



A/2 Pro	3
Overviews	3
A/2: Economic Growth	4
A/2: General	4
A/2: Consumption	4
**A/2: Inequality	4
A/2: Innovation	4
**A/2: Entrepreneurship	5
A/2: Job Flexibility	5
A/2: Bargaining Power	6
A/2: Job Growth	6
***A/2: Wages	7
**A/2: Reduce Poverty	7
A/2: Recession	8
A/2: Money for X	8
A/2: Automation	8
A/2: UBI Solves	9
A/2: Housing Prices	9
A/2: General Benefit	10
**A/2: Universalism	10
**A/2: Climate Change	10
*A/2: Education	10
A/2: Carbon Tax	10
A/2: Stress	11
A/2: Remittances	11
**A/2: Rent	12
**A/2: Increasing Caregiving	12
**A/2: Stigma	12
A/2: State Budget	12
**A/2: Education Spending	13

A/2: Women/Abuse	13
A/2: ODI Evidence	13
A/2: IPV	13
A/2: Trafficking	14
A/2: Welfare Worse	14
**A/2: Inefficiencies	14
A/2: Disincentivizes Work	14
A/2: Poverty Trap	15
A/2: Racism	15
A/2: TANF Bad	16
A/2: Worked in Other Places	16
A/2: General	16
A/2: Alaska	17
A/2: Finland	17
A/2: Other	17
A/2: Welfare Getting Cut Now	17
A/2: Roosevelt Study	17
A/2: Welfare Gets Wasted	17
**A/2: Wildquist	18
A/2 Con	18
A/2: Government Spending	18
A/2: Increasing Taxes	18
A/2: UBI Expensive	18
**A/2: VAT	19
A/2: Debt	19
*****A/2: Debt Increasing	19
A/2: Crowd Out	19
A/2: Interest Rates Rise	19
A/2: Foreign Aid	19
A/2: Emerging Markets	21
A/2: Credit Downgrade	22
A/2: Private Investment Crowd Out	22
A/2: Cutting Military	22
A/2: Politicians Won't Pass Stimulus	23
A/2: Fiscal Stimulus	23
A/2: UBI Bad	24
A/2: Disincentivizes Work	24
**A/2: Inequality	25

A/2: Inflation	25
**A/2: Demand-Pull Inflation	26
A/2: Misuse	26
A/2: Increasing Socialism	27
A/2: Less Work Hours	27
**A/2: Automatic Stabilizer	27
**A/2: Immigration	27
A/2: Welfare Better	28
A/2: General	28
A/2: SNAP	28
A/2: Housing Vouchers	29
A/2: Pell Grants	29
A/2: EITC	30
A/2: TANF	30
A/2: Medicaid	31
***A/2: Child Poverty	32
A/2: Work Requirements	32
A/2: Medicare/Social Security	33

A/2 Pro

Overviews

1. A UBI would drive up inflation for two reasons:
 - a. Perception. [Hill 18 of Archetto](#) writes that when everyone has more money, business owners know that people have more money to afford goods, which is why they'd just drive up prices. That's why he concludes that the inflation caused by a UBI negates any perceived gains of such a program.
 - b. The demand-pull. [Kimberly Amadeo at the Balance](#) explains in 2018 if everyone suddenly received more money, it would create inflation because most would immediately spend the cash. Retailers would then order and produce more, but if they can't increase supply, they drive up prices, making basics unaffordable. That's why she concludes in the long run a guaranteed income would not raise the standard of living.

A/2: Economic Growth

A/2: General

1. Disad. [Zamarota of CIS in 2018](#) finds that around 5 million non-citizen households in the U.S. receive welfare – this is because welfare benefits are given to illegal immigrants. However, Stanford University explains that a UBI definitionally is a periodic cash allowance to U.S. citizens – meaning those 5 million people are excluded.

A/2: Consumption

1. The assumption that consumer spending drives economic growth is wrong. [Dowell of FEE in 2019](#) explains that it's a common Keynesian notion, but it's wrong because economic growth is not simply just when everyone gets more money. In reality, economic growth occurs when you produce more valuable goods through capital goods. He concludes that increasing consumption through the UBI does the absolute opposite of growing the economy.
2. [Acemoglu in 2019](#) writes that much of the benefits for the UBI would be offset because of increased taxes to finance the proposal. Outweighs the potential marginal increase in consumption from lower classes because it takes capital away from much larger populations.
3. No economic gains for the people who really need it. UBI does not significantly increase the amount of capital for the people at the bottom who really need the increased consumption in assets such as food and medical care.

**A/2: Inequality

A/2: Innovation

1. [Babson College](#) reports in 2019 that entrepreneurial activity rates are 17.7% for men and 13.6% for women – which marks an all time high under a period where we have welfare.
2. Nonunique. UBI doesn't uniquely spur innovation. [Seamans of Forbes](#) find that “The U.S. economy already has multiple safety nets in place for would-be entrepreneurs and innovators, including bankruptcy laws, unemployment insurance, the Affordable Care Act (which allows employees to leave their firms without fear of losing health care), and other programs described below. It is not clear that replacing one set of safety nets with another will stimulate entrepreneurship and innovation”
3. Delink. [Seamans continues](#) that if a UBI increases the propensity for entrepreneurs to take risks, that means the capital provided by the financier is at a greater risk because there are so many people trying to invest in entrepreneurship. He explains that when

financiers can't delineate between what's high or low quality, they cut back on the amount of lending or stop altogether, meaning there's no net increase in innovation.

4. Innovation can't happen under the current monopolies. [Dayen of the American Prospect](#) in 2017 writes that because of predatory practices such as Facebook and Google using its wallet to buy out competition, seed funding in Silicon Valley has dropped by 40% since 2015, because investors don't see any point in it. That's why Solon of the Guardian in 2017 explains that because of big monopolies, there's barely an incentive for people to innovate and set up their own businesses because they can't compete. Indeed, [Luckerson of Time](#) in 2015 explains that big companies just buy out innovation to increase their footprints and get rid of competition.
5. Turn. Michelle White, a professor at UC San Diego, finds that higher levels of bankruptcy exemptions (the amount of money that an individual can retain when declaring bankruptcy) are correlated with more [loan denials](#) and [higher interest rates](#).
 - a. Forbes finds that higher levels of bankruptcy exemptions lead to [less innovation](#)—in terms of lower number of patents and lower overall patent quality—by small firms. This is because innovation is a costly undertaking, and when the supply of capital shrinks, these small firms have no choice but to cut back on innovation.

**A/2: Entrepreneurship

1. OV takes them out.

Ehrenfreund, Max. "How Welfare Encourages People to Start Businesses." The Washington Post, WP Company, 26 Mar. 2015, www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2015/03/26/wonkbook-how-welfare-encourages-people-to-start-businesses/?utm_term=.0a894c62e2ee<http://www.bath.ac.uk/publications/the-fiscal-and-distributional-implications-of-alternative-universal-basic-income-schemes-in-the-uk/attachments/Basic'Income'Working'Paper.pdf>.m=.0a894c62e2ee. KOHS-RR

A/2: Job Flexibility

1. Turn. [Dowell of FEE in 2019](#) explains that a basic income decreases the incentive for workers to quickly find new employment once they're out of a job while decreasing their sensitivity to the income differences between jobs. He concludes that the increased time between jobs means there will always be lower employment at any given time and, thus, less economic growth and production. For example, if I have a financial safety net, I'm more inclined to spend it on nonprofit work or caring for loved ones.

A/2: Bargaining Power

1. No Impact. [Rogers of the Boston Review](#) in 2016 notes that even if a UBI makes it easier for workers to demand reforms, the threat of termination or retaliation would still prevent workers from protesting or striking in the first place.
2. Because a UBI guarantees a stable monthly income, it would encourage informal, non-paid activities. This type of work decreases the relevance of workers' unions because informal workers do not require a union.

