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# Basic Income CP

## Counterplan Core

**Text**: [Aff actors] will implement a universal basic income and abolish the minimum wage. **Aziz 13[[1]](#footnote-1)**

I propose abolishing the minimum wage, and replacing it with a basic income policy, a version of which was first advocated in America by Thomas Paine. Individuals would be able to work for whatever wage they can secure, meaning that low-skilled individuals — especially the young, who currently face a particularly high rate of unemployment — would have an easier time finding work. And the level of basic income could be tied to the level of productivity, to reduce inequality.¶ There are two kinds of basic income policy. The first is a negative income tax [is] — if an individual’s income level falls beneath a certain threshold (say, $1,500 a month) the government makes up the difference. Funds for this could be accessed by consolidating existing welfare programs like state-run pension schemes and unemployment benefits, and by closing tax loopholes and raising taxes on corporate profits and high-income earners. Germany has [enacted this policy] enacted a similar policy — called the"Kurzabeit" — and it's been credited with shielding the German labor force from the worst of the recession and keeping their unemployment rate low since.¶ The second is a universal income policy, where everyone receives a payment irrespective of their income. This would obviously require more funds — meaning higher taxes — but in a future where corporations are making larger and larger profits while requiring fewer and fewer workers due to automation, such policies may become increasingly feasible. There are already very serious proposals to initiate such a scheme in Switzerland.

**Competition**:

**A.** a system of wages no longer exists, so it’s impossible to maintain a system of living wages alongside the CP.

**B.** net benefits – CP alone solves better than the aff, and the perm.

**C.** the basic income does the same thing as the living wage, it’s just not dependent on employment – no net benefit to the perm since it’s the same for recipients

**D.** no aff offense would justify it: living wage gets you to a particular income line, combining that with a basic income wage is just a requirement for twice the living wage line if you’re employed, which doesn’t make sense – the definition of a living wage is determined by what’s necessary to meet your needs

**E.** employment is a disad to the perm – Aziz means that jobs don’t exist otherwise since its not worth paying the living wage

Functions as a de facto floor, employers need to make work appealing despite people not being desparate for it. Coopts the entirety of the aff advantages without a requirement on employers. **Yglesias ‘13[[2]](#footnote-2)**

A GBI helps people by giving them money, obviously. It also serves as a kind of de facto minimum wage, since if people can earn money doing nothing, in practice you're going to need to offer them higher pay to get them to work. But it's much more flexible than a minimum wage. In a GBI world, an employer has to make work somehow appealing enough to get employees even though everyone's guaranteed a basic minimum whether they work or not. But that "appealing" factor could be high wages, could be valuable skills and training, could just be a pleasant work atmosphere, or could be some combination of the three. Current minimum wage policies sort of try to achieve these goals by having exemptions for educationally rewarding internships or vocational programs. But these exemptions manage to be simultaneously too prone to abuse and too inflexible to capture the full range of possible scenarios that arise in human life.

## Small-Impact Net Benefits

### Automation

Automation in the squo means decreasing jobs. **Rotman ’13[[3]](#footnote-3)** summarizes

Given his calm and reasoned academic demeanor, it is easy to miss just how provocative Erik Brynjolfsson’s contention really is. ­Brynjolfsson, a professor at the MIT Sloan School of Management, and his collaborator and coauthor Andrew McAfee have been arguing for the last year and a half that impressive advances in computer technology—from improved industrial robotics to automated translation services—are largely behind the sluggish employment growth of the last 10 to 15 years. Even more ominous for workers, the MIT academics foresee dismal prospects for many types of jobs as these powerful new technologies are increasingly adopted not only in manufacturing, clerical, and retail work but in professions such as law, financial services, education, and medicine. That robots, automation, and software can replace people might seem obvious to anyone who’s worked in automotive manufacturing or as a travel agent. But Brynjolfsson and McAfee’s claim is more troubling and controversial. They believe that rapid technological change has been destroying jobs faster than it is creating them, contributing to the stagnation of median income and the growth of inequality in the United States. And, they suspect, something similar is happening in other technologically advanced countries.

Living wages encourages that to continue: they make it too expensive to hire workers, so people can’t be employed who want to be and would accept less – that’s Aziz. Also guts aff solvency: people won’t have jobs or be receiving wages at all. Basic income solves and controls the internal link to econ: it’s key to avert a demand crisis. **Wells ‘14**[[4]](#footnote-4)

First, the material abundance being wrought by ever increasing automation makes the affordability and sustainability of a universal basic income more credible. The scourge of technological unemployment means that even if being paid a living wage to do nothing does dissuade lots of us from taking jobs and turns us into "surfer bums," that won't affect the tax base - since there will be few jobs left for humans to do anyway. Effects on the work ethic would be irrelevant. Second, because the labour market mechanism for transferring claims on economic output from capital to labour has broken down, we will need a new way of providing people with the ability to consume goods, or else we will end up in an economic crisis of under-consumption amid over-production (such as Marx prophesised). In that case even, the capitalists who own the machines and the algorithms will be less well-off than they could be, for no matter how cheap their goods and services would be to produce, their profits depend on people being able to afford them.

