



UBI AFF

Case Overview	2	Framework Extensions.....	28
1AC	3	A2: Solvency Deficits.....	30
Inherency	3	A2: Big Stick Impacts.....	31
Contention 1: Children and Families.....	4	A2: UBI IS UTOPIAN (AFF).....	36
Contention 2: Disability	8	A2: Conditional Cash Transfers	37
Contention 3: Unemployment	11	A2: Other programs failed	38
Solvency.....	15		
Framework: Structural Violence	18		
2AC Case Extensions.....	21		
Children and Families	21		
Disability	23		
Unemployment	25		
Solvency	27		



CASE OVERVIEW

- Inherency
- Advantages
 - Contention 1: Children and Families
 - Contention 2: Disabled people
 - Contention 3: unemployment
- Impact
 - Poverty is one of the leading causes of structural violence.
 - Structural violence is deadly and disproportionately targets low-income minority communities.
 - UBI will create economic growth and allow citizens to meet their basic needs, solving for poverty, which solves for structural violence.
- Plan
 - 6,000 for every adult, 500 per month for those under the top 10% of income
- Framework: Structural Violence
 - Poverty
- Solvency
 - Advocates for dynamic modeling UBI
 - Funding mechanisms? How will it be distributed?
 - Conditional Cash transfer programs
 - Child credit tax
 - Dynamic modeling



1 AC

INHERENCY

Numerous pilots have been launched in the recent years, since UBI first gained public attention in Andrew Yang's 2016 campaign. The pandemic has highlighted the need for UBI even more. However, the government has actively been working against establishing a permanent long term UBI, given the restrictions and means tested requirements of current initiatives. A true UBI has been in the public talks for years, but it never been done before.

INITIAL UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME PILOTS ARE VERY PROMISING, BUT MORE WORK NEEDS TO BE DONE.

Cyrus 2022 (Ramenda Cyrus is the John Lewis Writing Fellow at The American Prospect. "Is America ready for universal basic income?" December 19, 2022 <https://prospect.org/economy/is-america-ready-for-universal-basic-income/>)

The idea of a universal basic income (UBI) was launched into the spotlight in 2016, as a front-and-center piece to Andrew Yang's 2016 presidential bid. While Yang's run was short-lived, the concept of UBI resonated with many Americans. Since the pandemic, a multitude of guaranteed-income pilots have been launched across the country's cities and counties. Recipients report increased financial stability as they use the money to pay bills or buy food for their families. But the pilots, which have been championed by lawmakers, activists, and millionaires alike, are rife with issues. For as much stability as the money brings to recipients, they are also likely to encounter a myriad of challenges before they receive or continue receiving the funds. Now, there are many different iterations on the basic UBI format. What Yang championed was a flat amount (usually \$1,000) of unconditional income that everyone would receive, regardless of who they are. The pilots that have been launched, by contrast, are usually some form of guaranteed income, a type of UBI that puts money in the pockets of specific groups of low-income people, one that is often location-based. While recipients of the funds report increased economic security, whether through the ability to save or through money for food, clothes, and medicine, the pilots struggle to meet the promised needs and to scale up appropriately. The fact that low-income families benefit from more money is so obvious that one wonders why so many pilots are still trying to gather data to prove whether guaranteed income is worth the money and is a positive influence on the lives of recipients. However, even the best independent groups can't possibly meet overall American needs. Only the government can do that—but there is little appetite for huge new benefit programs. Sen. Joe Manchin (D-WV) refused to support the Child Tax Credit expansion mentioned above, and it expired. Even if he had, the program had severe administrative problems that left many poor families out, as did the famous pandemic checks. Soon-Shiong references the ideals of the Black Panther Party and their aspirations for a form of basic income. Ex-mayor Michael Tubbs, who launched Stockton's guaranteed-income program, drew inspiration from the writings of Martin Luther King Jr., who explicitly wrote about guaranteed income, as Smart Cities Dive reported in an interview with Tubbs. "This is not a new idea," Soon-Shiong said. "But it is the most talked-about policy that's never been done before."



CONTENTION 1: CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

Income pilots and other government programs similar to a UBI, have shown a UBI holds numerous of benefits to children and families. Currently, families are struggling. Families struggle to meet basic survival needs, let alone have the money for leisure, or other life fulfilling investments, such as a purchase of a car, house, washing machine etc. Millions of children are in poverty. Benefits include helping children out of the hardships of poverty, giving families more time to spend with their children, increased full time employment, and more financial security, all which resulted in to improved mental and physical health.

WHAT WE CAN LEARN FROM A UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME FOR THE EXPANDED CHILD TAX CREDIT.

Orozco, 21 (Diana Orozco is a Policy Analyst with the Income and Work Supports team at CLASP. She supports the team’s efforts to improve access to benefits for people with low incomes. “What we can learn from universal basic income expanded child tax credit” March 26, 2021

<https://www.clasp.org/blog/what-we-can-learn-universal-basic-income-expanded-child-tax-credit/>)

A basic income pilot in Stockton, California provided \$500 monthly payments to 125 residents with no strings attached. From improved family wellbeing and financial stability to an increase in full-time employment, these positive impacts hold hope for the refundable Child Tax Credit (CTC). While public policy has long focused on in-kind benefits such as health insurance or nutritional supports, mayors and advocates have grown increasingly interested in expanding direct cash support through a universal basic income (UBI). That is, a monthly basic income given to everyone regardless of work or income. It has been discussed as an anti-poverty measure to combat the rise of job loss due to automation as well as an anti-racist tool to address persistent racial wealth gaps that have kept families from meeting basic needs. Due to long-standing systemic inequities in employment and housing, workers disproportionately hold jobs in industries paying low wages that have been hit the hardest during the pandemic, affecting a household’s ability to pay for everyday needs. The first-year results from Stockton’s Economic Empowerment Development (SEED) basic income pilot have shown that families have reduced financial scarcity and opened the door to new opportunities to prepare for the future. Highlighting that participants experienced less month-to-month income volatility, lower anxiety and improved mental and physical health, this allowed participants to improve their financial stability. For parents, it mitigated constant financial worry allowing them to engage more with their children. Research shows that households with children, particularly households of color, experience greater hardships, compared to those without children. These challenges stemming from the ability to afford enough food and spillover effects of parents’ stress about meeting financial needs. When support and resources to meet, those financial needs are tied to complex requirements and administrative burdens, families carry the burden of lost time. The SEED report demonstrated that the \$500 monthly support allowed participants to dedicate time to their relationships and activities that weren’t possible before. Contrary to concerns that cash payments deter employment or job searching, the SEED project showed that there was an increase in full time employment for those that did receive the monthly payment, compared to those who did not. The results also confirmed that participants spent payments on food, home products, utilities and transportation – all everyday needs. Having basic needs met and newly found time, as the monthly income mitigated worries about making ends meet every month, helped reduce the barriers to searching for full time or improved employment opportunities.



A UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME IS MORE BENEFICIAL THAN MEANS-TESTED BENEFITS.

Howard 2023. (Michael W. Howard is a professor emeritus of philosophy at the University of Maine, as well as former president of the U.S. Basic Income Guarantee Network, past co-editor of *Basic Income Studies*, and co-editor, with Karl Widerquist, of two books on Alaska's Permanent Fund Dividend. January 6, 2023 "The Us Could Help Solve its poverty problem with a universal basic income" <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-u-s-could-help-solve-its-poverty-problem-with-a-universal-basic-income/>)

Universal basic income, or UBI, is defined as "a periodic cash payment unconditionally delivered to all on an individual basis, without means-test or work requirement," according to the Basic Income Earth Network. Universal benefits have several advantages over means-tested benefits. They avoid divisions between "us" and "them," removing the stigma associated with targeted benefits. Uptake by the needy, a persistent problem with targeted benefits, is improved when stigma and bureaucratic hurdles are removed. Universal benefits tend to be more popular and hence are more politically secure and better funded. And universal benefits, dispensing with means testing, are easier to administer. The universal child allowance would enroll all children at birth so no child would be excluded. No country has yet introduced a universal basic income sufficient for essential needs. Such research also shows that those who stop working for wages do so for good reasons, such as finishing high school or taking care of young children, and that a modest guaranteed minimum income can enable people to work who otherwise could not. Even if a few people would take the cash without contributing to society, the benefits may substantially outweigh the costs. The norm that every abled person receiving cash payments should be seeking a job can also be challenged. First, holding a job is not the only form of work. Taking care of children and elders is work—work that is performed mostly by women without compensation. A basic income is a way of supporting and recognizing that work without intrusive state monitoring and reinforcement of gendered division of labor. This is obvious in the case of income from inherited wealth, but no less true of income connected to jobs in capital-intensive industries or income involving inherited knowledge and technology. On the negative side, many people with unrecognized disabilities fall between the cracks of targeted cash transfer systems. A basic income is one way to equalize such morally arbitrary luck. Universal basic income does not give people something for nothing so much as equalize everyone's share of the luck. Fair giving and taking would then take place on the basis of a more equitable starting place. In addition to the belief that people will quit their jobs under a basic income, the idea faces another hurdle: apparent cost. A basic income of \$1,000/month for every person in the U.S. would have a gross cost of about \$4 trillion a year. A means-tested minimum income guarantee, which phases out as earned income increases above a threshold, could raise incomes by the same amount for perhaps one sixth of the gross cost of a basic income. However, the net cost to the taxpayers is no greater for basic income than for a means-tested minimum income because the higher taxes some will pay are offset by the basic income they receive. To the extent that the mere fact of "churning"—money going out to everyone, only to be taken back in taxes from some—is an obstacle to political support, the means-tested guaranteed income may be the more politically feasible policy, but it would lose some of the advantages of universal programs.



CURRENT LIVING WAGES ALLOW FOR POVERTY

Fisher, 2012 (Gordon M. Fisher is a scholar, serving for the Office of Secretary-United States Department of Health and Human Services. August 2012 “Standard budgets (basic needs budgets) in the United States since 2006” <https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/working-papers/2012/demo/udusbd3.pdf>)

“A living wage is a wage that allows families to meet their basic needs, without public assistance, and that provides them some ability to deal with emergencies and plan ahead. It is not a poverty wage.” The budgets used to calculate the living wage figures include amounts for savings for retirement and savings for emergencies; these budgets have included savings for retirement and for emergencies ever since the first Northwest Job Gap Study in 1999 (Northwest Policy Center and Northwest Federation of Community Organizations 1999). The North Carolina Justice Center continues to update its Living Income Standard for North Carolina (Sirota with McLenaghan 2011). “The failure of the Federal Poverty Level to capture the full range of factors contributing to economic hardship and the prolonged erosion in the value of the minimum wage have left a need for statistics that enable policymakers to better understand the lives of low-wage working families. To that end,” the Justice Center “created the Living Income Standard (LIS), a market-based approach to estimating how much income a working family with children must earn in order to pay for basic expenses.” “By using conservative estimates, the LIS provides a basic budget for an extremely modest, if not austere, lifestyle.” “Budgets only include essential items and contain no allowances for such luxuries as entertainment, meals eaten outside of the home, cable television, cellular phone service, extracurricular activities and gifts.” The LIS also contains no allowances for savings and debt payments. However, besides figures for the basic LIS, the Justice Center’s 2011 report also presents figures for all North Carolina counties for the LIS with allowances added for savings and debt payments; the Center’s previous report (Quinterno with Gray and Schofield 2009) had presented similar figures on an illustrative basis for three counties. The [Minnesota] JOBS NOW Coalition continues to update basic needs budgets for Minnesota (Ristau, LaFond, and Cederberg 2010). JOBS NOW’s Cost of Living in Minnesota Report “tries to answer questions that reflect the concerns of workers: What is a family-supporting wage? How many jobs pay this kind of wage?” To define a family-supporting wage, “JOBS NOW has created family budgets that measure the cost of meeting basic needs for food, housing, health care, clothing, transportation and child care.” “Our Cost of Living budgets are based on a ‘no-frills’ standard of living....Our budgets make NO allowance for items such as: education or training beyond high school; debt payments, life insurance, retirement and other savings; down payments for a home mortgage; vacations, pets, movies, gifts, and restaurant meals; or big ticket items such as washers, dryers, or refrigerators.”



