

*[The United States should replace means-tested welfare programs with a universal basic income.]*

### ***Contention 1 is Recession Recovery***

The US is heading for recession. **Chandler '20 of CCN** reports that a global recession is coming, with the global fears of a pandemic only increasing the chance the economy takes a nosedive soon.

*Problematically, replacing means-tested welfare with a universal basic income would worsen the recession by removing automatic stabilizers*

In times of economic downturn, **Lee '19 of Brookings** explains that automatic stabilizers both serve to ease financial stress on poor families and stimulate aggregate demand in order to boost the economy out of recession.

**Rubin '17 of the Washington Post** finds that our welfare programs serve as automatic stabilizers to help the economy recover from downturn. During recession, more people qualify for welfare, providing wealth to the poor and allowing them to spend in the economy.

However, replacing these programs with a UBI would not make up for this effect. **Economist Ellis Winningham '16** writes that a UBI is not an automatic stabilizer for the economy because it provides everyone a payment regardless of income, concluding that UBI is actually an economic destabilizer.

Automatic stabilizers are key to prevent further economic decline. **Madowitz '19 of the Center for American Progress** concludes that automatic stabilizers prevented an additional 18% decline in GDP during the 2008 recession.

Problematically, **Blanchard '13 of the IMF** concludes that the next global economic shock will push 900 million into poverty.

### ***Contention 2 is Foreign Aid***

A UBI necessitates funding from somewhere, and foreign aid is the first to be cut.

**Greenstein '19 for the CBPP** writes: A 10,000/year UBI given to all Americans would cost \$3.28 trillion a year.

However, replacing existing welfare with a UBI would not cover even close to the expense. **Gunn '19 for the Pacific Standard** qualifies: eliminating the existing means tested welfare programs would cover only about 20 percent of the cost of a UBI.

Without cutting from existing programs, there are two traditional ways to finance federal projects: taxes and deficit spending. Neither are feasible.

**Greenstein continues:** 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 is thus politically infeasible, especially given the tax increases we'll already need for Social Security, Medicare, infrastructure, and other needs.

Moreover, **Acemolgu '19 for the WEF writes** that because current tax revenue would have to be doubled, permanent UBI could not be financed with government debt or newly printed currency.

Without a means of financing a UBI, the first program to go will be foreign aid.

**Lancaster 2000 for Georgetown writes:** while the public tends to be in support of humanitarian aid, if issues of foreign aid are seen through the optic of a tradeoff with resources available for addressing domestic problems, they become much more critical.

**The Borgen Project '17** writes that most Americans believe over 25 percent of the federal budget goes toward foreign aid when it is in reality a fraction of a percent.

Thus, **Amadeo '18 of the Balance continues:** while the vast majority of the public opposes cuts to almost all categories of discretionary funding, they are less opposed to cuts to foreign aid.

The impact is massive.

**Werft '17 of Global Citizen quantifies:** 3 billion people kept from starvation through US-funded food assistance programs. Over the past 10 years, 743 million people were treated with donated medicines funded by USAID.

### ***Contention 3 is Indigenous Housing***

**The US Department of Housing** explains: the Native American Housing Block Grant Program provides a range of affordable housing activities on Indian reservations including housing development, assistance to housing, housing services, crime prevention and safety.

A UBI cannot solve: the **CRS '15** finds that complicated legal procedures, lack of accessible land, and banks hesitant on loaning without a guarantee of property seizure all pose barriers on the free market for housing on reservations.

**CRS** continues: 100,000 housing units have been built and acquired in the last two decades in Native American areas, net decreasing homelessness.

Maintaining this program is extremely important as the **CRS** concludes, Native Americans living on tribal lands are nearly twice as likely to live in poverty then the general population.

*Thus, we negate:*