Plano West affirms Resolved: The United States should replace means-tested welfare programs with a universal basic income, or UBI.

**NOTE:** [**https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Sl9DQ9WIXmsfwF1ttsETMR1ApUBEHeNDiywHp3WzaP0/edit**](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Sl9DQ9WIXmsfwF1ttsETMR1ApUBEHeNDiywHp3WzaP0/edit)

According to the [International Monetary Fund.](https://www.cnbc.com/2019/06/27/free-cash-handouts-what-is-universal-basic-income-or-ubi.html) Universal basic income refers to regular cash payments made to a given population (such as adult U.S. citizens, for example) with minimal or no requirements for receiving the money, in order to increase people’s income.

## Contention 1 is Lifting up Labor

**(:25) Sam Adler-Bell,** 6-10-**2019**, "Three Paths for Raising Incomes in America," **The Century Foundation,** <https://tcf.org/content/report/three-paths-raising-incomes-america/?agreed=1>

**[While]** Gross domestic product (**GDP) in the [US]** United States **has grown consistently since the Great Recession** of 2008, but **middle**-class **and****lower-income workers have not had their share of the rewards from this economic expansion**. Three trillion dollars of output has been added to the ranks of U.S. GDP **in the past ten years,**1 while **median hourly pay for American workers has increased by less than eighty cents.** This isn’t the way it was supposed to be. Whenever the United States experienced economic growth, wages generally rose along with it—that is, until the 1980s. Since then, workers have been badly left behind, compared to the robust wage growth of earlier times. Most American workers haven’t seen a substantial raise in forty years,3 while the poorest workers have only recently seen incomes rise slightly above 1980 levels.4 Since 1979, median wages have stagnated for every income strata but the very top, where incomes have risen rapidly.5 For four decades, the rich have captured almost all the rewards of growth, generating the hazardous levels of inequality we see today. This story of disappearing American wages is familiar by now, but it bears repeating. **The failure of incomes to rise has** fundamentally reshaped the American economy, **contribut[ed] to** working-class bitterness, **a** persistently **high poverty rate**, and a dispirited electorate. As wages have stagnated, **[while] the prices of basic goods, such as housing [and],** health care, **education,** and child care, adjusted for inflation, **have consistently trended upward**.6The sharp decline of private-sector unions has badly weakened bargaining power of labor and undermined protections against exploitative employers. **C**oupled with the sharp drop in manufacturing jobs, there’s no longer a reliable path to middle-class incomes for workers without a college degree.7 Furthermore, the failure to raise the minimum wage more than marginally until recently has also punished lower-income workers. The rise of piecemeal and gig economy work has introduced new and profound precarity—insecure and capricious employment—into more workers’ lives. Americans now work longer hours for less pay than their European counterparts.8

**Thankfully, a UBI would reverse this trend and empower American workers in multiple ways**

### Increasing working opportunities (:50).

#### **In the current economy without a UBI, workers are forced to accept low paying, exploitative jobs**

Kavi **Gupta 16** Forbes(Kavi Guppta. I write about technology and how it impacts workforce transformation. “Basic Income Might Be The Answer To Society's Productivity Crisis”. 9-22-2016. Forbes. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/kaviguppta/2016/09/22/basic-income-might-be-the-answer-to-societys-productivity-crisis/#26cb8b3162b3>) **//TruLe**

SS: Basic income isn't the only solution, but it's arguably the best solution because it's the solution that actually does the most. Look at education for example. It's been shown that increasing the incomes of parents does more for educational outcomes than something like pre-K. So why spend money on pre-K instead of parental incomes? If the reason kids aren't doing as well in school as they would if their parents just earned more money to improve household environments, why give money to schools instead of parents? It's the difference between treating the symptoms and treating the causes. Treating symptoms is wasteful and never ends. Treat the causes. Better yet, vaccinate against diseases so people don't get sick in the first place. When it comes to work, we as a society have a serious problem with how we look at it. We don't look at all the work going on that's unpaid as work, even though it's arguably the most important kind of work. Think of care work and volunteering in our communities and the open-source movement, and even art. All of this work is valuable but unpaid. Meanwhile there are countless jobs full of work that we arguably shouldn't be doing. Maybe because it's harmful to people or the environment, or because it's work better done by machines, or perhaps because it's work that actually takes 4 hours instead of 8 but we pretend to be busy when we're not. Meanwhile, jobs that people don't like doing for the most part pay very little, while more enjoyable jobs pay more, which is all backwards. But it's the way it is because **people must accept jobs if they can't [afford to] say no to them**. **Those facing destitution say[ing] yes to working poverty [is] because at least it's better than absolute poverty. [but] Basic income changes all of this by granting people the power to say no**. With the ability to say no to jobs no one wants to do, those employers must pay more for people to do them, or reduce the hours, or invest in automation. With the power to say no also comes the ability to say yes. People can choose to do the unpaid work that is arguably more valuable. They can choose to use their basic incomes as basic venture capital to startup new businesses, and people with basic incomes can even afford to work at these startups for free in exchange for something like stock options that will reward them far more down the road if the idea is successful than a wage would have, because they have the real ability to work for free. Basic income also changes the entire way we look at the growing gig economy. Right now Uber drivers might only be driving for Uber because they are barely getting by and need more money to meet their needs. With basic income operating as an income floor, Uber drivers have their basic needs covered and they are driving because they simply choose to drive for additional money (until a self-driving Uber provides far cheaper rides). On-demand labor with a basic income means that everyone has both greater ability to earn additional income and a feeling of economic security. On-demand labor without basic income means growing insecurity as more and more people try to just scrape by and monthly incomes vary so much that people are constantly falling behind and ceaselessly living on the edge. And finally basic income changes the automation discussion from will robots take our jobs to let's give our jobs to robots. I think it's extremely odd that we've developed our technology to the point it can not only do our muscle work for us, but also a great deal of our mind work, and we're all worried it will do our work for us. That makes no sense to me. The fact anyone is even worried at all that machines might actually do our jobs for us is a big bright signal that we're doing something wrong, and what we're doing wrong is that we require employment in order to live. If we break that connection and allow people to live without employment, then we dissolve our fear of technological unemployment.

**With UBI,**

George **Hill**, **2018** "4 Ways Universal Basic Income Could Impact Innovation," No Publication, https://channels.**theinnovationenterprise**.com/articles/4-ways-universal-basic-income-could-impact-innovation

The basis of modern socialism is the idea that the state should provide a safety net for people, so they can be guaranteed to not die from preventable disease, lose their house if they lose their job, and get a decent level of education regardless of their economic situation. However**, the ‘welfare** state’ **system** that normally takes up this mantle **is frequently being shown to be inadequate**. A prime example was reported in the Finnish experiment, with Marjukka Turunen, head of KELA, the legal unit at Finland's social insurance agency reporting a conversation she had with one of the participants who said ‘I was afraid every time the phone would ring, that unemployment services are calling to offer me a job’. The reason being that **often the lower paying jobs or part time jobs paid less than welfare, but meant that welfare payments would cease if somebody took the**m. UBI removes this because **it doesn’t matter if you’re working or not, you will always receive a wage that will allow you to undertake additional work without risk. This [could] has the potential to be a huge boon for innovative risky startups as they can get hotshot employees without needing to worry about paying them full time salaries, and individuals can work in companies that they are genuinely passionate about without having to worry too much about salary. Both [this has] ave a huge knock-on effect on innovation, with the ability to build ideas quicker than they otherwise would be able to for companies who would not be able to afford to hire these kind of passionate people full time.**

#### UBI increases entrepreneurship and has historically been proven to increase risk taking and innovation

**as** [**Santens**](https://medium.com/basic-income/what-is-there-to-learn-from-finlands-basic-income-experiment-did-it-succeed-or-fail-54b8e5051f60) **in 2019 explains**

**In Namibia [and India]’s UBI experiments, entrepreneurship jumped [over 300%] 301% [while] In India’s UBI experiment, entrepreneurship was observed at three times the rate.**

#### Leading to more businesses and jobs created.

### Job Retraining (:30)

**Bloomberg**, 8-14-**2019,** "Employers Can’t Retrain the U.S. by Themselves," Bloomberg, https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2019-08-14/employers-can-t-retrain-the-u-s-workforce-by-themselves

**As more workplace tasks become automated**, this deficit threatens to leave **millions****of** less-educated **workers** behind. According to a McKinsey report, low and middle-wage workers **are at greatest risk of seeing their jobs become obsolete [and]** by 2030. **Nearly two-thirds of the U.S. labor force will require additional training just to hold on to the[ir current] jobs they currently have**. High-wage jobs are expected to grow as a share of overall employment, but the country’s education system isn’t producing candidates with the skills required.

#### **A UBI increases the ability of workers to adapt to this new economy by learning new skills.**

Anna **Dent**, 2-12-**2019,** "Free money wouldn’t make people lazy – but it could revolutionise work," Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/feb/12/universal-basic-income-work-finland-experiment-payments

For its proponents, a UBI can provide a lifejacket and a route through some of these challenges. **A UBI could provide a stable income floor, a guaranteed minimum below which no one would fall.** Depending on the amount paid**, it could enabl[ing]** low-paid **workers****to [take]** turn down the worst jobs on offer, or enable **time away from paid work to retrain, or start a business [instead]**. It would financially compensate those (usually women) caring for family for their work, support more people to be creative, to volunteer, or simply to do nothing. In the US, proposals for a Green New Deal led by Democrats Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and Ed Markey appear to advocate for something like a UBI – potentially for those “unwilling” to work, although it is light on detail.

#### **These programs are highly effective**

Angela **Hanks** and David Madland, 2-22-20**18**, "Better Training and Better Jobs," Center for American Progress, https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/economy/reports/2018/02/22/447115/better-training-better-jobs/

A growing body of research suggests that training programs that operate on a sectoral level or across several sectors lead to better outcomes for participants. The first random assignment study of such programs, the 2010 Sectoral Employment Impact Study (SEIS), examined the extent to which sectoral programs raised the wages of **low-income** and other disadvantaged **workers**.14 Researchers conducted a random assignment study at three sites—the Wisconsin Regional Training Partnership (WRTP) in Milwaukee, Jewish Vocational Services in Boston, and Per Scholas in New York City—over the course of a 24-month period. Among study participants, just 10 percent had worked full time for the full 12 months preceding the study and almost 40 percent had received some public assistance at some point in their lives; for three-quarters of participants, a high school diploma or equivalent was their highest level of educational attainment.15 Researchers found that, over the course of the study, participants **enrolled in the sectoral [retraining] programs earned 18 percent more money** than control group participants. Program participants **were more likely to be engaged in work** over the course of the study period and employed for all 12 months of the year. Program participants also earned higher wages than control participants **and were more likely to work in jobs that offered benefits such as health insurance or paid leave**. Additionally, researchers observed earnings gains among all program participant subgroups.16

### Capital Injection (:30)

The fruits of economic growth have not reached those who need it.

**An** [**EIG report in 2016**](https://eig.org/news/over-50-million-americans-live-in-economically-distressed-communities) **found**

**[over] 50.4 million Americans live in distressed zip codes**. In the bottom 20 percent of zip codes that are the most distressed, nearly a quarter of adults have no high school degree, over half of adults are not working, and the median income is only two-thirds of the state level.