A/2: Job Growth

1. [Kearney of Brookings in 2019](#) finds that a UBI achieves the exact opposite effect, driving down employment rates. He concludes that giving unconditional cash to everyone would actually, both in theory and based on empirical evidence, decrease the rate of jobs.

decrease in demand for workers only occurred in the manufacturing and oil industries.

UBI would create a society in which “those who work too much ... work less, in order to avoid burnout, breathe a little, retrain for new work, or care for their loved ones, and the jobs thus freed up could then be taken by others.” That is, it doesn't aim at “working less, so all can work,” as the workers' movement traditionally did, but letting everyone choose how much to work at any given moment

The lack of an exit option for such workers, and their weak bargaining position with respect to employers, means that basic income could end up exacerbating poor pay and conditions if other workers were willing to reduce their wage demands as a result of the unconditional payment

The lack of an exit option for such workers, and their weak bargaining position with respect to employers, means that basic income could end up exacerbating poor pay and conditions if other workers were willing to reduce their wage demands as a result of the unconditional payment

UBI cuts wages and forces people with fewer skills to accept worse jobs – that independently increases stratification.

Zamora 17, Daniel. Daniel Zamora is a postdoctoral sociologist at the Université Libre de Bruxelles and Cambridge University. “The Case Against a Basic Income,” Jacobin Magazine, 12-28-2017, <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2017/12/universal-basic-income-inequality-work>

Perhaps most importantly, our current welfare system gets the incentives wrong. For example, it discourages work and marriage. The nation's highest marginal tax rates are not on the wealthy, but on a poor

person who leaves welfare for work. The loss of benefits, combined with taxes and the cost of employment, can leave some people worse off financially if they take a job.

***A/2: Wages

1.

Can't solve – wages go down but prices stay high.

Sadowski 16 [Jathan Sadowski (postdoctoral research fellow in smart cities at the University of Sydney, Australia) Why Silicon Valley is embracing universal basic income, The Guardian, 6/22/16]

<https://fee.org/articles/andrew-yang-s-math-doesn-t-add-up-on-universal-basic-income/>

This also says less sensitive to inc in wages- no desire for more

In finland wages went down 20 euros lol

<https://smartasset.com/financial-advisor/universal-basic-income>

There is a possibility that UBI could lower wages or freeze raises. For example, some competitive fields could end up lowering entry level salaries because they know everyone's income is being supplemented by UBI. Furthermore, certain entry-level jobs in fields that can become high-earning (such as politics, where interns often go unpaid) may start off at unlivable wages since those workers were receiving UBI. Would those entry-level jobs manage to find ways to pay employees less for even longer?

A/2: Reduce Poverty

1. Even if they are right that a UBI reduces poverty, they are not showing that it comparatively reduces poverty more than means-tested welfare programs enough to replace them. Indeed, means-tested welfare programs are more effective in reducing poverty, as [Greenstein of the CBPP](#) in 2019 explains that these programs lift tens of millions of people, including millions of children, out of poverty each year.
2. They are oversimplifying the concept of poverty. [Sumner of LEL](#) in 2019 explains that there are three forms of poverty, and they don't address these because:

- a. Even with a UBI, there would be plenty of people who make poor or unusual choices and end up with an inadequate consumption bundle.
- b. A UBI would not eliminate relative poverty because the concept will simply be redefined in the public's mind to reflect UBI incomes.
- c. If tax rates are required, UBI payments will have to be scaled back to levels that are lower than anticipated, and absolute poverty will reappear.

. The Census Bureau suggests that the poverty rate would be 2.5 percent higher in the absence of the EITC and other refundable tax credits.

A/2: Recession

1. Turn. Entitlements are crucial to keeping stability. [Rubin of the Washington Post in 2017](#) writes that means-tested welfare functions as an automatic stabilizer during times of recession because as downturns hit and people lose money, these programs expand to increase spending.
 - a. This outweighs on timeframe because short term monetary gains get normalized, but increasing spending during a recession stimulates the economy much more. [Coppola at Forbes](#) in 2018 explains that in the last recession when the U.S. government strengthened these programs while European governments made deep cuts to them to try to lower their debt, the U.S. economy had recovered much faster specifically because it supported these programs.

A/2: Money for X

A/2: Automation

1. [The EPI](#) explains that studies that attempt to estimate the number of jobs that will be potentially lost to automation in the future never take into account automation's positive effects on employment. Indeed, [Roe of Gartner](#) in 2018 finds that while artificial intelligence will automate away 1.8 million jobs, AI will also create 2.3 million jobs by 2020, driving a net gain of 500,000 new jobs.
2. Another comprehensive study from [Chowdry of Forbes](#) writes that automation will drive a net gain of 58 million jobs by 2022.

3. [Houser of Futurism in 2017](#) finds that a UBI is one of the worst possible responses to automation, while job training and job search assistance are much more likely to mitigate the potential unemployment situation than UBI.
4. [Dyan of Harvard University](#) in 2019 explains that switching to a UBI system would not avoid the harms of automation even if these people lost their because the policy does not address fundamental problems, like workers lacking the skills to complement the new wave of technology.
5. Turn. They say that automation will take away low level jobs meaning the poorest lose the most jobs. Under welfare the poor gain the most benefits because they are the only ones eligible. A UBI diverts funds to everyone including the rich, meaning it harms the poorest the most. When automation happens the poorest get hit the hardest with a UBI.
6. Turn. [The London School of Economics](#) in 2014 explains that if people leave the labour market due to automation but then live on the basic income for a prolonged period of time, their chances of re-entering the market become very slim because accelerated technological change makes existing skills obsolete more quickly, diminishing their ability to work. He concludes that these people would thus become stuck on basic income almost permanently, making the unemployment issue worse.

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/amitchowdhry/2018/09/18/artificial-intelligence-to-create-58-million-new-jobs-by-2022-says-report/#78c44bba4d4b> (NK) Machines and algorithms in the workplace are expected to create 133 million new roles, but cause 75 million jobs to be displaced by 2022 according to a new report from the World Economic Forum (WEF) called "The Future of Jobs 2018." This means that the growth of artificial intelligence could create 58 million net new jobs in the next few years. With this net positive job growth, there is expected to be a major shift in quality, location and permanency for the new roles. And companies are expected to expand the use of contractors doing specialized work and utilize remote staffing. In

A/2: UBI Solves

<https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2019/10/18/20919322/basic-income-freedom-dividend-andrew-yang-automation>

The aff is the worst response to automation – it pays people to not adapt, which harms them more in the long run.

http://www.realclearfuture.com/articles/2016/08/15/basic_income_worst_response_to_automation_111934.html

A/2: Housing Prices

1. If they read Blackwell of Bigger Pockets

- a. Doesn't take into account the loss of welfare.
 - b. Assumes a homeless person spends 100% of their UBI on housing. It's unrealistic considering they have to buy other basic goods like food or medicine.
 - c. The Bigger Pockets evidence is the equivalent of Reddit for real estate agents – there's no credibility and there is no study conducted.
2. If everyone has an extra \$12,000, demand for housing increases while supply stays the same, making it a necessity for landlords to raise prices to make more profit. It's especially true considering housing is inelastic ; people can't go without it, so they'll always buy.
 3. Turn. [Fox of the Census](#) in 2018 explains that government welfare housing subsidies to low-income forklift 2.9 million people out of poverty annually.

