## FW

**Because our Social Safety net and the free market better and more securely provides for the poor, I negate the resolution Resolved: The United States ought to provide a universal basic income,**

**My Value is Morality**

**The word ought in the resolution implies a moral obligation**

**Morality only makes sense in terms of the people who must live by it and what they can and cannot do . For instance, we might say it is moral to save a dying man, however, this only makes sense for certain people. It would be moral for a heart surgeon to perform a lifesaving heart surgery; however, it would be immoral for me a high school student to attempt the same surgery. For this reason, we must look at what is moral for the United States Government to do as it is the Resolution’s Actor.**

**For this reason, my Value Criterion is: Sensible Government Action.**

**Observation 1: In order to debate the morality of having a UBI, the affirmative must prove that the US could pass this policy and afford a UBI.**

### Contention 1: Current Safety net programs are superior in dealing with poverty and its causes , and consequences.

**Subpoint A: The present safety net programs target specific problems faced by the poor; UBI does not: Kliff 17**

Kliff, Byrd Pinkerton and Sarah. “The Case for and against a Universal Basic Income in the United States.” Vox, Vox, 12 May 2017, www.vox.com/2017/5/12/13954182/case-for-and-against-universal-basic-income-united-states.

Greenstein is skeptical of the idea. He worries, given his experience in the United States, that creating something like **a UBI** here **would mean slashing** other **important safety net programs**. And he doesn’t think **it**’s worth the trade-off: UBI **would replace** virtually **every program** in the federal budget **focused on low**- or moderate-**income people**. **No food stamps.** No **Medicaid.** No **low-income housing**. Forget **child care**. Head Start. **Job training**. Pell **Grants to** help people **attend college. You're going to have more deep poverty [and], homelessness** and things like that.

Programs like Medicaid, which are geared towards the poor, are especially important. The aff takes these crucial and targeted funds and spends them on all without regard to need, leaving the poor with less help.

**Subpoint B: While current safety net programs are affordable, UBI will be too expensive, even if 100% of taxes went to funding it the government would still be short: Greenstein 17**

Greenstein, Robert. “Commentary: Universal Basic Income May Sound Attractive But, If It Occurred, Would Likelier Increase Poverty Than Reduce It.” Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 10 Oct. 2017, [www.cbpp.org/poverty-and-opportunity/commentary-universal-basic-income-may-sound-attractive-but-if-it-occurred?version=meter%2Bat%2B0&module=meter-Links&pgtype=article&contentId=&mediaId=&referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.washingtonpost.com%2Fnews%2Flocal%2Fwp%2F2016%2F06%2F07%2Fis-a-basic-income-possible-in-d-c-the-city-is-looking-into-it%2F&priority=true&action=click&contentCollection=meter-links-click](http://www.cbpp.org/poverty-and-opportunity/commentary-universal-basic-income-may-sound-attractive-but-if-it-occurred?version=meter%2Bat%2B0&module=meter-Links&pgtype=article&contentId=&mediaId=&referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.washingtonpost.com%2Fnews%2Flocal%2Fwp%2F2016%2F06%2F07%2Fis-a-basic-income-possible-in-d-c-the-city-is-looking-into-it%2F&priority=true&action=click&contentCollection=meter-links-click).

**There are over 300 million Americans** today.  **Suppose UBI provided everyone with $10,000 a year.  That would cost more than $3 trillion a year** — and $30 trillion to $40 trillion over ten years. This **single-year figure equals more than three-fourths of the entire yearly federal budget** — **and double the** entire **budget outside Social Security, Medicare, defense, and interest payments**.  It’s **also equal to** close to **100 percent of all tax revenue** the federal government collects.

### Contention 2: The Market is a superior method for moving people out of poverty.

#### Subpoint A: The market is superior at creating jobs and work incentives.

Dolan 14 [The Economic Case for a Universal Basic Income (Part 1 of a series), EconoMonitor, Edwin G. Dolan is an economist and educator with a Ph.D. from Yale University. Early in his career, he was a member of the economics faculty at Dartmouth College, the University of Chicago, and George Mason University]

