability renders them vulnerable to domination outside the marketplace – the woman, for example, who stays with her abusive husband because she lacks the financial resources to support herself without him. Cases such as these point the way to a freedom-based case for a Basic Income Guarantee, of the sort that Hayek might very well have had in mind. A basic income gives people an option – to exit the labor market, to relocate to a more competitive market, to invest in training, to take an entrepreneurial risk, and so on. And the existence of that option allows them to escape subjection to the will of others. It enables them to say “no” to proposals that only extreme desperation would ever drive them to accept. It allows them to govern their lives according to their own plans, their own goals, and their own desires. It enables them to be free. If libertarians are concerned to protect **the** freedom of all, and not just the freedom of most, we will want some mechanism that catches those who fall through the cracks left by imperfect market competition. We will want, too, [and] some mechanism for protecting individuals whose economic vulnerability renders them vulnerable to domination outside the marketplace – the woman, for example, who stays with her abusive husband because she lacks the financial resources to support herself without him. Cases such as these point the way to a freedom-based case for a Basic Income Guarantee, of the sort that Hayek might very well have had in mind. A basic income gives people an option – to exit the labor market, to relocate to a more competitive market, to invest in training, to take an entrepreneurial risk, and so on. And the existence of that option allows them to escape subjection to the will of others. It enables them to say “no” to proposals that only extreme desperation would ever drive them to accept. It allows them to govern their lives according to their own plans, their own goals, and their own desires. It enables them to be free.

### Size of Government / Welfare State

#### UBI shrinks the size of government by replacing the welfare state bureaucracy and eliminates condescension toward the poor.

**Zwolinski, 2013 – Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego** [Matt, , “The Libertarian Case for a Basic Income” Libertarianism.org, August 4 2014, June 28 2017 https://www.libertarianism.org/columns/libertarian-case-basic-income] NJT [Premier]

Each one of those anti-poverty programs comes with its own bureaucracy and its own Byzantine set of rules. If you want to shrink the size and scope of government, eliminating those departments and replacing them with a program so simple it could virtually be administered by a computer seems like a good place to start. Eliminating bloated bureaucracies means more money in the hands of the poor and lower costs to the taxpayer. Win/Win.∂ A Basic Income Guarantee would also be considerably less paternalistic then the current welfare state, which is the bastard child of “conservative judgment and progressive condescension” toward the poor, in Andrea Castillo’s choice words. Conservatives want to help the poor, but only if they can demonstrate that they deserve it by jumping through a series of hoops meant to demonstrate their willingness to work, to stay off drugs, and preferably to settle down into a nice, stable, bourgeois family life. And while progressives generally reject this attempt to impose traditional values on the poor, they have almost always preferred in-kind grants to cash precisely as a way of making sure the poor get the help they “really” need. Shouldn’t we trust poor people to know what they need better than the federal government?

#### A Basic Income fixes the current welfare system-universality disincentives fraud, enables cohabitation with family, enables retraining periods, encourages entrepreneurship

Painter, 15 – Leader of the RSA’s Policy Development [Anthony, Creative citizen, creative state: the principled and pragmatic case for a Universal Basic Income, RSA, December 2015, <https://www.thersa.org/globalassets/reports/rsa_basic_income_20151216.pdf>, 6/27/17] JY [Premier]

Why is Basic Income back on the agenda? Despite radical changes to the welfare system, in-work poverty for working age non-parents has vastly increased and there are still more than two million working age parents in poverty. The poverty reduction measures of the past decade and a half have barely dented working-age poverty – for non-parents it has increased: Figure 1: Poverty and inequality statistics, 1983–2012 (poverty, millions)2 2 Source: Institute of Fiscal Studies, 2014 cited in John Curtice and Rachel Ormston, “British Social Attitudes 32” (London, 2015), www.bsa.natcen. ac.uk/media/38972/bsa32\_fullreport.pdf. Creative citizen, creative state 9 POWER TO CREATE The interaction between the welfare system and the current labour market is failing convincingly to shift poverty, indebtedness, dependency and insecurity. These strains will become increasingly apparent over time and the introduction of a highly complex Universal Credit system will only underscore the tensions. Difficulty in rolling out the scheme to just 18,000 of the expected seven million claimants, including the adoption of a costly but limited IT system, underline just how problematic and complex the system is.3 The administrative and potential political costs are likely to escalate further. Basic Income has a number of advantages over the current system. Benefit fraud is far less. It is not contingent on income and, therefore, the false reporting of income offers no advantage. Furthermore, as it is based on individual earnings, there is no household disadvantage to cohabiting. In this sense, it support[ing]s rather than potentially undermin[ing]es strong relationships. On a like for like basis, the Basic Income is, therefore, more supportive of the family. It focuses people on their relationships directly rather than the impacts of the welfare state on their relationships. These are strong messages in comparison with the current system. Secondly, [With] the spread of intelligent machines and new technology will impact the world of work considerably. Periods of retraining, entrepreneurship, lower hours and periods of unemployment could become more common. Indeed, a welfare system supportive of mobility across the life cycle will be critical. The current system fails in this regard focused as it is on work at all costs when workers might need periods of lower or no work to retrain. They may also wish to experiment with setting up a business without having the state breathing down their necks as they are claiming

#### The lack of cohesion in the current welfare programs calls for change – UBI would be a better libertarian solution.

**Tanner, 2016 – Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute** [Michael D., “The Basic Income Guarantee: Simplicity, but at What Cost?” Cato Institute, August 26 2014, accessed on June 28 2017 https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/26/basic-income-guarantee-simplicity-what-cost] NJT [Premier]

I set aside the question of whether redistribution – for that is what UBI really is – is ever justified. Matt Zwolinski makes a solid case in favor of such efforts, and certainly a limited amount of redistribution has been supported in the past by prominent libertarians, including Hayek, Nozick, and Friedman among others. On the other hand, as Michael Huemer points out, UBI will, of necessity, violate the Nonaggression Principle at the heart of much of modern libertarianism. Yet, as interesting as such debates are, there will be some form of government-imposed redistribution for the foreseeable future. The real question therefore is whether UBI offers a better way to fight poverty.∂ Our current welfare system is clearly a mess. The federal government currently funds 126 separate anti-poverty programs, at least 72 of which provide either cash or in-kind benefits to individuals. For example, there are 33 housing programs, run by four different cabinet departments, including bizarrely the Department of Energy. There are currently 21 different programs providing food or food purchasing assistance. These programs are administered by three different federal departments and one independent agency. There are eight different health care programs, administered by five separate agencies within the Department of Health and Human Services. And six cabinet departments and five independent agencies oversee 27 cash or general assistance programs. All together, seven different cabinet agencies and six independent agencies administer at least one anti-poverty program. This maze of overlapping bureaucracies is difficult to navigate for those in the system and perhaps even more difficult to supervise and evaluate.∂ And obviously we should be concerned that the existing welfare system has utterly failed at its primary mission: lifting people out of poverty and enabling them and their children to become independent and self-supporting members of society. Last year alone, the federal government spent nearly $700 billion to fund anti-poverty programs. State and local governments kicked in an additional $300 billion, bringing the total to roughly $1 trillion. Since the Start of the War on Poverty in 1965, we have spent nearly $19 trillion. Recent studies suggest that welfare programs did help to reduce the worst deprivations of material poverty, especially in their early years. But they have long since reached a point of diminishing returns. We may have reduced the discomfort of poverty, but we have failed to truly lift people out of poverty.

#### U.S. Welfare is inefficient – 1 trillion dollars spent still left 16% poor.

**Zwolinski, 2014 – Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego** [Matt, “The Pragmatic Libertarian Case for a Basic Income Guarantee” Cato Institute, August 4 2014, accessed on June 28 2017 https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/04/matt-zwolinski/pragmatic-libertarian-case-basic-income-guarantee] NJT [Premier]

From the perspective of anyone concerned with limiting government and encouraging individual responsibility, the contemporary American welfare state is a disaster. According to a report by the Cato Institute’s Michael Tanner, welfare programs at the federal level alone cost more than $668 billion annually, spread across at least 126 different programs. Add another $284 of welfare spending at the state and local level, and you’ve got almost $1 trillion dollars of government spending on welfare - over $20,000 for every poor person in the United States.∂ Not only does the U.S. welfare state spend a lot; it spends it badly. Poor Americans receiving assistance face a bewildering variety of phase-outs and benefit cliffs that combine to create extremely high effective marginal tax rates on their labor. As a result, poor families often find that working more (or having a second adult work) simply doesn’t pay. And still, despite massive expenditures by the welfare state, some 16% of Americans are left living in poverty.

#### UBI is cheaper than current programs: cutting programs that benefit solely the middle class benefits the poor and could pay for UBI.

**Zwolinski, 2014 – Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego** [Matt, “The Pragmatic Libertarian Case for a Basic Income Guarantee” Cato Institute, August 4 2014, accessed on June 28 2017 https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/04/matt-zwolinski/pragmatic-libertarian-case-basic-income-guarantee] NJT [Premier]

Second, a BIG could be considerably cheaper than the current welfare state. How much cheaper depends on the details of the particular proposal. Some, like Murray’s, which involve a progressive tax on the BIG once a certain threshold of income is reached, appear to be considerably cheaper. Other analyses, like Ed Dolan’s, suggest only that a moderate BIG would not cost more than what we currently spend.∂ Part of the explanation of the relatively low cost of a BIG comes from the reduction of bureaucracy, described above. But another reason is to be found in Director’s Law: If you’re like most people, when you hear “welfare” you think about transfers from the rich to the poor. But in reality, most political transfers benefit the middle class at the expense of the poor (and rich). If the BIG is going to replace the welfare state, then transfers to the middle class such as subsidies for higher education, the mortgage interest deduction, and tax benefits for retirement savings ought to be cut right along with (if not before) SNAP, TANF, etc.∂ Again, how much a BIG would cost relative to the current welfare state depends on the details of the particular BIG proposal. Various proposals need to be evaluated on their own merits, and of course I do not wish to claim that every BIG proposal will be more affordable than our current welfare state. But neither is there any reason to believe that no reasonable proposal could be.

#### UBI cuts down on inefficient bureaucracy-much simpler to administer than existing welfare programs

Danaher, 2013 – Lecturer at the National University of Ireland [John, a regular blogger at Philosophical Disquisitions, Libertarianism and the Basic Income (Part Two), Philosophical Disquisitions, 12/17/13, http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2013/12/libertarianism-and-basic-income-part-two.html, 6/27/17] JY [Premier]

That’s relatively okay. Premise (2) is where all the main problems are located. If we accept the need for some level of redistribution, we may well ask why it shouldn’t be selective and conditional in nature. After all, the motivating concern here is that some people are losing out relative to others. Surely, we just have to compensate them and not everyone else as well? Yes, but a universal and unconditional system — such as the UBI — may have a number practical advantages over selective systems of redistribution. Zwolinski mentions two in his article: Minimises State Intrusion into Private Life: Selective systems of redistribution, as are common in many countries around the world, often require substantial and expensive bureaucracies in order to be administered properly. For example, if the goal is only to provide assistance to those who are below a certain income threshold, we will have to engage in means-testing and other forms of surveillance and monitoring to ensure that the right people are getting the right amounts of money. Universal and unconditional payments are much easier to administer. Since classical liberals care about minimising state interference, they may consequently see the UBI as being preferable to selective forms of redistribution. Avoids Public Choice Problems: The bureaucracies associated [with] selective systems of redistribution have a tendency to expand over time and for their workers to engage in rent-seeking. This is due to the general social problem that actors within institutions, and institutions within governments, do not always have the same interests as those who set them up. Classical liberals would like prevent this from happening and so, once again, may be drawn to the administrative simplicity of the UBI.

#### A UBI is libertarian because it eliminates most of the welfare bureaucracy.

**Zwolinski 2014 – Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego** [Matt, The Pragmatic Libertarian Case for a Basic Income Guarantee. the Cato Institute on August 4, 2014. https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/04/matt-zwolinski/pragmatic-libertarian-case-basic-income-guarantee] JN [Premier]

Less Bureaucracy Every one of the more than 126 federal welfare programs comes with its own bureaucracy, its own set of arcane rules, regulations, and restrictions, and its own significant (and rising) overhead costs. A BIG, in contrast, requires significantly less in terms of administrative expense. A program in which everyone gets a check for the same amount is simple enough to be administered by a computer program. And even a more complicated proposal, like Murray’s or like Friedman’s NIT, could largely piggyback off of the already existing bureaucracy of the federal tax system. Eliminating a large chunk of the federal bureaucracy would obviously be good from the perspective of a libertarian concern to reduce the size and scope of government. But it would also be good from the perspective of welfare beneficiaries. Actually getting signed up for all the various welfare benefits to which one is entitled is tremendously costly in terms of time, effort, and skill at bureaucratic navigation. Many people miss out on benefits for which they qualify simply because they don’t know that the program exists, or what they need to do to draw from it. Getting the benefit of a BIG, in contrast, requires just a single signature on the back of a check. If we’re going to spend money on helping the poor, shouldn’t we make sure that they actually get the help we’re paying for? Cheaper Second, a BIG could be considerably cheaper than the current welfare state. How much cheaper depends on the details of the particular proposal. Some, like Murray’s, which involve a progressive tax on the BIG once a certain threshold of income is reached, appear to be considerably cheaper. Other analyses, like Ed Dolan’s, suggest only that a moderate BIG would not cost more than what we currently spend. Part of the explanation of the relatively low cost of a BIG comes from the reduction of bureaucracy, described above. But another reason is to be found in Director’s Law: If you’re like most people, when you hear “welfare” you think about transfers from the rich to the poor. But in reality, most political transfers benefit the middle class at the expense of the poor (and rich). If the BIG is going to replace the welfare state, then transfers to the middle class such as subsidies for higher education, the mortgage interest deduction, and tax benefits for retirement savings ought to be cut right along with (if not before) SNAP, TANF, etc. Again, how much a BIG would cost relative to the current welfare state depends on the details of the particular BIG proposal. Various proposals need to be evaluated on their own merits, and of course I do not wish to claim that every BIG proposal will be more affordable than our current welfare state. But neither is there any reason to believe that no reasonable proposal could be.

#### UBI is a compromise between the status quo and a libertarian utopia – it’s the most viable alternative to the welfare state.

**Zwolinski, 2014 – Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego** [Matt, “The Pragmatic Libertarian Case for a Basic Income Guarantee” Cato Institute, August 4 2014, accessed on June 28 2017 https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/04/matt-zwolinski/pragmatic-libertarian-case-basic-income-guarantee] NJT [Premier]

In Libertarian Utopia, we might not have any welfare state all, no matter how limited or efficient. Many libertarians believe that any redistribution of wealth by the state violates individual rights and is therefore morally impermissible. And even those libertarians who do not base their political ideology on a theory of individual rights will worry that welfare states will produce perverse incentives – both on the part of recipients and potential recipients, and in the political processes that sustain and shape government policy.∂ But we do not live in Libertarian Utopia, nor have any of its prophets yet produced any compelling plan for how to get There from Here. Moreover, most people are not libertarians, and so unless we are willing to impose our views on them by force, we must try to find policy proposals that can command the assent of those who do not share our fundamental moral commitments and empirical beliefs.∂ From this perspective, the question of social welfare policy becomes less an exercise in ideal theory and more a problem of comparative institutional analysis. The question is not whether a BIG is a perfectly libertarian policy in every way, but whether it is more libertarian than the other realistically available policy alternatives. I believe that the considerations examined above provide us with very strong reason for believing that it is.∂ But I also believe that a BIG need not be merely a compromise. Even in a Libertarian Utopia, in other words, I think there would be good reasons to provide a social safety net through the mechanism of a BIG. I have written about some of these arguments before, and while constraints of space prevent me from elaborating upon them here, I am happy to do so in the discussion that follows this essay.

## Other Frameworks

### Egalitarianism

#### A universal basic income is key to justice, because it maximizes the real freedom for all in society, including those who choose not to work

Danaher, 2014 - Lecturer at National University of Ireland [John, “Parasitic Surfers and the Unconditional Basic Income: A Debate”, July 12 2014, <http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/parasitic-surfers-and-unconditional.html>] [Premier]

Parijs has a different view. Far from it being the case that surfers are mere parasites, it is actually the case that justice — or at least a particular but plausible conception of justice — demands that they be provided for. The conception of justice in question is one that appeals to the good of real freedom: Real Freedom: The ability of people to pursue their own conception of the good life. It’s difficult to tell from the short extract I read, but it seems that Parijs looks on this as a fundamental good, i.e. one that should be the organising goal of any society. With that value in mind, Parijs then appeals to a fairly typical (Rawlsian) view that justice demands that fundamental social goods, like the good of real freedom, be maximinned. That is to say: Real-Freedom Principle of Justice: We ought to maximise the minimum provision of real freedom in society, i.e. maximise the provision of real freedom to those who are worst off. It is this principle of justice that provides Parijs with an argument for the UBI. For once this principle is in place, all he needs to do is argue that the UBI is an efficient and effective means by which to maximise the minimum provision of real freedom. Like this: (1) Justice demands that we maximise the minimum provision of real freedom in society. (2) An unconditional basic income is an efficient and effective way to maximin the provision of real freedom. (3) Therefore, the demands of justice are satisfied by the existence of an unconditional basic income. Premise (2) is of course the key here, but the argument in favour of it is pretty straightforward. The belief is that in providing the highest possible unconditional income grant to everyone (i.e. a grant at or above subsistence level), we free them from being beholden to others for their existence and thereby increase their ability to pursue their conception of the good life. We don’t guarantee that they will get there, but we improve their chances. Importantly, this includes freeing them up from involuntary employment, i.e. employment that they are forced into by basic necessities of living and that may not be concordant with their conception of the good life. The implication of this is that you may have those who pursue a life of idleness or (shudder to think) non-competitive surfing. But so be it.

#### A UBI is a fundamental democratic right because it is key to allowing individuals to exercise all of their freedoms

Pateman, 2004 – prof of Political Science at UCLA [Carole, Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income. Politics and Society on March 1, 2004. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0032329203261100>] [Premier]

My argument is that a basic income should be seen, like the suffrage, as a democratic right, or a political birthright. By a “democratic” right I have in mind a fundamental right in Henry Shue’s sense of a “basic right.” Basic rights “specify the line beneath which no one is to be allowed to sink.” Rights are basic “if enjoyment of them is essential to the enjoyment of all other rights.”13 Subsistence is one of Shue’s basic rights, which he defines as “what is needed for a decent chance at a reasonably healthy and active life of more or less normal length, barring tragic interventions.”14 Building on this line of argument, a basic income, at a level sufficient for a modest but decent standard of life, can be seen as a fundamental or democratic right. Such an income is necessary to enable all citizens to participate as fully as they wish in all aspects of the life of their society. A basic income as a fundamental right can more reasonably be compared to the suffrage than can a stake. Citizenship and the suffrage are for life, and a basic income is a right that also exists over a citizen’s lifetime, whereas a capital grant is a one-off payment at the beginning of adulthood. A stake provides young people with a valuable start, but what of the rest of their life as citizens? A basic income provides the lifelong security that helps safeguard other rights. Universal suffrage is the emblem of equal citizenship and underpins an orderly change of government through free and fair elections, so enhancing citizens’ security. A basic 94 POLITICS & SOCIETY income is the emblem of full citizenship and provides the security required to maintain that political standing. Another way of making this point is that a basic income as a democratic right is necessary for individual freedom as selfgovernment, a political freedom.

### International Law

#### A UBI would uphold our obligation to international law – Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights guarantees a basic standard of living.

Scherndl 2017- Share the Worlds Resources [Sonja, Article 25 and a Universal Basic Income: the perfect match, March 8, 2017, <http://www.sharing.org/information-centre/articles/article-25-and-universal-basic-income-perfect-match>, June 29, 2017] CL [Premier]

Most of us are aware of the problems we are collectively facing: environmental issues, job losses or job insecurity, homelessness, increased violence, terrorism, an immigration and refugee crisis, overpopulation, poverty and famine. What hardly anyone is talking about is that we are all connected, and as much as we may have separated ourselves by nationality, religion, cast, political parties etc., the fact remains that we are one humanity or, as some describe, “one human family”. The planet provides for all of us without making a distinction – food, water, air, oceans and land – our commons. Yet we have managed to privatize these essential resources for only one purpose: to make money and profit, thus determining who should have access and who should go without. So complacent has humanity become over the last few decades that 18 million people are dying every year in a world of plenty. They have become the forgotten people as we have normalized their plight in our minds, often with the words “poverty has always existed, it’s nothing new”. Yet that poverty is steadily growing in many countries, with more famines in the developing world and increased homelessness and foodbanks across the West. We don’t hear much of those either, unless we ourselves are affected. Yet these deprivations are directly connected to increased violence, immigration, a degrading environment, homelessness and overpopulation. So, what is the answer? Demanding Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and a Global Basic Income could be the solution we are looking for, as they go hand in hand. On December 10. 1948 the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted and proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, including Article 25 on the right to an adequate standard of living: Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control. Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection. Sadly, Article 25 has never been implemented globally through appropriate government interventions and redistributive measures, but if it were, it would finally end poverty and create hope for millions of people for the first time. An Unconditional Basic Income, a periodic cash payment delivered to all on an individual basis to cover basic needs, would also be essential, because it will help make it all possible. It will finally guarantee the universal realization of Article 25. Basic income is already widely debated around the world within some countries, like Finland, Spain, Canada, Holland and Scotland having trial projects. Peter Bevan Baker of the Green Party on Prince Edward Island, Canada, stated positive effects of an Unconditional Basic Income that include: "Local economic growth, supporting entrepreneurship, reducing administrative, complexity and costs, improving working conditions, reducing crime, improving health, and helping to build vibrant rural communities."

### Social Contract

**A UBI upholds the social contract – it allows the greatest possible prosperity for people forced to participate in society**

**Carter, 2014 – Bay Area Legal Aid** [Timothy, The One Minute Case for a Basic Income, Montreal, 2014, <http://basicincome.org/bien/pdf/montreal2014/BIEN2014_Carter.pdf>, 6/28/17] JY [Premier]

The one minute social contractarian case for a basic income: All individuals have the right to pursue their own goals free from interference from other individuals. But anarchy allows the strong to impose their will on the weak, and the rule of law imposes its will on everybody. The best rule of law should obtain the broadest possible consent of the governed, have the smallest possible reach into the lives of the governed, and provide the greatest possible prosperity to both those who consent and those who dissent to allow them to pursue their goals. Dissidents to the social contract are entitled to at least all of the same benefits of the social contract as willing participants because they are unwillingly forced to abide by it. “The broadest possible consent” implies democracy, and “the smallest possible reach” implies property-ownership and markets. A universal basic income is a dividend for all willing participants in the social contract paid from the prosperity generated by the rule of law, and a payment to all dissidents for having the rule of law imposed upon them.

### Virtue Ethics

#### A basic income encourages virtues like honesty and conscientiousness because it reduces stress.

Santens 2017- Founder of the BIG Patreon(Scott, March 29 2017, “Evidence Indicates That Universal Basic Income Improves Human Health”, Accessed on 6/29/17, https://futurism.com/evidence-indicates-that-universal-basic-income-improves-human-health/) [Premier]

However, the most powerful finding of all was in personality effects. These changes were observed as a result of better home environments that involved less stress and better parental relationships. Incredibly, the children of families who began receiving what we can call something very close to a basic income, saw long-term enhancements in two key personality traits: conscientiousness and agreeableness. That is, they grew up to be more honest, more observant, more comfortable around other people, and more willing to work together with others. And because personalities tend to permanently set as adults, these are most likely lifelong changes.

#### A UBI increases social cohesion because it reduces stress - empirical examples prove

Santens 2017- Founder of the BIG Patreon(Scott, March 29 2017, “Evidence Indicates That Universal Basic Income Improves Human Health”, Accessed on 6/29/17, https://futurism.com/evidence-indicates-that-universal-basic-income-improves-human-health/) [Premier]

Although what’s been happening for years in both Alaska and North Carolina are close to universal basic income in practice, they are not actually UBI. UBI requires regularly giving everyone in an entire community an amount of money sufficient to cover their basic needs. This has been done in three places so far: the city of Dauphin in Canada, the Otjivero-Omitara area of Namibia, and the Madhya Pradesh area of India. It’s in these areas that humanity has achieved what’s closest to creating Human Parks. As a direct result of guaranteeing everyone a basic income in Dauphin, hospitalization rates decreased 8.5% and high school graduation rates surpassed 100% as dropouts actually returned to school to finish. In Namibia, overall crime rates were cut almost in half and self-employment rates tripled. In India, housing and nutrition improved, markets and businesses blossomed, and overall health and well-being reached new heights. But if it’s one thing I find most interesting across all experiments, it’s the improved social cohesion — a proliferation of new and strengthened social supports. In Namibia, a stronger community spirit developed. Apparently, the need to ask each other for money was a barrier to normal human interaction. Once basic income made it so that no one needed to beg anymore, everyone felt more able to make friendly visits to each other, and speak more freely without being seen as wanting something in return. In India, where castes can still create artificial social divisions, those in villages given basic income actually began to gather across caste lines for mutual decision-making. And in Canada, the basic income guarantee had a notable impact on caring, with parents choosing to spend more time with their kids, and kids spending more time with each other in schools instead of jobs. Remember, social supports are the trump card of societies with less stress, and it appears that providing people with UBI strengthens existing social supports and creates new ones. Freed from a focus on mere survival, humans reach out to each other. This is also something that makes us different from every other animal on Earth — our ability to reach each other in ways unimaginable even to ourselves until only recently. We as humans are entirely unique in our ability to belong to multiple hierarchies, and through the internet create connections across vast distances and even time itself through recorded knowledge. Our place in a hierarchy matters, but we can decide which hierarchies matter more. Is it our position in the socioeconomic ladder? Is it our position in our place of employment? Or is it our position in our churches, our schools, our sports leagues, our online communities, or even our virtual communities within games like World of Warcraft and Second Life? “No other policy has the transformative potential of reducing anywhere near as much stress in society than the lifelong guaranteeing of basic economic security with a fully unconditional basic income.”

# Affirmative – Case Blocks

### AT Alone, UBI Not Enough

#### Alternate causes don’t dejustify a UBI – it is one, among many, essential steps

Pateman, 2004 – prof of Political Science at UCLA [Carole, Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income. Politics and Society on March 1, 2004. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0032329203261100>] [Premier]

Second, let me emphasize that a basic income is not a panacea. In itself, a basic income would not, for instance, provide an adequate stock of affordable housing, sufficient good quality education, adequate health care, an end to racism, or violence-free neighborhoods. Yet if a genuinely democratic society in which the freedom of women is as important as that of men remains an aspiration, it is hard to see that there is a substitute for an unconditional basic income.

**Even if a UBI alone cannot solve, it sets the precedent for further changes.**

**Zelleke 2011 - prof of political science at The New School** [Almaz, January 2011, [http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/tpp/pap/2011/00000039/00000001/art00004 June 27](http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/tpp/pap/2011/00000039/00000001/art00004%20June%2027), 2017] LA [Premier]

Basic income is by no means enough on its own to achieve true gender equality, but the feminist justification of a basic income, unlike justifications based on the traditional androcentric subject of justice and citizenship, implies other institutional and policy changes as well to make sharing caregiving responsibilities easier and more attractive for women and men. Some steps along the path to gender equality follow directly from the universal caregiver model of citizenship, and include: • the wider availability of part-time work and job sharing; • job security during periodic leaves for full-time caregiving; • the decoupling of access to benefits such as health insurance and pensions from paid employment (a continuing problem in the US); • the widespread availability of care centres, both publicly supported and privately run, for children, older people and adults unable to care for themselves; • the reconfiguring of children’s schooling away from an anachronistic schedule designed to conform to the requirements of an agricultural society and a schedule that recognises the realities of paid employment demands on many parents.6 Other steps require extending the norm of gender neutrality now prevalent in higher education and professional workplaces, for example to the still androcentric institutions of vocational education and skilled blue-collar workplaces (Bergmann, 2005; Estévez-Abe, 2006). Still other steps require a more radical restructuring of the employment sector including, for example, reductions in rewards for seniority or continuity of service in promotions or advancement to protected status in both blue-collar and professional jobs.

### AT Bureaucracy

#### UBI cuts down on inefficient bureaucracy-much simpler to administer than existing welfare programs

**Danaher, 2013 – Lecturer at the National University of Ireland** [John, a regular blogger at Philosophical Disquisitions, Libertarianism and the Basic Income (Part Two), Philosophical Disquisitions, 12/17/13, http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2013/12/libertarianism-and-basic-income-part-two.html, 6/27/17] JY [Premier]

That’s relatively okay. Premise (2) is where all the main problems are located. If we accept the need for some level of redistribution, we may well ask why it shouldn’t be selective and conditional in nature. After all, the motivating concern here is that some people are losing out relative to others. Surely, we just have to compensate them and not everyone else as well? Yes, but a universal and unconditional system — such as the UBI — may have a number practical advantages over selective systems of redistribution. Zwolinski mentions two in his article: Minimises State Intrusion into Private Life: Selective systems of redistribution, as are common in many countries around the world, often require substantial and expensive bureaucracies in order to be administered properly. For example, if the goal is only to provide assistance to those who are below a certain income threshold, we will have to engage in means-testing and other forms of surveillance and monitoring to ensure that the right people are getting the right amounts of money. Universal and unconditional payments are much easier to administer. Since classical liberals care about minimising state interference, they may consequently see the UBI as being preferable to selective forms of redistribution. Avoids Public Choice Problems: The bureaucracies associated [with] selective systems of redistribution have a tendency to expand over time and for their workers to engage in rent-seeking. This is due to the general social problem that actors within institutions, and institutions within governments, do not always have the same interests as those who set them up. Classical liberals would like prevent this from happening and so, once again, may be drawn to the administrative simplicity of the UBI.

**UBI shrinks the size of government by replacing the welfare state bureaucracy**

**Zwolinski, 2013 – Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego** [Matt, , “The Libertarian Case for a Basic Income” Libertarianism.org, August 4 2014, June 28 2017 https://www.libertarianism.org/columns/libertarian-case-basic-income] NJT [Premier]

Each one of those anti-poverty programs comes with its own bureaucracy and its own Byzantine set of rules. If you want to shrink the size and scope of government, eliminating those departments and replacing them with a program so simple it could virtually be administered by a computer seems like a good place to start. Eliminating bloated bureaucracies means more money in the hands of the poor and lower costs to the taxpayer. Win/Win.∂ A Basic Income Guarantee would also be considerably less paternalistic then the current welfare state, which is the bastard child of “conservative judgment and progressive condescension” toward the poor, in Andrea Castillo’s choice words. Conservatives want to help the poor, but only if they can demonstrate that they deserve it by jumping through a series of hoops meant to demonstrate their willingness to work, to stay off drugs, and preferably to settle down into a nice, stable, bourgeois family life. And while progressives generally reject this attempt to impose traditional values on the poor, they have almost always preferred in-kind grants to cash precisely as a way of making sure the poor get the help they “really” need. Shouldn’t we trust poor people to know what they need better than the federal government?

**A UBI reforms the welfare state – it reduces bureaucracy**

**Carter, 2014 – Bay Area Legal Aid** [Timothy, The One Minute Case for a Basic Income, Montreal, 2014, <http://basicincome.org/bien/pdf/montreal2014/BIEN2014_Carter.pdf>, 6/28/17] JY [Premier]

The one minute conservative case for a basic income: The welfare state may not be the society we would have created, but it has been here for 4 generations, people have come to expect and rely on it, and it would be extremely disruptive to society to get rid of it. But while we may not be able to get rid of the welfare state, we can reform it. The current welfare state necessitates an immense and expensive bureaucracy, it is prohibitively complicated for some of its intended beneficiaries to navigate, it puts bureaucrats in charge of the lives of the poor, it creates perverse incentives for people to avoid work and to remain poor, and it arbitrarily allows some people to fall through the cracks. A basic income would correct all of these problems. A basic income is simple to administer, treats all people equally, retains all rewards for hard work, savings, and entrepreneurship, and trusts the poor to make their own decisions about what to do with their money, taking these decisions out of the hands of paternalistic elitist politicians.

### AT Dependence

**A UBI won’t cause dependence – it empirically increases the amount of work people do – Uganda Proves.**

**Dunn 2015 - Writer for medium.com**, [Scott C, A basic guaranteed income in the context of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs, September 9 2015, <https://medium.com/basic-income/a-basic-guaranteed-income-in-the-context-of-maslow-s-hierarchy-of-needs-c0835b6b8900>, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

There has been some discussion lately of a guaranteed basic income. Instead of welfare, everyone, regardless of age or wealth will receive a check from the government as basic income for a year. A guaranteed basic income is mainly a liberal idea and has actually been around a long, long time. It is surprising to see even some conservatives giving serious consideration to the idea. But given how low skill jobs are slowly disappearing at the hidden hand of automation, as a culture, we need to remember that not everyone is an expert. It just isn’t humane to let people starve because they missed the boat, or were not gifted investors with friends in the right places. Despite the conservative rhetoric that a basic income guaranteed (BIG) would create further dependence on the welfare state, there is significant evidence to the contrary. Radio host and humanitarian Thom Hartmann has taken note of the benefits of a BIG: A paper published in 2013 looked at two groups in Uganda: one group that received a no-strings attached grant equal to their annual income — about 380 dollars per person — and a control group that received no grant. And what did the unemployed youth do when they were “paid not to work”? The group that received the grant worked on average an extra 17 hours in comparison to the control group. And they showed a 41% increase in earnings four years after receiving the grant. They invested in skills and businesses. Individuals were 65% more likely to practice a skilled trade two years after receiving the grants. Interesting, isn’t it? That looks to me like once the basic needs were met, people were free to starting thinking about and acting on what they really, really wanted to do. Consider this chart of Abraham Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs: This is a concept I learned about long ago.

**A UBI will not cause dependence – that is just a wild guess without evidence and empirically disproven, and irrelevant if the UBI is a right.**

**Bidadanure 2017 - Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Stanford** [Juliana, Interviewed by Vivan Malkani, Stanford Politics Understanding Universal Basic Income, March 17 2017, https://stanfordpolitics.com/understanding-universal-basic-income-178032e6090f , June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

VM: In 2016, the Swiss government failed the plan to introduce a 2,000 franc UBI to its citizens. One of the reasons given was the same fear of dependency that you mentioned. The experiments so far have had short timeframes, like the Madhya Pradesh experiment mentioned in the McCoy Family Center for Ethics in Society event on basic income. Isn’t this debate just conjecture about whether the recipients of UBI will become lazy and overly dependent or use the payments wisely? JB: I agree with you, and I think the debate is very ideological. That’s why we have experiments. For instance, people worry about alcohol consumption, but the experiment in Madhya Pradesh showed alcohol consumption going down. In the presentation you mention at Stanford, Joe Huston did a great job at showing that in various cash transfer experiments across the world there is no evidence for these claims of misuse. On the other hand, I want to be careful with these experiments. Philosophers are asking whether basic income is a right. If that is the case, then the debate should not be so much about what people would end up doing with the money. Sometimes, the focus on how people will use the money shifts the attention away from the normative reasons underpinning basic income, like the view that no one should be left without access to the resources they need to survive. There are different ways to deliver that right. Giving people jobs would be another way to ensure that people don’t fall below certain thresholds. The problem with this view is that many people do work that is not remunerated, like caregivers. We also know that the future of jobs is at risk because of automation. The exclusive focus on jobs as a solution to poverty is a problem for at least the two reasons aforementioned. Focusing on work as opposed to jobs is what basic income proponents seek to do.

#### A UBI won’t cause dependence – it won’t be enough to discourage work, and it couldn’t be worse than the current system

Siegel 2017 - President of Rain Mountain LLC an independent product development group [RP, Feb 14th, 2017 Could Donald Trump Deliver a Universal Basic Income? <http://www.triplepundit.com/2017/02/trump-universal-basic-income/> Acc 6/29/17 ] [Premier]

The pros and cons of a universal basic income Iain Murray is the Competitive Enterprise Institute’s vice president of strategy. He writes in the National Review that he, too, is “leaning” toward supporting a universal basic income (UBI). Murray argues that libertarians support the idea because they “see it as the least damaging way for the government to transfer wealth from some citizens to others. Either way, the UBI is an idea whose time has finally come, but it has to be done right.” Michael Strain, who is against it, lays out the following pros for the policy in the Washington Post: Far less government bureaucracy No stigma for recipients Personal responsibility for how the money is spent No penalty for supplementing income A base of economic security for all (oddly, he makes this point last) Despite these potential benefits, Strain says he can’t support it because, “In a UBI world, those who choose to work will support those who choose not to – not those who can’t work, but those who won’t. This really would be a world of makers and takers.” Strain says he simply can’t abide the idea that the wealth of some could bring comfort to the poverty of others — arguing this is somehow unfair, despite the fact that it’s already what happens, albeit quite imperfectly, in our current system. CEI’s Murray disagrees, taking comfort in the fact that the basic income stipends would be meager enough to dispel the sense of blatant unfairness: “[The] entitlement would almost certainly not give people enough money to shirk work,” he wrote. “It would avoid people starving on the streets, but it wouldn’t enable them to do much more.”

### AT Free Riding

#### Free riding is insignificant – it is outweighed by the moral benefits compared to other welfare programs

**Danaher, 2013 – Lecturer at the National University of Ireland** [John, a regular blogger at Philosophical Disquisitions, Libertarianism and the Basic Income (Part Two), Philosophical Disquisitions, 12/17/13, http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2013/12/libertarianism-and-basic-income-part-two.html, 6/27/17] JY [Premier]

We’ll deal with the more manageable objection first. This has to do with exploitation and free-riding. A major concern within the classical liberal tradition to prevent people from unjustly gaining from or exploiting the hard work of others, and to incentivise economic production. Consider the entrepreneur who assumes the risk of starting a business, puts in all the hard work, becomes wildly successful, only to have all his/her profits taken away and distributed to others. This is a nightmare from a classical liberal perspective: it saps the motivation needed for beneficial free market exchanges, and it unjustly rewards others. Isn’t there are danger that the UBI does something similar? Since the grant is not conditional upon effort or inclination to work, it may encourage exploitation of this kind? Zwolinski has two responses. First, he points out that the UBI will only be supported by reference to what is needed in order to justify the political regime. This implies that some people will have a legitimate moral claim to the redistributed income. Second, although there may be some cost in terms of exploitation, this must be weighed against the other benefits of the system, which are: (i) its ability to address a serious moral wrong; and (ii) its ability to minimise state intervention when compared to other systems of redistribution.

#### Free riding on a basic income does not exploit those who have to pay for it – our society currently exploits those who Need the income by trapping them in poverty, working to benefit those who own the means of production

Danaher, 2014 - Lecturer at National University of Ireland [John, “Parasitic Surfers and the Unconditional Basic Income: A Debate”, July 12 2014, http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/parasitic-surfers-and-unconditional.html] [Premier]

In a just society, everyone would probably get an equal, per capita share of those external resources, which they could then trade with others according to their desires in life. So, for example, Crazy and Lazy would get an equal tradable right to land. Crazy would like more land in order to earn more money; and Lazy could do without his share since he has no desire to earn a higher income. Lazy could then sell his right to Crazy, earning a certain fee for his troubles. Of course, such a world is a fiction. In reality, for a variety of historical and unjust reasons, people do not have an equal tradable right to external resources. This is clearly true of rights to capital (like land and technology), and Parijs argues that it is also true of jobs. He has a technical explanation of why that I won’t get into (hint: it has to do with the existence of non-Walrasian labour markets). The result is that many people earn excessive rents (from capital or from work) from which others are excluded. Taxing and redistributing those rents in the form of a basic income is a way to correct for those injustices and to maximin real freedom. Two comments about this line of reasoning are in order. First, I would add that the kinds of inequalities that block equal access to external resources are likely to increase in the future. This is the central thesis in Piketty’s Capital, which uses extensive historical evidence to demonstrate that the rate of return from capital is such that the rich tend to get richer over the course of history. Furthermore, this trend is likely to be increased in the future by technological unemployment, as capital takes an ever greater share of income from labour. Second, in developing this line of reasoning Parijs pinpoints the kinds of societies in which a basic income is likely to be feasible. They will be, according to him, reasonably affluent societies in which there are people earning high rents. Thus, modern, wealthy, industrialised and technologised societies are the most plausible places in which to pursue the basic income agenda. The upshot of all this should be a reorientation of our perspective on the likes of Crazy and Lazy. Far from it being the case that Lazy free-rides on the hard work of Crazy, it is actually Crazy who is likely to be taking an unfair share of external resources from Lazy. As Parijs puts it: “..those who take an unfair share of society’s resources are not those who opt for such a low-production, low-consumption lifestyle. They are people like myself and most of my readers who, thanks to the attractive job they were given, appropriate a huge employment rent.” (van Parijs, 2013, p. 21) So in a world in which a UBI grants them the maximum feasible level of income, “idle” surfers of this world will simply be living off their share, or possibly less than their share, of rents that would otherwise be monopolised by wealthy capitalists and job-holders.

#### The free riding argument reinforces racist and sexist stereotypes – only a basic income that recognizes social position can solve

Pateman, 2004 – prof of Political Science at UCLA [Carole, Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income. Politics and Society on March 1, 2004. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0032329203261100>] [Premier]

Similarly, Van Parijs argues that while “a defensible long-term vision” of an unconditional basic income at the highest sustainable level is vital, nevertheless more limited and politically feasible proposals are also essential. He states that a household-based guaranteed minimum income “would definitely be a major change in the right direction”37—but the right direction according to which reasons? Household-based schemes disregard not only all the problems about the sexual division of labor, and the fact that women earn less than men, but also income distribution within households. Can it be confidently assumed that income would be distributed equally between husband and wife? A basic income is important for feminism and democratization precisely because it is paid not to households but individuals as citizens. A focus on individuals does not imply resort to the atomistic individualism of neo-classical economics. The problem of women’s self-government and full standing as citizens is visible only when individuals are conceptualized within the context of social relations and institutions. A household-based basic income allows the problem of marriage, employment, and citizenship to be avoided since wives (women) disappear into the category of “the family” or “household.” To treat a basic income as a payment to households rather than individuals ignores the question of who performs the work of caring for household members. That is, it is tacitly assumed that reciprocity exists and that free-riding is only a problem about men avoiding employment. This assumption is nicely illustrated by the picture of a male surfer on the cover of Real Freedom for All. In academic discussions the surfer is used to represent non-contributors. But in the popular political imagination and the media other symbols of free-riding are present, such as the African American “welfare queen” or, more recently, the “illegal immigrant” or the “asylum seeker.”38 The figure of the surfer not only obscures the problem for democratization of popular attitudes embodied in these other symbols but also obliterates the systematic avoidance of one form of contribution, the vital caring work, by men who are in employment. Nor do the numerous suggestions for conditions to be placed on payment of a basic income as a solution to free-riding—Atkinson’s “participation income” is a well-known example39—get to grips with free-riding by men in the household. While the notion of a “contribution” may be broadened to include, for example, the work of caring for others, as in Atkinson’s proposal, this is insufficient to focus attention on the structural problem of the connections between marriage, employment, and free-riding by husbands. While payment of a basic income to a husband for his “contribution” through employment and to his wife for her “contribution” in the home is to recognize that she does indeed make a socially valuable contribution, this does little to calm the fears of some feminists that a basic income will merely reinforce women’s lesser standing and the idleness of husbands in the household.

#### The free riding argument relies on patriarchal assumptions – it ignores that the institution of marriage disproportionately allows husbands to free ride on unpaid domestic work by women – only my framework solves

Pateman, 2004 – prof of Political Science at UCLA [Carole, Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income. Politics and Society on March 1, 2004. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0032329203261100>] [Premier]

FREE-RIDING AND THE HOUSEHOLD The debates about basic income also center on the figure of a man in—or avoiding—paid employment. This is very clear in one of the major criticisms of, and apprehensions about, the idea of a basic income; that is, that it would encourage free-riding and idleness. Free-riders breach the principle of reciprocity by obtaining the fruits of the efforts of others and contributing nothing themselves in return; a basic income, it is charged, would “inspire a segment of the able population . . . to abjure work for a life of idle fun.”26 But who is being seen as so prone to idleness and fun? The assumption guiding the discussion of basic income is that the problem is about men and employment.27 A much greater problem about male free-riding to which a basic income is directly relevant, but a problem about the household, not employment, is therefore ignored. Van Parijs appears to be an exception to the prevailing view of free-riding. Unlike most other participants in discussions of basic income he has noticed that free-riding exists “on a massive scale” in household interactions.28 But who are the free-riders in the household? Barry notes that full-time housewives can be seen as free-riders.29 But they can only be seen in that way if “work” is taken to mean paid employment.30 As feminist scholars have emphasized for a very long time, housewives are working (unpaid) by undertaking the necessary caring work. Given the major contribution they already make for no monetary return at 98 POLITICS & SOCIETY all, wives (women) are hardly likely to be the target of the objection that a basic income would lead to idleness and fun. The majority of wives are now in some form of paid employment, but their labor force participation is usually different from that of men. This reflects the legacy of a wage-system that enshrined the belief that husbands (men) not wives (women) are “breadwinners.”31 Many more women than men work part-time, and women earn less than men. The private and public sexual division of labor, that is to say, continues to be structured so that men monopolize full-time, higher paying, and more prestigious paid employment, and wives do a disproportionate share of unpaid work in the home. Given the structure of institutions and social beliefs, this appears as a “rational” arrangement. The mutual reinforcement of marriage and employment explains why husbands can take advantage of the unpaid work of wives and avoid doing their fair share of the caring work. That is why there is massive free-riding in the household—by husbands. Neither free-riding by husbands nor its scale is usually acknowledged in discussions of basic income and stakeholding. This is because marriage and the household rarely enter the argument. The narrow parameters of discussion and the influence of the assumptions of neo-classical economics preclude attention to institutional structures and their interrelationships. Van Parijs is an exception in recognizing that a problem of free-riding exists in households, but his neoclassical theoretical apparatus leaves him unable to acknowledge that the problem is one of men (husbands) and the work of caring for household members. His argument is that free-riding arises merely because of differences in individual tastes or preferences. Free-riding, Van Parijs states, occurs when benefits enjoyed by both partners in a household are produced by only one of them, the partner who happens to care most about the particular benefit. His example is that the partner who most strongly prefers tidiness will make sure that the home is tidy.

### AT Misuse

**Poor people don’t just use their money on alcohol and tobacco- studies prove**

**Murphy 16- a New Hampshire-based reporter for Humanosphere** [Thomas, Poor people don’t spend cash transfers on booze and cigarettes, studies show, November 30, 2016, <http://www.humanosphere.org/social-business/2016/11/poor-people-dont-spend-cash-transfers-on-booze-and-cigarettes-studies-show/>, June 28, 2017] CL [Premier]

The longstanding criticism for giving poor people money is that they will waste it on alcohol and tobacco. A [new review](http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1086/689575) of 30 studies from Latin America, Africa and Asia disproves that notion. In fact, people spend less on “temptation goods” after receiving a cash transfer. “There is a sideshow on this belief that people are poor because they are spending their money on alcohol and cigarettes,” David Evans, a senior economist at the World Bank and co-author of the study, told Humanosphere. “This study tries to close the door on the sideshow. ” Evans and his co-author Anna Popova looked at studies that either surveyed cash transfer recipients about spending habits or directly tracked spending. In all cases, from India to Kenya to Peru, the average recipient spent as much or slightly less on alcohol and tobacco after getting the money. The major exception is Nicaragua where two studies observed significant decreases in spending on those goods. “This absolutely puts the questions to bed. We find that almost without exception that there is no significant impact and even in some cases a significant negative impact of cash transfers on alcohol and tobacco. And that is striking,” said Evans. The spending impact is significant regardless of the type of program. In some studies, money was given with conditions. Recipients had to spend the money in a certain way or do specific things in order to get it. Others had no conditions, the money could be spent as people felt necessary. In both cases, people spent less on tobacco or alcohol. The same went for programs that gave a lot or a little bit of money and studies that tracked over the short term and long term. Some studies tracked other types of personal spending. Researchers in the Congo looked at how much people spend on doughnuts and in Peru spending on chocolate was tracked. By comparing results across various dimensions, Evans feels confident in his conclusions. “We do have estimates from Peru that beneficiaries are more likely to purchase a roasted chicken at a restaurant or some chocolates soon after receiving their transfer, but hopefully even the most puritanical policymaker would not begrudge the poor a piece of chocolate,” Evans and Popova wrote. Another [recent study](http://www.humanosphere.org/social-business/2016/08/more-evidence-that-giving-people-money-does-not-discourage-work/) on cash transfers found that they do not decrease the incentive to work. The two new studies effectively disprove the two leading criticisms for giving the poor money: they will stop working and they will spend it on beer and cigarettes.

**Even if people misuse their Basic Income, they will have another chance because a UBI comes each month**

**Bidadanure 2017 - Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Stanford** [Juliana, Interviewed by Vivan Malkani, Stanford Politics Understanding Universal Basic Income, March 17 2017, https://stanfordpolitics.com/understanding-universal-basic-income-178032e6090f , June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

VM: In your basic income podcast, you mentioned that a problem with basic capital is that people can “blow it away” and be irresponsible with that capital. Doesn’t the same risk exist for periodic payments? JB: That is a valid concern but the difference is that even if you use your income ‘irresponsibly’, you get a new income stipend the following month! With basic income, you may fall below a certain threshold for a period of time because you made some questionable choices, but that period of time is quite short since you are raised above the threshold every month. The problem with basic capital is that you only get it once. You can be prudent with it and use it to go to college, but you still may not get a job afterwards; or you can make decisions that seem prudent at the time, like buying a house, and then lose a lot of capital through brute luck. I don’t think that a system that allows for large inequalities to be derived from brute luck is a just system.

### AT No Empirical Examples

#### Canada proves

Zon, 2016 – Director of Policy and Research at Maytree Foundation [Noah, “Policy brief: Would a universal basic income reduce poverty?”, *Maytree Foundation*, August 16, 2016, https://medium.com/@maytree\_canada/policy-brief-would-a-universal-basic-income-reduce-poverty-cd85fd64dbac. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

How do basic income proposals differ from what we have today? Many proposals around basic income treat it as something unfamiliar. For example, Vox’s Ezra Klein called it “the kind of radical policy that asks whether we actually need to live in this world, or whether there are better worlds on offer.” This isn’t true. We have a long experience with guaranteed incomes or very similar policies all over the world, and in particular here in Canada. In Canada today we have two sets of programs that look quite a bit like guaranteed incomes for those who we expect to be outside the workforce — seniors and children. The Old Age Security (OAS) program for seniors has been around in basically the same form for nearly a century, providing a guaranteed income to seniors regardless of their work history. The OAS currently provides $6,880 per year for those receiving the maximum amount. If you don’t have much income from other sources like pensions (Canada Pension Plan [CPP] or private), work or investments, then you can get more from the federal government (the Guaranteed Income Supplement [GIS], currently worth up to $10,277 per year) and from provinces. In Ontario, this combines for a guaranteed annual income of about $18,200 for single seniors and about $14,100 per person for couples. These programs have both residency requirements and clawbacks on support as other income increases, but this looks pretty close to the archetype of a basic income guarantee, combining the universal grant with an income top-up system for those with very low incomes. Canada also provides guaranteed incomes in the form of child benefits. Like Old Age Security, these benefits go back nearly a century to mother’s allowances. For the last decade, our basic income guarantee for children included a combination of a universal grant with a top-up for those with low incomes. The Universal Child Care Benefit provided $1,200 per year for each child in Canada under age six, and the National Child Benefit Supplement (along with provincial child benefits) provided targeted top-ups for low-income families. The largest program was the income-tested basic Child Tax Benefit, which served 9 in 10 families. As of July 2016, we have shifted to a different design of a basic income guarantee with the new Canada Child Benefit, which rolls different benefits and credits together into a single, larger basic income guarantee that delivers its largest benefit to lower-income families and phases out gradually as income increases.

**A UBI empirically works and would show similar effects in the U.S.**

**Standing 17- Professor of Development at University of London** [Bob, 1/6/17, “Universal Basic Income Is Our Best Weapon Against The Rising Far Right”, The World Post, Accessed on 6/27/17, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/universal-basic-income\_us\_586d0ce3e4b0eb58648b5349] JC [Premier]

The evidence shows that a basic income transforms lives. The pilots in India showed several positive results. First, welfare improved, with better sanitation, child nutrition, health and schooling. Meanwhile the consumption of private vices (in this case, usually tobacco and alcohol) declined. Second, the equity effects were positive. Those with disabilities, the elderly, women and those from lower castes, all benefited more than their counterparts. Third, the economic effects were positive: people did more work, productivity increased and income inequality declined. Of course, India is not the U.S. or the U.K. But the human condition is similar across the world. People in general want to improve their lives and the lives of their children and other loved ones. The claim that if people had a basic income they would become lazy is prejudiced and has been refuted many times in many places. The basic income pilot programs in India had strong emancipatory effects, particularly for women, who gained a greater say and control over their lives. The incidence of bonded labor also declined. Basic income enhances freedom from figures and mechanisms of unaccountable domination, particularly for women. It aids the precariat in their unedifying and undignified struggle with bureaucrats, in whose shadow they tremble. Targeted, conditional benefits erode freedom. The claim that if people had a basic income they would become lazy is prejudiced and has been refuted many times.