**The[se areas] country’s most distressed** zip codes **are stuck in a deep recession, while the most prosperous [zip codes] flourish**. During the recovery years from 2010 to 2013, the average distressed zip code lost 6.7 percent of its jobs and saw 8.3 percent of its businesses close. At the same time, the average prosperous zip code enjoyed booming job growth of 17.4 percent and business growth of 8.8 percent. In the median zip code, job growth was half the national average and no new businesses opened during those three years of recovery.

**However, Corporations will never revitalize these communities because according to the** [**NYT in 2018**](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/12/22/opinion/rural-america-economy-revive.html)**,**

**Tech industries and manufacturers now look at** the **quality of life**, not just tax breaks, **when scouting locations [to build in].**

**The only way to rescue these communities is to revitalize them with capital injections.**

Joanna **Lovell**, 1-30-**2020**, "The 15 most-asked questions about Universal basic income," hulldailymail, <https://www.hulldailymail.co.uk/news/hull-east-yorkshire-news/universal-basic-income-questions-expert-3791373>

**"When people on modest incomes have more money, they’ll invest it locally.** "As **local economies and businesses grow** from people spending more locally, then that **[which] would be good for living standards, [and] quality of life** and the economy for the whole country. "**A UBI will boost incomes and support local economies across this country.** As local economies grow and businesses grow, and they deliver services and sell more goods, then that controls inflationary pressures. "Economic growth and productivity keep inflation down. A UBI could help with this."

Katie **Scott**, 6-4-**2019,** "Keeping up with the Economy: Local Economic Multipliers," NASPO Pulse, <https://pulse.naspo.org/post/keeping-up-with-the-economy-local-economic-multipliers/>

The size of the economic multiplier varies based on different factors. For example: the size of the locality and if the area is urbanized are two major factors. Some economic studies report various magnitudes of the multiplier. The commonly defined multiplier effect ranges between 1.20 to 1.50. If the multiplier is valued at 1.50 this means that **for every additional dollar spent in the local economy, it has a $1.50 [total economic] impact in the local economy.** This effect occurs **because spending money** in the local economy **can raise wages , create jobs, and increase consumer spending. This effect radiates out** from the area the money was spent **and affects broader regions as it dissipates throughout the geographical area.**

### Debt alleviation

Michelle Chau, 2-17-2010, "NCCP," http://www.nccp.org/publications/pub\_918.html

Family assets are particularly important for low-income families; however, the prospects are not particularly bright for building their assets. Given limited incomes, many low-income families often struggle to make ends meet and save.9 Between 1984 and 2001, **the level of debt increased substantially among low- and moderate-income families, and the majority of low-income families** experienced **hav[e]ing family debt greater than or equal to 40 percent of total family income.**10 Further, the bankruptcy rate among middle-class families has increased; and African-American and Hispanic middle class families are more likely to file for bankruptcy than their White middle class counterparts.11 This research brief investigates the status of asset ownership and debt among families with children aged birth to 18, using the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) 2001 and 2007 data. It also examines disparities in asset holdings and debt by race12 and gender of family heads as well as age of children in the family. As asset holdings and debt can impact the well-being of children, in this report we examine the economic security of families with children based on family asset holdings and debt. First, we explore the concept of asset poverty and estimate the proportion of families who are asset poor, followed by the examination of debt and financial assets of families with children. The report concludes with policy implications and recommendations to promote the financial security of families with children.

[Wilkinson 2018](https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/jan/16/government-policy-poor-people-debt-benefits-universal-credit) Eye-watering **annual percentage rates mean debts can quickly spiral out of control.** Even initially enticing 0% credit cards can catch you out **[especially] if you fail to keep up with minimum payments. And if you’re barely bringing in enough to cover rent, food and bills, finding that regular extra income can be a struggle.**

UBI recipients empirically choose to pay off debt

**Jacob**, A., & Boyd, R. (**2020**). Addressing economic vulnerability among low-income families in America: is the basic income approach a viable policy option? Journal of Children and Poverty, 1–15. doi:10.1080/10796126.2019.1702757 [https://sci-hub.tw/https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10796126.2019.1702757](https://sci-hub.tw/https%3A//www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10796126.2019.1702757)

**Findings from the Alaska PFD** and the basic income trial in Finland reflect some of the core ideas of the capability approach. **In a recent survey of around 1000 Alaskan residents receiving the annual dividend checks**, 81% stated that the dividend improved their quality of life, and **72% disclosed plans to use the money to pay off outstanding debts** or save for future educational or retirement goals, among other things (Isenberg 2017).

[**Weller 11 CAP**](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/236986808_Unburdening_America%27s_Middle_Class_Shrinking_Families%27_Debt_Burden_Faster_Is_Imperative_for_Strong_Sustained_Economic_Growth)

All of these **highly indebted households offer little incentive for businesses to invest more quickly. Highly indebted households** also **have high debt payments and thus less money to spend on** other **consumption** items**.** And businesses may conclude that there is a likely slowdown for future consumption because con-sumers will remain heavily indebted into the foreseeable future. **Businesses will conclude that there will be slow consumption growth in the future and thus invest less.** The high debt levels of the past may thus help explain in part that business investment is well below its long-term historic trend.

### The first impact is growing wages (:55)

Molly **Miller**, 1-22-**2020**, "Fresh Talk: The case for universal basic income," courant, https://www.courant.com/opinion/op-ed/hc-op-fresh-talk-miller-universal-basic-income-0122-20200122-ywpp2dbbevbgtjj5kcpjrvy4by-story.html

The Roosevelt Institute has found that **a UBI** plan that promised citizens $1,000 per month **could grow the economy by nearly 13 percent and create 4.6 million jobs as people would have more disposable income to spend** and entrepreneurs would have a baseline safety net that would allow them to create business and, therefore, new jobs. Under a UBI system, the economy would flourish as more consumers and firms would be able to participate without fear of bankruptcy.

### The second impact is improving health outcomes (optional)

#### **Escaping poverty decreases peoples chance of becoming sick**

Dhruv **Khullar**, 10-4-**2018**, "Health, Income, &amp; Poverty: Where We Are &amp; What Could Help," No Publication, https://www.healthaffairs.org/do/10.1377/hpb20180817.901935/full/

While stark disparities in mortality along the economic gradient understandably capture our attention, we should not overlook substantial income-related differences in morbidity. The United States has among the largest income-based health disparities in the world: **Poor adults are five times as likely as those with [higher incomes] incomes above 400 percent of the federal poverty level to report being in poor or fair health.** In a nearly stepwise fashion, **low-income Americans have [with] higher rates** of physical limitation and **of heart disease, diabetes, stroke, and other chronic conditions,** compared to higher-income Americans. Americans living in families that earn less than $35,000 a year are four times as likely to report being nervous and five times as likely to report being sad all or most of the time, compared to those living in families earning more than $100,000 a year. These disparities emerge early in life and can be transmitted across generations. For the 6.8 million children living in deep poverty (those with family incomes of less than half of poverty), there are adverse consequences across the life course related to nutrition, environmental exposures, chronic illness, and language development.

#### **Additionally, Workers will gain access to employer-funded health insurance**

**CALPERS** <https://www.calpers.ca.gov/page/employers/policies-and-procedures/aca-guidance>

Under the Shared Responsibility for Employers Regarding Health Coverage (PDF) final rule, applicable large **employers** (ALEs) - generally defined as employers **with 50 or more** full-time or full-time equivalent **employees** in the prior year - **are required to offer** to at least 95 percent of their full-time employees - generally defined as working 30 or more hours per week **- health coverage [to their employees] that is** both **affordable and provides** minimum **value**. These requirements are known as the "employer shared responsibility" to offer health coverage or the "employer mandate." If ALEs fail to meet these requirements, they may be subject to penalties if a full-time employee enrolls in a qualified health plan for which the employee receives a premium tax credit.

### The third is preventing recessions

**Income Equality is the best way to prevent recessions**

**Harkinson 11** (Josh Harkinson. Born in Texas and based in San Francisco, Josh covers tech, labor, drug policy, and the environment. “Study: Income Inequality Kills Economic Growth”. 10-4-2011. Mother Jones. <https://www.motherjones.com/politics/2011/10/study-income-inequality-kills-economic-growth/>) **//TruLe**

Corporate chieftains often claim that fixing the US economy requires signing new free trade deals, lowering government debt, and attracting lots of foreign investment. But a major new study has found that those things matter less than an economic driver that CEOs hate talking about: equality. "Countries where income was more equally distributed tended to have longer growth spells," says economist Andrew Berg, whose study appears in the current issue of Finance & Development, the quarterly magazine of the International Monetary Fund. Comparing six major economic variables across the world's economies, Berg found that **equality of incomes was the most important factor in preventing a major [economic] downturn.** (See top chart.) Andrew Berg & Jonathan Ostry Andrew Berg & Jonathan OstryAndrew Berg & Jonathan Ostry In their study, Berg and coauthor Jonathan Ostry were less interested in looking at how to spark economic growth than how to sustain it. "Getting growth going is not that difficult; it's keeping it going that is hard," Berg explains. For example, the bailouts and stimulus pulled the US economy out of recession but haven't been enough to fuel a steady recovery. Berg's research suggests that sky-high income inequality in the United States could be partly to blame. So how important is equality? **According to the study, making an economy's income distribution 10 percent more equitable prolongs its typical growth spell by 50 percent.** In one case study, Berg looked at Latin America, which is historically much more economically stratified than emerging Asia and also has shorter periods of growth. He found that closing half of the inequality gap between Latin America and Asia would more than double the expected length of Latin America's growth spells. Increasing income inequality has the opposite effect: "We find that more inequality lowers growth," Berg says. (See bottom chart.) Berg and Ostry aren't the first economists to suggest that income inequality can torpedo the economy. Marriner Eccles, the Depression-era chairman of the Federal Reserve (and an architect of the New Deal), blamed the Great Crash on the nation's wealth gap. "A giant suction pump had by 1929-1930 drawn into a few hands an increasing portion of currently produced wealth," Eccles recalled in his memoirs. "In consequence, as in a poker game where the chips were concentrated in fewer and fewer hands, the other fellows could stay in the game only by borrowing. When the credit ran out, the game stopped." Many economists believe a similar process has unfolded over the past decade. Median wages grew too little over the past 30 years to drive the kind of spending necessary to sustain the consumer economy. Instead, increasingly exotic forms of credit filled the gap, as the wealthy offered the middle class alluring credit card deals and variable-interest subprime loans. This allowed rich investors to keep making money and everyone else to feel like they were keeping up—until the whole system imploded. Income inequality has other economic downsides. Research suggests that unequal societies have a harder time getting their citizens to support government spending because they believe that it will only benefit elites. A population where many lack access to health care, education, and bank loans can't contribute as much to the economy. And, of course, income inequality goes hand-in-hand with crippling political instability, as we've seen during the Arab Spring in Tunisia, Egypt, and Libya. History shows that "sustainable reforms are only possible when the benefits are widely shared," Berg says. "We hope that we don't have to relearn that the hard way."