However, the simple top-up scheme scores poorly in other respects. In particular, it provides poor work incentives. Three terms are helpful in understanding how transfers **[programs that take money from some to give to others] affect work incentives:** The benefit reduction rate for a program is the amount by which benefit payments fall for each add dollar of earned income. The marginal tax rate is the amount by which tax payments increase for each added dollar of earned income. The effective marginal tax rate is sum of the benefit reduction rate and the marginal tax rate. For example, if benefits are reduced by 25 cents for each dollar earned and if the marginal tax rate on earned income is 20 percent, then the effective marginal tax rate is 45 percent. In that case, disposable income after taxes and transfers would rise by just 55 cents for each add dollar of earned income. As the diagram shows, the simple top-up scheme imposes a benefit reduction rate (and effective marginal tax rate) of 100 percent on poor households, leaving them little incentive to work at all. Work incentives are also weak for those just above the poverty line. True, at the margin, such households can keep 80 cents of each added dollar of income, but varying income by a dollar at a time is not always feasible. Instead, **people will** often **face the choice between taking a job for a set number of hours per week, or remaining unemployed. Suppose**, for example, that **the poverty line is $20,000 and one person in the household gets an offer of a job that pays $25,000. Taking the job would raise disposable income by just $4,000**, after taking into account the loss of $20,000 in benefits and a 20 percent tax on income over the poverty line. **Work related expenses like childcare and transportation** could **easily eat up that whole amount**. Finally, despite its structural simplicity, a program that topped up income to the poverty line would not necessarily score well on administrative efficiency. It would require periodic reporting of earned income and adjustment of benefits, a task that would be all the harder because the 100 percent benefit reduction rate would provide a strong incentive to hide earnings.

#### In a world where people get a bunch of free money, jobs aren’t created, there are no work incentives, and the poor easily develop drug addiction and abuse. Drug addiction and abuse – these are all results of a world where people get a bunch of free money. Cove 18

Against the Universal Basic Income Cash transfers for every American would bring an end to our already-endangered culture of work. [Peter Cove](https://www.city-journal.org/contributor/peter-cove_39) January 8, 2018

The fatal flaw ofthe universal basicincome is the same one that hampers most existing anti-poverty programs: a lack of emphasis on encouraging work. Instead, these programs have sought to provide directly whatever poor people happen to lack. The result has been more than 50 years of massive public outlays, with little benefit other than making recipients dependent on government. The ongoing rise in worker’s disability claims follows a long string of recent expansions of welfare programs, such as food stamps, housing assistance, and even free phones to boost the standard of living among poor citizens. In the long run, this transfer-focused approach to welfare does more than create a disincentive to work. In his book [The Welfare Trait](https://www.amazon.com/Welfare-Trait-Benefits-Affect-Personality/dp/1137555289/ref=sr_1_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1515428760&sr=1-1&keywords=The+Welfare+Trait), British neurobiologist Adam Perkins argues that dependence on welfare creates work-resistant personalities, which are often passed on from one generation to the next. As one [review](https://www.theguardian.com/society/2016/mar/09/adam-perkins-welfare-dependency-can-be-bred-out) of Perkins’s work puts it, the welfare state “becomes a production line for damaged kids” and encourages parents in unemployed households to have more children than families led by breadwinners. More and more men have become absorbed in an entrenched lifestyle of joblessness, with bleak consequences. Male joblessness exceeds 20 percent in six states—Alabama, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, and West Virginia—and the number of fatalities from drug overdoses is well above the national average in each. According to economist Allan Kreuger, 44 percent of men who have left the workforce use pain medication—the fastest-growing form of substance abuse in the nation today. Even many federal lawmakers have begun to realize the costs of welfare and our joblessness epidemic. Welfare for single parents has undergone a series of reforms, and the addition of work requirements has returned many recipients to the job market, reducing welfare enrollment by more than 60 percent. These results demonstrate the value of making self-sufficiency the ultimate goal of government support, rather than expanding dependency with the “no-strings” approach of UBI.

#### Overall, I strongly urge you to vote negative in this round. I have shown you two main reasons why the United States should not provide a universal basic income: first is that UBI would lead to more poverty by redirecting current welfare funds in a less effective way and collapsing the wages of workers so that people will still not have enough money overall, and second is that UBI will hurt our nation's poorest - it encourages laziness in the workforce and thus getting fired and not having a job as well encouraging drug addiction and abuse with extra money that people do not need.

## Negative Income Tax

#### Better alternatives exist that Universal Basic Income. A Negative income tax, for example, provides monetary assistance to ONLY people below a certain poverty threshold. This is different from the affirmative, which gives free money to everyone, even billionaires. [Kevin](http://www.rstreet.org/author/kboyd/) Boyd from the R street institute explains in 2014:

POSTED ON SEPTEMBER 12, 2014 BY [KEVIN BOYD](http://www.rstreet.org/author/kboyd/) from the R street institute