A/2: General Benefit

**A/2: Universalism

1. Turn. Income Inequality increases. (Cross apply shit from Neg)

**A/2: Climate Change

1. Relies on the idea gets everyone richer- a. The observation beats this back and b. If ppl are getting poorer at the bottom
2. Lots of alt causes like public policy
3. No clarity- like why r people who are getting richer automatically taking u green tech and a climate movement- if anything, we as middle class citizens still create a ton of emissions

*A/2: Education

A/2: Carbon Tax

1. Delink. [The Heritage Foundation](#) explains that if businesses are faced with higher energy costs as a result of a carbon tax, they would just pass those on to consumers in the form of higher prices, less jobs, and lower income, eliminating the effects a UBI would have.
2. Turn. [Kreutzer of the Heritage Foundation](#) finds that a carbon tax would drive businesses overseas, push up energy costs, and raise production costs, costing the economy 1 trillion dollars over the next ten years. [Rose of the IAEE](#), in a meta-analysis of 20 studies and 42 observations, confirms that carbon taxation leads to an average of a 3 to 4 percent reduction in GDP.

A/2: Stress

Alaska faces some of the nation's worst social problems — sexual assault, violence, substance abuse, suicide. Yet despite Alaska's extraordinary wealth, spending is comparable to other states, where citizens pay taxes, [when measured in comparable terms](#).

A/2: Remittances

1. Turn: Morales, UMich, 2017 – only send 4% of the money back. Comparatively, all their money would be in the economy if they stayed.
2. Turn: Tumble, India Institute of Management, 2011 – remittances only go to wealthy individuals who were able to fund their children through higher education, which A. means they don't help those who actually need money and B. only perpetuate income inequality.
3. Turn: Economist, 2014 – the influx of foreign currency enters the country, driving up the money supply and rising prices of goods. Nisar, Zagreb International Review, 2013 – 1% increase in remittances increases inflation by 0.78%. Kakwani, University of New South Wales, 2007 – 1% increase in prices increases the number of people in poverty by 1.44%. This is because Talukdar, Texas Tech, 2012 – forced to spend more on basic needs like food.
4. Turn: European University Institute, 2013 – remittances mean the government decreases social spending for those individuals because they think the remittances will lift them out of poverty, quantifying that receiving remittances decreases public spending by 18%.
5. Turn: [Ahmed](#) 12 explains: when people get welfare for remittances, they stop demanding social services from the government, allowing the government to cut things like public health care and school spending. That's bad because those expenditures drive the overall economy in the long-term. That's why he finds: a 1 standard deviation increase in remittances reduces per capita incomes by \$600, on net.
6. Turn. Remittances increase corruption. [Iyevs](#) 15 explains that remittance households become attractive extortion targets for corruption prone officials, and those remittance receivers are more willing and able to bribe public officials. [Majeed](#) 16 finds empirically: a standard deviation increase in remittances increases corruption by .33%. Corruption is terrible for economic growth. [Mo](#) 2000 explains a couple of reasons: corruption harms innovation because it reduces access to needed government services like permits; it reduces investment because public officials can just sit on the remittance income instead of investing; it also increases economic inequalities by disproportionately raising the

incomes of corrupt officials. That's why Mo finds a 1% increase in corruption decreases growth by .72%

7. [Omata](#) 11 indicates that in reality, wealthy people in developing nations leave, and support their already wealthy family members. This actually discourages work, because those remittances become 95% of their income. Then she finds that the money is not going to the poorest, so not only is the money not going to the poor that need it, but it is discouraging the wealthy and powerful elite in these countries to create companies and jobs that could potentially spur economic development in these poorer countries. They can't achieve less poverty without economic development.

**A/2: Rent

UBI increase rent – gives power to landlords to ramp prices and zoning regulations

Sarris 17 (Sarris, Simon. Author @ Medium. "After universal basic income, the flood".

<https://medium.com/@simon.sarris/after-universal-basic-income-the-flood-217db9889c07>. 22 Oct 2017. Accessed 26 Feb 2018 SM)

**A/2: Increasing Caregiving

1. Ok middle class/high class caregiving alr a thing

**A/2: Stigma

1. People who live in absolute poverty would rather have government assistance to survive regardless of stigma attached to the welfare programs.

A/2: State Budget

1. [Marinescu of Wharton](#) finds that the most likely implementation of UBI would be on the state rather than federal level. There are two warrants:
 - a. That's the way welfare currently exists, so they wouldn't entirely reorient the system
 - b. Different states have different needs. For example, the UBI in California would be different than the UBI in North Dakota as the cost of living is different.
2. [Amadeo of The Balance](#) explains that states don't even provide funding for the welfare programs. In fact, the majority of funding for these programs is given to the states by the U.S. Federal Government; the states just administer the programs.

**A/2: Education Spending

A/2: Women/Abuse

A/2: ODI Evidence

1. The same evidence ALSO concludes in the article that in some cases with a UBI, abuse actually increases. Specifically, results found that emotional abuse of women increased, and one study found that in some circumstances there was an increase in physical abuse towards women when they received larger cash transfer amounts. The warrant is because there's resentment towards women who have an increased income and partners escalating their threats of violence to coerce money from women.

A/2: IPV

1. If the relationships were toxic and abusive, the abusive partners would just steal the victim's UBI because they're literally just checks. If anything that increases dependency on the abuser because now they're perceivably in charge. Welfare is better because it targets the women themselves and is not something that others can take away.
2. Intimate partner violence happens for a multitude of reasons and they vary from case to case. They don't prove why even if they receive more money, that suddenly means they are able to leave the relationship. Indeed, [LOR](#) explains 14 other psychological reasons as to why people choose to stay in abusive relationships, such as social and peer pressure, believing that abuse is normal, the need to care for their children, fear, and trauma. You can't just generalize abusive relationships to be solely caused by financial reasons. It's not a black or white thing.
3. [Brooks of Michigan State University](#) explains that women can't leave abusive relationships not because of their lack of money, but because abusive partners use coercion or fraud to access credit in their partner's name to tank their credit scores. That way, they have to depend on their users because they can't access resources as an independent. This means there are alternative reasons as to why they financially stay in relationships, just handing them \$1,000 won't solve.
4. [Wohlforth of ADN](#) in 2018 reports that Alaska, a state structured around a universal basic income, has some of the worst rates of social problems including sexual assault and violence. Their arguments are empirically untrue.
5. Welfare solves better than a UBI would. [The National Resource Center on Domestic Violence](#) writes that welfare programs are key for escaping domestic abuse. They explain that the combination of housing, health care, food, and transportation is crucial to giving someone time to acclimate to a new (and healthy) normal. Once they adapt to the change, they are able to build confidence and pride and independent financial stability.

A/2: Trafficking

1. UBI isn't accessible to most human trafficking victims - if you are being held physically or mentally, you probably can't get access to a bank account or actual cash.
2. Trafficking could worsen. When control over an individual now means control over thousands of dollars that they received every month or year, the incentive to control those people and consequently that source of income, becomes much stronger.

A/2: Welfare Worse

**A/2: Inefficiencies

1. Impact?

Rily not that inefficient

The major programs have administrative costs ranging between 1 percent (EITC) and 8.7 percent (housing vouchers), each proportionate to how much observation of recipients there is. Weighted, the average administrative cost is about 5 percent. To put this in perspective, compare it with private charity. According to estimates by Givewell, their most favored charities spend 11 percent on administrative costs, significantly more than is spent on these programs. More to the point, there isn't a lot of fat here. If all the administrative costs were reduced to 1 percent, you'd save around \$25 billion dollars. That's not going to add enough cash to create a floor under poverty, much less a BIG, by any means.