UBI WILL KEEP MILLIONS OF CHILDREN OUT OF POVERTY.

Greenwell, 2022. (Megan Greenwell is a journalist in New York. She is writing a book about private equity and how it affects workers. “Universal Basic Income Has Been Tested Repeatedly. It Works” October 24, 2022 at 9:50 a.m. EDT <https://www.washingtonpost.com/magazine/2022/10/24/universal-basic-income/>)

The question Tubbs and his allies did not originally confront, however, is what would happen if they showed that guaranteed income works — but still didn't convince enough lawmakers to support it. Toward the end of 2021, guaranteed-income advocates got a harsh lesson on the limitation of data when it comes to winning the hearts and minds of policymakers and voters. Earlier that year, in response to the pandemic, President Biden had signed a dramatically expanded version of the child tax credit (CTC). Suddenly, parents would be paid as much as \$3,600 per child per year, up from \$2,000. But there was a bigger change, too: The money became fully refundable, meaning parents would receive the funds even if their total tax liability was lower than the credit itself. Historically, the poorest one-third of parents didn't benefit from the CTC because they pay the least in taxes. Now, they would receive an extra several thousand dollars a year, delivered monthly — essentially a small, guaranteed income. Scholars called it one of the most important moves to fight poverty since the creation of Social Security.

As soon as parents began receiving the extra CTC funds, several groups of researchers began studying the results. “We were hopeful that people would be able to see the immediate benefits — the poverty reduction that was happening, but also ... the impacts for families in terms of reducing stress and the ability to afford the basics,” says Chris Wimer, who co-led one such team, at Columbia University's Center on Poverty and Social Policy. With that proof of effectiveness in hand, Wimer hoped, Congress would feel compelled to make the policy permanent. In December 2021, Wimer and his colleagues released a report on the first six months of the expanded CTC. Each month, they found, the policy single-handedly kept as many as 3.8 million children out of poverty, reducing the child poverty rate by nearly 30 percent. The largest percentage of money was spent on food, followed by essential bills, clothing, rent or mortgage payments, school expenses, and paying down debt. The number of families who didn't have enough to eat in a given week dropped by 24 percent; parents were no more likely to stop working because of the extra funds. A separate Columbia study found that a permanent expansion would have generated 10 times as much revenue as it cost. But ultimately, none of that mattered. The Build Back Better bill, which included a one-year extension of the CTC expansion, narrowly passed the U.S. House in November 2021, but all 50 Senate Republicans opposed it. When Biden's negotiations with Sen. Joe Manchin III, a conservative Democrat from West Virginia, broke down just before the holiday break, Biden stopped publicly advocating for the new version of the CTC.

After the expanded CTC ran out, Wimer and other scholars found that child poverty rates increased immediately, spiking 41 percent in the first month. About 1 in 7 American children lives below the poverty line, which — at just \$27,750 for a family of four — dramatically underestimates the number who are simply too poor to eat well or to have consistent electricity access or to afford registration fees for school sports.



CONTENTION 2: DISABILITY

Poverty disproportionately impacts people with poverty. Means tested models for disabled people prove to be exclusionary, emphasizing the need for a straight in UBI, regardless of income. With requirements on how much you can earn in order to receive necessary money, people with disabilities are forced to choose between staying in poverty or losing their benefits. A UBI with no strings attached will benefit marginalized groups the most.

UBI WILL HELP PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES ESCAPE POVERTY.

Delaney, 19. (July 2, 2019, Jack Delaney is a former disability policy analyst, federal lobbyist, and congressional intern. Jack worked on issues relating to health care, disability, and labor policy, and is an active member with the Democratic Socialists of America. <https://truthout.org/articles/universal-benefits-will-help-people-with-disabilities-escape-poverty/>)

Twelve thousand dollars a year. For many people with disabilities, living off this meager amount a year is customary. While poverty is on the rise in the U.S., the widening wealth gap between rich capitalists and the working class disproportionately impacts people with disabilities. The model for providing a route out of poverty for the disability community is broken, and a comprehensive overhaul is overdue. The structure of disability benefits programs, along with unfair labor practices, are confining people with disabilities to dire economic destitution. People with disabilities are dealing with higher rates of unemployment, underemployment and poverty compared to the general population. While disability benefits programs are lifesaving measures, the means-tested model, which determines benefits eligibility based on asset and income limits, has deprived people with disabilities a mechanism to exit impoverishment. Workers pay into these programs — collectively known as earned benefits — over the course of their careers, and then become beneficiaries once meeting eligibility requirements Like SSDI and Medicare, Social Security Income (SSI) and Medicaid are coupled together, and Medicaid eligibility often means becoming an SSI beneficiary (which varies based on states' rules). Yet, unlike SSDI and Medicare, eligibility for SSI and Medicaid is determined by a person's income and assets, or the Federal Poverty Level (FPL).

People with disabilities rely on Medicaid and SSI for basic survival, but the means-tested model has left people with disabilities in an economic trap without a clear route for escaping poverty. Although people with disabilities rely on means-tested programs, the very structure of the policy idea is flawed at its core. When Medicaid and SSI were created in 1965 and 1972, respectively, under amendments to the Social Security Act, the intention was to build a pathway out of poverty for people with disabilities and low-income workers. Yet the means-testing framework in the SSI and Medicaid programs have constrained its intent. Under means testing, an individual who earns more than \$12,140 per year is at risk for losing their health and income benefits. The amendments that created means testing in Medicaid and SSI were embraced by conservatives and liberals. Following the austerity of the Reagan administration, the Democratic Party of the 1990s moved to insert more means testing into the benefits system. Under the Clinton administration, Democrats worked with Republicans and implemented means testing in Medicare. Although championed by Clinton, means testing had bipartisan support, while Medicare beneficiaries were widely opposed to the proposal. In more recent years, the Obama administration floated further means testing in the Medicare program and cuts to social security, while GOP proposals have also sought means testing as a way to cut needed benefits.



ENDING MEANS TESTING WITH A UBI MODEL REDISTRIBUTES WEALTH TO CREATE AN ECONOMY THAT REDUCES POVERTY FOR MARGINALIZED PEOPLE

Delaney, 19. (July 2, 2019, Jack Delaney is a former disability policy analyst, federal lobbyist, and congressional intern. Jack worked on issues relating to health care, disability, and labor policy, and is an active member with the Democratic Socialists of America. <https://truthout.org/articles/universal-benefits-will-help-people-with-disabilities-escape-poverty/>)

Eliminating means testing altogether and building a system that is based on a universal benefit with the inclusion of people with disabilities is the route toward improving material conditions for all and alleviating the disproportionate rate of poverty within the disability community. To address the U.S. poverty crisis, especially among people with disabilities, working-class people must fight for a new universal benefits guarantee. A person with a disability should not be forced between living off \$12,000 a year and losing much-needed benefits. A universal health benefit through a single-payer model will provide increased affordability, universal access and improved outcomes, while creating a health system that views disability as part of the human experience rather than a charitable burden subjected to means testing. A Universal Basic Income (UBI) with increased funding for people with disabilities who are unable to work, united with a single-payer health system and a federal jobs guarantee, will ease the transition out of poverty. A UBI would provide much needed extra income for people with disabilities living on the margins and aid in reducing poverty in the U.S. A new universal benefits system can be achieved. When investments in health care, federal jobs and income are made, economic pressure can be alleviated. These policies will have certain impact in reducing poverty for the disability community in the long run and create a system that is based on sustainable universal equality and solidarity. A universal benefits program will maintain disability rights as human rights by including all working-class people into a universal program. Under a universal benefits model, people with and without disabilities are banded together and all are invested in a system that works to meet the needs of beneficiaries. By achieving a universal benefits model, attacks to the benefits system will be easier to stop, and all people will be invested into a system that delivers economic justice and inclusion. Within the wealthiest society in the existence of humankind, a person with a disability should not be forced between living off \$12,000 a year and losing much-needed benefits. For too long, people in the disability community have been overlooked by employers and elected officials. The U.S. has enough resources to fund the abolition of poverty of all workers, especially for vulnerable people with disabilities. Working people, poor people and people with disabilities must unite for a system that redistributes wealth to solve the U.S. poverty crisis and guarantees that all people, including those with disabilities, have a job, comprehensive health care and a basic income. Ending means testing and redistributing wealth to responsibly fund a universal benefits program will create an economy that reduces poverty for all workers, including people with disabilities who have been held back by a flawed system.



ALONG WITH POVERTY REDUCTION, UBI HOLDS MANY MORE BENEFITS FOR DISABLED PEOPLE.

Duffy & Elder-Woodward, 19. Simon Duffy is a public speaker, writer and policy advisor, serving as President of Citizen Network, and the Director of Citizen Network Research. Jim Elder-Woodward was born with cerebral palsy and has worked for central government, local authorities, the health service, the voluntary sector and universities. April 2019. "Basic income plus: Is ubi consistent with the goals of the independent movement" <https://citizen-network.org/uploads/attachment/727/basic-income-and-independent-living.pdf>)

Most advocates of Universal Basic Income (UBI) understand UBI as a transformative and liberating reform of income security. Many potential benefits have been identified: increased exercise of citizenship rights and responsibilities, personal liberation, the fulfilment of moral and ethical ideals, and many others. So, it may seem surprising that relatively little attention has been paid to the potential benefits (or risks) that UBI creates for disabled people. Here we will argue that this is a twofold error and that not only has UBI much to offer disabled people, but also that the movement for Independent Living, led by disabled people, has much to teach the UBI movement. This model raises a number of further questions that would also need to be explored; but for the purposes of this article we are going to assume: The extra income supplements would be introduced in accordance with the spirit of UBI, that is it '... unconditionally has three aspects. First there would be no income conditions, that is no means testing ... Second there would be no spending conditions ... Third there would be no behavioral conditions, requiring people to behave in certain ways and not others ...' (Standing 2017: 6). There would still need to be some kind of assessment or claim process for the additional elements. This process should be designed with disabled people to be empowering and respectful. Obviously, this would be radically different from the medical and professionalized models of assessment currently being used. The most obvious benefit of UBI for disabled people is that it reduces poverty and is also associated with a wide range of wider benefits including: better mental and physical health, reduced domestic violence, increased IQ and better educational outcomes (Standing 2017; Torry 2015). All disabled people would benefit from these changes but given that they are more likely to be in poverty than other groups, then they would tend to benefit more than most from these improvements (Elwan 1999). The second benefit of UBI for disabled people is that it would eliminate a chronic insecurity built into most welfare systems. To receive any income you must borrow from friends and relatives during the wait, or beg for food from the growing number of charitable 'foodbanks' (Garthwaite 2016). It is not clear yet how people who have failed disability tests will be treated under the UK's new system of Universal Credit (UC), but the situation looks likely to be even worse, since you might also lose the housing element of UC during a dispute. Even if you are successful under the UC, you may need to wait six weeks or more to get your first payment. So UBI+ would radically increase income security because the core UBI element of a cash grant would be received automatically, whatever the result of your disability assessment. This is not just a technical change, for the intrinsic purpose of UBI is to overturn the strangely illiberal assumptions of neoliberalism: that people lack social rights and that it is the job of the state to direct and control citizens for the sake of an economic system which benefits the better-off.



CONTENTION 3: UNEMPLOYMENT

Unemployment holds many consequences for the economy. A UBI will combat unemployment because it leads to overall financial security for the general public, reducing negative economic effects.