A negative income tax beats both the minimum wage and welfare A negative income tax is the best way to eliminate the pitfalls of both the minimum wage and the failed, bureaucratic welfare state. The NIT would function as a basic minimum income that would get cash to the people who need it without the red tape of bureaucracy and benefit rules. Since it is a cash payment that can be spent on anything (rather than a voucher-type system) and it is done through the tax code, there is no need for special welfare fraud enforcement. The NIT, especially when combined with tax reform that sets a decent-sized gap between the income ceiling to qualify for NIT payments and the income level where income and payroll taxes would apply, can eliminate the perverse incentives in the welfare state against work, education and marriage. Unlike the current welfare state, an NIT can serve both as a safety net and as a springboard to help recipients improve their lives. Since an NIT only covers the gap between between what someone makes and a certain basic income, there is no penalty for getting a raise that puts you over the income threshold. How would it work? The government would set a basic income amount, perhaps at 130 percent of the poverty threshold as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau. The poverty threshold is essentiallythe amount of money determined annually to feed, clothe, shelter a person or family in the United States. For a family of four, including 2 children, according to the latest figures available from 2013, the threshold would be $23,624 per year, such that 130 percent of that total is $30,711.20. The NIT would pay out benefits every month, rather than once a year, as is the case with the current Earned Income Tax Credit. The only paperwork difference would be that W-9s would be submitted monthly instead of annually. For a family of four, basic monthly income would be $2,559.25. If the family earned $2,000, they would receive a check for $559.25. The funds could be deposited directly, like Social Security, without the red tape and restrictions of the current multitude of welfare programs.

#### A Negative Income tax would solve current problems with welfare and is very feasible. Boyd Continues:

POSTED ON SEPTEMBER 12, 2014 BY [KEVIN BOYD](http://www.rstreet.org/author/kboyd/) from the R street institute

Studies demonstrate that welfare programs can discourage positive behaviors such as work, marriage and investment in education. Welfare programs tend to be structured with what economists call massive “tax cliffs,” in which benefits phase out as income increases in a way that it becomes more expensive to get off of them by working to improve one’s self. It’s hard to think of a more perverse disincentive to encouraging Americans to become more self-reliant than the current social safety net. There needs to be a solution that doesn’t discourage work, while at the same time encouraging productive social behaviors such as obtaining an education and getting married. Meanwhile, most citizens believe it is reasonable to provide a basic safety net to prevent Americans from being unable to feed, clothe or shelter themselves for reasons of both compassion and to maintain order in American society. History shows a correlation between people being unable to feed themselves and violent revolution. **Why a negative income tax?** A negative income tax is the best way to eliminate the pitfalls of both the minimum wage and the failed, bureaucratic welfare state. The NIT would function as a basic minimum income that would get cash to the people who need it without the red tape of bureaucracy and benefit rules. Since it is a cash payment that can be spent on anything (rather than a voucher-type system) and it is done through the tax code, there is no need for special welfare fraud enforcement. The NIT, especially when combined with tax reform that sets a decent-sized gap between the income ceiling to qualify for NIT payments and the income level where income and payroll taxes would apply, can eliminate the perverse incentives in the welfare state against work, education and marriage. Unlike the current welfare state, an NIT can serve both as a safety net and as a springboard to help recipients improve their lives. Since an NIT only covers the gap between between what someone makes and a certain basic income, there is no penalty for getting a raise that puts you over the income threshold. How would it work? The government would set a basic income amount, perhaps at 130 percent of the poverty threshold as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau. The poverty threshold is essentially the amount of money determined annually to feed, clothe, shelter a person or family in the United States. For a family of four, including 2 children, according to the latest figures available from 2013, the threshold would be $23,624 per year, such that 130 percent of that total is $30,711.20. The NIT would pay out benefits every month, rather than once a year, as is the case with the current Earned Income Tax Credit. The only paperwork difference would be that W-9s would be submitted monthly instead of annually. For a family of four, basic monthly income would be $2,559.25. If the family earned $2,000, they would receive a check for $559.25. The funds could be deposited directly, like Social Security, without the red tape and restrictions of the current multitude of welfare programs. The biggest objection that can be articulated is that a NIT still would discourage work by being paid out to the unemployed. Of course, one could retain the unemployment insurance program and count those benefits against the NIT threshold. For those who simply refuse to work, the NIT rate could be adjusted downward, say, for those who report no income for six months straight. If they bring in no income for another three months straight, it could be reduced again. If crafted correctly, an NIT can replace the welfare bureaucracy and its perverse disincentives and it can actually encourage work and achievement and break a cycle of dependence. Also, by eliminating the minimum wage, an NIT can possibly help increase employment and help low-skilled workers enter the workforce. It’s a public policy solution that policymakers should seriously consider as we consider overhauling the welfare state for the 21st century.

