**Part 1 is the framework:**

**Alexander Hamilton wrote in the federalist papers**

<https://www.goodreads.com/work/quotes/707252-the-federalist>

 “On the other hand, it will be equally forgotten that the vigor of **government is essential to the security of liberty**; that, in the contemplation of a sound and well-informed judgment, **their interest can never be separated**; and that a dangerous ambition more often lurks behind the specious mask of zeal for the rights of the people than under the forbidden appearance of zeal for the firmness and efficiency of government. History will teach us that the former has been found a much more certain road to the introduction of despotism than the latter, and that of those men who have overturned the liberties of republics, the greatest number have begun their career by paying an obsequious court to the people; commencing demagogues, and ending tyrants.”

**John Jay, another founding father, wrote**

“**Nothing is more certain than the indispensable necessity of government**, and it is equally undeniable, that **whenever and however it is instituted, the people must cede to it some of their natural rights in order to vest it with requisite powers.”**

**Because I agree with John Jay and Alexander Hamilton, I affirm and provide a framework along the same lines:**

**The thesis of the aff is that the rich lie outside the law and taxing them to even out income inequality would be beneficial to Americans**

**My value is Democracy and my value criterion is equality**

#### Democracy is defined as “the practice or principles of social equality” from the Merriam Webster Dictionary

#### Observation 1: Traditional welfare can’t solve poverty. We need reform. TANNER:

Domestic policy researcher [Michael. “The Pros and Cons of a Guaranteed National Income” The Cato Institute. May 12, 2015. Accessed 7/19/17.] NM

The purpose of an anti-poverty program should be to reduce poverty. Our current welfare system has done a remarkably poor job of this. Federal and state governments have spent more than $20 trillion ﬁghting poverty over the past 50 years. The evidence suggests that we successfully reduced the deprivations of material poverty, especially in the early years. However, in recent years, we have spent more and more money on more and more programs, while realizing few, if any, additional gains. Increased spending on anti-poverty programs has done little to increase economic mobility among the poor. This lack of mobility extends to their children as well, meaning multiple generations are trapped in poverty. We may have reduced the discomfort of poverty, but we have failed to lift people out of it. As Figure 2 shows, even as spending has increased over the last 50 years, the official poverty measure has remained essentially ﬂat. In fact, the only appreciable decline since the mid-1970s occurred in the 1990s, a time of state experimentation with tightening welfare eligibility, culminating in the passage of national welfare reform (the Personal Responsibility and Work Responsibility Act of 1996). Even using more recent, and arguably more accurate, supplemental poverty measures, the evidence suggests that while welfare may have helped reduce poverty initially, more recent increases in welfare spending have realized few gains. A study by Bruce Meyer and James Sullivan found that the majority of improvements in the poverty rate occurred prior to 1972. Less than a third of the improvement has taken place in the last four decades, despite massive increases in expenditures during that time (Figure 3).

#### Contention 1) Wealth Inequality in America is out of control

#### Income inequality is rampant. SANTENS:

Santens, Scott [writer, political advocate] . Feb 16, 2016. “inequality and the basic income guarantee”

To understand [how basic income could affect inequality](http://www.scottsantens.com/does-basic-income-reduce-income-inequality-gini), we first need to illustrate the current levels of both income and wealth inequality. To do this, we will imagine an island with a population of ten Americans, divided into fifths by income and wealth. Using 2012 data, the income and wealth distribution on the island is as follows. The richest two Americans have 85% of the wealth and 52% of the income. The second richest two have 11% of the wealth and 20% of the income. The middle pair has 4% of the wealth and 15% of the income. The next two have 9% of the income and the poorest two have 4% of the income. The bottom four collectively have so little wealth, it is essentially zero.

#### Contention 2) Money is the political muscle of the rich

#### Inequality is the biggest contributor to crime. BIRDSONG:

Nicholas Birdsong. FEB, 2012. “The Consequences of Economic Inequality” Seven pillars institute.