###

###

**Thus we affirm.**

### Affirm.

#### (optional) That’s key to the tax base - necessary for funding welfare?

Andrew Lundeen, 10-15-2014, "Economic Growth Drives the Level of Tax Revenue," Tax Foundation, https://taxfoundation.org/economic-growth-drives-level-tax-revenue/

Reality isn’t so simple. Instead, **economic growth is often the key driver of tax revenues.**

### Social Security Impact

#### Because social security is funded through the tax base

Richard **Johnson**, 2-4-**2016**, "Can economic growth really fix Social Security?," Urban Institute, https://www.urban.org/urban-wire/can-economic-growth-really-fix-social-security

**[If annual economic growth was increased by 1.3%, it]**

But let’s say we could somehow turbocharge worker productivity enough to achieve average real economic growth of 3.4 percent a year indefinitely (and even higher rates in the short-term as we continue to recover from the Great Recession), instead of the 2.1 percent long-term rate that the Social Security trustees assume. This is optimistic, but it did happen between 1995 and 2005 (albeit when the labor force was growing more rapidly than today). Let’s assume that all of this additional growth results from higher productivity, instead of by expanding the labor force through more immigration or higher employment rates, and that it raises earnings uniformly for all workers. Crunching the numbers with DYNASIM, Urban Institute’s projection tool, we find that such economic growth **would** in fact **significantly improve Social Security’s long-run balance sheet, [allowing it pay out benefits for an additional 30 years] pushing back by three decades the date when the system could no longer pay full benefits, from 2035 to 2064.**

Kathleen **Romig**, 7-19-20**19**, "Social Security Lifts More Americans Above Poverty Than Any Other Program," Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, https://www.cbpp.org/research/social-security/social-security-lifts-more-americans-above-poverty-than-any-other-program

**Social Security benefits play a vital role in reducing poverty in every state, and they lift more Americans above the poverty line than any other program. Without Social Security, 22.1 million more Americans would be poor,** according to analysis using the March 2018 Current Population Survey. Although most of those whom Social Security keeps out of poverty are elderly, 6.7 million are under age 65, including 1.1 million children. (See Table 1.) Social Security is particularly important for elderly women and people of color, who have fewer retirement resources outside of Social Security. Depending on their design, reductions in Social Security benefits could significantly increase poverty, particularly among the elderly.

### Health Impact

#### Wage growth key to healthcare

#### Matthew **Desmond**, 2-21**-2019,** "The $15 Minimum Wage Doesn’t Just Improve Lives. It Saves Them.," No Publication, https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2019/02/21/magazine/minimum-wage-saving-lives.html

For years, when American policymakers have debated the minimum wage, they have debated its effect on the labor market. Economists have gone around and around, rehashing the same questions about how wage bumps for the poorest workers could reduce employment, raise prices or curtail hours. What most didn’t ask was: **When low-wage workers receive a pay increase [they are],** how does that affect their lives? But recently, a small group of researchers scattered around the country have begun to pursue this long-neglected question, specifically looking into the public-health effects of a higher minimum wage. A 2011 national study showed that low-skilled workers reported fewer unmet medical needs in states with higher minimum-wage rates. In high-wage states, workers were **better able to pay for the [medical] care they needed.** In low-wage states, workers skipped medical appointments. Or consider the research on smoking. Big Tobacco has long targeted low-income communities, where three in four smokers in America now live, but studies have found strong evidence that increases to the minimum wage are associated with decreased rates of smoking among low-income workers. **Higher wages ease the grind of poverty, freeing up people’s capacities to quit [smoking]. Some of the biggest beneficiaries of minimum wage increases are children.** A 2017 study co-authored by Lindsey Bullinger, an assistant professor in the School of Public Policy at Georgia Institute of Technology, found that **raising the** minimum **wage[s] by $1 would reduce child-neglect reports by almost 10 percent.** Higher wages allow parents working in the low-wage labor market to keep the lights on and the refrigerator stocked; failing to do so can court neglect charges. “These studies show the positive externalities of increasing the minimum wage on serious outcomes, like reducing child abuse,” Bullinger said, issuing an eloquent barb at economists’ obsession with the “negative externalities” of minimum-wage hikes. The list goes on. Studies have linked higher minimum wages to decreases in low birth-weight babies, lower rates of teen alcohol consumption and declines in teen births. A 2016 study published in the American Journal of Public Health found that between roughly 2,800 and 5,500 premature deaths that occurred in New York City from 2008 to 2012 could have been prevented if the city’s minimum wage had been $15 an hour during that time, instead of a little over $7 an hour. That number represents up to one in 12 of all people who died prematurely in those five years. **The chronic stress that accompanies poverty** can be seen at the cellular level. It **has been linked to a wide array of adverse conditions, from maternal health problems to tumor growth.**Higher wages bring much-needed relief to poor workers. The lead author of the 2016 study, Tsu-Yu Tsao, a research director at the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, was “very surprised by the magnitude of the findings.” He is unaware of any drug on the market that comes close to having this big of an effect. A $15 minimum wage is an antidepressant. It is a sleep aid. A diet. A stress reliever. It is a contraceptive, preventing teenage pregnancy. It prevents premature death. It shields children from neglect. But why? Poverty can be unrelenting, shame-inducing and exhausting. When people live so close to the bone, a small setback can quickly spiral into a major trauma. Being a few days behind on the rent can trigger a hefty late fee, which can lead to an eviction and homelessness. An unpaid traffic ticket can lead to a suspended license, which can cause people to lose their only means of transportation to work. In the same way, modest wage increases have a profound impact on people’s well-being and happiness. Poverty will never be ameliorated on the cheap. But this truth should not prevent us from acknowledging how powerfully workers respond to relatively small income boosts. “When the minimum wage goes up, I see it,” says Dr. Margot Kushel, who directs the University of California, San Francisco Center for Vulnerable Populations, which is based in a local hospital. San Francisco and surrounding cities raised the minimum wage to $15 an hour last July. When Kushel’s patients have a bit more money in their pockets, “they exercise more. They are less stressed and can quit smoking. Their mental health improves pretty dramatically. Their sleep gets better. And people start eating healthier almost immediately.” Kushel continued: “We will spend an incredible amount on a new heart drug. But if we increased wages by $1, we’d save more lives.”

#### Thus we affirm.

# Framing

#### [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1UCi4aNqwevgph3E-PSxZ1v9cOeGTUXITbaycfqMrrls/edit#](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1UCi4aNqwevgph3E-PSxZ1v9cOeGTUXITbaycfqMrrls/edit)

#### Push welfare cuts if its conceded!!!

####

#### We link - healthcare

**We Link - recession**

**Harkinson 11** (Josh Harkinson. Born in Texas and based in San Francisco, Josh covers tech, labor, drug policy, and the environment. “Study: Income Inequality Kills Economic Growth”. 10-4-2011. Mother Jones. <https://www.motherjones.com/politics/2011/10/study-income-inequality-kills-economic-growth/>) **//TruLe**

Corporate chieftains often claim that fixing the US economy requires signing new free trade deals, lowering government debt, and attracting lots of foreign investment. But a major new study has found that those things matter less than an economic driver that CEOs hate talking about: equality. "Countries where income was more equally distributed tended to have longer growth spells," says economist Andrew Berg, whose study appears in the current issue of Finance & Development, the quarterly magazine of the International Monetary Fund. Comparing six major economic variables across the world's economies, Berg found that **equality of incomes was the most important factor in preventing a major [economic] downturn.** (See top chart.) Andrew Berg & Jonathan Ostry Andrew Berg & Jonathan OstryAndrew Berg & Jonathan Ostry In their study, Berg and coauthor Jonathan Ostry were less interested in looking at how to spark economic growth than how to sustain it. "Getting growth going is not that difficult; it's keeping it going that is hard," Berg explains. For example, the bailouts and stimulus pulled the US economy out of recession but haven't been enough to fuel a steady recovery. Berg's research suggests that sky-high income inequality in the United States could be partly to blame. So how important is equality? **According to the study, making an economy's income distribution 10 percent more equitable prolongs its typical growth spell by 50 percent.** In one case study, Berg looked at Latin America, which is historically much more economically stratified than emerging Asia and also has shorter periods of growth. He found that closing half of the inequality gap between Latin America and Asia would more than double the expected length of Latin America's growth spells. Increasing income inequality has the opposite effect: "We find that more inequality lowers growth," Berg says. (See bottom chart.) Berg and Ostry aren't the first economists to suggest that income inequality can torpedo the economy. Marriner Eccles, the Depression-era chairman of the Federal Reserve (and an architect of the New Deal), blamed the Great Crash on the nation's wealth gap. "A giant suction pump had by 1929-1930 drawn into a few hands an increasing portion of currently produced wealth," Eccles recalled in his memoirs. "In consequence, as in a poker game where the chips were concentrated in fewer and fewer hands, the other fellows could stay in the game only by borrowing. When the credit ran out, the game stopped." Many economists believe a similar process has unfolded over the past decade. Median wages grew too little over the past 30 years to drive the kind of spending necessary to sustain the consumer economy. Instead, increasingly exotic forms of credit filled the gap, as the wealthy offered the middle class alluring credit card deals and variable-interest subprime loans. This allowed rich investors to keep making money and everyone else to feel like they were keeping up—until the whole system imploded. Income inequality has other economic downsides. Research suggests that unequal societies have a harder time getting their citizens to support government spending because they believe that it will only benefit elites. A population where many lack access to health care, education, and bank loans can't contribute as much to the economy. And, of course, income inequality goes hand-in-hand with crippling political instability, as we've seen during the Arab Spring in Tunisia, Egypt, and Libya. History shows that "sustainable reforms are only possible when the benefits are widely shared," Berg says. "We hope that we don't have to relearn that the hard way."

