##  A2 Newark Kingsian Aff

### O^3 Kritik

#### Morality is defined as a guide to action but how we determine that guide is still up to question. For the aff, it is sufficient to justify our actions by only focusing only on a human centric conception of intentions and ethics. This creates a vertical ontology by privileging human ethics over the material world and renders objects invisible. Bryant 1

[Flat Ontology/Flat Ethics, larvalsubjects, June 1, 2012, Levi R. Bryant<http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/06/01/flat-ontologyflat-ethics/>]

**Vertical ontologies are characterized by treating one type of being as a privileged** being **within the order of existence,** such that all other beings are dependent on that being.  In contemporary thought, that being is generally treated as some variant of the human, the social, or language.  For a [basic account](http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/06/01/flat-ontologyflat-ethics/) of flat ontology, one can consult some of my previous posts [here](http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/05/29/worries-about-ooo-and-politics/) and [here](http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2010/02/24/flat-ontology-2/), or chapter 6 of*The Democracy of Objects*.  The basic characteristic of correlationist ontologies is **that the** treat the **lion’s share of agency** as **issuing from humans. [and]** For example, a theorist might endlessly **discuss** how signifiers structure **reality *without* examining the differences that nonhuman entities contribute to the world.  Under this model, things become passive matters awaiting inscriptions, and do no[t]** inscribing or **contribute** no **differences of their own.** This, I believe, has been the dominant way of thinking over the last forty years, if not the last two hundred years. Flat ontology rejects this approach, *not* because it holds that humans don’t contribute differences to the world– that would be absurd –but because it believes **this approach is dangerously one-sided** and prevents us from thinking both ecologically and from comprehending why societies and power take the form they do (follow the links above for a more detailed discussion of this).

#### To clarify, the link is not the action of the resolution but rather the way the 1AC justifies taking the action by focusing only on the human ethics and intentions specifically: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

#### Engaging in an analysis of human intentions is not sufficient to determine the valuation of an action as it ignores existential truths about the world. We are part of a world of objects that shapes all action through interactions. Only focusing on intentions and ethics causes us to ignore a vast domain of power that influences action that should also come into the discussion when we construct our “guide to action”. Bryant 2

[Bryant 9/14/13 Levi, prof of phil @ Collin College, “Agential Objects: Towards and Ontology of the Act,” Sep 14, 2013, Lecture @ 2013 Objects as Actors Symposium, Pasadena;http://larvalsubjects.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/pasadenaagentialobjects.pdf]