### Informal Sector

Minimum wage causes a shift to the informal sector. **Boeri ‘08**[[5]](#footnote-5)

Minimum wages may not have negative effects on employment in dual labor markets where the minimum wage does not apply to the secondary or informal labor market. Under these conditions there are important spillover effects between the two sectors. As pointed out by Gramlich (1976), Mincer (1976) and, Welch (1976), after a minimum wage increase, workers displaced in the formal sector move to the uncovered sector. Hence, as depicted in figure 2.4, wages in the informal sector fall (fromwoI tow1I),and labor supply in the formal sector declines (shifting the Ls curve to the left). The minimum wage then reallocates jobs from the formal to the informal sector, increasing the difference between formal and informal wages. This adjustment mechanism prevents employment losses only insofar as there is perfect labor mobility between the two sectors.

No link to the counterplan though – I don’t raise the minimum wage.

Informal sector kills growth, productivity, and competitiveness – turns case and outweighs. **Farrell ‘04**[[6]](#footnote-6)

In Portugal and Turkey, informality accounts for nearly 50 percent of the overall productivity gap with the US. Around the world, these informal players operate at just half the average productivity level of formal companies in the same sectors and at a small fraction of the productivity of the best companies. As a result, informal companies persistently drag down a country's overall productivity and standard of living. MGI's investigation also found that the substantial cost advantage that informal companies gain by avoiding taxes and regulations more than offsets their low productivity and small scale. Competition is therefore distorted because inefficient informal players stay in business and prevent more productive, formal companies from gaining market share. Any short-term employment benefits of informality are thus greatly outweighed by its long-term negative impact on economic growth and job creation.

**Libertarianism NC**

A basic income is compensation for the coercive power of the state: because of the system of private property, individuals don’t have the ability to sustain themselves on the commons, i.e., by letting animals graze freely. To avoid agents holding claims against civil society in general, you need a basic income. **Zwolinski[[7]](#footnote-7)**

The assurance of a certain minimum income for everyone, or a sort of floor below which nobody need fall even when he is unable to provide for himself, appears not only to be wholly legitimate protection against a risk common to all, but a necessary part of the Great Society in which the individual no longer has specific claims on the members of the particular small group into which he was born. (emphasis added) To those who know of Hayek only through second-hand caricatures of his argument from The Road to Serfdom, his claim here will no doubt be surprising. But as my colleague Kevin Vallier has documented repeatedly, Hayek was not opposed to the welfare state as such (not even in the Road to Serfdom). At the very least, he regarded certain aspects of the welfare state as permissible options that states might pursue. But the passage above suggests that he may have had an even stronger idea in mind - that a basic income is not merely a permissible option but a mandatory requirement of democratic legitimacy - a policy that must be instituted in order to justify the coercive power that even a Hayekian state would exercise over its citizens.

Employers have coercive power over employees, basic income is key to protect their opportunity for self-governance. **Zwolinski 2[[8]](#footnote-8)**

Cases such as these point the way to a freedom-based case for a Basic Income Guarantee, of the sort that Hayek might very well have had in mind. A basic income gives people an option – to exit the labor market, to relocate to a more competitive market, to invest in training, to take an entrepreneurial risk, and so on. And the existence of that option allows them to escape subjection to the will of others. It enables them to say “no” to proposals that only extreme desperation would ever drive them to accept. It allows them to govern their lives according to their own plans, their own goals, and their own desires. It enables them to be free.

**Lastly**, Poverty relief creates positive externalities – governmental action is key to solve. **Zwolinski 3[[9]](#footnote-9)**

Both Milton Friedman and Friedrich Hayek advocated for something like a Basic Income Guarantee as a proper function of government, though on somewhat different grounds. Friedman’s argument comes in chapter 9 of his Capitalism and Freedom, and is based on the idea that private attempts at relieving poverty involve what he called “neighborhood effects” or positive externalities [so]. Such externalities, Friedman argues, mean that private charity will be undersupplied by voluntary action. [W]e might all of us be willing to contribute to the relief of poverty, provided everyone else did. We might not be willing to contribute the same amount without such assurance. And so, Friedman concludes, some “governmental action to alleviate poverty” is justified. Specifically, government is justified in setting “a floor under the standard of life of every person in the community,” a floor that takes the form of his famous “Negative Income Tax” proposal.

Basic income eliminates bureaucracy and government intrusion while also allowing people more freedom to make life choices **Gordon 8/14[[10]](#footnote-10)**

In any case, these ideas are circumscribed by traditional boundaries. Neither is a truly radical small-government idea alternative. But **one idea** that Frum highlighted **is** more radical: **a guaranteed basic income,** otherwise known as just giving people money. The idea isn’t new. As Frum notes, Friederich Hayek endorsed it. In 1962, the libertarian economist Milton Friedman advocated a minimum guaranteed income via a “negative income tax.” In 1967, Martin Luther King Jr. said, “The solution to poverty is to abolish it directly by a now widely discussed measure: the guaranteed income.” Richard Nixon unsuccessfully tried to pass a version of Friedman’s plan a few years later, and his Democratic opponent in the 1972 presidential election, George McGovern, also suggested a guaranteed annual income. More recently, in a 2006 book, conservative intellectual Charles Murray proposed eliminating all welfare transfer programs, including Social Security and Medicare, and substituting an annual $10,000 cash grant to everyone 21 years and older.The Alaska Permanent Fund, funded by investments from state oil revenues, sends annual dividend checks to the state’s residents. Switzerland is voting on an unconditional basic income later this year. (Though the fundamental basic-income guarantee involves an unconditional grant to every citizen, no matter their wealth or age, other versions wouldn’t cut checks to those in top tax brackets or those receiving Social Security.) **Apart from lifting millions out of poverty, the plans promote efficiency** **and a shrinking of the federal bureaucracy**. **No more “79 means-tested programs.” Creating a single point of access would also make many recipients’ lives easier.** If they knew they had something to fall back on, **workers could negotiate better wages and conditions, or go back to school, or quit a low-paying job to care for a** child or **aging relative**. And with an unconditional basic income, workers wouldn’t have to worry about how making more money might lead to the loss of crucial benefits. In the Financial Times, Martin Wolf has contemplated a guaranteed income’s ability to help society adjust to the disappearance of low-skill, low-wage jobs.