UNEMPLOYMENT IS COSTLY

Wray, 09 (L. Randall Wray is a Professor of Economics at the Levy Economics Institute of Bard College and the 2022-2023 Teppola Distinguished Visiting Professor at Willamette University, Oregon. 2009, April. The Social and Economic Importance of Full Employment. The Social and Economic Importance of Full Employment | Levy Economics Institute. <https://www.levyinstitute.org/publications/the-social-and-economic-importance-of-full-employment>)

Unemployment was singled out by John Maynard Keynes as one of the principle faults of capitalism; the other is excessive inequality. Obviously, there is some link between these two faults: because since most people living in capitalist economies must work for wages as a major source of their incomes, inability to obtain a job means lower income. If jobs can be provided to the unemployed, inequality and poverty will be reduced— although such policy will not directly address the problem of excessive income at the top of the distribution. Most importantly, Keynes wanted to put unemployed labor to work— not digging holes, but in socially productive ways. This would help to ensure that the additional effective demand created by government spending would not be exhausted in higher prices as it ran up against bottlenecks or other supply constraints. Further, it would help maintain public support for the government's programs by providing useful output. And it would generate respect for, and feelings of self-worth in, the workers employed in these projects (no worker would want to spend her days digging holes that serve no useful purpose). President Roosevelt's New Deal jobs programs (such as the Works Progress Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps) are good examples of such targeted job-creating programs. These provided income and employment for workers, actually helped increase the nation's productivity, and left us with public buildings, dams, trails, and even music that we still enjoy today. As our nation (and the world) collapses into deep recession, or even depression, it is worthwhile to examine Hyman P. Minsky's comprehensive approach to resolving the unemployment problem. Instead, unemployment results from insufficient effective demand and can only be resolved by creating more jobs— which in turn requires higher demand for the output that would be generated by the additional workers. In other words, unemployment is "normal," resulting from the operation of market forces, thus; can be resolved only through purposive social policy well-targeted to raise aggregate demand and provide jobs for the unemployed. However, as an economy gets closer to full employment, it becomes far less clear that policy to raise aggregate demand should be adopted. The main objection is that if unemployment gets too low, inflation will result because firms will start bidding up wages to hire the more desirable workers (in short supply because most skilled workers will have already obtained jobs—although those with fewer skills and less work experience might remain unemployed). Unemployment is very costly—not only in terms of lost output, but also in terms of all of the social ills that accompany unemployment, including crime, family break-up, and physical and psychological health problems.



UBI CAN COMBAT THE EFFECTS OF UNEMPLOYMENT.

Stewart, 21 (Melissa Stewart is a writer in public policy at the University of North Carolina. 2021, March 10). *The Pros and cons of universal basic income*. College of Arts and Sciences.
<https://college.unc.edu/2021/03/universal-basic-income/>)

MacKay: The goals really differ, depending on the policymaker but also on who's proposing it. I think for a lot of folks on the left, they see it as more a platform to build your life on. So it's going to be there for you when you when you need it. If you think about the pandemic, when people are losing their jobs, it takes a long time for government to react. Had we had a basic income in place, that would have been a way of ensuring people are secure, have the ability to meet their basic needs and live a dignified human life. They don't need to appeal to various agencies. They have consistency in terms of being able to afford housing, food and so on. It's an anti-poverty measure.



UNEMPLOYMENT ACTS AS AN EPIDEMIC

Tcherneva, 17 (Pavlina Tcherneva is an author, educator, and scholar who specializes in Modern Monetary Theory and public policy. She works as an associate professor of economics at Bard College 2017, August “Unemployment: The Silent Epidemic” Unemployment: The Silent Epidemic | Levy Economics Institute. <https://www.levyinstitute.org/publications/unemployment-the-silent-epidemic>)

In other words, the data show that unemployment is not only persistent, but when mass layoffs take place, the effect transmits quite rapidly. Put simply, one unemployed person throws another one out of work. When Lowe’s or Home Depot lay off thousands of workers across the country, the resulting decline in aggregate demand disperses in a very specific geographic pattern, amplifying the unemployment problem in the community and neighboring areas. This pattern suggests that unemployment behaves much more like a virus or an infectious disease than a random shock event. Not only does it propagate in a specific geographic pattern, but it also inflicts severe consequences on individuals and communities. Indeed much of the literature on the costs of unemployment indicates that this is precisely how unemployment should be studied. The relevant literature comes from health economics, the cognitive sciences, and public health. There is a large and growing body of research on the social determinants of health outcomes/inequities and social well-being, for example, where unemployment and underemployment emerge as key determinants among a set of multiple deprivations. And while there is abundant research at the micro level on the impact of unemployment on labor markets, individuals, families, and communities, economic theory is impoverished for not theorizing these findings at the macroeconomic level. Apart from its transmission mechanism, unemployment resembles a disease in several other ways. At the macroeconomic level, it is well recognized that unemployment is a chronic problem. There is an ongoing shortage of jobs in recessions or expansions. There are always more job seekers than available job offers (figure 2). Even at the peak of a business cycle, there are more people in need of work than there are jobs available. Currently there are 2.2 people vying for every job opening (in May 2017, there were 5,666,000 vacancies for the 12,435,000 people who wanted full-time work). Policy is designed to tolerate chronic unemployment. Indeed, the Fed explicitly bases its interest rate policy on estimates of the “desirable” level of joblessness. And thus unemployment is not eradicated, while its chronic nature is reinforced by policy design. And just like an untreated chronic disease, joblessness creates other serious complications. The Mark of Unemployment Like a disease, joblessness is a pernicious problem. It creates a series of vicious labor market outcomes that are difficult to break. One of these is that unemployment breeds unemployability (so to speak), as evidenced by the secular rise in the share of long-term unemployment in total unemployment (Tcherneva 2012). Apart from the “last hired/first fired” phenomenon experienced by those in long-term unemployment, the impact on well-being is largely ignored by macroeconomists, despite abundant research that speaks to the problem. Unemployment is chronic, volatile, and pernicious. It also inflicts unbearable costs on individuals, their families, communities, and the economy that are largely ignored by macroeconomic analysis and policy design.



UNEMPLOYMENT CREATES A DEADLY IMPACT.

Tcherneva, 17 (Pavlina Tcherneva is an author, educator, and scholar who specializes in Modern Monetary Theory and public policy. She works as an associate professor of economics at Bard College 2017, August “Unemployment: The Silent Epidemic” Unemployment: The Silent Epidemic | Levy Economics Institute. <https://www.levyinstitute.org/publications/unemployment-the-silent-epidemic>)

Without slipping into hyperbole, joblessness is found to be literally deadly. In a widely cited research paper, Case and Deaton (2015, also 2017) find that increased mortality among working-class white men has been driven by “deaths of despair”—that is the pain, distress, and social dysfunction that emerged from the loss of stable blue-collar work that started in the 1970s and continued well after the Great Recession. Overall economic distress, and joblessness in particular, has produced complex socioeconomic and health problems that have contributed to the rise in mortality (Case and Deaton 2015, also 2017). But the link between unemployment and dying is even more direct. A metadata analysis of 63 countries reveals that the impact of unemployment on suicides is nine times higher than previously believed (Nordt et al. 2015). One in five suicides are due to unemployment (Nordt et al. 2015), but the impact of unemployment on psychological distress is underestimated by the suicide data, considering that the number of attempts far exceeds that of successful suicides (Drapeau and McIntosh 2014).⁵ The Nordt et al. (2015) study is corroborated by a panel study of 25 OECD countries, which explicitly examines the impact of unemployment and labor market institutions on suicides (Breuer and Rottmann 2014). Additionally, Stuckler and Basu (2013) estimate the number of suicides in the US that are specifically linked to Great Recession joblessness and find that states with higher unemployment rates have higher suicide rates. Furthermore, unemployment has significant, robust, and lasting negative effects on individuals’ social participation, which depresses their long-run social capital (Kunze and Suppa 2014). The isolation that unemployment causes erodes the social network that a person often needs for reemployment (Darity 1999). The scarring effects from joblessness—i.e., the permanent decline in well-being, even after one has been reemployed—are well documented (for a survey of some of the literature, see Clark, D’Ambrosio, and Ghislandi [2015]). Many of the costs of unemployment are nonpecuniary—one study puts that number between 85–93 percent (Winkelmann and Winkelmann 1995)—which suggests that interventions that mainly focus on providing income to the unemployed will also be inadequate.

Thus, the Plan, The USFG should provide \$1,000 a month to every American regardless of income.



SOLVENCY

Prior pilots prove a UBI solves and can be successfully implemented. Issues with prior pilots were that they were only temporary, so it could not create any lasting beneficial effects to the economy or families because they fell right back into poverty after the pilots ended. A monthly UBI of \$1000 per month will pull people out of poverty, improve health outcomes, and makes it easier for people to find jobs and take care of their children.

UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME HAS BEEN TESTED REPEATEDLY. IT WORKS.

Greenwell, 2022. (Megan Greenwell is a journalist in New York. She is writing a book about private equity and how it affects workers. “Universal Basic Income Has Been Tested Repeatedly. It Works” October 24, 2022 at 9:50 a.m. EDT <https://www.washingtonpost.com/magazine/2022/10/24/universal-basic-income/>)

In December 2021, Wimer and his colleagues released a report on the first six months of the expanded CTC. Each month, they found, the policy single-handedly kept as many as 3.8 million children out of poverty, reducing the child poverty rate by nearly 30 percent. The largest percentage of money was spent on food, followed by essential bills, clothing, rent or mortgage payments, school expenses, and paying down debt. The number of families who didn't have enough to eat in a given week dropped by 24 percent; parents were no more likely to stop working because of the extra funds. A separate Columbia study found that a permanent expansion would have generated 10 times as much revenue as it cost. But ultimately, none of that mattered. The Build Back Better bill, which included a one-year extension of the CTC expansion, narrowly passed the U.S. House in November 2021, but all 50 Senate Republicans opposed it. When Biden's negotiations with Sen. Joe Manchin III, a conservative Democrat from West Virginia, broke down just before the holiday break, Biden stopped publicly advocating for the new version of the CTC. After the expanded CTC ran out, Wimer and other scholars found that child poverty rates increased immediately, spiking 41 percent in the first month. About 1 in 7 American children lives below the poverty line, which — at just \$27,750 for a family of four — dramatically underestimates the number who are simply too poor to eat well or to have consistent electricity access or to afford registration fees for school sports. Now, though, as the country emerges from the pandemic, the guaranteed income movement sits at a crossroads. The pilot programs have created scores of stories like Everett's about how a small amount of money led to massive change in a recipient's life. And a growing body of research based on the experiments shows that guaranteed income works — that it pulls people out of poverty, improves health outcomes, and makes it easier for people to find jobs and take care of their children. If empirical evidence ruled the world, guaranteed income would be available to every poor person in America, and many of those people would no longer be poor. But empirical evidence does not rule the world, and it is far from clear that there is a political path forward for guaranteed income on a large scale. The city-level experiments cannot last forever. Early in the pandemic, some in the guaranteed-income movement had begun to whisper about accelerating the timeline for taking their efforts nationwide. America's most progressive social policies have always grown out of economic crises, so maybe covid would bring about a guaranteed-income policy in the next few years. But the failure of the expanded federal child tax credit diminished some of that optimism; many of those same advocates are now looking toward the long game. “You have to be willing to fight for something to the end,” says Baltimore Mayor Brandon Scott, who recently launched a guaranteed-income experiment, “even if it doesn't happen, even if you only push it a few feet further, even if it means that you die doing it.”



UBI WILL ALLEVIATE INEQUALITY AND POVERTY.