A/2: Disincentivizes Work

1. The EITC, or Earned Income Tax Credit program, prevents dependency. [CBPP in 2019](#) finds that it encourages and rewards work while offsetting federal payroll and income taxes. That's why they conclude that in 2018, the EITC lifted about 5.6 million people out of poverty, including about 3 million children.
2. North American UBI experiments prove the opposite. [Ruckert of the Oxford Academic in 2017](#) writes: a review of North American UBI experiments from the 1970s found that very few participants in UBI schemes actually withdrew from the labor market after qualifying for UBI, and that overall work efforts did not diminish significantly, and individuals who choose to reduce their workload were mothers and adolescent males who left school or university for financial reasons.
 - a. Specifically in Ontario, [McFarland in 2017](#) finds that there was no meaningful reduction in labour force participation after a basic income.

- b. [Lucchesi of Inverse in 2018](#) describes how in Alaska it actually *increased* part-time work by 17 percent. The Alaskan version of basic income was found to “increase the employment-to-population ratio by about 3 percentage points.”

A/2: Poverty Trap

1. Do the comparative analysis. We'd argue that lifting these people out of poverty is still comparatively better than handing everyone \$1,000, crossing your fingers and hoping that the impoverished can work up the income ladder themselves.
2. The welfare trap is an oversimplified myth because it's not a certain threshold where you immediately just lose all your benefits. Every different program has [different eligibility requirements](#), so your benefits phase out as you work up the income ladder to accommodate the progress.
3. [Adolphsen of the FGA](#) reports that only 1% of welfare recipients are within even 10% of the welfare cliff. Their argument has a very small scope.
4. [Isaac Shapiro of the CBPP](#) in 2016 explains that in an overwhelming majority of cases, adults in poverty are significantly better off if they get a job and work more hours. Because of reforms in the past two decades that make what analysts call a “work-based safety net,” there are substantially increased incentives for people in poverty to work now. That's why he concludes that workers in poverty typically have a greater incentive to work more hours. The people who aren't working choose not to for alternative reasons.
5. [Shapiro](#) continues that for most poor families, their credits grow with each additional dollar earned, lowering their marginal tax rates and increasing incentives to work. That's why studies have repeatedly shown that programs like the EITC have increased the share of workers, not the opposite.

A/2: Racism

1. By their logic, the reason racism occurs is because the government functionally and structurally is racist through their policies. Means-tested welfare was meant to combat racism, but just because it sounds ideal doesn't mean it'll happen. That means the same strings would exist in a world with a UBI as well, and they'll find ways to structurally oppress minorities.
2. [Jan of the Washington Post](#) in 2019 in a meta-analysis finds that Black Americans are the most likely to receive assistance, with 85% of those in poverty receiving aid. Among whites, there are only 70%. That's why Gould '18 finds that poverty for Blacks has fallen by 12% in the last 40 years while only 2% for whites.
3. [Moffitt of the National Academic Press](#) explains that the differences in welfare engagement across race and ethnic groups can be explained by the differences in income, family structure, employment, and education – concluding there is no difference in the stigma of welfare receipt across racial groups.

4. We solve racism better, as [Goulden of JRF](#) in 2018 explains that replacing welfare with a UBI would increase child poverty by 60%, and the [NCCP](#) explains that minorities are far more likely to be in poverty as a child than whites.

Immigrants

help

Black Americans are the most likely to receive assistance, with 85 percent of those in poverty receiving at least one form of aid. Hispanics and Asians are the least likely, with 66 percent and 67 percent, respectively. Among whites, 70 percent receive at least one benefit.

A/2: TANF Bad

1. Don't let them overblow this one program to warrant a complete replacement of the overall means-tested welfare system. [Trisi of the CBPP](#) in 2019 finds that welfare lifts 43 million out of poverty, so the programs are still on-net a good thing.
2. Even then, the CBPP in 2018 reports that the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program still lifted 349,000 people out of deep poverty in just one year alone.

A/2: Worked in Other Places

A/2: General

1. These are flawed comparisons because these countries are much smaller than the US, meaning that it's administratively so much easier to run and much cheaper.
2. These other countries literally didn't replace their means-tested welfare programs when they implemented their basic income systems. It's not the same.
3. All of their studies are just isolating the benefits of a UBI. Even if they are right that a UBI is beneficial to some extent in some other countries, they are not doing the comparative of a UBI being better than welfare programs enough to replace them, which is what the resolution is asking us to do. For example, just because orange juice is good for me in that it gives me vitamin C does not mean that I should replace my daily routine of drinking 8 cups of water with 8 cups of orange juice.
4. [Gentilini of Brookings](#) in 2017 explains that while there are plenty of ongoing trials around the world, each one misses at least one key feature of a true universal basic income if not most of its defining elements. He concludes that while the other countries serve as important in understanding the fundamental concept, it can't be compared to a true UBI implemented in the United States.

A/2: Alaska

1. Alaska's population is way smaller compared to the United States, and the only reason a basic income worked in the past 40 years was because they capitalized on a massive oil boom. However, [Rosen of ITT](#) reports that Alaska's oil-boom days are over, leaving massive holes in the state budget and creating struggles to fund the UBI now.

A/2: Finland

1. According to [Thirdway in 2018](#) the program in Finland was literally stopped a year into its implementation because the Finnish government couldn't keep up with the funding, and they chose instead to pursue alternative social welfare projects.

A/2: Other

A/2: Welfare Getting Cut Now

1. [Greenstein of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities](#) finds that conservatives support means tested welfare programs more than they do UBIs because they are substantially lower cost. That means that if anything, they'll push to cut UBI funding in their world as well.
2. [Davidson of the Wall Street Journal](#) writes just last week that Trump's proposals to gut welfare programs are unlikely to become law, as Democrats control the House and spending bills in the GOP-led Senate need bipartisan support. She furthers that democrats have already signalled their opposition, stating that the plan is "destructive and irrational."

A/2: Roosevelt Study

1. [Matthews of Vox](#) explains that the Roosevelt study is extremely flawed, as it makes two huge assumptions of
 - a. A basic income not discouraging work at all
 - b. Households not responding to changes in their tax burden
2. The Roosevelt model is also predicated on the idea that any negative effect due to the deficit would just be offset by huge economic growth caused by increased demand. It's extremely flawed and counterintuitive logic.

A/2: Welfare Gets Wasted

1. Turn. [Fernandez of Vox](#) in 2018 explains that the monetary assistance and re-training welfare programs provide directly keep 44.9 million people out of poverty every single year. Just last year alone, welfare lifted an additional 200,000 people out of poverty.

**A/2: Wildquist

A/2 Con

A/2: Government Spending

A/2: Increasing Taxes

1. Their argument doesn't
2. Their arguments assume that debt and interest rates are directly correlated, but our debt has been progressively increasing for years now. By their logic, interest rates should've also been on a steady increase, but [Bartash of MarketWatch](#) explains that the U.S. saw historic lows for their interest rates in 2018.
3. History disproves, **Tamny '17** finds that while the U.S deficit has soared 20-fold, treasury yields have declined by 8%, and **Hall '13** explains that the last 30 years prove debt has no effect on interest rates
4. **Cox '18** explains that because market prices declined 14% last month alone the Fed will not raise interest rates because it would lead to runaway inflation.
5. Turn, **Colombo '18** explains that lower interest rates create asset bubbles by A) making it cheaper to borrow money and speculate in assets, and B) discouraging holding cash versus speculation in riskier assets, finding that lower interest rates have caused nearly every U.S recession in the last 30 years.

A/2: UBI Expensive

1. [Fouksman of Quartz](#) explains that the UBI cost estimates that they cite just directly multiply the size of the UBI by the population which over-inflates the number. However, they don't account for the net beneficiaries, net contributors, and the rate at which we gradually switch people over from being beneficiaries to contributors as they get more money.
2. Indeed, [Widerquist of Georgetown University in 2018](#) finds that a UBI of \$12,000 a year could be paid for with welfare spending, only costing 25% of current welfare.