## Innovation/Warming Net Benefit – Extinction

UBI helps econ, lowers poverty and crime, makes creative work becomes more valuable. Santens 6/2**[[11]](#footnote-11)**

With unconditional basic income (UBI). By guaranteeing everyone has at the very least, the minimum amount of voice with which to speak in the marketplace for basic goods and services, we can make sure that the basics needs of life — those specific and universally important to all goods and services like food and shelter — are being created and distributed more efficiently. It makes no sense to make sure 100% of the population gets exactly the same amount of bread. Some may want more than others, and some may want less. It also doesn’t make sense to only make bread for 70% of the population, thinking that is the true demand for bread, when actually 80% of the population wants it, but 10% have zero means to voice their demand in the market. Bread makers would happily sell more bread and bread eaters would happily buy more bread. It’s a win-win to more accurately determine just the right amount. And that’s basic income. It’s a win-win for the market and those who comprise the market. It’s a way to improve on capitalism and even democracy, by making sure everyone has the minimum amount of voice. Can we really improve capitalism or is this just theory? If you want actual evidence of how much better capitalism would work with basic income, look at the pilot project in Namibia: “The village school reported higher attendance rates and that the children were better fed and more attentive. Police statistics showed a 36.5% drop in crime since the introduction of the grants. Poverty rates declined from 86% to 68% (97% to 43% when controlled for migration). Unemployment dropped as well, from 60% to 45%, and there was a 29% increase in average earned income, excluding the basic income grant. These results indicate that basic income grants can not only alleviate poverty in purely economic terms, but may also jolt the poor out of the poverty cycle, helping them find work, start their own businesses, and attend school.” Think about that for a second. Crime plummeted and people given a basic income actually created their own jobs and actually ended up with even greater earnings as a result. Or how about this psychology experiment as evidence for increased productivity? “The participants given a choice between either two or three puzzles each spent about 5 minutes working on the puzzle they selected. But those who were also given the option not to participate spent about 7 minutes working on their selected puzzle. Explicitly choosing to do something rather than not to do it greatly increased the amount of time people spent on the task.” This suggests that if we create the option for people to be able to choose not to work, genuinely choosing to work may result in even greater commitment, because it is suddenly a matter of choice and not force. Choice is a powerful motivator. Speaking of motivation, what does the science have to say about money as an effective motivator for complex and creative tasks? Larger rewards lead to poorer performance. “This is one of the most robust findings in social science, and also one of the most ignored. I spent the last couple of years looking at the science of human motivation, particularly the dynamics of extrinsic motivators and intrinsic motivators. And I’m telling you, it’s not even close. If you look at the science, there is a mismatch between what science knows and what business does... That’s actually fine for many kinds of 20th century tasks. But for 21st century tasks, that mechanistic, reward-and-punishment approach doesn’t work, often doesn’t work, and often does harm.” —Dan Pink In the 21st century, as we continue quickly automating away half our jobs in the next 20 years — jobs less cognitively-complex and more physically-laborious — we need to enable ourselves to freely pursue our more creative and complex ventures. Some of the best work happening right now, is the stuff being done in our free time — that is unpaid — like Wikipedia and our many other open-source community creations, not to mention all the care work performed for our young and elderly. Basic income is a means of recognizing this unpaid work as having great societal value, and further enabling it.

 Or how about the multiplier effect as evidence of enhanced capitalism? “All those dollars low-wage workers spend create an economic ripple effect. Every extra dollar going into the pockets of low-wage workers, standard economic multiplier models tell us, adds about $1.21 to the national economy. Every extra dollar going into the pockets of a high-income American, by contrast, only adds about 39 cents to the GDP.” This means that by redirecting that money pooling at the top doing comparatively very little, accumulating in ever increasing amounts through continual redistribution upwards from the bottom and middle of the income spectrum, and recirculating that clotted money back down to the bottom and middle, this would actually expand the entire economy while making it more sustainable and more inclusive. This is how the body works. This is how engines work. This is how systems work. A system cannot exist in perpetuity that is designed for one-way flow. Thomas Piketty has recently demonstrated in his sweeping Capital in the 21st Century that our current system is exactly that — one way. It is up to us to create a true circulatory system for the engine of capitalism. Without monetary circulation, the system as a whole will come to a grinding halt. If Piketty is right, then holding on to an ideology of income and wealth redistribution as “theft” may just be like a heart refusing to pump blood anywhere but the brain.