### AT No Children

**Children should also receive a UBI if it is accepted as a right.**

**Bidadanure 2017 - Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Stanford** [Juliana, Interviewed by Vivan Malkani, Stanford Politics Understanding Universal Basic Income, March 17 2017, https://stanfordpolitics.com/understanding-universal-basic-income-178032e6090f , June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

I believe in a mix of basic income and basic capital. Basic income should be the baseline. If it is a policy that is to be attached to a right of existence, then there is no reason why children should not get it. I think that we should have a system where half of the child’s basic income should go to the parents as child benefits and the other half should be saved, as a baby bond or trust fund that can be retrieved at age 18 or 21 in the form of basic capital. For me, that’s the best way to keep basic income as the baseline that people can rely on throughout their existence, but also address the wealth issue that is enormous especially in the US. In France, for example, I don’t think that it is that important to have basic capital in addition to basic income; because higher education is free. The necessity for a huge starting capital is far less important than here where having access to $100,000 can enable you to get a degree.

### AT Replaces Other Welfare Programs

**A UBI does not have to cancel other welfare programs - There are multiple alternative funding mechanisms that are better**

**Collins, 2017 – senior scholar at the Institute for Policy Studies** [Chuck Collins, The Case for a Universal Basic Income Blogging Our Great Divide, written April 21, 2017, <https://inequality.org/great- divide/argument-universal- basic-income/>, accessed June 26, 2017] [Premier]

Stern estimates his $1,000 a month UBI plan for every adult would cost between $1.75 trillion and $2.5 trillion per year. A Cato Institute report pegs UBI costs at somewhere between $2 trillion and $3 trillion. The first $1 trillion of that, more conservative UBI advocates argue, should come through eliminating 126 state and federal social assistance programs that currently total about that much. Most of these programs serve low-income people. By contrast, eliminating tax expenditures – think mortgage deductions and other government programs that benefit mostly higher-income people – would bring in about $1.2 trillion. Instituting a European style value-added tax could raise between $650 billion and $1.3 trillion. Another innovative financing approach would be to tie UBI funding to “commons-based revenue” in the same style as the Alaska Permanent Fund, a program that has worked to widely share the benefits from the state’s oil income. This approach could both supplement declining wage income and address natural resource depletion.

#### A UBI would solve best if it were phased in – this would prevent cuts to other programs and dramatic jumps in government spending

**Latour, 2017 – Basic Income Earth News contributor** [Hilde, “Karl Widerquist: Universal Basic Income Is a Good Deal for People Who Like Capitalism”, *BIEN*, June 20, 2017, http://basicincome.org/news/2017/06/karl-widerquist-universal-basic-income-good-deal-people-like-capitalism/. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

There are many variations on what people think UBI should look like around the world. Most people agree that it has to be at least enough to meet your basic needs (food, shelter, clothing and enough to live on is the minimum). The maximum is the highest sustainable income possible. Widerquist’s personal view is that “you should be compensated at the highest sustainable level, as it is a compensation for non-equal duties that the government is opposing on us.”∂ Starting at $12,000 in the US a year would be okay, in hopes of building up to $20,000 or more if it proves to be workable. But starting off at a higher level than $20,000 without building up to it gradually would be risky.∂ According to Widerquist. “The government is already spending over 2 trillion dollars a year to maintain people’s income and we still have 13.5% of the population living in poverty. So the current system is not working and extremely expensive”.∂ Widerquist does not believe that UBI requires cuts in other programs, but he gives some examples of government spending that can be replaced by it, including foodstamps and most unemployment benefits.

### AT Work Ethic

#### Automation will make a right to not work more feasible

**Danaher, 2014 – Lecturer at the National University of Ireland, Galway** [John, “Should we have a right not to work?”, Philosophical Disquisitions, July 17, 2014, http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/should-we-have-right-not-to-work.html, June 27 NJT] [Premier]

But maybe they should? Maybe the right not to work is something that a just and humane society should recognise?∂ That, at any rate, is the argument developed by Andrew Levine in his article “Fairness to Idleness: Is there a right not to work?”. In this post, I want to take a look at that argument. In broad outline, Levine defends the claim that a right not to work is entailed by the fundamental principles of liberal egalitarianism (of a roughly Rawlsian type). He does so, not because he himself endorses liberal egalitarianism, but because he wishes to highlight the more radical implications of that view.∂ I think Levine’s argument is intriguing. I also think that if we are entering an age of increasing automation and technological unemployment — i.e. a world in which economically productive activity will be taken over by machines — its alleged impracticalities will become less and less of an issue. Consequently, it is something we should start to take more seriously. I’ll break my discussion down into two main sections. First, I’ll sketch Levine’s argument for the right not to work. Second, I’ll consider his response to the major criticisms of that argument.

#### A UBI does not remove the incentive to work – people would still want to work, and would be free to pursue even more socially beneficial jobs.

Danaher, 2014 - Lecturer at National University of Ireland [John, “Parasitic Surfers and the Unconditional Basic Income: A Debate”, July 12 2014, http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/parasitic-surfers-and-unconditional.html] [Premier]

Finally, Anderson argues that a UBI promotes freedom without responsibility. In her view, social welfare programmes are best understood as part of social contract in which benefits (freedoms) and burdens (responsibilities) are shared among the population. The guiding assumption in most social insurance programmes is that you get money out of them when you fall on hard times, provided you are willing to pay into them at other times. Thus, for Anderson, working for a living, and paying into social insurance programmes is both a virtue and a duty. We should be willing to pay our fair share whenever we are able to do so. Her fear is that a UBI, particularly given its unconditional nature, would undermine this sense of social duty. Again, I think this is a legitimate concern, but possibly overstated. It’s not clear to me that a UBI would actually discourage people from working and fulfilling social duties. Such evidence as exists suggests that it doesn’t sap people of the motivation to work or do good. Furthermore, there is room for optimism: by freeing people from involuntary work, a UBI could actually help them to engage in more socially-oriented activities. This could actually reinforce a sense of social duty. Either way, it is an empirical question that has yet to be fully determined. We should, I think, be willing to experiment with social policies of this sort in order to learn more.

#### A UBI would not discourage work – that’s empirically disproven by existing welfare programs and we would be able to eliminate the minimum wage, increasing jobs.

Aziz, 2013- Economics and Business Correspondent at the Week [John, “There is a better alternative to raising the minimum wage” Dec 6, 2013 [Economics and Business Correspondent at The Week, Associate Editor at Pieria. Previous: Business Insider, Zero Hedge] [Premier]

I propose abolishing the minimum wage, and replaceing it with a basic income policy a version of which was first advocated in America by Thomas Paine. Individuals would be able to work for whatever wage they can secure, meaning that [the] low-skilled individuals — especially the young, who currently face a particularly high rate of employment — would have an easier time finding work. And the level of basic income could be tied to the level of productivity, to reduce inequality. ¶ There are two kinds of basic income policy. The first is a negative income tax — if an individual’s income level falls beneath a certain threshold (say, $1,500 a month) the government makes up the difference. Funds for this could be accessed by consolidating existing welfare programs like state-run pension schemes and unemployment benefits, and by closing tax loopholes and raising taxes on corporate profits and high-income earners. Germany has enacted a similar policy — called the "Kurzabeit" — and it's been credited with shielding the German labor force from the worst of the recession and keeping their unemployment rate low since. ¶ The second is a universal income policy, where everyone receives a payment irrespective of their income. This would obviously require more funds — meaning higher taxes — but in a future where corporations are making larger and larger profits while requiring fewer and fewer workers due to automation, such policies may become increasingly feasible. There are already very serious proposals to initiate such a scheme in Switzerland.¶ The most widespread criticism of basic income policies tends to be that they might encourage laziness. If you don’t have to work for a living, why would you work at all? But I don’t think this stands up to the evidence — America already has a welfare state — and there are still more people looking for jobs than there are jobs available. A basic income is basic. It does not make you rich or successful — it simply ensures a minimum standard[.], with a minimum of bureaucracy and without setting any price controls. People would still have many personal and financial incentives to work[.] and to become entrepreneurs. If anything, the fact that there is no longer a minimum wage would probably create more employment, not less.

**A UBI would not discourage work – there is no empirical proof, and unemployment isn’t always a problem**

**Zwolinski 2014 – Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego** [Matt, The Pragmatic Libertarian Case for a Basic Income Guarantee. the Cato Institute on August 4, 2014. https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/04/matt-zwolinski/pragmatic-libertarian-case-basic-income-guarantee] JN [Premier]

Many people argue that a BIG will create a strong disincentive to work. From a theoretical perspective, this makes sense. If you lower the cost of unemployment relative to employment, you’re going to get more unemployment. The famous Negative Income Tax experiments of the 1970s seem to lend some empirical support to this hypothesis. I find this argument [is] unimpressive for two reasons. First, it is not at all clear that a BIG really would lead to a significant increase in unemployment. The actual findings of the NIT experiments were much more ambiguous than they have generally been represented to be in the nonacademic press. And insofar as a BIG allows welfare recipients who start working to keep more of their money than they would under a conditional welfare system, we should expect at least some reduction of work disincentives relative to the current system. But suppose that a BIG actually would, on net, increase unemployment somewhat. The second response is: so what? Is it so obviously a flaw in the system if it leads more parents to take time off work to stay home with their children? Or college graduates to take a year off before beginning to work? Or if, among the population as a whole, the balance between work and leisure is slightly shifted toward the latter? My point is not that there isn’t any story that could be told about why work disincentives might be a problem. My point is simply that, even if they [unemployment] were guaranteed to occur, they wouldn’t obviously be a problem. Explaining why these somewhat increased disincentives are a problem requires something more substantial in the way of economic, sociological, and philosophical analysis than often seems to have been assumed.

#### Attitudes won’t block a UBI - Automation will change public perceptions about a Basic Income

**Streithorst, 2015 – Evonomics Journalist** [Tom, “How Basic Income Solves Capitalism’s Fundamental Problem”, *Evonomics*, December 20, 2015, http://evonomics.com/how-universal-basic-income-solves/. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

The first problem with the Basic Income Guarantee is that it sounds too good to be true. We have been told to be suspicious of anyone promising a free lunch, and giving people money for doing nothing certainly seems like a costless gift. Fear of scarcity is built into our DNA. For the Basic Income Guarantee to seem viable for most people, they need to learn that demand, not supply, is the bottleneck of growth. We need to recognise that money is something humans create, not something with fixed and limited supply. With Quantitative Easing, central banks created money and gave it to the financial sector, hoping it would stimulate lending. Today, even mainstream figures like Lord Adair Turner, Martin Wolf and even Ben Bernanke recognize that “helicopter drops” of money into individuals’ bank accounts could have been more effective. Technocrats are beginning to recognise the practicality of Basic Income. We in the economic blogosphere need to bring this message into the public eye. The rise of the robots, ever declining prices for goods and services, and disappearing jobs may ultimately teach this lesson more effectively than any number of well-meaning essays. The second problem is sociological. Most of us are still in employment. We feel, in some fundamental way, that our work makes us more worthy than lazy layabouts on benefits. This simultaneously makes us disinclined to raise benefits for others (or increase the number of people on benefit) and equally disinclined to think of ourselves as the kind of people that receive money from the state. Adam Smith, in The Theory of Moral Sentiments (the book he considered his masterpiece), said that we humans are motivated primarily by the regard of others. We want people to think well of us, and we want to think well of ourselves. The psychological pleasure of considering ourselves better than welfare recipients can trump genuine economic benefit. To overcome this objection, we need to recognise that defining ourselves by our jobs is very 20th century. If technological progress continues to kill traditional jobs, this objection too will eventually dissipate. As full-time jobs become harder to find, more of us will recognise the need for a Basic Income Guarantee.

# Affirmative – Off Case Blocks

## AT Morals/Framework

### AT Libertarianism / Property Rights / Authors

*[Ed Note: All the stuff in the aff libertarianism header is also applicable here]*

#### Libertarianism does not necessarily reject a UBI – there are different schools of Libertarianism, revise the theory to care about equality and consequences

Danaher, 2013 - a lecturer at the National University of Ireland [John Philosophical Disquisitions, December 17, Libertarianism and the Basic Income (Part One) <http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2013/12/libertarianism-and-basic-income-part-one.html>, Accessed June 27, 2017] LA [Premier]

2. What is libertarianism and how can it be justified? This is a tricky question. As with any long-standing political philosophy, “libertarianism” has come to denote a broad, often fractious, group of political theories. To make things more manageable, we’re going to have to indulge some stipulation and strategic indifference in this series (for example, the libertarian-socialist school of thought will not be addressed at all). This can be done by following Zwolinski’s lead. Zwolinski argues that libertarianism is a family of theories, generally committed to four things: (i) the primary importance of negative liberty rights (i.e. right to be left alone); (ii) the existence of strong property rights; (iii) the efficacy of free markets; and (iv) the dangers of a paternalistic state. There are two major branches of contemporary libertarian theory: Right Libertarianism: Acknowledges the importance of negative liberty rights and property rights, promotes free market exchanges, tries to minimise the role of the state, and has no deep concerns about equality/egalitarianism. (Note: Zwolinski prefers the term “market libertarianism” as he thinks libertarianism has little to do with traditional right wing political theories.) Left Libertarianism: Acknowledges the importance of all the same things as right libertarianism but adds in a concern for equality/egalitarianism. Extreme versions of right libertarianism, such as those defended by Michael Huemer (LINK), would completely reject the existence of the state and all its associated forms of coercion (taxation, imprisonment etc.). Since the UBI would seem to require coercive policies of some sort, it would be ruled out by all such theories (unless, per impossibile, everyone voluntarily consented to a UBI). Hence, in the remainder of this series the focus will be on the more moderate forms of libertarianism, i.e. the ones that accept some type of coercive state. Libertarianism can be defended in a number of ways. These include: The Deontological Defence: This is probably the most common philosophical defence of libertarianism. It presumes the existence of strong negative liberty and property rights, and argues that any coercive policy must be justified in relation to these rights. This results in a limited role for the state, perhaps only in ensuring these rights are protected. The theoretical grounding for the rights themselves can vary, from natural law to contractarianism. The Consequentialist Defence: This is the most popular defence of libertarianism among economists. It argues that a libertarian political framework, including property rights and a robust free market, is justified on the grounds that it achieves the best consequences for all. This is usually cashed out in terms of overall levels of well-being or economic efficiency. The Common Sense Defence: I hesitate to include this here since its pedigree is less well-established than the other two defences. This is, however, the defence adopted by Michael Huemer in his recent book The Problem of Political Authority. It does not presuppose any overarching normative theory. Instead, it adopts a range of common sense moral principles (often a blend of consequentialism and deontologism) and argues that these principles lead us to libertarianism. The consequentialist defence of libertarianism is probably most comfortable with the UBI proposal. This is not surprising given that consequentialist theories prioritise ends over means. Nevertheless, the deontological defence may also have a place for the UBI proposal. We’re going to exploring this possibility in later entries.

#### An ideal libertarian alternative is impossible the goal is not to create policy that is perfectly libertarian, but to create a policy that is the nearest to a libertarian view

**Zwolinski 2014 – Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego** [Matt, The Pragmatic Libertarian Case for a Basic Income Guarantee. the Cato Institute on August 4, 2014. https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/04/matt-zwolinski/pragmatic-libertarian-case-basic-income-guarantee] JN [Premier]

Utopia is Not an Option In Libertarian Utopia, we might not have any welfare state all, no matter how limited or efficient. Many libertarians believe that any redistribution of wealth by the state violates individual rights and is therefore morally impermissible. And even those libertarians who do not base their political ideology on a theory of individual rights will worry that welfare states will produce perverse incentives – both on the part of recipients and potential recipients, and in the political processes that sustain and shape government policy. But we do not live in Libertarian Utopia, nor have any of its prophets yet produced any compelling plan for how to get There from Here. Moreover, most people are not libertarians, and so unless we are willing to impose our views on them by force, we must try to find policy proposals that can command the assent of those who do not share our fundamental moral commitments and empirical beliefs. From this perspective, the question of social welfare policy becomes less an exercise in ideal theory and more a problem of comparative institutional analysis. The question is not whether a BIG is a perfectly libertarian policy in every way, but whether it is more libertarian than the other realistically available policy alternatives. I believe that the considerations examined above provide us with very strong reason for believing that it is. But I also believe that a BIG need not be merely a compromise. Even in a Libertarian Utopia, in other words, I think there would be good reasons to provide a social safety net through the mechanism of a BIG. I have written about some of these arguments before, and while constraints of space prevent me from elaborating upon them here, I am happy to do so in the discussion that follows this essay.

#### Strict libertarianism is not the only form of libertarianism – most important libertarian authors support a social safety net.

**Zwolinski 2014 – Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego** [Matt, The Pragmatic Libertarian Case for a Basic Income Guarantee. the Cato Institute on August 4, 2014. https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/04/matt-zwolinski/pragmatic-libertarian-case-basic-income-guarantee] JN [Premier]

For now I will say only that if the idea of a social safety net strikes many readers as obviously incompatible with libertarianism, this is testament to the way in which an excessively narrow understanding of libertarianism has come to dominate our political discourse. For many people, it seems, libertarian thought begins and ends with the ideas of Ayn Rand and Murray Rothbard. And, of course, both Rand and Rothbard were indeed important libertarians, and libertarians from whose ideas I and many others have profited immensely. But while those ideas have played and continue to play an important role in the libertarian intellectual tradition, they do not exhaust that tradition. Once we adjust our eyes to see past the giants of Rand and Rothbard, it is clear that the libertarian intellectual landscape is far more diverse than it first appeared, and far less hostile to the idea of a social safety net. We can, of course, define libertarianism however we wish, and it is possible to conceive it in a narrow enough way so as to rule out all support for income redistribution by definitional fiat. But any definition of libertarianism that is so narrow as to rule out the likes of John Locke, Thomas Paine, Adam Smith, Milton Friedman, Friedrich Hayek, Robert Nozick, Loren Lomasky, and Eric Mack, to name just a few, seems both historically distortive and pragmatically unhelpful. The arguments these thinkers have advanced on behalf of a (limited) social safety net might be mistaken. But that is something to be established by a careful examination of the substance of the arguments themselves. Arguments about what counts as a “real” libertarian position, especially arguments poorly informed by the writings of seminal historical and contemporary libertarian thinkers, do little to advance the debate.

#### The libertarian conception of property rights is flawed because it ignores the role of social institutions in creating wealth and estates

**Dymski and Kerstenetzky, 2008 – Prof of social sciences at the Univ of Greenwich and prof of economics at UFF** [Gary and Celia, , “Global Basic Income and Financial Globalization”, *BIEN*, June 15, 2008, http://basicincome.org/research/. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

There are many different ways of implementing real-freedom-for-all redistribution. While the circumstances of the least advantaged are not fully captured by their market incomes, one influential proposal for operationalizing real-freedom-for-all involves supplementing the market distribution of income by distributing a sizable universal and unconditional basic income (UBI) – mainly, not exclusively, in cash. At first shot, this policy proposal may appear to be hardly reconcilable with the multidimensional character of the many opportunities needed for people to lead the kinds of lives they like. But this unfortunate opposition would occur only on an unlikely extreme version of it. The focus on income is not exclusive: it is not meant to replace the important prior focus on the many basic freedoms and it is not necessarily in confrontation with other non-income opportunities. Part of the objection is ill-founded in the conflation of income with private consumption, which is certainly inaccurate: income may be used to pay taxes to fund public policies that provide services and other guarantees of real freedom, with the attractive feature in terms of a freedom approach that the social choice is left to the discretion of the individuals. ∂ UBI is based on a rethinking of property rights. First, Van Parijs extensively criticizes the perspective of taking property rights as natural rights pointing to the fact that extant entitlement rights actually derive from an institutional framework that legitimizes previous distributions of endowments, and regulates acquisition and transfer based on what people “own.” But neither natural resources nor accumulated social capital (including physical and financial capital, and knowledge) have natural private owners: property rights over these things have been extended to private owners due to institutional arrangements.

#### A UBI is libertarian because it eliminates most of the welfare bureaucracy.

**Zwolinski 2014 – Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego** [Matt, The Pragmatic Libertarian Case for a Basic Income Guarantee. the Cato Institute on August 4, 2014. https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/04/matt-zwolinski/pragmatic-libertarian-case-basic-income-guarantee] JN [Premier]

Less Bureaucracy Every one of the more than 126 federal welfare programs comes with its own bureaucracy, its own set of arcane rules, regulations, and restrictions, and its own significant (and rising) overhead costs. A BIG, in contrast, requires significantly less in terms of administrative expense. A program in which everyone gets a check for the same amount is simple enough to be administered by a computer program. And even a more complicated proposal, like Murray’s or like Friedman’s NIT, could largely piggyback off of the already existing bureaucracy of the federal tax system. Eliminating a large chunk of the federal bureaucracy would obviously be good from the perspective of a libertarian concern to reduce the size and scope of government. But it would also be good from the perspective of welfare beneficiaries. Actually getting signed up for all the various welfare benefits to which one is entitled is tremendously costly in terms of time, effort, and skill at bureaucratic navigation. Many people miss out on benefits for which they qualify simply because they don’t know that the program exists, or what they need to do to draw from it. Getting the benefit of a BIG, in contrast, requires just a single signature on the back of a check. If we’re going to spend money on helping the poor, shouldn’t we make sure that they actually get the help we’re paying for? Cheaper Second, a BIG could be considerably cheaper than the current welfare state. How much cheaper depends on the details of the particular proposal. Some, like Murray’s, which involve a progressive tax on the BIG once a certain threshold of income is reached, appear to be considerably cheaper. Other analyses, like Ed Dolan’s, suggest only that a moderate BIG would not cost more than what we currently spend. Part of the explanation of the relatively low cost of a BIG comes from the reduction of bureaucracy, described above. But another reason is to be found in Director’s Law: If you’re like most people, when you hear “welfare” you think about transfers from the rich to the poor. But in reality, most political transfers benefit the middle class at the expense of the poor (and rich). If the BIG is going to replace the welfare state, then transfers to the middle class such as subsidies for higher education, the mortgage interest deduction, and tax benefits for retirement savings ought to be cut right along with (if not before) SNAP, TANF, etc. Again, how much a BIG would cost relative to the current welfare state depends on the details of the particular BIG proposal. Various proposals need to be evaluated on their own merits, and of course I do not wish to claim that every BIG proposal will be more affordable than our current welfare state. But neither is there any reason to believe that no reasonable proposal could be.

#### Property rights constitute theft – natural resources are not the products of labor. Taxes for a basic income are justified to compensate for this theft.

Carter, 2014 – Bay Area Legal Aid [Timothy, The One Minute Case for a Basic Income, Montreal, 2014, <http://basicincome.org/bien/pdf/montreal2014/BIEN2014_Carter.pdf>, 6/28/17] JY [Premier]

The one minute Georgist case for a basic income: Property is a product of creation, not of mere use. “I made this.” confers property rights, “Tag! It's mine!” does not. Things that exist as a product of your labor must be yours, and for anyone else to appropriate them is to make you their slave. Land and natural resources, however, are not the products of people, but of nature or God. They are gifts to all of humanity. Individual property in land and natural resources may be practical or useful, but it is still theft. Utility might justify this theft, but compensation is still required. As the appropriation was done without consent, the compensation must be in the form that offers the greatest choice of use to the victims. That form is cash. The most efficient arrangement for payment is for the takers to pay the full rental or use value to a single entity which can then divide the proceeds equally among the population. Taxes are the tribute I pay to you for displacing you from land, the basic income is your dividend.

#### Current distributions of property were acquired unjustly, UBI solves -creates the least unjust property distribution

Carter, 2014 – Bay Area Legal Aid [Timothy, The One Minute Case for a Basic Income, Montreal, 2014, <http://basicincome.org/bien/pdf/montreal2014/BIEN2014_Carter.pdf>, 6/28/17] JY [Premier]

The one minute (right) libertarian case for a basic income: While it may have been theoretically possible to acquire property in a just manner soon after humans evolved, none was. Every square inch of inhabited land on earth can trace its title back to someone who acquired the land by force. All land titles on Earth are soaked in blood. And not just land titles. Thanks to past government spending, targeted tax breaks, intellectual property, corporate charters, slavery, and meddling regulations, no property or wealth can be said to have been justly acquired. If we assume that those who have the least are greatest net victims, a basic income would provide the best possible rectification with the least government control, producing the least unjust system of property distribution possible in the real world.

## AT Disadvantages

### AT Employment DA

*[Ed Note: Many cards under the aff consequentialism – economy header and under the case blocks header are relevant here too.]*

**Turn - UBI actually creates MORE incentives to work and pursue employment opportunities, five studies prove**

**Shulevitz 16- editor for the New York Times** [Judith, Jan 8th 2016, “It’s Payback Time for Women”, New York Times, Accessed on 6/27/17, https://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/10/opinion/sunday/payback-time-for-women.html] JC [Premier]

This is all very nice, skeptics say, but the U.B.I. still represents a moral hazard. Give people money for nothing, and the lazy will grow lazier and the rest of us will be bankrupted. But that does not appear to be the case. On the contrary: The U.B.I. gives workers less reason to loll about at home than do perversely disincentivizing policies like the one whereby a dollar earned is a dollar cut from a welfare check. Research suggests that, rather than weaken the will to work, unconditional regular disbursements let people manage their careers more wisely. In five famous studies on the negative income tax conducted in the United States and Canada in the 1970s, a minimum income did bring down work hours a bit, partly because the unemployed took longer to find new jobs. Researchers speculate that they were holding out for positions that better matched their skills. In the United States, male breadwinners scaled back by as much as 9 percent a year. In Canada, they hardly cut back at all. In both countries, teenagers stayed in school longer. And women with children did spend up to 30 percent less time on the job. The U.B.I. has feminist critics as well as supporters, and they don’t like that finding. The U.B.I. would encourage women to drop out of the work force, they say, ceding the ground feminism has fought so hard for. But that concern strikes me as, well, paternalistic. Women should have more choices, not fewer. So should men. Equality between the sexes should not require everyone to conform to traditionally male patterns of employment.

**No impact to a disincentive to work – current labor surpluses will overwhelm it.**

**Pressman, 2005 – Prof of economics at Monmouth Univ** [Steven, with Michael Lewis and Karl Widerquist The Basic Income Guarantee and Social Economics. This article appeared in Review of Social Economy on December 2005. http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/29770341.pdf?refreqid=search%3A9330359b12bad0e394957e75c30d95e6] JN [Premier]

Equally suspect is the conservative case against a Basic Income policy. As stated above, conservatives fear that a Basic Income would hurt the incentive to work.9 This, for neoclassical economists, is the empirical question of labor supply elastici- ties. Stafford [1986], in summarizing the results of 759 articles on labor supply, concluded that "labour economists have a consensus view that adult males have a labour supply which is relatively unresponsive to changes in income or wages while adult women have a labour supply which is quite responsive to changes in income or wage rates" [quoted in Leoni 1994, 19-20]. If we accept neoclassical measures of labor supply elasticities, we see that the very small reduction in male labor force participation,10 coupled with the moderate reduction in female labor participation, is much lower than existing labor market surpluses, thus causing no reduction in the number of workers (merely a redistribution of the labor force). But there is little evidence to suggest any output effects would result from any possible reduction in the labor force due to a Basic Income.11

#### A UBI would not destroy employment – the work ethic is too strong in our culture, and automation will solve the impact – there will be less need for employment

**Danaher, 2014 – Lecturer at the National University of Ireland, Galway** [John, “Should we have a right not to work?”, Philosophical Disquisitions, July 17, 2014, http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/should-we-have-right-not-to-work.html, June 27 NJT] [Premier]

Embedded in this rhetorical question are two related objections to the right to not to work. The first, and more straightforward, is the objection that the state couldn’t really sustain this sort of lifestyle choice. If everybody pursued the life of leisure, there would be nobody left to fund it. The second, and more ethically complex objection, is that even if some people did get to pursue this lifestyle, they could only do so by unjustly or unfairly exploiting others.∂ As I say, the first objection is the more straightforward one. We can respond to it in a couple of ways. One is by acknowledging that if everyone chose that lifestyle it would, indeed, be unsustainable, but then suggesting that this is unlikely. This is Levine’s response. He thinks the work ethic is so dominant in our societies that it is highly unlikely that a sufficient number of people will drop out of work. Another response, which I hinted at in the introduction, is to suggest that automation and technological unemployment will either (a) allow for many more people to drop out of work or (b) force many people out of work. Consequently, a life of leisure will become feasible (if not compulsory) for more and more people. Of course, technological unemployment on a large scale could create huge inequalities of wealth, and these would need to be addressed, but that wouldn’t defeat the point I making: that technological unemployment will bring us closer to a world in which a life of leisure is increasingly the norm.’

**A UBI increases overall employment by increasing the situations where it is economically reasonable to work - this makes low-productivity jobs viable, doesn’t withdraw funds with employment, and encourages self-employment; at the very least, it’s better than the jobless recovery in the status quo**

**McKay, 01 – Professor of Economics at Glasgow Caledonian University** [Alisa, a Scottish economist, government policy adviser, a leading feminist economist and Professor of Economics at Glasgow Caledonian University, RETHINKING WORK AND INCOME MAINTENANCE POLICY: PROMOTING GENDER EQUALITY T HROUGH A CITIZENS ’ BASIC INCOME, Feminist Economics, 3/1/01, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-923X.2004.00611.x/abstract, 6/27/] JY [Premier]

Arguments against a CBI primarily focus on the claimed prohibitive costs and the adverse effects such a scheme may have on work incentives. The tax rates required to finance the granting of an “adequate” level of income to all citizens are assumed to be both politically unacceptable (Peter Alcock 1989: 123) and damaging to economic effort (Parker 1989: 135). In fact, Parker, a supporter of unconditional income guarantees, argues that the tax rates required to finance a full basic income would “institutionalize” the unemployment and poverty traps rather than remove them (1991: 13). Given that a CBI has not yet been tested, these claims are based on theoretical assumptions that lack supporting empirical evidence. However, it is safe to assume that a policy that advocates paying people in exchange for nothing would not attract much electoral support given the value modern society attaches to work. For this reason due consideration has been given to analyzing the positive effects a CBI would have on labor market participation rates. Consequently, much of the contemporary debate has focused on the CBI and its relationship with formal labor market processes. THE CITIZENS’ BASIC INCOME AND PAID WORK Much of the basic income literature has been devoted to analyzing the effects an unconditional income grant would have on existing patterns of work (see, for example, Anthony Atkinson 1995; Guy Standing 1986, 1992; Van Parijs 1992b). Van Parijs summarizes the main issues by outlining three processes he identifies as leading to a more flexible labor market: basic income can be viewed as an employment subsidy given to the potential worker rather than to the employer, with crucially distinctive implications as to the type of low-productivity job that is thereby made viable. Secondly because it is given irrespective of employment status, the introduction of a basic income abolishes or reduces the unemployment trap, not only making more room for a positive income differential between total idleness and some work, but even more by providing the administrative security which will enable many people to take the risk of accepting a job or creating their own. Thirdly, basic income can be viewed as a soft strategy for job-sharing, by providing all with a small unconditional sabbatical pay, and thereby making it more affordable for many either to relinquish their job temporarily in order to get a break, go self-employed, or to work durably on a more part-time basis. (Van Parijs 1996: 65) A CBI, therefore, should not be viewed as a proposal that threatens the policy goal of encouraging active labor market participation but rather as one that meets the needs of a labor market adapting to technological change, the phenomena of “jobless growth,” and intensifying international competition.

#### Even if people choose not to work, the cooperative creation of leisure is positive sum.

**Danaher, 2014 – Lecturer at the National University of Ireland, Galway** [John, “Should we have a right not to work?”, Philosophical Disquisitions, July 17, 2014, http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/should-we-have-right-not-to-work.html, June 27 NJT] [Premier]

Embedded in this rhetorical question are two related objections to the right to not to work. The first, and more straightforward, is the objection that the state couldn’t really sustain this sort of lifestyle choice. If everybody pursued the life of leisure, there would be nobody left to fund it. The second, and more ethically complex objection, is that even if some people did get to pursue this lifestyle, they could only do so by unjustly or unfairly exploiting others.∂ As I say, the first objection is the more straightforward one. We can respond to it in a couple of ways. One is by acknowledging that if everyone chose that lifestyle it would, indeed, be unsustainable, but then suggesting that this is unlikely. This is Levine’s response. He thinks the work ethic is so dominant in our societies that it is highly unlikely that a sufficient number of people will drop out of work. Another response, which I hinted at in the introduction, is to suggest that automation and technological unemployment will either (a) allow for many more people to drop out of work or (b) force many people out of work. Consequently, a life of leisure will become feasible (if not compulsory) for more and more people. Of course, technological unemployment on a large scale could create huge inequalities of wealth, and these would need to be addressed, but that wouldn’t defeat the point I making: that technological unemployment will bring us closer to a world in which a life of leisure is increasingly the norm.’∂ The second objection is the more ethically contentious one. It derives its logic from classic “public goods” problems like the tragedy of the commons. Societies have a number of coordination problems to solve. Oftentimes, the solution requires some form of cooperation: if everyone (or a sufficient fraction thereof) pitches in, a cooperative gain will be realised. If they do not, the cooperative gain will be lost. The belief is that the gains from economic growth are much like this. Unless a sufficient number of people pitch in (either by supplying capital or labour), those cooperative gains will be lost. Furthermore, the belief is that the shares of those cooperative gains should, in a just and fair society, be proportionate in nature. That is to say, your share of the cooperative gain should be proportionate to the amount of effort you put into realising it. If your share is greater than your contribution, you are unjustly and unfairly profiting from the contribution of others.∂ The objection to non-work is simply that if society tolerated and facilitated this lifestyle, it would presumably have to be through some form of redistribution that allowed the leisure-seekers to meet their basic needs without working. That would mean they would receive a share of economic gains that was not proportionate to their contribution. Hence it would mean that they were unjustly and unfairly depriving others of what they were due.∂ Interestingly, Levine accepts this criticism (this is where the modification of premise (1) comes into play). He accepts that the life of leisure would involve some degree of unfair gain (though how great is a separate issue). He just doesn’t think this is a normative problem. Why not? Because cooperative gains are rarely, if ever, shared in accordance to contribution. It is usually very difficult to work out what the contributions really are, and oftentimes impractical or undesirable to distribute in accordance with those contributions. For example, the state provides (or heavily regulates the provision of) public goods that cannot be easily supplied by the market. A classic example is healthcare. When it does so, the benefits of that good are rarely equally shared among the population. But we usually do not fret greatly about this. For example, I contribute far more to the public healthcare in my country than I take out of it, but I don’t find this to be terribly unfair to me. Other people need those resources more than I do.

### AT Spending DA

**There are many ways to pay for a UBI that avoid a trade off.**

**Bidadanure 2017 - Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Stanford** [Juliana, Interviewed by Vivan Malkani, Stanford Politics Understanding Universal Basic Income, March 17 2017, https://stanfordpolitics.com/understanding-universal-basic-income-178032e6090f , June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

These costs must be factored in when looking at the bigger picture of implementing UBI. But this only addresses one part of the problem. The bigger question you ask about how expansive basic income would be can only be answered if we start thinking of different ways to fund basic income. Personally I think the best way to move forward is with a variety of funding mechanisms. This could be progressive taxation, wealth taxes, taxes on financial transactions, consumption taxes and even carbon taxes and a divestment from the prison system; there are many ways to fund this that would not imply framing basic income as a tradeoff. Raising funds will rely on innovative ways to save and divert resources. I believe that basic income is a concrete way to move us towards a more just world with fewer inequalities. In that sense, basic income is often seen as the end, but it should also be viewed as the means to get to a more just tax system and society.

**A UBI is cheaper than the status quo: by 2020 it would be almost one trillion dollars less**

**Worstall 14- Adam Smith Institute in London** [Tim Worstall, Fellow at the Adam Smith Institute, June 4 2016, “Of Course We Can Afford A Universal Basic Income: Do We Want One Though?”, Forbes, Accessed on 6/27/17, https://www.forbes.com/sites/timworstall/2016/06/04/of-course-we-can-afford-a-universal-basic-income-do-we-want-one-though/#7758eaec323c] JC [Premier]

One of the arguments against a universal basic income is that we can't actually afford one. Whatever amount that we were able to pay to everyone simply wouldn't be large enough to actually cover the basics of life. Well, not without pushing up taxation levels to unsupportable levels. This isn't in fact true: we can indeed afford a UBI at an entirely reasonable level within the confines of the amount that we already tax. So thus the question moves on to the next point: do we actually want one? At which point I say yes, obviously we do, as I have been saying for some years now. Simply on the basis that a UBI would be vastly better than the cruel, almost wicked, welfare states that we currently have. Which brings us to the calculation of how we can indeed afford a UBI. Charles Murray is in the WSJ today: In my version, every American citizen age 21 and older would get a $13,000 annual grant deposited electronically into a bank account in monthly installments. Three thousand dollars must be used for health insurance (a complicated provision I won’t try to explain here), leaving every adult with $10,000 in disposable annual income for the rest of their lives. There is no increment for children. From Murray's earlier book (which I think is being released in updated form soon) I recall that the argument here was interesting. A UBI requires that no one insist upon how you live your life. Here's your income, use it as you wish. If that includes having children then fine, if it includes not doing so then fine also. The point being that we really are trying to maximise human freedom here, even while making sure that all can at least eat. And if we're maximising freedom to do whatever you want then we can't go around changing how much you get because of what you do. It's possible that you think $13,000 a year isn't enough. It's certainly not going to be a plush lifestyle by American standards, not when someone decides to do no work at all to top it up. But it's also true that $13,000 a year puts you in the top 12% of all global income earners. It would be nicer if there was some more significant digit there, like $13k puts you into the global 10% or something, but that does seem a fair enough guarantee to get purely through the privilege of having been born an American. There's two issues which also get entirely solved by such a plan, over and above our destruction of the current welfare state....and as Murray points out, we would indeed destroy that: The UBI is to be financed by getting rid of Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps, Supplemental Security Income, housing subsidies, welfare for single women and every other kind of welfare and social-services program, as well as agricultural subsidies and corporate welfare. As of 2014, the annual cost of a UBI would have been about $200 billion cheaper than the current system. By 2020, it would be nearly a trillion dollars cheaper. A UBI at this level is actually cheaper than the current system.

#### A UBI wouldn’t overwhelm the budget – there are many tax credits and subsidies that could pay for it.

Santens 2017- Founder of the BIG Patreon(Scott, March 29 2017, “Evidence Indicates That Universal Basic Income Improves Human Health”, Accessed on 6/29/17, https://futurism.com/evidence-indicates-that-universal-basic-income-improves-human-health/) [Premier]

The idea of which I speak goes by the name of “basic income” but is best understood not by name, but by function, and that function is simply to provide a monthly universal starting point located above the poverty line as a new secure foundation for existence. It’s an irrevocable stipend for life. In the U.S. it would be something like $1,000 for every citizen every month. All other income would then be earned as additional income on top of it so that employment would always pay more than unemployment. This may sound overly expensive, but it would save far more than it costs. It would also really only require an additional net transfer of around $900 billion, and that’s without subtracting the existing welfare programs it could replace, and also without simplifying the tax code through the replacement of all the many credits, deductions, and subsidies it could also replace. Basically, we’re already handing out money to everyone, rich and poor alike, but in hundreds of different ways through thousands of government middlemen who only serve to disincentivize employment by removing government supports as a reward for working.

#### Alaska proves that we can pay for a UBI

**Latour, 2017 – Basic Income Earth News contributor** [Hilde, “Karl Widerquist: Universal Basic Income Is a Good Deal for People Who Like Capitalism”, *BIEN*, June 20, 2017, http://basicincome.org/news/2017/06/karl-widerquist-universal-basic-income-good-deal-people-like-capitalism/. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

UBI can also be seen as compensation to people for the duties that have been imposed on them, according to Widerquist. For instance, a plumbing system is created because the water is polluted, and people have to pay for it, even if they are not the ones that polluted the water. They don’t have a choice. He gives an example of how this can be compensated: The state took the land from the natives (Inuit) in Alaska to let companies drill the oil from it. These companies pay the government and a small part of it is given ‘back’ to the citizens (Alaska’s “Permanent Fund Dividend”).

**Funding a UBI with a Value Added Tax solves best – it is less regressive and have fewer loopholes**

**van Parijs, 2012 – Professor of Economic and Social Ethics at the University of Leuven** [Philippe, Yannick Vanderborght, Basic Income in a Globalised Economy, Social Justice Ireland, 7/13/12, https://www.socialjustice.ie/sites/default/files/file/2012-07-03%20-%20Book%20FULL%20TEXT%20-%20FINAL%20-%20Does%20the%20European%20Social%20Model%20Have%20a%20Future.pdf#page=40, 6/28/17] JY [Premier]

Whether in developed or in less developed countries, the main advantages claimed for VAT over the income tax at the national level are that it has a tax base that extends more widely beyond wages and that it turns out to be, if anything, less regressive than actual income tax schemes, adulterated as these tend to be by exemptions, discounts, the separate taxation of capital income, loopholes and sheer evasion. This argument is also relevant at the European level. But at that level, VAT funding has further advantages over income tax funding. Unlike the definition of personal income, the definition of value added for tax purposes is already homogenized at EU level, VAT is already used to fund part of the EU budget, and the fixing ofrates by each memberstate isstrongly constrained by EU legislation. The Value Added Tax, possibly supplemented by a modest EU-level energy tax, is therefore by far the most promising avenue for funding a significant Euro-dividend, and by extension any other significant supra-national basic income. 31 30 For example by Roland Duchatelet (1992) for Belgium, by Pieter Leroux (2006) for South Africa and by Götz Werner (2007) for Germany. 31 As came up in the US debate on the “fair tax” proposal, a very modest basic income — for example, the “prebate” advocated by Mike Huckabee, a candidate at the 2008 Philippe Van Parijs & Yannick Vanderborght Does the European Social Model Have a Future? 47 Whetherfunded in this orin practically any other way, a Euro-dividend, just as any othersupra-national basic income, would operate a systematic redistribution of wealth from the richer to the poorer parts of the territory concerned, and from the metropolitan to the rural areas. It would thereby help stabilize the population and avoid some of the undesirable externalities of migration. At the same time, it would buffer automatically, without needing ad hoc decisions, any asymmetric shock or productivity divergence affecting the various member states of the Eurozone. Unlike other conceivable supra-national schemes, it would create no perverse incentives on the individual or national level. Nor would it disrupt, homogenize or undermine current national welfare systems. Quite to the contrary. By fitting a modest yet firm base under the existing, more finely calibrated national redistribution institutions, it would help strengthen them and stabilize their diversity.

### AT Politics DA

#### A UBI has broad political support – automation and demographic are boosting its popularity

Calder, 2017 – welfare policy analyst at The Cato Institute [Vanessa, Universal Basic Income — Disease or Cure? This article appeared in Cayman Financial Review on April 26, 2017. <https://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/universal-basic-income-disease-or-cure>] [Premier]

Given the profound deficiencies of most state-run welfare programs, the world’s shifting demographics, and movement toward automating large sectors of the economy, UBI has become an increasingly appealing idea. Its appeal seemingly transcends ideological divides, with contemporary thought leaders as different as Charles Murray (self-professed libertarian at the American Enterprise Institute) and Andy Stern (the left-wing president emeritus of the Service Employees International Union) both advocating the adoption of the concept. Each has written books espousing the idea. The UBI also counts a variety of Silicon Valley entrepreneurs among its list of supporters. This includes big names in technology, like Tesla and SpaceX CEO Elon Musk, Y Combinator’s president Sam Altman, and Facebook co-founder Chris Hughes.

#### A UBI is popular – it has support across the political spectrum

Zon, 2016 – Director of Policy and Research at Maytree Foundation [Noah, “Policy brief: Would a universal basic income reduce poverty?”, *Maytree Foundation*, August 16, 2016, https://medium.com/@maytree\_canada/policy-brief-would-a-universal-basic-income-reduce-poverty-cd85fd64dbac. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

In some ways, the diverse support for basic income guarantees defies fundamental laws of political gravity. The idea that we should simply guarantee every person some minimum amount of money to meet their needs has vocal supporters from across the political spectrum; it seems to be the rare common ground for people who almost never agree on anything. This potential for unlikely alliances is turning heads and making universal basic income a surprisingly popular global topic. Canada is in the heart of this emerging international conversation with the Ontario government in the midst of developing a basic income pilot program and Quebec exploring its options.

#### A UBI has strong political support –

**Porter, 2016 – New York Times economics columnist** [Eduardo, “A Universal Basic Income Is a Poor Tool to Fight Poverty”, *New York Times*, May 31, 2016, https://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/01/business/economy/universal-basic-income-poverty.html. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

And it would be politically secure. Programs for the poor are often maligned as poor programs. Indeed, defunding antipoverty programs rarely carries political consequences because the poor rarely vote. It’s another story entirely when everybody benefits. The idea of universal basic income sounds extravagant, right? Well, the Finns and even the Swiss are thinking about it. On Sunday, Swiss citizens will vote in a referendum on whether to hand out 30,000 francs a year — just over $30,000 — to every citizen, regardless of wealth, work status or whatever.∂ In the United States, the idea has the support of thinkers on the left like Andrew Stern, former president of the Service Employees International Union. Some thinkers on the right, too, have managed to overcome their general distaste for government welfare to support the idea. This month, Charles Murray of the American Enterprise Institute will publish an updated version of his plan to replace welfare as we know it with a dollop of $10,000 in after-tax income for every American above the age of 21.

**A UBI has widespread support – its ambiguity prevents criticism of it.**

**Srnicek and Williams 2015 - lecturer at City University and editor in chief of The New Stack** [Nick and Alex, Inventing the Future: Post capitalism and a World Without Work. November 17 2015, https://s3.amazonaws.com/arena-attachments/576840/68a4032cf0d4b1ffc2564332ad7c9e36.pdf,June 27, 2017] LA [Premier]

Drawing upon moral arguments and empirical research, there are a vast number of reasons to support a UBI: reduced poverty, better public health and reduced health costs, fewer high school dropouts, reductions in petty crime, more time with family and friends, and less state bureaucracy. 105 Depending on how UBI is presented, it is capable of generating support from across the political spectrum – from libertarians, conservatives, anarchists, Marxists and feminists, among others. The potency of the demand lies partly in this ambiguity, making it capable of mobilising broad popular support. 106

**Almost nobody opposes public benefits**

**Clark 14-Independent Blogger** [Thomas, Independent Blogger specializing in economics and politics, August 15 2014, “Universal Basic Income vs the current welfare system”, Accessed on 6/26/17, <http://anotherangryvoice.blogspot.com/2014/08/universal-basic-income-sanctions.html>] [Premier]

The second problem with means tested benefits is the way in which they are perceived by the public. When a benefit is universal, very few people strongly oppose it because everyone is entitled to it. Take the provision of universal healthcare through the NHS as an example. The NHS has very strong public support, with just 7% of the public favouring NHS privatisation (not that this remarkable level of public support has stopped the Tories from carving up the NHS and giving it away to their donors).

### AT Trump Base DA

#### A UBI will Increase base support for Trump – he can sell it as economic populism and it helps him fulfill his campaign promises. He doesn’t care if the GOP establishment hates it – that Motivates his Base.

**Scarola 2017 - staff writer for Inverse Magazine** [Cory February 7, 2017 Donald Trump's (Potential) Case for Universal Basic Income, <https://www.inverse.com/article/26833-donald-trump-universal-basic-income-jobs-program>] [Premier]

The idea of universal basic income was largely ignored by Americans for forty years before it started to get traction again as a byproduct of conversations about automation and the end of the traditional manufacturing sector. Bernie Sanders popularized the pseudo-policy proposal in 2016, rallying supporters around the idea of an American social democracy. He didn’t win the primary. Which is not to say that the notion of paying citizens for being citizens is a wholly radical idea. Liberals have traditionally championed Social Security and Medicare, entitlement programs that offer state benefits to citizens in return for nothing. (Well, years in the workforce if you choose to look at it that way.) The Republican Party opposes these programs on the grounds that they are ineffective, wasteful, or simply incompatible with the idea of small government. What makes universal basic income interesting — especially with President Donald Trump in the White House — is that it can be pitched as both an initiative to shrink the government and as an element of a modern welfare state. And don’t be shocked if that’s exactly what happens. In order to understand why Trump might pick up a policy initiative most effectively pushed by Senator Bernie Sanders, it’s important to consider the fact that he hasn’t spent his career as a Republican Party stalwart. Trump is a pragmatist, willing to piss off people on his left and on his right. In this way, he’s very similar to former President Richard Nixon, who was the last — and only — president to support universal basic income. Nixon’s support for universal basic income was short lived and never led to law. But it does provide some historical precedent for a conservative openness to the idea and a willingness to advocate for it. Nixon went so far as to begin planning how to introduce the policy to Congress and the American people. Why was he so interested in paying Americans? Because he saw little use in fighting against the welfare state that had been steadily growing since FDR’s New Deal. Instead, Nixon thought it wise to come up with a Republican-branded entitlement that would be popular with his anti-elitist base of hardline conservatives. He figured that cash could be a populist policy, a tax cut given behind the back. Nixon was also interested in data. He commissioned studies on whether a universal basic income would depress employment or prove too costly. Experts did some work and came back with a verdict: neither. All Nixon would have to do was make the idea palatable for Congress and the electorate. By all accounts, he believed he could do that. He was wrong because he wasn’t prepared to deal with his own party’s willingness to be wrong about facts. Nixon’s plan would have provided “unconditional income for all poor families,” amounting to $10,000 yearly for a family of four (adjusted for inflation). Martin Anderson, an economic adviser with small-government proclivities, never liked that plan and presented Nixon with a case study of a similar policy in England that had failed. The findings in questions were later shown to be nonsense, but Nixon was not a man of conviction, and that was that. President Trump’s similarities to Nixon are striking. Nixon campaigned against an urban elite supposedly unwilling and unable to handle the rigors of governing outside of New York and Los Angeles because of their obsession with racial equality and an unwillingness to deal directly with high crime rates. Trump did the same — despite low crime rates. Both men capitalized on wedge issues to win ugly elections. Both men also wandered way off the conservatives’ script. Trump promised at various points during his campaign to build a border wall, refurbish American infrastructure, round up millions of immigrants, tighten immigration from Muslim countries, and reinstate illegal police tactics. These are not the policies of a small-government conservative. These are the sort of costly undertakings that grow a budget deficit. Yet, in the very same run-on sentence, Trump has frequently railed against the elite, promised jobs to blue-collar workers, and talked about a return to prosperity for all. That’s what Nixonian politics look like. The core problem with Trump’s promise to improve the lives of working class Americans is that there is no clear way for him to bring jobs back to the places they’ve disappeared (to the degree to which they have and to the degree to which the gig economy hasn’t filled gaps with benefit-free labor). This is likely why Trump has spoken very little about cutting or privatizing entitlement programs, something polls have consistently shown Americans don’t support. In fact, voters were encouraged by Trump’s promise not to do those things. If Trump’s base is concerned about economic backsliding — and that seems to be the case — universal basic income represents a politically expedient way to assuage their fears. Politically speaking, it also represents an expedient way to break through the Washington “gridlock.” Trump could easily present a UBI initiative as an effort to give Americans back the money taken from them by incompetent careerists and government elites. And, in a very literal sense, that would be the truth. It would also be big. And Donald Trump likes big. Trump’s “Muslim Ban,” and willingness to aggressively sign executive orders outside of consultation with experts, has put the left on the defensive and in the streets. But Trump can’t keep signing orders forever, which means that he won’t be able to distract from the fact that he doesn’t seem to have a jobs program — unless you count infrastructure investment, which you probably shouldn’t. Pressure will mount and Trump will have to decide if he wants to heavily regulate industry in the hopes of protecting or creating jobs. It would be antithetical to his extreme capitalist stance. So why not do the alternative and just hand out cash? There are far more ridiculous plans. More money in the hands of the public means more money being spent on products and services, as well as more widespread access to entrepreneurship. A universal basic income could even be sold as trickle-down economics at work — even though that’s not quite right. However Trump chooses to frame this policy, it will come first and foremost out of the image he’s crafted for himself as someone who gets things done. Trump’s pragmatism may be a symptom of ideological apathy, but that ultimately doesn’t matter if he truly wants to throw Washington’s inherited wisdom into the Potomac. If he wants to be a different sort of president, he’ll have to do something no other president has done. Handing out money is better than going to nuclear war.