Greenwell, 2022. (Megan Greenwell is a journalist in New York. She is writing a book about private equity and how it affects workers. “Universal Basic Income Has Been Tested Repeatedly. It Works” October 24, 2022 at 9:50 a.m. EDT <https://www.washingtonpost.com/magazine/2022/10/24/universal-basic-income/>)

Without a radical solution — like, say, giving people money with no strings attached — America will continue to be home to one of the worst rates of income inequality of any rich nation in the world. And from city to city, there is massive energy and momentum to keep expanding this experiment. But true believers also harbor a sense of anxiety about what the future holds. “I’m worried,” says Sean Kline, the associate director of Stanford University’s Basic Income Lab, “that these guaranteed income demonstrations are going to sunset and then it’s just going to go quiet.” For as long as America has had a poverty problem — which is to say, for its entire history — a small group of dreamers has proposed guaranteed income as a solution. The idea dates to the year the country was founded: Thomas Paine proposed a type of basic income in his 1776 pamphlet “Common Sense.” In the mid-20th century, it gained traction among Black American thinkers: In 1966, the Black Panthers’ Ten-Point Program demanded “employment or a guaranteed income” for everyone. A year later, the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. wrote in his last book — “Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community?” — that government aid programs all have a “common failing: they are indirect. Each seeks to solve poverty by first solving something else. I am now convinced that the simplest approach will prove to be the most effective — the solution to poverty is to abolish it directly by a now widely discussed measure: the guaranteed income.” If empirical evidence ruled the world, guaranteed income would be available to every poor person in America, and many would no longer be poor. But empirical evidence does not rule the world.



\$1000 MONTHLY PAYMENTS IS MORE THAN A SOCIAL SAFETY NET- IT IS A PLATFORM TO STAND ON AND TO BUILD A LIFE ON.

Stewart, 21 (Melissa Stewart is a writer in public policy at the University of North Carolina. 2021, March 10). *The Pros and cons of universal basic income*. College of Arts and Sciences.

<https://college.unc.edu/2021/03/universal-basic-income/>)

Unconditional cash payments to residents are more of a floor to stand on than a safety net, say these Carolina scholars in light of a proposed pilot project to give \$500 per month to formerly incarcerated Durham, North Carolina, residents. The idea of governments giving residents no-strings-attached cash payments is picking up steam, due in part to the economic impact of the coronavirus pandemic. Last June, Mayor Michael Tubbs of Stockton, California, created Mayors for a Guaranteed Income, a coalition to “advocate for a guaranteed income — direct, recurring cash payments — that lifts all of our communities, building a resilient, just America.” Before the pandemic hit, 2020 Democratic presidential candidate Andrew Yang put UBI, also known as guaranteed basic income, on the map by making it his signature policy. His proposed “Freedom Dividend” — \$1,000 per month payments to every American adult — was a response to job displacement by automation. Wendt: It is a regular cash payment by the government that is given on a monthly or annual basis. It’s unconditional in several respects. In contrast to many other welfare programs that you only get when you prove your willingness to work, a UBI would be unconditional in that respect. It would also be unconditional on what money you make, what you have in general and on what contribution you made to finance the UBI. Finally, it would be unconditional on your family situation, on whether you’re married or not. UBI is probably best conceived as a floor to stand on, not as a safety net. A safety net is only meant to catch you when you need it, which requires some institution to test whether you really need it, and that opens up all these worries about paternalism, bureaucracy and so on, whereas the UBI would be a floor to stand on for everybody. MacKay: I completely agree with Fabian’s description. UBI is a platform to stand on and to build a life on. But it’s not something that’s going to allow you to live a great life. The sort of numbers that we’re talking about are, at most, \$1,000 a month per person. People will still have a strong motivation to work. What are the main points of criticism against UBI? MacKay: A big one is a reciprocity worry — that in order to get access to public benefits, you should be at least willing to participate in the labor market. Wendt: Another common worry is that UBI is a waste of money on the wealthy. Why should all of those wealthy people get a monthly check? If the goal is to do something about poverty, then why UBI, since the rich by definition are not poor? That’s an understandable concern for sure. But the reply there is that depending on how the UBI is financed, the rich will not be net beneficiaries. They will contribute more to finance the UBI than what they get as their monthly check. One thing the pandemic has shown us is that the government got a little bit more comfortable with giving cash payments to people. Another thing I’m really excited about are these proposals to expand the child tax credit, both coming from [Mitt] Romney and also coming from the Democrats, which you might think of as a basic income for kids



FRAMEWORK: STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE

Inequality and poverty are the deadliest forms of structural violence. The current system justifies and perpetuates endless cycles of poverty for marginalized groups. It's time for a new policy. It is immoral and the government's obligation to alleviate poverty.

INEQUALITY IS A FORM OF STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE THAT CONDEMNS ENTIRE POPULATIONS TO PREVENTABLE SUFFERING AND DEATH.

Bezruchka 14 (Stephen Bezruchka, Senior Lecturer in Health Services and Global Health at the School of Public Health at the University of Washington, holds a Master of Public Health from Johns Hopkins University and an M.D. from Stanford University, 2014 (“Inequality Kills,” *Divided: The Perils of Our Growing Inequality*, Edited by David Cay Johnston, Published by The New Press, ISBN 9781595589446, p. 194-195)

Differences in mortality rates are not just a statistical concern—they reflect suffering and pain for very real individuals and families. The higher mortality in the United States is an example of what Paul Farmer, the noted physician and anthropologist, calls **STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE**. The forty-seven infant deaths occur every day because of the way society in the United States is structured, resulting in our health status being that of a middle-income country, not a rich country. There is growing evidence that the factor MOST RESPONSIBLE for the relatively poor health in the United States is the vast and rising inequality in wealth and income that we not only tolerate, but resist changing. Inequality is THE CENTRAL ELEMENT, the upstream cause of the social disadvantage described in the IOM report. A political system that fosters inequality limits the attainment of health. The claim that economic inequality is a major reason for our poor health requires that several standard criteria for claiming causality are satisfied: the results are confirmed by MANY DIFFERENT STUDIES by different investigators over different time periods; there is a DOSE-RESPONSE RELATIONSHIP, meaning more inequality leads to worse health; NO OTHER contending explanation is posited; and the relationship is BIOLOGICALLY PLAUSIBLE, with likely mechanisms through which inequality works. The field of study called stress biology of social comparisons is one such way inequality acts. Those studies confirm that **ALL THE CRITERIA FOR LINKING INEQUALITY TO POORER HEALTH ARE MET**, concluding that the extent of inequality in society reflects the range of caring and sharing, with more unequal populations sharing less. Those who are poorer struggle to be accepted in society and the rich also suffer its effects. A recent Harvard study estimated that about ONE DEATH IN THREE in this country results from our very high income inequality. INEQUALITY KILLS THROUGH STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE. There is NO SMOKING GUN with this form of violence, which simply produces a LETHALLY LARGE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC GAP BETWEEN RICH AND POOR.



POVERTY IS THE DEADLIEST FORM OF STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE

Ansell 17 (David A. Ansell, Senior Vice President, Associate Provost for Community Health Equity, and Michael E. Kelly Professor of Medicine at Rush University Medical Center (Chicago), holds an M.D. from the State University of New York Upstate Medical University College of Medicine, 2017, “American Roulette,” *The Death Gap: How Inequality Kills*, Published by the University of Chicago Press, ISBN 9780226428291, p. kindle 307-363)

There are many different kinds of violence. Some are obvious: punches, attacks, gunshots, explosions. These are the kinds of interpersonal violence that we tend to hear about in the news. Other kinds of violence are intimate and emotional. But the deadliest and most thoroughgoing kind of violence is woven into the fabric of American society. It exists when some groups have more access to goods, resources, and opportunities than other groups, including health and life itself. This violence delivers specific blows against particular bodies in particular neighborhoods. This unequal advantage and violence is built into the very rules that govern our society. In the absence of this violence, large numbers of Americans would be able to live fuller and longer lives. This kind of violence is called structural violence because it is embedded in the very laws, policies, and rules that govern day-to-day life. It is the cumulative impact of laws and social and economic policies and practices that render some Americans less able to access resources and opportunities than others. This inequity of advantage is not a result of the individual’s personal abilities but is built into the systems that govern society. Often it is a product of racism, gender, and income inequality. These rules and structures are powerful destructive forces. The same structures that render life predictable, secure, comfortable, and pleasant for many destroy the lives of others like Windora through suffering, poverty, ill health, and violence. These structures are neither natural nor neutral. Windora is not the only person struggling on account of structural violence. Countless neighborhoods nationwide are suffering from it, and people are dying needlessly young as a result. The magnitude of this excess mortality is mind-boggling. In 2009 my friend Dr. Steve Whitman asked a simple question, “How many extra black people died in Chicago each year, just because they do not have the same health outcomes as white Chicagoans?” When the Chicago Sun-Times got wind of his results, it ran them on the front page in bold white letters on a black background: “HEALTH CARE GAP KILLS 3200 Black Chicagoans and the Gap is Growing.” The paper styled the headline to look like the declaration of war that it should have been. In fact, we did find ourselves at war not long ago, when almost 3,000 Americans were killed. That was September 11, 2001. That tragedy propelled the country to war. Yet when it comes to the premature deaths of urban Americans, no disaster area has been declared. No federal troops have been called up. No acts of Congress have been passed. Yet this disaster is even worse: those 3,200 black people were in Chicago alone, in just one year. Nationwide each year, more than 60,000 black people die prematurely because of inequality. While blacks suffer the most from this, it is not just an issue of racism, though racism has been a unique and powerful transmitter of violence in America for over four hundred years.



THIS STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE LOCKS IN SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL DEPLETION, WHICH CULMINATES IN EXTINCTION AND MAKES WAR INEVITABLE.

Szentes 08 Tamás SZENTES is a Professor Emeritus at the Corvinus University of Budapest, and member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, '8 [April 22, 2008, "Globalisation and prospects of the world society," http://www.eadi.org/fileadmin/Documents/Events/exco/Glob.____prospects_-_jav..pdf, (Gender modified—Sigalos)]

It's a common place that human society can SURVIVE and develop only in a lasting real peace. Without peace countries cannot develop. Although since 1945 there has been no world war, but • numerous local wars took place, • terrorism has spread all over the world, undermining security even in the most developed and powerful countries, • arms race and militarisation have not ended with the collapse of the Soviet bloc, but escalated and continued, extending also to weapons of mass destruction and misusing enormous resources badly needed for development. Many "INVISIBLE WARS"¹ are suffered by the poor and oppressed people, manifested in mass misery, poverty, unemployment, homelessness, starvation and malnutrition, epidemics and poor health conditions, exploitation and oppression, racial and other discrimination, physical terror, organised injustice, disguised forms of violence, the denial or regular infringement of the democratic rights of citizens, women, youth, ethnic or religious minorities, etc., and last but not least, in the degradation of human environment, which means that THE "WAR AGAINST NATURE", i.e. the disturbance of ecological balance, wasteful management of natural resources, and large-scale pollution of our environment, is still going on, causing also losses and fatal dangers for human life. Behind global terrorism and "invisible wars" we find striking international and intra society inequities and distorted development patterns 2, which tend to generate social as well as international tensions, thus PAVING THE WAY FOR unrest and "VISIBLE" WARS. It is a commonplace now that peace is not merely the absence of war. The prerequisites of a lasting peace between and within societies involve not only - though, of course, necessarily - demilitarisation, but also a systematic and gradual elimination of the roots of violence, of the causes of "invisible wars", of the structural and institutional bases of large-scale international and intra-society inequalities, exploitation and oppression. Peace requires a process of social and national emancipation, a progressive, democratic transformation of societies and the world bringing about equal rights and opportunities for all people, sovereign participation and mutually advantageous co-operation among nations Under the contemporary conditions of accelerating globalisation and deepening global interdependencies in our world, peace is indivisible in both time and space. It cannot exist if reduced to a period only after or before war, and CANNOT BE SAFEGUARDED IN ONE PART OF THE WORLD when some others suffer visible or invisible wars. Therefore, the actual question is not about "sustainability of development" but rather about the "sustainability of human life", i.e. SURVIVAL OF [HU]MANKIND – because of ecological imbalance and globalised terrorism. Under the circumstances provided by rapidly progressing science and technological revolutions, human society cannot survive unless such profound intra-society and international inequalities prevailing today are soon eliminated. Like a single spacecraft, the EARTH CAN NO LONGER AFFORD to have a 'crew' divided into two parts: the rich, privileged, well-fed, well-educated, on the one hand, and the poor, deprived, starving, sick and uneducated, on the other.