Innovation solves warming. **Norris and Jenkins 9**[[12]](#footnote-12)

Whatever the cause, we have very little chance of overcoming climate change without enlisting young **innovators** at a drastically greater scale. Simply put, they **represent** one of **the most important catalyst**s **for** creating **a clean energy economy** and achieving long-term prosperity. The reason is this: at its core, **climate change is a challenge of** technology **innovation.** Over **the next four decades,** **global energy demand will** approximately **double**. Most of this growth will happen in developing nations as they continue lifting their citizens out of poverty and building modern societies. **But** over the same period, global greenhouse gas **emissions must fall dramatically** to avert the worst consequences of climate change. Shortly before his untimely death in 2005, the Nobel Prize-winning physicist Richard Smalley coined this the "Terawatt Challenge": increasing global energy production from roughly 15 terawatts in 2005 to 60 terawatts annually by 2100 in a way that simultaneously confronts the challenges of global warming, poverty alleviation, and resource depletion. The single greatest obstacle to meeting the Terawatt Challenge is the "technology gap" between dirty and clean energy sources. Low-carbon energy technologies remain significantly more expensive than fossil fuels. For example, solar photovoltaic electricity costs up to three to five times that of coal electricity, and plug-in hybrid and electric vehicles can be twice as expensive as their gasoline-fueled competitors. **Unless** this technology gap is bridged and **clean** energy **tech**nologies **become affordable** and scalable, **poor and rich nations alike will continue opposing** significant **prices on** their carbon **emissions and** will continue **rely**ing primarily up**on** coal and other **fossil fuels** to power their development. **This will** virtually **assure massive climate destabilization.** So the task is clear: **to avoid climate catastrophe** and create a new energy economy, we must unleash our forces of innovation - namely, scientists, engineers and entrepreneurs- to invent a new portfolio of truly scalable clean energy technologies, chart new paths to bring these technologies to market, and ensure they are affordable enough to deploy throughout the world.

Ocean studies prove warming causes extinction. **Sify 10**[[13]](#footnote-13)

Sydney: Scientists have sounded alarm bells about how growing concentrations of **greenhouse gases are driving irreversible** and dramatic **change**s **in** the way the **oceans** function, providing evidence that humankind could well be on the way to the next great extinction. **The findings** of the comprehensive report: 'The impact of climate change on the world's marine ecosystems' **emerged from a synthesis of recent research** on the world's oceans, carried out **by two of the world's leading marine scientists**. One of the authors of the report is Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, professor at The University of Queensland and the director of its Global Change Institute (GCI). 'We may see sudden, unexpected changes that have serious ramifications for the overall well-being of humans, including the capacity of the planet to support people. This is **further evidence that we are well on the way to** the next great **extinction** event,' says Hoegh-Guldberg. 'The findings have enormous implications for mankind, particularly **if the trend continues.** The earth's ocean, which produces half of the oxygen we breathe and absorbs 30 per cent of human-generated carbon dioxide, is equivalent to its heart and lungs. This study shows worrying signs of ill-health. It's as if the earth has been smoking two packs of cigarettes a day!,' he added. 'We are entering a period in which the ocean services upon which humanity depends are undergoing massive change and in some cases beginning to fail', he added.

## PTX Link Shield

Counterplan is well liked by Republicans-means it isn’t hard for Obama to push through **Gordon 8/14[[14]](#footnote-14)**

In any case, these ideas are circumscribed by traditional boundaries. Neither is a truly radical small-government idea alternative. But one idea that Frum highlighted is more radical: a guaranteed basic income, otherwise known as just giving people money. The idea isn’t new. As Frum notes, Friederich Hayek endorsed it. In 1962, the libertarian economist Milton Friedman advocated a minimum guaranteed income via a “negative income tax.” In 1967, [Martin Luther King Jr. said,](http://seattletimes.com/special/mlk/king/words/poverty.html) “The solution to poverty is to abolish it directly by a now widely discussed measure: the guaranteed income.” Richard Nixon unsuccessfully tried to pass a version of Friedman’s plan a few years later, and his Democratic opponent in the 1972 presidential election, George McGovern, also suggested a guaranteed annual income. More recently, in a 2006 book, conservative intellectual Charles Murray proposed eliminating all welfare transfer programs, including Social Security and Medicare, and substituting an annual $10,000 cash grant to everyone 21 years and older.[The Alaska Permanent Fund](http://www.iser.uaa.alaska.edu/Publications/bien_xiii_ak_pfd_lessons.pdf), funded by investments from state oil revenues, sends annual dividend checks to the state’s residents. [Switzerland is voting on](http://www.bbc.com/news/business-25415501) an unconditional basic income later this year. (Though the fundamental basic-income guarantee involves an unconditional grant to every citizen, no matter their wealth or age, other versions wouldn’t cut checks to those in top tax brackets or those receiving Social Security.) Apart from lifting millions out of poverty, the plans promote efficiency and a shrinking of the federal bureaucracy. No more [“79 means-tested programs.”](http://www.heritage.org/research/testimony/2012/05/examining-the-means-tested-welfare-state)Creating a single point of access would also make many recipients’ lives easier. If they knew they had something to fall back on, workers could negotiate better wages and conditions, or go back to school, or quit a low-paying job to care for a child or aging relative. And with an unconditional basic income, workers wouldn’t have to worry about how making more money might lead to the loss of crucial benefits. In the Financial Times, Martin Wolf has contemplated a guaranteed income’s ability to [help society adjust to the disappearance of low-skill, low-wage jobs](http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/dfe218d6-9038-11e3-a776-00144feab7de.html?ftcamp=published_links%2Frss%2Fhome_us%2Ffeed%2F%2Fproduct&siteedition=intl#axzz2t387Pg6s). Cutting all federal and state benefits for low-income Americans would save around a trillion dollars per year, so there would still be a significant gap to be closed by revenue increases like higher taxes or closing existing loopholes. That doesn’t seem likely, to say the least, in the current political environment. Alternatively, a guaranteed income could be means-tested, or just offered at a lower level. [In The Atlantic](http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2013/10/how-to-cut-the-poverty-rate-in-half-its-easy/280971/) last year, Matt Bruenig and Elizabeth Stoker argued policymakers could halve poverty by cutting a $3,000 check to Americans of all ages. Naturally, the idea is not without flaws. Some conservative critics contend a guaranteed income might create a society of layabouts by establishing a[disincentive to work](http://theweek.com/article/index/265009)(although [the jury is out](http://www.vox.com/2014/7/23/5925041/guaranteed-income-basic-poverty-gobry-labor-supply)). Others wonder [which immigrants would be eligible and when](http://www.bloombergview.com/articles/2013-12-04/four-reasons-a-guaranteed-income-won-t-work). But the most common conservative counterargument is that a guaranteed income [would destroy the progress against dependency and poverty effected](http://douthat.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/02/19/when-work-disappears/) by the welfare-to-work reforms of the last two decades. (Whether that progress was [real](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/09/obamas-end-run-on-welfare-reform-part-one-understanding-workfare), or [dependent on the broader economy](http://www.cbpp.org/cms/?fa=view&id=936), is a debate of its own.) Many liberal wonks are excited by the idea, but Democratic politicians are usually scared off by the political cost of advocating a new, large-scale redistribution or by the problems with scrapping existing welfare programs. After all, as Derek Thompson explains, [Social Security works pretty well](http://www.theatlantic.com/video/index/375166/social-security-the-greatest-government-policy-of-all-time/). When Democratic Representative Bob Filner, [since disgraced](http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/08/bob-filner-is-expected-to-resign-friday/278959/), proposed a guaranteed income on a very small scale in 2006, he picked up only one cosponsor. Yet the effort to create a reform conservatism and reconstitute the GOP as the “party of ideas” seems to demand contemplating legitimately radical new ideas on welfare reform. In the introduction to Room To Grow, Levin writes, “these ideas embody a conservative vision that sees public policy not as the manager of society but as an enabler of bottom-up incremental improvements.” Scott Winship, in a welfare-reform essay later in the same document, writes approvingly of Levin’s desire to provide an “alternative to the fundamentally prescriptive, technocratic approach inherent in the logic of the liberal welfare state.” A guaranteed income, in any form, would tear that logic apart. Maybe conservative welfare reform still has some room to grow.