# Lay Rhetoric

Cheese Frontline strats: We account, directionality, no warrant, not a turn

#### CX:

#### How much is an UBI?

# Frontlines

~~C~~[~~enter for Neighborhood Technology r~~](https://www.cnt.org/blog/new-economic-development-model-shows-how-cities-can-reduce-poverty-by-25-percent-with-smarter)~~eports in 2016~~

**~~For decades, cities and states have relied on top-down strategies for economic development, spending millions on outdated, unsustainable infrastructure and a mix of subsidies and tax breaks for corporations.~~** ~~CNT’s research shows that~~**~~[However] when civic leaders allocate resources to programs that reduce waste, lower expenses for families, and create connected communities,~~** ~~multiple benefits follow: Reduced spending on transportation by all households Lower household energy and water costs for all households Improved access to basic services, jobs, and education for everyone~~ ~~These~~ **~~investments~~** ~~are doubly effective because~~ ~~they~~ **~~lift low-income residents out of poverty~~** ~~and they provide benefits to people and businesses across the community. As poverty is reduced, wages go up, more jobs are created, and social service costs go down.~~

## General

### OV: Poverty

Welfare has failed - 50 mil in america still poor, child poverty is still extremely high

Why? Wages are stagnant - no way for working class to gain independence and escape pov

Need a fundamental shift in the way labor works

###

### OV: Medicaid

[medicaid sucks]

They try to tell you ppl get nothing when we replace medicaid - no UBI allows for a shift to the private market which is better

Prefer a UBI

1. CALPERS/Under Obamacare employers must provide healthcare to employees which is better quality than medicaid
2. Jobs give people income so they can purchase private insurance themselves - Obamacare is cheap - premiums are just 400/month - UBI can pay for it
3. Khullar- escaping poverty 5x Less likely to be sick in the first place - decreases the need for hospital visits
4. Overall - pnhp/ medicaid has 2x deaths as private

We solve best for [x] million people

#### OV: Debt/recession

harkinson/ dec inc ineq by 10% extends econ growth by 50%

We severely delay or prevent recession from happening in first place which is even better - this is conceded and controls the link to the overview

###

### Impact Extension

Miller - 13% gdp 4.6 mil jobs

###

### Weighing

Mag weighing

1. Poverty first - really bad
2. Scope - UBI is universal - Everyone gets a UBI- a lot of ppl are left out of welfare and get nothing but under a UBI everyone gets at least 12k - esp helps 50 mil in distressed communities
3. Prereq to Housing - $ to get away from bad places

### Frontlines

###

#### FL: Can’t afford it

1. (short) Can fund it through vat tax and wealth taxes on stored assets -Buchheit 18 and Gale 20 - on net budget neutral and can raise over 3 trillion- on net all our studies say its easily funded and the poor see big gains
2. Growing tax base pays for itself in the LT (we o/w)
3. Buchheit 18 - a 2% wealth tax would cover 12k a year
	1. The Hill 19 - There is overwhelming bipartisan support; 74% of registered voters are in favor of it
4. Gale 20 - 10% VAT pays for it and raises 2.9T extra
5. Anaya 19 - fund through carbon tax, which uhlman says is best way to cut emissions and stop warming (Wells 19- warming bad lol bs the card)
6. Anaya 19 - Capital gains tax if they really push on this lol
7. Link clarity - even if you do the math, UBI alone is enough to solve for the neg harms- 1200 housing + 500 insurance (their own numbers) still leaves 1700/month for things like retraining

#### FL: Carbon tax hurts the poor

1. Fremstad 17- makes 98% of the poorest decile better off when used as a dividend

#### FL: Andrew Yang is gone/plan not feasible

1. [Benson](https://www.inverse.com/innovation/why-basic-income-wont-die-with-andrew-yangs-campaign) 20 - it won’t die, yang kicked off a social movement and significantly increased popular support

#### FL: Not enough $$

1. covert 18/ 3k a month
2. Supplemental to a job

#### FL: Taxes dec incentive to work

1. Wealth tax/carbon tax - don’t affect the poor

#### FL: Less benefits than welfare

1. Ppl dont get coverage
2. they don't respond to the analsyis that monetary gain is not just from UBI - wage gains and better jobs solve back

#### FL: Still wage gap

1. Who cares everyone gets richer

#### FL: Employers cut wages

1. Incentive is NUQ
2. Bargaining power solves
3. Ability to quit solves
4. Entrepreneurship solves (make ur own biz instead)

#### FL: UBI means less work

1. Prochazka - Metanalysis of 165 studies by the odi - inc in work participation - always incentive to live a better life
2. [Quartz](https://qz.com/1205591/a-universal-basic-income-experiment-in-alaska-shows-employment-didnt-drop/) - ppl want more $ so will still work, alaska shows no dec and +17% part time work
3. Employers offer better working conditions so people want to work

### FL Cards

#### Benson 20

Thor Benson, 2-12-2020, "**Why basic income won’t die with Andrew Yang’s campaign,"** Inverse, https://www.inverse.com/innovation/why-basic-income-wont-die-with-andrew-yangs-campaign

In his post-announcement email, Yang cited a number of wins from the two-year campaign. **Popular support for universal basic income, he claimed, has reached 66 percent among Democrats and 72 percent among voters aged 18 to 34. Yang also praised the campaign for putting his policy into action, giving 13 families $1,000 per month for one year.** The Fassi family in New Hampshire, one of the recipients, praised the policy and put it toward college bills. Indeed, **Yang's campaign coincided with a marked rise in support for basic income.** A poll by Hill-HarrisX found in February 2019 that 43 percent of registered voters supported the idea versus 57 percent opposed, but by September 2019 the same firm found 49 percent support versus 51 percent opposition. **But can the movement outlast the campaign? Parallels can be drawn to Steve Forbes' 1996 and 2000 campaigns for the Republican nomination. Forbes ran on a similarly policy-focused platform, advocating for a flat tax**. The New York Times dismissed him in 1996 as "a bit of a flat campaigner." But Forbes' failure didn't kill off the idea entirely: it returned to the spotlight in the 2010s thanks to Ron and Rand Pauls' presidential campaigns, and a 2015 YouGov poll found 39 percent in favor. **As with many political ideas, its adoption may not rest on one politician's campaign, but on wider social and historical trends.**

#### Fremstad 17

Anders Fremstad,, 5-3-2017, "PERI," No Publication, <https://www.peri.umass.edu/publication/item/985-a-distributional-analysis-of-a-carbon-tax-and-dividend-in-the-united-states>

Although devoting carbon tax revenues to cut labor taxes makes nearly everyone (91 percent) in the bottom decile worse off, **devoting revenues to a dividend ensures that nearly everyone (98 percent) in the poorest decile is better off. While a dividend would maintain or increase the welfare of 55 percent of Americans, including 84 percent of those in the bottom half of the income distribution**, neither of the tax cuts modeled here would preserve the purchasing power of most Americans. Moreover, both tax cuts would redistribute income from the poor to the rich. The paper also provides new findings on the distributional impacts when sorting the population by race and ethnicity, age, and urban status. Findings suggest that labor tax cuts bypass a sizable portion of vulnerable populations, including Hispanics, blacks, and the elderly. We demonstrate that our key results are robust in three ways: our results are similar using alternative carbon intensities, our conclusion holds when we use income rather than expenditures to sort individuals, and results hold under different behavioral responses. We also show that accounting for a double dividend generated by tax cuts has little impact on our analysis. Moreover, while labor tax cuts redistribute income from the poor to the rich and have different effects on people of similar means, **a carbon dividend promotes both vertical and horizontal equity.** Since even a modest carbon tax represents a sizable reorganization of property rights, distributional concerns should be addressed. This paper demonstrates that **careful policy design can protect the environment as well as the welfare of the most vulnerable populations.**

#### Newcomer 20

**Andrew Yang’s plan will have long lasting political effects**

Eric Newcomer, 1-29-2020, "Yang's Universal Basic Income Message Could Outlive His Campaign,"No Publication, https://www.fa-mag.com/news/yang-s-universal-basic-income-message-could-outlive-his-campaign-53839.html

**Yang's Universal Basic Income Message Could Outlive His Campaign**

The chances that Yang becomes president remain minuscule. But e**ven if UBI isn’t enough to land him in the White House, his campaign’s legacy may be how it contributed to the mainstreaming of UBI**. Yang’s embrace of one of Silicon Valley’s pet causes hasn’t come without complications—people associated with some prominent UBI projects take issue with the specifics of Yang’s approach. Still, **UBI seems more relevant to the American political debate than it has in decades. “Andrew Yang,” said Stern, “has done more to promote the idea of universal basic income than almost anybody in American history.”** The concept of UBI has existed in one form or another for decades, but has mostly faded from the public discussion in the U.S. since the 1970s. Instead, other related ideas were implemented, like the earned income tax credit, which gives tax credits to low-wage workers based on their incomes and number of children. UBI has been inching back into the public conversation in the U.S. for years, with an unusal appeal across ideological lines. The left sees UBI as a step towards socialism; the right sees cash assistance to create a more market-based approach to services currently provided by government-managed programs.

Michael J. Coren, 2-13-2018, "When you give Alaskans a universal basic income, they still keep working," Quartz, https://qz.com/1205591/a-universal-basic-income-experiment-in-alaska-shows-employment-didnt-drop/

They found that full-time employment did not change at all, and the share of Alaskans who worked part-time jobs increased by 17%.

Tyler Prochazka, 1-29-2020, "Three big misconceptions about Yang’s Freedom Dividend&nbsp;," National Chengchi University, https://basicincome.org/news/2020/01/three-misconceptions-about-yangs-freedom-dividend/

As I reported in 2016, “The Overseas Development Institute just released the largest meta-analysis of cash transfer programs ever, spanning 15 years of data and **165** studies. The main takeaway is that studies show a consistent reduction in poverty measures. P**erhaps an even more important conclusion is that most evidence showed an increase in work participation after receiving the basic income.”**

####

#### Anaya 19

(better) UBI would be funded through a carbon tax

Tim Anaya, 9-12-2019, "Pacific Research Institute," No Publication, https://www.pacificresearch.org/is-universal-basic-income-really-a-freedom-dividend/

**Yang’s** platform consists primarily of one issue – a call to establish a **universal basic income system** in the U.S. Setting himself up as a potential real life Santa Claus, his plan would give every American – regardless of their income status – a $1,000 a month stipend, or $12,000 annually.

Yang’s plan is estimated to cost $2.4 trillion annually, which **he proposes to pay for through** reprioritizing current spending, a new $800 billion annual value added tax, a capital gains tax increase, and **a new carbon tax.** He also argues that the plan would generate $2.5 trillion in new economic opportunity and create 4.6 million new jobs through increased purchasing and consumption of goods and services – generating significant tax revenue.

**Carbon tax could be implemented immediately – solves warming and restores US negotiating credibility ensuring international action**

**Avi-Yonah & Uhlmann’9** (Reuven S. Avi-Yonah is the Irwin I. Cohn Professor of Law and the Director of the International Tax LLM Program at the University of Michigan Law School; David M. Uhlmann is the Jeffrey F. Liss Professor from Practice and the Director of the Environmental Law and Policy Program at the University of Michigan Law School, “Combating Global Climate Change: Why a Carbon Tax Is a Better Response to Global Warming Than Cap and Trade”, Feb, 28 Stan. Envtl. L.J. 3, lexis, CMR)

A more efficient and effective market-based approach to reduce carbon dioxide emissions would be a carbon tax imposed on [\*7] all coal, natural gas, and oil produced domestically or imported into the United States. A carbon tax would enable the market to account for the societal costs of carbon dioxide emissions and thereby promote emission reductions, just like a cap and trade system. A carbon tax would be easier to implement and enforce, however, and simpler to adjust if the resulting market-based changes were either too weak or too strong. A carbon tax also would produce revenue that could be used to fund research and development of alternative energy and tax credits to offset any regressive effects of the carbon tax. Because a carbon tax could be implemented and become effective **almost immediately**, it would be a much quicker method of reducing greenhouse gas emissions than a cap and trade system. In addition, because a carbon tax could be effective in advance of any international treaty regarding greenhouse gas emissions, a carbon tax would provide the United States **much needed credibility** in the negotiations over international carbon dioxide limits. A carbon tax could then supplement an international cap and trade system, combine with emission caps in an international hybrid "cap and tax" approach, or become the **focal point** for the next international treaty to address global climate change.