#### A UBI is a crucial issue to Trump’s base – their key focus is the loss of jobs, which includes jobs to automation

Siegel 2017 - President of Rain Mountain LLC an independent product development group [RP, Feb 14th, 2017 Could Donald Trump Deliver a Universal Basic Income? <http://www.triplepundit.com/2017/02/trump-universal-basic-income/> Acc 6/29/17 ] [Premier]

Finally, perhaps the most radical proposal of all is the idea of a universal basic income for every American. The idea has been around for a while. Economist Milton Friedman proposed a universal basic income just after World War II. And the idea goes back historically to the writings of Thomas Moore and John Stuart Mill. Perhaps its time has come. Finland is trying the idea with 2,000 adults to see how it works. Ontario, Canada, is also starting up a pilot. Switzerland put the idea up for a vote last summer, but it was soundly defeated. Yet the idea has a surprising amount of support in the U.S., not only among progressives, but also among conservatives who see it as a preferable to the “welfare state.” Is it time for a universal basic income in the U.S.? You would think this kind of talk would be limited to socialist blogs. However, as the libertarian Charles Murray wrote in the Wall Street Journal: “I think that a [universal basic income] is our only hope to deal with a coming labor market unlike any in human history and that it represents our best hope to revitalize American civil society.” Indeed, the forces of a world economy in transition — causing a split between old and new orders, with workers caught in the middle — was the impetus that propelled Donald Trump to the White House. The answer is clearly not as simple as talking tough, building walls or restricting immigration. However, even on the left, some faint cries can be heard for some reasonable level of protectionism in light of these changes. Check out Colin Hines’s thinking on the subject. A contributor to the Guardian newspaper, Hines believes that some level of restriction on immigration will be necessary to promote the flourishing of local economies. But it’s not just global trade that has siphoned off American jobs. Everywhere you look, you see technology where workers once stood. Whether it’s ATM machines, automated checkout lines, factory robots or, soon, driver-less taxis and trucks, all those lost wages are going directly into the pockets of business owners. Is it not the role of government to try and make things more fair?

#### Trump could spin a UBI to say he is fulfilling his campaign promises.

Siegel 2017 - President of Rain Mountain LLC an independent product development group [RP, Feb 14th, 2017 Could Donald Trump Deliver a Universal Basic Income? <http://www.triplepundit.com/2017/02/trump-universal-basic-income/> Acc 6/29/17 ] [Premier]

All that being said, is this a policy the Donald Trump administration will support? If Trump is consistently anything, it’s unpredictable. There are those who think he might back a UBI. It would be one relatively easy way to fulfill his campaign promise to help the middle class recover some of what they lost financially over the past few decades. If he wants to help the middle class, then many say a UBI is a much better idea than the tax cut he is now proposing. Indeed, it seems to fit many of the points Trump says he is aiming for: ending the status quo, reducing the size of government, cutting taxes and ending corporate welfare. Trump has yet to connect those dots, but it could happen. If he does, the outcome, as with the healthcare law, will be in the details. But in America, anything is possible. If it doesn’t happen during Trump’s time, then perhaps it will be one of the many things that happen afterward, as support for these policies seems to be growing steadily.

## AT Counterplans

### AT Conditional Basic Income CP

**A conditional UBI would not solve – it would continue to stigmatize the poor based on its conditions**

**Bidadanure 2017 - Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Stanford** [Juliana, Interviewed by Vivan Malkani, Stanford Politics Understanding Universal Basic Income, March 17 2017, https://stanfordpolitics.com/understanding-universal-basic-income-178032e6090f , June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

JB: I don’t think that we should frame this issue as an either-or scenario. Basic Income is necessary, but insufficient on its own to address poverty, precariousness, joblessness and growing inequalities. People who believe in basic income do so from differing political standpoints. Social democrats believe that what we owe each other is not just cash; we owe each other good institutions. In Europe, the basic income debate has been framed as a further enhancement of the welfare state. I grew up in France; there are many things that I think are done right there. We have universal healthcare, free higher education, but we also have a benefit system that is archaic and abusive. People who are out of work get only between 400 and 500 euros a month to survive, they are stigmatized and demonized as burdens, and some groups in society are excluded from the scheme, like young adults below the age of 25. The reasons for such restrictive and low benefits are ideological: that people should be taught the right values, or they can’t be trusted with cash,. In the UK, the benefit system creates an unemployment trap. If you receive cash on the condition that you are not working, and if you find a job, you lose the benefits straight away. That means that, if the job doesn’t work out after a month or so (as is the case with many precarious jobs), you may end up having to spend weeks without access to public assistance. The idea behind basic income is that you would not have to worry about that; that base is secure. You can then try different things like internships, trainings, volunteering, etc. because of your security. The existing benefits system also gives too much control to street level bureaucrats; people who are meant to deliver public assistance have too much control over the lives of the people receiving those benefits. This is particularly bad in the UK, where the system is intrusive and requires you to prove that you are applying to jobs, demanding that you send dozens of applications per week. This is punitive. The system is built on the view that you are responsible for being unemployed and that you must prove to society that you are not a parasite. This allows for and encourages divisive rhetoric that is detrimental to democracy. Political parties can use resentment towards “welfare queens” and “benefit scroungers” to create a spirit of resentment against those who are most reliant on society, which is very detrimental to social cohesion. I believe in basic income as a reformation and further enhancement of that benefit system. But I don’t think that UBI is just for developed welfare states. If we think that the people should be above a certain threshold, they are going to need a lot of cash, but also a lot more than just cash. Both in the US and India, the question of the development package is very important. But the case for cash can and should be made there too. There is a traditional school of thought in development that does not trust individuals with cash, and I think this mistrust must be challenged.

**Conditional policies won’t help women-they have to perform unpaid work that doesn’t count in a system based on contributions**

**McKay, 01 – Professor of Economics at Glasgow Caledonian University** [Alisa, a Scottish economist, government policy adviser, a leading feminist economist and Professor of Economics at Glasgow Caledonian University, RETHINKING WORK AND INCOME MAINTENANCE POLICY: PROMOTING GENDER EQUALITY T HROUGH A CITIZENS ’ BASIC INCOME, Feminist Economics, 3/1/01, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-923X.2004.00611.x/abstract, 6/27/] JY [Premier]

Formal social security arrangements have traditionally served men more favorably than women. This is in part due to the direct relationship between insurance based benefits and the labor market, but it is an indirect consequence of policies that fail to recognize the diverse roles of women as wives, mothers, workers, and caregivers. Women’s historically limited access to the labor market and their lower earnings relative to those of men are well documented. Consequently, women are disadvantaged in terms of rights to benefits within a system based on contributions made while in paid employment. Legislation promoting the removal of discriminatory policies has enhanced women’s formal position as claimants and established their rights to benefits. However, social and demographic factors, such as the increase in single-parent households (predominately headed by women), women’s longer life expectancy, and the unpaid work undertaken primarily by women in providing welfare within the household, further contribute to gender bias in social security systems. Ignoring such factors when designing systems inevitably results in unequal outcomes. Social security programs that continue to emphasize the role of the worker, alongside the traditional male-breadwinner family model, implicitly promote male citizenship while simultaneously denying women’s full inclusion as citizens by assuming their dependency on men.

**UBI makes the notion of citizenship more inclusive unlike conditional welfare programs**

**Zelleke 2005 – associate professor of practice of political science** [Almaz, December 2005, “Basic Income in the United States: Redefining Citizenship in the Liberal State,” Review of Social Economy, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29770344>, accessed 6/28/17] AO [Premier]

In one sense, the debate over work requirements for basic income in the US might seem to be settled. The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) approximates a modest conditional basic income for families with children?no more than $4,204 for families with at least two children, with up to another $1,000 per child under the Child Tax Credit.1 All in all the federal benefit comes to less than $2,000 on a per person basis in the most generous case, with some additional EITC benefits available in a few states. The EITC aims to reward the work effort of low-income workers, to boost their wages without economically distorting wage subsidies, and to make even low-income work more attractive than welfare benefits. The EITC is a favored policy of American welfare theorists who argue that employment must be the foundation of a multi-pronged attack on the problem of poverty, even if low wage jobs cannot by themselves lift the poor out of poverty. David Ellwood (1988), whose slogan is "making work pay," is the exemplar of this approach, but he is not alone. And though it is not characterized as a basic income, the EITC is a conditional cash grant that modestly achieves some of a basic income's goals. If this is the case, should basic income advocates concede the matter, drop the push for unconditionality, and settle instead for a conditional basic income?in effect, an expanded EITC with some administrative modifications to increase take-up, and with funding at a higher level? Perhaps, but it is premature to concede the conditionality issue just yet. What basic income advocates have yet to do is present a positive account of a non work-centered notion of liberal citizenship that surpasses the work-centered notion currently dominant in the US. And while it is the debate in the US that has the most to gain from this effort, it has implications for western Europe as well, where the more advanced debate over basic income is increasingly dominated by those who advocate a basic income conditional on a social contribution or participation requirement, in effect a weak work requirement that, while more liberal than a strict work requirement in intention, suffers from the same inegalitarian effects of selectivity. In this paper, I examine arguments for work-conditioned welfare and basic income. I focus here on arguments for work requirements that extend beyond the terms of the traditional welfare debate, where work requirements can be seen as the price the poor pay for benefits redistributed from the middle class and the wealthy, because the scope of an unconditional basic income extends beyond the poor and must be justified in a manner that goes beyond alleviating poverty. Therefore, I review and critique arguments about work and participation requirements which advance a definition of citizenship. A review of arguments for conditionality and the theories of citizenship they posit shows what advocates of unconditionality have yet to do in making the case for basic income. Arguments from distributive justice, the kind that dominate the basic income debate (e.g. Van Parijs 1995), go only so far in making the case for an unconditional basic income, and a compelling and persuasive account of the kind of society and citizenship to which it leads is necessary for the justification to be complete. To address this omission, I offer as a liberal alternative a radically pluralist notion of citizenship with a kind of universal economic suffrage, made possible by an unconditional basic income at its core. This proposal may not sway those who do not share the inclination toward a liberal, indeed a libertarian, foundation for society and social policy, but the analogy I posit between the political and economic spheres should, at the least, challenge supporters of work requirements to address the inequities in their own conceptions of citizenship that underlie and justify their calls for work requirements.

### AT EITC CP

**UBI makes the notion of citizenship more inclusive unlike EITC**

**Zelleke 2005 – associate professor of practice of political science** [Almaz, December 2005, “Basic Income in the United States: Redefining Citizenship in the Liberal State,” Review of Social Economy, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29770344>, accessed 6/28/17] AO [Premier]

In one sense, the debate over work requirements for basic income in the US might seem to be settled. The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) approximates a modest conditional basic income for families with children?no more than $4,204 for families with at least two children, with up to another $1,000 per child under the Child Tax Credit.1 All in all the federal benefit comes to less than $2,000 on a per person basis in the most generous case, with some additional EITC benefits available in a few states. The EITC aims to reward the work effort of low-income workers, to boost their wages without economically distorting wage subsidies, and to make even low-income work more attractive than welfare benefits. The EITC is a favored policy of American welfare theorists who argue that employment must be the foundation of a multi-pronged attack on the problem of poverty, even if low wage jobs cannot by themselves lift the poor out of poverty. David Ellwood (1988), whose slogan is "making work pay," is the exemplar of this approach, but he is not alone. And though it is not characterized as a basic income, the EITC is a conditional cash grant that modestly achieves some of a basic income's goals. If this is the case, should basic income advocates concede the matter, drop the push for unconditionality, and settle instead for a conditional basic income?in effect, an expanded EITC with some administrative modifications to increase take-up, and with funding at a higher level? Perhaps, but it is premature to concede the conditionality issue just yet. What basic income advocates have yet to do is present a positive account of a non work-centered notion of liberal citizenship that surpasses the work-centered notion currently dominant in the US. And while it is the debate in the US that has the most to gain from this effort, it has implications for western Europe as well, where the more advanced debate over basic income is increasingly dominated by those who advocate a basic income conditional on a social contribution or participation requirement, in effect a weak work requirement that, while more liberal than a strict work requirement in intention, suffers from the same inegalitarian effects of selectivity. In this paper, I examine arguments for work-conditioned welfare and basic income. I focus here on arguments for work requirements that extend beyond the terms of the traditional welfare debate, where work requirements can be seen as the price the poor pay for benefits redistributed from the middle class and the wealthy, because the scope of an unconditional basic income extends beyond the poor and must be justified in a manner that goes beyond alleviating poverty. Therefore, I review and critique arguments about work and participation requirements which advance a definition of citizenship. A review of arguments for conditionality and the theories of citizenship they posit shows what advocates of unconditionality have yet to do in making the case for basic income. Arguments from distributive justice, the kind that dominate the basic income debate (e.g. Van Parijs 1995), go only so far in making the case for an unconditional basic income, and a compelling and persuasive account of the kind of society and citizenship to which it leads is necessary for the justification to be complete. To address this omission, I offer as a liberal alternative a radically pluralist notion of citizenship with a kind of universal economic suffrage, made possible by an unconditional basic income at its core. This proposal may not sway those who do not share the inclination toward a liberal, indeed a libertarian, foundation for society and social policy, but the analogy I posit between the political and economic spheres should, at the least, challenge supporters of work requirements to address the inequities in their own conceptions of citizenship that underlie and justify their calls for work requirements.

### AT Household Income CP

#### A household basic income would not solve patriarchal problems because it would be coopted by patriarchal institutions like marriage

Pateman, 2004 – prof of Political Science at UCLA [Carole, Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income. Politics and Society on March 1, 2004. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0032329203261100>] [Premier]

Similarly, Van Parijs argues that while “a defensible long-term vision” of an unconditional basic income at the highest sustainable level is vital, nevertheless more limited and politically feasible proposals are also essential. He states that a household-based guaranteed minimum income “would definitely be a major change in the right direction”37—but the right direction according to which reasons? Household-based schemes disregard not only all the problems about the sexual division of labor, and the fact that women earn less than men, but also income distribution within households. Can it be confidently assumed that income would be distributed equally between husband and wife? A basic income is important for feminism and democratization precisely because it is paid not to households but individuals as citizens. A focus on individuals does not imply resort to the atomistic individualism of neo-classical economics. The problem of women’s self-government and full standing as citizens is visible only when individuals are conceptualized within the context of social relations and institutions. A household-based basic income allows the problem of marriage, employment, and citizenship to be avoided since wives (women) disappear into the category of “the family” or “household.” To treat a basic income as a payment to households rather than individuals ignores the question of who performs the work of caring for household members. That is, it is tacitly assumed that reciprocity exists and that free-riding is only a problem about men avoiding employment.

### AT Job Training CP

#### Education and training cannot prevent unemployment – automation will overwhelm their capacity to retrain.

**Davidow and Malone, 2014 – High technology industry executive and columnist for ABC News** [Bill, Michael, What Happens to Society When Robots Replace Workers?”, Harvard Business Review. https://hbr.org/2014/12/what-happens-to-society-when-robots-replace-workers. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

Politicians, economists, and scientists might debate these particular estimates, but to do so is to miss the larger point. Machine intelligence is already having a major effect on the value of work – and for major segments of the population, human value is now being set by the cost of equivalent machine intelligence.∂ The challenge now is to keep up with 40% to 60% rates of progress … when even a genius like Henry Adams despaired of keeping up with just a 7% rate.∂ The simplistic policy answer is better training. But at this pace of change, improving the educational system will be perpetually too little and too late. Likewise, artificially boosting the minimum wage will only hasten the reckoning by subsidizing job replacement by intelligent machines. David Brooks has suggested that the government should aggressively build infrastructure, “reduce its generosity to people who are not working but increase its support for people who are,” consider moving to a progressive consumption tax, and “doubling down on human capital, from early education programs to community colleges and beyond.” But even if his program were effectively and aggressively implemented, it might keep up with a 40% rate of progress for only a little while.∂ Meanwhile, Brooks’s solutions will lead only to bigger government and greater command and control. And it is difficult to imagine how such a sluggish government system could keep up with such a rapid rate of change when it can barely do so now.∂ Ultimately, we need a new, individualized, cultural, approach to the meaning of work and the purpose of life. Otherwise, people will find a solution – human beings always do – but it may not be the one for which we began this technological revolution.

### AT Means Tested Basic Income CP

**A basic income must be universal to solve – it values citizenship and government responsibility, it is the easiest to implement and has the most public support.**

**Mckay 2002 – prof of economics at Glascow Univ** [Ailsa with Jo Vanevery independent writer, Social Politics, Gender, Gender, Family, and Income Maintenance: A Feminist Case for Citizens Basic Income, Summer 2002, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

When discussing social security policy, universalism implies universal entitlement, that is, benefits are available to everyone with no qualifying test such as paid contributions or the demonstration of need. A program of universal benefits would involve the granting of benefit to every citizen, financed from general taxation. The Link between contribution and receipt is indirect, in that although citizens contribute to the program through their individual tax liability, payment of taxes is not a condition of entitlement and subsequently there is no barrier to entitlement for nontaxpayers. Universal programs are therefore based on the notion of common citizenship and the principle of government responsibility in securing independent income guarantees. Universalism is hence associated with comprehensive coverage and ease of delivery. The rationale for universal entitlement is quite distinct from that for contributory entitlement. The principle of universal coverage was the principal reason the Beveridge scheme (in the UK) benefited from widespread public support. The Beveridge model of social insurance based on flat rate benefits, flat rate contributions, and universal coverage encapsulates a particular principle of universalism—selective egalitarian universalism. The other main type of universal provision extant in contemporary western industrial societies could be called categorical universalism—paid to all members of a particular demographic category with no other qualifying test than belonging to the selected category. Noncontributory, non-means-tested benefits paid for children and to the elderly, for example, child benefit in the UK, and, until recently, old age security in Canada, are currently the closest approximation to a universal system of social security. Defining a Citizens Basic Income The characteristics that distinguish a basic income scheme from any existing mechanism of state supported cash transfer are the principles of universal and unconditional entitlement.

#### A UBI is better than targeted aid at reducing poverty; empirics in the US, Canada, Mexico, and others prove

Cerridwen, 2016 – science writer [Anemone Cerridwen has three science degrees and no job, Feminist Current A basic income guarantee is both feasible and feminist April 13, http://www.feministcurrent.com/2016/04/13/a-basic-income-guarantee-is-feasible-and-feminist/ Acc 6/29/17] [Premier]

There have been numerous experiments that show simply giving money to those living in poverty and letting them figure out what to do with it is more successful than giving them targeted aid. In the ’60s and ’70s, the US ran experiments in five different regions to see if people would quit working (they didn’t), while Canada experimented with a Mincome in Dauphin, Manitoba — for the five years the program existed in Dauphin, poverty was completely eliminated. In general, people’s motivation to work was not impacted, but when people did stop working outside the home, it was mostly women who were staying home with young children or teenagers who stayed in school longer. Mexico started giving impoverished people cash in the ’90s, to replace food subsidies, and found that people ate better and were healthier, and that children stayed in school longer. In 2008, Uganda’s Youth Opportunities Program offered cash to young rural applicants to learn a skilled trade. (Women in these programs fared particularly well because they were so much worse off to begin with.) In 2009, 13 long-term homeless London men (“rough sleepers”) were offered £3,000 each to help them move off the street, with logistical support from a project coordinator. Far more of them moved off the street than was originally expected. And in 2012, GiveDirectly, insipired by Mexico, gave impoverished Kenyan families $1,000 each to see what they would do. The Kenyans did things like upgrade their houses with better materials and start businesses. There have also been recent pilots in Namibia and India.

### AT Minimum Wage CP

**Permutation – A UBI with a minimum wage hike prevent lowered wages caused by subsidization of employers.**

**Pressman, 2005 – Prof of economics at Monmouth Univ** [Steven, with Michael Lewis and Karl Widerquist The Basic Income Guarantee and Social Economics. This article appeared in Review of Social Economy on December 2005. http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/29770341.pdf?refreqid=search%3A9330359b12bad0e394957e75c30d95e6] JN [Premier]

The liberal argument against Basic Income policies is a reaction to the labor market flexibility argument put forward by conservative advocates. Iacobacci and Seccareccia [1989] argue that if a Basic Income policy is seen as a substitute for a full employment policy in the traditional Keynesian sense, then it is a major step backward and would harm all workers. The Basic Income would, in effect, subsidize employers, allowing them to lower wages, and in the long run, adopt a low pay-low productivity employment policy instead of a high pay-high productivity em- ployment policy. At a minimum, this view holds that a Basic Income should be coupled with a statutory minimum wage to prevent wage subsidization. Furthermore, lacobacci and Seccareccia note that the labor flexibility benefit suggested by conser- vative advocates of a Basic Income policy would only lead to increases in employ- ment if the wage reductions encouraged exports, leading to export-lead job creation.

### AT Negative Income Tax CP

#### An NIT would cause a massive political backlash – EITC recipients would lose their credits, bureaucrats would lose their jobs, and the public prefers programs to handing out cash.

Sorman, 2016 – **former economic advisor to the French prime minister** [Guy, Why Not a Negative Income Tax. City Journal during Winter 2011. https://www.city-journal.org/html/why-not-negative-income-tax-13352.html] [Premier]

George Shultz—who, before serving as Ronald Reagan’s secretary of state, was chair of his Economic Policy Advisory Board, where Friedman was a major intellectual force—calls the NIT “a brilliant and unworkable idea.” Why? “The NIT is unworkable not from a theoretical standpoint but from a political perspective,” he says. “The 27 million families who receive the EITC love it” and wouldn’t want to see their tax credit replaced; further, “most Americans believe that nonworking welfare recipients should get programs and not cash.” One more reason: “The bureaucrats who manage the current welfare state like the power it grants them.” Another former Reagan advisor, Martin Anderson—now, like Shultz, a fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford—fears that an NIT would simply be added to, rather than replace, existing programs; politicians are better at piling on benefits than at reengineering the state, he points out.

### AT Participation Income CP

#### The participation income counter plan reinforces patriarchal norms by focusing on Conditions for the income – only a basic income that goes to All individuals can solve

Pateman, 2004 – prof of Political Science at UCLA [Carole, Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income. Politics and Society on March 1, 2004. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0032329203261100>] [Premier]

Similarly, Van Parijs argues that while “a defensible long-term vision” of an unconditional basic income at the highest sustainable level is vital, nevertheless more limited and politically feasible proposals are also essential. He states that a household-based guaranteed minimum income “would definitely be a major change in the right direction”37—but the right direction according to which reasons? Household-based schemes disregard not only all the problems about the sexual division of labor, and the fact that women earn less than men, but also income distribution within households. Can it be confidently assumed that income would be distributed equally between husband and wife? A basic income is important for feminism and democratization precisely because it is paid not to households but individuals as citizens. A focus on individuals does not imply resort to the atomistic individualism of neo-classical economics. The problem of women’s self-government and full standing as citizens is visible only when individuals are conceptualized within the context of social relations and institutions. A household-based basic income allows the problem of marriage, employment, and citizenship to be avoided since wives (women) disappear into the category of “the family” or “household.” To treat a basic income as a payment to households rather than individuals ignores the question of who performs the work of caring for household members. That is, it is tacitly assumed that reciprocity exists and that free-riding is only a problem about men avoiding employment. This assumption is nicely illustrated by the picture of a male surfer on the cover of Real Freedom for All. In academic discussions the surfer is used to represent non-contributors. But in the popular political imagination and the media other symbols of free-riding are present, such as the African American “welfare queen” or, more recently, the “illegal immigrant” or the “asylum seeker.”38 The figure of the surfer not only obscures the problem for democratization of popular attitudes embodied in these other symbols but also obliterates the systematic avoidance of one form of contribution, the vital caring work, by men who are in employment. Nor do the numerous suggestions for conditions to be placed on payment of a basic income as a solution to free-riding—Atkinson’s “participation income” is a well-known example39—get to grips with free-riding by men in the household. While the notion of a “contribution” may be broadened to include, for example, the work of caring for others, as in Atkinson’s proposal, this is insufficient to focus attention on the structural problem of the connections between marriage, employment, and free-riding by husbands. While payment of a basic income to a husband for his “contribution” through employment and to his wife for her “contribution” in the home is to recognize that she does indeed make a socially valuable contribution, this does little to calm the fears of some feminists that a basic income will merely reinforce women’s lesser standing and the idleness of husbands in the household.

### AT Tax Cut CP

#### A UBI is better for the economy than a tax cut for the wealthy – the poor are more likely to stimulate demand.

**Streithorst, 2015 – Evonomics Journalist** [Tom, “How Basic Income Solves Capitalism’s Fundamental Problem”, *Evonomics*, December 20, 2015, http://evonomics.com/how-universal-basic-income-solves/. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

The third problem is perhaps the most central. By stimulating the economy and pushing it towards its production possibilities frontier, the Basic Income Guarantee will be growth enhancing, but it is undeniable that it will also be redistributive. The pie will be larger, but it will be sliced differently. For the past 30 years, we have stimulated the economy by shovelling money towards rich people. A Basic Income Guarantee shovels money towards poor people. And for many in the top 1%, that is anathema.∂ Conservatives generally favour tax cuts as a way of stimulating the economy. Although they don’t like to admit it, this is textbook Keynesianism. As long as the government does not cut spending, more money in consumers’ pockets will inevitably increase demand. Unfortunately, tax cuts generally favour the richest among us, and they, unlike the poor, are liable to save rather than spend their windfall. Stimulating savings is a waste of a tax cut. Today, we have an over-abundance of saving and a shortfall of investment and consumption. A Basic Income Guarantee can be thought of as a tax cut targeted to those most likely to spend it, which is what the economy needs. The Basic Income Guarantee solves the problem of demand, stimulates the economy, increases corporate profits, gives workers more freedom, and provides a safety net to the most vulnerable. It is economically sound and politically savvy. But the very rich don’t fear unemployment, they fear redistribution and they will be the most significant force against the implementation of the Basic Income Guarantee.

### AT Wage Subsidy CP

**A UBI is better than wage subsidies because it is universal and it allows workers to bargain for higher wages**

**Bidadanure 2017 - Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Stanford** [Juliana, Interviewed by Vivan Malkani, Stanford Politics Understanding Universal Basic Income, March 17 2017, https://stanfordpolitics.com/understanding-universal-basic-income-178032e6090f , June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

VM: What about something like wage subsidies or earned income tax credit? These measures seem to retain several positive aspects of UBI while addressing the inequality aspect more directly. JB: People who believe in basic income are pushing for more universality, unconditionality and individuality. There are strong philosophical value-based reasons to push for these three features for an income support scheme. Universality emphasizes that we should not separate deserving from undeserving poor. Un-conditionality matters because conditional benefits are often intrusive and abusive and foster anti-democratic rhetoric. Individuality is crucial because we want to make sure that people who do not receive any benefits at present because they depend on a rich enough spouse have the ability to exit abusive relationships. Any policy that further those three goals must be seriously considered. A negative aspect of tax credits is the bureaucratic approach of filing, which is also often household-based as opposed to individual-based. It may be an improvement over the current system but I choose to focus on basic income because of such flaws. With regard to wage subsidies, we don’t want to subsidize employers; we want workers to have more bargaining power to get fairer wages. Basic income doesn’t negate the need for better wages, but it helps solve the problem by putting people in a better position to argue for fairer wages or work conditions, by enabling them to quit their jobs if they want to. Wage subsidies address the problem of working poverty, which is a structural problem that worries me very much. But the more radical solution is to push for structural changes in the balance of power in the workplace and the labor market. If basic income can help empower workers, I think it is a more promising and transformative policy than wage subsidies.

## AT Kritiks

### AT Ableism K

#### A UBI does not discriminate against the disabled if it does not cancel other welfare programs – everyone benefits from income to promote their freedom.

**Danaher, 2014 - Lecturer at National University of Ireland** [John, “Parasitic Surfers and the Unconditional Basic Income: A Debate”, July 12 2014, http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/parasitic-surfers-and-unconditional.html] [Premier]

The second criticism has to do with Parijs’s assumption that income translates readily into freedom. Remember, for Parijs the UBI is justifiable because it helps to maximin people’s capacity to pursue their conception of the good life. This means he must be assuming that people can leverage the income they receive into that pursuit. But this isn’t necessarily the case. Anderson highlights the fact that the elderly, the disabled and those with care-giving duties, are often unable to translate a share of income into greater freedom. They need other things (e.g. new technologies, or disproportionate shares of income) to achieve the kinds of freedoms available to single, able-bodied adults. Her fear is that prioritising a UBI over other types of welfare many simply benefit the single able-bodied adults at the expense of those others. I think there are legitimate concerns here, though I would note that the link between income and freedom is not completely implausible, even for the individuals Anderson identifies, and it isn’t necessarily the case that a UBI would replace all other forms of social welfare. Specific payments to those with disabilities or with care-giving duties could continue, though the political and practical feasibility of this would need to be explored.

**A UBI is key to restoring dignity to folks with disabilities – current programs require humiliating applications**

**Carter, 2014 – Bay Area Legal Aid** [Timothy, The One Minute Case for a Basic Income, Montreal, 2014, <http://basicincome.org/bien/pdf/montreal2014/BIEN2014_Carter.pdf>, 6/28/17] JY [Premier]

The one minute disability rights case for a basic income: The process of applying for disability benefits is arduous, arbitrary, and demoralizing. We think we can easily tell who \*really\* needs our help, when the truth is that many – but certainly not all – people with obvious disabilities like blindness or deafness lead easier and more fulfilling lives than many people with invisible disabilities like depression, fibromyalgia, or chronic fatigue. We force people who cannot work to convince skeptical judges about how pitiful their lives are and then we label them as being either lazy frauds or useless burdens. You really cannot know what another person's life is like. To make someone prove they cannot work is to make them convince themselves they have no hope. Health insurance should include paying for specific items that are needed for a specific disability. But we all deserve our basic living expenses equally, and no one should be forced to prove it.

### AT Borders K

**The US’s belief that welfare is dependent on work spills over into debates about citizenship—no work means no inclusion**

**Zelleke 2005 – associate professor of practice of political science** [Almaz, December 2005, “Basic Income in the United States: Redefining Citizenship in the Liberal State,” Review of Social Economy, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29770344>, accessed 6/28/17] AO [Premier]

In the United States, the debate over welfare reform has been dominated by those who believe welfare should be conditional on work. This domination holds both at the level of policy, with the passage of the 1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA), and at the level of theory, with almost all welfare analysts, liberal and conservative, united on the importance of integration of poor adults into the workforce as a condition not only of liberation from poverty but also as a prerequisite to full and equal citizenship. This argument holds sway in the US not only because of its relatively full employment economy, but also because of its founding image as the land of opportunity where no barriers stand in the way of those who would work hard to achieve social, political, and economic liberty. Even among analysts of the American left, who believe that this image is mythical for many Americans, for reasons of race, education, or socio-economic background, it is hard to find any who advance an alternative conception of citizenship and independence that does not include paid employment as an essential element.

### AT Capitalism K

**A UBI breaks down capitalism. Our demand for a basic income breaks the power of the capitalist class, eliminates the coercive nature of labor, and increases the bargaining power of workers.**

**Srnicek and Williams 2015 - lecturer at City University and editor in chief of The New Stack** [Nick and Alex, Inventing the Future: Post capitalism and a World Without Work. November 17 2015, https://s3.amazonaws.com/arena-attachments/576840/68a4032cf0d4b1ffc2564332ad7c9e36.pdf,June 27, 2017] LA [Premier]

However, for our purposes the significance of UBI as a demand lies in four key interrelated factors. The first point to emphasise is that the demand for UBI is a demand for a political transformation, not just an economic one. It is often thought that UBI is simply a form of redistribution from the rich to the poor, or that it is just a measure to maintain economic growth by stimulating consumer demand. From this perspective, UBI would have impeccable reformist credentials and be little more than a glorified progressive tax system. Yet the real significance of UBI lies in the way it overturns the asymmetry of power that currently exists between labour and capital. As we saw in the discussion of surplus populations, the proletariat is defined by its separation from the means of production and subsistence. The proletariat is thereby forced to sell itself in the job market in order to gain the income necessary to survive. The most fortunate among us have the leisure to choose which job to take, but few of us have the capacity to choose no job. A basic income changes this condition, by giving the proletariat a means of subsistence without dependency on a job. 107 Workers, in other words, have the option to choose whether to take a job or not (in many ways, taking neoclassical economics at its word, and making work truly voluntary). A UBI therefore unbinds the coercive aspects of wage labour, partially decommodifies labour, and thus transforms the political relationship between labour and capital. This transformation – making work voluntary rather than coerced – has a number of significant consequences. In the first place, it increases class power by reducing slack in the labour market. Surplus populations show what happens when there are large amounts of slack in the labour market: wages fall, and employers are free to debase workers. 108 By contrast, when the labour market is tight, labour gains the political edge. The economist Michał Kalecki recognised this long ago when he argued that it explained why full employment would be resisted at every step. 109 If every worker were employed, the threat of being fired would lose its disciplinary character – there would be more than enough jobs waiting just outside. Workers would gain the upper hand, and capital would lose its political power. The same dynamic holds for a basic income: by eliminating the reliance on wage labour, workers gain control over how much labour to supply, giving them significant power in the labour market. Class power is also increased in a variety of other ways. Strikes are easier to mobilise, since workers no longer have to worry about pay being docked or dwindling strike funds. The amount of time spent working for a wage can be modified to one’s own desire, with free time spent building communities and engaging with politics. One can slow down and reflect, safely protected from the constant pressures of neoliberalism. The anxieties that surround work and unemployment are reduced with the safety net of a UBI. 110 Moreover, the demand for UBI combines the needs of the employed, the unemployed, the underemployed, migrant labour, temporary workers, students and the disabled. 111 It articulates a common interest between these groups and provides a populist orientation for them to mobilise towards. The second related feature of UBI is that it transforms precarity and unemployment from a state of insecurity to a state of voluntary flexibility. It is often forgotten that the initial push for flexible labour came from workers, as a way of demolishing the constraining permanency of traditional Fordist labour. 112 The repetitiveness of a nine-to-five job, combined with the tediousness of most work, is hardly an appealing prospect for a life-long career. The demands of care labour often require a flexible approach as well, further undermining the appeal of traditional jobs. Marx himself invokes the liberating aspects of flexible labour in his famous claim that communism ‘makes it possible for me to do one thing today and another tomorrow, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticise after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, herdsman or critic’. 113 In the face of these desires for flexibility, capital adapted and co-opted them into a new form of exploitation. Today, flexible labour simply presents itself as precarity and insecurity, rather than freedom. The UBI responds to this generalisation of precarity and transforms it from a state to be feared back into a state of liberation. Third, a basic income would necessitate a rethinking of the values attributed to different types of work. Given that workers would no longer be forced to take a job, they could instead simply reject jobs that paid too little, required too much work, offered too few benefits, or were demeaning and undignified. Low-waged work is often crass and disempowering, and under a programme of UBI it is unlikely that many would want to undertake it. The result would be that hazardous, boring and unattractive work would have to be better paid, while more rewarding, invigorating and attractive work would be less well paid. In other words, the nature of work would become a measure of its value, not merely its profitability. 114 The outcome of this revaluation would also mean that, as wages for the worst jobs rose, there would be new incentives to automate them. UBI therefore forms a positive-feedback loop with the demand for full automation. On the other hand, a basic income would not only transform the value of the worst jobs, but also go some way towards recognising the unpaid labour of most care work. In the same way that the demand for wages for housework recognised and politicised the domestic labour of women, so too does UBI recognise and politicise the generalised way in which we are all responsible for reproducing society: from informal to formal work, from domestic to public work, from individual to collective work. What is central is not productive labour, defined in either traditional Marxist or neoclassical terms, but rather the more general category of reproductive labour. 115 Given that we all contribute to the production and reproduction of capitalism, our activity deserves to be remunerated as well. 116 In recognising this, the UBI indicates a shift from remuneration based upon ability to remuneration based upon basic need. 117 All the genetic, historical and social variations that make effort a poor measure of a person’s worth are rejected here, and instead people are valued simply for being people.

#### Reforms to promote cooperative security are key catalysts to dismantle capitalism

Boston Review, 2017 (Undercommons, Freedom School in LA, May 3 2017, “No Racial Justice Without Basic Income”, Accessed on 6/29/17, http://bostonreview.net/class-inequality-race/undercommons-no-racial-justice-without-basic-income) [Premier]

Incremental adjustments to our capitalist society—such as means-tested welfare benefits, anti-gentrification, and policing reform—are important and should be fought for. But many of these approaches are perceived, sometimes accurately, to pit exploited groups against each other in zero-sum games. Taxpaying people who are not targeted by specific welfare programs represent welfare recipients as being supported by their dime; efforts to protect neighborhoods from newcomers further constrict an increasingly unaffordable housing market for outsiders; and many view the police as necessary to protect them from intimidating populations, especially youth of color. When these ways of generating antagonistic security dominate political discussions, they support the dangerous and mistaken idea that social groups must primarily protect themselves from other groups, This neglects the hidden framework of false choices that seem to constrict the viable possibilities to only various forms of antagonistic security. The result is a political climate that fails to imagine how we might build cooperative security together. UBI- capitulates to exactly these kinds of forces by secretly serving as an offensive against welfare programs and other forms of government-provided security. UBI+ asks instead that we find ways to struggle together for forms of cooperative security—security that does not sacrifice the lives and liberty of vulnerable people. Only when this is our orientation will we be in a position to dismantle racial capitalism.

#### A UBI that expands on existing programs challenges capitalism by preventing worker exploitation and promoting dignity for all workers

Boston Review, 2017 (Undercommons, Freedom School in LA, May 3 2017, “No Racial Justice Without Basic Income”, Accessed on 6/29/17, http://bostonreview.net/class-inequality-race/undercommons-no-racial-justice-without-basic-income) [Premier]

More radical challenges to racial capitalism are possible. UBI+, by guaranteeing everyone an income sufficient to live on, reframes the way society treats labor and provides security to its citizens. For example, this kind of guarantee recognizes that the labor of raising children and caring for the elderly—work done disproportionately by women—is valued as work. Currently much of this work is uncompensated, and as a result we economically and socially marginalize those who do it. In a capitalist system where economic value and overall value are often conflated, this reinforces the idea that caregiving is not an important contribution to society and penalizes people who try to do this work alongside paid work (e.g., child-unfriendly work policies, expensive child care, lack of clear leave policies for caring for children or elders). UBI- would provide a guaranteed income but eliminate programs that respond to these specific concerns, such as those provided by Social Security that target the needs of elderly and disabled people. This would effectively offer security with one hand while taking it with the other. Because it is unpaid, caregiving is seen as an unimportant contribution to society, and those who do it alongside paid work are penalized. UBI+ likewise helps provide freedom from exploitation. It contributes to freedom from harmful relationships by helping to eliminate reliance on the income of a partner who does paid work, a dynamic that often plays out in relationships between women and men. A UBI+ that is sufficient to meet basic needs, and supported by social services that strengthen its impact, will allow people to live with dignity, choices, and the kind of freedom that many in the United States seek but routinely fail to achieve.

#### UBIs are key to combat consumerism because it would allow individuals to abstain from racing toward materialism

Pateman, 2004 – prof of Political Science at UCLA [Carole, Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income. Politics and Society on March 1, 2004. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0032329203261100>] [Premier]

Ackerman and Alstott also criticize a basic income on the grounds that it “encourages a short-term consumerist perspective.”18 The only sense in which, as far as I can see, a basic income might do this is if it were introduced at a level below that required for a modest but decent standard of life. A payment below subsistence level might be seen, at least by those well above the poverty level, as merely an extra bit of discretionary income available for immediate spending. But even this would be mitigated if the tax system came into play for those at higher income levels. There seems no good reason why a basic income implemented at the level I am suggesting would encourage consumerism. Indeed, one could make the opposite case; by breaking the link between income and the labor market it would allow individuals, if they so wished, to abstain from the race to accumulate ever more material goods and help combat the identification of freedom with consumerism.

**Increased leisure time allows workers to organize radical politics against capitalism**

**Noguchi, 2004 – Associate Professor of the Columbia School of Social Work** [Eri , Michael A Lewis, , In Defense of Lazy: An Argument for Less Work, More Community, USBIG, August 2004, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265744874\_In\_Defense\_of\_Lazy\_An\_Argument\_for\_Less\_Work\_More\_Community, 6/28/17] JY [Premier]

There were some among the business classes who also understood, or rather, in their case, feared, that reduced work hours might lead to more civic participation as well, as Schor reports in the following passage: As Saturday work was contested, business “equated increased leisure … with crime, vice, the waste of man’s natural capacity, corruption, radicalism [italics added], debt, decay, degeneration, and decline.” Business warned that idleness breeds mischief – even worse – radicalism. The common people had to be kept at their desks and machines, lest they rise up against their betters (Schor, 1991, p. 74). It is clear from this passage that, at least among some businessmen, the fear of increased leisure time was precisely that workers would use that time to become more politically involved, to become more informed and active around the issues that affected them, and that that might, ultimately, lead to their participation in activities that would run counter to the interests of the business class.

**A UBI would destroy corporate greed in the welfare system by preventing skimming of the welfare budget**

**Clark 14-Independent Blogger** [Thomas, Independent Blogger specializing in economics and politics, August 15 2014, “Universal Basic Income vs the current welfare system”, Accessed on 6/26/17, <http://anotherangryvoice.blogspot.com/2014/08/universal-basic-income-sanctions.html>] [Premier]

The introduction of a system based on Universal Basic Income would eliminate the possibility of corporate outsourcing parasites skimming the welfare budget and diverting money that should be helping the most vulnerable people in society into their corporate accounts. With the massively reduced bureaucracy, and the end of sanctions backed forced labour schemes that UBI would bring about, the scope for corporate parasitism of the welfare system would be severely reduced. Of course there would still be a role for private companies looking to profit from helping people into work, but they'd have to help people train for and find the kind of work they want, rather than just hoovering up government subsidies in return for forcing them onto unpaid forced labour schemes under the threat of absolute destitution via benefits sanctions.

**A UBI is not reformist capitalism – it is a much more significant and radical transformation of the labor market that mobilizes an attack on capitalism**

**Srnicek and Williams 2015 - lecturer at City University and editor in chief of The New Stack** [Nick and Alex, Inventing the Future: Post capitalism and a World Without Work. November 17 2015, https://s3.amazonaws.com/arena-attachments/576840/68a4032cf0d4b1ffc2564332ad7c9e36.pdf,June 27, 2017] LA [Premier]

While a universal basic income may appear economically reformist, its political implications are therefore significant. It transforms precarity, it recognises social labour, it makes class power easier to mobilise, and it extends the space in which to experiment with how we organise communities and families. It is a redistribution mechanism that transforms production relations. It is an economic mechanism that changes the politics of work. And in terms of class struggle, there is little to distinguish full employment from full unemployment: both tighten the labour market, give power to labour, and make it more difficult to exploit workers. Full unemployment has the added advantages of not being reliant upon the gendered division of labour between the household and the formal economy, of not keeping workers chained to the wage relation, and of allowing workers autonomy over their lives. For all of these reasons, the classic social democratic demand for full employment should be replaced with the future-orientated demand for full unemployment.

### AT Racism K

#### A UBI spills over to address racial issues – it gives black activists money to focus on combatting racism

Boston Review, 2017 (Undercommons, Freedom School in LA, May 3 2017, “No Racial Justice Without Basic Income”, Accessed on 6/29/17, http://bostonreview.net/class-inequality-race/undercommons-no-racial-justice-without-basic-income) [Premier]

A guaranteed income would also give activists and organizers within marginalized communities more space to work on the myriad problems a basic income would not solve. Many people working for a more just world get little to no pay for their work. In a world with basic income, activists would not have to work a day job or constantly hustle to get by, but would be able to give their lives to agitating for other causes without the anxiety that comes from being financially precarious. For these reasons the Movement for Black Lives—a coalition of more than fifty black-led organizations seeking “radical transformation, not reactionary reform” for racial justice—released a six-point platform that included reparations for slavery and the institutional exclusion and disenfranchisement that followed. UBI+ alone would go a long way to improving security for all marginalized individuals and families in the United States, but a UBI+ coupled with a broader social vision of cooperative security, such as the one advanced by the Movement for Black Lives, could change the game. This vision would, wherever possible, embrace radical forms of cooperative security, from universal health care coverage to the abolition of both police and prisons.

# Theory/Topicality

## Definitions

### UBI

**A UBI must meet three criteria – it is to individuals regardless of their income or work.**

**Danaher, 2013 - a lecturer at the National University of Ireland**  [John Philosophical Disquisitions, December 17, Libertarianism and the Basic Income (Part One) <http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2013/12/libertarianism-and-basic-income-part-one.html>, Accessed June 27, 2017] LA [Premier]

1. What is a Universal Basic Income? The UBI is a (somewhat) radical proposal for reforming the way in which welfare payments are made. Following the work of Daniel Raventos we can characterise the proposal in the following manner: Unconditional Basic Income: An income that is unconditionally granted to all members of a social group on an individual basis, without means test or work requirement. It is a form of minimum income guarantee that differs from those that now exist in three important ways: It is paid to individuals rather than households; It is paid irrespective of income from other sources It is paid without requiring the performance of any work or the willingness to accept a job if offered. This is a general characterisation.

#### Contextual sources define a UBI to include eliminating existing programs

**Kleiner 2016- Political Economy Researcher** (Dmytri, 8/8/16, “Universal Basic Income is a neoliberal plot to make you poorer”, accessed on 6/28/17, <http://www.furtherfield.org/features/articles/universal-basic-income-neoliberal-plot-make-you-poorer>) [Premier]

To the Cato Institute, the elimination of social programs is a part of the meaning of Universal Income. In an article about the Finish pilot project, the Institute defines UBI as “scrapping the existing welfare system and distributing the same cash benefit to every adult citizen without additional strings or eligibility criteria”. And in fact, the options being considered by Finland are constrained to limiting the amount of the basic income to the savings from the programs it would replace.

**UBI is defined by 3 components-individual, universal, unconditional payments**

**van Parijs, 2012 – Professor of Economic and Social Ethics at the University of Leuven** [Philippe, Yannick Vanderborght, Basic Income in a Globalised Economy, Social Justice Ireland, 7/13/12, https://www.socialjustice.ie/sites/default/files/file/2012-07-03%20-%20Book%20FULL%20TEXT%20-%20FINAL%20-%20Does%20the%20European%20Social%20Model%20Have%20a%20Future.pdf#page=40, 6/28/17] JY [Premier]

A basic income is an income unconditionally granted to all members of a society on an individual basis, without means test or work requirement. 11 It is a form of minimum income guarantee that is unconditional in [with] three distinct senses: (1) individual: the right to it and its level are independent of household composition; (2) universal : it is paid irrespective of any income from other sources, which can therefore be added to the basis it provides; (3) free of counterpart : it is paid without requiring the performance of any work or the willingness to accept a job if offered.

**All definitions of a UBI include unconditional government cash transfers to individuals**

**Zon, 2016 – Director of Policy and Research at Maytree Foundation**  [Noah, “Policy brief: Would a universal basic income reduce poverty?”, *Maytree Foundation*, August 16, 2016, https://medium.com/@maytree\_canada/policy-brief-would-a-universal-basic-income-reduce-poverty-cd85fd64dbac. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

What is “Basic Income,” anyway? It depends who you ask. Basic income is an idea that has many names (including universal basic income, basic income guarantee, guaranteed annual income or guaranteed minimum income) and many definitions. The common theme of each of these definitions involves having the government transfer money to individuals or households without strings attached about how it is used or how people spend their time. The basic idea is that rather than the current suite of sometimes complex programs with different rules to get support if you need it (e.g., social assistance, subsidized housing, rebates for energy costs), the government would simply provide regular cash transfers to people, letting them direct that money towards their needs. Beyond that general idea, there are some fundamental differences between different proposals for a basic income.

**A UBI is a monetary grant to all within a geopolitical space**

**Danaher, 2014 - a lecturer at the National University of Ireland, Galway** [John Danaher, Widerquist on Freedom and the Basic Income, Sunday, July 13, 2014, <http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/widerquist-on-freedom-and-basic-income.html>, June 27, 2017] [Premier]

This post is part of an ongoing series I’m doing on the unconditional basic income (UBI). The UBI is an income grant payable to a defined group of people (e.g. citizens, or adults, or everyone) within a defined geo-political space. The income grant could be set at various levels, with most proponents thinking it should be at or above subsistence level, or at least at the maximum that is affordable in a given society. In my most recent post, I looked at Van Parijs’s famous defence of the UBI. Today, I look at Widerquist’s critique of Parijs, as well as his own preferred justification for the UBI.

### Targeted =/= UBI

**A targeted basic income is not a “UBI” because it is not universal**

**Calder, 2017 – welfare policy analyst at The Cato Institute** [Vanessa, Universal Basic Income — Disease or Cure? This article appeared in Cayman Financial Review on April 26, 2017. <https://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/universal-basic-income-disease-or-cure>] [Premier]

The practical realities of budget constraints inevitably lead advocates — at least in the real world — to consider whether to limit the eligible population to strictly low-income individuals. However, this leaves UBI looking a lot less “universal” and a lot more like your average cash transfer welfare program, which fell out of favor in the U.S. in the 1990s.

## Normal Means

### Amendment

#### Normal Means for a UBI would require a constitutional amendment

**Zwolinski 2014 – Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego** [Matt, The Pragmatic Libertarian Case for a Basic Income Guarantee. the Cato Institute on August 4, 2014. https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/04/matt-zwolinski/pragmatic-libertarian-case-basic-income-guarantee] JN [Premier]

No libertarian would wish for a BIG as an addition to the currently existing welfare state. But what about as a replacement for it? Such a revolutionary overhaul of the welfare state would almost certainly require a constitutional amendment, both to insulate debate somewhat from the pleas and protests of special interests, and to make it considerably more difficult to renege on the deal afterwards. Charles Murray has given us a rough idea of what such an amendment might look like: Henceforth, federal, state, and local governments shall make no law nor establish any program that provides benefits to some citizens but not to others. All programs currently providing such benefits are to be terminated. The funds formerly allocated to them are to be used instead to provide every citizen with a cash grant beginning at age twenty-one and continuing until death. The annual value of the cash grant at the program’s outset is to be $10,000.

### Drug Tests

#### Normal means for a UBI does not include drug testing or means testing

**Zwolinski 2014 – Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego** [Matt, The Pragmatic Libertarian Case for a Basic Income Guarantee. the Cato Institute on August 4, 2014. https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/04/matt-zwolinski/pragmatic-libertarian-case-basic-income-guarantee] JN [Premier]

For purposes of this essay, I will use the phrase “Basic Income Guarantee” quite broadly to refer to a wide range of distinct policy proposals, including Milton Friedman’s Negative Income Tax (NIT), Bruce Ackerman and Anne Alstott’s proposal for a Stakeholder Grant, the Thomas Paine / Henry George inspired idea of a citizen’s dividend, the Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend, and Charles Murray’s 2006 proposal for the government to write a $10,000 each year to every American citizen over the age of twenty-one.[1] There is, of course, quite a bit of variation among these plans in terms of cost, payouts, implementation, and so on. Despite these differences, however, they all have in common two important features. First, they involve a cash grant with no strings attached. Unlike other welfare programs which encourage or require recipients to consume certain specific kinds of good – such as medical care, housing, or food – a BIG simply gives people cash, and leaves them free to spend it, or save it, in whatever way they choose. Second, a BIG is an unconditional grant for which every citizen (or at least every adult citizen) is eligible. It is not means-tested; checks are issued to poor and rich alike (though on some proposals payments to the rich will be partially or fully recaptured through the tax system). Beneficiaries do not have to pass a drug test or demonstrate that they are willing to work. If you’re alive, and a citizen, you get a check. Period.

### Funding

#### Normal means for funding a UBI is taxation – most proposals have some form of a tax

**Pressman, 2005 – Prof of economics at Monmouth Univ** [Steven, with Michael Lewis and Karl Widerquist The Basic Income Guarantee and Social Economics. This article appeared in Review of Social Economy on December 2005. http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/29770341.pdf?refreqid=search%3A9330359b12bad0e394957e75c30d95e6] JN [Premier]

Basic Income A Basic Income is an income unconditionally paid to all on an individual basis, without means test or work requirement. It is a guaranteed income. A full basic in- come would set the guaranteed income above the poverty line and would replace all other forms of public assistance. A partial basic income scheme is one in which the level is set below the poverty level and in which some form of public assistance is provided to increase the incomes of those who still have inadequate income. Basic income proposals are often financed by a flat tax on all other personal incomes, with the elimination of all or most tax deductions in order to widen the tax base. However, a flat tax is not the only method of financing such a scheme. Both a progressive tax on income and alternative taxation regimes (such as an energy tax) are alternative methods.

### Trade Off?

#### Canceling existing programs makes a big difference to solvency

Boston Review, 2017 (Undercommons, Freedom School in LA, May 3 2017, “No Racial Justice Without Basic Income”, Accessed on 6/29/17, http://bostonreview.net/class-inequality-race/undercommons-no-racial-justice-without-basic-income) [Premier]

In 1966 the Black Panthers released their Ten Point Platform, a series of demands and calls to action that offered a clear statement of their political orientation. The second point of the program demanded that the federal government provide either full employment or a guaranteed income. In 2016 this call was renewed by the Movement for Black Lives. What the Panthers understood in 1966 is what the Movement for Black Lives understands today: capitalism in the United States functions by creating, maintaining, and exploiting class and racial differences to produce antagonistic forms of security. Antagonistic security is security that is created for some people by processes that work against the ability of others to access resources such as wealth and political power. For those on its receiving end, it often generates precarity, from barbed wire fences to predatory police patrols. A basic income that supplemented existing welfare structures could make everyone safer while ending the most pernicious forms of policing. In the right context, basic income has the potential to expand cooperative security, which is security with others: the kind of security that a dam provides a nearby village, or that mass vaccination schemes provide a community that develops herd immunity. However, a basic income advanced as a replacement for labor regulations and other security-enhancing government programs—“UBI-,” we call it—will only further exploit those whose lives are made most precarious by this system. Conversely, a basic income that supplements existing or new welfare structures—“UBI+”—could radically redistribute security, remove incentives for the most pernicious forms of policing, and create the conditions for a more thorough overhaul of the current political system.