**Objects are actors.** They are activities. They are doings. They are doers. Why is **it [is] important to recognize this**? Let us return to the figure of the scholar and the philosopher. There is a sociology and psychology of the scholar and philosopher that leads them to overlook the agency of objects. The reflective stance leads the scholar to treat all agency as arising from mind alone and to reduce objects to a set of properties and vehicles of meaning.Workingperpetuallywith texts and ideas**,** leads scholars tosee[ing] power as arising solely from ideas, beliefs, and texts.For example, **we explain the reason the social world takes the form** or patternit has **by reference to the beliefs**, ideologies, and **ideas of people.** Power is conceived in largely discursive terms. This is reinforced by the class position of the scholar. The technologies that sustain academics such as computers and word processing programs are largely available and function as they should, and for this reason we tend not to notice them. After all, as Heidegger taught, you tend not to look at your glasses, but through your glasses so long as they aren’t cracked or broken. They become invisible. Likewise, for academics, the worries of shelter and food are generally taken care of. The struggles waged between academics take place largely at the intellectual level as battles of ideas between rival camps. Not surprisingly **we** thus **come to think of ideas,** of texts, **as organizing** the entire world andall **social relations**. What is missed here is the power that objects contribute to the formation of social assemblages, the differences they make.In some ways this isn’t a surprise as there’s a way in which objects are more radically unconscious than even the Lacanian unconscious. This isn’t so much because we’re unaware of objects and how they act upon us, but because they’re so ubiquitous and ever present in our lives. As Heidegger argued, **we think in terms of meanings and purposes.** What he did not say is that this makes it incredibly difficult for us to think in terms of causes**.** We attend to the signification of an object or what use it can be put to, **and** thereby **overlook how the** very design of an **object,** its material powers, **influences our actions, [and] how** we relate to one another, our affects, and our cognition.This is a missed opportunity, for if it is true that it’s not simply ideas, the conceptual, that exercise power but also objects, then one way of producing change in the world would be through **the design of new objects and different arrangements of objects** that **would affect people and forge relations in different ways.** On the one hand, **we critique the system of ideas that we believe maintains power and** find, much to our dismay, that **nothing changes.** How, if social relations are organized discursively, can we show that ideas are mistaken and convince people of this and still have everything remain the same? Why isn’t persuasion and critique alone sufficient to change the world? On the other hand, if it 14is true that **objects,** the material features of the world, **exert power, we miss a crucial dimension of social organization** that contributes to the failure of entropy to set in with respect to certain odious social relations. Just as a raindrop will follow the path on a leaf that defines the least resistance, **people will**, in part, **live** and relate to one another **along the grooves afforded by the objects populating the world about them. This** formation of vectors of movement is bound up with the agency of objects, with how objects act upon us, and is how they exert their power. **It is not a matter of what the object means or signifies**, nor a matter of what the object signifies, **but** rather is a matter of what the object does or **how** it**[objects] acts on us, affording certain ways of acting,** relating, feeling, **and doing, while limiting other** possible **paths**. There’s a way in which objects exert a certain gravity upon us; not in the Newtonian or Einsteinian sense, but through the formation of paths along **which we move despite ourselves and our intentions.** To see how objects exert this sort of power, take the ubiquitous smart phone. If we were Baudrillardian hermeneuts of objects or semioticians,we might discuss the signification of the smart phone, and how it is a marker of class, status, sexuality, and ideology. For example, we might contrast Android with iPhone, analyzing how the iPhone is representative of a countercultural,ecological ideology, whereas Android is a marker of corporate America and technocratic attitudes. We might look at how teenage women have adopted the custom of placing the iPhone in their back pocket, peaking out the top, both as a visible sign of social status and class, as well as an obscure signifier of sexuality. **All of this is important** and valuable, **and is not to be abandoned as a mode of analysis.**

#### This means that the basis in which they justify the resolution is self-defeating. Focusing only on the human in social assemblages ensures that we ignore a vast domain of existence that influences actions and can never achieve our intentions and obligations.

#### Our alternative is the view the world from the lens of the flat ontology. This means that all objects, humans and non-humans are on an equal ontological playing field. The alternative opens up the starting point for determining a guide to action from merely human values to one that recognizes the effects of the material world. Bryant 3

[Levi R. Bryant, The Democracy of Objects, 1. Grounds For a Realist Ontology, [Open Humanities Press, 2011](http://www.openhumanitiespress.org/), [http://quod.lib.umich.edu/o/ohp/9750134.0001.001/1:5/--democracy-of-objects?rgn=div1;view=fulltext](http://quod.lib.umich.edu/o/ohp/9750134.0001.001/1%3A5/--democracy-of-objects?rgn=div1;view=fulltext)]