Studies establish a positive relationship between income inequality and crime. According to a survey of research conducted between 1968 and 2000, most researchers point to evidence economically unequal societies have higher crime rates.[33] That survey concludes that inequality is “the single factor most closely and consistently related to crime.”[34] Researchers propose several possible explanations for the inequality-crime correlation. First, disadvantaged members of a society may be more likely to suffer from resentment and hostility as a result of their economic position or competition over scarce jobs or resources, resulting in a higher propensity for criminal behavior.[35] Second, inequality increases the incentive to commit crimes. Fewer methods of lawfully obtaining resources are available for the increasing number of poor who live in an unequal society. Even when risks of punishments are taken into account, illegal methods of gaining assets may provide better returns than legal means of obtaining resources.[36] Third, a wide gap between rich and poor tends to increase crime by reducing law enforcement spending in low-income areas. Wealthy members of a society tend to concentrate in secluded communities, especially as the disparity between the rich and poor increase.[37] Rich neighborhoods or countries have more funds for the police than their poorer counterparts, resulting in a less effective police force or a higher number of officers susceptible to bribes in an increasing number of poor areas. Increasingly concentrated wealth leads to higher crime rates in poor areas which are prevalent in economically unbalanced societies. In societies with a sufficiently high degree of economic inequality, state investments in reducing economic inequality is vastly more effective at reducing crime than increasing spending law enforcement.[38]

#### Democracy is undermined due to wealth inequality. BIRDSONG:

Nicholas Birdsong. FEB, 2012. “The Consequences of Economic Inequality” Seven pillars institute.

When wealth distribution becomes concentrated in a small number of hands, political power tends to become[s] skewed in favor of that small wealthy group. High-income groups are able and incentivized to manipulate government in their favor through both legal processes and through corrupt practices. Impoverished or working class groups are simultaneously less able to become educated or participate in the political process as economic means become increasingly scarce. Wealthy groups receive political advantages in several different ways. In democratic societies that lack public financing of campaigns such as the United States, political figures require private financial backing in order to run effective campaigns. Federal candidates during the 2010 elections cycle spent around six billion dollars altogether.[54] Successful candidates in Senate races spent an average of $10.3 million on their elections, while winning Congressional candidates spent an average of $1.6 million.[55] While more money spent does not always result in more votes, campaign expenditures correlate so closely with votes that researchers have been able to reliably predict that for every $5 spent, a candidate will receive approximately one vote.[56] Political figures are required to court potential wealthy donors in order to fund successful campaigns. Half or more of the average Congressperson’s time is spent speaking with potential donors and raising money.[57] According to one report, “It is considered poor form in Congress — borderline self-indulgent — for a freshman [legislator] to sit at length in congressional hearings when the time could instead be spent raising money.”[58] Wealthy donors are given extreme access to elected officials. Politicians are likely to be reluctant to support policies that are not in the interests of their wealthy backers for fear of loosing vital financial support and subsequently the next election. Low-income groups are less able to influence elected officials. Political interest and involvement is substantially depressed in economically unequal societies. According to one survey, individuals living in the most economically equal societies are four times more likely to be actively involved in politics and 2.7 times more likely to vote compared to the most economically unequal society.[59] Poorer groups are politically disadvantaged by the inability to dedicate time for political activities. Lower income groups tend to spend more time at work or securing basic needs. Consequently, they are less able to invest time or money to obtain political knowledge or participate in the political process. Additionally, economic inequality decreases participation by the poor because the poor are less able to influence outcomes.[60] The apparent futility of low-income groups’ efforts to influence policy discourages subsequent attempts to affect policies.