2AC CASE EXTENSIONS

CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

THE U.S. COULD HELP SOLVE ITS POVERTY PROBLEM WITH A UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME

Howard, 23 (Michael W. Howard is a professor emeritus of philosophy at the University of Maine, as well as former president of the U.S. Basic Income Guarantee Network, past co-editor of *Basic Income Studies*, and co-editor, with Karl Widerquist, of two books on Alaska's Permanent Fund Dividend. January 6, 2023 "The Us Could Help Solve its poverty problem with a universal basic income" <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-u-s-could-help-solve-its-poverty-problem-with-a-universal-basic-income/>)

When the child tax credit, first established in 1997, was expanded for a year in 2021, it was a major political and social win for the country. At a time when the pandemic had worsened many families' financial distress, the Biden administration's decision not only added to the amount of the tax credit and converted the payment from a year-end lump sum to monthly payments; it also abandoned the work requirement for parents. This immediately affected one third of all children in the U.S., including 52 percent of Black children and 41 percent of Hispanic children, whose families were formerly excluded because the parents earned too little to qualify for the tax credit. The tax credit expansion lifted 3.7 million children out of poverty by December 2021 without significantly reducing parents' work participation. Then in January 2022, the expanded tax credit expired, which plunged 3.7 million back into poverty, with higher percentage increases in poverty among Hispanic and Black children. The credit showed us that cash assistance could help families stay afloat and, contrary to some political beliefs, parents would not leave the labor system because of it. Even so, the failure to renew the expansion should not negate this important political milestone: Congress came within one vote of abandoning parental work requirements as a condition to get cash assistance for their families. The child tax credit expansion is one step toward a universal basic income that could eliminate poverty without increasing unemployment. There are 37.9 million people in poverty in the U.S., according to 2021 Census Bureau figures. Providing a government-funded monthly payment to every individual would broadly lift them out of poverty, while providing millions of children a better chance at a good education, improved health and higher future earnings. With 11.6 percent of people in the U.S. living at or under the poverty line, this payment would benefit millions and save hundreds of billions of dollars by reducing the social costs of poverty. The question becomes: Can we convince our elected officials that poverty is not a moral failing, but a social condition that can be addressed by establishing an income floor below which no one falls?



BASIC NEEDS BUDGET ARE NOT ENOUGH.

(Gordon M. Fisher is a scholar, serving for the Office of Secretary-United States Department of Health and Human Services. August 2012 “Standard budgets (basic needs budgets) in the United States since 2006” <https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/working-papers/2012/demo/udusbd3.pdf>)

A “standard budget” is a list of goods and services that a family of a specified size and composition—and sometimes of a specified social class or occupational group—would need to live at a designated level of well-being, together with the estimated monthly or annual costs of those goods and services (Innes 1990; Orshansky 1959). Other terms used for the “standard budget” concept in recent American literature include “basic needs budget,” “family budget,” and “expert budget. The Self-Sufficiency Standard Dr. Diana Pearce and the organizations with which she partners continue to develop and update the Self-Sufficiency Standard; Self-Sufficiency Standards are now available for 37 states and two major metropolitan areas. “The Self-Sufficiency Standard measures how much income a family of a certain composition in a given place needs to adequately meet their basic needs—without public or private assistance” (Pearce 2012). The Standard is calculated for working one-adult and two-adult families with zero to three children, with the children divided into four age categories. Figures are calculated for each county or county-equivalent. “The Self-Sufficiency Standard...is a basic family survival budget, with no frills—no take-out pizza, no movies...no budget for emergencies, car repair or long-term savings” Costs for major budget components (housing, child care, food, health care, etc.) “are set at a minimally adequate level, which is determined whenever possible by using what government sources have determined are minimally adequate for those receiving assistance, e.g., child care subsidy benefit levels” (Pearce 2012). Depending on the place and the type of family involved, the Self-Sufficiency Standard ranges from 150 percent to over 300 percent of the federal poverty line (Pearce 2009b). The 2008 update of the Self-Sufficiency Standard for New Jersey (Pearce 2008) included a section entitled “Disability and Self-Sufficiency” (pp. 25-29). In the 2001 study, the national median budget for a two-parent, two-child family for the 400 areas was equal to 198 percent of the official poverty threshold, with budgets for this family type for individual areas ranging between 160 and 308 percent of the threshold. In the 2005 study, the national median budget for a two-parent, two-child family was equal to 209 percent of the official poverty threshold, with budgets for this family type for individual areas ranging between 162 and 338 percent of the threshold. NCCP’s Basic Needs Budgets are “bare-bones” budgets, including only a family’s “most basic living expenses—enough to get by but not enough to get ahead”; they are based on “modest” assumptions about costs. The budgets do not include durable goods (for instance, furniture or household appliances) or entertainment. They do not include funds to purchase life or disability insurance. They do not include savings for emergencies, home purchase, a child’s education, or a parent’s retirement. They do not include funds to pay off debt. Depending on the locality and the size and type of family,



DISABILITY

UBI WILL REMOVE POVERTY TRAPS CAUSED BY MEANS TESTING.

Duffy & Elder-Woodward, 19. (Simon Duffy is a public speaker, writer and policy advisor, serving as President of Citizen Network, and the Director of Citizen Network Research. Jim Elder-Woodward was born with cerebral palsy and has worked for central government, local authorities, the health service, the voluntary sector and universities. April 2019. “Basic income plus: Is ubi consistent with the goals of the independent movement” <https://citizen-network.org/uploads/attachment/727/basic-income-and-independent-living.pdf>)

The third benefit of UBI+ is that it radically removes the poverty-traps caused by means-testing and conditionality, and enables people to do paid work on terms that make sense to the individual. Many disabled people can and want to carry out paid work; but they cannot necessarily work in exactly the same way as other people. For example, people with chronic illness may go through prolonged periods of incapacity; yet may also be able to do periods of paid work when they have adequate energy levels (Hale 2018: 11). Of course, opportunities for paid work also will depend on employers or customers; but UBI increases the ability to negotiate reasonable accommodations, while maintaining reasonable incentives. You will never be made worse off by taking paid work and you will be taxed on your new earnings at the same rate as other citizens; no longer will you have to pay an effective tax rate close to or, sometimes even exceeding 100% (Duffy and Dalrymple 2014). Fourthly, UBI+ helps achieve a long-standing objective of the Disabled People’s Independent Living movement (hereafter referred to as the Movement), by establishing a universal system for funding care or support – what is sometimes called individualised funding or personal budgets. There has been important progress in disability rights in shifting control over service funding into the hands of disabled people (Duffy 2018a). However, these systems are often complex and unreliable, often applying multiple criteria for eligibility as well as means-testing. In some countries (like the UK and the USA), funding for disability support is also severely means-tested (Coalition on Charging 2008). But, by including personal budgets within the UBI+ model, it becomes easier to both increase personal control over support and to end the application of means-testing to disability support services. The fifth benefit of UBI+ is political. Disabled people would share a common cause with all other citizens in ensuring that the base UBI level was set at the highest feasible level. Advocates of UBI, those fighting poverty and inequality, would have an important ally in the Movement if these causes were clearly linked by a common framework. Currently this is not the case, for disability-related benefits are disconnected from unemployment benefits and there is no advantage to disabled people from increases in unemployment benefit, and no advantage to unemployed people from increases in disability benefit. Worse, not only are the economic interests of these two groups disconnected, both are also subject to separate prejudice and scapegoating while this can also further undermine the alliances necessary to advance social justice.



THE MEANS-TESTED BENEFITS MODEL HAS TRAPPED PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES IN POVERTY WITHOUT A CLEAR PATH OUT.

Delaney, 19. (July 2, 2019, Jack Delaney is a former disability policy analyst, federal lobbyist, and congressional intern. Jack worked on issues relating to health care, disability, and labor policy, and is an active member with the Democratic Socialists of America. <https://truthout.org/articles/universal-benefits-will-help-people-with-disabilities-escape-poverty/>)

For people with disabilities, means-tested benefits have equated to survival, but have simultaneously contributed to the high rates of poverty, while also leaving those slightly above the FPL in precarious economic circumstances. Means-tested benefits create a poverty trap and are counteractive to providing a pathway toward economic advancement. Because of the means-tested model, working more hours or earning a higher income prevents people with disabilities from improving their financial standing. When a person with a disability wants to work more or earns a higher income, they are in jeopardy of losing their means-tested benefits. The added income from working more isn't a wise economic tradeoff for means-tested beneficiaries. Benefits from Medicaid and SSI are lifesaving supports, and a few thousand dollars in added income won't make up for the lifeline that these programs deliver. The means-tested system for people with disabilities wasn't designed to reduce poverty. In health economics, this phenomenon is called the Medicaid notch. Say a person with a disability who is receiving Medicaid and SSI is just under the FPL and can work 10 extra hours per week at the federal minimum wage of \$7.25 per hour. That would amount to an extra income of only \$3,700 per year, bringing their total income up to just under \$16,000. Attempting to leave poverty through earning more income will have a higher cost through the loss of means-tested benefits. Means-testing programs like Medicaid and SSI create an entrapment into the benefits system, and ultimately, people with disabilities are restrained to a callous economic fate. Means testing isn't an efficient or equitable model of determining benefits eligibility. The amount of administrative costs for means testing negates any alleged savings it offers. Furthermore, leaving out a person who makes just over the poverty line does not allow for them to receive benefits that would aid in their escape from economic hardship. Most importantly, means testing has not worked in reducing poverty for people with disabilities. Since the 1980s, poverty among people with disabilities has fluctuated year to year, but overall has been on the rise. Means testing has only encouraged a broken system and held people with disabilities in a cycle of poverty. According to a 2017 Social Security Administration report, only around 5 percent of people with disabilities receiving SSI were working, and a majority — 57 percent — received SSI as their main source of income. In other words, people receiving means-tested benefits are held back from participating in the labor force and earning more income to escape from poverty. The means-tested system hasn't allowed for people with disabilities living below the FPL to earn more income while retaining their needed benefits. The system wasn't designed to reduce poverty. It was designed with governmental budgetary concerns and austerity rather than a poverty-reducing measure for a historically disregarded population.