Onticology proposes what might be called, drawing on DeLanda's term yet broadening it, a flat ontology.Flat ontology is a complex philosophical concept that bundles together a variety of ontological theses under a single term. First, due to the split characteristic of all objects, **flat ontology rejects any ontology** of transcendence or presence **that privileges one** sort of **entity** as the origin of all othersand as fully present to itself. In this regard, onticology proposes an ontology resonant with Derrida's critique of metaphysics insofar as, in its treatment of beings as withdrawn, it undermines any pretensions to presence within being. If this thesis is [persuasive](http://quod.lib.umich.edu/o/ohp/9750134.0001.001/1%3A10/--democracy-of-objects?rgn=div1;view=fulltext), then metaphysics can no longer function as a synonym for “metaphysics of presence”, nor substance as a synonym for “presence”, but rather an ontology has been formulated that overcomes the primacy of presence. In this section, I articulate this logic in terms of Lacan's graphs of sexuation. Here I believe that those graphs have little to tell us about masculine or feminine sexuality—for reasons I will outline in what follows—but a great deal to tell us about ontologies of immanence or flat ontologies and ontologies of transcendence. Second, flat ontology signifies that the world or the universe does not exist.I will develop the argument for this strange claim in what follows, but for the moment it is important to recognize the definite article in this claim.The claim that the world doesn't exist is the claim that there is no super-object that gathers all other objects together in a single, harmonious unity. Third, followingHarman,flat ontology **[it] refuses to privilege the subject-object, human-world relation as** either a) **a form of**[metaphysical](http://quod.lib.umich.edu/o/ohp/9750134.0001.001/1%3A10/--democracy-of-objects?rgn=div1;view=fulltext) **relation different in *kind* from other relations between objects,** and that b)refuses to treat the subject-object relation as implicitly included in every form of object-object relation. To be sure, flat ontology readily recognizes that humans have unique powers and capacities and that how humans relate to the world is a topic more than worthy of investigation, yet nothing about this establishes that humans must be included in every inter-object relation or that how humans relate to objects differs in kind from how other entities relate to objects. Finally, fourth, flat ontology argues that all entities are on equal ontological footing and that no entity, whether artificial or natural, symbolic or physical, possesses greater ontological dignity than other objects. While indeed some objects might influence the collectives to which they belong to a greater extent than others, it doesn't follow from this that these objects are more real than others. Existence, **being, is a binary** such that something either is or is not. Apart from the fact that I believe these propositions to be ontologically true, the [broader](http://quod.lib.umich.edu/o/ohp/9750134.0001.001/1%3A10/--democracy-of-objects?rgn=div1;view=fulltext) strategic import of **the concept of flat ontology is to diminish the obsessive focus on the human,** subjective and the cultural **within** social, political, cultural **theory and philosophy** that found in Ian Bogost's work, pathbreaking work such as that found in Protevi, DeLanda, and Massumi, ecologists like Timothy Morton, Marx's meditations on how the money-form, technologies, and factories change our very identities, critical animal theorists such as Cary Wolfe, and a host of other thinkers.

#### The perm is impossible, affirming flat ontology cannot generate a “ought” because ontology is merely descriptive. Bryant 4

Levi Bryant, November 12, 2013, “Political Ontology and the Place of Ontology in Politics”, larvalsubjects, [http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2013/11/12/political-ontology-and-the-place-of-ontology-in-politics/#more-7535](http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2013/11/12/political-ontology-and-the-place-of-ontology-in-politics/%22%20%5Cl%20%22more-7535%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank)

**Ontology is about what *is*,** about what it means to be, how things are, and what types of things- in the broadest terms possible –are. At its best, **it makes no claims about what *ought* to be**.  Rather, **ontology is concerned with the being of beings in their pure beingness**(how’s that for a sentence!).  By contrast, politics is a machine that evaluates how things *ought* to be and develops strategies and techniques for attempting to bring this selection and arrangement of being into existence.  **If,**building on Thorne’s example**, our ontology says “all is fire”, that ontology has nothing to say about what sorts of fires we ought to promote.  It**doesn’t tell us whether we ought to prefer neoliberal fires or anarchist fires, but **just**argues that both of these forms of being are fire and **gives an account of how fire comes to take the form**of one or the other of these configurations

#### The role of the ballot is to endorse a better ontological understanding. Our ontological understanding of the world shapes the way we perceive any kind of thinking it becomes a prerequisite before making any type of decision. Dillon

[Michael Dillon, MA and PhD and Professor in Department of philosophy, politics, and religion @ University of Lancaster, 1999, Moral Spaces: Rethinking Ethics and World Politics Pgs. 96-98]