**Contention 3) A universal basic income would use taxes to increase political participation**

#### UBI makes it harder for people to avoid the will of the state. TANNER:

TANNER, Michael. May 12, 2015. “The Pros and Cons of a Guaranteed National Income” Cato institute

A guaranteed national income scheme would also create fewer openings for special interests to become part of the system. Rent seeking is an enormous part of the current system, with a host of interest groups including landlords, health care providers, farmers, and so on. For example, food stamps have long been supported by a coalition of urban liberals and farm-state Republicans. There is a reason, after all, why food stamp reauthorization is included in the farm bill. Similarly, hospitals have been one of the largest interest groups pushing for states to expand their Medicaid programs under the Affordable Care Act. Moving to cash would cut such middlemen out of the process, reducing their incentive to lobby for increased funding or special favors.

#### The UBI checks back on political abuse – ensures participation. SANTENS 2:

Santens, Scott [writer, political advocate] . Feb 16, 2016. “inequality and the basic income garuntee”

At present, it should be clear what happens when political power concentrates within a small group of only the wealthiest citizens. This inequality exists due to the undue influence of money on the political process, and it is this inequality that can be reduced through basic income. Although true that each citizen has one vote, vast amounts of cash serve as artificial votes and citizens tired of being [effectively disenfranchised by wealthy special interests](http://www.princeton.edu/~mgilens/Gilens%20homepage%20materials/Gilens%20and%20Page/Gilens%20and%20Page%202014-Testing%20Theories%203-7-14.pdf) drop out of the process entirely as a result. Basic income has the potential to reverse this through two routes. On the one hand it would enable citizens to outspend even the rich on a small donation level. Enough voters spending just $50 of their basic income in an election would be sufficient to outspend big money. This would be much more possible than it is now, where currently so many are living paycheck to paycheck. On the other hand, it would enable citizens to actually be citizens, spending more of their time becoming informed of issues and also volunteering their time as active participants of democracy.

####

**A universal basic income also solves for the economic wage gaps between all people and solves for the economic inequalities.**

**Gorbis 17** Gorbis, Marina. “To Fix Income Inequality.” Qz.com, Qz.com, 11 Oct. 2017, qz.com/1096659/to-fix-income-inequality-we-need-more-than-ubi-we-need-universal-basic-assets/.

Since the Occupy protests of September of 2011, the subject of America’s large and growing income inequalities has become fodder for media stories, policy discussions, and a growing body of academic studies. Hardly a day goes by without some new research pointing out how dire the situation has become. The [Institute for Policy Studies](http://www.ips-dc.org/billionaire-bonanza/) most recently stated that “America’s 20 wealthiest people—a group that could fit comfortably in one single Gulfstream G650 luxury jet—now own more wealth than the bottom half of the American population combined, a total of 152 million people in 57 million households.” To counter gaping economic inequality, many organizations and thought leaders are offering solutions that tackle this issue. These include everything from Universal Basic Income (UBI), whereby money would be given unconditionally to every individual regardless of their income levels or employment status, to investing in employee training that upskills workers (thereby [saving them from the robots](https://qz.com/1034358/ubi-and-automation-could-be-the-symbiotic-solution-for-displaced-workers/)) or lowering tax rates.

**They continue:**

The more assets you have, the more you can leverage them to generate even more assets, and the more income you can eventually bring in. Money in particular is a kind of asset that gives people access to other assets, such as a good education, better health care, and crime-free neighborhoods to live in. But ownership of financial assets has become highly polarized: A recent study by the International Monetary Fund concluded that the share of national income paid to workers [has been falling since the 1980s](http://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/Issues/2017/04/04/world-economic-outlook-april-2017). Wages simply haven’t kept pace with gains in productivity, and a greater amount of income is being earned through equity ownership and financial investments. In today’s world, returns are going to investors and shareholders, not to workers. Economists are starting to take notice. “Policy discussions about rising global inequality should focus on how to equalize the distribution of primary assets, including human capital, financial capital, and bargaining power, rather than merely discussing the ex-post redistribution through taxes and transfers,” [says French economist Thomas Pikkety](https://eml.berkeley.edu/~saez/Piketty-Saez-ZucmanNBER16.pdf) and colleagues. In other words, we need to start thinking about wealth in terms of assets, not income.