[Buchheit 18 Common Dreams](https://www.commondreams.org/views/2018/03/19/2-financial-wealth-tax-would-provide-12000-annual-stipend-every-american-household)

Largely because of the stock market, **U.S. financial wealth has surged to $77 trillion, with the richest 10% owning over three-quarters of it. Just a 2 percent tax on total financial wealth would generate enough revenue to provide a $12,000 annual stipend to every American household** (including those of the richest families). It's easy to justify a wealth tax. Over half of all basic research is paid for by our tax dollars. All the technology in our phones and computers started with government research and funding. Pharmaceutical companies wouldn't exist without decades of support from the National Institutes of Health. Yet the tech and pharmaceutical companies claim patents on the products paid for and developed by the American people.

[The Hill 19](https://thehill.com/hilltv/what-americas-thinking/428747-new-poll-americans-overwhelmingly-support-taxing-the-wealth-of)

A new poll is finding broad support for an annual wealth tax on people with assets of at least $50 million, underlining support for taxing the rich. The Hill-HarrisX survey released Wednesday found that **74 percent of registered voters back an annual 2 percent tax on people with assets over $50 million, and a 3 percent tax on people with assets in excess of $1 billion. The poll showed support for the idea among people of all ages and races and from both political parties.**

Bryce Covert, 8-15-2018, "The Promise of a Universal Basic Income—and Its Limitations," Nation, https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/the-promise-of-a-universal-basic-income-and-its-limitations/

Lowrey’s argument about poverty is persuasive. By giving every family in the United States $250 a month for each of its children, we would reduce child poverty by about 40 percent and effectively wipe out the most extreme cases. **By giving every American about $3,000 a month, we would cut the official poverty rate in half and provide a higher standard of living for all—even for those who are not impoverished.** In a review of the existing research on universal cash dispersals in developed countries—the Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend, for example, which gives every Alaskan resident a cut of the state’s oil profits—economist Ioana Marinescu found that universal basic incomes help people improve their nutrition, education, and health.

William G. Gale, 1-30-2020, "How a VAT could tax the rich and pay for universal basic income," Brookings, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2020/01/30/how-a-vat-could-tax-the-rich-and-pay-for-universal-basic-income/>

The Congressional Budget Office just projected a series of $1 trillion budget deficits—as far as the eye can see. Narrowing that deficit will require not only spending reductions and economic growth but also new taxes. One solution that I’ve laid out in a new Hamilton Project paper, “Raising Revenue with a Progressive Value-Added Tax,” is **a 10 percent Value-Added Tax (VAT) combined with a universal basic income (UBI)—effectively a cash payment to every US household. The plan would raise substantial net revenue, be very progressive, and be as conducive to economic growth as any other new tax. The VAT would complement, not replace, any new direct taxes on affluent households, such as a wealth tax or capital gains reforms. A 10 percent VAT would raise about $2.9 trillion over 10 years, or 1.1 percent of Gross Domestic Product, even after covering the cost of the UBI.** As with any tax, its effects on the economy would depend on how government uses the revenue. But all else equal, it would be better for the economy (that is, less distortionary) than hiking income tax rates. To avoid disrupting the economy in the short run, the VAT proceeds should be used in the early years to stimulate the economy, and the Fed should accommodate the VAT by letting the consumer price level rise. **The Tax Policy Center estimates that the VAT in conjunction with a UBI would be extremely progressive. It would increase after-tax income of the lowest-income 20 percent of households by 17 percent. The tax burden for middle-income people would be unchanged while incomes of the top 1 percent of households would fall by 5.5 percent.** But liberals should realize that the VAT can be progressive, especially when combined with the UBI. It would be even more progressive if the revenues financed, say, health care or childcare. **There are benefits for conservatives as well. Despite claims to the contrary, there is little evidence that VATs ever increase overall government spending. And in the US, A VAT could be enacted as part of a broader budget agreement that explicitly slows federal spending growth over time. Border adjustments are ubiquitous in VATs around the world and do not constitute tariffs. And almost all VAT countries exempt small businesses (somehow defined). Limiting the VAT to firms with more than $200,000 in gross receipts would exempt 43 million small businesses.**

**Reich 07 CBPP**/ Some welfare programs come in the form of a block grant in which the federal govt gives states a certain amount of money to be spent on certain types of welfare. Because states have the discretion/leeway of where the money can be spent, many divert money intended for welfare away to fund anything else.

**For example, DeParle 12 NYT**/Nationally, only 30% of TANF benefits is spent on welfare, the rest is used to fill state level budget holes

## Sub a. Worker opportunities/entrepreneurship

### Case Extension

Gupta says people are forced to accept low paying jobs but UBI gives them the ability to say no. This increases innovation because people have more flexibility to engage in entrepreneurship. That’s why Santens reports there was a 300% increase in entrepreneurship in India.

### Weighing

### Frontlines

#### FL: UBI is not enough money

1. Caramela 18 - 3k is enough

#### FL: Welfare programs for entrepreneurs/welfare solves

1. [Needels](https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/OASP/legacy/files/SEA-Study-Report.pdf) 17 - Programs like Self-employment assistance/unemployment benefits exist - they arent MTWP so they wont be cut
2. No flexibility - you can’t fund a startup with food stamps
3. Welfare just sucks
4. Empirics disprove -poverty is still high
5. o/w link magnitude with santens in case - 300% growth in india and namibia
	1. UBI is just much better than shitty existing programs - switch IS effective

#### FL: Less investment bc risk

1. [Peek](https://www.uschamber.com/co/start/startup/guide-to-due-diligence) 19 - Due diligence investigation process solves back - only invest if expected returns are worth the risk
2. Caramela 18 - 3k is enough to start a small biz

#### FL: SB doesn’t create Jobs

1. [Acharya](https://www.forbes.com/sites/nishacharya/2019/05/05/who-is-creating-jobs-in-america/#204c5f20597d) 19 - fast growing, high impact startups account for almost all net job creation in the economy
2. [Theorux](https://www.sba.gov/advocacy/small-businesses-drive-job-growth-us) 18 - SB employs 47.5% of the private workforce and is the key to driving economic and job growth

#### FL: A lot of SB fail

1. that’s just a reason why we need to create more of them

#### FL: India/Namibia are different

1. Limiting factor is still an inability to take risks - even if prices are lower there we will still see some effect in the US

### FL Cards

Nish Acharya, 5-5-2019, "Small Business Are Having A Bigger Impact On Job Creation Than Large Corporations," Forbes, https://www.forbes.com/sites/nishacharya/2019/05/05/who-is-creating-jobs-in-america/#204c5f20597d

The CRS study calls these growing startups “high impact”. High-impact businesses are defined as “having sales that have doubled over the most recent four-year period and have an employment growth quantifier of two of more over the same time period”. While high-impact startups account for only 5-6% of all businesses with employees, they seem to account for “almost all [net] job creation in the economy”. In addition, these high impact startups exist in all regions and states, although they tend to be close to urban centers, and are relatively evenly distributed across all industries - regardless of the vibrancy of the industry they are in. Large companies with over 500 employees have only accounted for about 30% of American job gains since 2011.

####

Emily Theorux, 4-25-2018, "Small Businesses Drive Job Growth in the U.S.," No Publication, https://www.sba.gov/advocacy/small-businesses-drive-job-growth-us

The United States’s 2018 Small Business ProfileDownload Adobe Reader to read this link content shows that small businesses added 1.9 million net new jobs during the latest year studied. There are 30.2 million small businesses in the United States, which employ 47.5 percent of the state’s private workforce. The top three industries for small business employment in the United States are (1) health care and social assistance, (2) accommodation and food services, and (3) retail trade. “Small businesses are the United States’s economic engine,” said Acting Chief Counsel Major L. Clark, III, “they are the key to the state’s ability to grow economic output, entrepreneurship, and private sector employment.”

####

#### Caramela 18

Sammi Caramela, Writer, 4-12-2018, "Getting Your Startup off the Ground," Business News Daily, https://www.businessnewsdaily.com/5-small-business-start-up-costs-options.html

According to the U.S. Small Business Administration, most microbusinesses cost around $3,000, while most home-based franchises cost $2,000 to $5,000 to start. While every type of business has its own financing needs, experts have some tips to help you figure out how much cash you'll require.Apr 12, 2018

Sean Peek, 9-24-2019, "What Startups Should Know About Due Diligence," https://www.uschamber, https://www.uschamber.com/co/start/startup/guide-to-due-diligence

According to Thomson Reuters, **due diligence is a formal legal investigation which helps confirm that a business investment or acquisition will be beneficial to the investor or buyer. Every financial decision comes with risk, and it's important for anyone investing a large sum of money to fully understand the specific risks that come with their decision. Generally speaking, due diligence involves looking at the investment or acquisition target's intellectual property, business operations and financial track record.** A potential buyer may also consider how well an acquisition fits with their overall strategic plan. There are three basic phases of due diligence that are typically carried out by attorneys for the buyer or investor: Preparation. This is where goals and priorities are set for the due diligence process. Depending on the investor or acquirer, some aspects of a business will be more important than others. For example, they may choose to overlook a minor operational issue in favor of strong financial figures. Investigation. In this phase, all relevant information is collected from the business being investigated, including business documents, financial statements, personal interviews and more. Results. **The findings of the investigation are presented, and the buyer or investor makes a final decision on whether the deal is worth the risk.**

Needels 17 - <https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/OASP/legacy/files/SEA-Study-Report.pdf>

Individuals who lose their jobs may have the skills and desire to start their own businesses. Some states have taken action to help unemployed workers create their own jobs by establishing Self-Employment Assistance (SEA) programs, which allow Unemployment Insurance (UI) eligible individuals who meet SEA program requirements to receive a weekly self-employment allowance while they are setting up their businesses. This allowance is equal in amount and duration to regular UI benefits. SEA program participants are also exempted from actively seeking wage and salary jobs so they can devote their energies to self-employment activities while they receive SEA allowances. The SEA program was created in 1993 and permanently reauthorized in 1998. The program’s scope and funding were expanded and under the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, P.L. 112-96 (the Act). Section 2183(b)(2) of the Act required the Secretary of Labor to provide a report describing the operations and effectiveness of SEA programs to Congress by February 22, 2017. To help meet this legislative requirement, the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) contracted with Mathematica Policy Research to conduct this study of the SEA program. The study focused on learning about states’ motivation for establishing SEA programs, states’ experiences with implementing it, and outcomes of SEA participants and their businesses.

## Sub b: Job Retraining

### Case Extension

Bloomberg 19 says two-thirds of the American workforce will need training to maintain their current jobs. And Dent of the Guardian reports a UBI works as an income floor enabling them to retrain.