As Heidegger—himself an especially revealing figure of the deep and mutual implication of the philosophical and the political4 — never tired of pointing out, the **relevance of ontology to all** other **kinds of thinking is** fundamental and **inescapable.** For **one cannot say anything about any-thing that is, without** always **already having made assumptions about the is as such**. Any mode of thought, in short, always already carries an ontology sequestered within it. What this ontological turn [challenges] does to other-regional-modes of thought is to challenge the ontology within which they operate. The implications of that review reverberate through-out the entire mode of thought, demanding a reappraisal as fundamental as the reappraisal ontology has demanded of philosophy. **With ontology at issue, the entire foundations** or underpinnings **of any mode of thought are rendered problematic.** This applies as much to any modern discipline of thought as it does to the question of moder-nity as such, with the exception, it seems, of science, which, having long ago given up the **ontological questioning** of when it called itself natural philosophy, appears now, in its industrialized and corporatized form, to be invulnerable to ontological perturbation. With its foundations at issue, the very authority of a mode of thought and the ways in which it characterizes the critical issues of freedom and judgment (of what kind of universe human beings inhabit, how they inhabit it, and what counts as reliable knowledge for them in it) **is** also put in question. The very ways in which Nietzsche, Heidegger, and other continental philosophers challenged Western ontology, simultaneously, therefore reposed the fun-damental and inescapable difficulty, or **aporia, for human** being of **decision and judgment**. In other words, **whatever ontology you subscribe to**, knowingly or unknowingly, as a human being **you still** have to **act**. Whether or not you know or acknowledge it, the **ontology** you subscribe to **will construe the problem of action** for you in one way rather than another. You may think ontology is some arcane question of philosophy, but Nietz-sche and Heidegger showed that it intimately shapes not only a way of thinking, but a way of being, a form of life. Decision, a fortiori political decision, in short, is no mere technique. It is instead a way of being that bears an understanding of Being, and of the fundaments of the human way of being within it. This applies, indeed applies most, to those mock -innocent political slaves who claim only to be technocrats of decision making.

### Basic Income CP

#### CP Text: Implement a guaranteed basic income, where all adults receive payments equal in value to the poverty line funded by corporate taxes. Hughes 03 explains

Hughes 03 [Hughes, James. Prof of Health Policy at Trinity College, Director fo the World Transhumanist Society. “Getting Paid in Our Jobless Future Only a guaranteed basic income can ensure economic growth, technological innovation and social welfare” 9/22/2003. http://hanson.gmu.edu/press/BetterHumans-9-22-03.htm

Brain proposes that a national account be created to provide the basic income payments, and that it be funded from a variety of sources. Money could come from the dividends on a national mutual fund invested in the stock market, from corporate fines and from the sale of national resources. For instance, all Alaskans get a US$1,500 annual check from the Alaska Permanent Fund created by the sale of publicly owned oil. But part of the resources should also come from the "extremely" wealthy since, Brain notes, "Robots will turbocharge the concentration of wealth."¶ The pedigree for Brain's proposal goes back much farther than the Triple Revolution manifesto. The French Revolutionary Condorcet proposed a universal welfare system, and it featured in the utopian visions of Saint-Simon and Fourier. The computer scientist Hans Moravec also comes to the same conclusions as Brain in his book Robot.¶ "Incremental expansion of such a subsidy would let money from robot industries, collected as corporate taxes, be returned to the general population as pension payments," Moravec argues. "By gradually lowering the retirement age, most of the population would eventually be supported. The money could be distributed under other names, but calling it a pension is meaningful symbolism. Social Security pension payments begun at birth would subsidize a long, comfortable retirement for the entire original-model human race."

#### Competition: Mutually exclusive –

#### First, in a methods debate the question is of competing methodologies. A permutation just proves my methodology is good, which isn’t a reason he should win.

#### Second, the counterplan abolishes the idea of wages. In the world of the CP, the wage would be zero. That means there’s no living wage that’s possible in the neg world.

#### CP solves inequality, crime, malnutrition, education, economy, and women’s rights. Bergman 13

Bregman, Rutger. [Reporter with the Dutch-language online outlet De Correspondent] "Free Money Might Be the Best Way to End Poverty." Washington Post. The Washington Post, 29 Dec. 2013. Web. 10 Apr. 2015. PH