#### UBI is a key starting point to large-scale political transformation.

Srnicek 15 [Nick (Lecturer in Digital Economy in the Digital Humanities department at King’s College London), and Alex Williams. *Inventing the future: Postcapitalism and a world without work*. Verso Books, 2015]

The first point to emphasise is that the demand for UBI **is a demand for** a **political transformation**, not just an economic one. It is often thought that UBI is simply a form of redistribution from the rich to the poor, or that it is just a measure to maintain economic growth by stimulating consumer demand. From this perspective, UBI would have impeccable reformist credentials and be little more than a glorified progressive tax system. Yet the real **significance** of UBI lies **in** the **way it overturns the asymmetry of** power that currently exists between **labour and capital**. As we saw in the discussion of surplus populations, the proletariat is defined by its separation from the means of production and subsistence. The proletariat is thereby forced to sell itself in the job market in order to gain the income necessary to survive. The most fortunate among us have the leisure to choose which job to take, but few of us have the capacity to choose no job. A basic income changes this condition, **by giving the proletariat a means of subsistence without dependency on a job**. 107 **Workers**, in other words, **have the option to choose** whether to take **a job** or not (in many ways, taking neoclassical economics at its word, and making work truly voluntary). A **UBI** therefore **unbinds** the **coercive aspects of wage labour**, partially decommodifies labour, and thus transforms the political relationship between labour and capital. This transformation – **making work voluntary** rather than coerced – has a number of significant consequences. In the first place, **it increases class power by reducing slack in** the **labour market**. Surplus populations show what happens when there are large amounts of slack in the labour market: wages fall, and employers are free to debase workers. 108 By contrast, when the labour market is tight, labour gains the political edge. The economist Michał Kalecki recognised this long ago when he argued that it explained why full employment would be resisted at every step. 109 **If every worker were employed, the threat of being fired would lose** its disciplinary **character** – there would be more than enough jobs waiting just outside. Workers would gain the upper hand, and **capital would lose** its **political power**. The same dynamic holds for a basic income: **by eliminating the reliance on wage labour, workers gain control over how much labour to supply,** giving them significant power in the labour market. Class power is also increased in a variety of other ways. **Strikes are easier** to mobilise, since workers no longer have to worry about pay being docked or dwindling strike funds. The amount of time spent working for a wage can be modified to one’s own desire, with free time spent building communities and engaging with politics. **One can slow down** and reflect, safely **protected from the constant pressures of neoliberalism**. The anxieties that surround work and unemployment are reduced with the safety net of a UBI. 110 Moreover, the demand for **UBI** combines the needs of the employed, the unemployed, the underemployed, migrant labour, temporary workers, students and the disabled. 111 It articulates **a common interest** between these groups and provides a populist orientation for them to mobilise towards.

#### The UBI can be used to challenge and reform market practices to help the poor.

**Ferguson 10** [James (Chair of the Anthropology Department at Stanford University). "The uses of neoliberalism." Antipode 41.s1 (2010): 166-184.]

- Statistical techniques for calculating the probabilities of workplace injuries were originally developed by employers to control costs, but became the basis for social insurance which brought unprecedented gains to the working class