**Extend#2 Retraining**

Bloomberg - 2/3 of american workforce replaced by automation like cashiers, truck drivers

Dent - gives money to adapt, go to technical schools and camps to learn new skills like computer skills

Without retraining they become unemployed- clearest link to econ collapse (since no money to spend in the economy)

### Weighing

### Frontlines

###

#### FL: People lose incentive

1. People don’t stop working empirically - read the jobs FLs - they still want to make $

#### FL: Gov Training Programs

1. [Muro](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/the-avenue/2017/01/10/maladjusted-its-time-to-reimagine-economic-adjustment-programs/) 17 - They fail
	1. Severely underfunded- TAA budget is only 13 mil
	2. Limited in scope
	3. Reactive- only enabled after people lose their jobs
	4. He concludes a UBI will solve
2. [Ireland](http://regulatingforglobalization.com/2018/04/26/the-u-s-trade-adjustment-assistance-taa-program-failure-has-been-an-option/?doing_wp_cron=1581735640.2922799587249755859375) 18 - TAA has been a failure - super hard to qualify for it

#### FL: Employers will retrain them

1. Won’t happen to low-skill employees probably-it’s cheaper to just lay them off
	1. [Kolakowski](https://insights.dice.com/2019/02/26/pepsico-relentless-automation-cost-jobs/) 19 - Empirics prove- pepsiCo (perfect example of american company) this year just layed off a ton of its employees

#### FL: Market changing too quickly/ppl dont know what to do (atlantic)

1. this ev specific to gov retraining which are inefficient - not talking about private sector programs vocational schools, bootcamps much more effective at teaching basic skills
2. UBI offers a constant source of money - not a one time thing
3. Workers learn fundamental skills which persist over time- for example computer programmers who went to college 15 years ago still have a job b/c always need for programmers (- learning one programming language makes learning the rest much easier in the future)
4. Eggleston 20 - 80% of coding bootcamps are employed and leads to an average 51% salary increase

#### FL: UBI creates Jobs

1. Yeah but need retraining to adapt - ie. cashiers to robot makers

#### FL: Pell grants better

1. Welfare getting cut - NUQ
2. Cooper Forbes -Pell grants incent. colleges to raise tuition $1 PG inc tuition by 40 cents. Harder for ppl who dont get pell grants (scope weighing -pell grants only cover 6 mil which isnt enough)
3. ~~Butry - only 39% graduate~~
4. Only 6.5k/yr max, don’t cover the full cost
5. Part time work with UBI is better

### FL Cards

Liz Eggleston, 2-7-2020, "Are Coding Bootcamps Worth It? ," No Publication, https://www.coursereport.com/blog/are-coding-bootcamps-worth-it

#### Kolakowski 19

Nick Kolakowski, 2-26-2019, "PepsiCo 'Relentless' Automation Shows Cost to Jobs," Dice Insights, https://insights.dice.com/2019/02/26/pepsico-relentless-automation-cost-jobs/

When most corporations automate their workforces, they tend to keep the news quiet. “One Thousand Jobs Lost to a Robot” makes for a bad headline from a PR standpoint, even if that sort of “efficiency” cheers investors and others who look at human beings as overhead costs. Yet none of that reasoning has stopped **PepsiCo from declaring it’s going to lay off a sizable (but as-yet-unknown) number of employees as part of a plan that involves “relentlessly automating and merging the best of our optimized business models” (in the words of CEO Ramon Laguarta). This efficiency-minded reorganization will allow PepsiCo “to develop scale and sharpen core capabilities that drive even greater efficiency and effectiveness, creating a virtuous cycle,” Laguarta added. In the meantime, the company plans to pay out $2.5 billion in restructuring costs over the next four years, some 70 percent of it on employee severance.**

#### Ireland 18

Robert Ireland, 4-26-2018, "The U.S. Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) Program: Failure has been an Option," Regulating for Globalization, http://regulatingforglobalization.com/2018/04/26/the-u-s-trade-adjustment-assistance-taa-program-failure-has-been-an-option/?doing\_wp\_cron=1581735640.2922799587249755859375

A supplement—or alternative—are income security and retraining programs to support people who have lost their jobs because of international trade competitiveness. Many developed countries have such programs, but some are more successful than others.  **The U.S. Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program is one of the failures.** The TAA was regrettably put in a damaging statutory straightjacket at birth. The level of proof to show injury is three-pronged and challenging. **Applicants must show (1) serious injury (2) caused by imports (3) resulting from U.S. “concessions granted under trade agreements.” Moreover, the TAA has since inception been starved for adequate funding. Finally, the process for applying for assistance is bureaucratic, inefficient, and can be expensive. The number of workers supported by the TAA has been unimpressive since the outset and this continues to this day**. A recent U.S. Department of Labor report reflects that In fiscal year 2016 an estimated 126,844 workers became eligible for TAA benefits and services and less than **50% (45,814 participants)** were served. The total amount of funds provided to states in fiscal year 2016 for all benefits and services was a mere $626.8 million.

#### Muro 17

Mark Muro and Joseph Parilla, 1-10-2017, "Maladjusted: It’s time to reimagine economic ‘adjustment’ programs," Brookings, https://www.brookings.edu/blog/the-avenue/2017/01/10/maladjusted-its-time-to-reimagine-economic-adjustment-programs/

Taken individually, most of these programs are well-intentioned and helpful. The problem, though, is that while adjustment is hard in any event, the programs are modest in scale and disjointed and often reactive in structure and effect. Here are some of the issues: **U.S. adjustment efforts are too small.** Currently, other industrialized countries spend much more than the United States does on labor-market adjustment programs. Relative to five other industrialized peers (see figure), the United States spends the least while having perhaps the most volatile labor market. The EDA’s TAA for Firms program has a budget of just $13 million, while the Defense Industry Adjustment receives just $50 million. None of this is equal to the challenges. **U.S. adjustment efforts are narrow, piecemeal, and therefore hard to access at scale**. The nation’s adjustment offerings are not just small but overly segmented. The programs address particular challenges with multiple discrete, small-bore programs focused narrowly on individual causes of disruption. Further complexity and under-performance results from the programs’ widely varying eligibility and types of benefits. **U.S. adjustment efforts are reactive. Perhaps the greatest concern is that the programs provide help only after the fact—and in increasingly old-school circumstances. Tuition, counseling, and training, for example, are usually made available only after a plant has closed or workers have been laid off. Moreover, the dated assumptions of the programs tend to tilt them toward tangible manufacturing dislocations when much broader sources of labor market disruption are now resulting from game-changing technologies (like robotics and automation) or disruptive business models (such as those powered by online digital platforms for freelance worker matching). Yet these trends are not part of the federal adjustment offerings**. Similarly, the available programs do not reflect recent thinking that suggests that government should do more to help people who want to physically move to areas with more jobs and opportunity. Such shortcomings are why, like President Nixon before him, President Obama pushed for a comprehensive displaced-worker program—focused on an overhaul of the federal unemployment insurance system—that would offer TAA-type benefits to all workers. And they are why President-elect Trump and the next Congress should move urgently to upgrade the nation’s patchwork of labor market adjustment programs. **What might such a rethinking look like? Ultimately, the nation might see its way to create a single, holistic, multipurpose, adjustment benefit—a sort of basic transition offering—that might bundle together a core set of broadly relevant tools: job-search counseling, including opportunities in promising remote locations; sizable cash grants for training; sizable relocation grants; and wage insurance. Call it a Universal Basic** Adjustment Benefit with a nod to proposals for a universal basic income from writers like Martin Ford, Dylan Matthews, and others that would mitigate predicted large-scale dislocation through automation. Granted, no such benefit will be happening any time soon. But such a model should be kept in mind as a compass point for nearer-term, more incremental changes.

Preston Cooper, 4-26-2016, "Doubling Pell Grants Is A Terrible Idea," Forbes, https://www.forbes.com/sites/prestoncooper2/2016/04/26/doubling-pell-grants-is-a-terrible-idea/#1918923041b3

One study, published by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, **found that each dollar of additional Pell Grant aid increases sticker-price tuition by around 40 cents.** This cost increase filters down to low-income students who might not be paying full tuition. According to the study, Pell Grants also lead colleges to reduce institutional financial aid. When the federal government increases Pell Grant generosity, colleges “capture” some of those additional funds by raising tuition. When students can pay more, colleges charge more , which partially cancels out any benefits to students. If maximum Pell Grant awards were increased from $5,815 to $13,000, average tuition would rise by at least 40% of the difference, or about $2,900. That is just tuition—it does not take into account any effects of Pell Grants on other college costs such as room and board, which have also been rising.

Sarah Butrymowicz,, 2-1-2020, "Billions in Pell Grants go to students who never graduate," PBS NewsHour, https://www.pbs.org/newshour/education/billions-pell-grants-go-students-never-graduate

There are many reasons students who receive Pell grants never finish. At many universities and colleges, the money doesn’t cover the full cost of tuition, fees, and other expenses, and some students don’t have the resources to pay the rest. Others arrive from low-performing public high schools less well prepared than their higher-income classmates. In January 2014, Congress gave the Department of Education 120 days to produce, for the first time, Pell grant graduation rates for every university and college in the country. The department finally released the months-overdue report in November, but did not break down the information by institution, citing problems with the data, and was only able to analyze 70 percent of Pell recipients. Only 39 percent of the 1.7 million students in its sample earned a bachelor’s degree in six years.

<https://research.collegeboard.org/trends/student-aid/figures-tables/pell-grants-recipients-maximum-pell-and-average-pell>

$21.0 billion in 2018 dollars). The number of Pell Grant recipients was 10% higher (6.8 million vs. 6.2 million) in 2018-19 than in 2008-09. The maximum Pell Grant is the most frequently cited measure of per-student subsidies provided by the program.

###

## Sub c: Capital Injections

### Case Extension

Extend EIG - 50 mil people live in distressed communities which are stuck in poverty because of a lack of investment and spending -businesses arent coming bc no consumer spending or demand. When people get UBI, they spend their income on local businesses - when you buy a new outfit from a mom and pop shop the money goes to paying the employee’s salary, growing local businesses.

Extend lowell and scott- best way to lift people out poverty- 1$ -> 1.50 total econ impact - it creates a ripple effect - leads to more jobs and higher wages

O/w tf - recession temp but forever recession in distressed

 unlike welfare programs where money goes straight to the gov.