#### Some advocates defend eliminating social security, Medicaid, and Medicare; others say UBI is just an addition

Collins, 2017 – senior scholar at the Institute for Policy Studies [Chuck Collins, The Case for a Universal Basic Income Blogging Our Great Divide, written April 21, 2017, <https://inequality.org/great- divide/argument-universal- basic-income/>, accessed June 26, 2017] [Premier]

Stern, in fact, rather enjoys the “strange bedfellows” convergence that’s coming together around the UBI idea. He reminds us that UBI supporters in the past have included everyone from Richard Nixon and John Kenneth Galbraith to Ralph Nader and Milton Friedman. In pursuit of a UBI, Stern’s even willing “to cash out a large number of the anti-poverty programs my liberal and progressive colleagues support.” The prospect of ditching food stamps, energy assistance, and other social programs has been attracting libertarian-leaning right-wing think tanks to the UBI notion for quite some time. Hard-core libertarians would like to go a giant step further and also eliminate Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare. Stern balks at that extension. Many progressive UBI supporters, unlike Stern, reject the idea that a Universal Basic Income can ever adequately replace any significant part of the existing ecosystem of support programs that serve to help “raise the floor.” They see the UBI instead as a smart addition to this ecosystem. This ecosystem needs strengthening, not replacement. We need universal treatment on demand for addiction, for instance, and early health care intervention for learning disabilities and mental illness.

## Specification

### Neg

#### The affirmative must specify the details of implementation – that is key ground for solvency and libertarian debates.

**Danaher, 2013 - a lecturer at the National University of Ireland**  [John Philosophical Disquisitions, December 17, Libertarianism and the Basic Income (Part One) <http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2013/12/libertarianism-and-basic-income-part-one.html>, Accessed June 27, 2017] LA [Premier]

There are a number of key desiderata that we will need to settle before a UBI like this can be implemented in practice. We will need to decide exactly who is entitled to the payment. The general characterisation says “all members of a social group”, but this will typically exclude[s] children and may exclude (though this is more controversial) non-citizens. We will need to decide who pays the income. The obvious candidate would be the state, but technically any public institution could do the job. We will also need to decide how often the income is paid. One of the main differences between the UBI and the stakeholder grant proposal is that the former is paid at semi-regular intervals, whereas the latter is a one-off payment at a certain point in an individual’s life. Proponents of the UBI will need to decide on the payment schedule. Finally, we will need to decide how it will be funded. Some kind of tax-and-transfer scheme would be the most obvious, but what exactly should be taxed? As we shall see, the answer to this final question is particularly important to libertarians. Many people view the UBI as an unrealistic and impractical proposal, particularly when they first come across it. But quite a bit of work has been done on how it could be work, how its negative incentive effects may be less than you might think, and on its lower administrative and bureaucratic burdens when compared to traditional selective forms of welfare payment. A UBI currently exists in the state of Alaska. It has been paid since 1982 to all residents of the state (with certain restrictions). The fund through which it is paid was established in 1976 and derives most of its income from the state’s oil industry. The amount paid per annum is quite low, hovering between $800 and $2000 for the past 25 years. A more radical UBI will be put before the Swiss people in the near future. It proposes that $2800 dollars be paid to each citizen per month. This amounts to approximately 42% of the GDP per capita in that country.

#### Specifying the type of UBI is essential to productive discussion of basic income.

**Zon, 2016 – Director of Policy and Research at Maytree Foundation**  [Noah, “Policy brief: Would a universal basic income reduce poverty?”, *Maytree Foundation*, August 16, 2016, https://medium.com/@maytree\_canada/policy-brief-would-a-universal-basic-income-reduce-poverty-cd85fd64dbac. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

As basic income guarantees capture the public’s and policymakers’ attention, the distinction between these approaches has remained blurry. So have some important questions such as whether these guarantees would cover the needs of seniors and children as well as adults, and even whether a basic income is intended to replace or complement existing programs. To have a productive conversation about which (if any) version of basic income offers promise, we need to be clear about what is being proposed.

**AFF needs to specify details concerning the implementation of a UBI-simply defending the concept of a UBI ignores the underlying range of details and is too vague making the AFF a moving target**

**Wispelaere, 15 – Policy Research Fellow at the Institute for Policy Research at the University of Bath** [Jurgen, , The Struggle for Strategy: On the Politics of the Basic Income Proposal, Sagepub, 2015, <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jurgen_Wispelaere/publication/277133686_The_Struggle_for_Strategy_On_the_> Politics\_of\_the\_Basic\_Income\_Proposal/links/57d1701308ae0c0081e0144f/The-Struggle-for-Strategy-On-the-Politics-of-the-Basic-Income-Proposal.pdf, 6/27/17] JY [Premier]

The standard definition excludes many operational dimensions of the BI idea that need to be explicated and decided in full before moving from the general idea to an actual policy proposal. For instance, the choice of paying a BI on a monthly basis as part of a refundable tax credit, or once a year after the assessment of one’s tax liability has been conducted, is likely to impact differently on distinct groups of beneficiaries (De Wispelaere and Stirton, 2011). And different political factions are likely to take contrasting positions on this matter, as argued in De Wispelaere and Stirton (2013). Or take the important question of the level of the BI grant, which Van Parijs (1995) emphatically insists may (but does not have to) match the poverty line. This is as straightforward a political issue as they come, in Harold Lasswell’s (1950) classic definition of politics as ‘who gets what, when and how’, and inevitably requires the political resolution of strongly opposing views. These two considerations no doubt cause friction among the different political factions within a BI coalition, but even more serious opposition will arise when considering which programmes will have to be sacrificed in return for a broad commitment to support BI. Left-wing BI advocates (e.g. Raventós, 2007; Wright, 2006) will promote a larger level of BI as well as resist the rolling back of many support programmes, while supporters from the political right (e.g. Buchanan, 1997; Murray, 2006) are likely to insist on a smaller grant combined with a more extensive ‘recalibrating’ (i.e. abolition) of the existing welfare state. Turning our gaze away from the general idea of a BI and onto its policy detail shines a bright light on the deep ideological tensions inherent in different BI models. The resulting problem of persistent political division eats into the shared basis for building a stable and lasting coalition of progressive and conservative BI advocates.11 Progressive BI advocates in particular seem attracted to this idea of a ‘grand BI coalition’ that includes both progressive and conservative supporters, in large part because they believe the progressive form would eventually emerge from the ensuing conflict over policy detail (Barry, 2001; Van Parijs, 2004). The strategy seems to rely on something like the ‘veil of vagueness’ (Gibson and Goodin, 1999), in which we deliberately hide policy detail to reach agreement at a higher level of generality – in this case, BI in its abstract form. Under a veil of vagueness we purposefully leave the detailed operational decisions to the next stage of political negotiation, possibly to be dealt with through administrative discretion (Huber and Shipan, 2002; Riccucci et al., 2004). The advantage of this strategy appears straightforward: by locking the idea of a BI in place, we have committed the different political factions of the grand coalition to a path that will likely deliver the full progressive version over time.

#### It is critical to define the details of a UBI or else we can’t measure its benefits

**Zon, 2016 – Director of Policy and Research at Maytree Foundation**  [Noah, “Policy brief: Would a universal basic income reduce poverty?”, *Maytree Foundation*, August 16, 2016, https://medium.com/@maytree\_canada/policy-brief-would-a-universal-basic-income-reduce-poverty-cd85fd64dbac. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

As a policy idea, a universal basic income is not new. The idea was popular in the 1960s and 70s, backed by figures ranging from Martin Luther King Jr. to Richard Nixon. Canada famously ran a pilot project called MINCOME in Manitoba in the 1970s, and there were also a handful of other small, similar experiments in the U.S. during this period. After a long stretch waiting in the wings, the idea of a universal basic income has returned to centre stage. However, the shared enthusiasm can be misleading. When you scratch the surface, you find very quickly that people are talking about very different things with different merits. At one end of the spectrum, some envision a transformation of our current social safety net, replacing core components (such as social housing) by giving people cash transfers instead. At the other end of the spectrum, some are positioning basic income as an opportunity to significantly augment the current safety net with new investment. So before we can talk about whether basic income is the right solution, we need to start with the basics — what exactly are we are talking about? That’s a conversation worth having. There are some powerful goals behind the case for basic income including: Guaranteeing a minimum income that allows people to maintain a decent standard of living regardless of their circumstances; Strengthening our social safety net by addressing its gaps and weaknesses; and Making sure that as our economy changes and creates new opportunities, those who are displaced do not get left behind.

#### Specifying the amount of a UBI is key to policy discussion

**Henderson, 2015 –prof of economics at the Naval Postgraduate School's School of Public Policy** [David R., A Philosophical Economist's Case against a Government-Guaranteed Basic Income. This article appeared in The Independent Review in the Spring of 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/24563064.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A79bf90b3116741c8d2dcf25fb3a5e858] JN [Premier]

To argue about a policy, it helps to know the specifics of the policy being considered. In an August 21, 2014, email, Matt Zwolinski told me that although he "can't stand too firmly behind any particular dollar value" for a basic-income guarantee (BIG), he had in mind $10,000 annually for every U.S. citizen age twenty-one or older. That is the proposal I discuss throughout this essay, unless I specify otherwise. The specifics matter. In 2013, about 230 million people in the United States were age twenty or older.1 Of all U.S. residents, 87.1 percent were born in the United States (U.S. Census Bureau 2014). Of the foreign-born people, a substantial per centage would have, like me, become U.S. citizens. So a lower-bound estimate of the percentage of residents who are citizens would be 90 percent. Applying this factor to the 229.8 million adults gives us 206.8 million adult U.S. citizens. The annual BIG expenditure for U.S. citizens, then, would be approximately $2.068 trillion. This expenditure estimate does not include any expenditure for administering the program or for monitoring for fraud. In other words, it is a minimum estimate. Zwolinski has argued elsewhere that a BIG "would be much better than the current welfare state." He writes: "Current federal social welfare programs in the United States are an expensive, complicated mess. According to Michael Tanner, the federal government spent more than $668 billion on over one hundred und twenty-six anti-poverty programs in 2012. When you add in the $284 billion spent by state and local governments, that amounts to $20,610 for every poor person in America" (2013b, emphasis in original). He wonders, "Wouldn't it be better just to write the poor a check?"

# Negative – Consequentialism

## Counterplans

### Basic Renters Income

#### A Basic Rental Income given to all renters funded through a land tax contingent on rising land value provides a basic income

**Painter, 15 – Leader of the RSA’s Policy Development** [Anthony, Creative citizen, creative state: the principled and pragmatic case for a Universal Basic Income, RSA, December 2015, <https://www.thersa.org/globalassets/reports/rsa_basic_income_20151216.pdf>, 6/27/17] JY [Premier]

The third option which the RSA proposes for further exploration is the introduction of a ‘Basic Rental Income’. The Basic Rental Income would not be 47 Citizen’s Income Trust, “Citizen’s Income: An Introducation.” 48 Graeme Cooke and Bill Davies, “Benefits to Bricks: Mobilising Local Leadership to Build Homes and Control the Benefits Bill,” 2014, www.ippr. org/files/publications/pdf/benefits-to-bricks\_June2014.pdf. 49 It should be noted that there is a current anomaly between £100,000 and £121,200 per annum where the personal allowance is withdrawn at a rate of £1 for every £2 earned. This gives a marginal tax rate that is higher than 47 percent. See www.gov.uk/income-tax-rates/income-over-100000 Creative citizen, creative state 34 POWER TO CREATE income-contingent and therefore does not have the same disincentive or perverse incentive (eg family break-up) effects as housing benefit and council tax credit. A Basic Rental Income based upon local market conditions (and this would vary from year to year) would be granted to every individual who rented rather than owned a property. It could be linked to continuous residency (three years minimum say) to increase local cohesion. Local authorities would retain their statutory duty to house the homeless and should be given freedom to borrow and invest in new low-cost housing. The Support for Mortgage Interest Scheme for house-owners who are out of work would continue as now. A Basic Rental Income would have cost implications. The source of funding for additional cost should be those who have gained the most from increases in housing equity. Philosophically, the justification for this has roots in Thomas Paine’s argument in favour of a ‘basic endowment’. The reason that there have been large gains for some in the housing market whilst others struggle is because our common institutions have failed to provide enough housing to enable affordable rents and housing ownership to be even more widespread. The introduction of a land value tax or similar to fund any shortfall in the Basic Rental Income is therefore justified on the basis of gains received by a few from the institutions of society and its collective action failures rather than through the individual’s endeavour. This is a means of redistributing the economic rents that have arisen from the institutional structures of land and property. Some such as Adair Turner argues that cooling the housing market should be a ‘primary policy objective’ from an economic stability perspective.50 This policy would help quell some house price inflation as the demand for higher prices may be somewhat quelled. Furthermore, both a land value tax and the Basic Rental Income together could provide for even more creative living 50 Adair Turner, Between Debt and the Devil: Money, Credit, and Fixing Global Finance (Princeton University Press, 2015), www.press.princeton. edu/titles/10546.html. Creative citizen, creative state 35 POWER TO CREATE spaces. Co-operatives could come together by aggregating Basic Rental Incomes giving power to individuals acting collectively to design these new creative living spaces. This opportunity could be open to all. The beauty of this system, in principle, is that the imposition of land value tax would release further land for development. The Basic Rental Income therefore becomes empowering in a way that Housing Benefit is not given its stigma and the lack of security it provides. This proposal could revolutionise the way many people live further enhancing freedom, creativity and security. A Basic Rental Income is for further modelling and exploration that is beyond the scope of this paper. j. Basic Income - the principled case The idea of a Basic Income is far from new.51 In fact, it has been around for many centuries. It can be found in the ideas of Thomas Paine in his notion of endowment funded by land rents. JS Mill articulated a similar idea though funded from productive assets. The liberal peer Juilet Rhys-Williams proposed a conditional Basic Income (conditional on availability to work) as an alternative to the Beveridgean system in 1942. The economist James Meade and the historian and political economist GDH Cole advocated a ‘social dividend’. Cole may have coined the phrase ‘Basic Income’.52Cole’s justification relies on the social basis of current production as a common inheritance: “Social heritage of inventiveness and skill incorporated in the stage of advancement and education reached in the arts of production.” 53 The American writer and entrepreneur, Peter Barnes, deploys a similar argument when he advocates taxing use of common assets such as the environment (the air), financial infrastructure, intellectual property protection, and electromagnetic 51 For an excellent historical summary see: BIEN, “History of Basic Income,” Basic Income Earth Network (BIEN), accessed December 3, 2015, www. basicincome.org/basic-income/history/. 52 G.D.H Cole, Money: Its Present and Future (London: Cassell & Co, 1944). 53 BIEN, “History of Basic Income.” Creative citizen, creative state 36 POWER TO CREATE spectrum to fund a US Basic Dividend.54

### Children

#### Providing a basic income only to children solves for poverty and avoids stigmatization and rewards domestic work with income

**Konczal, 2016 – Fellow at the Roosevelt Institute** [Mike, “These Policies Could Move America Toward a Universal Basic Income”, *The Nation*, August 15-22, 2016, https://www.thenation.com/article/these-policies-could-move-america-toward-a-universal-basic-income/. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

Still, a guaranteed basic income would require a big shift in perspective among American voters. What we need is a policy (or perhaps several of them) that benefits Americans while destigmatizing the concept of giving people no-strings-attached cash. Think of it as a basic-income starter kit, which would also include things like a $12-an-hour minimum wage and generous paid leave. And there’s one policy in particular that should lead: a basic income for children.∂ Often called a “child allowance,” this would be a small cash payment made regularly to parents with children. We know that access to resources makes a major difference in the development of children. Yet 17 percent of children live in poverty according to the Century Foundation, with nearly 5 percent living in deep poverty (defined as just 50 percent of the poverty line). There are a lot of ways to structure such a program, but the idea is that any parents with a child would have a guaranteed level of income regardless of whether they work for wages. Unless you’re a stone-cold Randian, you probably don’t think 3-year-olds should survive only on the wages they can earn.∂ Since this allowance would be universal, it would avoid much of the stigma associated with the welfare system dismantled by former president Bill Clinton in the 1990s. Politically, it would counter the argument that people with basic incomes will frivolously play video games, cease contributing to society, and cause the decline of Western civilization. Practically, it would reward the essential labor that takes place within the household—work that the capitalist system relies on, but never pays for. Taking care of kids is hard work.∂ Such a program is clearly workable. Other countries, like Canada and England, have child allowances, and they’re very effective. Estimates from the Century Foundation argue that a $2,500-a-year child allowance would lift 5.5 million children out of poverty. That allowance would cost $100 billion a year—a hefty sum, but still less than 20 percent of the military’s budget, and about as much as it costs us to subsidize the wealthy by allowing them to pay lower taxes on capital income.

### Deregulation

#### A counterplan of deregulation of the drug war, policing and occupational licensing solves the harms of the case – this is comparative with the UBI

**Henderson, 2015 –prof of economics at the Naval Postgraduate School's School of Public Policy** [David R., A Philosophical Economist's Case against a Government-Guaranteed Basic Income. This article appeared in The Independent Review in the Spring of 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/24563064.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A79bf90b3116741c8d2dcf25fb3a5e858] JN [Premier]

Do Libertarian Opponents of a BIG Advocate "Doing Nothing at All"? In arguing for a BIG, Zwolinski, as noted earlier, refers to the alternative of "doing nothing at all" and finds this alternative "imperfect from the standpoint of justice." I agree. Fortunately, much can be done to reduce injustice. Let's end the drug war. As noted, the drug war is extremely unjust. Ending it by allowing the production, sale, import, and advertising of drugs—and by letting out of prison the hundreds of thousands of people currently incarcerated for simply buying, selling, or producing illegal drugs—would go a long way to reduce future injustice. Occupational licensing, whereby local, state, and federal governments insist that people be licensed before they can practice in one of about eight hundred occupations, prevents people, many of them at below-median income, from working in some of those occupations (see Kleiner 2000). Morris Kleiner (2000), the leading authority on occupational licensing, estimated in 2008 that 23 percent of U.S. workers were required to get state licenses, up from just 5 percent in 1950 (Simon 2011). Let's end occupational licensing. Restrictions on building housing, especially on both U.S. coasts, cause the prices of millions of houses to be hundreds of thousands of dollars higher than they need be (Glaeser and Gyourko 2002). Let's end those restrictions. Let's end asset forfeiture, which allows police to grab the assets of tens of thousands of people who are not even charged with a crime (Williams et al. 2010, 30). I have just begun. The web of regulation—at all levels of government in the United States—makes it difficult for people to start or expand businesses. Let's end all of those regulations that don't address an important negative externality. And even for those regulations that do address important negative externalities, let's regulate only narrowly, with regulations that directly address the externalities. Will all this dismantling of regulations be difficult? Yes, it will. And just as I have criticized advocates of a BIG for assuming that the public-choice problems with their proposals are large, they may rightly criticize me because the public-choice problems with my proposals are large. Imagine, for example, the difficulty of fight ing off unions that represent prison guards and the millions of people whose houses are worth hundreds of thousands of dollars more because of restrictions on building. But that's not the final word. First, if we fight to end these regulations, we will know that we are engaged in a just cause, something that is less clear if we fight for a BIG. Second, our resources to fight for or against anything are scarce. If we fight for a BIG, we will divert time and money away from fighting against unjust regulations. That is not a good trade-off.

### Means Testing

#### It’s better to guarantee a basic income ONLY to those with incomes below a certain level - it establishes a universal floor of income and is less costly.

**Tanner, 2016 – Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute** [Michael D., “The Basic Income Guarantee: Simplicity, but at What Cost?” Cato Institute, August 26 2014, accessed on June 28 2017 https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/26/basic-income-guarantee-simplicity-what-cost] NJT [Premier]

Moreover, whatever the initial size of the UBI, there will be enormous political pressure to increase it. A UBI would establish as both a legal and a philosophical concept that every American citizen is entitled to a minimum income - exacted from the taxpayers. Once that “right” is established, the political process will inevitably expand it. Murray argues that $10,000 is the correct amount. But how long before some politician comes along and says, “No one can live on $10,000. We need to make it $11,000.” Soon another politician, not wanting to be thought less compassionate than the first, will propose $12,000. There would also be pressure to “carve-out” additional payments to certain groups, like families with a person with a disability or some kind of long-term illness, adjusting for age (since the elderly have higher health care expenses), and so on. We could then get to the point that we have moved far away from the unconditional universal cash grant, to some extent sacrificing the very simplicity that makes up part of the UBI’s appeal.∂ The more affordable alternative would be to make the grant available only to those with incomes below some predefined level. While under this approach the grant itself would not be universal, it would nevertheless establish a universal floor of income below which no American would be allowed to fall. Friedman’s negative income tax takes this approach. Similarly, Murray would begin to tax back a portion of benefits for families with earned income above $25,000.

#### UBI needs to means test—otherwise it’s a waste that could be used on more important human capital.

**Aiyar, 2016 – research fellow at the Cato Institute** [Swaminathan S. Anklesaria, “Universal Basic Income Is Neither Desirable Nor Practical”, Cato Institute, August 31 2016, accessed on June 28 2017 https://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/universal-basic-income-neither-desirable-nor-practical] NJT [Premier]

Providing human capital to the poor is far more important than cash grants. Providing equality of opportunity is far more important than doles.∂ I oppose the idea as conceptually flawed and impractical. My ideal is an empowered citizenry that takes pride in standing on its own feet and not depending on government doles. The government needs to support this with high-quality public goods and safety nets. That’s not easy, but nor is any other ideal.∂ I reject as absurd a UBI that benefits Mukesh Ambani, Ratan Tata and illiterate villagers equally. Universal rights are fine if they cost no money (like free speech or religion). But entitlements are not rights, and should be restricted to the needy.∂ Targeted schemes have been very leaky in India, with many errors of inclusion (of the undeserving) and exclusion (of the deserving). Universal schemes have fewer errors. But if UBI, to reach the bottom half, provides an equal benefit to the top half, that locks in a 50 per cent leakage.∂ To help overcome inequality and poverty, the government must finance or provide public goods that promote equality of opportunity. Every village should have a good school and health centre, electricity, pukka roads, telecom, easy access to safety nets, a good police-judicial system and administrators that quickly redress grievances. That’s a much better goal than a cash dole for all. India’s greatest inequality is not in income but in opportunity. The elite effortlessly reproduce themselves, and even mediocrities flourish because they have access to the best education, medical services and connections to political and business networks. By contrast, the brightest in villages have scant chance of progress because of pathetic government services that keep them functionally illiterate and unable to develop human capital. A small cash dole will be a palliative, but not a cure for this entrenched inequality of opportunity.

#### Making a UBI universal does not increase its security – means tested programs have more political support

**Greenstein 2016- president of The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities** [Robert, Commentary: Universal Basic Income May Sound Attractive But, If It Occurred, Would Likelier Increase Poverty Than Reduce It, May 31, 2016, <http://www.cbpp.org/poverty-and-opportunity/commentary-universal-basic-income-may-sound-attractive-but-if-it-occurred?version=meter>, June 29, 2017] CL [Premier]

Universal vs. Means-Tested Programs Some UBI supporters stress that it would be universal. One often hears that means-tested programs eventually get crushed politically while universal programs do well. But the evidence doesn’t support that belief. While cash aid for poor people who aren’t working has fared poorly politically, means-tested programs as a whole have done well. Recent decades have witnessed large expansions of SNAP, Medicaid, the EITC, and other programs. If anything, means-tested programs have fared somewhat better than universal programs in the last several decades. Since 1980, policymakers in Washington and in a number of states have cut unemployment insurance, contributing to a substantial decline in the share of jobless Americans — now below 30 percent — who receive unemployment benefits. In addition, the 1983 Social Security deal raised the program’s retirement age from 65 to 67, ultimately generating a 14 percent benefit cut for all beneficiaries, regardless of the age at which someone begins drawing benefits. Meanwhile, means-tested benefits overall have substantially expanded despite periodic attacks from the right. The most recent expansion occurred in December when policymakers made permanent significant expansions of the EITC and the low-income part of the Child Tax Credit that were due to expire after 2017. In recent decades, conservatives generally have been more willing to accept expansions of means-tested programs than universal ones, largely due to the substantially lower costs they carry (which means they exert less pressure on total government spending and taxes). The record of recent decades thus points to an alternative course — pushing for steady incremental gains through available mechanisms, including means-tested programs, to provide as much of a floor as possible for Americans of lesser means.

#### Prefer welfare programs that target those who can’t help themselves—anything else is wasteful.

**Caplan 17- Professor of Economics at George Mason University** [Brian, Professor of Econ at George Mason University, February 21 2017, “A UBI is worse than Welfare”, Accessed on 6/27/17, https://fee.org/articles/ubi-is-even-worse-than-welfare/] JC [Premier]

The UBI is an extremely wasteful form of forced charity. Helping the small minority of people who can't help themselves doesn't cost much. Giving an unconditional grant to every citizen wastes an enormous amount of money. If you were running a private charity, it would never even occur to you to "help everyone," because it's such a frivolous use of scarce charitable resources. Instead, you'd target spending to do the most good. And unlike the UBI, the status quo makes some effort to so target its resources.

#### The Status quo targets those who need assistance in order to minimize costs; a UBI is just frivolous spending to those who don’t need the monetary boost

**Caplan 17- Professor of Economics at George Mason University** [Brian, Professor of Econ at George Mason University, February 21 2017, “A UBI is worse than Welfare”, Accessed on 6/27/17, https://fee.org/articles/ubi-is-even-worse-than-welfare/] JC [Premier]

My claim: The Universal Basic Income is indeed worse than the status quo. In fact, all the fundamental criticisms of the welfare state apply with even greater force Some forced charity is more unjust than other forced charity. Forcing people to help others who can't help themselves - like kids from poor families or the severely disabled - is at least defensible. Forcing people to help everyone is not. And for all its faults, at least the status quo makes some effort to target people who can't help themselves. The whole idea of the Universal Basic Income, in contrast, is of course, to give money to everyone whether they need it or not. Of course, the UBI formula normally reduces the net payment as income rises; but if a perfectly able-bodied person chooses never to work, the UBI gravy train never stops.

### Monthly Turnover

#### A monthly turnover UBI program results in more money going into the economy than any other plan due to constant circulation

**Henry 14- Independent Researcher** [Malcom, Independent private researcher, Exact date of publication unknown, “How to Fund a Universal Basic Income”, Centre for Welfare Reform, Accessed on 6/27/17, http://www.centreforwelfarereform.org/library/by-date/how-to-fund-a-universal-basic-income.html] JC [Premier]

Our current system attempts to distribute money as a combination of wages, dividends, interest, and welfare payments but all of these methods are precarious or inadequate, or both. This is where I came across the idea of a universal basic income which seemed to me to be an ideal mechanism for distributing money throughout the economy on a regular basis. In order to ensure that the money flows through the economy and doesn’t get siphoned off to rot in our bank accounts my version of UBI has some novel features. First it’s paid into dedicated individual UBI accounts from which we have to spend it within a calendar month. Any UBI money that you fail to spend or transfer out of your UBI account before the end of the month disappears – use it or lose it. The other feature of the UBI account is that you can’t pay any money into it. The only money that can enter the account is your monthly UBI payment. So we have a steady flow of money being distributed as UBI and spent (or transferred) into the economy, thanks to the use-it-or-lose-it feature. We now need a collection mechanism that gathers money from the economy to refill the UBI pot ready for the start of the following month. Our current collection methods include gross profits (used by businesses to pay wages, dividends and interest), taxation and government borrowing (used to pay for government programmes and welfare), but these are notoriously inadequate with all sorts of unpleasant consequences including widespread poverty and debt. Every proposal that I’ve seen for funding UBI relies on some form of conventional taxation, most of which is directed at commercial activity – income tax, corporation tax, VAT, etc. Taxing the productive activities on which we all rely for our survival and comfort has always seemed to me to be counterproductive to the point of stupidity, so I started to look for alternative ways of managing the collection part of the cashflow cycle. When we understand the need for money to be available and mobile the target for our collection system becomes obvious: idle money. Money in the bank is stagnant, doing nothing to facilitate productive activity. If we shave off a small percentage from every bank balance every hour of every day, not only do we refill our UBI pot in a way that’s proportionally fair, we also discourage the longterm hoarding of money. What I’m proposing is effectively a negative interest rate (sometimes called demurrage) on all money wherever it’s held, with the exception of the money in your UBI account. When we spend or transfer our UBI money into the mainstream banking system the negative interest rate kicks in and encourages us to make use of that money before we “lose” it back into the UBI pot. So instead of money lying idle it will be put to use. Some will get spent, which will ensure that businesses have customers. Some will get invested in activities where the money is spent on something productive (rather than gambled). Some will be lent to individuals, businesses and government departments that need a temporary cashflow boost. It’s likely that most lending will be done at interest rates of zero or below, which will, over time, get rid of the mountain of positive-interest bearing debt under which we are currently buried. The evils of compound interest will disappear from our lives, as will the costs of servicing government debt. The UBI will remove from government the costs of funding most subsistence benefits - welfare, state pensions, tax credits, and so on, which will allow us to immediately abolish some of the taxes that are a drag on commerce (e.g. VAT and NICs), and it should be possible to reduce or get rid of other unhelpful taxes (e.g. corporation tax, income tax) as government departments learn how to manage their cashflows using temporary loans from businesses and individuals who have spare money and are looking for ways to preserve its value.

### Negative Income Tax

#### An NIT solves poverty better –it still provides cash to the poor, but it reduces bureaucracy and dependence and avoids the Poverty trap

**Sorman, 2016 – former economic advisor to the French prime minister** [Guy, Why Not a Negative Income Tax. City Journal during Winter 2011. https://www.city-journal.org/html/why-not-negative-income-tax-13352.html] [Premier]

Republicans would do well to revisit Friedman’s alternatives. The most familiar is the school voucher, which students could use as tuition at any school, public or private, willing to accept them. But one of the most inventive and potentially effective of Friedman’s alternatives to statist bureaucracy receives far less attention than vouchers do. Liberals tend to dismiss Friedman as an extremist libertarian, a blind advocate of selfishness, an enemy of any kind of social help. This was always an absurd charge. In his 1962 book Capitalism and Freedom, Friedman acknowledged that some form of welfare was necessary in capitalist societies and that the state would likely play a role in its provision. The trick was to imagine a very different, radically improved, and more efficient form of welfare—what Friedman’s son, David, also an economist, calls “libertarian redistributionism.” What kind of program could help protect every citizen from destitution without granting excessive power to bureaucrats, creating disincentives to work, and clogging up the free-market economy, as the modern welfare state has done? Friedman’s answer was the negative income tax, or NIT. The NIT is easy to describe. “The basic idea,” Friedman wrote in a 1968 Newsweek column, “is to use the mechanism by which we now collect tax revenue from people with incomes above some minimum level to provide financial assistance to people with incomes below that level.” Already, he pointed out, no one pays taxes on the first few thousand dollars of income, thanks to personal exemptions and deductions. Most earners pay a fraction of their “positive taxable income”—that is, the amount by which their earnings exceed that first few thousand dollars. In Friedman’s plan, the poor would similarly receive a fraction of their “negative taxable income”—the amount by which their earnings fell short of that level. This direct cash grant would replace all other welfare programs for the poor, which, Friedman rightly observed, were generating a huge bureaucracy and extensive welfare dependency. But wouldn’t the NIT—in effect, a government-guaranteed income—still be a disincentive to work, just as no-questions-asked welfare benefits were before being reformed in the 1990s? “Any state intervention, any income redistribution, creates disincentives and distortions,” admits Gary Becker, a University of Chicago economist and Friedman disciple. “But if society decides that a certain level of redistribution must take place, the NIT is the best, the most minimally distorting, solution ever devised.” To limit the disincentive, Friedman argued, the NIT should be progressive. Say the government drew the income line at $10,000 for a family of four and the NIT was 50 percent, as most economists recommend. If the family had no income at all, it would receive $5,000—that is, 50 percent of the amount by which its income fell short of $10,000. If the family earned $2,000, it would get $4,000 from the government—again, 50 percent of its income shortfall—for a total post-tax income of $6,000. Bring in $4,000, and it would receive $3,000, for a total of $7,000. So as the family’s earnings rise, its post-tax income rises, too, preserving the work incentive. This is very different from many social welfare programs, in which a household either receives all of a benefit or, if it ceases to qualify, nothing at all. The all-or-nothing model encourages what social scientists call “poverty traps,” tempting the poor not to improve their situations.

#### A Negative Income tax solves welfare stigma just as much as the affirmative – taxes are universal

**Sorman, 2016 – former economic advisor to the French prime minister** [Guy, Why Not a Negative Income Tax. City Journal during Winter 2011. https://www.city-journal.org/html/why-not-negative-income-tax-13352.html] [Premier]

Robert Moffitt, an economist at Johns Hopkins University and a leading authority on the NIT, notes another advantage of the program over other forms of state assistance: “No stigma attaches to the NIT.” Everyone fills out the same forms, and no infantilizing government meddles with a household’s food, shelter, and health care, as under the current system. The NIT simply provides the poor with money, which they can use to meet their various needs. Friedman strongly believed that individuals have the capacity to promote their own interests.

#### An NIT solves better than welfare – it has the least amount of bureaucracy and allows us to eliminate the minimum wage

**Sorman, 2016 – former economic advisor to the French prime minister** [Guy, Why Not a Negative Income Tax. City Journal during Winter 2011. https://www.city-journal.org/html/why-not-negative-income-tax-13352.html] [Premier]

Yet another NIT advantage is a freer labor market. No minimum wage would be necessary, since a minimum income would now be guaranteed. This would boost employment: as economists recognize, a legal minimum wage tends to increase joblessness by discouraging employers from recruiting unskilled labor. The NIT would reduce illegal immigration, too. Managed by the IRS, it would apply only to citizens and legal residents, and since it would eliminate welfare programs, aliens would have less incentive to cross the border illegally for government benefits (though local authorities would still have to decide whether to grant them access to schools and hospitals). “From an economist’s perspective, the negative income tax is the perfect design,” Moffitt says. “The only reason an economist would oppose it would be from a strict libertarian perspective—opposition to any kind of government-managed welfare.” But the biggest advantage of the NIT is that it requires the smallest possible bureaucracy to implement. The IRS already exists; it knows how to assess income statements; and, to run the NIT, it has only to take money or pay it out. No longer would the federal and state governments maintain the sprawling multiple agencies necessary to distribute food stamps, public housing, Medicaid, cash welfare, and a myriad of community development programs. Nor would they need to pay the salaries and enormous future pensions of the public employees who run all these programs. According to a Heritage Foundation study by Robert Rector, Kiki Bradley, and Rachel Sheffield, the federal portion of America’s welfare system cost a staggering $522 billion in 2008, which works out to about $12,000 per poor person aided. Speaking very generally, then, we can estimate that so long as a federal NIT’s average payout amounted to less than $12,000, it would cost less than the current welfare system does. True, replacing Medicaid with a cash benefit would pose great difficulties in America’s current, heavily regulated health-care system, in which private insurance is artificially expensive. One solution would be leaving Medicaid in place and bestowing a less generous NIT; another, which Friedman himself proposed at the end of his life, would be health-care vouchers, which would work along the same lines as school vouchers.

### Participation Income

#### A Participation Income solves better because a UBI fails to challenge gender norms

**Danaher 14 – lecturer at National University of Ireland, Galway.** [John, “Feminism and the Basic Income (Part Two),” 15/7/14, <http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/feminism-and-basic-income-part-two.html> , 6/27/17] AO [Premier]

2. The Care-Giver Model The Care-Giver model is premised on the value of care work, particularly the unpaid forms of care work that have traditionally been performed by women. It rejects the notion that sexual equality is advanced simply by encouraging women to become more like men. Instead, it calls for us to use the welfare system to raise the status and recognition of care work, bringing it onto the same level as paid employment. This would allow women to choose between different roles (care-giver; breadwinner) or mixes of those roles (e.g. part-time in both). It would not, however, challenge the sexual division of labour with respect to care-work. In order for this model to work a variety of policy reforms would be needed. Fitzpatrick mentions the following: [W]omen would require: care-allowances set at a level comparable to breadwinner wages; workplace reforms to facilitate the kind of life pattern flexibility just mentioned [i.e. the ability to choose between the different roles]; job search, retraining and flexitime; extensive social welfare programs. Here, then, most care-work would continue to remain in the home but would be supported with substantial public funds. Part-time jobs and care-work would have to generate as many entitlements to insurance benefits as full-time employment but, as before, a residual assistance tier would also be required. (Fitzpatrick, 2013, p. 169) Some of these policies have been implemented in different countries, particularly those concerning flexitime and direct provisions for childcare. The effect of these on revaluing care-work and raising its status are, again, questionable. Could the UBI have any role to play in a care-giver model of welfare? Fitzpatrick argues that it could. One thing it could definitely do is facilitate the transition of women in and out of the labour market. In particular, it could make part-time work a more viable option for many women. Women in those roles would receive two incomes: their basic income grant and the income from the work. And if the UBI was financed through a progressive tax, they may not even need to pay taxes toward it. One major problem with UBI, however, is that it might not be specific enough to raise the status of unpaid care work. Since the income would be payable to all, irrespective of what they do, it wouldn’t single out care-work for special treatment. A Participation Income (i.e. one granted to people on the condition that they engage in unpaid but socially valuable work) might be better able to achieve this aim. 3. The Universal Care-Giver Model The universal care-giver model is premised on the value of completely de-gendering care-work and encouraging a more equitable distribution of work between the sexes. This marks a contrast from the two other models. The universal breadwinner model was questionable in that it implied that paid work was of greater value; the care-giver model was questionable in that it did not challenge the traditional sexual division of labour with respect to care-work. The universal care-giver model tries to go beyond the limitations of these two models. It aims to equalise the status of both kinds of work and to breakdown the traditional sexual division of labour with respect to care-work. What reforms would be required for this? Fitzpatrick mentions three (based on Fraser’s work): First, all jobs would have to be designed for people who are also part-time carers which means a working week shorter than that for full-time jobs and the support of employment-enabling services. Second, care-work activities would be distributed between the state, the household, and civil society. (Fraser talks of locally-managed and democratically care-work institutions). Finally, the most substantial change would be cultural, that is, a dismantling of the gendered assumptions which sustain the existing forms of social organisation. (Fitzpatrick, 2013, p. 169-70) A basic income could play some part in achieving these ends, though its limitations would have to be acknowledged. By de-linking work and income, and increasing job-choice flexibility, it could encourage more men to take-up care-giving duties. But it could only really do so with substantial shifts in the cultural attitude toward care-work. Changes in income payment cannot do this, certainly not in the short-term. In fact, they could simply encourage more men to drop out of paid work, without taking up any corresponding care-work duties. Fitzpatrick once again suggests that a Participation Income, which tied income payments to specific socially valuable forms of work, would be more beneficial in this regard.

## Disadvantages

### Politics

#### Conservatives oppose the UBI as a redistribution of wealth.

**Streithorst, 2015 – Evonomics Journalist** [Tom, “How Basic Income Solves Capitalism’s Fundamental Problem”, *Evonomics*, December 20, 2015, http://evonomics.com/how-universal-basic-income-solves/. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

The third problem is perhaps the most central. By stimulating the economy and pushing it towards its production possibilities frontier, the Basic Income Guarantee will be growth enhancing, but it is undeniable that it will also be redistributive. The pie will be larger, but it will be sliced differently. For the past 30 years, we have stimulated the economy by shovelling money towards rich people. A Basic Income Guarantee shovels money towards poor people. And for many in the top 1%, that is anathema.∂ Conservatives generally favour tax cuts as a way of stimulating the economy. Although they don’t like to admit it, this is textbook Keynesianism. As long as the government does not cut spending, more money in consumers’ pockets will inevitably increase demand. Unfortunately, tax cuts generally favour the richest among us, and they, unlike the poor, are liable to save rather than spend their windfall. Stimulating savings is a waste of a tax cut. Today, we have an over-abundance of saving and a shortfall of investment and consumption. A Basic Income Guarantee can be thought of as a tax cut targeted to those most likely to spend it, which is what the economy needs. The Basic Income Guarantee solves the problem of demand, stimulates the economy, increases corporate profits, gives workers more freedom, and provides a safety net to the most vulnerable. It is economically sound and politically savvy. But the very rich don’t fear unemployment, they fear redistribution and they will be the most significant force against the implementation of the Basic Income Guarantee.

#### UBI is only supported by fringe parties that don’t influence policy-major parties always shift their political capital to other goals

**Wispelaere, 15 – Policy Research Fellow at the Institute for Policy Research at the University of Bath** [Jurgen, , The Struggle for Strategy: On the Politics of the Basic Income Proposal, Sagepub, 2015, <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jurgen_Wispelaere/publication/277133686_The_Struggle_for_Strategy_On_the_> Politics\_of\_the\_Basic\_Income\_Proposal/links/57d1701308ae0c0081e0144f/The-Struggle-for-Strategy-On-the-Politics-of-the-Basic-Income-Proposal.pdf, 6/27/17] JY [Premier]

Unfortunately, there is little reason to think that groups who move up on the political ladder will necessarily sustain their support for BI. After all, in the absence of policy responsibility one’s support for BI is ‘cheap’ in a second critical sense: there are few political costs associated with supporting BI in an environment in which one is never put in the position of having to defend one’s support against a skeptical – at times even hostile – political base (Steensland, 2006). This is even more so when we consider that furthering the case for BI means precious political capital must be spent at the expense of other political objectives. The political opportunity cost of supporting BI once one has achieved a position of policy responsibility may simply prove too high to be politically sustainable.5 We can reasonably expect to find the very same parties or politicians who support BI while in opposition suddenly ditching their support when achieving office, whether as a majority government or as part of a governing coalition.6 We can find a poignant illustration of this dynamic in the recent controversy surrounding the newly minted radical Spanish party Podemos, which after only a year has surged in the opinion polls and is heading towards an electoral victory in the upcoming elections.7 Right from the very start, when the party burst onto the political scene, the leadership declared itself in favour of BI, but much to the consternation of its popular base, the economic policy document released late November 2014 downgraded BI to a long-term aspiration. A simple explanation is that the Podemos leadership, while being sincere in its appreciation of BI, is exceedingly aware of the need to reach beyond its grassroots support to secure a firmer voting base. In this sense, dropping BI from its electoral manifesto constitutes a classic Downsian electoral move.8 We can see examples of cheap support also in the coalition politics of parties already in government. After persistent lobbying efforts from pro-BI groups such as CORI (Conference of the Religious in Ireland), the Irish government in 2002 committed itself to releasing a Green Paper on basic income, only to have it comprehensively sidelined soon afterwards (Healy and Reynolds, 2000). This strategy enabled the government, which at the height of the Celtic Tiger was constrained by social partnership agreements, to have its cake and eat it too by simultaneously assuaging some of its partners in favour of BI (if only temporarily), while nevertheless not having to face up to any of the costs associated with promoting the scheme in earnest. Another poignant example is the case of Brazil (Suplicy, 2005). Despite having enacted BI legislation a decade ago (Law 10.835 or Lei de Renda Básica de Cidadania, enacted in January 2004), a provision stipulating that implementation remains the budgetary prerogative of the federal executive branch effectively rendered the legislation moot (Lavinas, 2013). Here, too, the split between legislation and policy allows government to bypass any political costs associated with implementing BI, leading critics such as Lena Lavinas (2013) to aptly label it the ‘lost road’ to BI.

#### Widespread bipartisan support of the UBI is a façade-most groups are not willing to commit resources to UBI

**Wispelaere, 15 – Policy Research Fellow at the Institute for Policy Research at the University of Bath** [Jurgen, , The Struggle for Strategy: On the Politics of the Basic Income Proposal, Sagepub, 2015, <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jurgen_Wispelaere/publication/277133686_The_Struggle_for_Strategy_On_the_> Politics\_of\_the\_Basic\_Income\_Proposal/links/57d1701308ae0c0081e0144f/The-Struggle-for-Strategy-On-the-Politics-of-the-Basic-Income-Proposal.pdf, 6/27/17] JY [Premier]

When challenged about the political feasibility of BI, its advocates typically refer to numerous instances of individual politicians, political parties, social movements or interest groups (e.g. trade unions) who are on record as being supportive of BI. This response takes the form of a simple numbers game, in which the level of support for BI can be read off more-or-less directly from the instances of expressed support elicited from such individuals or organisations. [However,] The idea that an increase in expressed support for a BI from a variety of social and political actors is directly conducive to building a sustained political coalition is flawed, however. The reason is that not all instances of expressed support for a policy imply a sustained commitment to promoting this policy.4 It is one thing for a social or political agent to express a sincere preference in favour of BI, but quite a different matter to actively canvass support among constituents, party members or like-minded associations and groups, build a shared platform across political factions, utilise scarce political resources (money, time and, above all, political capital) to further the cause, bargain and possibly compromise on other political goals, and so on.

#### Diverse support decreases a UBI’s political feasibility because differing parties support it for different reasons.

**Pressman, 2005 – Prof of economics at Monmouth Univ** [Steven, with Michael Lewis and Karl Widerquist The Basic Income Guarantee and Social Economics. This article appeared in Review of Social Economy on December 2005. http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/29770341.pdf?refreqid=search%3A9330359b12bad0e394957e75c30d95e6] JN [Premier]

Arguments For and Against Basic Income4 One of the most interesting aspects of Basic Income is the wide ideological range of its supporters. Basic Income policies have been supported by conservative economists such as James Meade, as well as by European Green parties. This diversity causes a certain amount of confusion for occasionally the reasons that conservatives like Basic Income contradict those cited by the left and by environmentalists in support of the policies.

#### Coalition building behind UBI impossible – polarization is too strong in the status quo, multiple examples globally

**Wispelaere, 15 – Policy Research Fellow at the Institute for Policy Research at the University of Bath** [Jurgen, , The Struggle for Strategy: On the Politics of the Basic Income Proposal, Sagepub, 2015, <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jurgen_Wispelaere/publication/277133686_The_Struggle_for_Strategy_On_the_> Politics\_of\_the\_Basic\_Income\_Proposal/links/57d1701308ae0c0081e0144f/The-Struggle-for-Strategy-On-the-Politics-of-the-Basic-Income-Proposal.pdf, 6/27/17] JY [Premier]

The fact that cheap political support for BI may not be sufficiently robust to survive a move by its supporters into a position of policy responsibility is not the only problem, however. Worse still, some instances of political support for BI may even be counterproductive as support from one particular faction may prevent others from endorsing the same policy. Because political factions often use identification with policy positions as an instrument to differentiate themselves from their (internal or external) political competitors (Cox and McCubbins, 2005), support for BI from Faction X may prevent Faction Y from endorsing a policy that would otherwise naturally fit their political profile. There may exist a ‘first mover disadvantage’ to BI that is associated with a political faction that is unable to move BI up on the policy agenda, when precisely this association prevents more powerful individuals or groups from offering valuable support. In this case, express support is ‘noxious’ to the case for BI. In some countries (e.g. Ireland, Namibia) BI is promoted by groups with a strong religious affiliation, which may well prevent non-confessional social movements or associations from expressing support. Similarly, BI advocates who adopt an entrepreneurial perspective may find it difficult to curry favour with factions endorsing strong socialist values. Both the entrepreneur Roland Duchâtelet, billionaire founder of the Belgian political party Vivant, and Götz Werner, the German owner of the DM-Drogerie Markt drugstore chain, are staunch promotors of BI (Liebermann, 2012; Vanderborght, 2000). However, advancing the cause from within a distinctive liberal economic perspective, both have faced repeated opposition from the progressive corners of the BI movement.9 Initial effects of the identification of BI with one specific faction, combined with the ‘reactive reluctance’ of other factions to support the policy because of such political identification, may produce a form of path dependency that causes BI to be marginalised by association. The problem of cheap support, as outlined in this section, poses something of an impasse for BI advocates intent on building a robust political coalition.

### Spending

#### UBI will overwhelm the federal budget – studies prove that it would cost trillions.

**Calder, 2017 – welfare policy analyst at The Cato Institute** [Vanessa, Universal Basic Income — Disease or Cure? This article appeared in Cayman Financial Review on April 26, 2017. <https://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/universal-basic-income-disease-or-cure>] [Premier]

Although UBI is a departure from traditional welfare, the idea isn’t truly devoid of welfare’s pitfalls. On some fronts, UBI seems not only unable to avoid traditional welfare’s problems, but also likely to exacerbate them. Many of the utopian qualities that recommend UBI to its supporters are strained in the real world. To begin with, the numbers for UBI don’t seem very feasible — at least not without large tax increases. According to Michael Tanner’s calculations, if the government provided just $12,316 for every individual in the United States, or enough to bring them to the non-elderly federal poverty line, the cost of UBI in the U.S. would be nearly $4.4 trillion, more than the entire U.S. federal budget. In his paper on the topic, he notes that “even if the guaranteed national income replaced every existing anti-poverty program, we would still be some $3.4 trillion short.” In order to make ends meet in this scenario, the tax liabilities of high-income individuals would likely be substantially impacted.

#### A UBI is ridiculously expensive and impossible to pay for

**Caplan 17- Professor of Economics at George Mason University** [Brian, Professor of Econ at George Mason University, February 21 2017, “A UBI is worse than Welfare”, Accessed on 6/27/17, https://fee.org/articles/ubi-is-even-worse-than-welfare/] JC [Premier]

A politically acceptable UBI would be insanely expensive. Libertarian economist and UBI advocate Ed Dolan has a detailed, fiscally viable plan to provide a UBI of $4452 per person per year. But every non-libertarian I've queried thinks it should be at least $10,000 per person per year. Even with a one-third flat tax, that implies that a family of four would have to make $120,000 a year before it paid $1 of taxes. This is pie in the sky.

#### A UBI would massively increase our spending and taxation.

**Henderson, 2015 –prof of economics at the Naval Postgraduate School's School of Public Policy** [David R., A Philosophical Economist's Case against a Government-Guaranteed Basic Income. This article appeared in The Independent Review in the Spring of 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/24563064.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A79bf90b3116741c8d2dcf25fb3a5e858] JN [Premier]

In short, three effects of a $10,000 BIG for all U.S. adults would be (1) a huge increase in the size of the federal government, (2) a huge increase in federal taxes, and (3) a huge increase in the deadweight loss from federal taxes. This analysis assumes, moreover, that the BIG would replace all existing federal welfare programs, including Medicaid, that are aimed at the poor and near-poor.

#### New Taxes to fund a UBI are impossible – we are already going to need tax increases for other budget crises.

**Greenstein 2016- president of The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities** [Robert, Commentary: Universal Basic Income May Sound Attractive But, If It Occurred, Would Likelier Increase Poverty Than Reduce It, May 31, 2016, <http://www.cbpp.org/poverty-and-opportunity/commentary-universal-basic-income-may-sound-attractive-but-if-it-occurred?version=meter>, June 29, 2017] CL [Premier]

The Cost There are over 300 million Americans today. Suppose UBI provided everyone with $10,000 a year. That would cost more than $3 trillion a year — and $30 trillion to $40 trillion over ten years. This single-year figure equals more than three-fourths of the entire yearly federal budget — and double the entire budget outside Social Security, Medicare, defense, and interest payments. It’s also equal to close to 100 percent of all tax revenue the federal government collects. Or, consider UBI that gives everyone $5,000 a year. That would provide income equal to about two-fifths of the poverty line for an individual (which is a projected $12,700 in 2016) and less than the poverty line for a family of four ($24,800). But it would cost as much as the entire federal budget outside Social Security, Medicare, defense, and interest payments. Paying For It Where would the money to finance such a large expenditure come from? That it would come mainly or entirely from new taxes isn’t plausible. We’ll already need substantial new revenues in the coming decades to help keep Social Security and Medicare solvent and avoid large benefit cuts in them. We’ll need further tax increases to help repair a crumbling infrastructure that will otherwise impede economic growth. And if we want to create more opportunity and reduce racial and other barriers and inequities, we’ll also need to raise new revenues to invest more in areas like pre-school education, child care, college affordability, and revitalizing segregated inner-city communities. A UBI that’s financed primarily by tax increases would require the American people to accept a level of taxation that vastly exceeds anything in U.S. history. It’s hard to imagine that such a UBI would advance very far, especially given the tax increases we’ll already need for Social Security, Medicare, infrastructure, and other needs.

#### Replacing current programs with UBI is unfeasible and costly – even scrapping all programs for UBI would still fall short of the cost.

**Tanner, 2016 – Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute** [Michael D., “The Basic Income Guarantee: Simplicity, but at What Cost?” Cato Institute, August 26 2014, accessed on June 28 2017 https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/26/basic-income-guarantee-simplicity-what-cost] NJT [Premier]

But despite these potential advantages, I would want to see better answers to several important questions before I could endorse such an approach.∂ 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.

### Trade Off

#### A UBI can worsen poverty if it cancels existing programs

Zon, 2016 – Director of Policy and Research at Maytree Foundation [Noah, “Policy brief: Would a universal basic income reduce poverty?”, *Maytree Foundation*, August 16, 2016, https://medium.com/@maytree\_canada/policy-brief-would-a-universal-basic-income-reduce-poverty-cd85fd64dbac. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

Our safety net is designed to address some needs that can’t easily be addressed by cash alone. Some parts of the safety net are designed to replace income, such as Employment Insurance, pensions, and disability insurance programs. In each of these areas, we have seen some significant gaps emerge, leaving some people poorly covered. However, a basic income that provides, say, $10,000 per year, would not be good insurance to replace income of $50,000 in the case of job loss or disability. These particular gaps in the safety net would not be well-served by a basic income approach. If a universal basic income came at the expense of these other functions of the safety net, or programs that make sure that people can get medicine or access post-secondary education, then we could leave many people worse off.