**A/2: VAT

1. Only yang's plan includes vat cause it doesn't wipe out all MTW- vat p unlikely given its economic unpopularity
2. Yang 2020- even if prices rise
 - a. Competition checks back prices skyrocketng

- b. Youd have to pay 12k extra in taxes for it to effect like your ubi but if u paying like 1\$ or something extra a week on taxes
3. Vat good- cut turns
4. Vat good checks back automation/ puts it off- turn outweighs bc automation kills jobs

A/2: Debt

*****A/2: Debt Increasing

A/2: Crowd Out

1. There is no limit to the amount of debt the US government can have. [Coppola of Forbes](#) in 2018 explains that for advanced economies in good standing, the government's debt capacity appears to be infinite. This is because foreign creditors will always need to buy US debt for a few reasons:
 - a. Because the U.S. debt is just about the safest investment. [Amadeo at The Balance](#) in 2018 writes that purchasers of Treasury bills are always confident that America has the economic power to pay them back. The U.S. has never defaulted on a loan before.
 - b. The dollar is the reserve currency. [Zoffer of Harvard University](#) in 2012 writes that the use of the US Treasury securities in currency reserves has created an almost unlimited demand for US debt. This artificially high demand means that the United States can issue debt at extremely low interest rates, especially relative to its national debt. No nation wants to call in its debt for fear that it would devalue the rest of its dollar holding.
2. [Grisham of US News](#) in 2015 explains that in the last 60 years, whenever the United States reached their debt ceiling, they just raised it even higher. Insofar as they've already done it 78 times, they can always just continue doing so.

A/2: Interest Rates Rise

A/2: Foreign Aid

1. Four reasons the U.S. will never cut aid
 - a. [Thrush](#) of the New York Times in 2018 writes that Trump is embracing a massive expansion of foreign aid because he wants to counter China's growing geo-political influence in Africa and Latin America.
 - b. [Solomon](#) of the Financial Post writes in 2019 that Trump uses threats of foreign aid cuts to bribe countries to do his bidding. Cutting aid holistically would

jeopardize this leverage. For example, Trump used an aid cut of 200 million dollars to Palestinians to try and force them to come to peace talks.

- c. Foreign aid won't be the main target for debt reduction efforts because the [Borgen Report in 2018](#) finds that foreign aid takes up an incredibly marginal amount of the deficit. We'd say politicians are much likelier to cut in other directions that will significantly impact the debt.
 - d. [Foreign Policy in 2016](#) writes that 6 pieces of *bipartisan* aid legislation has passed, providing aid for things like water, energy, and food sustainability. If the advocacy to increase aid is garnering bipartisan support then there's a low likelihood it gets cut in the AFF. It also says that Trump is likely to embrace this bipartisan approach. We're fine.
2. Foreign aid is bad.
- a. Foreign aid cripples recipient nations' economies through predatory loans: Malik of The [Guardian](#) in 2018 explains that a high proportion of foreign aid is given through loans, making the recipient nation become indebted, paying back more in interest payments to the US than they were given
 - b. [Deaton](#) of Princeton University in 2015 writes that foreign aid makes regimes less accountable to the people because they no longer rely on them as much as a source of revenue. As such, they hold no incentive to please their constituents, creating unrest and an incentive to revolt, citing Rwanda, Ethiopia, and Somalia as examples of countries where aid created a divide between the government and people, facilitating conflict and oppression
 - c. [Gryting of the GAB in 2017](#) explains^[1] that 76% of current foreign aid goes to corrupt nations. That's bad because [Murray of the Center for Policy Analysis in 2013](#) explains^[2] that additional revenue to corrupt nations worsens the conditions of their people and turns into a backdoor source funding for the arms trade. This outweighs their impact on probability because most of the aid is going to countries which use the revenue to worsen conditions for their people, not the positive cherry picked stats they read.
 - d. [Layton of BYU](#) explains^[3] foreign aid is associated with income inequality, because foreign aid flows through the wealthy bureaucratic structures of governments before finally making their way down to the people who need it.
 - e. [Rajan of the NBER](#) finds^[4] empirically, increasing aid by 1% of the GDP decreases economic growth by 0.1% per year. Prefer this evidence over our opponents because it checks for long term growth, while theirs only looks at short term growth. This is because although aid in the short term might provide some economic boost, in the long term it increases dependency and decreases the incentive for governments to take active steps to be accountable for their people.
 - f. [Kono '13](#) of UC Davis writes that the foreign aid that has flowed into many developing nations has simply fallen into military coffers and not actually helping the people. This approach makes a lot of sense to a corrupt leader, since they retain control through coercion and will always prioritize giving resources to their small groups of supports and military establishments. That's why [Collier '07](#) of

Oxford University writes that a 1% increase in foreign aid results in a 3.3% increase in military spending. This plays out in real life; he continues that 40% of African military spending is financed by aid. Thus, [Bluhm '16](#) of the Swiss Economic Institute writes that a 1% increase in aid increases the probability of escalation of conflict by 1.4%.

A/2: Emerging Markets

1. No correlation. [The World Bank](#) found that when interest rates were peaking in 2007 at 4%, the United States was giving \$523 billion to emerging markets. But after the recession when rates were near 0, we were giving \$300b. Now, rates are hovering around \$400b.
2. U.S interest rate hikes won't affect them, as [Mimh of Bloomberg in 2018](#) furthers that differing commodity prices and growth are the cause of varying interest rates, not the U.S.
3. Non-unique for two reasons:
 - a. [Srivastava of CNBC in 2018](#) finds that emerging markets are experiencing changes in government pushing for economic reform, bringing in investors.
 - b. [Isbitts of Forbes in 2018](#) finds that the slowing Chinese economy and trade war has slowed investment in emerging markets
5. [The Financial Times in 2011](#) writes that after the 2011 downturn, investors quickly bought treasury bonds because they still viewed it as safe, and thus lowering interest rates. If the market crashes and lowers interest this turns their argument.
5. Delink. [Vaishampayan](#) of Wall Street Journal in 2017 writes that the dollar has been weakening relative to emerging market currencies, so investors are staying in emerging markets, preventing any capital flight and higher interest rates in other countries.
6. Delink. [Spiro](#) of the South China Morning Post in 2018 writes that inflows into emerging markets reached a record high across the board last year despite three interest rate hikes. Thus, he continues that the reduced investment in specific emerging markets is due to domestic factors, not external ones.
7. Delink. [Vaishampayan](#) of Wall Street Journal in 2018 writes that emerging markets don't raise interest rates when America does anymore because low inflation makes hikes impossible. That's why [Mihm](#) of Bloomberg writes that historically has not happened. In the 1980s, despite the Fed increasing interest rates consistently, private capital continued flowing into emerging markets. In fact, he continues in 2006, the Fed increased the rate to an all-time high of 5.25% and yet private capital actually increased into those countries.