UNEMPLOYMENT

UNEMPLOYMENT HOLDS A NEGATIVE IMPACT ON CHILDREN, FAMILIES, AND COMMUNITIES

Tcherneva, 17 (Pavlina Tcherneva is an author, educator, and scholar who specializes in Modern Monetary Theory and public policy. She works as an associate professor of economics at Bard College 2017, August “Unemployment: The Silent Epidemic” Unemployment: The Silent Epidemic | Levy Economics Institute. <https://www.levyinstitute.org/publications/unemployment-the-silent-epidemic>)

Unemployment does not just affect the unemployed; it also harms their children and families. It is a causal factor in malnutrition and growth stunting, and negatively impacts the mental health of spouses and children (Lindo 2010; Bubonya, Cobb-Clark, and Wooden 2014). Children’s educational attainment, labor market outcomes, and social mobility are also negatively affected (Venator and Reeves 2013; Reeves and Howard 2013). Unemployment causes entrenched urban blight and economic crimes. There is a cyclical component to criminal activity linking it to changes in unemployment. Raphael and Winter-Ebmer (2001) examine the period from 1970 to 1997 and find that there are sizable effects of unemployment on the seven felony offenses recorded by the Department of Justice. Additionally, they find significant and sizable positive effects of unemployment on the rates of specific violent, as well as property, crimes. In a subsequent study, the authors find that nearly 40 percent (their most conservative estimate) of the decline in property crime rates during the 1990s is attributable to the concurrent decline in the unemployment rate (Raphael and Winter-Ebmer 2001). There is also a strong correlation between youth unemployment and crime (Fougère, Kramarz, and Pouget 2009). Youth unemployment is linked to violent and nonviolent right-wing extremist crime (Falk and Zweimüller 2005). In the US, one study finds that crime has become an underlying result of youth unemployment and poverty, rather than an exogenous “deviant behavior” factor (Freeman 1992). Globally, youth unemployment has been on the rise. The International Labour Organisation (ILO) puts that number at 71 million youth and highlights the linkages between crime and social unrest (ILO 2016). After accelerating rapidly during the Great Recession and declining for two years, youth unemployment is on the rise again (ILO 2016). Additionally, regional studies from around the world attribute human trafficking and forced and child labor to high rates of poverty and unemployment. Unemployment is a direct and indirect contributor to inequality. It increases the general level of income inequality in most countries (Galbraith 1998; Sen 1997a) and leads to greater inequality within labor and between labor and capital (Tcherneva 2014). The social exclusion produced by unemployment exacerbates interracial and interethnic tensions and antisocial and criminal behavior (Burgess and Mitchell 1998; Darity 1999; Sen 1997b). Sen (1997a) additionally finds a negative impact on technological change, innovation, and output. Mitchell (2012) estimates that in the middle of the Great Recession, the US lost \$10 billion of output each day as a result of high levels of unemployment. Unemployment is a contributing factor to financial crises and economic instability (Galbraith 2009, 2012), as well as social and political instability, human trafficking, exploitation, and slavery.



UBI PAYS FOR GOODS, NOT BADS.

Tcherneva, 17 (Pavlina Tcherneva is an author, educator, and scholar who specializes in Modern Monetary Theory and public policy. She works as an associate professor of economics at Bard College 2017, August “Unemployment: The Silent Epidemic” Unemployment: The Silent Epidemic | Levy Economics Institute. <https://www.levyinstitute.org/publications/unemployment-the-silent-epidemic>)

In a sense the job guarantee prevents the exacerbation of the social costs of unemployment and other social deprivations by attempting to match the unemployed to jobs that meet basic unsatisfied needs, e.g., healthy food, afterschool care, clean public spaces. The job guarantee aims to create socially useful output, i.e., it produces “goods” and is therefore superior to the status quo, which produces “bads.”

It is useful to remember that unemployment is already “paid for” in terms of the lost output and increased resources dedicated to tackling poverty, declining health, crime, and other associated problems. The public sector and society in general are already bearing these costs. The job guarantee redistributes the expenditures and real resources toward more productive uses, such as human capital and community investment, rehabilitation, and renewal.



SOLVENCY

PRIOR PILOTS PROVE SUCCESS.

Greenwell, 2022. (Megan Greenwell is a journalist in New York. She is writing a book about private equity and how it affects workers. “Universal Basic Income Has Been Tested Repeatedly. It Works” October 24, 2022 at 9:50 a.m. EDT <https://www.washingtonpost.com/magazine/2022/10/24/universal-basic-income/>)

In Baltimore, where more than 1 in 5 residents live below the federal poverty line, a new guaranteed-income pilot gives \$1,000 a month to 200 recipients, all of them parents in high-crime neighborhoods. “We’re like the birthplace of racial redlining, right?” Scott says. “You’re not going to erase inequality, inequity that was caused by policy, without creating policy to do the opposite.” The notion of guaranteed income as a government-backed corrective for decades of racist policies has spread to dozens of cities, many led by young, Black mayors. Scott, 38, consults regularly with St. Louis Mayor Tishaura Jones, 50, whose city launched a guaranteed-income pilot in December 2021. St. Paul, Minn., Mayor Melvin Carter, 43, serves as co-chair of Mayors for a Guaranteed Income, and is a mentor to Tubbs, 32. According to Tubbs, guaranteed-income programs in Columbia, S.C.; Shreveport, La.; and Atlanta were the result of a Black mayors’ group text shortly after George Floyd’s murder in which he evangelized for King’s approach to solving urban poverty, before sending everyone a copy of “Where Do We Go From Here.” It’s no coincidence that these are the people plotting the future of guaranteed income in America, Scott argues. Many of them grew up in families that would have benefited from guaranteed-income programs. “We’re the first group of elected folks who actually lived through all of the s---,” he said, looking up from his phone for a rare moment during a 30-minute interview at Baltimore City Hall and drawing out the vowel sound in “lived.” “We lived through crack and heroin. We lived through zero tolerance. So all the stuff that folks are now talking about, we understand it in a way that no one else will.” The most basic objection to guaranteed-income programs is about cost. Providing \$1,000 a month to every American regardless of income — which some scholars argue would make the policy more palatable than one targeted to people in poverty — would cost \$3.1 trillion a year, nearly half the federal government’s entire budget in 2021. And yet, the adage that it is expensive to be poor applies not just to individuals, but to their governments. A mountain of evidence shows how tightly income inequality correlates with crime rates, education levels, drug abuse, incarceration, intimate-partner violence, and physical and mental health, which together cost billions upon billions of tax dollars. Numerous studies, for example, have found it would be cheaper to give homes to unhoused people than it is to cover all the costs associated with allowing them to stay on the streets, but progressives have faced an uphill climb to convince policymakers and voters that providing free housing is a worthwhile strategy. A year later, data from a D.C.-based guaranteed-income experiment showed similarly promising results. Thrive East of the River provided \$5,500 to 600 families in Ward 8 during the pandemic, either as a lump sum or as five monthly payments. Although the program was too short-term to measure effects on employment, Urban Institute researchers found significant positive effects on recipients’ mental health, food security and ability to meet their children’s needs.



FRAMEWORK EXTENSIONS

WE ARE ONLY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACTION OF THE PLAN.

Harris '8 (Alex; 8/15/8; J.D. Stanford University, B.A. from Harvard University, Practicing Appellate and Constitutional Law at Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP, former Adjunct Analyst at The Competitive Enterprise Institute; Philosopher's Corner, "Philosopher's Corner: The Principle of Intervening Action," <https://cei.org/blog/philosophers-corner-principle-intervening-action>) *PIA = Principle of Intervening Action*

Gewirth takes the position that **we are solely responsible for** the morality of **our own actions** in two senses. First, only we are responsible for the acts we commit, even if someone else's action caused us to act as we did. (For example, if a woman's husband cheated on her and she, upon finding out, grew enraged and killed his lover, she - not he - would bear sole responsibility.) Second, we are only responsible for our own actions, **even if they lead to other actions**. Thus, **we have a preeminent duty to never act immorally**, even if doing so would preclude others from taking even more immoral actions. Gewirth contends that **never violating the negative rights of another "is an obligation so fundamental that it cannot be overridden even to prevent evil consequences** from befalling some persons." Gewirth argues: "It would be unjustified to violate the mother's right to life in order to protect the rights to life of the many other residents of the city. For **rights cannot be justifiably protected by violating another right.**" PIA is the only consistent, justifiable moral theory of consequences. First, one should note that **only PIA sets a non-arbitrary limit on** the string of **effects** that can factor into the moral calculation. PIA says that **no consequences** of other actions can **count**; the only other non-arbitrary standard says that all consequences in the chain must count. **One cannot claim that I am responsible for only, say, the first four other actions resulting from my action. One must either consider only my actions or all resulting actions.** Thus, if the destruction of the city by terrorists actually ended up preventing more rights violations by, say, staving off a Malthusian population crunch that would result in mass starvation and world war, then the consequentialist position has to endorse the terrorists' action. **Consequentialists have to count every effect in the chain, even in the absurdly far-off future, to determine whether an action is moral.** This fact, of course, does not by itself constitute a reason to reject consequentialism in favor of PIA, but it does suggest that PIA is the only reasonable interpretation of the requirement of non-consequentialism. **Some could argue that we should be responsible for the results of these actions. PIA states that we are.** If a person gets a wrecking ball and knocks over a building, which then falls and crushes twenty people, the person is to some degree responsible for those results. **But this is not the case if someone else's action intervenes, because another moral agent is the more proximate cause of the effects; she has stepped into the line of causation to take the moral responsibility.** The person is **morally responsible for the totality of her actions**; thus no one else can assume any portion of that responsibility.



THERE IS AN ETHICAL OBLIGATION TO ADDRESS OUR IMPACTS – IT OUTWEIGHS.

Ansell 17 (David A. Ansell, Senior Vice President, Associate Provost for Community Health Equity, and Michael E. Kelly Professor of Medicine at Rush University Medical Center (Chicago), holds an M.D. from the State University of New York Upstate Medical University College of Medicine, 2017, “American Roulette,” The Death Gap: How Inequality Kills, Published by the University of Chicago Press, ISBN 9780226428291, p. kindle 307-363)

Beyond racism, poverty and income inequality perpetuated by exploitative market capitalism are singular agents of transmission of disease and early death. As a result, there is a new and alarming pattern of declining life expectancy among white Americans as well. Deaths from drug overdoses in young white Americans ages 25 to 34 have exploded to levels not seen since the AIDS epidemic. This generation is the first since the Vietnam War era to experience higher death rates than the prior generation.¹² White Americans ages 45 to 54 have experienced skyrocketing premature death rates as well, something not seen in any other developed nation.¹³ White men in some Appalachian towns live on average twenty years less than white men a half-day’s drive away in the suburbs of Washington, DC. Men in McDowell County, West Virginia, can look forward to a life expectancy only slightly better than that of Haitians. But those statistics reflect averages, and every death from structural violence is a person. When these illnesses and deaths are occurring one at a time in neighborhoods that society has decided not to care about—neighborhoods populated by poor, black, or brown people—they seem easy to overlook, especially if you are among the fortunate few who are doing incredibly well. The tide of prosperity in America has lifted some boats while others have swamped. Paul Farmer, the physician-anthropologist who founded Partners in Health, an international human rights agency, reflects on the juxtaposition of “unprecedented bounty and untold penury”: “It stands to reason that as beneficiaries of growing inequality, we do not like to be reminded of misery of squalor and failure. Our popular culture provides us with no shortage of anesthesia.” That people suffer and die prematurely because of inequality is wrong. It is wrong from an ethical perspective. It is wrong from a fairness perspective. And it is wrong because we have the means to fix it.



A2: SOLVENCY DEFICITS

UTILITARIAN BALANCING CAN'T JUSTIFY CONTINUED VIOLENCE. ONE-PERCENT RISK OF A SOLVENCY DEFICIT TO A COUNTERPLAN INFINITELY OUTWEIGHS EVEN THE LARGEST NET-BENEFIT.