### Weighing

1. Probability: CNT says that top down poverty alleviation is best way to solve

### Frontlines

#### FL: Welfare has the same effect

1. It can only be spent on very limited categories of items - not enough to incentivize companies to come.
2. [Kenny](https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2015/09/welfare-reform-direct-cash-poor/407236/) 15- In-kind programs are significantly more wasteful and inefficient than just giving cash directly, which is why it has a larger economic multiplier effect
3. Welfare is being cut in the squo
4. Cross apply welfare answers

#### FL: Poor have higher MPC

1. Not actually into market (ie. big pharma companies)

### FL Cards

#### Kenny 15

Charles **Kenny**, 9-25-**2015,** "The Best Way to Reform Welfare: Give Poor People Cash," Atlantic, https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2015/09/welfare-reform-direct-cash-poor/407236/

**That concern with handing out money has led to complex systems of in-kind welfare support—or, as Carson put it, “Let me give you housing subsidies, let me give you free health care because you can’t do that.” In the United States, programs range from SNAP (electronic food stamps) and free school meals to Medicaid and rental assistance. I**n India, the poorest can buy subsidized grains or kerosene. Especially in the developing world, these systems are often inefficient and expensive to run. The Indian government, for instance, has estimated that two-fifths of the kerosene involved in its subsidy scheme goes missing before it is distributed and only half of what is left flows to the poorest families. **But more to the point, the programs are almost certainly less effective at reducing poverty than simply giving poor people cash. When governments give people in-kind support like food, it frequently costs more to deliver that support than it would to distribute cash—and for the same or even a lesser impact.** Jesse Cunha of the Naval Postgraduate School conducted a randomized trial of cash versus in-kind transfers in rural Mexico. In addition to finding that cash recipients didn’t spend more on tobacco or alcohol, Cunha learned that those who received cash experienced the same improvements in nutrition and child-health measures as those who received food. But the food program cost at least 20 percent more to administer, and the cash program led to significantly higher non-food consumption by recipients. In other words: **At less cost to the government, cash programs led to the same health outcomes as food-based programs, but also provided additional resources for recipients to spend on schooling, medicine, and transport. This is not a one-off finding. In many cases, cash programs are simply much more effective than in-kind transfers at turning dollars spent into positive nutritional outcomes.** A 2013 survey by Sarah Bailey for the Canadian Foodgrains Bank—involving Zimbabwe, Ecuador, Malawi, and Yemen, among other countries—found that cash transfers usually led to far greater increases in a “food consumption score” of dietary diversity and food frequency than did similarly priced food delivery. In Malawi, the food consumption score increased by 50 percent for cash recipients compared to 20 percent for food recipients. This despite the fact that households in the countries surveyed only report spending between 45 and 90 percent of the cash they receive on food, with the rest going to expenses like debt repayment, household items, and school fees. **Cash also has a larger multiplier effect.** Bring food from elsewhere to an area, and the impact of that food stops with those who eat it. Give people cash and they spend it on goods provided by local farmers and traders, who are often poor themselves and benefit as well. A 2010 study in Zimbabwe by Cormac Staunton of Concern Worldwide and Micheal Collins of Trinity College Dublin compared food transfers to cash transfers, and estimated that each dollar provided by cash transfers circulated 2.59 times around the local economy before being spent on goods and services from elsewhere. That compared to the 1.00 multiplier of food that was simply consumed.

## Sub d: Collective bargaining

### Case Extension

### Weighing

### Frontlines

#### Unions good ev here [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1gl8Kc9TiEgNSIy\_bCn0x6mGyZKrkZHB6dv-Vl\_tO4f4/edit#](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1gl8Kc9TiEgNSIy_bCn0x6mGyZKrkZHB6dv-Vl_tO4f4/edit)

####

#### FL: Unions powerful now

1. Adler in case - still not enough

#### FL: Hurts individual bargaining

1. Duh doesnt work - you just get fired - strength in numbers

#### FL: Offshoring

1. Shitty link - no quant
2. NUQ - SE asia is always cheaper
3. Service jobs can’t be outsourced
4. Skilled jobs solve?

### FL Cards

###

###

# Extra Cards

#### UBI increases wages, creating a cycle of economic growth

**Manjarin**, E., & Szlinder, M. (**2016**). A Marxist Argumentative Scheme on Basic Income and Wage Share in an Anti-capitalist Agenda. Basic Income Studies, 11(1). doi:10.1515/bis-2016-0010

[https://sci-hub.tw/https://doi.org/10.1515/bis-2016-0010](https://sci-hub.tw/https%3A//doi.org/10.1515/bis-2016-0010)

Therefore **basic income strengthens workers’ bargaining position by giving them basic security**, **and providing them** some quality **time11to struggle for higher wages** and engage in political struggle for more progressive reforms,and give them more freedom to choose those types of activities they want toperform. In these aspects basic income clearly outstrips a proposal often com-pared to it i. e. the Job Guarantee, which provides everyone with security, butnot with time, forcing people to perform a full-time labour. Moreover it does notgive freedom, because it cannot provide jobs that are suitable for needs andpreferences of all those who can’t find a job in the private labour market.

 We argue that a **basic income should lead to a rise of the share of wages** in the GDP, **by significantly improving their bargaining position** in various ways.

Basic income, **because of its effect on the wage [it]share** (due to the aforemen-tioned four elements) may be considered an exemplary case of a pro-labourpolicy, that **would lead to a greater growth of GDP****in** a wage-led regimes, i. e.most of the developed and big economies like **[the] United States**, Germany, UnitedKingdom, France or Italy (and certainly the eurozone as a whole) (Lavoie &Stockhammer, 2012, p. 19–20).9Those economies are wage-led even when wetake into consideration the negative impact of the increase in wages on the tradebalance. That means that the neoliberal project in lowering wages went furtherthan the requirements related to the process of globalisation Moreover, in these economies **the** same **increase in wage share can create higher output and**, plausibly, **greater employment, thus enforcing the bargaining position of workers even more [creating]**. **Because this would again rise the wage share, we may face a reinforcing cycle**, a progressive dynamic leading (or atleast getting close) to the full employment (a new“kaleckian moment”). The limits to that dynamic are created by“the feedback effects driven by the productivity regime. Fast output growth may not entail fast employment growth,because of the rise in productivity growth generated by Kaldor-Verdoorn effect”(Lavoie & Stockhammer, 2012, p. 25). But those limits because of the rise ofproductivity don’t escape the realm of other possible economic policies.10Therefore basic income strengthens workers’ bargaining position by giving them basic security, and providing them some quality time11to struggle for higher wages and engage in political struggle for more progressive reforms,and give them more freedom to choose those types of activities they want to perform. In these aspects basic income clearly outstrips a proposal often com-pared to it i. e. the Job Guarantee, which provides everyone with security, butnot with time, forcing people to perform a full-time labour. Moreover it does notgive freedom, because it cannot provide jobs that are suitable for needs andpreferences of all those who can’t find a job in the private labour market

## Unions Link

### Collective Bargaining (:50)

**A UBI improves the ability of workers to strike for better working conditions**

Joshua **Murray**, 9-24-**2019,** "The strike against GM will likely fail," MarketWatch, https://www.marketwatch.com/story/the-strike-against-gm-will-likely-fail-2019-09-23

In the process of our research we also gained an understanding of what makes an auto strike successful. Essentially, **for a strike to achieve its aims, workers need sufficient leverage over production to be able to disrupt normal [business] functioning for long enough that it would be cheaper for the company to offer the concessions.** Put another way, workers have to cause the auto maker enough pain to make it cry uncle.

**Which is why he concludes that**

**The longer and more disruptive a strike is, the larger the concessions.** Higher levels of what we call structural leverage mean that a relatively small number of workers can cause maximal disruption.

#### **However, because workers don’t get paid during strikes, he finds that**

**right now, it is unlikely that workers will be able to strike long enough to win major concessions from their employers. (paraphrased)**

This isn’t to say that it’s impossible for auto workers to launch a successful strike in today’s environment. It’s just that it’ll take a lot longer**. And this matters because striking workers suffer during strikes. Their pay goes** from [$16 to $38 per hour](https://work.chron.com/average-pay-auto-workers-union-member-24071.html) **to about** [**$1.25 per hour**](https://www.usatoday.com/story/money/2019/09/16/gm-uaw-workers-strike-pay/2342075001/)**, which they get out of the union’s strike fund.**

**While it’s not impossible that workers will** wait out GM and **win major concessions,** but **given the structure they are operating in, it is unlikely.**

**This is why**

**Coote 19 New Economics Foundation explains how UBI solves this problem.**

<http://www.world-psi.org/sites/default/files/documents/research/en_ubi_full_report_2019.pdf>

For some trade unionists, **UBI offers a way of strengthen[s]ing workers’ bargaining power, so that they are better able to improve** or safeguard **pay and [working] conditions**, or resist redundancies or other changes that would make them worse off and less secure. They envisage c**[C]ash payments [would] making it easier for workers to withdraw their labour, because they would have a basic income to fall back on, or could use some or all of the cash to help build up a strike fund.** UBI is thought by some to mitigate the financial risk of a volatile labour mar-ket, by creating a buffer for workers who have to move frequently between jobs, who work under “zero-hours” contracts or who are trying to set up and run their own business. The founder of India’s Network for Basic Income, Sar-ath Davala, argues that UBI would provide security to a growing precariat9

#### **Unions r good**

Susan **Dynarski**, 7-6-**2018**, "Fresh Proof That Strong Unions Help Reduce Income Inequality," No Publication, https://www.nytimes.com/2018/07/06/business/labor-unions-income-inequality.html

**Union workers now earn about 20 percent more than nonunion workers in similar jobs**. Remarkably, this union premium has held steady since the 1930s. Throughout this period, **the biggest boost from union membership has gone to the least educated workers**, who have, in turn, driven the rise and fall of union membership. The decades following World War II, when unskilled workers formed the union movement’s backbone, marked**[who see] the most rapid decreases in income inequality.** Wages for nonwhite workers were particularly strong then. But increasing wages for low-skilled union members is just one channel through which unions can reduce income inequality.**[while] unions can also [increase]** affect **the earnings of nonunion workers.** To capture such effects, the researchers broadened their lens to include the entire distribution of workers and their wages beyond those who are in typically unionized jobs and industries. They found that, going back to the 1930s, more unions meant more income equality. During years and in states where workers were more likely to be unionized, income inequality was lower.

####

#### A2: not enough

Micheal **Blann ’18**, “The Paradox of Universal Basic Income” Wired, 03-29-2018, DOA-01-19-2020 https://www.wired.com/story/the-paradox-of-universal-basic-income/

Nevertheless, just as many conservatives and liberals don’t like the concept. Conservatives against UBI worry that it will decrease incentives to work and cost too much, racking up a bill that those who do work will have to pay. Skeptical liberals worry that employers will use it as an excuse to pay even lower wages. They also fear politicians will offer it as a rationale to gut existing social programs and unwind institutions that help those most in need. The result is that UBI is a partisan issue that, paradoxically, has bipartisan support.

[...]

They may be getting ahead of themselves. Luke Martinelli, a researcher at the University of Bath Institute for Policy Research, has written that “an affordable UBI is inadequate, and an adequate UBI is unaffordable.” I believe that is roughly true. One of the biggest problems with UBI is that a base sum that would allow people to refuse work and look for something better (rather than just allowing employers to pay workers less) is around $1000 per month, which would cost most countries somewhere between 5 percent to 35 percent of their GDP. That looks expensive compared with the cost to any developed country of eradicating poverty, so the only way a nation could support this kind of UBI would be to eliminate all funding for social programs. That would be applauded by libertarians and some conservatives, but not by many others.