In recent years, numerous studies of development aid have found impressive correlations between free money and reductions in crime, inequality, malnutrition, infant mortality, teenage pregnancy rates and truancy. It is also correlated with better school completion rates, higher economic growth and improvement in the condition of women. “The big reason poor people are poor is because they don’t have enough money,” economist Charles Kenny, a fellow at the Center for Global Development, wrote in June. “It shouldn’t come as a huge surprise that giving them money is a great way to reduce that problem.” In the 2010 report “Just Give Money to the Poor,” researchers from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development give numerous examples of money being scattered successfully. In Namibia, malnourishment, crime and truancy fell 25 percent, 42 percent and nearly 40 percent, respectively, after grants were given. In Malawi, school enrollment of girls and women rose 40 percent in settings where money was given with or without conditions on its use . From Brazil to India and from Mexico to South Africa, free-money programs have flourished in the past decade. More than 110 million families in at least 45 countries benefit from them. It is time to apply these lessons to rich but increasingly unequal societies. A world where wages no longer rise still needs consumers. Middle-class purchasing power has been maintained through loans, loans and more loans. The Calvinistic reflex that you have to work for your money has turned into a license for inequality.

The entirety of the AC solvency evidence is based on misunderstanding of the living wage. Curry, their author, conflates the Living wage with the guaranteed income- this means you negate even if they win the case debate since that would just prove that guaranteed income is good.

#### In “The Cost of a Thing” Curry quotes King arguing that the guaranteed income is the best solution to poverty- he conflates the terms. Curry 14

(Tommy, Associate Professor of Philosophy, A liated Professor of Africana Studies, and a Ray A. Rothrock Fellow at Texas AandM University) “The Cost of a Thing: A Kingian Reformulation of a Living Wage Argument in the 21st Century” PH

Martin Luther King had such an alternative to remedy these concerns. In his last book Where Do We Go From Here? Chaos or Community, King introduces the living wage as a practical political reorientation of the self aimed towards addressing the plague of poverty. Though King’s text is dedicated specifically to racism, white supremacy, and American imperialism, he surprisingly addresses poverty nationally, because there are more poor whites than Blacks in the 1960’s. King argues that thinkers erroneously “have proceeded from a premise that poverty is a consequence of multiple evils: lack of education restricting job opportunities; poor housing which stultified home life and suppressed initiative; fragile family relationships¶ which distorted personality development. The logic of this approach suggested that each of these causes be attacked one by one.” This moment-realization is important for how King aims to resolve the phenomenon of poverty through policy which reorients our values towards workers in our society more generally. King points out that as discrete programs our remedies do little to address the wholeness of the workers Black or white dealing with the social consequences of poverty. Each program while embodying both a value and call towards the political fails because the self which is the object of program is still lacking. A living wage however is more effective because it gives substance to the frail social self aiming to be empowered by education, housing, and family structure. As King says “While none of these remedies in itself is unsound, all have a fatal disadvantage. The programs have never proceeded on a coordinated basis or at similar rates of development… In addition to the absence of coordination and sufficiency, the programs of the past all have another common failing—they are indirect. Each seeks to solve poverty by first solving something else.” King concludes then that a living wage is the only way to deal with poverty, he says: “I am now convinced that the simplest approach will prove to be the most effective—the solution to poverty is to abolish it directly by a now widely discussed measure: the guaranteed income.” The guaranteed income or the living wage expresses a desire King has for the worker to be more than the object of exploitation. He recognizes that politics and normative endeavor alone is insufficient to transform that which is simply an instrument of work into the human. King is aiming for the transubstantiation the meek/laborer/object into the human—a move consistent with his more general thinking of Agape.

#### To get around this problem the next sentence conflates the guaranteed income and the living wage. Curry 2

Curry 14 (Tommy, Associate Professor of Philosophy, A liated Professor of Africana Studies, and a Ray A. Rothrock Fellow at Texas AandM University) “The Cost of a Thing: A Kingian Reformulation of a Living Wage Argument in the 21st Century” PH