A/2: Credit Downgrade

1. There's absolutely no brightline or clarity of link for this argument. It's heavily uncontextualized.

2. [Burton of MarketWatch](#) in 2013 writes that after 2011's downgrading of the debt, the stock market and bond market immediately bounced back, which is why there wasn't a recession during this time period.
3. [Moody Research in 2018](#) explains that because of America's exceptional economic strength and low exposure to credit-related shocks, America's credit outlook is always strong.
4. [Reuters in 2011](#) finds that credit agencies have lost a tremendous amount of influence on the global market after 2011 downgrade - not much influence on investors anymore

A/2: Private Investment Crowd Out

1. [Snyder of WP University in 2012](#) explains that empirically, the increased economic growth generated from tax cuts or spending increases outweighs any marginal decrease in private investment
2. [Rosenberg in 2018](#) finds that there has been little evidence of "crowding-out" occurring, because the U.S consumer savings pool is too large to be affected, which is why [Hall in 2013](#) explains that historically every time the U.S ran large deficits, it did not raise the cost of money and did not crowd out investment
3. Turn. [Kahn in 2018](#) explains that because increased interest rates also increase the rate of return on low volatility assets--it raises rewards of investing. He concludes that a 1% increase in government borrowing increases the return on safe assets by .6% and increases total investment by 13%.
4. Turn. Strong economic growth increases overall consumer confidence and thus investment. Empirically, [Amadeo in 2018](#) finds that consumer confidence recently hit an 18 year high due to strong economic growth.

A/2: Cutting Military

1. Turn. [Schwartz of the New York Times](#) in 2018 explains that just paying the interest on the debt will overtake the Department of Defense budget in 4 years. Not resolving the debt means even less money allocated to the military in the long-term.
2. No probability of this argument occurring.
 - a. [Lebowitz of Business Insider](#) in 2018 explains that Trump has recently reversed course and has proposed to increase defense spending to \$750 billion.
 - b. [Shane of Military Times](#) in 2018 explains that Republicans will not allow any cuts to military spending, and have even released a plan to boost spending in 2020.
3. No impact. [Wilford of Washington Examiner in 2018](#) concludes that we could cut several useless military programs, and save hundreds of billions, without harming our military readiness at all.
4. [McCarthy of the Guardian](#) in 2018 explains that the U.S is the world's biggest military spender, outspending the next eight countries combined, yet has the highest mortality rate in the developed world
 - a. Military taking a small hit won't be that bad
 - B. Should prioritize impacts with greater effect on people

A/2: Politicians Won't Pass Stimulus

1. [USA Today](#) in 2017 writes that there is no political pressure to actually reduce the debt both parties have switched from fiscally conservative platforms in 2013 to now completely ballooning the deficit (tax cuts, social spending), which is why every president since Clinton has drastically increased the debt.
2. [Bloomberg](#) in 2018 writes that the deficit is down to number 14 in voter priorities no one really cares about debt.
3. [Gallup](#) in 2009 finds the public support for a stimulus package was over 59%, people want things that help the econ
4. [Ausherback](#) of Berkeley University in 2017 writes that policymakers will always have flexibility for fiscal stimulus because the stimulus pays for itself by raising revenues, indicating that this is never a problem.

A/2: Fiscal Stimulus

1. Government can always release a fiscal stimulus:
 - a. [Roche in 2018](#) explains that the deficit-to-GDP ratio was 6.5% higher before the 2008 fiscal stimulus than it is now, yet inflation did not spike
 - B. The government can just take out more debt to pay, 2008 stimulus was only 800 billion versus the 21 trillion debt
2. [Sparshott of The Wall Street Journal](#) explains why we can still pass stimulus, even after accounting for debt to GDP ratio. The U.S. always remains the best investment option as the global economy declines- we will always have funding which he concludes allows for a fiscal stimulus.
3. [Litan of Brookings in 2018](#) explains that it is political suicide not to release a fiscal stimulus in a recession because it is one of the policies to uplift the economy.
4. Japan did it. [Harding of the Financial Times](#) in 2016 reports that despite their extremely high amounts of debt, they were able to pass a \$45 billion stimulus package.
5. [Farmer of Governing Magazine](#) finds that the vast majority of states are prepared to survive the recession, concluding they will not need the stimulus. This means the government will have to do a lot less than they predict and can still pass a small stimulus at best, or states can redistribute.

A/2: UBI Bad

A/2: Disincentivizes Work

1. People can't live off of \$12,000 a year, there's still an incentive to find a source of income through work.
2. [Hanna of Harvard](#) in 2015 in a meta-analysis of 7 studies finds that there is no systematic evidence that cash transfer programs discourage work.
3. [Marinescu of NBER](#) in 2018 in another meta-analysis finds that there is no significant effect on labor supply, and that cash transfers if anything improve health and educational outcomes while decreasing criminality and drug & alcohol use.
4. [Gohd of Futurism](#) writes in 2018 that in Alaska, after they implemented a universal basic income, not only did employment not decrease, but the number of people in part-time work actually increased by a significant 17%
5. [Santens of the WEF](#) in 2017 writes that welfare is what disincentivizes work because if people get paid to work, they lose all of their benefits. He explains that with basic income, all income from paid work is earned as additional income. Thus, he concludes that a UBI doesn't disincentivize work, but rather it removes the existing disincentive to work that welfare creates in the status quo.

The greatest cause of poverty in America today is the current welfare system itself. That is because the incentives of the welfare system lead people to take the counterproductive actions that cause poverty in the first place – not working, or non-work, and single mothers bearing children outside of marriage.

Today In: [Opinion](#)

Taxpayers today are paying the poorest people in America a trillion dollars a year not to work. And so that is what they are doing in response. In 1960, nearly two-thirds of U.S. households in the lowest-income one-fifth of the population were headed by persons who worked. But after the War on Poverty began in 1965, by 1991 this work effort had declined by about 50 percent, with only one-third of household heads in the bottom 20 percent in income working at all, and only 11 percent working full-time, year-round. One central reason for the inequality between the top 20% and the bottom 20% is that

according to the Census Bureau families in the top 20% work 16 times as much as families in the bottom 20%.

**A/2: Inequality

1. [Gorbis of Quartz](#) finds that UBI increases Access to public resources public education, healthcare, nature, and transportation infrastructure—are important assets that serve as a great economic equalizer.
2. Income inequality has literally reaches all time highs UNDER WELFARE

Example: Nordic countries consistently come out on top of global rankings of social mobility. Just think: In Denmark, the chances of reaching the [top fifth of income levels](#) (pdf) during your lifetime are virtually the same for children born to poor families compared to those born into wealthy ones. The chance [for the same children](#) living in Charlotte, Columbus, or Atlanta is 5%, and for those from Memphis only 2.8%. This is largely because of the differences in access to public assets.

<https://www.counterpunch.org/2019/12/17/the-case-for-a-universal-basic-income/>

The **closest model to a sustained UBI program is the Alaskan Permanent Fund Dividend**, a royalty payment program derived from the state-owned and managed Alaska Permanent Fund. The Fund is an investment of oil and gas royalties established by Republican Governor Jay Hammond in 1976 and paid for by mineral companies. Dividends from the Alaska Permanent Fund—now worth \$65 billion—are distributed to nearly all Alaskan citizens and range from about \$1000 to \$2000 per year. **Strikingly, Alaska had the highest poverty and inequality rates of all US states when the fund was established. Twenty years later, they were the lowest.**

A/2: Inflation

1. Inflation only occurs when the federal reserve prints more money into our economy. However, the UBI doesn't constitute the printing of new money, as [Jameson of Medium in 2019](#) explains that the money used to pay for a UBI is money already in the economy in the form of welfare and tax allowances.
2. This has proven true in the real world. [UBI Earth](#) compiles data from places that have tested a universal basic income and found that a UBI did not have any effect on inflation

in places like Lebanon, Sub Saharan Africa, and Mexico. In fact, inflation even decreased after a UBI in places like Alaska and Kuwait.

- a. Specifically, [Santens 14](#) confirms in Kuwait, inflation decreased from record levels down to the targeted 4% after the imposition of a basic income program.
3. Even if a UBI drives inflation, automation offsets the effect so that prices don't actually increase. [Bartash of MarketWatch](#) in 2019 explains that automation has made production costs exponentially lower and profit margins much higher, allowing companies to significantly decrease prices. For example, Amazon literally sells products at a loss because they can afford to do so. That's exactly why inflation has remained low in the past few years even in the face of the usual telltale signs of rising prices.