## Kritikal

### Productivism

A basic income reshapes the labor relation underlying modern biocapitalism – it ends the dominance of employers over workers and the exploitation of common goods – means I solve the cause of AC harms, which is also consistent with the Kingian approach. **Fumagalli[[15]](#footnote-15)**

However, almost all the social partners are opposed to the introduction of basic income. Trade Unions because they have not yet fully imderstood the current transformation of labour and the new mode of valorization, fear the loss of their basis and, above all, are linked to a conception rn of wage labour fundamentally ethical (labour ethic)”. Entrepreneurial associations, unlike the conservative behaviour of most unions, consider the introduction of basic income as potentially dangerous for the maintenance of labour discipline. And, indeed, from their point of view, they have right. The introduction of basic income, in fact, can be considered a potential counter-power, that undermines the current system of subordination and blackmail of the precarious multitude”. In fact, to ensure a stable and continuous income regardless of labour activity, means to reduce[s] the degree of blackmail of workers: a blackmail imposed by contractual individualism and by the need to work for living. Basic income can lead to exercise the “right to choose its own work” (instead of the traditional “right to work”, whatever it may be), an element that could shake the foundations of hierarchical and social control in cognitive bio-capitalism. At the same time, the partial or total removal of income blackmail can potentially foster a process of recomposition of the precarious multitude. We say "potentially" because such recomposition is not automatic but depends on the subjectivity of the involved individuals”. The outcome that would arise in any event linked, in any case, to a less availability to a supine acceptance of any labour conditions. Secondly - and this is even a more important factor, although most misunderstood — basic income presupposes that a proportion (greater or lesser extent) of the social wealth produced by the general intellect and by the structure of cooperative production should return to the same “producers”. This means a reduction in proﬁt margins, arising from the exploitation of social cooperation and common goods, unless immaterial productivity gains, generated by more stable and satisfying income conditions, are not able to compensate for this reduction.

**Outweighs: A.** Minimum wages make the condition of work more palatable but the squo proves that they don’t fundamentally challenge capitalism – the system continues to exist and be exploitive.

**B.** aff benefits are contingent on *employment*, so employers still control access to life-sustainment: no challenge to the balance of power between workers and employers. You revalue people for their productive capacity, but not as people, **Indeed**, the aff’s strategy criminalizes poverty replaces the social state to entrench oppression of unskilled workers – their value is made contingent on productivity. **Wacquant[[16]](#footnote-16)**