Martin Luther King had such an alternative to remedy these concerns. In his last book Where Do We Go From Here? Chaos or Community, King introduces the living wage as a practical political reorientation of the self aimed towards addressing the plague of poverty. Though King’s text is dedicated specifically to racism, white supremacy, and American imperialism, he surprisingly addresses poverty nationally, because there are more poor whites than Blacks in the 1960’s. King argues that thinkers erroneously “have proceeded from a premise that poverty is a consequence of multiple evils: lack of education restricting job opportunities; poor housing which stultified home life and suppressed initiative; fragile family relationships¶ which distorted personality development. The logic of this approach suggested that each of these causes be attacked one by one.” This moment-realization is important for how King aims to resolve the phenomenon of poverty through policy which reorients our values towards workers in our society more generally. King points out that as discrete programs our remedies do little to address the wholeness of the workers Black or white dealing with the social consequences of poverty. Each program while embodying both a value and call towards the political fails because the self which is the object of program is still lacking. A living wage however is more effective because it gives substance to the frail social self aiming to be empowered by education, housing, and family structure. As King says “While none of these remedies in itself is unsound, all have a fatal disadvantage. The programs have never proceeded on a coordinated basis or at similar rates of development… In addition to the absence of coordination and sufficiency, the programs of the past all have another common failing—they are indirect. Each seeks to solve poverty by first solving something else.” King concludes then that a living wage is the only way to deal with poverty, he says: “I am now convinced that the simplest approach will prove to be the most effective—the solution to poverty is to abolish it directly by a now widely discussed measure: the guaranteed income.” The guaranteed income or the living wage expresses a desire King has for the worker to be more than the object of exploitation. He recognizes that politics and normative endeavor alone is insufficient to transform that which is simply an instrument of work into the human. King is aiming for the transubstantiation the meek/laborer/object into the human—a move consistent with his more general thinking of Agape.

#### Curry cites a page of King’s book when making his argument that NEVER discusses the living wage; it provides a description of UBI instead. MLK writes

KING Martin Luther King, Where Do We Go From Here? Chaos or Community (Boston: Beacon Press, 2010) 170-171 PH

In recent years a multitude of civil rights programs have been¶ elicited from specialists and scholars. To enhance their value¶ and increase support for them, it is necessary that they be¶ discussed and debated among the ordinary people aƒected by¶ them. To facilitate study, I have grouped some of the more¶ challenging proposals separately in an appendix to this volume.¶ There is only one general proposal that I would like to¶ examine here, because it deals with the abolition of poverty¶ within this nation and leads logically to my final discussion¶ of poverty on an international scale.¶ In the treatment of poverty nationally, one fact stands out:¶ there are twice as many white poor as Negro poor in the¶ United States. Therefore I will not dwell on the experiences¶ of poverty that derive from racial discrimination, but will¶ discuss the poverty that aƒects white and Negro alike.¶ Up to recently we have proceeded from a premise that¶ poverty is a consequence of multiple evils: lack of education¶ restricting job opportunities; poor housing which stultified¶ home life and suppressed initiative; fragile family relationships¶ which distorted personality development. The logic of¶ this approach suggested that each of these causes be attacked¶ one by one. Hence a housing program to transform living¶ conditions, improved educational facilities to furnish tools¶ for better job opportunities, and family counseling to create¶ better personal adjustments were designed. In combination¶ these measures were intended to remove the causes of¶ poverty. ¶ While none of these remedies in itself is unsound, all have¶ a fatal disadvantage. The programs have never proceeded on a¶ coordinated basis or at similar rates of development. Housing¶ measures have fluctuated at the whims of legislative bodies.¶ They have been piecemeal and pygmy. Educational reforms¶ have been even more sluggish and entangled in bureaucratic¶ stalling and economy-dominated decisions. Family assistance¶ stagnated in neglect and then suddenly was discovered to¶ be the central issue on the basis of hasty and superficial¶ studies. At no time has a total, coordinated and fully adequate¶ program been conceived. As a consequence, fragmentary¶ and spasmodic reforms have failed to reach down to the¶ profoundest needs of the poor.¶ In addition to the absence of coordination and su¤ciency,¶ the programs of the past all have another common failing—¶ they are indirect. Each seeks to solve poverty by first solving¶ something else.¶ I am now convinced that the simplest approach will¶ prove to be the most eƒective—the solution to poverty is¶ to abolish it directly by a now widely discussed measure: the¶ guaranteed income.¶

In fact, the terms “living wage” or “minimum wage” never appears in King’s book AT ALL.
Impacts:

#### A. All of the solvency evidence in the AC is actually evidence for the counterplan. To clarify, my argument is not that because King advocated the UBI so you should vote neg but rather that all AC offense is in the context of a guaranteed income. There is a massive conflation of the UBI and the living wage in the Curry article and all of the advantages he describes are actually reasons to adopt the UBI. So, only by adopting the CP can we create the reorientation of values that the aff talks about.