## Universal Guaranteed Work

**A UGW would solve better than UBI. This would entail paying those without work to maintain skill and job training until they find sustainable work: Krupanksy 17**

Krupansky, Jack. “I've Proposed an Alternative to UBI - Universal Guaranteed Work (UGW) Which Focuses on Open-Ended...” Medium, Medium, 12 Dec. 2017, [medium.com/@jackkrupansky/ive-proposed-an-alternative-to-ubi-universal-guaranteed-work-ugw-which-focuses-on-open-ended-de74d473e49d](mailto:medium.com/@jackkrupansky/ive-proposed-an-alternative-to-ubi-universal-guaranteed-work-ugw-which-focuses-on-open-ended-de74d473e49d).

I’ve proposed **an alternative to UBI [is]** — **Universal Guaranteed Work** (UGW) **which focuses on open-ended online training and neighborhood work centers**, but **you get paid** even if you can’t find (paying) work, **as long as you keep training and developing skills**. Even if you want to focus on unpaid volunteer work as your passion, skill development and training are very valuable. And if you get paid for that training, it would be a double win.

## AT Automation

#### AUTOMATION CREATES JOBS, DECREASING IT WILL COST JOBS

***International Federation of Robotics 17*** *(*connects the world of robotics around the globe. Our members come from the robotics industry, national or international industry associations and research & development institutes. Our federation represents over 50 members from more than 20 countries. The IFR statistical department is the primary global resource for data on robotics.)*, World Robotics Federation IFR: Why Bill Gates’ robot tax is wrong, 2/27/17*

Bill Gates' latest idea to tax robots aims to solve a problem that does not exist: **empirical analysis of economic data and forecasts shows that automation** and the use of robots **create new jobs by increasing productivity**. This is **in line with the historical experience** of technological revolutions, last **seen when computers and software automated the business world**. To tax production tools instead of their profits would have a negative impact on competitiveness and employment. This is presumably why the European Parliament rejected the idea to impose a robot tax and the International Federation of Robotics strongly agrees with that decision. **According to the McKinsey Global Institute**, more than **90 percent of jobs will not be fully automatable in the future**. Instead, robots and humans will work together. The positive impact that the increased productivity of robots has on employment can already be seen in the most advanced industrial nations. The **US automotive industry**, for instance, **installed more than 60,000** industrial **robots** between 2010 and 2015. **During this same period**, the number of **employees in the** US automotive **sector increased by 230,000**. The same trends can be seen in the most advanced economies in Europe and Asia. Moreover, recent research by the OECD on the future of productivity shows: companies that employ technological innovation effectively are up to 10 times more productive than those that do not. This has a positive impact on competitiveness.

#### There’s no evidence robots are coming after your jobs

Knowledge@Wharton 17 (Knowledge@Wharton, news site run by students at the under-graduate and graduate level at Wharton, “Is a Universal Basic Income a Good Idea?” Mar 14, 2017, http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article/universal-basic-income-good-idea/)

While talk of providing a guaranteed income has been around for many years — five major experiments were conducted in the U.S. and Canada in the 1960s and 1970s that yielded mixed results — the idea has resurfaced in recent years as concerns grew that self-driving technology, artificial intelligence and robotics will destroy many jobs. There is no consensus on how big the impact will be, but one 2013 estimate out of Oxford University is that 47% of U.S. jobs are at risk of being automated in 20 years. However, Peter Cappelli, Wharton management professor and director of the school’s Center for Human Resources, says he has yet to see evidence that robots are going to cause massive joblessness. Observes Kent Smetters, Wharton professor of business economics [says] and public policy: “The evidence is that robotics is a labor complement and is increasing skilled wages. While robotics are replacing some lower-skilled jobs,the most efficient response is to not kill the golden goose but to make sure we have job training programs that are effective in increasing skills.”

## AT Poverty

#### UBI is a band-aid solution to poverty. It fails to understand that the root cause of poverty is social not economic. Not only will UBI entrench poverty, but it distracts us from actual solutions. Cass 16.