The resolutely punitive turn taken by penal policies in advanced societies at the close of the twentieth century thus does not pertain to the simple diptych of “crime and punishment.” It heralds the establishment of a new government of social insecurity, “in the expansive sense of techniques and procedures aimed at directing the conduct of the men”17 and women caught up in the turbulence of economic deregulation and the conversion of welfare into a springboard toward precarious employment, an organizational design within which the prison assumes a major role and which translates, for the groups residing in the nether regions of social space, in the imposition of severe and supercilious supervision. It is the United States that invented this new politics of poverty during the period from 1975 to 1995, in the wake of the social, racial, and statist reaction to the progressive movements of the previous decade that was to be the crucible of the neoliberal revolution.18 This is why this book takes the reader across the Atlantic to probe the entrails of this bulimic penal state that has surged out of the ruins of the charitable state and the big black ghettos. The argumentation unfolds in four movements. The first part (“Poverty of the Socialwelfare State”) shows how the rise of the carceral sector partakes of a broader restructuring of the US bureaucratic field tending to criminalize poverty and its consequences so as to anchor precarious wage work as a new norm of citizenship at the bottom of the class structure while remedying the derailing of the traditional mechanisms for maintaining the ethnoracial order (Chapter 2). The planned atrophy of the social state, culminating with the 1996 law on “Work and Personal Responsibility,” which replaces the right to “welfare” with the obligation of “workfare,” and the sudden hypertrophy of the penal state are two concurrent and complementary developments (Chapter 3). Each in its manner, they [which] respond, on the one side, to the forsaking of the Fordist wage-work compact and the Keynesian compromise in the middle of the 1970s, and, on the other side, to the crisis of the ghetto as a device for the sociospatial confinement of blacks in the wake of the Civil Rights Revolution and the wave of urban riots of the 1960s. Together, they ensnare the marginal populations of the metropolis in a carceralassistential net that aims either to render them “useful” by steering them onto the track of deskilled employment, or to warehouse them out of reach in the devastated core of the urban “Black Belt” or in the penitentiaries that have become the latter’s distant satellites.

Productivism outweighs, it’s impossible to reorient our values within this paradigm – everything becomes an object which means that they retrench the problems and prevent the AC’s revaluation. **Morgareidge 98**[[17]](#footnote-17)

To show why this is the case, let me turn to capital's greatest critic, Karl Marx. Under capitalism, Marx writes, everything in nature and everything that human beings are and can do becomes an object: a resource for, or an obstacle to, the expansion of production, the development of technology, the growth of markets, and the circulation of money. For those who manage and live from capital, nothing has value of its own. Mountain streams, clean air, human lives -- all mean nothing in themselves, but are valuable only if they can be used to turn a profit. If capital looks at (not into) the human face, it sees there only eyes through which brand names and advertising can enter and mouths that can demand and consume food, drink, and tobacco products. If human faces express needs, then either products can be manufactured to meet, or seem to meet, those needs, or else, if the needs are incompatible with the growth of capital, then the faces expressing them must be unrepresented or silenced. Obviously what capitalist enterprises do have consequences for the well being of human beings and the planet we live on. Capital profits from the production of food, shelter, and all the necessities of life. The production of all these things uses human lives in the shape of labor, as well as the resources of the earth. If we care about life, if we see our obligations in each others faces, then we have to want all the things capital does to be governed by that care, to be directed by the ethical concern for life. But feeding people is not the aim of the food industry, or shelter the purpose of the housing industry. In medicine, making profits is becoming a more important goal than caring for sick people. As capitalist enterprises these activities aim single-mindedly at the accumulation of capital, and such purposes as caring for the sick or feeding the hungry becomes a mere means to an end, an instrument of corporate growth. Therefore ethics, the overriding commitment to meeting human need, is left out of deliberations about what the heavyweight institutions of our society are going to do. Moral convictions are expressed in churches, in living rooms, in letters to the editor, sometimes even by politicians and widely read commentators, but almost always with an attitude of resignation to the inevitable. People no longer say, "You can't stop progress," but only because they have learned not to call economic growth progress. They still think they can't stop it. And they are right -- as long as the production of all our needs and the organization of our labor is carried out under private ownership. Only a minority ("idealists") can take seriously a way of thinking that counts for nothing in real world decision making. Only when the end of capitalism is on the table will ethics have a seat at the table.

An effective strategy must reject employment as a site for emancipation. Realignment of values ends up being along governmental lines – turns case and means the perm can’t sole. **Barchiesi[[18]](#footnote-18)**

Taking aim at the centrality of work in the governmental norms of societies where jobs as such are the constitutive condition of precarity highlights two important political tasks. First, one has to recognize that employment-based understandings of emancipation have to be discarded as their recentering of desire around employment is indeed a uniquely effective enabler for authoritarian identifications and collective realignments along governmental rationality. Second, the precariousness of employment, rather than its idealized celebration, must be placed at the core of a new grammar of politics and representations into which the sociology of work and technocratic policymaking modalities of conflict, which can counteract the socially pathologizing representations into which the sociology of work and technocratic policymaking have cast precarity.

### MLK Poverty Approach (AT Curry)

The basic income is what King actually advocated for and fundamentally challenges the way we approach poverty in the squo – it moves us from an overly optimistic, piecemeal approach to one that fights it at the core. **Weissmann[[19]](#footnote-19)**

So what, exactly, was King's economic dream? In short, he wanted the government to eradicate poverty by providing every American a guaranteed, middle-class income—an idea that, while light-years beyond the realm of mainstream political conversation today, had actually come into vogue by the late 1960s. To be crystal clear, a guaranteed income—or a universal basic income, as it's sometimes called today—is not the same as a higher minimum wage. Instead, it's a policy designed to make sure each American has a certain concrete sum of money to spend each year. One modern version of the policy would give every adult a tax credit that would essentially become a cash payment for families that don't pay much tax. Conservative thinker Charles Murray has advocated replacing the whole welfare state by handing every grown American a full $10,000. King had an even more expansive vision. He laid out the case for the guaranteed income in his final book, 1967's Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community? Washington's previous efforts to fight poverty, he concluded, had been "piecemeal and pygmy." The government believed it could lift up the poor by attacking the root causes of their impoverishment one by one—by providing better housing, better education, and better support for families. But these efforts had been too small and too disorganized. Moreover, he wrote, "the programs of the past all have another common failing—they are indirect. Each seeks to solve poverty by first solving something else." It was time, he believed, for a more straightforward approach: the government needed to make sure every American had a reasonable income. In part, King's thinking seemed to stem from a sense that no matter how strongly the economy might grow, it would never eliminate poverty entirely, or provide jobs for all. As he put it: We have come a long way in our understanding of human motivation and of the blind operation of our economic system. Now we realize that dislocations in the market operation of our economy and the prevalence of discrimination thrust people into idleness and bind them in constant or frequent unemployment against their will. The poor are less often dismissed from our conscience today by being branded as inferior and incompetent. We also know that no matter how dynamically the economy develops and expands it does not eliminate all poverty.