Gross 1 (James A. Gross, Professor of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University, holds a Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2001, "A Human Rights Perspective on U.S. Education: Only Some Children Matter," The Catholic University Law Review (50 Cath. U.L. Rev. 919), Summer, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Lexis-Nexis)

What is excused as misfortune must be recognized as injustice and what has been dismissed as the status quo must be traced to the action or inaction of the unjust. A just society, particularly one with the economic resources of the United States, would not choose to reject any of its children. A just society would treat each of its children as an "unprecedented wonder" and would be committed to enabling them to realize their potential for living a full human life. n244 Each child would be recognized for the person he is; his presence on this earth would be treated as an "unconditional blessing." This recognition and celebration of life is the core principle of human rights. It was recognized by a Freedmen's Bureau commissioner who urged that the freed people in the Bureau's schools be "treated as men with immortal souls rather than as beasts of burden or machines for pulling cotton." n246 More than 100 years later, Thomas Sowell similarly noted that the "only common denominator among the successful schools [in the black community/ghetto] was that the students were treated like human beings and everything was geared to the expectation that they would succeed." n247 The children understood that they were important in and of themselves. Conscious choices violate the human rights of certain children. Yet human rights constitute the most essential moral claims that all human beings can assert. n249 They confirm the sacredness of human beings and their intrinsic dignity. Human rights are entitlements. The great disparity in the amount of money spent for some compared to that spent on the education of other people's children is a measure of how little certain children are valued as human beings. As a result, a message is sent that those children "deserve to be neglected [and] to be surrounded by a blatant lack of respect." It is a selfishness that consists not only of an unwillingness to redistribute resources to others in need, but also of a deliberate perpetuation of an unfair distribution of the benefits of the educational system which secures advantages in society. It is about the unprecedented wonder of each and every human being, the rights and duties of each other. It is about history and heritage as well as partaking in cultural stories and heritage. It is about sharing all the intellectual adventures at the heart of civilization. It is about morals and ethics and the content of character. It is also about participating in decisions that affect one's life. There is no reason that can justify the perpetuation of human rights violations to education: not transparent appeals to the democratic principle of local control of education (it would be a perverted [*956] democracy that commits or tolerates violations of the human rights of children); not a state's use of local control as an excuse rather than as a justification for interdistrict inequality.



A2: BIG STICK IMPACTS

REJECT THE FEAR OF EXTINCTION – OBSESSION WITH MAGNITUDE REFLECTS A PRIVILEGED CONCEPTION OF SECURITY THAT LOCKS-IN THE STATUS QUO

Jackson, 12 (Richard, PhD in Political Science from University of Canterbury, New Zealand, Deputy Director of the National Peace and Conflict Studies Centre at the University of Otago, New Zealand, “The Great Con of National Security,” August 15, <https://richardjacksonterrorismblog.wordpress.com/2012/08/05/the-great-con-of-national-security/>)

For the most part, however, most of what you’ve been told about national security and all the big threats which can supposedly kill you is one big con designed to distract you from the things that can really hurt you, such as the poverty, inequality and structural violence of capitalism, global warming, and the manufacture and proliferation of weapons – among others. Along with this obsessive and perennial discussion of so-called ‘national security issues’, the state spends truly vast sums on security measures which have virtually no impact on the actual risk of dying from these threats, and then engages in massive displays of ‘security theatre’ designed to show just how seriously the state takes these threats – such as the x-ray machines and security measures in every public building, surveillance cameras everywhere, missile launchers in urban areas, drones in Afghanistan, armed police in airports, and a thousand other things. This display is meant to convince you that these threats are really, really serious. And while all this is going on, the rulers of society are hoping that you won’t notice that increasing social and economic inequality in society leads to increased ill health for a growing underclass; that suicide and crime always rise when unemployment rises; that workplaces remain highly dangerous and kill and maim hundreds of people per year; that there are preventable diseases which plague the poorer sections of society; that domestic violence kills and injures thousands of women and children annually; and that globally, poverty and preventable disease kills tens of millions of people needlessly every year. In other words, they are hoping that you won’t notice how much structural violence there is in the world.. Politicians are a part of the system; they don’t want to change it. For them, all the insecurity, death and ill-health caused by capitalist inequality are a price worth paying to keep the basic social structures as they are. A more egalitarian society based on equality, solidarity, and other non-materialist values would not suit their interests, or the special interests of the lobby groups they are indebted to. For politicians looking towards the next election, it is clearly much easier to paint immigrants as a threat to social order or pontificate about the ongoing danger of terrorists. It is also more exciting for the media than stories about how poor people and people of colour are discriminated against and suffer worse health as a consequence. Viewed from this vantage point, national security is one massive confidence trick – misdirection on an epic scale. Its primary function is to distract you from the structures and inequalities in society which are the real threat to the health and wellbeing of you and your family, and to convince you to be permanently afraid so that you will acquiesce to all the security measures which keep you under state control and keep the military-industrial complex ticking along. Don’t believe the hype: you’re much more likely to die from any one of several forms of structural violence in society than you are from immigrants or terrorism.



EXISTENTIAL FRAMING BREAKS DOWN RATIONAL RISK ANALYSIS, ELIMINATES DECISION-MAKING, AND JUSTIFIES ENDLESS PREEMPTIVE WARFARE.

Mueller & Stewart '11 (John, Woody Hayes National Security Studies and Professor of Political Science @ Ohio State University, Mark, Professor of Civil Engineering and Director of the Centre for Infrastructure Performance and Reliability at the University of Newcastle in Australia, "Terror, Security, and Money", page numbers below) *****We don't endorse discriminatory rhetoric**

Focusing on Worst-Case Scenarios Cass Sunstein, who seems to have invented the phrase "probability neglect," assesses the version of the phenomenon that comes into being when "emotions are intensely engaged." Under that circumstance, he argues, "people's attention is focused on the bad outcome itself and they are inattentive to the fact that it is unlikely to occur." Moreover, they are inclined to "demand a substantial governmental response—even if the magnitude of the risk does not warrant the response." It may be this phenomenon that Treverton experienced. Playing to this demand, government officials are inclined to focus on worst-case scenarios, presumably in the knowledge, following Sunstein's insight, that this can emotionally justify just about any expenditure, no [end page 14] matter how unlikely the prospect the dire event will actually take place. It is sometimes argued that conventional risk analysis breaks down under extreme conditions because the risk is now a very large number (losses) multiplied by a very small number (attack probability). Moreover, the vast bulk of homeland security expenditures is not focused on events that fit a definition like that, but rather on comparatively low-consequence ones, like explosions set off by individual amateur jihadists. Analyst Bruce Schneier has written penetratingly of Worst-case thinking. He points out that it , involves imagining the worst possible outcome and then acting as if it were a certainty It substitutes imagination for thinking, speculation for risk analysis, and fear for reason. It fosters powerlessness and vulnerability and magnifies social paralysis. And it makes us more vulnerable to the effects of terrorism. It leads to bad decision making because it's only half of the cost-benefit equation. We will run short of power and society will collapse into anarchy. It could be seen in action less than a week after 9/11, when President George W Bush outlined his new national security strategy: "We cannot let our enemies strike first . . . [but must take] anticipatory action to defend ourselves, even if uncertainty remains as to the time and place of the enemy's attack. To forestall or prevent such hostile acts by our adversaries, the United States, will, if necessary act preemptively. America will act against such emerging threats before they are fully formed." The 2003 invasion of Iraq, then, was justified by invoking the precautionary principle based on the worst-case scenario in which Saddam Hussein might strike. If, on the other hand, any worst-case thinking focused on the potential for the destabilizing effects a war would have on Iraq and the region, the precautionary principle would guide one to be very cautious about embarking on war. There are considerable dangers in applying the precautionary principle to terrorism: on the one hand, any action taken to reduce a presumed risk always poses the introduction of countervailing risks, while on the other, larger, expensive counterterrorism efforts will come accompanied by high opportunity costs.



THIS LOGIC OF UTILITARIANISM CULMINATES IN EXTINCTION

Santos 3 2003, Boaventura de Souza Santos is a Professor of Sociology at the University of Coimbra, "Collective Suicide?", Bad Subjects, Issue # 63 , <http://www.ces.fe.uc.pt/opiniao/bss/072en.php>

According to Franz Hinkelammert, the West has repeatedly been under the illusion that it should try to save humanity by destroying part of it. This is a salvific and sacrificial destruction, committed in the name of the need to radically materialize all the possibilities opened up by a given social and political reality over which it is supposed to have total power. This is how it was in colonialism, with the genocide of indigenous peoples, and the African slaves. This is how it was in the period of imperialist struggles, which caused millions of deaths in two world wars and many other colonial wars. This is how it was in Stalinism, with the Gulag and in Nazism, with the holocaust. And now today, this is how it is in neoliberalism, with the collective sacrifice of the periphery and even the semiperiphery of the world system. It is above all appropriate to ask if the new illusion will not herald the radicalization and the ultimate perversion of the western illusion: destroying all of humanity in the illusion of saving it. Sacrificial genocide arises from a totalitarian illusion that is manifested in the belief that there are no alternatives to the present-day reality and that the problems and difficulties confronting it arise from failing to take its logic of development to its ultimate consequences. If there is unemployment, hunger and death in the Third World, this is not the result of market failures; instead, it is the outcome of the market laws not having been fully applied. If there is terrorism, this is not due to the violence of the conditions that generate it; it is due, rather, to the fact that total violence has not been employed to physically eradicate all terrorists and potential terrorists. This political logic is based on the supposition of total power and knowledge, and on the radical rejection of alternatives; it is ultra-conservative in that it aims to infinitely reproduce the status quo. Inherent to it is the notion of the end of history. During the last hundred years, the West has experienced three versions of this logic, and, therefore, seen three versions of the end of history: In its sacrificial genocide version, neoliberalism is a mixture of market radicalization, neoconservatism and Christian fundamentalism. Its death drive takes a number of forms, from the idea of "discardable populations", referring to citizens of the Third World not capable of being exploited as workers and consumers, to the concept of "collateral damage", to refer to the deaths, as a result of war, of thousands of innocent civilians. We must bear in mind that, historically, sacrificial destruction has always been linked to the economic pillage of natural resources and the labor force, to the imperial design of radically changing the terms of economic, social, political and cultural exchanges in the face of falling efficiency rates postulated by the maximalist logic of the totalitarian illusion in operation. In today's version, the period of primitive accumulation consists of combining neoliberal economic globalization with the globalization of war. The machine of democracy and liberty turns into a machine of horror and destruction.



A RESPECT FOR HUMAN DIGNITY IS NECESSARY TO SUSTAIN THE ESSENTIAL MEANING OF BEING HUMAN --- WITHOUT IT TYRANNY, WAR AND ECOLOGICAL COLLAPSE ARE INEVITABLE

Weiwei, 19 --- leading contemporary artist, activist and advocate of political reform in China (1/1/2019, Ai, "Human dignity is in danger. In 2019 we must stand as one to survive," <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/jan/01/human-dignity-danger-ai-weiwei>, accessed on 5/1/2020, JMP)

What does it mean to be human? That question sits at the core of human rights. To be human has specific implications: human self-awareness and the actions taken to uphold human dignity – these are what gives the concept of humanity a special meaning. Human self-awareness and human actions determine the interplay between individual thought and language and the wider society. It is our actions as humans that deliver economic security, the right to education, the right to free association and free expression; and which create the conditions for protecting expression and encouraging bold thinking. When we abandon efforts to uphold human dignity, we forfeit the essential meaning of being human, and when we waver in our commitment to the idea of human rights, we abandon our moral principles. What follows is duplicity and folly, corruption and tyranny, and the endless stream of humanitarian crises that we see in the world today. In part these challenges stem from the disparate demands of countries in different stages of development, with contrasting economic situations and competing interests. But challenges also come from divergent conceptions and understandings of human rights, human dignity, morality and responsibility, and from different interpretations and applications of the core principles of human rights. In the contemporary world, as our grasp of the fundamental values and principles of human rights and humanitarianism weakens, we risk losing our rights, responsibilities and our power to uphold human dignity. History shows that a moral failure is always accompanied by painful realities, visible everywhere. Religious divisions, ethnic contradictions, and regional disputes all feed into primitive power plays. Their logic is simple: to weaken individual freedoms and strengthen the controls imposed by governments and dominant elites. The end result is that individuals are deprived of the right to live, denied freedom from fear, and freedom of expression, or denied the rights to maintain their living environment and develop. Human rights are shared values. Human rights are our common possession. When abuses are committed against anyone in any society, the dignity of humanity as a whole is compromised. By the same token, it is only when the rights of any individual and rights of the people of any region receive our care and protection that humanity can achieve a shared redemption. Such is the principle of human rights, in all its stark simplicity. But a shared understanding of that truth still eludes us. Why so? Could it be that we are too selfish, too benighted, too lacking in courage? Or, perhaps, we are insincere, we don't really love life enough: we con ourselves into imagining we can get away without discharging our obligation to institute fairness and justice, we fool ourselves into thinking that chaos is acceptable, we entertain the idea that the world may well collapse in ruin, all hopes and dreams shattered.