#### A UBI that cancels other welfare programs will fail to solve poverty – it cannot replace the resources and expertise of these other programs.

Collins, 2017 – senior scholar at the Institute for Policy Studies [Chuck Collins, The Case for a Universal Basic Income Blogging Our Great Divide, written April 21, 2017, <https://inequality.org/great- divide/argument-universal- basic-income/>, accessed June 26, 2017] [Premier]

Stern, in fact, rather enjoys the “strange bedfellows” convergence that’s coming together around the UBI idea. He reminds us that UBI supporters in the past have included everyone from Richard Nixon and John Kenneth Galbraith to Ralph Nader and Milton Friedman. In pursuit of a UBI, Stern’s even willing “to cash out a large number of the anti-poverty programs my liberal and progressive colleagues support.” The prospect of ditching food stamps, energy assistance, and other social programs has been attracting libertarian-leaning right-wing think tanks to the UBI notion for quite some time. Hard-core libertarians would like to go a giant step further and also eliminate Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare. Stern balks at that extension. Many progressive UBI supporters, unlike Stern, reject the idea that a Universal Basic Income can ever adequately replace any significant part of the existing ecosystem of support programs that serve to help “raise the floor.” They see the UBI instead as a smart addition to this ecosystem. This ecosystem needs strengthening, not replacement. We need universal treatment on demand for addiction, for instance, and early health care intervention for learning disabilities and mental illness.

#### A UBI would dramatically increase spending – even if it cut welfare programs, it would still overwhelm the budget

**Henderson, 2015 –prof of economics at the Naval Postgraduate School's School of Public Policy** [David R., A Philosophical Economist's Case against a Government-Guaranteed Basic Income. This article appeared in The Independent Review in the Spring of 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/24563064.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A79bf90b3116741c8d2dcf25fb3a5e858] JN [Premier]

Assume, as Zwolinski advocates, that such a program would displace all 126 federal antipoverty programs and all state and local government antipoverty programs. Later, I challenge that assumption, but for now imagine that it is true. Notice what would happen. A $2.068 trillion program would replace programs whose total expenditures in 2012 were $952 billion. Even rounding up the $952 billion to $1 trillion, the program that Zwolinski advocates is more than twice as costly in budgetary terms as current antipoverty programs. How would such a program be funded? Let's grant for now Zwolinski's assumption that all other antipoverty programs would be eliminated. How would the federal government obtain the additional $1.068 trillion?2 Before considering that question, let's put the number in perspective. Federal government spending for fiscal year 2014 will come in at about $3.576 trillion (U.S. Joint Economic Committee and Council of Economic Advisers 2014, 32). So if the federal government were to implement a $10,000 BIG today, spending by the federal government would increase by 30 percent. This amount is actually an underestimate. I am assuming that Zwolinski would want the BIG to be a federal program. So the $284 billion that he estimates would be saved by state and local governments would not be automatically remitted to the federal government. Rounding up the $668 billion spent by the feds in 2012 to $700 billion, I conclude that the federal government would spend not an additional $1.068 trillion, but rather an additional $1.368 trillion.3 This would be a whopping 38 percent increase in federal spending. How would Zwolinski fund this major increase in federal spending? If his goal were to keep the already bloated half-trillion-dollar federal deficit constant rather than increasing it, he would need to have the federal government increase taxes from their estimated $2.993 trillion to $4.361 trillion, an increase of 45.7 percent. One of the most well-established facts in the economics literature on govern ment finance is that raising a tax rate by x percent raises the revenue from that tax by less than x percent.4 The reason for this relationship is that the higher tax rate discourages the activity being taxed, so the tax base on which the tax is levied is smaller than otherwise. So if the federal government were to raise all tax rates by the same percentage to generate the revenue needed, it would have to raise all tax rates by more than 45.7 percent and probably substantially more.

#### There won’t be enough administrative savings to pay for a UBI – current programs have low administrative costs

**Greenstein 2016- president of The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities** [Robert, Commentary: Universal Basic Income May Sound Attractive But, If It Occurred, Would Likelier Increase Poverty Than Reduce It, May 31, 2016, <http://www.cbpp.org/poverty-and-opportunity/commentary-universal-basic-income-may-sound-attractive-but-if-it-occurred?version=meter>, June 29, 2017] CL [Premier]

Some UBI proponents may argue that by ending current programs, we’d reap large administrative savings that we could convert into UBI payments. But that’s mistaken. For the major means-tested programs — SNAP, Medicaid, the EITC, housing vouchers, Supplemental Security Income (SSI), and school meals — administrative costs consume only 1 to 9 percent of program resources, as a CBPP analysis explains.[1] Their funding goes overwhelmingly to boost the incomes and purchasing power of low-income families. Moreover, as the Roosevelt Institute’s Mike Konczal has noted, eliminating Medicaid, SNAP, the EITC, housing vouchers, and the like would still leave you far short of what’s needed to finance a meaningful UBI.[2]

### Unemployment

#### A UBI would undermine the economy by discouraging work – the consensus of economic studies proves.

**Calder, 2017 – welfare policy analyst at The Cato Institute** [Vanessa, Universal Basic Income — Disease or Cure? This article appeared in Cayman Financial Review on April 26, 2017. <https://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/universal-basic-income-disease-or-cure>] [Premier]

Outside of the cost of the program, providing every U.S. citizen with a cash grant is likely to have a large and negative behavioral effect. Economists agree that welfare programs create labor supply disincentives, meaning that individuals reduce work because of government benefits. As the Congressional Research Service has noted, an “increase in [the value of welfare benefits] is expected to cause people to reduce work hours.” While this is true of all welfare programs, only around 1/5th of the current U.S. population is currently impacted. If UBI were instituted, labor supply disincentives would touch 100 percent of the population, rather than a subgroup of eligible applicants.

#### A UBI disincentivizes work—more money to justify leisure and less tradeoff for less work

**Dolan 14- prof of economics at Dartmouth College** [Ed, August 18th 2014, “A Universal Basic Income and Work Incentives”, Econo Monitor, Accessed on 6/27/17, http://www.economonitor.com/dolanecon/2014/08/18/a-universal-basic-income-and-work-incentives-part-1-theory/] JC [Premier]

First, you can see that regardless of how much you work, you will receive some benefit from the government, so your disposable income will rise. Other things being equal, people tend to “spend” part of their increased income on increased leisure, in the form of shorter hours, longer vacations, a longer time in school, earlier retirement, or longer breaks between jobs. Economists call that the income effect of a higher income. Second, the income support program changes the tradeoff you face between additional work and additional earned income. Suppose your best available job pays $10 per hour. Without the MTIS, one more hour of work brings you $10 of added disposable income. With the MTIS, one more hour of work raises your disposable income by only $2.50, because the $10 you earn is offset by a loss of $7.50 in benefits. In effect, the program reduces the “price” (more properly, the opportunity cost) of leisure, so you are more likely to substitute leisure for work and the disposable income it brings in. Economists call that the substitution effect of the program. Below the break-even level of income, the income and substitution effects work in the same direction, so there is an unambiguous incentive to work less. Some people might stop working altogether. Some might reduce their hours, take longer vacations, or spend more time between jobs. Whatever the specifics, the average response will be a reduction in work hours. Even if some people have employers who allow no flexibility in hours worked, the average response for the whole population to whom the policy applies will be zero.

#### A UBI fails – it discourages work – a basic income cannot replace many aspects of work

**Porter, 2016 – New York Times economics columnist** [Eduardo, “A Universal Basic Income Is a Poor Tool to Fight Poverty”, *New York Times*, May 31, 2016, https://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/01/business/economy/universal-basic-income-poverty.html. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

Work, as Lawrence Katz of Harvard once pointed out, is not just what people do for a living. It is a source of status. It organizes people’s lives. It offers an opportunity for progress. None of this can be replaced by a check.A universal basic income has many undesirable features, starting with its non-negligible disincentive to work. Almost a quarter of American households make less than $25,000. It would be hardly surprising if a $10,000 check each for mom and dad sapped their desire to work.∂ A universal income divorces assistance from need. Aid is fixed, regardless of whatever else is going on. If our experience with block grants serves as precedent, it is most likely to become less generous over time.∂ To libertarians this will sound more like a feature than a flaw, but replacing everything in the safety net with a check would limit the scope of government assistance in damaging ways. Say we know the choice of neighborhood makes a difference to the development of poor children. Housing vouchers might lead them to move into a better one. A monthly check would probably not.

#### A UBI undermines the values of hard work and instead replaces them with apathy

**Cass 16- senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute** [Oren, June 15 2016, “Why a Universal Basic Income Is a Terrible Idea”, Nat Review, Accessed on 6/27/17, <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/436621/universal-basic-income-ubi-terrible-idea>] JC [Premier]

A UBI would undermine all this: Work by definition would become optional, and consumption would become an entitlement disconnected from production. Stripped of its essential role as the way to earn a living, work would instead be an activity one engaged in by choice, for enjoyment, or to afford nicer things. For many proponents of the scheme, this is the point. Releasing people from any responsibility to support themselves or their families represents the zenith of a hyper-individualistic culture. The goal is to maximize freedom and satisfaction by minimizing obligation and constraint. As the slogan of the moment proclaims: “You do you.” This should give pause to anyone who believes that the good life entails more, or that a free society requires its members, as Yuval Levin writes in his new book The Fractured Republic, to “commit ourselves to more than our own will and whim. It requires a commitment precisely to the formative social and cultural institutions that we have seen pulled apart from above and below in our age of fracture.” Even if a UBI represents just one more slip in our culture’s long downward slide, that is no argument in its favor. Only after halting the slide and regaining its footing can the culture hope to reclaim lost ground.

### Immigration

#### A UBI kills immigration reform – is undermines those who support immigrants coming for jobs

**Calder, 2017 – welfare policy analyst at The Cato Institute** [Vanessa, Universal Basic Income — Disease or Cure? This article appeared in Cayman Financial Review on April 26, 2017. <https://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/universal-basic-income-disease-or-cure>] [Premier]

Regardless of political feasibility, in an era of rising populism, exercising restraint in advocating for a costlier, more comprehensive welfare program seems essential. For those that support open society policies like immigration, the provision of a larger benefit package with fewer strings attached is likely to reduce political support for friendly immigration policies. Taxpayers intuitively understand that a comprehensive policy like UBI will place extra pressure on government finances and institutions. As Milton Friedman stated in his lecture What is America, “… it is one thing to have free immigration to jobs. It is another thing to have free immigration to welfare. And you cannot have both. If you have a welfare state, if you have a state in which every resident is promised a certain minimal level of income, or a minimum level of subsistence, regardless of whether he works or not, produces it or not, then it really is an impossible thing.”

#### UBI may cause increased restrictions on immigration – the more immigrants, the bigger the drain on the economy.

**Zwolinski, 2013 – Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Diego** [Matt, , “The Libertarian Case for a Basic Income” Libertarianism.org, August 4 2014, June 28 2017 https://www.libertarianism.org/columns/libertarian-case-basic-income] NJT [Premier]

2) Effects on Migration - When most people think about helping the poor, they forget about two groups that are largely invisible - poor people in other countries, and poor people who haven’t been born yet (see this paper by Tyler Cowen for more). With respect to the first of those groups, I think (and have argued before) that there is a real worry that a Basic Income Guarantee in the United States would create pressures to restrict immigration even more than it already is. After all, when every new immigrant is one more person collecting a check from your tax dollars, it’s not entirely unreasonable to view those immigrants as a threat, and to be more willing to use the coercive power of the state to keep them out. That worries me, because I think the last thing anybody with a bleeding heart ought to want to do is to block the poorest of the poor from access to what has been one of the most effective anti-poverty programs ever devised - namely, a policy of relatively open immigration into the relatively free economy of the United States. Especially when one’s justification for doing so is merely to provide a bit of extra cash to people who are already citizens of one of the wealthiest countries on the face of the planet.

#### A UBI would increase an anti-immigrant backlash – nationalists would be concerned that immigrants would receive benefits

**Danaher, 2013 – Lecturer at the National University of Ireland** [John, a regular blogger at Philosophical Disquisitions, Libertarianism and the Basic Income (Part Two), Philosophical Disquisitions, 12/17/13, http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2013/12/libertarianism-and-basic-income-part-two.html, 6/27/17] JY [Premier]

The more serious objection, at least from Zwolinski’s perspective, is the impact a UBI might have on immigration policy. If a UBI is paid to all citizens (or all legally recognised residents) it is likely to fuel anti-immigration lobbying, and hence to encourage the government to adopt a more restrictive immigration regime. Zwolinski thinks this would be bad. It would encourage nationalism and other forms of racial or ethnic prejudice; it would limit cultural diversity; and, most importantly, it would negatively impact on those for whom migration is a path to a better life. Of course, the problem identified by Zwolinski could be addressed by adopting a truly universal approach to the UBI, but that’s undoubtedly an unrealistic policy in the short-to-medium term. In the meantime, any country that unilaterally introduces a UBI is likely to face the kinds of pressures envisaged by Zwolinski. There’s certainly enough anti-immigration sentiment out there. This would indeed be a problem.

#### Immigration makes UBI fail – it creates racial resentment and organizational obstacles

**van Parijs, 2012 – Professor of Economic and Social Ethics at the University of Leuven** [Philippe, Yannick Vanderborght, Basic Income in a Globalised Economy, Social Justice Ireland, 7/13/12, https://www.socialjustice.ie/sites/default/files/file/2012-07-03%20-%20Book%20FULL%20TEXT%20-%20FINAL%20-%20Does%20the%20European%20Social%20Model%20Have%20a%20Future.pdf#page=40, 6/28/17] JY [Premier]

There is, however, a second, specifically political mechanism through which actual (unlike merely potential) migration makes genuine redistribution shakier. Immigration tends to make populations more heterogeneous in racial, 15 See, for example, Peterson & Rom (1990), Peterson (1995) and Borjas (1999) for discussions of this phenomenon in the case of the United States. Philippe Van Parijs & Yannick Vanderborght Does the European Social Model Have a Future? 35 religious and linguistic terms, and this ethnic heterogeneity tends to weaken the political sustainability of a generous redistributive system through two distinct mechanisms. 16 Firstly, the degree of heterogeneity affects the extent to which the net contributors to the transfer system identify with (those they perceive as) its net beneficiaries, i.e. the extent to which they regard them [the benficiaries] as “their own people”, to whom they owe solidarity. In particular, when genuinely redistributive schemes are perceived to benefit more than proportionally some ethnic groups, the resentment of those who fund them will tend to block the expansion of such schemes and even to jeopardize their viability. Secondly, institutionalized solidarity can also be expected to be weaker in a heterogeneous society because ethnic differences erect obstacles to smooth communication and mutual trust between the various components of the category that can expect to gain from generous redistributive schemes. Such obstacles make it more difficult for all net beneficiaries to coordinate, organize and struggle together. 17 As a result of the conjunction of these two mechanisms, one can expect institutionalized redistribution to be less generous in more heterogeneous societies than in more homogeneous ones, as seems confirmed by empirical evidence. 18

#### A UBI causes a political backlash against immigration and is economically unsustainable.

**van Parijs, 2012 – Professor of Economic and Social Ethics at the University of Leuven** [Philippe, Yannick Vanderborght, Basic Income in a Globalised Economy, Social Justice Ireland, 7/13/12, https://www.socialjustice.ie/sites/default/files/file/2012-07-03%20-%20Book%20FULL%20TEXT%20-%20FINAL%20-%20Does%20the%20European%20Social%20Model%20Have%20a%20Future.pdf#page=40, 6/28/17] JY [Premier]

In connection with each of the features listed above, it has also been the subject of fierce criticisms from both the right and the left. In the present context, I shall make no attempt to give a general overview of the rich discussion triggered by these criticisms. 12 I shall focus instead on one dimension of this discussion that is gaining in importance every day. Most of the arguments about the (un)desirability and (un)feasibility of a basic income have been formulated within the framework of fairly self-contained nation-states. This may have made a lot of sense in the case of the brief British debate in the 1920s, in the case of the hardly less brief US debate in the late 1960s, perhaps even in the case of the European debates that started in the 1980s. But how could it possibly make any sense in the twenty first century, in the era of globalization, in an era in which capital and goods, people and ideas are crossing national borders as they have never done before? In this new context, are the prospects for a basic income not deeply altered. Indeed, have they not dramatically worsened? 12 See e.g. Van Parijs (2006), Caputo ed. (2012), De Wispelaere & al. ed. (2012), and Van Parijs & Vanderborght (in progress) for general overviews; Van Parijs (1995), Van Donselaar (2009) and Birnbaum (2012) for extensive discussions of the ethical justification of the idea; and Standing (2011) for a demonstration of its contemporary relevance. Basic Income in a Globalized Economy 32 Does the European Social Model Have a Future? The challenge of migration: race to the bottom and ethnic diversity Of the many aspects of globalization, trans-national migration is the one that creates the most obvious threat to the sustainability of a significant unconditional basic income. The existence of such a threat is particularly disturbing for many supporters of basic income. For the joint appeal of equality and freedom, which endeared basic income to them should also make them firm supporters of free migration. The real freedom to choose the way to spend one’s life should encompass the freedom to choose where to spend it, and this freedom should not be restricted to those who happen to be born in the privileged part of the planet. Why is there a tension between trans-national migration and the sustainability of basic income schemes? For two reasons, one that is primarily economic, the other specifically political. 13 The first reason has to do with the race to the bottom which transnational migration, both effective and potential, is expected to trigger. The underlying mechanism has two components. One of these concerns the tax base required to fund a basic income and all other social transfers. Note, first of all, that even in the absence of any transnational migration of people, the trans-national mobility of capital already presents a threat, at least in combination with the trans-national mobility of products. If globalization means that capital can move freely from one country to another and be invested so as to produce goods that can in turn be exported freely from one country to another, profits will be hard to tax by any national government in a globalized economy. Significant redistribution remains possible, however, as long as the highly-skilled and hence highly paid workers are hardly mobile trans-nationally. But as soon as the trans-national mobility of human capital ceases to be marginal, genuine redistribution from people with a high labour income becomes problematic too. 13 See Howard (2006) for a discussion of this issue in a broadly similar spirit, with a focus on the first dimension of the challenge. Philippe Van Parijs & Yannick Vanderborght Does the European Social Model Have a Future? 33

#### A UBI increases the exploitation of immigrant workers – empirically proven in Dubai

**Collins, 2017 – senior scholar at the Institute for Policy Studies** [Chuck Collins, The Case for a Universal Basic Income Blogging Our Great Divide, written April 21, 2017, <https://inequality.org/great- divide/argument-universal- basic-income/>, accessed June 26, 2017] [Premier]

Stern’s take on the UBI doesn’t address a variety of important questions. One example: What’s to stop employers from continuing to employee illegal or guest-worker immigrants for low-wage work? With a UBI making low-wage work less attractive, the United States could come to resemble Dubai, a society where oil wealth has lifted most citizens while unprotected immigrants perform all the hard labor.

# Negative – Kritiks

## Ableism

#### A UBI that replaces other social programs discriminates against people with disabilities because it assumes that income will ensure freedom of action, which isn’t true for all bodies.

Danaher, 2014 - Lecturer at National University of Ireland [John, “Parasitic Surfers and the Unconditional Basic Income: A Debate”, July 12 2014, http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/parasitic-surfers-and-unconditional.html] [Premier]

The second criticism has to do with Parijs’s assumption that income translates readily into freedom. Remember, for Parijs the UBI is justifiable because it helps to maximin people’s capacity to pursue their conception of the good life. This means he must be assuming that people can leverage the income they receive into that pursuit. But this isn’t necessarily the case. Anderson highlights the fact that the elderly, the disabled and those with care-giving duties, are often unable to translate a share of income into greater freedom. They need other things (e.g. new technologies, or disproportionate shares of income) to achieve the kinds of freedoms available to single, able-bodied adults. Her fear is that prioritising a UBI over other types of welfare many simply benefit the single able-bodied adults at the expense of those others. I think there are legitimate concerns here, though I would note that the link between income and freedom is not completely implausible, even for the individuals Anderson identifies, and it isn’t necessarily the case that a UBI would replace all other forms of social welfare. Specific payments to those with disabilities or with care-giving duties could continue, though the political and practical feasibility of this would need to be explored.

## Capitalism

#### UBI reinforces capitalism – it poses no threat to capitalism because the money from the UBI will just end up in the hands of capitalists – it only increases consumption

**Kleiner 2016- Political Economy Researcher** (Dmytri, 8/8/16, “Universal Basic Income is a neoliberal plot to make you poorer”, accessed on 6/28/17, <http://www.furtherfield.org/features/articles/universal-basic-income-neoliberal-plot-make-you-poorer>) [Premier]

The notion that we can solve inequality within capitalism by indiscriminately giving people money and leaving the provisioning of all social needs to corporations is extremely dubious. While this view is to be expected among those, like Murray and Friedman, who promote capitalism, it is not compatible with anticapitalism. UBI will end up in the hands of capitalists. We will be dependent on these same capitalists for everything we need. But to truly alleviate poverty, productive capacity must be directed toward creating real value for society and not toward "maximizing shareholder value" of profit-seeking investors. Many people don't dispute the fact that establishment promoters of UBI are only doing it in order to eliminate social programs, but they imagine that another kind of basic income is possible. They call for a basic income that disregards the “deal” that Charles Murray advocates, but want UBI in addition to other social program, including means-tested benefits, protections for housing, guarantees of education and child care, and so on.This view ignores the political dimension of the question. Proposing UBI in addition to existing program mistakes, a general consensus for replacing social programs with a guaranteed income for a broad base of support for increasing social programs. But, no such broad base exists. Writing in 1943, with the wartime policies of "full employment" enjoying wide support, Michal Kalecki wrote a remarkable essay entitled "The Political Aspects of Full Employment." Kalecki opens by writing, "a solid majority of economists is now of the opinion that, even in a capitalist system, full employment may be secured by a government spending programme." Though he is talking about full employment, which means an "adequate plan to employ all existing labour power," the same is true of UBI. The majority of economists would agree that a plan to guarantee an income for all is possible. However, Kelecki ultimately argues that full employment policies will be abandoned: "The maintenance of full employment would cause social and political changes which would give a new impetus to the opposition of the business leaders. Indeed, under a regime of permanent full employment, ‘the sack' would cease to play its role as a disciplinary measure. The social position of the boss would be undermined, and the self-assurance and class-consciousness of the working class would grow.”

#### A UBI saves capitalism because it hides the problems of capitalism and solves the problem of consumer demand

**Streithorst, 2015 – Evonomics Journalist** [Tom, “How Basic Income Solves Capitalism’s Fundamental Problem”, *Evonomics*, December 20, 2015, http://evonomics.com/how-universal-basic-income-solves/. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

The Basic Income Guarantee (BIG) is back in the news. The Finns are considering implementing it, as are the Swiss, replacing all means tested benefits with a simple grant to every citizen, giving everyone enough money to survive. Unlike most current benefits programmes, it is not contingent on being worthy or deserving or even poor. Everybody gets it, you, me, Rupert Murdoch, the homeless man sleeping under a bridge. Last seriously proposed by Richard Nixon in 1969, more and more economists and bloggers are suggesting that the Basic Income Guarantee may ultimately be the salvation of capitalism. The BIG will eliminate poverty, lessen inequality, and vastly improve the lives of the most vulnerable among us. But that is not why we need it. It may seem impractical, even utopian: but I am convinced the BIG will be instituted within the next few decades because it solves modern capitalism’s most fundamental problem, lack of demand.∂ Technology and capitalism have largely solved the problem of supply. We are able to make more stuff, with fewer inputs of labour and capital, than ever before. We have the knowhow, we have the resources, we have the trained labour, we have the money. The only thing businesses lack is customers. Making stuff has become easy. It is selling it that keeps entrepreneurs (and central bankers) awake at night. Stagnant wages tell us that the supply of labour exceeds demand. Microscopic interest rates tell us that we have more capital than we need. Since the Great Depression most economists have recognised that demand is the Achilles heel of the modern economy.

#### A UBI entrenches neoliberalism – it reinforces consumerism and doesn’t address the ownership of the means of production

**Kolkotronis 2017- PhD student Political Science at Yale**  [Alexander, March 29 2017, “Why Socialist Job Guarantees are better than Universal Basic Income”, Accessed on 6/29/2017, <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/40022-why-socialist-job-guarantees-are-better-than-universal-basic-income>) [Premier]

UBI programs hold the potential to actually fit quite well into a neoliberal paradigm. Some see UBI as administratively efficient; this ethos could evolve into one that only further perpetuates decreases in welfare provision and accompanying decreases in public employment. In support of a pro-UBI article in the Wall Street Journal, John Daniel Davidson has written in the conservative-leaning magazine The Federalist that, "Instead of the sprawling mess of welfare programs we have today, the idea is to end all social welfare programs and instead just cut everyone a check." This is hardly an end to neoliberalism; it is an intensification of it, as every individual is granted a certain sum of money to fulfill their status as a good and abiding consumer. With UBI -- and the presumably unchanged state and capitalist control of credit -- one's status as a consumer is perpetuated while their status as a worker is tentative and subject to elimination. Capitalist control over the means of production remains intact, and the finance, insurance and real estate sectors continue to go unchecked and unconstrained.

#### A UBI would enhance capitalism – it would force dependence between the worker and the capitalist and would make the poor vulnerable to cuts

**Kleiner 2016- Political Economy Researcher** (Dmytri, 8/8/16, “Universal Basic Income is a neoliberal plot to make you poorer”, accessed on 6/28/17, <http://www.furtherfield.org/features/articles/universal-basic-income-neoliberal-plot-make-you-poorer>) [Premier]

The conflict between the worker and the capitalist, or between the rich and the poor, cannot be sidestepped simply by giving people money, if capitalists are allowed to continue to monopolize the supply of goods. Such a notion ignores the political struggle between the workers to maintain (or extend) the "basic income” and the capitalists to lower or eliminate it in order to strengthen their social position over the worker and to protect the power of “the sack.” Business leaders fight tooth and nail against any increase of social benefits for workers. Under their dominion, only one kind of UBI is possible: the one supported by Friedman and Murray, the Canadian Liberal Party, and all others who want to subject workers to bosses. The UBI will be under constant attack, and unlike established social programs with planned outcomes that are socially entrenched and difficult to eliminate, UBI is just a number, one that can be reduced, eliminated, or simply allowed to fall behind inflation. UBI does not alleviate poverty and turns social necessities into products for profit. To truly address inequality we need adequate social provisioning. If we want to reduce means testing and dependency on capitalist employment, we can do so with capacity planning. Our political demands should mandate sufficient housing, healthcare, education, childcare and all basic human necessities for all. Rather than a basic income, we need to demand and fight for a basic outcome — for the right to life and justice, not just the right to spend.

#### A UBI provides cover for a neoliberal agenda – it will be used to justify eliminating government programs for the poor.

**Kleiner 2016- Political Economy Researcher** (Dmytri, 8/8/16, “Universal Basic Income is a neoliberal plot to make you poorer”, accessed on 6/28/17, <http://www.furtherfield.org/features/articles/universal-basic-income-neoliberal-plot-make-you-poorer>) [Premier]

Basic Income is often promoted as an idea that will solve inequality and make people less dependent on capitalist employment. However, it will instead aggravate inequality and reduce social programs that benefit the majority of people. At its Winnipeg 2016 Biennial Convention, the Canadian Liberal Party passed a resolution in support of “Basic Income.” The resolution, called "Poverty Reduction: Minimum Income," contains the following rationale: "The ever growing gap between the wealthy and the poor in Canada will lead to social unrest, increased crime rates and violence... Savings in health, justice, education and social welfare as well as the building of self-reliant, taxpaying citizens more than offset the investment.” The reason many people on the left are excited about proposals such as universal basic income is that they acknowledges economic inequality and its social consequences. However, a closer look at how UBI is expected to work reveals that it is intended to provide political cover for the elimination of social programs and the privatization of social services. The Liberal Party's resolution is no exception. Calling for "Savings in health, justice, education and social welfare as well as the building of self-reliant, taxpaying citizen," clearly means social cuts and privatization. UBI has been endorsed by neoliberal economists for a long time. One of its early champions was the patron saint of neoliberalism, Milton Friedman. In his book Capitalism and Freedom, Friedman argues for a “negative income tax” as a means to deliver a basic income. After arguing that private charity is the best way to alleviate poverty, and praising the "private ... organizations and institutions" that delivered charity for the poor in the capitalist heyday of the nineteenth century, Friedman blames social programs for the disappearance of private charities: "One of the major costs of the extension of governmental welfare activities has been the corresponding decline in private charitable activities." To Friedman and his many powerful followers, the cause of poverty is not enough capitalism. Thus, their solution is to provide a "basic income" as a means to eliminate social programs and replace them with private organizations. Friedman specifically argues that "if enacted as a substitute for the present rag bag of measures directed at the same end, the total administrative burden would surely be reduced." Friedman goes on to list some the "rag bag" of measures he would hope to eliminate: direct welfare payments and programs of all kinds, old age assistance, social security, aid to dependent children, public housing, veterans' benefits, minimum-wage laws, and public health programs, hospitals and mental institutions. Friedman also spends a few paragraphs worrying whether people who depend on "Basic Income" should have the right to vote, since politically enfranchised dependents could vote for more money and services at the expense of those who do not depend on these. Using the example of pension recipients in the United Kingdom, he concludes that they "have not destroyed, at least as yet, Britain's liberties or its predominantly capitalistic system." Charles Murray, another prominent libertarian promoter of UBI, shares Friedman's views. In an interview with PBS, he said: "America’s always been very good at providing help to people in need. It hasn’t been perfect, but they’ve been very good at it. Those relationships have been undercut in recent years by a welfare state that has, in my view, denuded the civic culture." Like Friedman, Murray blames the welfare state for the loss of apparently effective private charity Murray adds: "The first rule is that the basic guaranteed income has to replace everything else — it’s not an add-on. So there’s no more food stamps; there’s no more Medicaid; you just go down the whole list. None of that’s left. The government gives money; other human needs are dealt with by other human beings in the neighborhood, in the community, in the organizations. I think that’s great."

#### A UBI does not address capitalism because it is individualized – it undermines the collective action of unions.

**Kolkotronis 2017- PhD student Political Science at Yale**  [Alexander, March 29 2017, “Why Socialist Job Guarantees are better than Universal Basic Income”, Accessed on 6/29/2017, <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/40022-why-socialist-job-guarantees-are-better-than-universal-basic-income>) [Premier]

UBI's aim of a society of "free labor" -- or no labor at all -- is appealing, but it is individualizing and lacks coordinating devices. With a self-managed socialist job guarantee, free labor would be an associated and socialized labor. At the same time, it would socialize the deployment of capital to meet community needs. Tcherneva likewise stated at a talk that the job guarantee program is an institutional vehicle -- a coordinating mechanism -- for addressing social needs, "as [a] place to come, and to truly nurture participation." Participatory budgeting, at its best, has been used to allot funds through the seeds of a distinct non-state logic. A similar non-state associationist logic can be deployed to cooperatively determine, assign and administer publicly-backed labor. As illustrated above, there are a number of overlapping ways that needs and desirable social projects could be identified at different scales. These include utilizing a variety of participatory forms, through both an intensification of the existing, and in experimentation with the imagined. A job guarantee program could be leveraged to meet needs, identified and solved through a multichannel participatory fashion. It could be utilized to rapidly democratize work itself.

## Feminism

#### Debating about a Basic Income without accounting for the gendered nature of work and the family reinforces the patriarchy. It subordinates women by encouraging them to leave the labor market, reinforcing the public/private dichotomy, and relegating women to the ‘private sphere.’

Pateman, 2004 – prof of Political Science at UCLA [Carole, Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income. Politics and Society on March 1, 2004. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0032329203261100>] [Premier]

Now is the time to ask the second question. The conditions under which the institution of employment and the Anglo-American social insurance system were constructed have now crumbled. “Old economy” male breadwinner jobs are being swept away in global economic restructuring and “downsizing.” New jobs have been created but many are low paid, lacking benefits, and temporary, and economic insecurity is widespread. Views about femininity, masculinity, and marriage are changing too, but since we are still in the midst of all these changes it is hard to know what the eventual outcome will be. Still, times of rapid change provide opportunities to investigate new ideas and look critically at old arrangements—including the moral hazard of institutions that give incentives to men to avoid their fair share of the unpaid work of caring for others. It has now become possible to rethink the connections between income and paid employment; between marriage, employment, and citizenship; between the private and public division of labor; and between caring work and other work—and to reconsider the meaning of “work.” But such rethinking requires a different approach from that taken by many participants in the debate about stakeholding and basic income. This is crucial if proper account is to be taken of women’s freedom, which has received rather short shrift in discussions of a basic income. As early as 1792, Mary Wollstonecraft argued in A Vindication of the Rights of Woman that rights, citizenship, and full standing for women required economic independence, whether a woman was married or single.33 As Ackerman and Alstott emphasize, a capital grant would be a step in this direction, but a basic income would for the first time provide all women with lifelong economic independence. Thus feminists might be expected strongly to support the introduction of a basic income.34 Yet this is not the case. Some feminists are critical of the idea because they fear a basic income would reinforce the existing sexual division of labor and women’s lesser citizenship. They argue that the provision of an income without having to engage in paid employment would, in light of women’s position in the labor market combined with lingering beliefs about the proper place and tasks of women and men, give women an even greater incentive to undertake more unpaid caring work in the household, and, conversely, men would have another incentive to freeride. A basic income, that is, would reinforce existing limitations on women’s freedom.35 This objection illustrates the importance of the reasons advanced for supporting a basic income. The probability of feminist fears being borne out is higher, for example, when the argument is made that to avoid weakening the “incentive to work” a basic income should be below subsistence level. This “incentive” is promoted with men and paid employment in mind. A basic income at this level provides no incentive for wives to “work” (i.e., enter paid employment); rather, it would encourage them to do more unpaid caring work. Again, to support basic income on the grounds that it would improve the living standards of the poorest sectors of the population does not promote consideration of the structural connections between marriage, employment, and citizenship, and the private and public sexual division of labor. Without the debates about basic income being informed by feminist arguments, and a concern for democratization (and genuine democratization necessarily includes women’s freedom and standing as citizens), the discussion will revolve around ways of tinkering with the existing system rather than encouraging thinking about how it might be made more democratic. Putting democratization at the center requires attention to institutional structures, especially the institutions of marriage and employment. For instance, Ackerman and Alstott remark in The Stakeholder Society that the “case for stakeholding does not ultimately rest on its effects on employment, marriage, or crime. It rests on each American’s claim to respect as a free and equal citizen.”36 However (leaving crime aside), the respect accorded to women and men as free and equal citizens has a great deal to do with the institutions of marriage and employment. It is not possible to understand women’s lesser citizenship, as Ackerman and Alstott show in their discussion of social security, without understanding the relationship between their position as wives and men’s position as workers.

#### We should reject the gendered assumptions in the affirmative’s discourse of the basic income, breaking down the public/private dichotomy.

Pateman, 2004 – prof of Political Science at UCLA [Carole, Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income. Politics and Society on March 1, 2004. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0032329203261100>] [Premier]

Now is the time to ask the second question. The conditions under which the institution of employment and the Anglo-American social insurance system were constructed have now crumbled. “Old economy” male breadwinner jobs are being swept away in global economic restructuring and “downsizing.” New jobs have been created but many are low paid, lacking benefits, and temporary, and economic insecurity is widespread. Views about femininity, masculinity, and marriage are changing too, but since we are still in the midst of all these changes it is hard to know what the eventual outcome will be. Still, times of rapid change provide opportunities to investigate new ideas and look critically at old arrangements—including the moral hazard of institutions that give incentives to men to avoid their fair share of the unpaid work of caring for others. It has now become possible to rethink the connections between income and paid employment; between marriage, employment, and citizenship; between the private and public division of labor; and between caring work and other work—and to reconsider the meaning of “work.” But such rethinking requires a different approach from that taken by many participants in the debate about stakeholding and basic income. This is crucial if proper account is to be taken of women’s freedom, which has received rather short shrift in discussions of a basic income. As early as 1792, Mary Wollstonecraft argued in A Vindication of the Rights of Woman that rights, citizenship, and full standing for women required economic independence, whether a woman was married or single.33 As Ackerman and Alstott emphasize, a capital grant would be a step in this direction, but a basic income would for the first time provide all women with lifelong economic independence

#### Adopting the feminist lens can break down the public/private dichotomy by recognizing that the personal is political

MacKinnon, 1989 - Professor of Law at University of Michigan[Catherine Mackinnon, , 1989, Toward a Feminist Theory of State] [Premier]

In private, consent tends to be presumed. Showing coercion is supposed to avoid this presumption. But the problem is getting anything private to be perceived as coercive. This is an epistemic problem of major dimensions and explains why privacy doctrine is most at home at home, the place women experience the most force, in the family, and why it centers on sex. Why a person would “allow” force in the private (the “why doesn't she leave” question raised to battered women) is a question given its insult by the social meaning of the private as a sphere of choice. For women the measure of intimacy has been the measure of oppression. This is why feminism has seen the personal as the political. The private is public for those for whom the person is political. In this sense, for women there is no private, either normatively or empirically. Feminism confronts the fact that women have no privacy to lose or to guarantee. Women are not inviolable. Women’s sexuality is not only violable, it is—hence, women are--seen in and as their violation. To confront the fact that women have no privacy is to confront the intimate degradation of women as the public order.

#### A feminist framework identifies masculinist biases in our discourse about a basic income – this is key to ending gender inequality

**Mckay 2002 – prof of economics at Glascow Univ** [Ailsa with Jo Vanevery independent writer, Social Politics, Gender, Gender, Family, and Income Maintenance: A Feminist Case for Citizens Basic Income, Summer 2002, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

Developing a feminist perspective on the nature of state supported income maintenance policies facilitates the identification of androcentric bias inherent within the current basic income debate. Social security mechanisms, which are intrinsically linked to the labor market, are criticized for generating and sustaining gender inequalities. This is due in part to the invisibility of various forms of work, particularly care work, provided outside of the labor market. The family is a key institution providing care in contemporary societies. The family is also a deeply gendered institution, often criticized for its inequalities. In addition, radical changes in family forms have occurred which contribute to the "welfare crisis." It is argued that although a basic income provides an opportunity to redefine the basis of citizenship beyond the productivist ethic focused on labor market participation, and is thus an ideal policy for the "postfamilial" society, the current literature does not do this in any sustained way. By examining the relationship between gender, family, and the state, we draw attention to the potential a citizens basic income has for providing the foundations of a new gender-neutral conceptualization of social justice.

#### In an academic setting we must break down the public/ private dichotomy through a feminist pedagogy. Only through a feminist pedagogy can we create a liberation and emancipation of gender.

Scering, 1997 – Thorton Elementary School [Grace E. Sikes Scering, journal of teacher education, themes of a critical feminist pedagogy, <http://jte.sagepub.com/content/48/1/62> Connected knowing fuels a more critical stance for school knowledge, something essential if schools are to become vehicles for critical democracy (Goodin, 1992). [Premier]

As a guide for a curriculum correlating democracy with critical/ feminist pedagogy, connected knowing emphasizes an expanded base for school knowledge and the development or students’ responsibilities to themselves, their peers, children and adults. Critical knowing needs to be at the core of issues and practices related to the power dynamics within schools**…** Young people also need clear instructions to help them visualize democratic values with a broader societal and global context (Goodman 1992). Emphasis on caring and responsibility linked to democracy may develop values and attitudes undergirding production of critical and connected knowledge. The dominant white male epistemology emphasizing dichtomization of social life apart from private values and the distancing of individual from others causes the failure to relate caring and responsibility to democracy in traditional schooling. Maher (1987) maintains that gendered (feminist) and liberation (critical) models of pedagogy complement one another because the gendered models tend to ignore the personal domain Leck (1987) acknowledges that a heightened awareness of gender is insufficient for changing the masculine paradigm of schooling but that liberation theory is a model for praxis, the intersection of theory, practice and action (Giroux, 1988). Yet critical/ feminist pedagogy is more than an extended liberation theory or a part of liberation theory (Giroux, 1988). It has the potential to affect the top-down educational stance of liberationist theorists. Feminist pedagogy may be able to move liberationist theorists to a full recognition of their own risk as they work in interrelationships within the limits of his dualistic, hierarchal and patriarchal paradigm. And paradoxically, without such systematic consciousness-raising among liberation theorists who are not primarily defined as doing feminist pedagogy, it would be unlikely that educators would recognize the role of patriarchy as an educational paradigm

#### The affirmative conception of justice marginalizes women because their conception of the independent adult is androcentric.

**Zelleke 2011 - prof of political science at The New School** [Almaz, January 2011, [http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/tpp/pap/2011/00000039/00000001/art00004 June 27](http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/tpp/pap/2011/00000039/00000001/art00004%20June%2027), 2017] LA [Premier]

Here I focus on examining the premises on which the most salient objections to an unconditional basic income are constructed. I argue that traditional theories of justice and citizenship posit an ostensibly gender-neutral but clearly androcentric subject – the autonomous, ‘independent’ and dependant-free adult faced with a choice between employment and leisure. Dominant theories of justice and citizenship make this problematic presumption without fully understanding how that subject embodies a gender bias that is inimical to women’s equality. The effect of this gender bias in the realm of distributive justice in general, and in the basic income debate in particular, is the reinforcement of economic inequalities between those with disproportionate responsibility for care work and those without, through the undervaluing of care work as a social contribution, and through misconceptions about the extent to which care work can be commodified and those who now provide it unburdened of it. Training a feminist lens on justice and citizenship, through which androcentric theories are tempered by recognition of these dependencies and of the importance of care work, suggests the broad outlines of a feminist theory of justice and citizenship that promotes the fullest conception of distributive justice – one that embodies a substantive equality of the genders.

# Negative – Morals/Framework

## Libertarianism

#### UBI is impermissible because the state does not have the authority to coerce redistribution of wealth which treats taxpayers as a means to other people’s freedom

**Huemer 2014 - professor of Philosophy at the University of Colorado at Boulder** [Michael, Is a basic Income Permissible?, August 6 2014, <https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/06/michael-huemer/basic-income-permissible>, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

The central point for which Matt Zwolinski’s lead essay argues is that a basic income guarantee would be less bad than the status quo. Having been recruited for a critical comment, I hope my role is not to dispute this thesis, because I can’t think of how one could defend the status quo from any philosophical standpoint. I therefore hope I may be excused for focusing on something that Zwolinski did not argue in this essay but that he has argued elsewhere: Is a government-provided basic income guarantee ethically permissible? The answer to this is non-obvious, but I think it is probably no. (Note that this is compatible with the fact that the status quo is even worse.) I will summarize my main reason for this, then address Zwolinski’s arguments from other postings. I. The Basic Argument Against a Basic Income My basic argument is this: 1. A basic income guarantee is permissible only if the state has political authority. 2. No one has political authority. 3. Therefore, a basic income guarantee is impermissible. What is meant by “political authority” here? Roughly, political authority involves a kind of exemption from the usual norms of non-aggression in interpersonal ethics – an exemption that entitles the agent who has authority to coercively impose rules of conduct on the rest of society, in conditions or for reasons that would not justify coercion on the part of ordinary private agents. (For a better explanation, see my The Problem of Political Authority, chapter 1). Why is premise (1) true? Suppose I decided to provide a basic income for my neighborhood. I don’t have enough justly acquired money to do this, so I extract the needed funds from my neighbors by threatening them with kidnaping and long-term imprisonment if they fail to hand over the funds I require. Sometimes a neighbor evades my efforts, usually by lying to me about his income. I kidnap these neighbors and hold them prisoner in small cells for years at a time. This part is crucial – carrying out the coercive threats on recalcitrant citizens is practically necessary to maintaining a tax system in any realistic society. This behavior seems impermissible, to put it mildly. Even registered Democrats would agree with this. Now, that does not yet establish that a government-guaranteed basic income is impermissible. Perhaps the government is different from me and other private agents in some ethically relevant way, which exempts them from the moral constraint that enjoins me from behaving in this way. What the example shows is that basic-income advocates need some account of how the government is thus exempt. That is, they need a theory of political authority. I hold, however, that no agent has ever possessed political authority. I can’t give you the argument for that here. The argument consists in reviewing the most plausible and influential accounts of the basis of the state’s authority – for example, theories based on the social contract, the democratic process, fairness, or utilitarian considerations – and showing, in each case, how the theories fail. If you want to know more about that, I’m afraid you have to read my book (sorry!). II. The Rectification Argument for a Basic Income History is full of injustice, much of it affecting the distribution of property. Following a suggestion of Robert Nozick’s, Zwolinski elsewhere suggests that, since the chain of causation is difficult to trace in individual cases, and since those who are doing especially badly now are disproportionately likely to have been harmed by that injustice, the state might be justified in redistributing wealth to the poor in general, as a kind of approximation to the rectification of injustice. Here are a few brief problems with this line of thought: A. We should expect that the effects of injustices tend to wash out over time. Personal choices and innate abilities probably have much more to do with a person’s present-day income level than events occurring a century or more in the past. This is one reason for adopting a sort of statute of limitations on reparations for past injustices. B. A basic income would redistribute money from the rich and the middle class to the poor. But those from whom the money is taken are not guilty of any crimes for which they owe compensation. For example, no living person is responsible for slavery; it would therefore be unjust to force anyone to pay compensation for it. C. Zwolinski suggests that despite point (B), the state might owe compensation for past injustices, because the same state continues to exist despite changes in personnel. Analogously, corporations retain debts and other obligations even when the members who incurred those obligations are no longer in the corporation, or even are no longer alive. Shouldn’t a similar principle therefore hold for governments? Very briefly, I think this continuity of obligations is possible for private corporations because new members of a corporation, in voluntarily joining the organization, thereby undertake whatever obligations go along with their accepted role in the corporation. These may include, for example, seeing to the payment of debts incurred by past managers. The same does not hold for the state, because new taxpayers do not voluntarily undertake the obligations of the government; rather, they have the government’s debts forcibly imposed on them. Admittedly, my view here will appeal more to anarchists than to anyone else, since the inability to collect funds to pay its debts would create serious practical problems for running a government. III. The Freedom Argument In another posting, Zwolinski suggested that a basic income might be justified on the grounds that it protects individuals’ freedom, because having a basic income insulates one from certain kinds of coercion by one’s employer. Zwolinski characterizes this as a libertarian argument for a basic income. I think this illustrates the problem with characterizing libertarianism merely as a pro-freedom philosophy. As I understand it, the (typical) minimal-state libertarian’s view is not that the job of the state is to act so as to maximize freedom. Rather, the state is charged with protecting the rights of individuals, while avoiding violating rights itself. Typically one is not justified in violating another person’s rights solely to prevent something slightly worse from happening – not even if the slightly worse thing would involve a diminution of someone’s freedom. For example, it is not ethically permissible to murder an innocent person, even if doing so somehow prevents two other innocent people from being murdered. Or so I believe, and so says the usual deontological conception of rights. I thus find the “freedom” argument unpersuasive. 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.

#### Libertarianism still rejects a UBI – it is not enough to be “less impermissible” than the present system – it is still coercive.

**Henderson, 2015 –prof of economics at the Naval Postgraduate School's School of Public Policy** [David R., A Philosophical Economist's Case against a Government-Guaranteed Basic Income. This article appeared in The Independent Review in the Spring of 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/24563064.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A79bf90b3116741c8d2dcf25fb3a5e858] JN [Premier]

Moreover, even if the BIG were better than the existing welfare state—a proposition that, as argued earlier, Zwolinski has not successfully demonstrated—this argument is an unusual one for a libertarian to make. The reason is that among the ways that we should reduce the size of government is bringing an end to the welfare state. Here is how philosopher Michael Huemer puts the point in the introductory paragraph of his response to Zwolinski in the Cato Unbound discus sion: "The central point for which Matt Zwolinski's lead essay argues is that a basic income guarantee would be less bad than the status quo. Having been recruited for a critical comment, I hope my role is not to dispute this thesis, because I can't think of how one could defend the status quo from any philosophical standpoint" (2014). I have challenged the idea that the BIG would be less bad, at least in a budgetary sense, than the status quo. But Huemer's point is on target: even if the BIG were less bad than the status quo, that is not a strong argument, especially for a libertarian to make. To put it blundy, the status quo is ugly. To drive the point home, consider two libertarians discussing the drug war. Libertarian A wants to end the drug war and allow as free a market in drugs as is allowed in candy bars. Libertarian B wants to make illegal drugs legal but tax them heavily and severely restrict their distribution. Libertarian B argues that his option is better than the status quo, under which hundreds of thousands of people, if not millions, have their lives wrecked by government. Libertarian A agrees but thinks we would do better by ending the drug war altogether. In this argument, the status quo in the drug arena is so awful that simply coming up with a less intrusive alternative is not good enough because it is still intrusive. Zwolinski might argue that if he can make his BIG superior to the current welfare state, possibly by cutting the amount per person to, say, $5,000, then his case for a BIG would stand. But that's not so. The case for a BIG would stand only as an alternative to the current welfare state, not as an ideal. The only way he could make the case would be if he were explicitly to propose a BIG as a temporary step away from the current welfare state. But that is clearly not what he is doing. Here's the test. If someone were to come up with a way of ending the current welfare state and not replacing it with a BIG, would Zwolinski favor that way? Based on the arguments he has used for a BIG, one's answer would have to be "no."

#### The UBI is still theft even if it might be marginally better than the current welfare state.

**Navabi 13 – PhD in Economics** [Ash, 12/6/13, “Against ‘The Libertarian Case for a Basic Income’,” Mises Institute, <https://www.mises.ca/against-the-libertarian-case-for-a-basic-income/>, accessed 6/28/17] AO [Premier]

Zwolinski’s first defence: A Basic Income Guarantee would be much better than the current welfare state. This has a simple response: Why should the federal government be taking money by force from anyone, for any reason at all? There are many economic costs associated whenever the government purloins the public, of course; but there are also moral issues involved with theft. Just because a BIG may be less paternalistic and condescending to the poor than the current welfare paradigm, as Zwolinski suggests, does not mean that it [is]just and ethical to do in the first place. Zwolinski provides no defense of why the state has either the right or the obligation to take from some to give to others.

#### Libertarianism opposes UBI—disincentives to work, effects on migration, economic growth, and the non-aggression principle.

**Navabi 13 – PhD in Economics** [Ash, 12/6/13, “Against ‘The Libertarian Case for a Basic Income’,” Mises Institute, <https://www.mises.ca/against-the-libertarian-case-for-a-basic-income/>, accessed 6/28/17] AO [Premier]

Some brief comments on the potential objections he anticipates libertarians to make against his arguments: 1) Disincentives It’s true that under today’s regime, many don’t work at all in order to keep collecting their (meager) welfare checks. But under his proposed regime of giving $20,000 to every poor person in America, he is suggesting that giving people the equivalent of working full-time for $10 an hour (almost 50% above the current federal minimum wage) will have no more, and perhaps an even negative, effect on willingness to seek employment. Colour me unconvinced. 2) Effects on Migration Zwolinski does not attempt to refute this objection. He also does not consider my objection above, of forcing new immigrants (some of whom could not even be citizens yet) to paying taxes to support citizens, either native born or naturalized. 3) Effects on Economic Growth Asking how much poorer the country would be if some centuries old policy limited economic growth is an impossible question to answer. The counterfactuals are literally unimaginable. We have no idea what radical innovations may have been deemed to expensive to develop, and which would have enormous effects today. But his question of how much poorer the \*poorest\* Americans would be is slightly easier to answer: not much, if we take “poorest” in the literal sense, meaning someone who is homeless and barely has any clothes. However, even their already limited access to charity would be even more limited, and because of this reason there may in fact be many more people who classify as among the poorest in the country. As well, we have to remember that America’s riches had vast “network effects” around the whole world: advances in health care, entertainment, information technology, and manufacturing that started in the US have enriched many millions, if not billions, around the world today. BONUS (not included in Zwolinski’s list of objections): 4) The Non-Aggression Principle Zwolinski didn’t offer this as an objection himself, but I found it shocking that he did not include it in an article that appeared on a website called Libertarianism.org: namely, the non-aggression principal. I know that Zwolinski has elsewhere criticized the NAP, and that he himself is a consequentialist (the defining feature of all Bleeding Heart Libertarians), but why not include the NAP-based objection in his list of objections? Surely a significant portion of the libertarian community reject his claims here on the basis that they violate the NAP. Does Zwolinski not think of these libertarians as significant? Or as not worth engaging? Either way, a troubling sign.