A/2: Demand-Pull Inflation

1. [Velocity of money is at an all time low](#) right now which means there's a lot of room to grow without threatening price increases because the amount of supply is heavily outpacing demand. This means that even if demand skyrockets, prices won't spike
2. They have to prove the empirics as to whether it's gonna out-pace or not because there's no numbers or evidence stating that the increase in prices is gonna overcome all the money. Even if inflation increases, they don't prove it's enough to offset the value of the money that people are getting.
3. Even if prices increase, it's not an immediate rise which means that a UBI still has short term effects. For example, if milk rises by 2 cents but you're getting a thousand dollars a month more then your consumption isn't really going to go down.
4. This assumes the supply of goods is inelastic otherwise there is no reason as to why demand would outpace supply. For example, if people want to buy more iPhones with their money, Apple can just produce more iPhones.
5. Delink. [Jameson of The Medium](#) finds that Basic Income will be *instead* of most other welfare payments and *instead* of personal tax allowances — not as well as — so people, on average won't suddenly have lots of extra buying-power.
6. UBI.earth explains that contrary to skeptics, the positive effect on production and growth caused by a UBI means that the elasticity of supply would offset any inflationary pressure. That's why inflation didn't increase in other places that implemented a UBI, and inflation in [Alaska and Kuwait even decreased](#).

A/2: Misuse

1. [Coleman of Futurism](#) finds that UBI experiments had recipients spending about 40% of the funds on food, 24% of sales and merchandise, and 11% on utility bills, spending the remainder on car maintenance, medical expenses, insurance, education, self care, and even donations. Their argument is just empirically outweighed.
2. [Popova of Stanford University](#) reports in a meta-analysis that concerns about the use of cash transfers for alcohol, tobacco, and other temptation goods are unfounded. He

concludes that on average, cash transfers actually have the opposite effect, decreasing the total expenditure of temptation goods by -0.18 standard deviations.

3. When you assume that all impoverished people just spend the money on drugs and alcohol, you degrade their ability to make good decisions and ultimately villainize them, adding to their stigma. It's problematic to reinforce the idea that all poor people are addicts rather than addressing the underlying socioeconomic factors.

A/2: Increasing Socialism

1. They say it's a socialist policy, but there is literally no impact to this argument.
2. [Rubio of the Journal Blog in 2019](#) explains that the UBI is by no means a leftist concept, but one that has been pondered by several economists, pragmatists, and policy makers willing to think beyond the traditional welfare state paradigm. He concludes that socialism seeks to redistribute wealth by nationalizing industries and the means of production, but the UBI maintains the market economy. In no way are we advocating that the government takes control of the economy and suppress political discourse.

A/2: Less Work Hours

1. Turn. While work hours may decrease, it's not like they do it without keeping in mind their best interests. The decrease is actually a good thing, as [Hoynes of Berkeley](#) in 2019 explains that a UBI would loosen constraints, allowing more education investment and on-the-job training so that mid-career workers who can't forgo earnings in the status quo can translate the time into higher wages in the future.
2. Turn. Taking time off stops worker burnout increasing productivity [Harris of the Guardian](#) in 2018 quantifies that in New Zealand, an extra day off per week, or a 20% decrease in working hours, led to a 20% increase in productivity, stress levels decreased by 7%, and work-life balance scores increased by 24%. Quality over quantity.

**A/2: Automatic Stabilizer

1. According to the [CBO](#), [changes in tax] revenues have accounted for about three-quarters, on average, of the effect of automatic stabilizers on the budget over the past 50 years not spending increases.

Fiscal stimulus disad--- consumption turn

**A/2: Immigration

1. [Cato Institute](#)- ineligible for means tested welfare.

A/2: Welfare Better

A/2: General

1. [Jan of the Washington Post](#) reports in 2019 that tens of millions of people currently living below the poverty line are disconnected from federal programs despite qualifying for them. It's a flawed system and my opponents are only isolating the benefits for the people who benefit, as [the other 73%](#) of the impoverished are suffering in the status quo. For example, if only 2 students in a class understand the material, the teacher's curriculum should not be considered successful just because some people are being benefited from it.
 - a. Indeed, [Santens of TechCrunch](#) in 2016 explains that most programs are accessible to only a quarter of people who need them and that a UBI would be comparatively better because you're helping EVERYONE.
2. Even if they're right that welfare programs are good, they are not proving that the system is comparatively better than a UBI. [The U.S. Census Bureau](#) quantifies that in dollar amount, the average monthly payment benefit for American welfare recipients is only \$404. A UBI not only gives more than double this amount, but they also give it to those who aren't receiving benefits at all without any constraints and much more freedom with their financial choices.

A/2: SNAP

1. The SNAP program seems like they provide a lot of money for food, but [the National Association of Counties](#) reports that in actuality the average SNAP benefit per person was only about \$126 per month, which works out to about \$1.40 per person for every meal. That's nowhere near enough for people to survive.
2. Nonunique. [Dickinson of The Atlantic](#) in 2019 finds that Trump recently approved a new rule that forces harsher work requirements for SNAP that will cut off 700,000 recipients – since they were left behind the only way to ensure those 700,000 get money is through a UBI.
3. Turn. SNAP actually worsens inequality. [Erika Eichelberger of Mother Jones](#) explains that SNAP forces applicants to undergo "asset tests" to show that they do not own more than \$2,000 in savings or \$5,000 in personal assets. This is harmful because asset tests disincentivize people from saving money or going out to find better paying jobs, because making too much money would disqualify recipients from more help. He concludes that SNAP forces the poor to accept long-term poverty in exchange for short-term assistance, pushing people to live on the margins and preventing a real solution to inequality.
4. Turn. [Tanner of CATO](#) explains that SNAP is fraud-ridden and creates a dependency trap where people begin using the program as a permanent source of income as opposed to a temporary safety net. They are never actually going to live a flexible life in their world.

5. We solve this issue. A world without food stamps incentivizes social mobility to escape the trap, as [Brownback of the Hill](#) explains that in Kansas, when they implemented reforms to move people off food stamps, more than half of these people began working immediately, and 60% of them saw their income increase by over 127% in the first year alone, offsetting the food stamps lost and making them more financially secure.

A/2: Housing Vouchers

1. The housing system is absolutely atrocious, as [Matthews of Vox](#) reports that despite millions of people qualifying for housing assistance, 76% of the people do not actually receive any assistance. The system is determined by a lottery, and if you aren't lucky, you just have to accept your unfortunate fate.
2. Terminal defense. [Semuels of the Atlantic](#) explains that housing assistance has no solvency for two reasons:
 - a. Outdated voucher pricing isn't enough to overcome the rising costs of rent or homeownership.
 - b. Tenants favor real cash over government IOUs, and thus refuse to accept Section 8 housing assistance if there are other renters out there who can offer their actual income
3. Their argument doesn't align with reality. [Lucas Waldron of the Oakland City Council](#) writes that in some counties, voucher usage increased rent prices by 14.1%, hurting people on and off the program.
4. Turn. [Paramark](#) explains that the Section 8 housing program is underfunded so the waiting time to receive your voucher can be up to years, which traps people in poverty in the short-term. They won't receive the housing assistance that they need in time.
5. Turn. [Olsen of the University of Virginia](#) quantifies that housing assistance has a substantial disincentive effect on the poor; it leads to lower labor earnings because people won't work if the government is paying their rent. He writes that recipients of vouchers lose \$3,600 of income every year.