The End of Work By [OREN CASS](https://www.nationalreview.com/author/oren-cass/) June 27, 2016 5:00 AM

What about poverty? Proponents say a UBI would end it, because each American would receive a check lifting him above the poverty line. But poverty is not only, or even primarily, a matter of material well-being. If it were, the $20,000 in safety-net spending per person below the poverty line, the presence of air conditioning and cable television and cell phones in the majority of such households, even the obesity epidemic ravaging low-income communities would all be signs that the war on poverty is nearly won. But we care about social as well as material conditions, and we care about upward mobility. By these measures, a UBI makes things worse. The greatest crisis facing less educated and lower-income Americans is social, not economic. As Charles Murray’s Coming Apart (2012) documents in harrowing detail, measures of social health that once looked roughly equal across economic classes now show gaping disparities, from family formation to employment to civic engagement to basic levels of trust. In 1960, Murray reports, more than 95 percent of white children were living with both biological parents when the mother turned 40, regardless of class. By the 2000s, the upper-class figure was 90 percent but the lower-class figure had declined to barely 30 percent, a level “so low that it calls into question the viability of white working-class communities as a place for socializing the next generation.” The story for other races is similar. Appreciating the status of work in these communities is critical to understanding their decline. Work gives not only meaning but also structure and stability to life. It provides both socialization and a source of social capital. It helps establish for the next generation virtues such as responsibility, perseverance, and industriousness. Yet of the lower-class households Murray studied, the share with a full-time worker declined from 81 percent in 1960 to 53 percent in 2010. Facing that trend, society cannot afford to withdraw its remaining expectation that able-bodied people try to make ends meet and its remaining respect for those who do. Yes, a UBI might flood these communities with additional resources. But a similar flood has already occurred over the past 40 years, with safety-net spending increasing eightfold. The result has been ever greater social erosion. Many UBI advocates deny that a UBI would produce any great discouragement to work, but their claims are undermined by a vocal subset who embrace this result. Good riddance, they say, to lousy jobs taken only out of need. “I think it’s a bad use of a human to spend 20 years of their life driving a truck back and forth across the United States,” Albert Wenger, a venture capitalist, told the New York Times. “That’s not what we aspire to do as humans — it’s a bad use of a human brain.” This attitude recalls the investment banker quoted by Myron Magnet who lamented “the man and his wife slogging away in menial jobs that are dead-end jobs, with three kids, trying to deal with an environment that is very depressing, . . . living dead-end lives.” Why, asks Magnet, does this family, working to support itself and raise upstanding citizens who will start families of their own, represent “a dead end rather than a human accomplishment worthy of honor and admiration”? This dead-end message is especially toxic for upward mobility because it tells prospective low-wage workers that, in Magnet’s words, “the first step they once could have taken toward achieving [respect] — putting a foot firmly on the bottom rung of the job ladder — has had respectability withdrawn from it.” Young people with limited skills and education are already too disconnected from the labor force. A UBI that reduces the perceived importance of work while putting cash in their pockets can only reduce the likelihood of their making the daily trek to low-wage jobs. And a subculture composed of their peers would presumably become less rather than more supportive of the choice to seek work. For unemployed workers of any age, the UBI’s guaranteed paycheck would only reduce the pressure to find work or relocate in search of opportunity. Yet for those at the bottom of the economic ladder, there is simply no substitute for stepping onto the first rung. A UBI might provide the same income as such a job, but it can offer none of the experience, skills, or socialization. A nation in which people sitting beside the ladder live more comfortably but are less likely to climb it may be one with a lower government-reported poverty rate, but it is not more effectively combating poverty.

#### High Tax Rates would cancel out any proposed benefits of a UBI

Straubhaar 17 [Thomas, Professor at the University of Hamburg, “On the Economics of a Universal Basic Income,” March/April 2017, pp. 74-80, <http://archive.intereconomics.eu/year/2017/2/on-the-economics-of-a-universal-basic-income/>]

**Determining the UBI level is** necessarily a **political** decision. Economists can only argue that **a high UBI would require high tax rates** (and vice versa) in order to finance it. And high tax rates normally decrease incentives to work, because they have a negative impact on the available income. Of course**, the question of the financial level** and the extent of the subsistence minimum **is a controversial and politically charged issue.** And it cannot be ruled out that **parties could be tempted to promise** (**unrealistic**ally) **high UBIs prior to elections**. But this is by no means different from current practices. Competition for the electorate is part of democracy. **A population must decide through democratic procedures** whether it wants the subsistence level to be high or low, and **whether it is willing to accept the consequences of this decision** – including the high (or low) tax rates required for the funding of the UBI. Turning again to Germany, the federal government already presents a "report on the amount of the minimum subsistence level of adults and children to be tax-exempt", i.e. the minimum subsistence rate, every two years.26 Therefore, **the political determination of the subsistence minimum in the context of a UBI would not be new but rather the continuation of long-established political procedures.**

### AT Rejoinder

#### University of Vermont writes:

University of Vermont, Basic Debate Terminology Steve Hunt, Lewis & Clark, 1990, http://debate.uvm.edu/terminology.html

Both sides have the burden of rejoinder meaning they must answer the relevant arguments of their opponents to keep the debate progressing.