#### True libertarianism flows neg. Charity can’t be forced. Even then, the plan is economically impossible.

**Caplan 17 - Professor of Economics at George Mason University** [Bryan, and Senior Scholar at the Mercatus Center Why Libertarians should oppose the Universal Basic Income, February 20, 2017, http://econlog.econlib.org/archives/2017/02/why\_libertarian\_2.html, June 27,2017] CL [Premier]

Libertarians have a standard set of fundamental criticisms of the welfare state. 1. Forced charity is unjust. Individuals have a moral right to decide if and when they want to help others. 2. Forced charity is unnecessary. In a free market, voluntary donations are enough to provide for the truly poor. 3. Forced charity gives recipients bad incentives. If the government takes care of you, you're less likely to take care of yourself by work and saving. 4. The cost of forced charity is high and growing rapidly, leading to a future of exhorbitant taxes or financial crisis. Taken together, I think these criticisms justify the radical libertarian view that the welfare state should be abolished. But this is an extremely unpopular view, so it's natural for libertarians to consider more moderate reforms like the Universal Basic Income. And when you're considering moderate reforms, the right question to ask isn't: "Is it ideal?" but "Is it better than the status quo?" My claim: the Universal Basic Income is indeed worse than the status quo. In fact, all the fundamental criticisms of the welfare state apply with even greater force. 1. Some forced charity is more unjust than other forced charity. Forcing people to help others who can't help themselves - like kids from poor families or the severely disabled - is at least defensible. Forcing people to help everyone is not. And for all its faults, at least the status quo makes *some* effort to target people who can't help themselves. The whole idea of the Universal Basic Income, in contrast, is to give money to everyone whether they need it or not. Of course, the UBI formula normally reduces the net payment as income rises; but if a perfectly able-bodied person chooses never to work, the UBI gravy train never stops. 2. The UBI is an extremely wasteful form of forced charity. Helping the small minority of people who can't help themselves doesn't cost much. Giving an unconditional grant to every citizen wastes an enormous amount of money. If you were running a private charity, it would never even occur to you to "help everyone," because it's such a frivolous use of scarce charitable resources. Instead, you'd target spending to do the most good. And unlike the UBI, the status quo makes *some* effort to so target its resources. 3. Overall, the UBI *probably* gives even worse incentives than the status quo. Defenders of the UBI correctly point out that it might improve incentives for people who are *already* on welfare. Under the status quo, earning another $1 of legal income can easily reduce your welfare by a $1, implying a marginal tax rate of 100%. But under the status quo, vast populations are ineligible for most programs. Such as? You guys! If you're an able-bodied adult, aged 18-64, who doesn't have custody of any minor children, the current system doesn't give you much. Switching to a UBI would expand the familiar perverse effects of the welfare state to the entire population - including you. And if taxes rise to pay for the UBI, the population-wide disincentives are even worse. 4. A politically acceptable UBI would be insanely expensive. Libertarian economist and UBI advocate Ed Dolan has a [detailed**, fiscally viable plan**](http://www.economonitor.com/dolanecon/2014/01/13/could-we-afford-a-universal-basic-income/) to provide a UBI of $4452 per person per year. But every non-libertarian I've queried thinks it should be at least $10,000 per person per year. Even with a one-third flat tax, that implies that a family of four would have to make $120,000 a year before it paid $1 of taxes. This is pie in the sky. But doesn't the UBI give people their freedom? In some socialist sense, sure. But libertarianism isn't about the freedom to be coercively supported by strangers. It's about the freedom to be left alone by strangers. If abolition of the welfare state is extremely unlikely and the UBI is worse than the status quo, does this mean libertarians should accept the welfare state as it is? Not at all. There's a straightforward moderate path to a freer world: AUSTERITY. Cut benefits. Restrict eligibility. Remind the world of the great Forgotten Man: the taxpayer. We probably can't convince the majority to end the welfare state. But "Welfare should be limited to genuinely poor people who can't help themselves" has broad appeal - and unlike the UBI, it's a clear step in the libertarian direction.

# Negative – AT Consequentialism

## Case Blocks – Economy

### Inflation

#### Turn - A UBI would destroy the economy – it would ignite hyperinflation and crush growth, causing stagflation

**Kolkotronis 2017- PhD student Political Science at Yale**  [Alexander, March 29 2017, “Why Socialist Job Guarantees are better than Universal Basic Income”, Accessed on 6/29/2017, <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/40022-why-socialist-job-guarantees-are-better-than-universal-basic-income>) [Premier]

UBI as Hyperinflationary Economist Pavlina Tcherneva has argued there could be disastrous results from wide-scale implementation of UBI. In a paper from 2006, Tcherneva argues that solely implementing UBI would lead to "stagflation," i.e., "low employment and high prices." She writes: In order to coax [UBI] recipients back into the labour market, employers will need to offer higher wages (which, at first approximation, is a desirable result). However, soon thereafter, these same employers will also raise prices, to cover the increases in wage costs. As a consequence, rising prices will erode the purchasing power of the [UBI] payment, which will affect particularly those recipients who did not return to the labour market. To maintain the objective of the universal guarantee and provide just levels of standard living, there will be pressure to revise the [UBI] benefit upward. If this happens it will further induce some exit from the labour market, drop in output, a compensatory rise in wages and prices and further drop in [UBI] purchasing power. This vicious cycle renders the income guarantee self-defeating. Note that, if the benefit is continually increased -- the income guarantee becomes not just inflationary, but hyperinflationary. Within a political-economic climate preoccupied with budget-neutrality (i.e., balanced budgets; running no fiscal deficits), "if taxes are raised ... they will also induce workers on the margin to exit the labour force." This coupling of a rising UBI to compensate for increased prices, with rising taxes (again, partially resulting from an obsession with budget-neutrality), will result in declining output.

### Labor

#### Turn - A UBI would undermine the economy by discouraging work – the consensus of economic studies proves.

**Calder, 2017 – welfare policy analyst at The Cato Institute** [Vanessa, Universal Basic Income — Disease or Cure? This article appeared in Cayman Financial Review on April 26, 2017. <https://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/universal-basic-income-disease-or-cure>] [Premier]

Outside of the cost of the program, providing every U.S. citizen with a cash grant is likely to have a large and negative behavioral effect. Economists agree that welfare programs create labor supply disincentives, meaning that individuals reduce work because of government benefits. As the Congressional Research Service has noted, an “increase in [the value of welfare benefits] is expected to cause people to reduce work hours.” While this is true of all welfare programs, only around 1/5th of the current U.S. population is currently impacted. If UBI were instituted, labor supply disincentives would touch 100 percent of the population, rather than a subgroup of eligible applicants.

#### A UBI disincentivizes work—more money to justify leisure and less tradeoff for less work

**Dolan 14- prof of economics at Dartmouth College** [Ed, August 18th 2014, “A Universal Basic Income and Work Incentives”, Econo Monitor, Accessed on 6/27/17, http://www.economonitor.com/dolanecon/2014/08/18/a-universal-basic-income-and-work-incentives-part-1-theory/] JC [Premier]

First, you can see that regardless of how much you work, you will receive some benefit from the government, so your disposable income will rise. Other things being equal, people tend to “spend” part of their increased income on increased leisure, in the form of shorter hours, longer vacations, a longer time in school, earlier retirement, or longer breaks between jobs. Economists call that the income effect of a higher income. Second, the income support program changes the tradeoff you face between additional work and additional earned income. Suppose your best available job pays $10 per hour. Without the MTIS, one more hour of work brings you $10 of added disposable income. With the MTIS, one more hour of work raises your disposable income by only $2.50, because the $10 you earn is offset by a loss of $7.50 in benefits. In effect, the program reduces the “price” (more properly, the opportunity cost) of leisure, so you are more likely to substitute leisure for work and the disposable income it brings in. Economists call that the substitution effect of the program. Below the break-even level of income, the income and substitution effects work in the same direction, so there is an unambiguous incentive to work less. Some people might stop working altogether. Some might reduce their hours, take longer vacations, or spend more time between jobs. Whatever the specifics, the average response will be a reduction in work hours. Even if some people have employers who allow no flexibility in hours worked, the average response for the whole population to whom the policy applies will be zero.

#### A UBI fails – it discourages work – a basic income cannot replace many aspects of work

**Porter, 2016 – New York Times economics columnist** [Eduardo, “A Universal Basic Income Is a Poor Tool to Fight Poverty”, *New York Times*, May 31, 2016, https://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/01/business/economy/universal-basic-income-poverty.html. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

Work, as Lawrence Katz of Harvard once pointed out, is not just what people do for a living. It is a source of status. It organizes people’s lives. It offers an opportunity for progress. None of this can be replaced by a check.A universal basic income has many undesirable features, starting with its non-negligible disincentive to work. Almost a quarter of American households make less than $25,000. It would be hardly surprising if a $10,000 check each for mom and dad sapped their desire to work.∂ A universal income divorces assistance from need. Aid is fixed, regardless of whatever else is going on. If our experience with block grants serves as precedent, it is most likely to become less generous over time.∂ To libertarians this will sound more like a feature than a flaw, but replacing everything in the safety net with a check would limit the scope of government assistance in damaging ways. Say we know the choice of neighborhood makes a difference to the development of poor children. Housing vouchers might lead them to move into a better one. A monthly check would probably not.

#### A UBI undermines the values of hard work and instead replaces them with apathy

**Cass 16- senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute** [Oren, June 15 2016, “Why a Universal Basic Income Is a Terrible Idea”, Nat Review, Accessed on 6/27/17, <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/436621/universal-basic-income-ubi-terrible-idea>] JC [Premier]

A UBI would undermine all this: Work by definition would become optional, and consumption would become an entitlement disconnected from production. Stripped of its essential role as the way to earn a living, work would instead be an activity one engaged in by choice, for enjoyment, or to afford nicer things. For many proponents of the scheme, this is the point. Releasing people from any responsibility to support themselves or their families represents the zenith of a hyper-individualistic culture. The goal is to maximize freedom and satisfaction by minimizing obligation and constraint. As the slogan of the moment proclaims: “You do you.” This should give pause to anyone who believes that the good life entails more, or that a free society requires its members, as Yuval Levin writes in his new book The Fractured Republic, to “commit ourselves to more than our own will and whim. It requires a commitment precisely to the formative social and cultural institutions that we have seen pulled apart from above and below in our age of fracture.” Even if a UBI represents just one more slip in our culture’s long downward slide, that is no argument in its favor. Only after halting the slide and regaining its footing can the culture hope to reclaim lost ground.

### Recession

#### Turn - Wage flexibility harms the economy because it makes demand unstable during recessions

**Pressman, 2005 – Prof of economics at Monmouth Univ** [Steven, with Michael Lewis and Karl Widerquist The Basic Income Guarantee and Social Economics. This article appeared in Review of Social Economy on December 2005. http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/29770341.pdf?refreqid=search%3A9330359b12bad0e394957e75c30d95e6] JN [Premier]

Economic Questions Raised by Basic Income The cases for and against a Basic Income policy rest on economic assumptions as to how a Basic Income policy will influence the economy. Thus, the conservative case for a Basic Income Policy rests on the assumption that wage rigidity is the major cause of unemployment and that increased wage flexibility will reduce unemployment. There are many problems with the conservative case for a Basic Income, not the least being that, as Keynes so clearly pointed out in the General Theory, wage flexibility may cause more problems than it solves by making aggregate demand more unstable. In particular, during recessions downwardly flexible labor costs would lead to a fall in consumption spending, exacerbating the cyclical down- swing. As Guy Standing [1986] has demonstrated, labor markets have become much more flexible, in the neoclassical sense, since the late 1970s, while unemployment has risen, not fallen. The main weakness in the neoclassical position stems from the assumption that there exists a "labor market" that is comparable to the market for soybeans. Real labor markets do not have market clearing price mechanisms and have never exhibited the type of responses to changes in supply and demand we teach our students in economic principles classes.8

### Taxes/Economy

#### Turn - UBI would massively increase tax rates which triggers deadweight loss—this cuts the economy in half

**Henderson 2015 – Associate Professor of Economics** [Davis, research fellow at Stanford, Spring 2015, “A Philosophical Economist’s Case against a Government-Guaranteed Basic Income,” The Independent Review, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24563064>, accessed 6/27/17] AO [Premier]

How would Zwolinski fund this major increase in federal spending? If his goal were to keep the already bloated half-trillion-dollar federal deficit constant rather than increasing it, he would need to have the federal government increase taxes from their estimated $2.993 trillion to $4.361 trillion, an increase of 45.7 percent. One of the most well-established facts in the economics literature on government finance is that raising a tax rate by x percent raises the revenue from that tax by less than x percent.4 The reason for this relationship is that the higher tax rate discourages the activity being taxed, so the tax base on which the tax is levied is smaller than otherwise. So if the federal government were to raise all tax rates by the same percentage to generate the revenue needed, it would have to raise all tax rates by more than 45.7 percent and probably substantially more. Assume, for simplicity, a 50 percent increase in all tax rates, although the percent age would probably be more. Why more? Assume conservatively that a 45.7 percent increase in tax rates would reduce by only 5 percent the base on which the taxes are levied.5 Then a 45.7 percent increase in tax rates would increase the federal government's tax revenues by only 38.4 percent.6 Thus, tax rates would have to be increased by substantially more than 45.7 percent. That conservatively estimated 50 percent increase in tax rates means that the current Social Security payroll tax (Federal Insurance Contributions Act or FICA tax), instead of its current 6.2 percent each on employer and employee, would be 9.3 percent. The bottom marginal tax rate on individual income, instead of being 10 percent, would be 15 percent. The top marginal tax rate on individual income, instead of being its current 39.6 percent,7 would instead be 59.4 percent. With the magnitude of these tax increases, one strong concern would be the size of what economists call "deadweight loss." The deadweight loss from taxes is the loss in wealth caused by taxes that goes to no one. So, for example, a 10 percent tax on gasoline might cause a loss in producer and consumer surplus of $10 billion while creating "only" $9 billion in tax revenue for the government. The $1 billion loss in consumer and producer surplus that goes to no one is called "deadweight loss." Every tax, except a lump-sum tax,8 causes a deadweight loss. Moreover, a theorem in economics shows that the size of the deadweight loss from a tax is proportional to the square of the tax rate. So, for example, raising a 39.6 percent tax rate by 50 percent up to 59.4 percent would not raise the deadweight loss by 50 percent; it would raise the deadweight loss by 125 percent.9 A reasonable minimum estimate of the deadweight loss from the current federal tax system is 25 percent of revenues raised. So the tax increases required to fund the BIG would push deadweight loss from about 25 percent of revenue to 62.5 percent of revenue raised.

**AT Automation**

#### No job loss - job creation from technology and automation outweighs.

**Mishel and Bivens, 2017 – president and director of research at the Economic Policy Institute** [Lawrence and Josh, The zombie robot argument lurches on - There is no evidence that automation leads to joblessness or inequality. Economic Policy Institute on May 24, 2017. http://www.epi.org/publication/the-zombie-robot-argument-lurches-on-there-is-no-evidence-that-automation-leads-to-joblessness-or-inequality/] [Premier]

Technological change and automation absolutely can, and have, displaced particular workers in particular economic sectors. But technology and automation also create dynamics (for example, falling relative prices of goods and services produced with fewer workers) that help create jobs in other sectors. And even when automation’s job-generating and job-displacing forces don’t balance out, government policy can largely ensure that automation does not lead to rising overall unemployment. The narrative that automation creates joblessness is inconsistent with the fact that we had substantial and ongoing automation for many decades but did not have continuously rising unemployment. And the fall in unemployment from 10 percent to below 5 percent since 2010 is inconsistent with the claim that surging automation is generating greater unemployment. As noted above, fluctuations in the pace of technological change have been associated with both good and bad labor market outcomes. So there is no reason to deduce that we should fear robots. The American labor market has plenty of problems keeping it from working well for most Americans, and these are the problems that should occupy our attention.

#### Automation is not destroying jobs – the media exaggerates and ignores alternative causes of unemployment

**Mishel and Bivens, 2017 – president and director of research at the Economic Policy Institute** [Lawrence and Josh, The zombie robot argument lurches on - There is no evidence that automation leads to joblessness or inequality. Economic Policy Institute on May 24, 2017. http://www.epi.org/publication/the-zombie-robot-argument-lurches-on-there-is-no-evidence-that-automation-leads-to-joblessness-or-inequality/] [Premier]

The media are full of stories about robots and automation destroying the jobs of the past and leaving us jobless in the future; call it the coming Robot Apocalypse. We are also told that automation and technology are responsible for the poor wage growth and inequality bedeviling the American working class in recent decades, and that looming automation will only accelerate and ratchet up these problems. Recent research by economists Daron Acemoglu of MIT and Pascual Restrepo of Boston University is but the latest fuel for the automation media narrative (Acemoglu and Restrepo 2017a). What is remarkable about this media narrative is that there is a strong desire to believe it despite so little evidence to support these claims. There clearly are serious problems in the labor market that have suppressed job and wage growth for far too long; but these problems have their roots in intentional policy decisions regarding globalization, collective bargaining, labor standards, and unemployment levels, not technology. This report highlights the paucity of the evidence behind the alleged robot apocalypse, particularly as mischaracterized in the media coverage of the 2017 Acemoglu and Restrepo (A&R) report. Yes, automation has led to job displacements in particular occupations and industries in the past, but there is no basis for claiming that automation has led—or will lead—to increased joblessness, unemployment, or wage stagnation overall. We argue that the current excessive media attention to robots and automation destroying the jobs of the past and leaving us jobless in the future is a distraction from the main issues that need to be addressed: the poor wage growth and inequality caused by policies that have shifted economic power away from low- and moderate-wage workers. It is also the case that, as Atkinson and Wu (2017) argue, our productivity growth is too low, not too high. Rather than debating possible problems that are more than a decade way, policymakers need to focus on addressing the decades-long crisis of wage stagnation by creating good jobs and supporting wage growth. And as it turns out, policies to expand good jobs and increase wages are the same measures needed to ensure that workers potentially displaced by automation have good jobs to transition to. For these workers, the education and training touted as solutions in the mainstream robot narrative will be inadequate, just as they were not adequate to help displaced manufacturing workers over the last few decades.

#### Turn - Focusing on job loss from automation distracts us from creating policies that will actually improve our economy.

**Mishel and Bivens, 2017 – president and director of research at the Economic Policy Institute** [Lawrence and Josh, The zombie robot argument lurches on - There is no evidence that automation leads to joblessness or inequality. Economic Policy Institute on May 24, 2017. http://www.epi.org/publication/the-zombie-robot-argument-lurches-on-there-is-no-evidence-that-automation-leads-to-joblessness-or-inequality/] [Premier]

Maybe one day robots or some other technological advance really will become a primary threat to American living standards. Anything can happen. But scarce resources and attention today should be focused on the current threat to these living standards: policies that have shifted bargaining power from working Americans to capital owners and corporate managers. Alleviating the struggles of working Americans will thus require a redistribution of economic leverage and bargaining power. Making this happen will be a huge political project, and will require a clear focus. Claims that the struggles of working Americans are instead the sad byproduct of bloodless trends in technology obscure this clear focus. The overwhelming evidence still strongly suggests that rapid technological advances are associated with better, not worse, economic outcomes for working Americans. To be clear, rapid technological advances alone are just a necessary, not a sufficient, condition to boost wages across the board. American workers also need policies that support their ability to claim an equitable share of productivity growth. Adopting policies to lift labor standards, broaden collective bargaining, and maintain genuine full employment would help ensure that there are good-quality jobs available for workers displaced by technology. This, more than training and education, is what is needed to respond to any potential wave of automation. These policies would also confront the wage stagnation already upon us. These policies are identified in our Agenda to Raise America’s Pay (EPI 2016). If even a quarter of the attention paid to robots were instead shifted to these policy changes, we could have a much more fruitful debate about economic policy.

#### Alt cause – the job loss from bad US trade policies with China are much more drastic than from automation.

**Mishel and Bivens, 2017 – president and director of research at the Economic Policy Institute** [Lawrence and Josh, The zombie robot argument lurches on - There is no evidence that automation leads to joblessness or inequality. Economic Policy Institute on May 24, 2017. http://www.epi.org/publication/the-zombie-robot-argument-lurches-on-there-is-no-evidence-that-automation-leads-to-joblessness-or-inequality/] [Premier]

The New York Times and other outlets have described A&R’s national estimates of job loss due to robots as “large.” But A&R’s estimates of job loss due to robots are actually quite modest when scaled against reasonable benchmarks. For example, at the upper end of the range they find that 670,000 jobs were lost due to robots (Acemoglu and Restrepo 2017a, 36). Since these jobs were lost over a 17-year period, 1990–2007, this translates to about 40,000 jobs lost each year. (Note that 40,000 jobs equates to about 2 percent of jobs gained on net in recent years.) Further, A&R find that robot displacement of workers led to a 0.34 percentage-point decline in the share of the working-age population with a job. These two sample employment impacts pale in comparison with the employment impacts of trade with China, and with employment declines overall in recent decades. A&R’s own estimate suggests that job displacements caused by trade with China in the 2000s were four times as large as their estimate of job loss due to robots In footnote number 26 in their 2017 report, A&R note that their estimated employment decline due to the effect of robots is only a third as large as the negative employment impact of U.S. trade with China.1 This finding flatly contradicts The New York Times reporting that A&R found larger effects stemming from robot adoption than from growing trade with China. We note that A&R estimated the impact of U.S. trade with China on U.S. employment for the entire 1990–2007 period. However, the impact of China trade on U.S. employment was mostly felt in the latter part of that period, when imports from China grew much faster than Chinese imports grew earlier in the period. This suggests that the “China trade effect” for the years from 1999 to 2007 would be even more than three times as large as the “robot effect” for those same years.

#### Unemployment from automation is decades off – MIT research proves

**Darrow, 2017 – Senior writer at *Fortune*** [Barb, Senior writer at *Fortune* with a focus on technology, Automation, Robots, and Job Losses Could Make Universal Income a Reality, *Fortune*, May 24, 2017, http://fortune.com/2017/05/24/automation-job-loss-universal-income/. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

The rise of automation and resulting job losses could force the federal government to guarantee some income for everyone, but that won't happen for years or even decades, according to some academics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.∂ This sort of payment, usually referred to as Universal Basic Income (UBI), has been embraced by much of Silicon Valley and other tech enclaves, in part to offset anxiety that the technology built in these places is killing off people's livelihoods.∂ UBI, if enacted, would be a flat payment to every citizen that would, in theory, act as a basic safety net for those who have little. Proponents, like Tesla (TSLA, -3.23%) and SpaceX founder Elon Musk, have argued such payments would be more efficient and less bureaucratic than current welfare programs.∂ But opinions vary as to when such a program will be needed. "We are nowhere near peak employment," said Andrew McAfee, co-director of MIT's Initiative on the Digital Economy, while speaking Wednesday at the MIT Sloan CIO Symposium. "We are nowhere near a plateau in how much work our economy requires to function."∂ His view: "Thinking of a post-work world is incredibly premature."∂ His colleague, Erik Brynjolfsson, who is director of the initiative, agreed: "There is no shortage of work that only people can do. We are moving very, very fast, but it's decades before we get to that kind of world." But, Brynjolfsson continued, people need to be willing to re-train themselves as needed and to be engaged.

#### Automation won’t devastate employment – empirical examples and historical data disprove the trend

**Calder, 2017 – welfare policy analyst at The Cato Institute** [Vanessa, Universal Basic Income — Disease or Cure? This article appeared in Cayman Financial Review on April 26, 2017. <https://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/universal-basic-income-disease-or-cure>] [Premier]

So what led to the idea rearing its head in the modern debate? Modern agitation about the automation of jobs is certainly one of the leading drivers, and recent research on this topic has led to growing anxiety in academic circles. In 2016, a White House Economic report suggested that jobs that pay $20 or less per hour have an 83 percent median probability of automation. Meanwhile, McKinsey research suggests that as many as 45 percent of current paid jobs could be automated by utilizing or adapting current technology. And a 2013 report from Oxford University suggests that 50 percent of jobs could be taken by robots in 10 to 20 years. Some tech and science voices share these concerns. Moshe Vardi, a computer science professor at Rice University and Guggenheim fellow recently suggested that “We are approaching the time when machines will be able to outperform humans at almost any task.” Elon Musk reiterated the point in a recent CNBC interview where he said that “there’s a pretty good chance we end up with a universal basic income, or something like that, due to automation.” This is not to say that agreement regarding the threat of automation is universal. For example, MIT economist David Autor suggests that automating repetitive tasks will make complementary skills more lucrative and essential, rather than less. He points to historical examples, like the automated teller machine (ATM) for evidence: in the 45 years since its invention, the number of human bank tellers has roughly doubled. Autor also points out that the fraction of human adults employed in the labor market is higher in 2017 than in 1890, despite the explosion in technological development that’s occurred over the intervening 125 years.

#### Affirmative studies that show automation destroying jobs are flawed – they have unrealistic assumptions and ignore counter evidence

**Mishel and Bivens, 2017 – president and director of research at the Economic Policy Institute** [Lawrence and Josh, The zombie robot argument lurches on - There is no evidence that automation leads to joblessness or inequality. Economic Policy Institute on May 24, 2017. http://www.epi.org/publication/the-zombie-robot-argument-lurches-on-there-is-no-evidence-that-automation-leads-to-joblessness-or-inequality/] [Premier]

In this paper we make the following points: Acemoglu and Restrepo’s new research does not show large and negative effects on overall employment stemming from automation. A&R’s methodology delivers high-quality local estimates of the impact of one sliver of automation (literally looking just at robots). But their translation of these high-quality local estimates (for “commuting zones”) into national effects relies on stylized and largely unrealistic assumptions. Even if one takes the unreliable simulated (not estimated) national effects as given, they are small (40,000 jobs lost each year) relative to any reasonable benchmark. For example, our analysis shows that their estimated job losses from the “China trade shock” are roughly four times as large as their estimated job losses from growing robot adoption in the 2000s. While A&R’s report shows that “robots” are negatively correlated with employment growth across commuting zones, it finds that all other indicators of automation (nonrobot IT investment) are positively correlated or neutral with regard to employment. So even if robots displace some jobs in a given commuting zone, other automation (which presumably dwarfs robot automation in the scale of investment) creates many more jobs. It is curious that coverage of the A&R report ignores this major finding, especially since it essentially repudiates what has been the conventional wisdom for decades—that automation has hurt job growth (at least for less-credentialed Americans). The A&R results do not prove that automation will lead to joblessness in the future or overturn previous evidence that automation writ large has not led to higher aggregate unemployment. Technological change and automation have not been the main forces driving the wage stagnation and inequality besieging working-class Americans.

#### Automation will not lead to joblessness. Historical trends prove

**Mishel and Bivens, 2017 – president and director of research at the Economic Policy Institute** [Lawrence and Josh, The zombie robot argument lurches on - There is no evidence that automation leads to joblessness or inequality. Economic Policy Institute on May 24, 2017. http://www.epi.org/publication/the-zombie-robot-argument-lurches-on-there-is-no-evidence-that-automation-leads-to-joblessness-or-inequality/] [Premier]

There is no historical correlation between increases in automation broadly defined and wage stagnation or increasing inequality. Automation—the implementation of new technologies as capital equipment or software replace human labor in the workplace—has been an ongoing feature of our economy for decades. It cannot explain why median wages stagnated in some periods and grew in others, or why wage inequality grew in some periods and shrank in others. Indicators of automation increased rapidly in the late 1990s and the early 2000s, a period that saw the best across-the-board wage growth for American workers in a generation. Indicators of automation fell during two periods of stagnant (or worse) wage growth: from 1973 to 1995 and from 2002 to the present. In these periods, inequality grew as wage growth for the richest Americans far outpaced wage growth of everyone else. During the long period of shared wage growth from the late 1940s to the mid-1970s (shared because all workers’ wages grew at roughly the same pace), indicators of automation also increased rapidly. There is no evidence that automation-driven occupational employment “polarization” has occurred in recent years, and thus no proof it has caused recent wage inequality or wage stagnation. First, numerous studies have documented that there was no occupational employment polarization—in which employment expands in higher-wage and lower-wage occupations while hollowing out in the middle—in the 2000s. Employment has primarily expanded in the lowest-wage occupations. Yet wage inequality between the top and the middle has risen rapidly since 2000. Second, wage inequality overwhelmingly occurs between workers within an occupation, not between workers in different occupations. So even if occupational employment polarization had occurred, it could not explain the growth of wage stagnation or inequality. There is no evidence of an upsurge in automation in the last 10 to 15 years that has affected overall joblessness. The evidence indicates automation has slowed. Trends in productivity, capital investment, information equipment investment, and software investment suggest that automation has decelerated in the last 10 or so years. Also, the rate of shifts in occupational employment patterns has been slower in the 2000s than in any period since 1940. Therefore, there is no empirical support for the prominent notion that automation is currently accelerating exponentially and leading to a robot apocalypse. The fact that robots have displaced some jobs in particular industries and occupations does not mean that automation has or will lead to increased overall joblessness.

#### Automation creates more jobs that leave overall unemployment unchanged.

**Mishel and Bivens, 2017 – president and director of research at the Economic Policy Institute** [Lawrence and Josh, The zombie robot argument lurches on - There is no evidence that automation leads to joblessness or inequality. Economic Policy Institute on May 24, 2017. http://www.epi.org/publication/the-zombie-robot-argument-lurches-on-there-is-no-evidence-that-automation-leads-to-joblessness-or-inequality/] [Premier]

Before tackling the unrealistic assumptions in the model, it is worth discussing the many ways that automation can create jobs that potentially offset the jobs lost in industries affected by automation and thus leave overall employment and unemployment unchanged. The machinery used to replace human labor must be built and installed, creating jobs. Complementary jobs are created in activities that necessarily accompany the investment, such as programming and maintenance. The main dynamic, however, is that employers deploy automation because it will lower costs, and lowering costs will ultimately lower the prices of the goods and services produced (in addition to raising profits). These lower prices mean that consumers who purchase the less costly goods and services will have income left to purchase other goods and services—unless, of course, consumers run out of things they want to buy, which we doubt. This increase in the demand for other goods and services will create jobs to generate those additional goods and services. Where these jobs will appear is unknowable, but history affirms that they do show up. The easiest illustration is what happened to agriculture. Due to automation, the share of the workforce employed in agriculture fell from around 50 percent in 1880 to just 20 percent in 1940 while still feeding the nation (Lebergott 1966, Table 2). Lower food prices allowed households to buy other goods, so employment rose in other sectors. Despite many decades of ominous warnings, we have not seen evidence of automation leading to large-scale overall joblessness. That is, automation has been proceeding for many decades. If automation were creating increased joblessness we would have expected to see an ever-rising unemployment rate, but we have not seen that. The failure of past automation to cause increased overall joblessness has led economists to believe that automation displaces specific jobs but does not increase aggregate unemployment.3 The notion that automation has led to a rapid surge in joblessness is also hard to square with recent trends in unemployment: aggregate unemployment fell from 10 percent in late 2009 to under 5 percent in 2017.

## Case Blocks – Poverty

### General / Laundry Lists

#### Turn - A UBI would increase poverty – extraordinary costs in our republican climate would cause them to slash funding for poverty programs that are more effective.

**Stone, 2016 – chief economist at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities** [Chad, A Universal Basic Income Is No Solution US News on June 3, 2016. https://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2016-06-03/a-universal-basic-income-wouldnt-reduce-poverty] [Premier]

At the 10,000-foot level, its appeal is twofold. First, unlike today's safety net, a universal income looks simple and seems to ensure that no one falls through the cracks. Second, since everyone gets it, it carries no stigma and should be politically popular, like the Alaska oil payment. The devil's in the details, however, as the New York Times' Eduardo Porter suggests here. More pointedly, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities President Robert Greenstein argues compellingly that any universal income likely to emerge in today's political climate would more likely increase poverty than reduce it. A universal basic income that gives all Americans enough income to meet their basic needs would be quite expensive. This year's poverty line will be roughly $12,500 for an individual, twice that for a family of four. A universal income of $10,000 per person – which is too small for a single person but generous for a family of four – would cost more than $3 trillion for today's population of over 300 million. To put the $3 trillion figure in perspective, the Congressional Budget Office projects that, under current tax laws, federal revenues in 2016 will be about $3.4 trillion. While it's arithmetically possible to craft a budget with a program on that scale, it's hard to imagine any such budget that's remotely feasible politically. Vox's Matthew Yglesias makes the arithmetic argument here, but he assumes that the goal of ending poverty would make conservatives and GOP politicians comfortable with raising federal spending to European levels and sending checks to able-bodied people who don't have a job and aren't looking for one. Even if a poverty-ending universal income isn't feasible, mightn't sufficient bipartisan support exist to enact a less ambitious program with a smaller payment? Perhaps, but Greenstein argues that going down that path is risky, since any apparent left-right agreement on the general desirability of a universal income masks fundamental differences in the ultimate objectives of such a program. On the right, conservatives generally view such a program as a replacement for existing safety net programs – not, as progressives would hope, a supplement to them that boosts the safety net's anti-poverty effectiveness. If policymakers were simply to reallocate the money that now funds existing safety net programs to a universal income, the result would be to spread that money over the entire population, reducing the amount that now goes specifically to reducing poverty. Nor, by redirecting the funds we now spend on anti-poverty programs, would we reap significant administrative savings, Greenstein argues. For the major means-tested programs – SNAP (food stamps), Medicaid, the Earned Income Tax Credit, housing vouchers, Supplemental Security Income and school meals – administrative costs consume only 1 to 9 percent of program resources, as this CBPP analysis explains. Good charities spend 11 percent on administrative costs, according to evidence that the Roosevelt Institute's Mike Konzcal cites in critiquing the conservative case for a universal income. Some universal income advocates believe that targeted means-tested programs are more politically vulnerable to budget cuts than universal programs. Greenstein makes a strong case that the opposite is likelier true, pointing to the numerous expansions in such programs over the years that even conservatives have supported.

#### Turn - A UBI hurts the poor – it creates the illusion of a cure-all, scales back assistance with income and is vulnerable to rollback

**Sawhill, 2016 – Senior fellow in Economic Studies at the Brookings Institution** [Isabel, “Money for nothing: Why a universal basic income is a step too far”, *Brookings*, June 15, 2016, https://www.brookings.edu/blog/social-mobility-memos/2016/06/15/money-for-nothing-why-a-universal-basic-income-is-a-step-too-far/. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

Robert Greenstein argues, however, that a UBI would actually hurt the poor by reallocating support up the income scale. His logic is inescapable: either we have to spend additional trillions providing income grants to all Americans or we have to limit assistance to those who need it most. One option is to provide unconditional payments along the lines of a UBI, but to phase it out as income rises. Libertarians like this approach since it gets rid of bureaucracies and leaves the poor free to spend the money on whatever they choose, rather than providing specific funds for particular needs. Liberals fear that such unconditional assistance would be unpopular and would be an easy target for elimination in the face of budget pressures. Right now most of our social programs are conditional. With the exception of the aged and the disabled, assistance is tied to work or to the consumption of necessities such as food, housing, or medical care, and our two largest means-tested programs are Food Stamps and the Earned Income Tax Credit. THE CASE FOR PATERNALISM Liberals have been less willing to openly acknowledge that a little paternalism in social policy may not be such a bad thing. In fact, progressives and libertarians alike are loath to admit that many of the poor and jobless are lacking more than just cash. They may be addicted to drugs or alcohol, suffer from mental health issues, have criminal records, or have difficulty functioning in a complex society. Money may be needed but money by itself does not cure such ills.∂ A humane and wealthy society should provide the disadvantaged with adequate services and support. But there is nothing wrong with making assistance conditional on individuals fulfilling some obligation whether it is work, training, getting treatment, or living in a supportive but supervised environment.∂ In the end, the biggest problem with a universal basic income may not be its costs or its distributive implications, but the flawed assumption that money cures all ills.

#### Turn - UBI increases poverty because it is untargeted. and people would fall back to poverty

**Smulian 17- a freelance journalist** [Mark, Universal basic income would not reduce poverty, OECD concludes, May 30, 2017, <http://www.publicfinanceinternational.org/news/2017/05/universal-basic-income-would-not-reduce-poverty-oecd-concludes>, June 28, 2017] CL [Premier]

Moving to a system of universal basic income would produce more winners than losers among low-income groups but prove ineffective in reducing poverty, the OECD has found. web\_europecurrencies\_istock-508035222.jpg Europe currencies. iStock 508035222 In a study on Basic Income as a Policy Option, it said that in countries such as Finland and France – where there is relatively good benefit coverage among poorer households – poverty would rise under UBI. While spending would be higher, it would be less well targeted. Current benefit spending was not enough to finance a basic income close to the poverty line in any of 23 countries studied, it noted. Looking at the UK, France, Finland and Italy, the OECD found that basic income would see losses among both the poor and the rich, with those in the middle more likely to gain. If the UBI was anchored on existing minimum-income benefits, many of those who were lifted out of poverty by things like unemployment insurance or early retirement benefits would fall back into poverty again, the report said. Even in countries such as Italy, where benefit spending is not well targeted on poorer households, “poverty would be roughly the same in the case where existing spending was used to give everyone a basic income rather than targeted on specific groups”. In the UK, paying a basic income at a revenue neutral level would be “significantly below the level of existing guaranteed minimum-income benefits, so it is perhaps unsurprising that this leads to much higher levels of poverty”. The OECD noted that there was growing interest in the basic income concept – under which the state pays an unconditional income to all citizens – but Finland had the only national pilot. Discussions were however in progress in France and Quebec, while a number of municipalities had expressed interest including Oakland, California, Livorno in Italy and districts in Ontario. It said that while an opinion poll in the European Union had found 68% support for the idea, there was “evidence that support fades when people are shown details of feasible benefit amounts or of the tax rises needed to finance it”.

#### A UBI doesn’t help those in poverty; instead it ignores the root causes that keep people in poverty

**Cass 16- senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute** [Oren, June 15 2016, “Why a Universal Basic Income Is a Terrible Idea”, Nat Review, Accessed on 6/27/17, <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/436621/universal-basic-income-ubi-terrible-idea>] JC [Premier]

What about poverty? Proponents say a UBI would end it, because each American would receive a check lifting him above the poverty line. But poverty is not only, or even primarily, a matter of material well-being. If it were, the $20,000 in safety-net spending per person below the poverty line, the presence of air conditioning and cable television and cell phones in the majority of such households, even the obesity epidemic ravaging low-income communities would all be signs that the war on poverty is nearly won. But we care about social as well as material conditions, and we care about upward mobility. By these measures, a UBI makes things worse. The greatest crisis facing less educated and lower-income Americans is social, not economic. As Charles Murray’s Coming Apart (2012) documents in harrowing detail, measures of social health that once looked roughly equal across economic classes now show gaping disparities, from family formation to employment to civic engagement to basic levels of trust. In 1960, Murray reports, more than 95 percent of white children were living with both biological parents when the mother turned 40, regardless of class. By the 2000s, the upper-class figure was 90 percent but the lower-class figure had declined to barely 30 percent, a level “so low that it calls into question the viability of white working-class communities as a place for socializing the next generation.” The story for other races is similar. The greatest crisis facing less educated and lower-income Americans is social, not economic.

#### A UBI cannot solve income insecurity because the hard work ethic is too engrained in American culture – people would resent paying for it.

**Stone 2016- chief economist at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities** [Chad, A Universal Basic Income Is No Solution, US News and World Report, June 3, <https://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2016-06-03/a-universal-basic-income-wouldnt-reduce-poverty>, June 29, 2017] CL [Premier]

Finally, some advocates think that a universal income can address the problem of middle-class income insecurity and concerns that the economy of the future won't generate enough good jobs to keep everyone employed. In this view, it can substitute for earnings for people displaced from work. The Times' Porter is skeptical of the whole argument; Greenstein thinks such challenges would prove just as likely to put a universal income further out of reach politically because millions of struggling Americans would be far less inclined to pay higher taxes to finance it; and Vox's Ezra Klein explains how it would require that we change how we think about work. A universal basic income is an intriguing idea for understandable reasons. But I can only echo Greenstein's conclusion: "Were we starting from scratch – and were our political culture more like Western Europe's – UBI might be a real possibility. But that's not the world we live in."

### Can’t Solve Root Cause

#### Affirmative authors focus on individual impacts of a UBI – they don’t account for the social situations where they occur. This increases the risk of injustice.

**Birnbaum, 2004 – prof of political science at Stockholm Univ** [Simon Real Libertarianism, Structural Injustice And The Democratic Ideal DRAFT, 2004-10-20 1 basicincome.org/bien/pdf/2004Birnbaum.pdf Acc 6/29/2017] JY [Premier]

However, once attention is moved from isolated individual choices to the structural group-patterns that emerge from them, we see that such a development is likely to be detrimental to strategic gender interests.15 If the outcome of the real-libertarian job auction is to be considered just, the background conditions must be specified so as to rule out the impact of unjust barriers to social inclusion. Hence, unless the interrelated problems of gender discrimination and the unequal division of informal care work were dealt with in a forceful way basic income may well increase the exclusion of vulnerable groups from the labor market and other important social spheres. The empirical arguments introduced above and paths to avoid such a development within a basic income regime have been explored in some detail by others (e.g. Robeyns, 2000, 2001, Pateman, 2003). Whether or not the pessimistic scenario is likely to materialize depends crucially on the general policy packet in which the basic income is incorporated and what kind of basic income we are talking about (Offe et al, 1992).16 The aim of this study is not to assess such empirical hypotheses but to argue that there doesn’t seem to be any fundamental reasons why we should find the pessimistic scenario unjust from a real-libertarian point of view. Van Parijs’ focus on ameliorative justice (captured by the principle of value equalization) will, if not appropriately supplemented or restricted by other principles that demand preventive policies for equal opportunities in the labor market, conceal and thereby justify social injustice.

#### Turn - A UBI would increase structural injustice – poor implementation and impossible expectations will make it counterproductive, even if there are some successes.

**Birnbaum, 2004 – prof of political science at Stockholm Univ** [Simon Real Libertarianism, Structural Injustice And The Democratic Ideal DRAFT, 2004-10-20 1 basicincome.org/bien/pdf/2004Birnbaum.pdf Acc 6/29/2017] JY [Premier]

Introduction In his widely acclaimed Real Freedom for All Philippe Van Parijs makes a sophisticated liberal-egalitarian case for the gradual implementation of the highest sustainable basic income as an expression of ideal justice.1 In the academic debate on basic income many theorists who are sympathetically inclined towards this idea rightly emphasize that a universal and unconditional basic income is not a panacea. I believe that a basic income, in some form and under some conditions, has the potential to empower and liberate the least fortunate in society as well as establishing a new social cornerstone in a liberal-egalitarian democracy. However, if too many hopes are packed into this particular idea and it is not inserted into a broader and well-balanced policy-package it may well turn out to be counterproductive to the cause of justice. A basic income may provide increased security, employment opportunities and bargaining power for those having the greatest difficulties in finding decent jobs or other meaningful activities, but it does not address the informal barriers of unjust norms that make some groups more likely than others to be in such a vulnerable position in the first place. Although a basic income could make it less miserable to be a victim of discrimination and demeaning stereotypes, it is likely to make a small or even negative impact by itself to counter such mechanisms of structural injustice.

### Costs Too Much

#### A Basic Income does not solve poverty – it is too expensive to be effective and there are other solutions for poor people

**Zon, 2016 – Director of Policy and Research at Maytree Foundation**  [Noah, “Policy brief: Would a universal basic income reduce poverty?”, *Maytree Foundation*, August 16, 2016, https://medium.com/@maytree\_canada/policy-brief-would-a-universal-basic-income-reduce-poverty-cd85fd64dbac. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

Conclusion With the discussion about basic income guarantees heating up in Canada and elsewhere, it’s worth grounding ourselves in what we are trying to achieve before we size up largely hypothetical policies. While there are some sharp political differences between some of the camps arguing for universal basic income, there is also some important common ground. For example, it is good news to see broad support for the goal of improving the flexibility and responsiveness of our social safety net. Many of our income support programs are burdened by a tangle of arcane regulations and punitive rules that treat low-income people poorly and trap them in poverty. Many involved in the basic income debate have also emphasized that we are falling short today of ensuring that people are guaranteed a dignified existence. If we really want to solve these problems, we should not fixate on a basic income policy. When we compare against the strengths and weaknesses of our current system, we can see that most proposals for a basic income are both prohibitively expensive and leave many people with very low incomes worse off. That’s not a good basis for a massive transformation of social policy. That doesn’t mean that we shouldn’t look to build guaranteed incomes. The guaranteed income systems that we now have in place for children and seniors are some of the most important tools we have in Canada to reduce poverty. There is room to build on those systems and improve other programs to have a more effective and connected approach to income security. The way that we reformed income support for children in the 1990s is a good example of a more incremental approach towards guaranteed incomes. We moved support for low-income children out of the social assistance system, where it was subject to punitive and counter-productive rules, to a simpler guaranteed income program for children that is now at the heart of the Canada Child Benefit. It’s worth looking at which other kinds of support — including both cash and in-kind benefits like prescription drug coverage — can be made more broadly available to low-income Canadians that need it. Even within financial support, we should also be looking beyond income support to include programs like the Canada Learning Bond that help low-income people build assets that provide some financial security.

#### UBI can’t solve for poverty- economic constraints mean it can’t solve the deficit in taking away other programs, and it ignores special circumstances

**Satpathy 16- master's student at the Information School at the University of** **Washington** [Arunahb, The woes of Universal Basic Income, January 26, 2016, <http://www.dailyuw.com/opinion/article_8dbccd56-c4a9-11e5-9471-4b9ef4cc5a27.html>, June 28, 2017] CL [Premier]

In March 2015, I wrote on Universal Basic Income (UBI), calling it “an income unconditionally granted to individuals without question, as a means to their basic livelihood.” I also ruefully said that governments of large countries wouldn’t pick it up until at least some proof-of-concept existed. And here I am, nearly 10 months later, to report that it’s being greeted with skepticism or outright rejection. I think the idea is intellectually very appealing, but underdeveloped. As it stands, it probably won’t pass in any major country’s legislature with bipartisan support. America in particular is hostile toward it. All this while, it is increasingly unlikely that there will be many low-level jobs available to college students in five years. A non-means-tested allowance (i.e. government financial-assistance given without eligibility testing) given to all citizens is a compelling idea with advantages that everyone on the political spectrum can like. Small government conservatives will love the UBI guarantee because of its reduction in bureaucratic overheads and the reduction of benefit fraud, especially compared to massive, unwieldy welfare programs. Progressives love the idea of a social security net without holes that contributes to fair redistribution of income during times of increasing automation. They also like that it addresses the concerns of the “precariat,” a neologism describing an emerging class of people who earn wages, but without much job security. It is highly unlikely that the political establishment in the United States will give it an easy pass. I can already envision pundits hysterically denouncing “free money handouts” on television. Politicians will likely also jump into the anti-UBI bandwagon. But, there are several issues unrelated to money that need to be solved with UBI. If such a sweeping change is to come, there needs to be support from both sides of the aisle. UBI doesn’t solve the problem of some welfare benefits declining at a greater rate than wages go up. This problem has been identified by the Cato Institute and a 2014 report by the Illinois Policy Institute. For example, it’s possible for a minimum wage job to only pay a post-tax amount of $50 a week with the loss of welfare benefits greater than $50, and an increase in transportation and child care costs. Even if the trap wasn’t a problem, UBI won’t really solve poverty, except statistically. Yes, a check that technically puts you above the governmental poverty line will allow the government to show that poverty has been eliminated on paper, but only on paper. In reality, UBI shifts the burden of responsibility to the citizen to carefully spend every dollar. Some of these people might have children, who as minors will be dependent on their parents. Is more money then given to those with children? Doesn’t verification mean that the premise of a non-means-tested allowance is defeated? Finally, having UBI could indirectly harm America’s golden goose: immigration. Legal immigrants have long been a source of increasing prosperity in the nation. Forty-two percent of Fortune 500 companies were started by immigrants, while Silicon Valley relies on wave after wave of foreign talent. But with UBI, it could become politically fashionable to choke immigration to keep more money for those who are already citizens.

#### Turn - A UBI would hurt the poor because the astronomical costs would cut programs necessary for the poor.

**Porter, 2016 – New York Times economics columnist** [Eduardo, “A Universal Basic Income Is a Poor Tool to Fight Poverty”, *New York Times*, May 31, 2016, https://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/01/business/economy/universal-basic-income-poverty.html. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

Its first hurdle is arithmetic. As Robert Greenstein of the left-leaning Center on Budget and Policy Priorities put it, a check of $10,000 to each of 300 million Americans would cost more than $3 trillion a year.∂ Where would that money come from? It amounts to nearly all the tax revenue collected by the federal government. Nothing in the history of this country suggests Americans are ready to add that kind of burden to their current taxes. Cut it by half to $5,000? That wouldn’t even clear the poverty line. And it would still cost as much as the entire federal budget except for Social Security, Medicare, defense and interest payments. Thinkers on the right solve the how-to-pay-for-it problem simply by defunding everything else the government provides, programs as varied as food stamps and Social Security. That, Mr. Greenstein observes, would actually increase poverty. It would redistribute wealth upward, taking money targeted to the poor and sharing it with everybody, including you and me.∂ As Lawrence H. Summers, the former Treasury secretary and onetime top economic adviser to President Obama, told me, paying a $5,000 universal basic income to the 250 million nonpoor Americans would cost about $1.25 trillion a year. “It would be hard to finance that in a way that wouldn’t burden the programs that help the poor,” he said.

#### A UBI costs too much to solve poverty

**Greenstein 2016- president of The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities** [Robert, Commentary: Universal Basic Income May Sound Attractive But, If It Occurred, Would Likelier Increase Poverty Than Reduce It, May 31, 2016, <http://www.cbpp.org/poverty-and-opportunity/commentary-universal-basic-income-may-sound-attractive-but-if-it-occurred?version=meter>, June 29, 2017] CL [Premier]

Conclusion I greatly admire the commitment of UBI supporters who see it as a way to end poverty in America. But for UBI to do that, it would have to: (1) be large enough to raise people to the poverty line without ending Medicaid, child care assistance, assistance in meeting high rental costs, and the like (otherwise, out-of-pocket health, child care, and housing costs would push many people back into poverty); and (2) include among its recipients people who aren’t currently working (and lack much of an earnings record), something no U.S. universal program does. It also would have to be financed mainly by raising taxes layered on top of the large tax increases we’ll already need — and will probably have to fight tough political battles to achieve — to avert large benefit cuts in Social Security and Medicare and meet other needs. The chances that all this will come to pass — whether now or 10 to 20 years from now, a time when the baby-boomers will nearly all be retired and Social Security and Medicare costs will be much higher, placing greater pressure on the rest of the budget and on taxes — are extremely low. Were we starting from scratch — and were our political culture more like Western Europe’s — UBI might be a real possibility. But that’s not the world we live in. TOPICS: Federal Budget, Poverty and Opportunity, Family Income Support

## Case Blocks – Solvency (General)

#### Turn - Conservatives will coopt and control implementation of a UBI -progressives are at a disadvantage in negotiations

**Wispelaere, 15 – Policy Research Fellow at the Institute for Policy Research at the University of Bath** [Jurgen, , The Struggle for Strategy: On the Politics of the Basic Income Proposal, Sagepub, 2015, <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jurgen_Wispelaere/publication/277133686_The_Struggle_for_Strategy_On_the_> Politics\_of\_the\_Basic\_Income\_Proposal/links/57d1701308ae0c0081e0144f/The-Struggle-for-Strategy-On-the-Politics-of-the-Basic-Income-Proposal.pdf, 6/27/17] JY [Premier]

Instead of regarding what happens after initial agreement behind the veil of vagueness as something akin to the inevitable unfolding of history, we should remain aware that the operational detail of the BI proposal necessarily entails political negotiations in which the deep and persistent tensions between the different factions will re-emerge with a vengeance. One further worry is that the policy that materialises after the general idea of a BI is agreed in principle may turn out to be even less desirable than the status quo. For instance, the institution of a BI at a level falling short of the poverty line, combined with the dismantling of assistance to the poor and vulnerable, is an outcome at odds with the progressive case for BI.12 The proposal of Charles Murray (2006) would, for that reason, be entirely unacceptable to anyone supporting BI on progressive grounds. Progressives relying on conservative support for introducing a BI, while hoping to get away with any conservative ‘by-products’ by agreeing on the basic idea behind a veil of vagueness, are in fact buying into a high-risk strategy. For there exists an important asymmetry of power between progressives and conservatives that is highly relevant to the political strategy of starting a BI at a modest level and building up from there in a piecemeal fashion. In such cases, at each phase of the development towards a full BI, progressives must negotiate and possibly compromise on several aspects with their conservative partners. Conservatives, on the other hand, merely need to hold out, and at each point retain the power of vetoing the next step. The latter is an example of policy drift, a powerful mechanism by which deliberate non-decision allows political factions to exert policy change significantly over time (Hacker, 2004 and 2005; Mahoney and Thelen, 2010). Wispelaere 137

#### Empirical examples of UBI are insufficient for policy – data is incomplete or too divergent to draw accurate conclusions.

**Calder, 2017 – welfare policy analyst at The Cato Institute** [Vanessa, Universal Basic Income — Disease or Cure? This article appeared in Cayman Financial Review on April 26, 2017. <https://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/universal-basic-income-disease-or-cure>] [Premier]

In response to these concerns, a variety of legislators, academics and philanthropists around the world have become intrigued by the idea and eager to test its viability. In Kenya, a charity called GiveDirectly is testing the idea on 40 villages over a 12-year time horizon beginning in 2017. Meanwhile, in Silicon Valley, California, the largest startup accelerator will provide $1,500 to 100 families from a variety of socioeconomic backgrounds during a pilot experiment later this year. If it’s successful, the study will be scaled. A variety of other nonprofits or research institutes have followed. Some countries are even sponsoring their own basic income pilot experiments. In Marica, Brazil, the town’s former mayor spent last year piloting a version of UBI for its 14,000 poorest families. Finland is currently in the process of its own UBI experiment, where 2,000 randomly selected citizens will be provided a $630 monthly stipend in lieu of welfare benefits. The city of Utrecht, in the Netherlands, is expected to begin its own study in May 2017. Governments in such diverse locations as Livorno, Italy, Madhya, Pradesh, India, and Ontario, Canada, have followed suit. In many cases, these experiments are nascent or incomplete. In a few cases, they have been completed, but practical differences between experimental treatments and geographic contexts make it challenging to draw concrete conclusions. For these and other reasons, UBI is still more of a thought experiment, and the results of the experiment are more often described in the theoretical.