The aff continues that piecemeal legacy – it fights a cause of poverty – poor wages from a job, but not what poverty *is*, which is a lack of money. MLK was right – economic development cannot and will not solve poverty. In the status quo, automation is the latest example. **Rotman ’13[[20]](#footnote-20)** summarizes

Given his calm and reasoned academic demeanor, it is easy to miss just how provocative Erik Brynjolfsson’s contention really is. ­Brynjolfsson, a professor at the MIT Sloan School of Management, and his collaborator and coauthor Andrew McAfee have been arguing for the last year and a half that impressive advances in computer technology—from improved industrial robotics to automated translation services—are largely behind the sluggish employment growth of the last 10 to 15 years. Even more ominous for workers, the MIT academics foresee dismal prospects for many types of jobs as these powerful new technologies are increasingly adopted not only in manufacturing, clerical, and retail work but in professions such as law, financial services, education, and medicine. That robots, automation, and software can replace people might seem obvious to anyone who’s worked in automotive manufacturing or as a travel agent. But Brynjolfsson and McAfee’s claim is more troubling and controversial. They believe that rapid technological change has been destroying jobs faster than it is creating them, contributing to the stagnation of median income and the growth of inequality in the United States. And, they suspect, something similar is happening in other technologically advanced countries.

Living wages encourages that to continue: they make it too expensive to hire workers, so people can’t be employed who want to be and would accept less – that’s Aziz.

**A.** Guts aff solvency and outweighs – Even if the aff is entirely correct about the revaluation of workers, it’s only for *workers*. If you no longer need them, they’ve become even more disposable since they no longer have *any* value whatsoever to dominant institutions.

**B.** Outweighs in terms of material conditions, which makes your value reorientation hollow at best – values are relevant for their influence on policies and allowance for concrete possibilities of action. If your set of values can’t do that, it’s as if they don’t exist

### Fem

The gendered division of labor is the root cause since it’s the delineation of an inferior group that makes it possible, and it’s the proximate cause of violence against women in the status quo, so solving it outweighs. The basic income makes it possible to transition to a society beyond that division. **Elgarte ‘08**[[21]](#footnote-21)

Ultimately, women’s lower status is bound to have graver effects than misrecognition, as cross-cultural studies show that the lower women’s status in a society, the higher the likelihood of rape and violence against women (Sanday 1981). While this is not surprising given that lower status groups or individuals are usual targets of violent attacks, a propensity to perpetrate violence against women is to be expected in men exhibiting the traits of hypermasculinity mentioned above, as further corroborated by delinquency literature on rapists (Lisak 1991) Effects on gender violence speak strongly against the gendered division of labour and for the importance of getting men more involved in the domestic sphere (Coltrane 1988, Lisak 1991). But role sharing is also arguably the only way to end the misrecognition of traditionally female work and afford women an equal status relative to men. And for a number of other reasons, including concern for children’s wellbeing and the promotion of civic virtue, other feminist scholars have also regarded the abolishment of the gendered division of labour as a necessary step towards a just society (Okin 1989, Bubeck 1995, Gornick-Meyers 2003). If, then, full justice for women entails the abolishment of the gendered division of labour, the question arises whether a basic income could not only counter the effects of the gendered division of labour on women’s income security and bargaining power but also play a supportive role in the transition towards a society where the gendered division of labour could be abolished and full justice for women attained. As we move from one form of social organization to another (from a society molded by the gendered division of labour to one in which such division is no longer socially enforced and has come to lose its current ascendancy on people’s lives) what we need is an income security policy that can be supportive to those at the vanguard while also protecting those who lag behind and enabling them to move forward. In making role sharing economically viable for everyone while keeping everyone safe from poverty and economic dependency, a basic income scheme would indeed be up to this defy: it would protect homemakers without trapping them in the household and provide economic security to double shifters, while also enabling all couples to share paid and unpaid work in allowing them to both work for pay less than full-time or to temporarily interrupt labour market participation in order to free time for care work without thereby making household income to fall below a decent minimum.

**Even if** I don’t access those benefits, the aff does nothing to challenge the division of labor and respect. The CP is the only option that does.

A basic income provides financial security, which protects women from domination in relationships and ensures their independence. **Elgarte 2**