Scott **Santens**, 11-30-**2016,** "Universal Basic Income will Accelerate Innovation by Reducing Our Fear of Failure," Medium, https://medium.com/basic-income/universal-basic-income-will-accelerate-innovation-by-reducing-our-fear-of-failure-b81ee65a254

For decades now our economy has been going through some very significant changes thanks to advancements in technology, and we have simultaneously been actively eroding the institutions that pooled risk like trade unions and our public safety net. Incomes adjusted for inflation have not budged for decades, and the jobs providing those incomes have gone from secure careers to insecure jobs, part-time and contract work, and now recently even gig labor in the sharing economy. **Decreasing economic security means a population decreasingly likely to take risks.** Looking at it this way, of course startups have been on the decline. **How can you take the leap of faith required for a startup when you’re more and more worried about just being able to pay the rent?** None of this should be surprising. The entire insurance industry exists to reduce risk. When someone is able to insure something, they are more willing to take risks. Would there be as many restaurants if there was no insurance in case of fire? Of course not. The corporation itself exists to reduce personal risk. **Entrepreneurship and risk are inextricably linked. Reducing risk aversion is paramount to innovation.**

**Manjarin**, E., & Szlinder, M. (**2016**). A Marxist Argumentative Scheme on Basic Income and Wage Share in an Anti-capitalist Agenda. Basic Income Studies, 11(1). doi:10.1515/bis-2016-0010

[https://sci-hub.tw/https://doi.org/10.1515/bis-2016-0010](https://sci-hub.tw/https%3A//doi.org/10.1515/bis-2016-0010)

Secondly,**basic income would increase the wage share, because it would get the workers away from the tight corner**–as long as this benefit would exist, they would never have to worry about the survival of themselves and their families.Therefore, **in the worst of cases they could resign from some particular job if they perceived it as not satisfactory (in terms of wage or working conditions) and have time to look for a better job (also in a different city or region). In this sense a basic income would obviously improve workers’ bargaining position, espe-cially in the pay negotiations** (Vanderborght, 2006, p. 5–6).

**Institute for Policy Studies**, 3-12-2014, "Wall Street Bonuses and the Minimum Wage," https://ips-dc.org/wall\_street\_bonuses\_and\_the\_minimum\_wage/

**All those dollars low-wage workers spend** create an economic ripple effect. **Every extra dollar going into the pockets of low-wage workers,** standard economic multiplier models tell us**, adds about $1.21 to the national economy** [while]. Every extra dollar going into the pockets of a high-income American, by contrast, only adds about 39 cents to the GDP.

**As businesses grow,**

**Manjarin**, E., & Szlinder, M. (**2016**). A Marxist Argumentative Scheme on Basic Income and Wage Share in an Anti-capitalist Agenda. Basic Income Studies, 11(1). doi:10.1515/bis-2016-0010

[https://sci-hub.tw/https://doi.org/10.1515/bis-2016-0010](https://sci-hub.tw/https%3A//doi.org/10.1515/bis-2016-0010)

We argue that a basic income should lead to a rise of the share of wages in the GDP, by significantly improving their bargaining position in various ways.

Firstly, the bargaining position of workers would improve due to the macro-economic consequences of implementing **[because] a basic income system.** This reform**,by [would] redistribut[e] income to the advantage of the poorer groups of the society[, it] would increase** internal effective **demand [incentivizing more] creating a better ground for profitable investments. That should induce investment,** which depends on sales and expected profitability, **which [in turn] may increase[s] employment and decrease[s] the unemployment rate.**8The existence of a huge group of unemployed or, as Marx puts it, the industrial reserve army, creates a downward pressure on wages, because it plays a role of a scarecrow discouraging the workers from struggling for their rights, better conditions of labour and higher wages. As this role is directly proportional to the level of unemployment, the smaller it is the lesser intimi-dated the workers are.

Sarita **Gupta**, 1-20-**2015,** "Protect and Expand Workers' Ability to Bargain," BillMoyers, https://billmoyers.com/2015/01/20/protect-expand-workers-ability-bargain/

Greedy corporations have been on a decades-long bender to take advantage of working people — depressing wages, benefits and job standards, which has led to record inequality and poverty.

Fighting poverty requires expanding and protecting the ability of workers to bargain with their employers…At Jobs With Justice, we believe that **fighting poverty requires expanding and protecting the ability of workers to bargain with their employers to demand higher wages, better working conditions and better living standards.** As the nature of work changes, we look at collective bargaining through the union workplace campaign lens, but also through nontraditional forms, including legislative, policy, rulemaking and industry-wide interventions that put more money in workers’ pockets and improve standards and conditions for workers**. Only through bargaining do workers have the power to directly confront the corporate actors behind poverty and inequality.**

**Erik Wright Uni of Wisconsin**

<https://www.ssc.wisc.edu/~wright/Basic%20Income%20as%20a%20Socialist%20Project.pdf>

And third, **basic income is a kind of unconditional and inexhaustible strike fund, which** also **would contribute to strengthening the labor movement. Even if basic income was not accompanied by more favorable laws governing the process of union organizing, therefore, it would in this way enhance the capacity of workers to struggle for unions.**Now unions supporters have, in some times and places, argued against basic income for a variety of reasons. Sometimes unionists object to basic income on the same grounds that unions are sometimes hostile to welfare: this is just a device by which hardworking people are forced to support the lazy. But there is also an argument more directly linked to union power: the fear is that with a basic income workers would no longer need unions. If the only function of unions were to guarantee minimum standards of living, then this might be a realistic concern. But insofar as unions are also concerned with the organization of the labor process, conditions of work, fair treatment within disputes, and so on, basic income would in no way threaten the function of unions. In any case, the added capacity for struggle provided by the guaranteed income seems likely to be a bigger effect than any marginal reduction in functions for collective organization

#### **Warming turns every impact and causes extinction**

Torres 16

(Phil, affiliate scholar @ Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies PhD candidate @ Rice University in tropical conservation biology, Op-ed: Climate Change Is the Most Urgent Existential Risk,<http://ieet.org/index.php/IEET/more/Torres20160807>)

Humanity faces a number of formidable challenges this century. Threats to our collective survival stem from asteroids and comets, supervolcanoes, global pandemics, climate change, biodiversity loss, nuclear weapons, biotechnology, synthetic biology, nanotechnology, and artificial superintelligence. With such threats in mind, an informal survey conducted by the Future of Humanity Institute placed the probability of human extinction this century at 19%. To put this in perspective, it means that the average American is more than a thousand times more likely to die in a human extinction event than a plane crash.\* So, given limited resources, which risks should we prioritize? Many intellectual leaders, including Elon Musk, Stephen Hawking, and Bill Gates, have suggested that artificial superintelligence constitutes one of the most significant risks to humanity. And this may be correct in the long-term. But I would argue that two other risks, namely *climate change* and biodiveristy loss, should *take priority* right now over *every other known threat*. Why? Because these ongoing catastrophes *in slow-motion* will frame our *existential predicament* on Earth not just for the rest of this century, but for literally *thousands of years* to come. As such, they have the capacity to *raise or lower* the *probability of other risks scenarios* unfolding. Multiplying Threats Ask yourself the following: are wars more or less likely in a world marked by *extreme weather events*, *megadroughts*, *food supply disruptions*, and sea-level rise? Are terrorist attacks more or less likely in a world beset by *the collapse of global ecosystems*, *agricultural failures*, *economic uncertainty*, and *political instability*? Both government officials and scientists agree that the answer is *“more likely.”* For example, the current Director of the CIA, John Brennan, recently identified “the impact of climate change” as one of the *“deeper causes* of this rising instability” in countries like *Syria*, *Iraq*, *Yemen*, *Libya*, and *Ukraine*. Similarly, the former Secretary of Defense, Chuck Hagel, has described climate change as a *“threat multiplier”* with “the potential to exacerbate many of the challenges we are dealing with today — from infectious disease to terrorism.” The Department of Defense has also affirmed a connection. In a 2015 report, it states, “Global climate change will aggravate problems such as *poverty*, *social tensions*, *environmental degradation*, *ineffectual leadership* and *weak political institutions* that threaten stability in a number of countries.” *Scientific studies* have further shown a connection between the environmental crisis and violent conflicts. For example, a 2015 paper in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences argues that climate change was a causal factor behind the record-breaking 2007-2010 drought in Syria. This drought led to a mass migration of farmers into urban centers, which fueled the 2011 Syrian civil war. Some observers, including myself, have suggested that this struggle could be the beginning of World War III, given the complex tangle of international involvement and overlapping interests. The study’s conclusion is also significant because the Syrian civil war was the Petri dish in which the Islamic State consolidated its forces, later emerging as the largest and most powerful terrorist organization in human history. A Perfect Storm The point is that climate change and biodiversity loss could very easily push societies *to the brink of collapse*. This will exacerbate *existing geopolitical tensions* and introduce entirely *new power struggles* between state and nonstate actors. At the same time, advanced technologies will very likely become increasingly powerful and accessible. As I’ve written elsewhere, the malicious agents of the future will have bulldozers rather than shovels to dig mass graves for their enemies. The result is a perfect storm of more conflicts in the world along with unprecedentedly dangerous weapons. If the conversation were to end here, we’d have ample reason for placing climate change and biodiversity loss at the top of our priority lists. But there are other reasons they ought to be considered urgent threats. I would argue that they could make humanity more vulnerable to a catastrophe involving superintelligence and even asteroids. The basic reasoning is the same for both cases. Consider superintelligence first. Programming a superintelligence whose values align with ours is a formidable task even in stable circumstances. As Nick Bostrom argues in his 2014 book, we should recognize the “default outcome” of superintelligence to be “doom.” Now imagine trying to solve these problems amidst a rising tide of interstate wars, civil unrest, terrorist attacks, and other tragedies? The societal stress caused by climate change and biodiversity loss will almost certainly compromise important conditions for creating friendly AI, such as sufficient funding, academic programs to train new scientists, conferences on AI, peer-reviewed journal publications, and communication/collaboration between experts of different fields, such as computer science and ethics. It could even make an “AI arms race” more likely, thereby raising the probability of a malevolent superintelligence being created either on purpose or by mistake. Similarly, imagine that astronomers discover a behemoth asteroid barreling toward Earth. Will designing, building, and launching a spacecraft to divert the assassin past our planet be easier or more difficult in a world preoccupied with other survival issues? In a relatively peaceful world, one could imagine an asteroid actually bringing humanity together by directing our attention *toward a common threat*. *But* if the “conflict multipliers” of climate change and biodiversity loss have already *catapulted civilization* into chaos and turmoil, I strongly suspect that humanity will become more, rather than less, susceptible to dangers of this sort. Context Risks We can describe the dual threats of climate change and biodiversity loss as “context risks.” Neither is likely to directly cause the extinction of our species. But *both will define the context in which civilization confronts all the other threats* before us. In this way, they could *indirectly* contribute to the *overall danger of annihilation* — and this worrisome effect could be significant. For example, according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the effects of climate change will be “severe,” “pervasive,” and “irreversible.” Or, as a 2016 study published in Nature and authored by over twenty scientists puts it, the consequences of climate change “will extend longer than the entire history of human civilization thus far.” Furthermore, a recent article in Science Advances confirms that humanity has already escorted the biosphere into the sixth mass extinction event in life’s 3.8 billion year history on Earth. Yet another study suggests that we could be approaching a *sudden*, *irreversible*, catastrophic *collapse of the global ecosystem*. If this were to occur, it could result in “widespread social unrest, economic instability and loss of human life.” Given the potential for environmental degradation to *elevate the likelihood of nuclear wars*, *nuclear terrorism*, *engineered pandemics*, a *superintelligence takeover*, and perhaps even *an impact winter*, it ought to take precedence *over all other risk concerns* — at least in the near-term. Let’s make sure we get our priorities straight.