REJECT HIGH-MAGNITUDE IMPACTS WHICH PUSH MINORITY BODIES TO THE BACK OF THE TRIAGE -- GIVE A NEW SENSE OF URGENCY TO THESE BODIES AS A RADICAL CRITIQUE OF THE WAITING POLITICS OF THE NEGATIVE WHICH SERVE TO MAKE SUFFERING INFINITE BY CONTINUALLY DELAYING THE AFF

Elizabeth Olson 2015 (Associate Professor of Geography and Global Studies at UNC-Chapel Hill, Geography and ethics I: Waiting and urgency, Progress in Human Geography, DOI: 10.1177/0309132515595758) 6/26/17

Though toileting might be thought of as a special case of bodily urgency, geographic research suggests that the body is increasingly set at odds with larger scale ethical concerns, especially large-scale future events of forecasted suffering. Emergency planning is a particularly good example in which the large-scale threats of future suffering can distort moral reasoning. Zizek (2006) lightly develops this point in the context of the war on terror, where in the presence of fictitious and real ticking clocks and warning systems, the urgent body must be bypassed because there are bigger scales to worry about: What does this all-pervasive sense of urgency mean ethically? The pressure of events is so overbearing, the stakes are so high, that they necessitate a suspension of ordinary ethical concerns. Bodies that are currently suffering cannot be urgent, because they are excluded from the potential collectivity that could be suffering everywhere in some future time. The urgent body is at best an assumed eventuality, one that will likely require another state of waiting, such as triage (e.g. Greatbach et al., 2005). Urgency can clarify the implicit but understated ethical consequences and normativity associated with waiting, and encourage explicit discussion about harmful suffering. Waiting can be productive or unproductive for radical praxis, but urgency compels and requires response. Geographers could be instrumental in reclaiming the ethical work of urgency in ways that leave it open for critique, clarifying common spatial misunderstandings and representations. Geographic research suggests a contemporary popular bias towards the urgency of large-scale futures, institutionalized in ways that further obscure and discredit the urgencies of the body. This bias also justifies the production of new waiting places in our material landscape, places like the detention center and the waiting room. In some cases, waiting is normatively neutral, even providing opportunities for alternative politics. In others, the technologies of waiting serve to manage potentially problematic bodies, leading to suspended suffering and even to extermination (e.g. Wright, 2013). One of my aims has been to suggest that moral reasoning is important both because it exposes normative biases against subjugated people, and because it potentially provides routes toward struggle where claims to urgency seem to foreclose the possibilities of alleviation of suffering. Saving the world still should require a debate about whose world is being saved, when, and at what cost – and this requires a debate about what really cannot wait. My next report will extend some of these concerns by reviewing how feelings of urgency, as well as hope, fear, and other emotions, have played a role in geography and ethical reasoning.



A2: UBI IS UTOPIAN (AFF)

ADVOCATES OF UBI NEED TO RECOGNIZE, AND COMMUNICATE CLEARLY, THAT UBI IS NOT A PANACEA FOR SOLVING EVERY SOCIAL PROBLEM NOR FOR MEETING EVERY VITAL NEED

Delaney, 19. (July 2, 2019, Jack Delaney is a former disability policy analyst, federal lobbyist, and congressional intern. Jack worked on issues relating to health care, disability, and labor policy, and is an active member with the Democratic Socialists of America. <https://truthout.org/articles/universal-benefits-will-help-people-with-disabilities-escape-poverty/>)

For many, existing disability benefits could be converted into a form of UBI+ simply by: Ending work conditions, Ending income-testing and the clawing-back of earnings, Ending rules that limit entitlements for people in families. This is not such an outrageous or utopian idea. Secondly, advocates of UBI need to recognise, and communicate clearly, that UBI is not a panacea for solving every social problem nor for meeting every vital need. Every distinct social good has its own distinct properties and logic. Unless advocates of UBI are clear about these caveats, then they cannot expect to ease the fears of persistently disadvantaged groups such as disabled people. Basic income is not, and never can be, a suitable replacement for universal healthcare. Instead, for any meaningful alliance to be built around UBI, it will be essential that all sides are committed to the welfare state as a whole and to extending its emancipatory role. UBI must be seen to play an appropriate role within the whole welfare state, which includes measures to open up opportunities for all and to bar prejudice and discrimination. In fact this is exactly what mainstream advocates of UBI propose, and no serious advocate of social justice is likely to believe that UBI is an alternative to universal education, healthcare or other vital services (De Wispelaere 2015: 20). Of course, in the wrong hands, any idea can be used badly. For an extreme example, Hitler exploited the idea of a national health service to advance eugenic policies. But this is not an argument against a national health service, instead it is an argument for ensuring that all such system are democratically accountable and run according to human-rights principles. Advocacy for basic income needs to be built on a positive and progressive account of the purpose of the welfare state. Currently the welfare state is too often understood negatively, as merely a form of insurance or as a safety mechanism, to ensure basic needs are met. However, this is not the positive purpose envisioned by advocates of Independent Advocates of UBI need to recognise, and communicate clearly, that UBI is not a panacea for solving every social problem nor for meeting every vital need UBI is a technical and political system for redistributing money directly to citizens. There are many good reasons to believe that such a system could have many positive impacts in terms of advancing human rights and reducing inequality. However, it is how it is implemented, and the beliefs and practices of those who implement it that will determine what it will actually achieve. Any system can be used well, or badly; and it is unwise to have faith in any technical and political system, purely as an end in itself. Independent Living does not just require technological and political change, it is also a philosophy of emancipation and equality. Disabled people, based on their lived experience of resisting oppression, have developed insights into the purpose and meaning of life. They realise that every human being has value and can live a life of meaning, if they have the freedom, resources and support to make this possible.



A2: CONDITIONAL CASH TRANSFERS

UNCONDITIONAL CASH TRANSFERS ARE A STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION- BUT ONLY A SMALL ONE. ONLY UBI CAN SOLVE.

Greenwell, 2022. (Megan Greenwell is a journalist in New York. She is writing a book about private equity and how it affects workers. “Universal Basic Income Has Been Tested Repeatedly. It Works” October 24, 2022 at 9:50 a.m. EDT <https://www.washingtonpost.com/magazine/2022/10/24/universal-basic-income/>)

Meanwhile, the concept of *conditional* cash-transfer programs — in other words, paying poor people for desirable behavior — was gaining steam in middle-income countries like Mexico and Brazil. In 2007, New York Mayor Mike Bloomberg launched a program called Opportunity NYC, which rewarded parents for tasks like taking their children to the doctor and completing job-training courses. The experiment had a moderate positive effect on families’ overall finances but did not boost academic performance among elementary-schoolers or increase families’ likelihood to seek preventive medical care, researchers found. Bloomberg did not extend the program when it expired in 2010.

Among many poverty scholars and activists, conditional cash transfers are seen as a step in the right direction, but only a small one. To maximize the impact on poor people’s lives, they say, money must be a right, not a reward, because that’s the only way to empower people to make their own choices. “There are positive outcomes from conditional cash, there are positive outcomes from unconditional cash,” Kline says. “But I think for me, making it conditional misses a really fundamental value around trust, dignity, agency, freedom.” The word “dignity” comes up a lot among guaranteed-income advocates. Research shows that the vast majority of people don’t “waste” cash on vices like drugs and alcohol, but rather use even small amounts to improve their life circumstances dramatically. In a 2019 working paper, Nobel Prize-winning development economist Abhijit Banerjee and two co-authors concluded that the distribution of unconditional cash in low-income countries had positive effects on “income, assets, savings, borrowing, total expenditure, food expenditure, dietary diversity, school attendance, test scores, cognitive development, use of health facilities, labor force participation, child labor migration, domestic violence, women’s empowerment, marriage, fertility, and use of contraception, among others.”

Banerjee is part of the research team studying the world’s largest basic-income program, which is midway through a 12-year run across 300 rural villages in Kenya. For about 5,000 people, that means an extra \$22 a month for more than a decade. Thus far, the researchers have found, participants have been less likely to get sick or go hungry, and more likely to start a business.



A2: OTHER PROGRAMS FAILED

DESPITE SETBACKS OF OTHER PROGRAMS, UBI IS STILL A GOOD IDEA.

Greenwell, 2022. (Megan Greenwell is a journalist in New York. She is writing a book about private equity and how it affects workers. “Universal Basic Income Has Been Tested Repeatedly. It Works” October 24, 2022 at 9:50 a.m. EDT <https://www.washingtonpost.com/magazine/2022/10/24/universal-basic-income/>)

Despite the setbacks at the federal level, philanthropic interest in guaranteed income continues to increase and the body of research on local programs continues to grow. No two experiments work exactly the same way — some are only for people making under a certain income, others are limited to certain neighborhoods or just for single parents — making each city feel like its own laboratory. Ultimately, though, getting more money to more people requires the type of massive funding that only governments can provide. FGI recently announced partnerships with two government-run programs in California, one in Sonoma County and one in Long Beach. Tubbs, meanwhile, is now working as an adviser to California Gov. Gavin Newsom, who last year approved a \$35 million fund to create additional guaranteed-income pilots. “I am a hyper-pragmatist,” Tubbs says. Community Love Fund “is great for the five women in Roxbury. It’s going to change their lives. But there’s thousands who need it, and governments scale, right?” Many of the newest pilots are doing their best to have it both ways: running the program through the city government — which allows them to combine philanthropic dollars with pandemic-relief funds — but planning the details with an unusual level of input from ordinary residents. In Baltimore, three representatives from neighborhood groups sat on the pilot steering committee alongside scholars, lawyers and nonprofit executives. In July 2021, the group proposed three potential target populations for the pilot, asking Mayor Scott to choose among young parents, residents of neighborhoods with the highest crime rates, or formerly incarcerated residents. Instead, he asked for a hybrid approach: 18- to 24-year-old parents in high-crime neighborhoods, all of them making under the city’s median income. In August, 200 young parents in Baltimore received their first \$1,000 payments of the two-year pilot. By the time they get their last, in summer 2024, the guaranteed income movement will be in a very different place. Where that will be, no one is entirely sure. Perhaps the wave of evidence-based support for anti-poverty initiatives will have grown into an unstoppable groundswell, forcing conservatives and moderates to get on board. But it’s disconcertingly easy to imagine the opposite: that poverty rates continue to rise unchecked after a precipitous drop during the pandemic, and most of us silently agree to look the other way. Back in Stockton, Zohna Everett still hadn’t been able to return to work as of September, because of chronic illness, and since her \$500 a month ran out in early 2021, she has struggled to make ends meet. She’s on a variety of state benefits programs, picks up a little extra money doing nails for friends and neighbors, and occasionally swallows her pride enough to accept handouts from church, but it’s never quite enough. A few months after SEED ended, her car was repossessed. If the current pilots end without a clear path toward a larger policy, thousands of people will be left in Everett’s shoes. She remains thankful for the \$12,000 she received over the two years of SEED, but these days, an early poster child of guaranteed income’s possibilities has yet again been left to fend for herself.