The fact that women effectively bear exclusive (or main) responsibility for socially useful yet unpaid and undervalued household and caring work has several adverse consequences for women. The most immediate and apparent is deprivation of a (sufficient and reliable) independent income, which leads to domination while living with a (male) partner, and grave risk of poverty after a breakup or death of partner, especially when children are involved. A basic income has been regarded as a policy that could advance gender justice precisely because of its ability to protect women from the distinct economic risks they face due to the gendered division of labour (Alstott 2001, Parker 1993). Full or partial specialization in unpaid care work puts women at serious financial risk in the (very likely) event of divorce, for no or weak labour market attachment leads to lower earning potential while main responsibility for childcare after divorce amounts to greater financial needs and less time available for paid work. Furthermore, the consequences of women’s more disrupted work-life extend far beyond child-rearing years into old age, for and/or intermittent earnings lead to meager or no pension and social security entitlements. By decoupling benefit entitlement from paid work, a basic income is effectively able to provide life-long income security both to homemakers and part-time or intermittent workers, thus meeting women’s distinctive needs regarding income security.Additionally, as pointed out by Van Parijs (2001), a livable basic income would substantially improve most women’s fallback option from any relationship (in giving them a modest but sufficient income they can count on no matter what). This enhanced fallback option due to economic independence would benefit women: I) by increasing their ability to exit (or not to enter) undesirable relationships of any sort, thus significantly protecting them from domination and its damaging effects (as described by Pettit 2007) and II) by consequently enhancing their voice within relationships (and hence the power to shape them so as to make them more satisfactory). These are indeed strong prima facie reasons for feminists to support basic income: it could provide income security for homemakers and double shifters, while endowing all women with an income of their own, thus considerably protecting them from domination and enhancing to some degree their ability to shape the relationships they choose to enter into fairer ones. However, further considerations need to be brought in, for, as I shall argue, the gendered division of labour has some important effects not taken into account in our previous assessment: effects on women’s status and on the likelihood of gender violence.

# 2NR Frontlines

## AT People Don’t Work

No, it doesn’t, in fact its better than a minimum wage at stopping unemployment. **Van Parijs ‘04[[22]](#footnote-22)**

Makes work pay? The other aspect of **the unemployment trap** generated by means-tested guaranteed minimum schemes is the one most commonly stressed by economists. It **consists in** **the lack of a significant** positive income **differential between no** work **and low-paid work**. At the bottom end of the earnings distribution, if each Euro of earnings is offset, or practically offset, or more than offset, by a lossof one Euro in benefits, one does not need to be particularly lazy to turn down a job that would yield such earnings, or to actively look for such jobs. Given the additional costs, travelling time or child-care problems involved, one may not be able to afford to work under such circumstances. Moreover, **it would generally not make much sense for employers to design and offer such jobs**, as people who would be grateful for being sacked are unlikely to constitute a conscientious and reliable work force. A **minimum wage** legislation **may** anyway **prevent full-time jobs from being offered at a wage lower than the income guarantee**, in which case the latter consideration only applies to parttime jobs. The replacement of a means-tested guaranteed income by **a universal basic income is often presented as a way of tackling this second aspect of the unemployment trap too.** If one gave everyone a universal basic income but taxed at 100 percent the portion of everyone’s earnings that does not exceed the minimum guarantee (see for example Salverda 1984), the unemployment trap would be the same, in this respect, as under a means-tested guaranteed minimum income. (See Fig. 1 and Fig. 3 in the appendix.) But **if** one makes the mild assumption that the explicit tax rate applying to the lowest income brackets must remain noticeably lower than 100 percent, then **the following statement holds.** Sin**ce you can keep the full amount of your basic income, whether working or not**, whether rich or poor, **you are bound to be better off when working than out of work.**

## AT Welfare Discriminates

**B.** Avoids discrimination through individuality, turns aff solvency since the aff’s one-size-fits-all approach disincentivizes certain groups of workers. Aff is incompatible, so no perm. **Stirton 04[[23]](#footnote-23)**

Individuality refers to the¶ standard unit at which a policy is directed. Welfare policy schemes basically face¶ a choice of administering their services¶ either directly to individuals or indirectly¶ through a household unit. Basic income is¶ routinely advocated as a form of income¶ support that caters to individuals. However, some advocates, mainly for reasons¶ of goodness-of-fit with traditional approaches in welfare policy, have been¶ willing to compromise[d] on this and recom-¶ mend instituting a basic income targeted¶ to households. The dimension of indi-¶ viduality therefore does not lose its relev-¶ ance for policy purposes.¶ hi the case of households many ques-¶ tions arise with respect to the appropriate¶ definition of a household and its internal¶ composition. Tony Atkinson distin-¶ guishes four types of household units,¶ each with its own delineation and com-¶ position problems: ‘households’ based on¶ common residence; ‘spending units’ based on common spending patterns;¶ ‘family units’ defined by blood ties or¶ marriage; and ﬁnally the ‘inner family’¶ defined in terms of a sustained depend-¶ ence relationship. Switching from one¶ household base to another in policy de-¶ sign has been shown to imply up to a¶ quarter of reductions in the measurement¶ of people on low income.‘ Measuring the¶ actual effects of welfare policies [are] is clearly¶ sensitive to choice of household type.¶ Similar observations can be made¶ regarding the administrative challenges¶ associated with targeting policies to¶ households. These reasons often lead¶ policy-makers to favour a more individualised approach.¶ From a normative point of view, the¶ chief sources of concern are the often¶ arbitrary discrimination of life-style¶ choices associated with household-based¶ policies; unacceptable inequalities between single-income and double-income households and between single persons and double-income households (some-times leading to perverse redistributive effects from the poor to the well-off); and¶ the fact that non-individualised rights¶ often generate employment traps or trap¶ partners into a dependency relation.‘ ¶While conservative political factions are¶ often keen to use welfare policies to¶ strengthen the traditional nuclear family¶ unit, the increasing variation of living¶ arrangements within and across genera-¶ tions suggests this argument may have¶ outlived its usefulness. Although much¶ attention has recently been devoted to the¶ effects of individualising benefits on in-¶ tra-householder power relations, the re-¶ search remains surprisingly ambivalent¶ about its implications for basic income.
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