#### Turn – Existing programs - A UBI would worsen poverty because it would cost too much and require tradeoffs that hurt the poor

**Stone 2016- chief economist at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities** [Chad, A Universal Basic Income Is No Solution, US News and World Report, June 3, <https://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2016-06-03/a-universal-basic-income-wouldnt-reduce-poverty>, June 29, 2017] CL [Premier]

What's the best way to provide an effective safety net that has broad political support in today's changing economy? One idea that's attracting attention in disparate pockets across the political spectrum is a universal basic income, known as a UBI – a no-strings-attached, monthly government payment to all Americans, rich and poor, working or not. At the 10,000-foot level, its appeal is twofold. First, unlike today's safety net, a universal income looks simple and seems to ensure that no one falls through the cracks. Second, since everyone gets it, it carries no stigma and should be politically popular, like the Alaska oil payment. The devil's in the details, however, as the New York Times' Eduardo Porter suggests here. More pointedly, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities President Robert Greenstein argues compellingly that any universal income likely to emerge in today's political climate would more likely increase poverty than reduce it. A universal basic income that gives all Americans enough income to meet their basic needs would be quite expensive. This year's poverty line will be roughly $12,500 for an individual, twice that for a family of four. A universal income of $10,000 per person – which is too small for a single person but generous for a family of four – would cost more than $3 trillion for today's population of over 300 million. To put the $3 trillion figure in perspective, the Congressional Budget Office projects that, under current tax laws, federal revenues in 2016 will be about $3.4 trillion. While it's arithmetically possible to craft a budget with a program on that scale, it's hard to imagine any such budget that's remotely feasible politically. Vox's Matthew Yglesias makes the arithmetic argument here, but he assumes that the goal of ending poverty would make conservatives and GOP politicians comfortable with raising federal spending to European levels and sending checks to able-bodied people who don't have a job and aren't looking for one. Even if a poverty-ending universal income isn't feasible, mightn't sufficient bipartisan support exist to enact a less ambitious program with a smaller payment? Perhaps, but Greenstein argues that going down that path is risky, since any apparent left-right agreement on the general desirability of a universal income masks fundamental differences in the ultimate objectives of such a program. On the right, conservatives generally view such a program as a replacement for existing safety net programs – not, as progressives would hope, a supplement to them that boosts the safety net's anti-poverty effectiveness. If policymakers were simply to reallocate the money that now funds existing safety net programs to a universal income, the result would be to spread that money over the entire population, reducing the amount that now goes specifically to reducing poverty.

#### Turn - A UBI would hurt the poor by increasing inflation for necessities.

**Kleiner 2016- Political Economy Researcher** (Dmytri, 8/8/16, “Universal Basic Income is a neoliberal plot to make you poorer”, accessed on 6/28/17, <http://www.furtherfield.org/features/articles/universal-basic-income-neoliberal-plot-make-you-poorer>) [Premier]

"Basic Income" Won't Alleviate Poverty From a social welfare point of view, the substitution of social programs with market-based and charitable provision of everything from health to housing, from child support to old-age assistance, clearly creates a multi-tier system in which the poorest may be able to afford some housing and health care, but clearly much less than the rich — most importantly, with no guarantee that the income will be sufficient for their actual need for health care, child care, education, housing, and other needs, which would be available only by way of for-profit markets and private charities. Looking specifically at the question of whether Friedman's proposal would actually improve the conditions of the poor, Hyman A. Minsky, himself a renowned and highly regarded economist, wrote the "The Macroeconomics of a Negative Income Tax." Minsky looks at the outcome of a "social dividend," which "transfers to every person alive, rich or poor, working or unemployed, young or old, a designated money income by right." Minsky conclusively shows that such a program would "be inflationary even if budgets are balanced" and that the "rise in prices will erode the real value of benefits to the poor ... and may impose unintended real costs upon families with modest incomes." This means that any improved spending power afforded to citizens through an instrument such as UBI will be completely absorbed by higher prices for necessities. Rather than alleviating poverty, UBI will most likely exacerbate it. The core reasoning is quite simple: the prices that people pay for housing and other necessities are derived from how much they can afford to pay in the first place. If you imagine they way housing is distributed in a modern capitalist society, the poorest get the worst housing, and the richest get the best. Giving everyone in the community, rich and poor alike, more money, would not allow the poorest to get better housing, it would just raise the price of housing. If UBI came at the expense of other social programs, such as health care or child care, as Friedman intended, then the rising cost of housing would draw money away from other previously socially provisioned services, forcing families with modest incomes to improve their substandard housing by accepting worse or less childcare or healthcare, or vice versa. A disabled person whose mobility needs requires additional expenditure on accessible housing may not have enough of the basic income left for any additional health care they also require. Yet replacing means testing and special programs that address specific needs is the big idea of UBI.

#### Turn - A UBI can worsen poverty if it raises the effective tax rate.

Zon, 2016 – Director of Policy and Research at Maytree Foundation [Noah, “Policy brief: Would a universal basic income reduce poverty?”, *Maytree Foundation*, August 16, 2016, https://medium.com/@maytree\_canada/policy-brief-would-a-universal-basic-income-reduce-poverty-cd85fd64dbac. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

The biggest question about whether basic income would really allow people to maintain a decent standard of living comes down to just how much income the program would provide. From the information that we have to rely on, there is a real risk that a universal basic income could leave some of the poorest Canadians worse off, especially if some important existing supports are cancelled to pay for it. Take the Manitoba MINCOME experiment from the 1970s, which tested an income guarantee with a sample of Manitobans, including the town of Dauphin (population 12,000). The guarantee was equivalent to about 60 per cent of the poverty line at the time ($7,500 in 2016 dollars for a single person or $23,500 for a family of five). This is not enough on its own to allow people to maintain a decent standard of living. Any other income was clawed back at 50 cents on the dollar, so that low-income people faced a very high effective tax rate, and a single person with the equivalent of $15,000 in income (in today’s dollars) would not get any support from the program. While this was an improvement on the welfare programs at the time, it would take more to guarantee a better standard of living for Canadians today. In the mid-1990s, a federal government panel studied two other potential approaches that were ultimately not adopted (more on these below). They found that in these cases, a basic income would have meaningful but modest effects on poverty. The more generous of the two approaches was projected to reduce the share of households living in poverty from 12.8 per cent to 9.7 per cent, while the more modest package would reduce the share to 11.4 percent. The study also found that while poverty would go down on aggregate, some people living in poverty would have been worse off if the federal government had followed through with one of these approaches to a basic income.

#### Turn – Welfare Conditionality - A UBI now would hurt current welfare programs – it attracts too many migrants creating backlash and pressure to make welfare conditional

**van Parijs, 2012 – Professor of Economic and Social Ethics at the University of Leuven** [Philippe, Yannick Vanderborght, Basic Income in a Globalised Economy, Social Justice Ireland, 7/13/12, https://www.socialjustice.ie/sites/default/files/file/2012-07-03%20-%20Book%20FULL%20TEXT%20-%20FINAL%20-%20Does%20the%20European%20Social%20Model%20Have%20a%20Future.pdf#page=40, 6/28/17] JY [Premier]

As if this were not bad enough, the race-to-the-bottom mechanism has a second component on the recipient side. Globalization involves not only increasing migration of the high earners, but also of the low earners and potential benefit claimants. In this context, countries with more generous benefit systems — in terms of levels and/or conditions — will operate as “welfare magnets”. As suggested by the observation of interstate migration in the United States, differences in generosity may have less impact by persuading some people to leave their country in order to move to another than by determining the destination of those who have decided to migrate. 15 This will again put pressure on any scheme that involves significant genuine redistribution, whether it takes the form of cash transfers, subsidized health care, subsidized education or wage subsidies. In order to stem the selective migration of likely net beneficiaries, countries with generous schemes will be under pressure to make them less generous. Downward social competition [and] will thus join hands with downward tax competition. This economically motivated race to the bottom is one mechanism through which trans-national migration (actual or merely potential) can be expected to worsen the prospects of a significant unconditional basic income, indeed even the prospects of maintaining the levels and the degrees of unconditionality of existing schemes.

#### Turn - A UBI is impossible to contain – it will continue to grow—violates the Constitution

**Henderson 2015 – Associate Professor of Economics** [Davis, research fellow at Stanford, Spring 2015, “A Philosophical Economist’s Case against a Government-Guaranteed Basic Income,” The Independent Review, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24563064>, accessed 6/27/17] AO [Premier]

Even if a scaled-down BIG were just, though—and I emphasize that I don't believe it would be—there is another major problem: the "public-choice" problem. As Thomas Jefferson put it, "The natural progress of things is for liberty to yeild [wc] and government to gain ground."10 Many of the Founding Fathers were aware of this process and tried to put limits on government in the U.S. Constitu tion. Among those limits were the Bill of Rights, the division of powers, and relatively strict limits on Congress and especially on the U.S. president. Many of those limits, arguably most, have not stood the test of time. This fact of government growth puts an extra burden on those who advocate further government programs: they must show that there is a high probability that such government programs will not grow further. Also, in the case of a BIG, they must show that there is a high probability that a scaled-down BIG really would replace all of the existing programs for the poor and near poor. This is hard to do because the various interest groups that favor the existing programs will not sit back: they will fight to keep some or all of those programs. Zwolinski has written, "Merely adding a basic income on top of the existing welfare state would be a disaster." He and I agree on this point. How does he handle the public-choice problem? By invoking the U.S. Constitution. Specifically, he writes that if the BIG "were implemented via a constitutional amendment, many of the public choice considerations could be reduced, I think, to an accept able level."11 Yet, as Randy Barnett (2004) and Robert Levy and William Mellor (2008) show, even strict constitutional limits on federal government power have yielded to the U.S. president, Congress, and the courts.

#### Turn – focusing on a UBI diverts attention from deregulation that would solve better – the opportunity costs are real

**Henderson 2015 – Associate Professor of Economics** [Davis, research fellow at Stanford, Spring 2015, “A Philosophical Economist’s Case against a Government-Guaranteed Basic Income,” The Independent Review, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24563064>, accessed 6/27/17] AO [Premier]

In arguing for a BIG, Zwolinski, as noted earlier, refers to the alternative of "doing nothing at all" and finds this alternative "imperfect from the standpoint of justice." I agree. Fortunately, much can be done to reduce injustice. Let's end the drug war. As noted, the drug war is extremely unjust. Ending it by allowing the production, sale, import, and advertising of drugs—and by letting out of prison the hundreds of thousands of people currently incarcerated for simply buying, selling, or pro ducing illegal drugs—would go a long way to reduce future injustice. Occupational licensing, whereby local, state, and federal governments insist that people be licensed before they can practice in one of about eight hundred occupations, prevents people, many of them at below-median income, from work ing in some of those occupations (see Kleiner 2000). Morris Kleiner (2000), the leading authority on occupational licensing, estimated in 2008 that 23 percent of U.S. workers were required to get state licenses, up from just 5 percent in 1950 (Simon 2011). Let's end occupational licensing. Restrictions on building housing, especially on both U.S. coasts, cause the prices of millions of houses to be hundreds of thousands of dollars higher than they need be (Glaeser and Gyourko 2002). Let's end those restrictions. Let's end asset forfeiture, which allows police to grab the assets of tens of thousands of people who are not even charged with a crime (Williams et al. 2010, 30). I have just begun. The web of regulation—at all levels of government in the United States—makes it difficult for people to start or expand businesses. Let's end all of those regulations that don't address an important negative externality. And even for those regulations that do address important negative externalities, let's regulate only narrowly, with regulations that directly address the externalities. Will all this dismantling of regulations be difficult? Yes, it will. And just as I have criticized advocates of a BIG for assuming that the public-choice problems with their proposals are large, they may rightly criticize me because the public-choice problems with my proposals are large. Imagine, for example, the difficulty of fight ing off unions that represent prison guards and the millions of people whose houses are worth hundreds of thousands of dollars more because of restrictions on building. But that's not the final word. First, if we fight to end these regulations, we will know that we are engaged in a just cause, something that is less clear if we fight for a BIG. Second, our resources to fight for or against anything are scarce. If we fight for a BIG, we will divert time and money away from fighting against unjust regulations. That is not a good trade-off.

#### A UBI that cuts current programs would increase poverty – those programs have successfully lifted millions out of poverty

Greenstein 2016- president of The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities [Robert, Commentary: Universal Basic Income May Sound Attractive But, If It Occurred, Would Likelier Increase Poverty Than Reduce It, May 31, 2016, <http://www.cbpp.org/poverty-and-opportunity/commentary-universal-basic-income-may-sound-attractive-but-if-it-occurred?version=meter>, June 29, 2017] CL [Premier]

The Risk UBI’s daunting financing challenges raise fundamental questions about its political feasibility, both now and in coming decades. Proponents often speak of an emerging left-right coalition to support it. But consider what UBI’s supporters on the right advocate. They generally propose UBI as a replacement for the current “welfare state.” That is, they would finance UBI by eliminating all or most programs for people with low or modest incomes. Consider what that would mean. If you take the dollars targeted on people in the bottom fifth or two-fifths of the population and convert them to universal payments to people all the way up the income scale, you’re redistributing income upward. That would increase poverty and inequality rather than reduce them. Yet that’s the platform on which the (limited) support for UBI on the right largely rests. It entails abolishing programs from SNAP (food stamps), which largely eliminated the severe child malnutrition found in parts of the Southern “black belt” and Appalachia in the late 1960s, the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), Section 8 rental vouchers, Medicaid, Head Start, child care assistance, and many others. These programs lift tens of millions of people, including millions of children, out of poverty each year and make tens of millions more less poor. Some UBI proponents may argue that by ending current programs, we’d reap large administrative savings that we could convert into UBI payments. But that’s mistaken. For the major means-tested programs — SNAP, Medicaid, the EITC, housing vouchers, Supplemental Security Income (SSI), and school meals — administrative costs consume only 1 to 9 percent of program resources, as a CBPP analysis explains.[1] Their funding goes overwhelmingly to boost the incomes and purchasing power of low-income families. Moreover, as the Roosevelt Institute’s Mike Konczal has noted, eliminating Medicaid, SNAP, the EITC, housing vouchers, and the like would still leave you far short of what’s needed to finance a meaningful UBI.[2] Would we also end Pell Grants that help low-income students afford college? Would we terminate support for children in foster care, for mental health, and for job training services? Ed Dolan, who favors UBI, has calculated that we could finance it by using the proceeds from eliminating all means-tested programs outside health care — including Pell Grants, job training, Head Start, free school lunches, and the like, as well as refundable tax credits, SNAP, SSI, low-income housing programs, etc. The result, Dolan found, would be an annual UBI of $1,582 per person, well below the level of support most low-income families (especially working-poor families with children) now receive. The increase in poverty and hardship would be very large.[3] That’s why the risk is high that under any UBI that could conceivably gain traction politically, tens of millions of poor people would likely end up worse off.

#### Regard their economic claims with heavy skepticism- UBI isn’t tested enough and there are too many factors to track

**Prochazka 16-** [Tyler, Will Basic Income cause inflation, November 7, 2016, <http://basicincome.org/news/2016/11/will-basic-income-cause-inflation/>, June 28,2017] CL [Premier]

I recently led a roundtable discussion on basic income at National Chengchi University (NCCU), which was attended by students from various countries. The participants vigorously debated whether a basic income would result in inflation, with some parties worrying that the greater spending power will push up the demand for goods and, in turn, prices. The increased prices could possibly erode much of the spending power from a basic income. To confirm whether these worries were justified, I reached out to three experts on basic income (BI), co-editors of the Ethics and Economics of a Basic Income Guarantee, to see what the research says about basic income and inflation. It turns out: it depends. Overall, the scholars agreed that there could be some areas where prices are pushed up, but that it would depend on how the BI is implemented. Knowledge about the topic is limited since none of the BI research has looked at inflation, nor have the experiments been long enough to get a true idea of the BI’s effect on prices. Dr. Steven Pressmen, former professor of Economics and Finance at Monmouth University, said this means economists “therefore must fall back on theory to answer the question about the inflationary consequences of a BIG (basic income guarantee).” Dr. Michael Lewis, associate professor at Silberman School of Social Work at Hunter College, added that “multiple variables affect inflation”: if government spending is reduced in some area after a basic income is introduced, there would be a simultaneous push-and-pull effect on inflation. Pressman also said that the outcome of a basic income on inflation will be based on “the overall condition of the economy and how a BIG is financed.” According to Pressman, there are several potential scenarios that could play out. If the economy is near full employment, then a BI would likely “push up prices rather than employment.” Also, since much of the gains in income from a BI would go to people in poverty and “people with low income tend to spend any extra income that they get,” then total spending will increase along with inflation. On the supply side, Pressman said there are two important factors: taxation and labor. If a basic income is financed by sales tax or value added tax (VAT), then this will increase prices and inflation. Second, if BI gives employees more leverage to increase wages, firms may “try to pass along these costs to consumers in the form of higher prices,” Pressman said. On the other hand, Pressman said that financing a BI is paid for by reducing other government spending means “there should be little or no inflationary impact of a BIG.” Dr. Karl Widerquist, co-chair of BIEN and associate professor at Georgetown University SFS-Qatar, said that Denmark’s economy demonstrates that spending on welfare such as basic income should not lead to inflation “taking away all those workers’ gains.” “There is nothing special about Basic Income spending. It is not any more likely to cause inflation than any other spending,” Widerquist said. “It is not any more difficult to use taxes and borrowing to counteract inflationary pressure caused by Basic Income spending than it is to counteract inflationary pressure caused by military spending or any other kind of spending.” Regardless, some inflation may not be such a bad thing for the economy, according to Pressman. He pointed to the Japanese deflationary spiral in the 1990s as to why some inflation may help an economy. For policymakers considering a basic income, it may be useful to think about adjusting the BI benefit depending on economic conditions. “It also may (make) sense to think about a variable BIG — one that increases as unemployment rises and falls as the economy gets closer and closer to full employment. This too will reduce the inflationary impact of any BIG program,” Pressman said. Although more research needs to be done, it appears a basic income is unlikely to contribute to inflation in a substantial way because there are so many factors that influence prices. “Policy matters, and sensible fiscal and monetary policies can ensure that more egalitarian social policies are consistent with low inflation,” Widerquist said.

## AT Conditional UBI

#### Conditional basic incomes reinforce second class citizenship by denying a democratic Right to income

Pateman, 2004 – prof of Political Science at UCLA [Carole, Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income. Politics and Society on March 1, 2004. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0032329203261100>] [Premier]

In conclusion I want to make two further points. First, schemes for a conditional basic income raise another problem. In effect, these proposals declare irrelevant the comparison of basic income with universal suffrage as a democratic right. The criteria for eligibility for a conditional income may be very generously interpreted, but there are always likely to be individuals who fail, or refuse, to meet the conditions. What, then, is their status? Are they, like individuals who lack the franchise, to become second-class citizens? All the time that a basic income is conditional, a privilege not a right, the problem of second-class and lesser citizenship cannot be avoided. The use that citizens make of their freedom is open to no guarantees. Democratic self-government entails that they decide for themselves how and when they will contribute, or whether they will contribute at all. If the cost of improving democratic freedom for all citizens is the existence of some drones, then, I submit, it is a cost worth paying.

#### A conditional UBI would not solve – it would continue to stigmatize the poor based on its conditions

**Bidadanure 2017 - Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Stanford** [Juliana, Interviewed by Vivan Malkani, Stanford Politics Understanding Universal Basic Income, March 17 2017, https://stanfordpolitics.com/understanding-universal-basic-income-178032e6090f , June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

JB: I don’t think that we should frame this issue as an either-or scenario. Basic Income is necessary, but insufficient on its own to address poverty, precariousness, joblessness and growing inequalities. People who believe in basic income do so from differing political standpoints. Social democrats believe that what we owe each other is not just cash; we owe each other good institutions. In Europe, the basic income debate has been framed as a further enhancement of the welfare state. I grew up in France; there are many things that I think are done right there. We have universal healthcare, free higher education, but we also have a benefit system that is archaic and abusive. People who are out of work get only between 400 and 500 euros a month to survive, they are stigmatized and demonized as burdens, and some groups in society are excluded from the scheme, like young adults below the age of 25. The reasons for such restrictive and low benefits are ideological: that people should be taught the right values, or they can’t be trusted with cash,. In the UK, the benefit system creates an unemployment trap. If you receive cash on the condition that you are not working, and if you find a job, you lose the benefits straight away. That means that, if the job doesn’t work out after a month or so (as is the case with many precarious jobs), you may end up having to spend weeks without access to public assistance. The idea behind basic income is that you would not have to worry about that; that base is secure. You can then try different things like internships, trainings, volunteering, etc. because of your security. The existing benefits system also gives too much control to street level bureaucrats; people who are meant to deliver public assistance have too much control over the lives of the people receiving those benefits. This is particularly bad in the UK, where the system is intrusive and requires you to prove that you are applying to jobs, demanding that you send dozens of applications per week. This is punitive. The system is built on the view that you are responsible for being unemployed and that you must prove to society that you are not a parasite. This allows for and encourages divisive rhetoric that is detrimental to democracy. Political parties can use resentment towards “welfare queens” and “benefit scroungers” to create a spirit of resentment against those who are most reliant on society, which is very detrimental to social cohesion. I believe in basic income as a reformation and further enhancement of that benefit system. But I don’t think that UBI is just for developed welfare states. If we think that the people should be above a certain threshold, they are going to need a lot of cash, but also a lot more than just cash. Both in the US and India, the question of the development package is very important. But the case for cash can and should be made there too. There is a traditional school of thought in development that does not trust individuals with cash, and I think this mistrust must be challenged.

# Negative – AT Kritik

## AT Feminism

### Excludes Minorities / Essentializes

#### The affirmative framework essentializes feminism which excludes black women – it ignores the different impact of black women’s oppression in the labor market

**Reynolds, 2017 – Professor of social sciences at the University of Greenwich** [Tracy, , “Black women, Gender Equality and Universal Basic Income”, *Compass*, January 27, 2017, https://www.compassonline.org.uk/black-women-gender-equality-and-universal-basic-income/. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

Feminist debates have been central to discussions on the benefits and pitfalls of a Universal Basic Income for women and what this would mean for gender equality. Much of this focus has been of the care dimension of women’s contribution to the labour market. However this presupposes that women all experience their caring role, responsibilities and labour in a homogenous way, ignoring important differences, such as class, ‘race’ generational divisions that exist between these women. For example, the argument that universal basic income would encourage women, especially those in low-paid and low education employment, to exit the labour market in providing childcare and domestic labour at home on a full-time basis, and by doing so, reinforcing men’s and women’s gendered normative role within the families completely disregards the historical and cultural experiences of Black women, and other racialized migrant women, in the UK labour market. Some of my earlier research work highlighted that the continued high rates of Black women engagement in paid and full-time employment outside of their home means that they are able to construct for themselves a mothering identity that combines their dual status of economic worker and domestic carer (Reynolds 2005). The subordinate position that Black women continue to occupy in the labour market on account of their racialized gendered status reveals itself in the limited employment opportunities Black women encounter. There is a plethora of research evidence pointing to the fact that Black women are statistically more likely to engage in low-paid jobs with low levels of job security and employment protection rights. This has continued to be an ongoing and collective experience for Black women since labour market data statistically reported on the demographic profile of individuals’ labour market contribution according to gender, ethnic/racial backgrounds. As recently as December 2016, a research finding report by Runnymede Trust suggested that Black women in the role as paid workers or ‘economic breadwinners’ have been hit the hardest by recent austerity measures and the tax and benefit changes. This is because Black women are most likely to be employed in these very job sectors and services: i.e. ‘frontline’ public sector and at the very levels (i.e low-paid, temporary and low level) where services are being cut and slashed back to the bone. Although there is a case for arguing that the UBI could offset some of this financial loss and provide an income which allows for a basic measure of economic security; it is very clear that the provision of the UBI would not deter Black women from taking out paid work outside of the home as they have always done, and nor would it impact on their conceptualisations of gender and the care-giving model. The focus on UBI as a way of securing gender equality detracts from the more fundamental issue of addressing the broader systems of oppression and structural inequalities that Black women experience in the labour market and society more generally. Therefore, and as McLean and MckKay (2015) argue, it is important that any discussion of the UBI moves beyond gendered division of labour to highlight other forms of disadvantage and oppression encountered by women with intersected identities. It is all too easy with UBI to make invisible other systems of inequality, such as zero-contract hours that afford workers – disproportionately drawn from white working class, BME and migrant communities – limited or no employment protection rights in terms of holiday pay, sick pay and maternity rights and to allow for the exploitation of these workers to remain unchallenged.

#### The affirmative essentializes women – their framework ignores that a UBI affects poor minority women differently than upper class women.

**Danaher, 2014 – Lecturer at the National University of Ireland** [John, Feminism and the Basic Income (Part One). This article appeared in Philosophical Disquisitions on July 14, 2014. <http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/feminism-and-basic-income-part-one.html>] [Premier]

The second argument is slightly more straightforward. It is simply that the UBI is too blunt a tool. One worry people have had about the classic forms of feminism is their tendency to essentialise or homogenise the experiences of different groups of women. This can be unhelpful. After all, the experiences of a well-educated upper class woman are arguably quite different from those of an under-educated lower class woman. The problem with the UBI is that it treats all these women in the same way. It pays them all the same income. If it is likely that some women will exit the labour market and take up the traditional familial roles as a result of the UBI, is it not possible that those women are more likely to be drawn from lower class and/or ethnic minorities? Particularly given that those women have lower participation anyway, and are more likely to experience direct and indirect forms of discrimination?

### AT Stereotypes

#### UBI doesn’t solve the Breadwinner Model – it would be poorly implemented to reinforce traditional female roles which reduces women working outside the home.

**Lethbridge, 2017 – Director of the Business Faculty in University of Greenwich** [Jane, “Universal basic income: further dismantling of the Welfare State?”, *Compass*, January 6, 2017, http://www.compassonline.org.uk/universal-basic-income-further-dismantling-of-the-welfare-state/. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

Whether or not UBI provides additional benefits for women is subject to debate. The Welfare State was built on a series of assumptions about the primacy of the male breadwinner and their entitlement to welfare benefits. This has been the subject of extensive critiques and UBI has brought some of the same issues into focus, which include payment for work in the household and participation of women in the labour force.∂ There are dangers for women in the introduction of UBI. Large cash grants may reinforce women’s traditional role by encouraging them to return to providing care and household services (Meulders, 2016). This would reduce women’s participation in the labour force which has contributed to their independence and increased status.∂ Any UBI programme has to be designed carefully if women are not to be affected negatively. The provision of child care and other labour force supports can help to give women economic autonomy and control. However, we need to be aware that in a climate of reduced social security benefits, UBI would not necessarily be supported by well- funded, publicly-run public services.∂

#### A UBI would not solve the commodification of women – it de-commodifies work, but still leaves women linked to the family, which entrenches their subordination

**Danaher, 2014 – Lecturer at the National University of Ireland** [John, Feminism and the Basic Income (Part One). This article appeared in Philosophical Disquisitions on July 14, 2014. <http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/feminism-and-basic-income-part-one.html>] [Premier]

3. Two Feminist Arguments Against the UBI Now we’ll look at two feminist arguments against the UBI. Again, these come from the work of Tony Fitzpatrick. The first argument picks up from the observation I just made. It holds that proponents of the UBI focus on the value of decommodification and ignore the need for defamilialisation. Decommodification is the process whereby that which typically has a price or market value attached to it is denuded of that value. Consequently, it becomes something that can no longer be traded on an open market. This is one thing that the UBI can do to human labour (i.e. it can de-link labour from income). Decommodification is seen as a worthwhile goal by many left-leaning feminists, but also an insufficient one. The reason being that traditional forms of female labour have always been decommodified. That is why they are unpaid. The problem with that type of work — and with the position of women more generally — is that it is familialised. In other words, it is linked to a particular role within a family structure. Women are then dependent on occupying that role, which is what gives rise to the traditional sexual division of labour (male breadwinner; female caregiver). The goal for a feminist social policy should be to de-familialise women’s social position. The concern is that the UBI may not be able to do this. In fact, it may serve to entrench the sexual division of labour. This is because if women no longer need to work out of economic necessity, they may succumb to social pressures to take up the traditional caregiver role. Men could then continue to free-ride on the unpaid work of women; and women could be further excluded from the labour market.

#### A UBI does not break the “Male Breadwinner” model – it does not challenge the role of work or bring equality to the workplace – many other reforms would be required.

**Danaher 14 – lecturer at National University of Ireland, Galway.** [John, “Feminism and the Basic Income (Part Two),” 15/7/14, <http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/feminism-and-basic-income-part-two.html> , 6/27/17] AO [Premier]

1. The Universal Breadwinner Model Each of the three models is based on a set of values and assumptions. The universal breadwinner model is based on the assumption that paid employment, and the traditional wage contract, is good and that the cause of sexual equality is advanced by allowing women to access those things. In this respect, the universal breadwinner model maps onto the classic goals of liberal feminism (at least as “liberal” feminism is commonly understood). It tries to make women more like men by de-gendering the role of the breadwinner, but without questioning the value of that role. What kinds of reform would be needed to achieve the goals of the universal breadwinner model? Fitzpatrick mentions a few: [W]omen would require: employment-enabling services to free them from unpaid responsiblities; workplace reforms to promote equal opportunity; cultural reforms so that women identify themselves with the workplace (and so that men can accept this); macroeconomic policies to generate high levels of quality jobs; social insurance reforms to ensure that women’s entitlements are equal to men’s. Care work would need to be shifted from the family to the market and the state, but the status of care-work employment should also be raised. Benefits would be strongly linked to employment status and record, but a residual means-tested safety-net would still be required. (Fitzpatrick, 2013, p. 168) No doubt elements of this mix of policies will be familiar. Arguably, it is this model of welfare that has been pursued in European countries over the past 50 or so years, though how successful this has been in achieving the goal of de-gendering the breadwinner role is, of course, debatable. The question we are interested in is whether the UBI would have any role to play in this model of welfare. Fitzpatrick argues that it would not. Indeed, many of the central features of the UBI would run contrary to the spirit of the universal breadwinner model. The UBI deliberately tries to de-link income from paid employment, thereby challenging the ethics of paid work. In doing so, it provides people with the choice of opting out of paid employment. That said, the UBI may encourage some people to seek work, particularly work they actually enjoy, which could bolster the breadwinner model, but this would be a secondary and unintended effect. On the whole then, the UBI is unsympathetic to the aims of the universal breadwinner model.

#### The UBI does not eliminate the gender roles in care giving – it makes it possible for both genders to leave work

**Danaher 14 – lecturer at National University of Ireland, Galway.** [John, “Feminism and the Basic Income (Part Two),” 15/7/14, <http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/feminism-and-basic-income-part-two.html> , 6/27/17] AO [Premier]

2. The Care-Giver Model The Care-Giver model is premised on the value of care work, particularly the unpaid forms of care work that have traditionally been performed by women. It rejects the notion that sexual equality is advanced simply by encouraging women to become more like men. Instead, it calls for us to use the welfare system to raise the status and recognition of care work, bringing it onto the same level as paid employment. This would allow women to choose between different roles (care-giver; breadwinner) or mixes of those roles (e.g. part-time in both). It would not, however, challenge the sexual division of labour with respect to care-work. In order for this model to work a variety of policy reforms would be needed. Fitzpatrick mentions the following: [W]omen would require: care-allowances set at a level comparable to breadwinner wages; workplace reforms to facilitate the kind of life pattern flexibility just mentioned [i.e. the ability to choose between the different roles]; job search, retraining and flexitime; extensive social welfare programs. Here, then, most care-work would continue to remain in the home but would be supported with substantial public funds. Part-time jobs and care-work would have to generate as many entitlements to insurance benefits as full-time employment but, as before, a residual assistance tier would also be required. (Fitzpatrick, 2013, p. 169) Some of these policies have been implemented in different countries, particularly those concerning flexitime and direct provisions for childcare. The effect of these on revaluing care-work and raising its status are, again, questionable. Could the UBI have any role to play in a care-giver model of welfare? Fitzpatrick argues that it could. One thing it could definitely do is facilitate the transition of women in and out of the labour market. In particular, it could make part-time work a more viable option for many women. Women in those roles would receive two incomes: their basic income grant and the income from the work. And if the UBI was financed through a progressive tax, they may not even need to pay taxes toward it. One major problem with UBI, however, is that it might not be specific enough to raise the status of unpaid care work. Since the income would be payable to all, irrespective of what they do, it wouldn’t single out care-work for special treatment. A Participation Income (i.e. one granted to people on the condition that they engage in unpaid but socially valuable work) might be better able to achieve this aim.

#### A UBI does not change social stereotypes toward women and work - would not go far enough to de-gender caregiving – the culture must change first

**Danaher 14 – lecturer at National University of Ireland, Galway.** [John, “Feminism and the Basic Income (Part Two),” 15/7/14, <http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/feminism-and-basic-income-part-two.html> , 6/27/17] AO [Premier]

3. The Universal Care-Giver Model The universal care-giver model is premised on the value of completely de-gendering care-work and encouraging a more equitable distribution of work between the sexes. This marks a contrast from the two other models. The universal breadwinner model was questionable in that it implied that paid work was of greater value; the care-giver model was questionable in that it did not challenge the traditional sexual division of labour with respect to care-work. The universal care-giver model tries to go beyond the limitations of these two models. It aims to equalise the status of both kinds of work and to breakdown the traditional sexual division of labour with respect to care-work. What reforms would be required for this? Fitzpatrick mentions three (based on Fraser’s work): First, all jobs would have to be designed for people who are also part-time carers which means a working week shorter than that for full-time jobs and the support of employment-enabling services. Second, care-work activities would be distributed between the state, the household, and civil society. (Fraser talks of locally-managed and democratically care-work institutions). Finally, the most substantial change would be cultural, that is, a dismantling of the gendered assumptions which sustain the existing forms of social organisation. (Fitzpatrick, 2013, p. 169-70) A basic income could play some part in achieving these ends, though its limitations would have to be acknowledged. By de-linking work and income, and increasing job-choice flexibility, it could encourage more men to take-up care-giving duties. But it could only really do so with substantial shifts in the cultural attitude toward care-work. Changes in income payment cannot do this, certainly not in the short-term. In fact, they could simply encourage more men to drop out of paid work, without taking up any corresponding care-work duties. Fitzpatrick once again suggests that a Participation Income, which tied income payments to specific socially valuable forms of work, would be more beneficial in this regard.

#### A UBI needs to recognize women’s nonwork activities to achieve gender equality-addressing one economic factors while ignoring the root mindset does nothing

**McKay, 01 – Professor of Economics at Glasgow Caledonian University** [Alisa, a Scottish economist, government policy adviser, a leading feminist economist and Professor of Economics at Glasgow Caledonian University, RETHINKING WORK AND INCOME MAINTENANCE POLICY: PROMOTING GENDER EQUALITY T HROUGH A CITIZENS ’ BASIC INCOME, Feminist Economics, 3/1/01, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-923X.2004.00611.x/abstract, 6/27/] JY [Premier]

Much research . . . suggests the stylized fact that wives’ increased agency has been permitted, not so much by husbands taking on affiliative work, but by decreases in wives’ standards of living, particularly in regard to time for rest and recreation. (Nelson 1996: 74) If work is associated with productive outputs then surely affiliative work is productive, measurable by the positive contributions it makes to individual welfare. However, the personal nature of such activities renders them difficult, if not impossible, to measure. If such activities are continually devalued within market-based economies it is unrealistic to assume that by removing or altering one aspect of the social constraints imposed upon women, that is access to economic resources, the result will automatically be equal sharing between men and women of affiliative work. Individual preferences within market-based economies will be influenced directly by the value attached to activities producing identifiable and exchangeable output. Individuals may therefore demonstrate a preference for “valued work” that forms the basis for common cultural and social identities over “nonwork” activities. [Moreover,] There is therefore no reason to assume men will alter their preferences, and while women may be influenced to pursue “socially valued” activities, there is no reason to assume they will do so at the expense of sacrificing their existing preference for affiliation. Men will continue to engage in “valued work” and women will now engage in both work and “nonwork” activities. The tendency to commodify all human activity results in unduly restrictive social citizenship rights, particularly those related to income security. Thus, policies aiming to achieve gender equality must take account of gender-based social structures of constraint and explicitly recognize the positive welfare contribution of “nonwork” activities. The question remaining is: how can this technically be achieved?

### AT Solves Female Poverty

#### Turn - A UBI hurts women – it reduces their participation in the labor market and paying for it would cause disproportionate taxes on women

**Danaher, 2014 - a lecturer at the National University of Ireland**, [John July 14, 2014 Feminism and the Basic Income (Part One) http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/feminism-and-basic-income-part-one.html [Premier]

Robeyns identifies three possible first order effects of a basic income. They are: It may (slightly) reduce women’s labour market participation: It is well-known that women are less likely to participate in the labour market than men. Historically, this was because they weren’t allowed to do so. Nowadays it is because it is still expected and accepted that they will perform unpaid work in the home. Studies (cited by Robeyns) have have shown that women’s participation in the labour market is positively affected by education and net wage, and negatively affected by age, number of children and income of spouse or partner. Men’s labour market participation is largely unaffected by these things (indeed, men seem seek paid work no matter what). Robeyns cites two studies (both based on models, not real data) on the likely effect of a UBI on female labour market participation. Both studies suggest that women’s participation would decrease with the introduction of a UBI, with estimates for that reduction varying from 9% to 20%. It is very difficult to know what would happen in reality, and Robeyn’s suggests that actual social experiments would help. Her article was written in the early 2000s. I’m not sure if any such experiments have been performed since. I know Brazil has attempted welfare reforms along these lines. Does anyone know of studies emanating from this? It would have a variable impact on the actual amount of income received by women: Women who received no income prior to the introduction of the UBI would see their incomes increase, but the effect on other women is unclear. Women who engage in paid work are on average paid less than men, so the method of financing would be critical. If the UBI was financed by a flat tax, for instance, instead of a progressive tax, then those women who work may see their net incomes go down. This would depend on what they were earning and the actual amount of the UBI. Robeyns suggests that single mothers are likely to be the major financial beneficiaries of the UBI.

#### There is no empirical proof of the effect of a UBI on women

**Danaher, 2014 - a lecturer at the National University of Ireland**, [John July 14, 2014 Feminism and the Basic Income (Part One) http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/feminism-and-basic-income-part-one.html [Premier]

These are all the first and second order effects mentioned by Robeyns. As you can see, they are something of a mixed bag. Some suggest positive outcomes for women; some suggest negative. They are also all somewhat speculative. Since no country has implemented a UBI on the scale advocated by most activists, we don’t have the data to say for sure whether these effects will materialise.

#### Turn - A UBI hurts women – it encourages them to drop out of the work force, which denies them work benefits and reinforces stereotypes of them

**Danaher, 2014 – Lecturer at the National University of Ireland** [John, Feminism and the Basic Income (Part One). This article appeared in Philosophical Disquisitions on July 14, 2014. <http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/feminism-and-basic-income-part-one.html>] [Premier]

It could cause women to lose the non-pecuniary advantages of paid labour: Paid employment has benefits beyond the income received. It gives one access to certain social networks, allows one to demonstrate competence, and can increase one’s feeling of self-respect. If the UBI causes more women to drop out of the labour market, they could lose some of those advantages. It could depreciate women’s “human capital” and reduce their income in the long-term: Studies have shown that those who drop out of paid employment, even if only temporarily, often struggle to re-enter the labour market and secure better paid jobs. Again, if the UBI causes more women to temporarily drop out of the labour market, it could add to this struggle. It could actually increase statistical/implicit discrimination against women: Implicit biases arise whenever people form subconscious associations between groups of people and certain properties that are stereotypically applied to members of those groups. For example, in the US there is often an implicit association between African-American males and criminal activity. This can affect how people behave toward members of those groups, even if there is no evidence to suggest that an individual fits that stereotype. Robeyns suggests that the UBI could exacerbate certain implicit biases against women in the employment sphere. For example, by incentivising some women to drop out of paid employment, or take more career breaks, it could bolster the association between female employees and lower productivity that many employers are likely to have. This could then impact negatively on individual women, even if they are not inclined to drop out of paid employment.

#### Turn - A UBI that pushes women into paid work just commodifies housework-substitutes the women’s presence at home with goods and services

**McKay, 01 – Professor of Economics at Glasgow Caledonian University** [Alisa, a Scottish economist, government policy adviser, a leading feminist economist and Professor of Economics at Glasgow Caledonian University, RETHINKING WORK AND INCOME MAINTENANCE POLICY: PROMOTING GENDER EQUALITY T HROUGH A CITIZENS ’ BASIC INCOME, Feminist Economics, 3/1/01, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-923X.2004.00611.x/abstract, 6/27/] JY [Premier]

The emphasis on viewing a CBI as a tool for supporting more flexible forms of working implicitly encourages women to enter the realm of paid work. Constraints on choice in this area are effectively removed by providing independent income security. As women gain in terms of rights and increasingly enter the labor market, their jobs become an important source of identity. Furthermore, the continual process of substituting unpaid work normally performed by women in the home with goods and services that can now be purchased externally suggests that cultural identifications associated with family labor diminish in importance. The existence in the marketplace of relatively cheap substitute goods, produced and consumed impersonally, further devalues the work that women continue to do within the family. All of this assumes that women have suddenly switched from a preference for affiliation, that is, the need to be part of a collective loving family unit and to take on all of the rights and obligations that entails, to one for promoting their own self-interested autonomous needs, or as Nelson refers to “agency needs” (Nelson 1996). This begs the question of who now should shoulder the responsibilities of caring for children and families?

## AT Reparations

#### Taxation is an unjust way to pay a UBI to an oppressed group – it is impossible to only tax people responsible for the oppression.

**Henderson, 2015 –prof of economics at the Naval Postgraduate School's School of Public Policy** [David R., A Philosophical Economist's Case against a Government-Guaranteed Basic Income. This article appeared in The Independent Review in the Spring of 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/24563064.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A79bf90b3116741c8d2dcf25fb3a5e858] JN [Premier]

Is Taxing the Innocent Right? Let's say that we single out a particular group that has been treated particularly unjustly. The problem then becomes: Whom do we tax to compensate the group? It would presumably be people who gained from the unjust treatment of the group. But who would those people be? It is difficult to think of a group that should pay. It can't simply be those with high income. Most people with high income probably did not get much of it by treating others unjustly. This is not a small dilemma. It's the same one that economist Thomas Piketty confronts in Capital in the Twenty-First Century (2014). After pointing out specific instances of what he regards (and many libertarians might regard) as fortunes acquired unjustly, Piketty writes: "In any case, the courts cannot resolve every case of ill-gotten gains or unjustified wealth. A tax on capital would be a less blunt and more systematic instrument for dealing with the question" (446). Piketty is right that a tax on capital would be "less blunt and more systematic." It would also be profoundly unjust. Advocates of a BIG, looking around for whom to tax to fund their program, face the same problem. The Problem of Deadweight Loss from Past Injustices In his case for the justice of a BIG, Zwolinski writes: "But any method of correcting for past injustice—including doing nothing about it at all—is imperfect from the standpoint of justice. We simply do not have the kind of detailed information about past events or the relevant counterfactuals that would be necessary to make everyone precisely as well of[f] as they would have been had no injustice occurred" (2013a, emphasis in original). I dealt earlier with the problem that a BIG could well be more unjust than "doing nothing at all."

#### All reparation programs punish the innocent—it’s impossible to calculate with enough specificity

**Navabi 13 – PhD in Economics** [Ash, 12/6/13, “Against ‘The Libertarian Case for a Basic Income’,” Mises Institute, <https://www.mises.ca/against-the-libertarian-case-for-a-basic-income/>, accessed 6/28/17] AO [Premier]

Zwolinski suggests that some people in the United States deserve reparations. But he admits that it may impossible to determine precisely who deserves these reparations, and thus concludes that the best way to remedy this situation would be for the state to take from the rich and give to the poor. He calls this an “approximate rectification”. There are are several problems with this line of reasoning. First, state reparations entail collective punishment, which is at odds with the individualism of libertarianism. Not everyone in the US is guilty of some past crime. For example, why should rich or upper middle class immigrants from eastern Europe or central Africa, or southeast Asia be paying reparations to any American? Beyond the US, what past injustice are the rich and middle class of Switzerland paying for? There is no ground for calling the BIG “approximate rectification”. Zwolinski admits that there is not much historical information to go by to determining who really is a victim today of injustice in the past and who is a beneficiary. He then suggests that the poor today are most likely to have been victims, and so deserve to be remunerated by the rich. But there is absolutely no reason to assume this. There is just as much likelihood that a rich person today is the descendant of a victim of some grave injustice in centuries past as a poor person is the descendant of a robber baron or a British baron. Stealing from some innocents today to repay the descendants of those who potentially may have been robbed in centuries past and have been on net innocent of all other crimes is not approximate justice. It is precisely baloney.

#### BIG as reparations is illogical—it doesn’t redress rights violations, it’s not a one-time payment and it’s not sufficient.

**Henderson 2015 – Associate Professor of Economics** [Davis, research fellow at Stanford, Spring 2015, “A Philosophical Economist’s Case against a Government-Guaranteed Basic Income,” The Independent Review, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24563064>, accessed 6/27/17] AO [Premier]

But back to what I assume is the main point of Zwolinski's paragraph: that the existing distribution of property rights ought not to be regarded as inviolable. I agree with that. I also agree with the reason that gets Zwolinski to that conclusion—namely, that "the existing distribution is in many ways the product of past acts of uncompen sated theft and violence." But how do we get from that fact—both he and I would regard it as a fact—to the conclusion that a BIG is justified? That is difficult. I think we all can agree that many people have what they have at least in part due to previous rights violations. It is not clear to me that these people are "at the top" in what I take to be Zwolinski's narrower sense rather than in my wider sense. I think, for example, of people who paid into Medicare and Social Security only a fraction, even in present value terms, of what they get back from taxes paid by the current young and middle-aged people. Sure, many of them are on top, but many are not. I don't see how a BIG redresses that rights violation. How does Zwolinski reach his conclusion that a BIG is a good answer? He writes: "In a world in which all property was acquired by peaceful processes of labor-mixing and voluntary trade, a tax-funded Basic Income Guarantee might plausibly be held to violate libertarian rights. But our world is not that world. And since we do not have the information that would be necessary to engage in a precise rectification of past injustices, and since simply ignoring those injustices seems unfair, perhaps something like a Basic Income Guarantee can be justified as an approximate rectification?" (2013b, emphasis in original). His question mark at the end is perplexing. I assume, though, that Zwolinski is saying that a BIG can be justified. Again, however, go back to my Social Security and Medicare example. Social Security and Medicare are huge systemic attacks on people's rights, and I don't see a guaranteed minimum income as even an approximate rectification of these wrongs. David Friedman has pointed out two other problems with Zwolinski's liber tarian case: "If I justly owe you forty cents, taking a dollar from me and giving it to you makes the resulting distribution less just, not more. Unless most inequali ties are inherited from past rights violations, a claim I think few libertarians would support, the logic of the argument breaks down" (2013). "A further problem with Matt's [Zwolinski's] argument," writes Friedman, is that, even if you believe that a guaranteed basic income reduces net injustice, it is hard to argue that it is the best rule of thumb for the purpose. Consider the case of Afro-Americans. Almost nobody whose ancestors immigrated to the U.S. after the Civil War is the heir of benefits created by violation of the rights of their ancestors by his ancestors. On the other hand, the ancestors of present-day Afro-Americans were enslaved by Africans to be sold to European slave traders. The present inhabitants of Africa, at least sizable parts of it, are more likely than the present inhabitants of North America to be descendants of people who owe, and did not pay, reparation to slaves and their descendants. (2013) It follows that Matt's second argument implies that the (very poor) present inhabitants of Africa owe compensation to the (relatively rich) present American blacks. I do not think Matt would accept that argument, whether or not he could rebut it. If so, he does not really believe in his second argument. An explanation of Friedman's point about African slave traders is required. Because many potential slave owners in the United States were competing for slaves, the price of slaves paid in Africa was bid up to approximately equal the gain that slave owners would get. So slavery created, ex ante, no large wealth transfer to U.S. slave owners. According to Friedman's reasoning, the big wealth transfer was to the original enslavers—that is, Africans. I should point out, though, that ex post the story is different. Many slave owners in the United States bought slaves before commodity prices soared, increasing the marginal productivity of slaves. Had they not been slaves, they would have received these gains. So the issue does become messier than Friedman claims. Nevertheless, he is right that for the sake of simple justice some of the wealth of relatively poor Africans would need to be transferred to relatively wealthy African Americans. How would one get around this problem that Friedman raises? By targeting a group that is likely to have been treated so unjustly that it would be highly unlikely that the compensation would be too much. What group might that be? One's first thought might be the descendants of slaves. If the descendants were only one generation away from the people who were slaves, this would superficially seem to make sense because they would be starting from a large deficit. But even here that does not make sense. Think about where the slaves came from: Africa. What do we know about in the 17th, 18th and early 19th centuries? It was incred ibly poor, and most people were not very free there either. They weren't slaves— they were substantially freer than slaves—but they were not very free. So what did slavery do for these descendants? It caused them to be born in a more prosperous country where, although they had to contend with Jim Crow laws, most of them still had more freedom—and better opportunities—than they would have had if their parents had not been enslaved and they had been born in Africa. So one might argue that the net effect of the injustice of the enslavement of their ancestors was that they themselves were freer and more prosperous. Then no compensation could be justified. Moreover, the case against compensation gets even stronger the more genera tions there are between the slave generation and the relatively free generation. Even more years have passed in which they could develop their human capital and gain simply by being part of an extensive division of labor in an increasingly prosperous country. Adding to this case is the fact that even the Jim Crow laws disappeared. There have been no substantial Jim Crow laws since the middle of the 1960s, which is now about two generations ago. Economist Walter Williams, himself a descendant of slaves, likes to point out that he is substantially better off precisely because slavery caused him to be born in a country with great opportunities (2010, 95). The moral claim for a BIG as a form of reparation requires not merely that an injustice has occurred but also that the injustice led to material deprivation for one's descendants. If the injustice led instead to material improvement for one's descendants, one can still deplore the initial injustice while failing to justify any claims for reparation. Even if we grant that those with low income or wealth are in that state because of unjust treatment, and even if we grant that they deserve restitution, why would restitution not be a one-time payment? Why would it be a monthly or annual stipend extending out forever, even to those not yet born? It is true that one can convert any finite payment over time into a lump-sum value using the appropriate discount rate. Nonetheless, this seems a strange way to arrange a payoff. If the payments obtained now make those receiving them now properly compensated, what could possibly justify continuing to compensate such people's descendants in their turn?

#### Trying to amend past injustices via taxation fails

**Henderson 2015 – Associate Professor of Economics** [Davis, research fellow at Stanford, Spring 2015, “A Philosophical Economist’s Case against a Government-Guaranteed Basic Income,” The Independent Review, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24563064>, accessed 6/27/17] AO [Premier]

But there is a further problem. It is not only that we "do not have the kind of detailed information about past events or the relevant counterfactuals that would be necessary to make everyone precisely as well of[f] as they would have been had no injustice occurred." It is that even if we had that detailed information about past events, that would still not suffice to "make everyone precisely as well off as they would have been had no injustice occurred." The reason is that most unjust government policy creates losses to the losers that substantially exceed, in dollars, the gains to the winners. That is, most unjust government policy creates large deadweight losses. So, for example, price controls on gasoline during the 1970s were an unjust policy because they prevented sellers from charging free-market prices to buyers. The price controls created gains to some consumers who had low time values and therefore did not lose much value by spending time in line. But the losses to gasoline sellers and to consumers with higher time values outweighed the gains to the consumers with low time values. So even if one could identify the particular gainers from these price controls, many of whom are dead, it would be impossible to compensate the losers by extracting from the winners the amount they gained. A dramatic illustration of the deadweight loss from unjust government policy is the drug war. I trust that I do not need to explain at length why the drug war is unjust. The short version is that it prohibits people from engaging in voluntary exchange and imposes large penalties on those, especially sellers, who do engage in such exchange. Those large penalties are what led to the deadweight loss. The drug war causes many people to be thrown in prison, where their income falls from a low or moderate level to close to zero (Henderson 2012). That is a large loss. And, of course, even if people thrown in prison lost no income in the process of being incarcerated, they are in prison. That means that their freedom is restricted, and if and when they are finally let out, their options are restricted. Those are two more large losses. There are other losses from the drug war. Two large losses are to customers who must pay higher risk-adjusted prices and to taxpayers who pay for enforcing the drug war and for housing people in expensive prisons. The main gainers are the fighters of the drug war and the prison guards. Their gains, although potentially large per person, are small compared to the losses. Thus, the drug war causes large deadweight losses. These losses can only be ended. They can never be recovered so that everyone is "precisely as well off as they would have been had no injustice occurred."