A/2: Pell Grants

1. [Robinson of the John Williams Pop Center in 2012](#) finds that although pell grants increase college participation, it hasn't led to any tangible increase in graduation among low-income students. In fact, she concludes that if anything it's decreased education levels by 2 percent.
2. [Waldman of the Atlantic](#) finds that that pell grants are associated with lower completion rates. 51% of pell students graduate, compared to 65% of non-pell students, because pell grants just throw the students into low income schools.
3. UBI solves better for child education. [Widerquist of the BIEN in 2018](#) finds that with the Basic Income Grant in Namibia, more than double the number of parents paid school fees and the parents prioritized the buying of school uniforms. More children are now attending school and the stronger financial situation has enabled the school to improve

teaching material for the pupils. The school principal reported that drop-out rates at her school were cut by up to 35%

A/2: EITC

1. [Verbruggen of IF Studies](#) in 2019 explains that in the largest study of the EITC ever conducted, there was no causal increase in the labor-force participation rate and the benefits are simply attributable to an improving economy. Probably because people have an incentive to find work anyways.
2. [The CBPP](#) reports that the average EITC for families with children was \$3000 and the average without is just \$300. A UBI is substantially more.
3. [Edwards of CATO in 2015](#) explains that the EITC has a phase-out rate, which means if you pass an income threshold you no longer receive benefits. 3/4ths of EITC recipients are in this phase-out range meaning they have an incentive to work less. For this reason, he concludes that the EITC reduces overall U.S. output and employment.
4. Poverty reduction through the EITC is entirely temporary. [Sabrina Tavernise of the New York Times](#) explains that most people who receive credit fall back into the same cycle of poverty and reliance on credit within the year. This is for two reasons:
 - a. The EITC is a windfall payment, meaning all of it is received as a lump-sum at one point in the year. This makes it really hard to manage, especially because the poor have generally low financial literacy rates.
 - b. 90% of the money paid out from credit is spent immediately on durables or desirables, meaning it fails to address the fundamental lack of human capital necessary to escape poverty.
5. Turn. The EITC program discourages sustainable labor. [Chris Edwards of the Cato Institute](#) writes that the EITC produces a negative income effect leading to a reduction in hours worked. This is because as employees log hours, the corresponding benefits of tax credits start to phase out. As a result, 75% of recipients observe negative work incentives to reduce wages. Indeed, **Paul Trampe of George Mason University** looks to the 1993 expansion of the EITC program and finds that it empirically led to 8 hours less worked per week.

A/2: TANF

1. The benefits of TANF are only temporary, as they [only last for a maximum of five years](#). Even if one were fortunate enough to receive \$1,000 per month through TANF, a UBI would do the same thing but over an entire lifespan.
2. [Santens of TechCrunch](#) reports in 2016 that barely anyone even receives the assistance. For example, in Oklahoma, only 7% of people in poverty receive TANF, while in Wyoming only 1% do. She concludes that cash welfare, as it exists today, is not given to the overwhelming majority of those living in poverty who need it.
3. [Vallas of American Progress](#) in 2015 furthers that only 1 in 4 TANF dollars goes to families, with the rest going to states for other purposes. Also, no state provides TANF benefits of even half the federal poverty level, which explains why it does little to nothing

to mitigate poverty and hardship. He concludes that reducing poverty isn't even one of the program's four core goals.

4. Even if TANF was once really effective, [Covert of ThinkProgress](#) in 2017 explains that the program is a block grant system, where states get a fixed amount of money no matter the circumstances. Because the amount of money hasn't increased for decades, inflation has decreased the value of the program by 36%. It's only going to get more and more useless if you negate; it's time for change.

A/2: Medicaid

1. UBI is a prerequisite to their argument, because giving people the money they need to actually maintain a healthy and sustainable lifestyle would supercede a system where the government dictates what the people can and can't do. This means that less people will need the health coverage in our world as they live healthier lives in the first place.
2. Even if you buy that Medicaid is somewhat good, funding for the program is being decreased now. [CBPP](#) in 2019 reports that Trump has approved state Medicaid restrictions like eligibility waivers that have cut off millions from care. Problematically, [Matthews of Vox](#) explains that states have begun pushing for work requirements in Medicaid, which would cut off 2/3rds of recipients. That's why [Goodnough of the New York Times](#) just two weeks ago wrote a similar shift in 2018 led to 17,000 people in Arkansas losing coverage in 2018. You preserve their care through a UBI.
3. Two warrants for why Medicaid is counterproductive:
 - a. [Roy of Forbes](#) explains that Medicaid pays hospitals and doctors less than 60% of private what private insurers pay, so they refuse Medicaid patients. As a result, they go to emergency rooms instead of a doctor that has routine checkups and preventative care. That's why [Gottlieb of Forbes](#) finds that people enrolled in Medicaid are 40% more likely to end up in the emergency room than their uninsured counterparts.
 - b. [Waldman](#) in 2017 explains that Medicaid prohibits recipients from receiving free charity care, which is why traffic through free clinics has declined substantially.
4. Delink. [Roy of Forbes](#) cites a two-year Oregon study that concluded that Medicaid generated no significant improvement in measured physical health outcomes. In fact, he concludes that patients on Medicaid are 13% more likely to die than those without any insurance and have higher medical costs.
5. [Corbett of the Atlantic in 2019](#) explains that Medicaid isn't truly free, and that it's the only welfare program that functions more as a loan where recipients are expected to repay the government for medical expenses; states will seize houses and other assets after the recipients die in order to satisfy the debt. There have already been multiple cases of this happening where the government requests hundreds of thousands of dollars. Even if Medicaid saves lives, they are ultimately using their own money in the form of loans anyways.

6. Medicaid isn't that great. [Davidson in 2016](#) explains that Medicaid is a prime example of a program that is systematically abused. The state agency in charge of Medicaid pays managed care organizations to take care of the enrollees, but the MCOs have a vested interest in paying as little as possible to keep as much of the initial contracted money for themselves. That's why he finds that there were over \$124.7 billion in Medicaid fraud in just one year alone.

**A/2: Child Poverty

1. We are a prerequisite to their argument. [Hoynes of Berkeley](#) explains that a UBI would increase families' resources when children are young, leading to benefits in the children's development, health, and capital attainment, which eventually leads to higher wages, decreasing poverty rates.
2. [Worstell in 2015](#) finds that the average welfare recipient only receives \$9,000 in annual benefits. But a UBI would give single-parent households \$12,000 annually, so it would give them more cash to help raise their children, reducing child poverty.
3. Turn. Their evidence assumes that a UBI wouldn't be given to children, but according to [Matthews of Vox](#) in 2017 explains that children would receive a UBI for 2 reasons:
 - a. Most European countries, Canada, and Japan all give a universal basic income, or at least smaller stipend, to children not just parents.
 - b. The most mainstream universal basic income is Nancy Pelosi's plan, which most democrats support, and is the most politically mainstream plan. And Matthews in 2019 finds that Romney and Democrat Michael Bennet announced a plan that would give a UBI to children and it has bipartisan support. He concludes a UBI would cut child poverty by up to 50%.

A/2: Work Requirements

1. Winfree of [Daily Signal](#) reports in 2015 that only two out of more than 80 means-tested welfare programs include even modest work or training requirements. And, for some of the programs like [SNAP](#), 36 states waive that requirement, which is why 74% of people who would be forced to work choose not to.
2. Delink. [Levitz of the New York Magazine](#) explains that work requirements fail to genuinely make people self-sufficient. He cites multiple studies to conclude that work requirements have shown little to no effect on family income relative to poverty because the increased earnings are mostly offset by the reduction in cash aid, so families don't see any true net gain in income.

A/2: Medicare/Social Security

1. [Rother of AARP](#) explains that programs like Medicare and Social Security are not welfare programs, despite the belief of some.