Can we on the left do what the right has, in recent decades, done so successfully, that is, to develop new modes and mechanisms of government? And (perhaps more provocatively) are the neoliberal “arts of government” that have transformed the way that states work in so many places around the world inherently and necessarily conservative, or can they be put to different uses? To ask such questions requires us to be willing at least to imagine the possibility of a truly progressive politics that would also draw on governmental mechanisms that we have become used to terming “neoliberal”. I have been led to these questions by my current interest in antipoverty programs in southern Africa that seek to provide cash support for incomes, and thus (in theory) harness markets to the task of meeting the needs of the poor. This is happening in several African countries, but also in a great many other postcolonial states—from Brazil and Venezuela to Mexico and Bangladesh—where leftist and rightist regimes alike have seen fit to introduce policies that transfer cash directly into the hands of the poor. (See Fiszbein and Schady 2009; Standing 2008 [2007] for reviews.) The South African Basic Income Grant campaign is the example I will explore here. The proposal, which I will discuss in some detail shortly, is to deal with a crisis of persistent poverty by **providing an unconditional minimum monthly payment to all. The argument goes like this: markets aren’t working for poor people because they’re too poor to participate in them; government programs aren’t working because the state is inefficient. So, provide income support directly, in the form of cash, and then say to the poor: “you are now empowered to solve your own problems in the way you see best”. In contrast to older forms of “welfare” assistance, the claim is that such grants rely on poor people’s own ability to solve their own problems, without imposing the policing, paternalism, and surveillance of the traditional welfare state. More broadly, similar new lines of thought are calling for an increased role for direct cash transfers** in many forms of social and humanitarian policy (eg famine relief, which will be briefly discussed shortly). The reasoning here often includes recognizably neoliberal elements, including the valorization of market efficiency, individual choice, and autonomy; themes of entrepreneurship; and skepticism about the state as a service provider. But the politics are avowedly (and, I think, on balance, genuinely) “pro-poor” (as the phrase has it). “Pro-poor” and neoliberal—it is the strangeness of this conjunction that is of interest here. **For the sorts of new progressive initiatives I have in mind seem to involve not just opposing “the neoliberal project”, but appropriating key elements of neoliberal reasoning for different ends**. We can’t think about this (or even acknowledge its possibility) if we continue to treat “neoliberal” simply as a synonym for “evil”. Instead, I suggest (and this is a deliberate provocation) that some **innovative (and possible effective) forms of new politics in these times may be showing us how fundamentally polyvalent the neoliberal arts of government can be. Let me emphasize that to say that certain political initiatives and programs borrow from the neoliberal bag of tricks doesn’t mean that these political projects are in league with the ideological project of neoliberalism** (in David Harvey’s sense)—only that they appropriate certain characteristic neoliberal “moves” (and I think of these discursive and programmatic moves as analogous to the moves one might make in a game). **These moves are recognizable enough to look “neoliberal”, but they can, I suggest, be used for quite different purposes** than that term usually implies. In this connection, one might think of statistical techniques for calculating the probabilities of workplace injuries. These were originally developed in the nineteenth century by large employers to control costs (Ewald 1986), but they eventually became the technical basis for social insurance, and ultimately for the welfare state (which brought unprecedented gains to the working class across much of the world). Techniques, that is to say, can “migrate” across strategic camps, and devices of government that were invented to serve one purpose have often enough ended up, though history’s irony, being harnessed to another. Might we see a similar re-appropriation of “market” techniques of government (which were, like workplace statistics, undoubtedly conservative in their original uses) for different, and more progressive sorts of ends? Maybe not—one should remain genuinely open-minded about this—but it is perhaps worth at least considering. Let me present two empirical examples from southern Africa as a way of making this proposition perhaps a bit more plausible.

#### UBI solves political deadlock. REICH:

Reich, Robert B. September 29, 2016. “Why We’ll Need a Basic Universal Income”

**The** idea of a **universal basic income** historically isn’t as radical as it may sound. It’s **had support from people on both the left and the right**.  In the 1970s, President Nixon proposed a similar concept for the United States, and it even passed the House of Representatives. **The idea is getting** some **traction** again, partly **because of the speed of technological change**. I keep running into executives of high-tech companies who tell me a universal basic income is inevitable, eventually. Some **conservatives believe it’s superior or other kinds of public assistance because a universal basic income doesn’t tell people what to spend the assistance on**, and doesn’t stigmatize recipients because everyone qualifies. In recent years, evidence has shown that giving people cash as a way to address poverty actually works. In study after study, people don’t stop working and they don’t drink it away.