## AT Transhumanism

#### A UBI doesn’t solve for scarcity – scarcity is inevitable because human desires beyond subsistence are infinite

**Newman, 2015 – Professor of Economics at Auburn University** [Jonathan, Star Trek Is Wrong: There Will Always Be Scarcity. This article appeared in Politics and Society on October 20, 2015. https://mises.org/library/star-trek-wrong-there-will-always-be-scarcity] JN [Premier]

Moving Beyond “Subsistence” Is Not the Same as Moving Beyond “Scarcity” All this means is that people can pursue other ends besides survival, like art, entertainment, learning, or simple relaxation. Our demand for goods and services does not stop once we are at subsistence levels of consumption. This is obviously true for anybody with the means to read this article. Also, there may be demand for food and other goods specifically made by human hands even when robots or replicators could have made something identical or more precisely machined at a lower cost. We see this today, and we are far from Star Trek. Sometimes we like knowing something was made in a certain way, and this translates into demand for goods with a specific, usually labor-intensive, production process. Craft and hand-made trade fairs are common, even when many of the items offered are mass-produced elsewhere. Toward the end of the episode, when Ralph Offenhouse is reeling in an existential crisis, he asks Captain Picard about the purpose of twenty-fourth-century life if it’s not “accumulating wealth”: Captain Jean-Luc Picard: Material needs no longer exist. Ralph Offenhouse: Then what's the challenge? Captain Jean-Luc Picard: The challenge, Mr. Offenhouse, is to improve yourself. To enrich yourself. Enjoy it. What Picard doesn’t realize is that improving and enriching yourself, even with the Enterprise’s mission: “to explore strange new worlds, to seek out new life and new civilizations, to boldly go where no one has gone before” involves the use of scarce, material resources, like starships, starship crews, planets to explore, communicators, teleportation machines, phasers, and warp drives. Picard also doesn’t realize how wealthy he is. Wealth is the ability to satisfy ends, and his spot on the Enterprise makes him enormously wealthy, with all the replicators and the holodeck (environment simulator) and the instant access to top-notch medical care. For someone who rejects accumulating wealth, he has accumulated a lot of it. Although biological needs may be abundantly satisfied, human desires outnumber the stars. As such, scarcity is unavoidable in the same way gravity is unavoidable, or the forward “continual flux” of time, to use the words of Mises. Our goal is the optimal allocation of those scarce resources, and only unhampered markets can “make it so.”

#### A post-scarcity economy is impossible – finite resources can never satisfy human needs.

**Newman, 2015 – Professor of Economics at Auburn University** [Jonathan, Star Trek Is Wrong: There Will Always Be Scarcity. This article appeared in Politics and Society on October 20, 2015. https://mises.org/library/star-trek-wrong-there-will-always-be-scarcity] JN [Premier]

With the recent successes and announcements of sci-fi movies and TV shows like The Martian, Interstellar, and new incarnations of Star Trek and Star Wars, no one can deny that we crave futurism and stretching our imagination on what advanced technology can accomplish. Many look to the example of these fictional worlds as an indication of what life might be like when technology can provide for all of our basic needs, a condition some call “post-scarcity.” The same people call on dramatic government interventions to make sure everybody can earn a “living wage” when robots and automation do all of the producing. They say that “post-scarcity” conditions will completely overturn economies and even economics itself. But, scarcity can never be eliminated because our infinite human wants will always outnumber the means available in this finite universe. Scarcity is found even in the shows and movies that supposedly represent worlds without scarcity.

#### Scarcity is inevitable. Just because there is an increased abundance of something does not mean that there is an infinite amount of that something.

**Newman, 2015 – Professor of Economics at Auburn University** [Jonathan, Star Trek Is Wrong: There Will Always Be Scarcity. This article appeared in Politics and Society on October 20, 2015. https://mises.org/library/star-trek-wrong-there-will-always-be-scarcity] JN [Premier]

Unfortunately for all of us, however, scarcity isn’t going anywhere. And the only way to maximize human want satisfaction with a limited pool of resources is with unhampered markets: private property and prices. Scarcity is a fundamental fact of our universe — we are bound to it by physical laws and logic. Scarcity is even present in the fictional [“post-scarcity”] Star Trek universe, as well as self-ownership and private property. In the very same episode, Captain Picard and the crew have a tense confrontation with the Romulans, who have invaded Federation space. Both parties were investigating the destruction of some of their outposts in the “Neutral Zone.” Space is not only the final frontier, but apparently ownable. The Romulan and Federation outposts are also scarce and owned. When Ralph Offenhouse wandered onto the main bridge during this confrontation, Captain Picard ordered security officers to “Get him off my bridge!” We can’t even conceive of a fictional universe with no scarcity. There can be no time, space, or anything that has any limited capabilities in satisfying our desires. Such a universe would be timeless, incorporeal, and all satisfying. It’s hard to imagine a TV show based in such a universe because there could be no conflict for the characters to overcome. What Manu Saadia and Noah Smith mean by “post-scarcity,” then, is just that some things are more abundant than before. But this prospect does not mean the end of economics, because even today many goods are more abundant than they have been in the past. No matter what, individuals will still be making choices about how to use the resources that are scarce. We may make things relatively less scarce, but we can never repeal scarcity as a fundamental condition of our universe.

#### Work is good—it gives meaning and satisfaction to life. UBI takes away those experiences.

**Cass 16- senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute** [Oren, June 15 2016, “Why a Universal Basic Income Is a Terrible Idea”, Nat Review, Accessed on 6/27/17, <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/436621/universal-basic-income-ubi-terrible-idea>] JC [Premier]

Appreciating the status of work in these communities is critical to understanding their decline. Work gives not only meaning but also structure and stability to life. It provides both socialization and a source of social capital. It helps establish for the next generation virtues such as responsibility, perseverance, and industriousness. Yet of the lower-class households Murray studied, the share with a full-time worker declined from 81 percent in 1960 to 53 percent in 2010. Facing that trend, society cannot afford to withdraw its remaining expectation that able-bodied people try to make ends meet and its remaining respect for those who do. Yes, a UBI might flood these communities with additional resources. But a similar flood has already occurred over the past 40 years, with safety-net spending increasing eightfold. The result has been ever greater social erosion. Many UBI advocates deny that a UBI would produce any great discouragement to work, but their claims are undermined by a vocal subset who embrace this result. Good riddance, they say, to lousy jobs taken only out of need. “I think it’s a bad use of a human to spend 20 years of their life driving a truck back and forth across the United States,” Albert Wenger, a venture capitalist, told the New York Times. “That’s not what we aspire to do as humans — it’s a bad use of a human brain.” This attitude recalls the investment banker quoted by Myron Magnet who lamented “the man and his wife slogging away in menial jobs that are dead-end jobs, with three kids, trying to deal with an environment that is very depressing, . . . living dead-end lives.” Why, asks Magnet, does this family, working to support itself and raise upstanding citizens who will start families of their own, represent “a dead end rather than a human accomplishment worthy of honor and admiration”? This dead-end message is especially toxic for upward mobility because it tells prospective low-wage workers that, in Magnet’s words, “the first step they once could have taken toward achieving [respect] — putting a foot firmly on the bottom rung of the job ladder — has had respectability withdrawn from it.” Young people with limited skills and education are already too disconnected from the labor force. A UBI that reduces the perceived importance of work while putting cash in their pockets can only reduce the likelihood of their making the daily trek to low-wage jobs. And a subculture composed of their peers would presumably become less rather than more supportive of the choice to seek work. For unemployed workers of any age, the UBI’s guaranteed paycheck would only reduce the pressure to find work or relocate in search of opportunity. Yet for those at the bottom of the economic ladder, there is simply no substitute for stepping onto the first rung. A UBI might provide the same income as such a job, but it can offer none of the experience, skills, or socialization. A nation in which people sitting beside the ladder live more comfortably but are less likely to climb it may be one with a lower government-reported poverty rate, but it is not more effectively combating poverty.

#### Transhumanism is coopted for white male elites – it reinforces inequality

**Hughes 2002 - Executive Director of the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies** [James, The Politics of Transhumanism 2.0, March 1, 2002, <https://ieet.org/index.php/IEET2/more/1385>, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

With the emergence of cyberculture, the technoutopian meme-plex has found a natural medium, and has been furiously mutating and crossbreeding with political ideologies. One of its recent manifestations has adopted the label “transhumanism,” and within this sparsely populated but broad ideological tent many proto-ideological hybrids are stirring. Much transhumanist proto-politics is distinctly the product of elitist, male, American libertarianism, limiting its ability to respond to concerns behind the growing Luddite movement, such as with the equity and safety of innovations. Committed only to individual liberty, libertarian transhumanists have little interest in building solidarity between “posthumans” and “normals,” or in crafting techno-utopian projects which can inspire broad social movements.

#### Transhumanist movements are dominated by hypermasculinity and exclude women

**Hughes 2002 - Executive Director of the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies** [James, The Politics of Transhumanism 2.0, March 1, 2002, <https://ieet.org/index.php/IEET2/more/1385>, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

The extropian list often was filled with vituperative attacks on divergent points of view, and those who had been alienated by the extropians but were nonetheless sympathetic with transhumanist views began to amount a sizable group. Although More’s wife, Natasha Vita-More, is given prominent acknowledgement of her transhumanist arts and culture projects, there are few women involved in the extropian subculture, and there have been women who left the list citing the dominant adolescent, hyper-masculine style of argumentation. In a February/March 2002 poll more than 80% of extropians were male, and more than 50% were under 30 years old (ExiCommunity Polls, 2002). In 1999 and 2000 the European fellow-travelers of the extropians began to organize and meet, and the World Transhumanist Association was organized with founding documents distinctly less libertarian than the Extropian Principles. In the latter 1990s, as transhumanism broadened its social base, a growing number of non-libertarian voices began to make themselves heard on the extro email lists.

#### Transhumanism reinforces humanistic attachment to technoscientific control of human progress.

**Hughes 2002 - Executive Director of the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies** [James, The Politics of Transhumanism 2.0, March 1, 2002, <https://ieet.org/index.php/IEET2/more/1385>, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

According to an account by Max More’s wife, Natasha Vita-More, the term “transhuman” was first used in 1966 by the Iranian-American futurist F.M. Esfandiary while he was teaching at the New School for Social Research. The term subsequently appeared in Abraham Maslow’s 1968 Toward a Psychology of Being and in Robert Ettinger’s 1972 Man into Superman. Like Maslow and Ettinger, F.M. Esfandiary (who changed his name to FM-2030) used the term in his writings in the 1970s to refer to people who were adopting the technologies, lifestyles and cultural worldviews that were transitional to post-humanity. In his 1989 book “Are You Transhuman?” FM-2030 says (Transhumans) are the earliest manifestations of new evolutionary beings. They are like those earliest hominids who many millions of years ago came down from the trees and began to look around. Transhumans are not necessarily committed to accelerating the evolution to higher life forms. Many of them are not even aware of their bridging role in evolution.” (FM-2030, 1989) In the early 1980s, FM-2030 befriended More’s future wife, Natasha Vita-More (Nancie Clark), and later became a friend and supporter of More and the Californian extropians. In the lexicon adopted by the extropians, transhumanism involves a self-conscious ideological leaning, not merely having been an early adopter of posthuman tech. For instance, More defined transhumanism in a 1990 essay: Transhumanism is a class of philosophies that seek to guide us towards a posthuman condition. Transhumanism shares many elements of humanism, including a respect for reason and science, a commitment to progress, and a valuing of human (or transhuman) existence in this life rather than in some supernatural "afterlife". Transhumanism differs from humanism in recognizing and anticipating the radical alterations in the nature and possibilities of our lives resulting from various sciences and technologies such as neuroscience and neuropharmacology, life extension, nanotechnology, artificial ultraintelligence, and space habitation, combined with a rational philosophy and value system. (More, 1990)

## AT Welfare Stigma

#### Turn - A UBI replaces a welfare stigma with oppressive volunteerism – people are stigmatized if they choose not to work – this entrenches racism

**Kolkotronis 2017- PhD student Political Science at Yale**  [Alexander, March 29 2017, “Why Socialist Job Guarantees are better than Universal Basic Income”, Accessed on 6/29/2017, <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/40022-why-socialist-job-guarantees-are-better-than-universal-basic-income>) [Premier]

UBI as Oppressive Volunteerism Besides macroeconomic incoherence, other issues emerge. Tcherneva points to the likely stigmatization of those who do not work. More than this, UBI points to the emergence of a new subaltern class, as UBI "does not deal with the loss of skill and deterioration of human capital that result from unemployment." Nathan Tankus, a research scholar at Modern Money Network, has noted that, "If you distributed to everyone the same amount of IOUs regardless of whether they worked, production will fall into volunteerism and the community has no method of insuring that work is distributed equally or that production continues at adequate levels given the goals of the community." This holds the potential for exacerbating gender and racial inequities.

#### A UBI is not necessary to solve the stigma – alternate means already exist and there is little evidence of solvency

**Zon, 2016 – Director of Policy and Research at Maytree Foundation**  [Noah, “Policy brief: Would a universal basic income reduce poverty?”, *Maytree Foundation*, August 16, 2016, https://medium.com/@maytree\_canada/policy-brief-would-a-universal-basic-income-reduce-poverty-cd85fd64dbac. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

One of the common arguments for a basic income is to overcome the stigma of welfare for recipients, to improve their lives through social inclusion and to keep political support for the program. For the stigma on recipients, we don’t need to introduce a new basic income. We can build on how we already deliver an increasing number of our programs—simple electronic funds transfers that no one other than the recipient needs to know about. As far as whether people are more likely to support assistance to people with low income if it’s part of a universal program, the evidence is mixed, especially when we look at long-term trends. Even then, a program with universal eligibility does not mean that every person needs to get the same thing—universal health care means that everyone has access to the treatment they need when they need it, not that they get the same treatment regardless of condition.

# Negative – AT Morals/Framework

## AT Libertarianism

#### Positive or ‘real freedom’ is flawed – it is too vague, and it allows free-riders

Danaher, 2014 - a lecturer at the National University of Ireland, Galway [John Danaher, Widerquist on Freedom and the Basic Income, Sunday, July 13, 2014, <http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/widerquist-on-freedom-and-basic-income.html>, June 27, 2017] [Premier]

Widerquist thinks there are a variety of problems with this argument. Some of his criticisms line-up with those proffered by Elizabeth (covered in the previous entry). For example, Widerquist also worries that “real freedom” is too generic and all-encompassing because it elevates and overvalues freedoms of an unsavoury and oftentimes immoral type. But he doesn’t dwell on this objection. This is because he thinks there are two other, more serious, problems with Parijs’s argument. The first is that the concept of real freedom is too vague to actually provide any real support for the UBI. Parijs wants us to believe that the UBI achieves the maximin level of real freedom. But to be able to say that, he would need three things: (i) some reasonably precise way to measure real freedom; (ii) a measurement or prediction of the increase in real freedom following the introduction of a UBI; and (iii) a comparison of that that increase with the increases associated with other welfare policies. The fact that he has does none of these things goes against his argument. It could well be that other welfare reforms increase the level of real freedom by more. We just don’t know. The second problem is that in his defence of the argument, Parijs never really gets to grips with the “Reciprocity” (or “exploitation”) objection to the UBI. The reciprocity/exploitation objection was covered in the previous post, though it wasn’t named as such. The idea is that a UBI, if it is at or above subsistence level, will give people the option of avoiding paid employment. But, of course, it will be those in paid employment that help to finance the availability of this option. The worry then is that those who opt out of the system of paid employment are exploiting those who opt-in. They are failing to do their fair share.

#### Real Freedom does not promote a stable society – treating every pursuit of each person’s conception of the good life as “equal” undermines the virtues necessary for democracy

**Danaher, 2014 - Lecturer at National University of Ireland** [John, “Parasitic Surfers and the Unconditional Basic Income: A Debate”, July 12 2014, <http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/parasitic-surfers-and-unconditional.html>] [Premier]

Anderson’s Critique So much for Parijs’s defence of the UBI and its tolerance of those with low-production and low-consumption lifestyles. What about Anderson’s critique? I’ll be much briefer here since Anderson’s main criticisms are effectively a set of bullet points. Nevertheless, they raise important issues that a defender of the UBI should be willing to address. There are three such criticisms. The first criticism has to do with Parijs’s concept of real freedom and the foundational role it plays in his argument. As you may have noticed, this concept of real freedom is completely generic. It does not say that certain conceptions of the good life ought to be prioritised over others, or that certain specific types of freedom ought to be prioritised over others. The person who wants to spend their life curing sick children in a poor country finds that their choices are worth just as much as those of the idle surfer. Anderson, for one, finds this to be unwelcome. As she sees it, there are certain kinds of freedoms we should care about more. Specifically, she thinks we should focus on the kinds of freedom (and the means to those freedoms) that help us to avoid things like social exclusion, exploitation, violence, and that allow us to function as equal citizens in a democratic state. In other words, Anderson has a highly instrumental understanding of the value of freedom: freedom is not valuable simply in and of itself; it is valuable as a means toward securing a more equitable and democratic society. It could be that the conflict of values between herself and Parijs is too great on this score.

#### Affirmative doesn’t solve for real freedom- future economy will be vastly different from today’s, and even then UBI will only give the chance of freedom, where many will not achieve it.

Jeung 12- Kongju National University [Mingull, Ecological Expansion of Basic Income: Beyond Capitalism, 2012, <http://basicincome.org/bien/pdf/munich2012/Jeung.pdf>, June 28, 2017] CL [Premier]

Discussions on basic income mostly presume that the capitalism is an appropriate, at least practical, system for a human society. The basic income seems an auxiliary tool to guarantee social justice by minimizing side effect of capitalism. The future economic system, however, would not be the same as the today. In future no human labor would be needed to produce commodities. Most work will be institutional and operational. No labor, but only capital. Thus we have to prepare for such a future. What should a social and economic system be in future? What kind of institutional and operational relation among persons will be just? In nature nearly no organisms produce their food by themselves. Organisms of previous steps in a food chain just flourish and organisms of next steps simply eat only some of them. Unlike what Darwin assumed, in nature, food is not frequently in shortage. It is difficult to find concrete examples of extinction caused by competition among species. Only in human societies, supply is not frequently enough to survive or satisfy limitless desire. Of course, we cannot say that organismal world is just, or more just than human world. Human being, however, always tries to evaluate anything, even nature. Thus ecologists have devised tools to evaluate conceptual goodness of ecosystems. One of them is the concept of biodiversity. The higher the value of biodiversity is, the better the ecosystem is. Higher biodiversity does not simply mean more number of species in an ecosystem than in another ecosystem. It tells us more even distribution of species in the ecosystem than in another. The concept of biodiversity would provide conceptual foundation for basic income and a devising frame for fair future societies without traditional labor, therefore, social justice. Ecologists have devised measure to assess biodiversity reflecting anthropocentric notion of equity, number and evenness. Accidently such anthropocentric measures succeed in presenting the degree of stability of communities at large. Basic income will be a device, which materializes ecological equity in human society. I. What makes being human peculiar? Is human different from the other life forms? We are not sure whether the answer would be ‘yes’, or ‘no.’ Biologically saying, no fundamental difference between human and the other forms. All are made of cells, have hierarchical anatomy, and even have the same genetic materials and physiology. Human, however, has thought that human, more strictly being human, is divinely different from the others. Is that right? In an actual society, we see so many in-divine things that human being has done till now, and on. Human history has provided so many examples of inhuman deed. People kill people without cause. Presumably, just for loyalty or allegiance to the greedy lord, for fun, or even for boredom. People humiliate and look down people without reason. Oh, just humble birth! Yes, that’s right. The divine fate of slavery. Now people think that such a caste system persists no longer in this world. Is that right? Maybe not. Although there is no apparent official caste in most countries, especially in highly industrialized countries, money is another divine criterion of social position, divine monetary caste. Everybody says Thomas Jefferson’s phrase, ‘all men are created equal.’ The phrase seems to declare equality before the law, and to promise a society without any discrimination before the law. All men are created equal; however, they are divinely born and raised unequal. In olden days, they had just inherited their parents. We call it ancestry. We do not know who have created the ancestry. Probably, divine force. It could be chance, strength, god, or money. If you have a good chance, great physical strength, blessing revelation, or wealth, whether it is parent’s or your own, you are grown in higher status. It seems natural. Right? Although you are created equal, your own or parent’s effort makes you wealthy and powerful and gives you the right to throne. That is natural law. But what is the difference between natural law and the positive law, man-made law? Who does define ‘natural?’ Who does make ‘the law?’ People. Who, out of people? The divinely raised person. If he says, it should be right. Because he has been divinely raised, he has all the right to get surplus value. Only his mercy makes workers survive. If he does not have any mercy on them of mean birth, they are all kept in poor conditions. Bill Gates’ mercy makes several million workers all around the world happy without hunger. Bill Gates’ share, which might be much greater than the sum of his workers’ bags, is the just result of the divine society. Does such divinity make human, being human, peculiar? Apparently, Yes. It is the reason why we work so hard and try to get higher position. After setting a divine device to collect money through labor of mean birth, anybody will get rich enough to buy power. It makes the life of a person exciting. That could be one of the features that make human divine. Is anything wrong in this answer? We will try to get the answer to the question. II. Is basic income an auxiliary tool to guarantee social justice? If everybody in a society earns basic income, will he be happy without discrimination? If so, how much will make him happy? Is the amount equivalent to the income that a worker gets after working for minimum hours at a minimum wage enough for basic income? Probably it will not be enough. Then is the basic income an auxiliary tool for everybody to be happy? More exactly speaking, the basic income might provide equity of opportunity. It will give everybody the same chance to set the divine device, at least a hope to get the chance. The chance. Will it actually make everybody happy? Definitely, no. If you buy a lottery ticket, you get a chance to win a prize. You, however, seldom win a prize. Just being futilely happy between buying and drawing. Will you repeat this thing in vain indefinitely? To prevent being futilely happy, what does a society guarantee everybody? Huge amount of basic income for a government not to be capable of paying might not be an answer, especially when the government tries to get finances through taxation. One of feasible answers is restructuring economic framework in a society. What kind of restructuring would be actualized? III. What will produce commodities in future? In a market a consumer gets commodities and a seller gets money. A manufacturer produces commodities using labor of workers by capital. The seller buys commodities from the manufacturer and the latter gets money. Money comes from the consumer at the beginning. Then, where does the consumer get the money? I could not give an answer for this question in here because of its complication. In equivalent exchange nobody gets profit or surplus value. They get exactly the value for that they pay. Without considering money matters anybody in the exchange gets a kind of surplus value that is added by labor. Then somebody realizes the hidden surplus value and extracts it from the equivalent exchange. Accumulation of the value becomes capital. The capital, now, buys labor, i.e., employs workers. If a capitalist pays a worker a salary enough to compensate the value added by the latter, then the former does exchange for nothing. If the seller pays exactly the same amount that the capitalist pays, and gets the same amount from the consumer, then the seller does exchange in vain, too. But the capitalist and the seller also added some labor to the commodities, although not directly to the commodities themselves, via managing workers and enhancing accessibility, respectively. They can claim that they also create surplus value. That seems reasonable. Anyhow, a market devices a method to extract any surplus value from such exchange with help of currency. As history goes, workers have recognized the capitalists’ profit as exploitation of the surplus value that they created. Then workers resist against the exploitation. Instead of sharing or getting reasonable profit, the capitalists have tried to enhance productivity by replacing workers by machine. This makes a society more complicated. It is getting more difficult to resolve conflict between workers and capitalists.

#### The libertarian UBI would be too small to solve the problems of the poor

Danaher, 2013 – Lecturer at the National University of Ireland [John, a regular blogger at Philosophical Disquisitions, Libertarianism and the Basic Income (Part Two), Philosophical Disquisitions, 12/17/13, http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2013/12/libertarianism-and-basic-income-part-two.html, 6/27/17] JY [Premier]

That’s just the in principle case for a UBI. It faces a number of limitations and objections. In terms of limitations, the main one highlighted by Zwolinski has to do with the size of the income grant that would be justified by the argument. Since the classical liberal concern is to compensate for losses (to the degree needed for justification), and not to ensure equality or anything close to that, it is likely to justify a relatively small income grant. This will be disappointing to many of the more traditional supporters of the UBI. In terms of objections, two are discussed by Zwolinski, one which he thinks is serious, the other which he thinks is manageable.

#### A UBI does not solve simplification of bureaucracy – any flexibility will increase the complexity of the program

**Zon, 2016 – Director of Policy and Research at Maytree Foundation**  [Noah, “Policy brief: Would a universal basic income reduce poverty?”, *Maytree Foundation*, August 16, 2016, https://medium.com/@maytree\_canada/policy-brief-would-a-universal-basic-income-reduce-poverty-cd85fd64dbac. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

For some, the problem to be solved by universal basic income policies is that our social safety net is riddled with complications that allow some people to slip through while trapping others in poverty with “welfare wall” effects. Our approach to social policy reflects a collection of “clumsy but temporarily effective” responses to problems as they arise, each justifiable in their own context, but taken together, combine for the kind of “gerry-rigged, opaque and complicated” approach that Steven Teles calls a “kludgeocracy.” Basic income is a chance to replace the red tape and stigma with a simpler approach that can support people in a way that respects their dignity and agency. The related libertarian version of this problem is that our current system sees government play too large a role in the economy and people’s lives, and that we would be better off giving that money directly to individuals to meet their needs in the market, saving money on administration of programs in the process, money that could be redirected to people in need.∂ Replacing a patchwork of responses to particular needs with a universal income approach would also respond to the gaps that have emerged as our safety net has failed to keep pace with economic and social transformations. Rather than creating a set of targeted programs, the flexibility of an all-purpose universal basic income would allow it to respond to challenges like the financial burden of unpaid caregiving or the high costs of child care that more and more families need to rely on. The overall approach of a basic income could definitely improve on the complicated set of programs we have today. However, not all of the problems that we try to address through the social safety net can be easily addressed by providing everyone with a little more money. Would a basic income account for people’s different needs, including those such as drug coverage, that are not well-served by the market? The more adjustments that we make for these complexities, the more a basic income starts to look like our current system, for better or for worse.

#### A UBI will not solve bureaucracy – any flexibility will create eligibility criteria and paperwork

**Zon, 2016 – Director of Policy and Research at Maytree Foundation**  [Noah, “Policy brief: Would a universal basic income reduce poverty?”, *Maytree Foundation*, August 16, 2016, https://medium.com/@maytree\_canada/policy-brief-would-a-universal-basic-income-reduce-poverty-cd85fd64dbac. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

By nature, a universal basic income would help to make sure that people don’t fall through the worst cracks of the existing safety net based on onerous eligibility requirements like limits on liquid assets. It would theoretically also be more flexible to help people address a variety of needs, including those we haven’t designed targeted programs for. How well it would do this, and whether it would offer a simple, user-friendly system to improve on our sometimes clumsy social safety net depends on the details. All but the most simplistic of basic income policies would tailor the level of support based on income, leaving in place at least some of the administration and the “welfare wall” effects. The more sensitive to individual situations that the policy gets—adjustments for local cost of living, additional support for persons with disabilities, responsiveness to changes in income or need—the more a basic income policy looks like what we have now, with similar strengths and weaknesses.

#### Reducing bureaucracy undermine solvency for poverty – it makes welfare a one size fits all solution which isn’t flexible enough

**Zon, 2016 – Director of Policy and Research at Maytree Foundation**  [Noah, “Policy brief: Would a universal basic income reduce poverty?”, *Maytree Foundation*, August 16, 2016, https://medium.com/@maytree\_canada/policy-brief-would-a-universal-basic-income-reduce-poverty-cd85fd64dbac. June 27, 2017] NJT [Premier]

The fact that we have a variety of different policies and programs is one of the core strengths of our social safety net, not a failing to overcome. People in different situations, of different ages, and different parts of the country have different needs. A single transfer is alluringly simple, but one size does not fit all. A diverse system of policies and programs is better suited to our diverse needs and arguably more politically resilient in tougher times than a single costly program that is not tied to any particular group or need. We would be better off looking at different policies designed with particular problems in mind — expanding the Working Income Tax Benefit, reforming Employment Insurance, building better support for people with disabilities — than trying to address all of these different needs with a single tool.∂ Where we have seen success in Canada and elsewhere is in income guarantees and income top-ups that move people out of poverty. The federal government has made a transformative move to guarantee a minimum income for families with the Canada Child Benefit. It also has boosted the income guarantee for seniors through an add-on to the Guaranteed Income Supplement. There are many good reasons that we have two different programs there for different groups with different needs. As the Ontario government develops its pilot project and other governments explore basic income, they would do well to keep in mind this approach of different solutions to match different problems.∂ It’s great to see the enthusiasm that the basic income discussion is bringing to the goal of ending poverty and improving people’s lives. At the risk of spoiling the party, it’s important to be clear just what we’re talking about. A simple universal program has a natural appeal. In practice, there is a real risk that basic income could worsen poverty, rather than eliminate it.

#### UBI is impermissible because the state does not have the authority to coerce redistribution of wealth which treats taxpayers as a means to other people’s freedom

**Huemer 2014 - professor of Philosophy at the University of Colorado at Boulder** [Michael, Is a basic Income Permissible?, August 6 2014, <https://www.cato-unbound.org/2014/08/06/michael-huemer/basic-income-permissible>, June 27 2017] LA [Premier]

The central point for which Matt Zwolinski’s lead essay argues is that a basic income guarantee would be less bad than the status quo. Having been recruited for a critical comment, I hope my role is not to dispute this thesis, because I can’t think of how one could defend the status quo from any philosophical standpoint. I therefore hope I may be excused for focusing on something that Zwolinski did not argue in this essay but that he has argued elsewhere: Is a government-provided basic income guarantee ethically permissible? The answer to this is non-obvious, but I think it is probably no. (Note that this is compatible with the fact that the status quo is even worse.) I will summarize my main reason for this, then address Zwolinski’s arguments from other postings. I. The Basic Argument Against a Basic Income My basic argument is this: 1. A basic income guarantee is permissible only if the state has political authority. 2. No one has political authority. 3. Therefore, a basic income guarantee is impermissible. What is meant by “political authority” here? Roughly, political authority involves a kind of exemption from the usual norms of non-aggression in interpersonal ethics – an exemption that entitles the agent who has authority to coercively impose rules of conduct on the rest of society, in conditions or for reasons that would not justify coercion on the part of ordinary private agents. (For a better explanation, see my The Problem of Political Authority, chapter 1). Why is premise (1) true? Suppose I decided to provide a basic income for my neighborhood. I don’t have enough justly acquired money to do this, so I extract the needed funds from my neighbors by threatening them with kidnaping and long-term imprisonment if they fail to hand over the funds I require. Sometimes a neighbor evades my efforts, usually by lying to me about his income. I kidnap these neighbors and hold them prisoner in small cells for years at a time. This part is crucial – carrying out the coercive threats on recalcitrant citizens is practically necessary to maintaining a tax system in any realistic society. This behavior seems impermissible, to put it mildly. Even registered Democrats would agree with this. Now, that does not yet establish that a government-guaranteed basic income is impermissible. Perhaps the government is different from me and other private agents in some ethically relevant way, which exempts them from the moral constraint that enjoins me from behaving in this way. What the example shows is that basic-income advocates need some account of how the government is thus exempt. That is, they need a theory of political authority. I hold, however, that no agent has ever possessed political authority. I can’t give you the argument for that here. The argument consists in reviewing the most plausible and influential accounts of the basis of the state’s authority – for example, theories based on the social contract, the democratic process, fairness, or utilitarian considerations – and showing, in each case, how the theories fail. If you want to know more about that, I’m afraid you have to read my book (sorry!). II. The Rectification Argument for a Basic Income History is full of injustice, much of it affecting the distribution of property. Following a suggestion of Robert Nozick’s, Zwolinski elsewhere suggests that, since the chain of causation is difficult to trace in individual cases, and since those who are doing especially badly now are disproportionately likely to have been harmed by that injustice, the state might be justified in redistributing wealth to the poor in general, as a kind of approximation to the rectification of injustice. Here are a few brief problems with this line of thought: A. We should expect that the effects of injustices tend to wash out over time. Personal choices and innate abilities probably have much more to do with a person’s present-day income level than events occurring a century or more in the past. This is one reason for adopting a sort of statute of limitations on reparations for past injustices. B. A basic income would redistribute money from the rich and the middle class to the poor. But those from whom the money is taken are not guilty of any crimes for which they owe compensation. For example, no living person is responsible for slavery; it would therefore be unjust to force anyone to pay compensation for it. C. Zwolinski suggests that despite point (B), the state might owe compensation for past injustices, because the same state continues to exist despite changes in personnel. Analogously, corporations retain debts and other obligations even when the members who incurred those obligations are no longer in the corporation, or even are no longer alive. Shouldn’t a similar principle therefore hold for governments? Very briefly, I think this continuity of obligations is possible for private corporations because new members of a corporation, in voluntarily joining the organization, thereby undertake whatever obligations go along with their accepted role in the corporation. These may include, for example, seeing to the payment of debts incurred by past managers. The same does not hold for the state, because new taxpayers do not voluntarily undertake the obligations of the government; rather, they have the government’s debts forcibly imposed on them. Admittedly, my view here will appeal more to anarchists than to anyone else, since the inability to collect funds to pay its debts would create serious practical problems for running a government. III. The Freedom Argument In another posting, Zwolinski suggested that a basic income might be justified on the grounds that it protects individuals’ freedom, because having a basic income insulates one from certain kinds of coercion by one’s employer. Zwolinski characterizes this as a libertarian argument for a basic income. I think this illustrates the problem with characterizing libertarianism merely as a pro-freedom philosophy. As I understand it, the (typical) minimal-state libertarian’s view is not that the job of the state is to act so as to maximize freedom. Rather, the state is charged with protecting the rights of individuals, while avoiding violating rights itself. Typically one is not justified in violating another person’s rights solely to prevent something slightly worse from happening – not even if the slightly worse thing would involve a diminution of someone’s freedom. For example, it is not ethically permissible to murder an innocent person, even if doing so somehow prevents two other innocent people from being murdered. Or so I believe, and so says the usual deontological conception of rights. I thus find the “freedom” argument unpersuasive. 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.

#### Libertarianism still rejects a UBI – it is not enough to be “less impermissible” than the present system – it is still coercive.

**Henderson, 2015 –prof of economics at the Naval Postgraduate School's School of Public Policy** [David R., A Philosophical Economist's Case against a Government-Guaranteed Basic Income. This article appeared in The Independent Review in the Spring of 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/24563064.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A79bf90b3116741c8d2dcf25fb3a5e858] JN [Premier]

Moreover, even if the BIG were better than the existing welfare state—a proposition that, as argued earlier, Zwolinski has not successfully demonstrated—this argument is an unusual one for a libertarian to make. The reason is that among the ways that we should reduce the size of government is bringing an end to the welfare state. Here is how philosopher Michael Huemer puts the point in the introductory paragraph of his response to Zwolinski in the Cato Unbound discus sion: "The central point for which Matt Zwolinski's lead essay argues is that a basic income guarantee would be less bad than the status quo. Having been recruited for a critical comment, I hope my role is not to dispute this thesis, because I can't think of how one could defend the status quo from any philosophical standpoint" (2014). I have challenged the idea that the BIG would be less bad, at least in a budgetary sense, than the status quo. But Huemer's point is on target: even if the BIG were less bad than the status quo, that is not a strong argument, especially for a libertarian to make. To put it blundy, the status quo is ugly. To drive the point home, consider two libertarians discussing the drug war. Libertarian A wants to end the drug war and allow as free a market in drugs as is allowed in candy bars. Libertarian B wants to make illegal drugs legal but tax them heavily and severely restrict their distribution. Libertarian B argues that his option is better than the status quo, under which hundreds of thousands of people, if not millions, have their lives wrecked by government. Libertarian A agrees but thinks we would do better by ending the drug war altogether. In this argument, the status quo in the drug arena is so awful that simply coming up with a less intrusive alternative is not good enough because it is still intrusive. Zwolinski might argue that if he can make his BIG superior to the current welfare state, possibly by cutting the amount per person to, say, $5,000, then his case for a BIG would stand. But that's not so. The case for a BIG would stand only as an alternative to the current welfare state, not as an ideal. The only way he could make the case would be if he were explicitly to propose a BIG as a temporary step away from the current welfare state. But that is clearly not what he is doing. Here's the test. If someone were to come up with a way of ending the current welfare state and not replacing it with a BIG, would Zwolinski favor that way? Based on the arguments he has used for a BIG, one's answer would have to be "no."

#### Even if property rights are not absolute, a UBI is still impermissible, because past violations don’t justify further violations

**Henderson, 2015 –prof of economics at the Naval Postgraduate School's School of Public Policy** [David R., A Philosophical Economist's Case against a Government-Guaranteed Basic Income. This article appeared in The Independent Review in the Spring of 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/24563064.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A79bf90b3116741c8d2dcf25fb3a5e858] JN [Premier]

But back to what I assume is the main point of Zwolinski's paragraph: that the existing distribution of property rights ought not to be regarded as inviolable. I agree with that. I also agree with the reason that gets Zwolinski to that conclusion—namely, that "the existing distribution is in many ways the product of past acts of uncompensated theft and violence." But how do we get from that fact—both he and I would regard it as a fact—to the conclusion that a BIG is justified? That is difficult. I think we all can agree that many people have what they have at least in part due to previous rights violations. It is not clear to me that these people are "at the top" in what I take to be Zwolinski's narrower sense rather than in my wider sense. I think, for example, of people who paid into Medicare and Social Security only a fraction, even in present value terms, of what they get back from taxes paid by the current young and middle-aged people. Sure, many of them are on top, but many are not. I don't see how a BIG redresses that rights violation. How does Zwolinski reach his conclusion that a BIG is a good answer? He writes: "In a world in which all property was acquired by peaceful processes of labor-mixing and voluntary trade, a tax-funded Basic Income Guarantee might plausibly be held to violate libertarian rights. But our world is not that world. And since we do not have the information that would be necessary to engage in a precise rectification of past injustices, and since simply ignoring those injustices seems unfair, perhaps something like a Basic Income Guarantee can be justified as an approximate rectification?" (2013b, emphasis in original). His question mark at the end is perplexing. I assume, though, that Zwolinski is saying that a BIG can be justified. Again, however, go back to my Social Security and Medicare example. Social Security and Medicare are huge systemic attacks on people's rights, and I don't see a guaranteed minimum income as even an approximate rectification of these wrongs. David Friedman has pointed out two other problems with Zwolinski's liber tarian case: "If I justly owe you forty cents, taking a dollar from me and giving it to you makes the resulting distribution less just, not more. Unless most inequali ties are inherited from past rights violations, a claim I think few libertarians would support, the logic of the argument breaks down" (2013). "A further problem with Matt's [Zwolinski's] argument," writes Friedman, is that, even if you believe that a guaranteed basic income reduces net injustice, it is hard to argue that it is the best rule of thumb for the purpose. Consider the case of Afro-Americans. Almost nobody whose ancestors immigrated to the U.S. after the Civil War is the heir of benefits created by violation of the rights of their ancestors by his ancestors. On the other hand, the ancestors of present-day Afro-Americans were enslaved by Africans to be sold to European slave traders. The present inhabitants of Africa, at least sizable parts of it, are more likely than the present inhabitants of North America to be descendants of people who owe, and did not pay, reparation to slaves and their descendants. (2013) It follows that Matt's second argument implies that the (very poor) present inhabitants of Africa owe compensation to the (relatively rich) present American blacks. I do not think Matt would accept that argument, whether or not he could rebut it. If so, he does not really believe in his second argument.

#### Trying to amend past injustices via taxation fails due to deadweight loss--the winners never won.

**Henderson 2015 – Associate Professor of Economics** [Davis, research fellow at Stanford, Spring 2015, “A Philosophical Economist’s Case against a Government-Guaranteed Basic Income,” The Independent Review, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24563064>, accessed 6/27/17] AO [Premier]

But there is a further problem. It is not only that we "do not have the kind of detailed information about past events or the relevant counterfactuals that would be necessary to make everyone precisely as well of[f] as they would have been had no injustice occurred." It is that even if we had that detailed information about past events, that would still not suffice to "make everyone precisely as well off as they would have been had no injustice occurred." The reason is that most unjust government policy creates losses to the losers that substantially exceed, in dollars, the gains to the winners. That is, most unjust government policy creates large deadweight losses. So, for example, price controls on gasoline during the 1970s were an unjust policy because they prevented sellers from charging free-market prices to buyers. The price controls created gains to some consumers who had low time values and therefore did not lose much value by spending time in line. But the losses to gasoline sellers and to consumers with higher time values outweighed the gains to the consumers with low time values. So even if one could identify the particular gainers from these price controls, many of whom are dead, it would be impossible to compensate the losers by extracting from the winners the amount they gained. A dramatic illustration of the deadweight loss from unjust government policy is the drug war. I trust that I do not need to explain at length why the drug war is unjust. The short version is that it prohibits people from engaging in voluntary exchange and imposes large penalties on those, especially sellers, who do engage in such exchange. Those large penalties are what led to the deadweight loss. The drug war causes many people to be thrown in prison, where their income falls from a low or moderate level to close to zero (Henderson 2012). That is a large loss. And, of course, even if people thrown in prison lost no income in the process of being incarcerated, they are in prison. That means that their freedom is restricted, and if and when they are finally let out, their options are restricted. Those are two more large losses. There are other losses from the drug war. Two large losses are to customers who must pay higher risk-adjusted prices and to taxpayers who pay for enforcing the drug war and for housing people in expensive prisons. The main gainers are the fighters of the drug war and the prison guards. Their gains, although potentially large per person, are small compared to the losses. Thus, the drug war causes large deadweight losses. These losses can only be ended. They can never be recovered so that everyone is "precisely as well off as they would have been had no injustice occurred."

#### The libertarian world is key to solving for gender discrimination – it avoids coercive assimilation

**Birnbaum, 2004 – prof of political science at Stockholm Univ** [Simon Real Libertarianism, Structural Injustice And The Democratic Ideal DRAFT, 2004-10-20 1 basicincome.org/bien/pdf/2004Birnbaum.pdf Acc 6/29/2017] JY [Premier]

To liberals the difficulties begin to emerge when one opts for a strategy that Brian Barry calls “coercive assimilation”with respect to gender roles, i.e. a politics that will forbid certain cultural expressions and force people who identify strongly with established gender roles to change their minds. Liberals who regard the ideal of assimilation as attractive may feel that it is their ethical obligation to join the struggle to change such heterosexual norms, or any norms that connect one’s sex to particular expectations and ideals in life, as part of their political activism in civil society. 17 On the other hand, a liberal [libertarian] society – a society of free associations where individuals will share and debate ideas of the good and live according to their personal convictions - will unavoidably make it possible for people to associate with whomever they want, and to attach significant cultural meaning to whatever body parts they like (Barry, 1996:543). Claiming that something is part of an attractive social state of affairs is different from claiming it to be just. For example, freedom of thought and freedom of association will guarantee people the freedom to live by some religious or other ethical ideals that encourage a traditional gender division of labor. Hence, if we take basic liberties seriously, we cannot strive towards the complete abolishment of traditional gender roles by way of coercive assimilation (Rawls, 1999:600, Young, 2000:178f).

#### Individuals need not consent to every governmental action under libertarianism – rather governments must enforce libertarian rights.

**Vallentyne 2012 – Professor of Philosophy at the** **University of Missouri at Columbia** [Peter, 1/19/12, “Libertarianism and the Justice of a Basic Income,”, <http://klinechair.missouri.edu/docs/libertarianism_and_basic_income.pdf>, accessed 6/28/17] AO [Premier]

A basic income is normally understood as a payment provided by the state from tax revenues. There is, of course, an important question of whether libertarianism can judge any kind of non-consensual state to be just.2 Although I believe that the most plausible version of libertarianism will judge a state to be just only if each of the governed individually validly consents to it (see Simmons 2001, 2005 for related discussion), I believe that something resembling a state can be just according to libertarianism if it only enforces prohibitions of activities that violate someone’s libertarian rights (see Vallentyne 2007 for elaboration). Thus, if I have an enforceable duty to make a certain payment to you (e.g., to repay a loan), then the state may use force, with your consent, to ensure that I make the payment (just as you could or someone else could on your behalf). Libertarianism recognizes no non-consensual duty to make tax payments to a state, but if individuals have, as I shall suggest below, enforceable libertarian duties to make certain payments to others, then the state, like any individual, may use force to collect those payments and transfer them to the relevant individuals. If those payments take the form of a basic income, then libertarianism can recognize the justice of a basic income.

## AT Rawls

#### Even Rawls admits that work is a virtue, and that a basic income would encourage free riding

**Danaher, 2014 - Lecturer at National University of Ireland** [John, “Parasitic Surfers and the Unconditional Basic Income: A Debate”, July 12 2014, <http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/parasitic-surfers-and-unconditional.html>] [Premier]

Parasites, the Moralisation of Work and the Demands of Justice Parijs famously defended the right to a UBI in an article entitled “Why Surfers Should be Fed”. The title was inspired by something that happened in Hawaii in the early 1970s. Concerned about the prospect of welfare hippies flocking to the island in order to kick back, surf and take advantage of their reasonably generous social welfare provisions, the Hawaiian state legislature instituted a one-year residency requirement for welfare entitlements. The hope was that this would dissuade the idle, leisure-seeking surfers from draining the resources of the state. When enacting the measure, one senator was heard to comment “There will be no parasites in paradise”. The reaction of the Hawaiian legislatures evinces an attitude common among citizens of the industrious world. Work is moralised (deemed virtuous) and idleness is demonised. Thus, the “idle” surfers are viewed as little more than parasites living off the hard-earned taxes of the virtuous workers. This attitude is common among political philosophers too. Rawls, for example, seemed to approve of something like the Hawaiian measure when he said that “those who surf off Mailbu…would not be entitled to public funds” (Rawls, 1988). The view espoused here by Rawls seems to be that justice does not demand that any welfare payments be made to those who opt for leisure over work. Parijs has a different view. Far from it being the case that surfers are mere parasites, it is actually the case that justice — or at least a particular but plausible conception of justice — demands that they be provided for.

#### A UBI does not increase justice – there are many other barriers to freedom that income cannot overcome

**Danaher, 2014 - a lecturer at the National University of Ireland, Galway** [John Danaher, Widerquist on Freedom and the Basic Income, Sunday, July 13, 2014, <http://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.ie/2014/07/widerquist-on-freedom-and-basic-income.html>, June 27, 2017] [Premier]

What are we to make of all this? I have relatively little to say by way of criticism because I’ll be doing more posts on this in the future. Nevertheless, one quick observation. The assumption underlying Widerquist’s argument is that income is key to achieving ECSO. That could easily be challenged. There are other “mind-forged manacles” that keep people beholden to and under the control of others. Religious and cultural beliefs, for example, can often keep people in a servile state. Income itself may do little to overcome those other sources of unfreedom. So UBI may not make the critical difference that Widerquist imagines. People could still be unfree, even though they have economic independence.

#### Affirmative doesn’t solve for justice - future economy will be vastly different from today’s, and even then UBI will only give the chance of freedom, where many will not achieve it.

**Jeung 12- Kongju National University** [Mingull, Ecological Expansion of Basic Income: Beyond Capitalism, 2012, <http://basicincome.org/bien/pdf/munich2012/Jeung.pdf>, June 28, 2017] CL [Premier]

Discussions on basic income mostly presume that the capitalism is an appropriate, at least practical, system for a human society. The basic income seems an auxiliary tool to guarantee social justice by minimizing side effect of capitalism. The future economic system, however, would not be the same as the today. In future no human labor would be needed to produce commodities. Most work will be institutional and operational. No labor, but only capital. Thus we have to prepare for such a future. What should a social and economic system be in future? What kind of institutional and operational relation among persons will be just? In nature nearly no organisms produce their food by themselves. Organisms of previous steps in a food chain just flourish and organisms of next steps simply eat only some of them. Unlike what Darwin assumed, in nature, food is not frequently in shortage. It is difficult to find concrete examples of extinction caused by competition among species. Only in human societies, supply is not frequently enough to survive or satisfy limitless desire. Of course, we cannot say that organismal world is just, or more just than human world. Human being, however, always tries to evaluate anything, even nature. Thus ecologists have devised tools to evaluate conceptual goodness of ecosystems. One of them is the concept of biodiversity. The higher the value of biodiversity is, the better the ecosystem is. Higher biodiversity does not simply mean more number of species in an ecosystem than in another ecosystem. It tells us more even distribution of species in the ecosystem than in another. The concept of biodiversity would provide conceptual foundation for basic income and a devising frame for fair future societies without traditional labor, therefore, social justice. Ecologists have devised measure to assess biodiversity reflecting anthropocentric notion of equity, number and evenness. Accidently such anthropocentric measures succeed in presenting the degree of stability of communities at large. Basic income will be a device, which materializes ecological equity in human society. I. What makes being human peculiar? Is human different from the other life forms? We are not sure whether the answer would be ‘yes’, or ‘no.’ Biologically saying, no fundamental difference between human and the other forms. All are made of cells, have hierarchical anatomy, and even have the same genetic materials and physiology. Human, however, has thought that human, more strictly being human, is divinely different from the others. Is that right? In an actual society, we see so many in-divine things that human being has done till now, and on. Human history has provided so many examples of inhuman deed. People kill people without cause. Presumably, just for loyalty or allegiance to the greedy lord, for fun, or even for boredom. People humiliate and look down people without reason. Oh, just humble birth! Yes, that’s right. The divine fate of slavery. Now people think that such a caste system persists no longer in this world. Is that right? Maybe not. Although there is no apparent official caste in most countries, especially in highly industrialized countries, money is another divine criterion of social position, divine monetary caste. Everybody says Thomas Jefferson’s phrase, ‘all men are created equal.’ The phrase seems to declare equality before the law, and to promise a society without any discrimination before the law. All men are created equal; however, they are divinely born and raised unequal. In olden days, they had just inherited their parents. We call it ancestry. We do not know who have created the ancestry. Probably, divine force. It could be chance, strength, god, or money. If you have a good chance, great physical strength, blessing revelation, or wealth, whether it is parent’s or your own, you are grown in higher status. It seems natural. Right? Although you are created equal, your own or parent’s effort makes you wealthy and powerful and gives you the right to throne. That is natural law. But what is the difference between natural law and the positive law, man-made law? Who does define ‘natural?’ Who does make ‘the law?’ People. Who, out of people? The divinely raised person. If he says, it should be right. Because he has been divinely raised, he has all the right to get surplus value. Only his mercy makes workers survive. If he does not have any mercy on them of mean birth, they are all kept in poor conditions. Bill Gates’ mercy makes several million workers all around the world happy without hunger. Bill Gates’ share, which might be much greater than the sum of his workers’ bags, is the just result of the divine society. Does such divinity make human, being human, peculiar? Apparently, Yes. It is the reason why we work so hard and try to get higher position. After setting a divine device to collect money through labor of mean birth, anybody will get rich enough to buy power. It makes the life of a person exciting. That could be one of the features that make human divine. Is anything wrong in this answer? We will try to get the answer to the question. II. Is basic income an auxiliary tool to guarantee social justice? If everybody in a society earns basic income, will he be happy without discrimination? If so, how much will make him happy? Is the amount equivalent to the income that a worker gets after working for minimum hours at a minimum wage enough for basic income? Probably it will not be enough. Then is the basic income an auxiliary tool for everybody to be happy? More exactly speaking, the basic income might provide equity of opportunity. It will give everybody the same chance to set the divine device, at least a hope to get the chance. The chance. Will it actually make everybody happy? Definitely, no. If you buy a lottery ticket, you get a chance to win a prize. You, however, seldom win a prize. Just being futilely happy between buying and drawing. Will you repeat this thing in vain indefinitely? To prevent being futilely happy, what does a society guarantee everybody? Huge amount of basic income for a government not to be capable of paying might not be an answer, especially when the government tries to get finances through taxation. One of feasible answers is restructuring economic framework in a society. What kind of restructuring would be actualized? III. What will produce commodities in future? In a market a consumer gets commodities and a seller gets money. A manufacturer produces commodities using labor of workers by capital. The seller buys commodities from the manufacturer and the latter gets money. Money comes from the consumer at the beginning. Then, where does the consumer get the money? I could not give an answer for this question in here because of its complication. In equivalent exchange nobody gets profit or surplus value. They get exactly the value for that they pay. Without considering money matters anybody in the exchange gets a kind of surplus value that is added by labor. Then somebody realizes the hidden surplus value and extracts it from the equivalent exchange. Accumulation of the value becomes capital. The capital, now, buys labor, i.e., employs workers. If a capitalist pays a worker a salary enough to compensate the value added by the latter, then the former does exchange for nothing. If the seller pays exactly the same amount that the capitalist pays, and gets the same amount from the consumer, then the seller does exchange in vain, too. But the capitalist and the seller also added some labor to the commodities, although not directly to the commodities themselves, via managing workers and enhancing accessibility, respectively. They can claim that they also create surplus value. That seems reasonable. Anyhow, a market devices a method to extract any surplus value from such exchange with help of currency. As history goes, workers have recognized the capitalists’ profit as exploitation of the surplus value that they created. Then workers resist against the exploitation. Instead of sharing or getting reasonable profit, the capitalists have tried to enhance productivity by replacing workers by machine. This makes a society more complicated. It is getting more difficult to resolve conflict between workers and capitalists.