#### B. Do not let them indict BI in the next speech! They’re going to say that although King advocated a UBI it doesn’t matter if he can prove that the living wage is better for thingification. This does not make sense because although his evidence says “living wage” NONE of it is actually about the living wage, it is based on a conflation.

#### C. Solves better for slave-master slave ontology since the CP puts the power in the hands of the employee, they can choose whether to work or not contingent on how the employee treats them. I eliminate the need to be apart of the coercive relationship in the first place.

Also turns case since living wage makes workers more dependent on the employer

#### Additionally, King’s argument for the UBI is a great net benefit to the CP against LW. Employment based solutions to poverty are useless in a world where racial discrimination locks some, people out of the job market. Weissmann 13

Jordan Weissmann, Senior associate editor at The Atlantic. “Martin Luther King's Economic Dream: A Guaranteed Income for All Americans” The Atlantic. August 28th, 2013. PH

One of the more under-appreciated aspects of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s legacy is that by the end of his career, he had fashioned himself into a crusader against poverty, not just among blacks, but all Americans. In the weeks leading to his assassination, the civil rights leader had been hard at work organizing a new march on Washington known as the "Poor People's Campaign." The goal was to erect a tent city on the National Mall, that, as Mark Engler described it for The Nation in 2010, would "dramatize the reality of joblessness and deprivation by bringing those excluded from the economy to the doorstep of the nation's leaders." He was killed before he could see the effort through.¶ 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 problem indicates that our emphasis must be two-fold. We must create full employment or we must create incomes. People must be made consumers by one method or the other. Once they are placed in this position, we need to be concerned that the potential of the individual is not wasted. New forms of work that enhance the social good will have to be devised for those for whom traditional jobs are not available Note, King did not appear to be arguing that Washington should simply pay people not to work. Rather, he seemed to believe it was the government's responsibility to create jobs for those left behind by the economy (from his language here, it's not hard to imagine he might even have supported a work requirement, in some circumstances), but above all else, to ensure a basic standard of living. ¶ More than basic, actually. King argued that the guaranteed income should be "pegged to the median of society," and rise automatically along with the U.S. standard of living. "To guarantee an income at the floor would simply perpetuate welfare standards and freeze into the society poverty conditions," he wrote. Was it feasible? Maybe. He noted an estimate by John Kenneth Galbraith that the government could create a generous guaranteed income with $20 billion, which, as the economist put it, was "not much more than we will spend the next fiscal year to rescue freedom and democracy and religious liberty as these are defined by 'experts' in Vietnam." In recent years a multitude of civil rights programs have been¶ elicited from specialists and scholars. To enhance their value¶ and increase support for them, it is necessary that they be¶ discussed and debated among the ordinary people aƒected by¶ them. To facilitate study, I have grouped some of the more¶ challenging proposals separately in an appendix to this volume.¶ There is only one general proposal that I would like to¶ examine here, because it deals with the abolition of poverty¶ within this nation and leads logically to my final discussion¶ of poverty on an international scale.¶ In the treatment of poverty nationally, one fact stands out:¶ there are twice as many white poor as Negro poor in the¶ United States. Therefore I will not dwell on the experiences¶ of poverty that derive from racial discrimination, but will¶ discuss the poverty that aƒects white and Negro alike.¶ Up to recently we have proceeded from a premise that¶ poverty is a consequence of multiple evils: lack of education¶ restricting job opportunities; poor housing which stultified¶ home life and suppressed initiative; fragile family relationships¶ which distorted personality development. The logic of¶ this approach suggested that each of these causes be attacked¶ one by one. Hence a housing program to transform living¶ conditions, improved educational facilities to furnish tools¶ for better job opportunities, and family counseling to create¶ better personal adjustments were designed. In combination¶ these measures were intended to remove the causes of¶ poverty. ¶ While none of these remedies in itself is unsound, all have¶ a fatal disadvantage. The programs have never proceeded on a¶ coordinated basis or at similar rates of development. Housing¶ measures have fluctuated at the whims of legislative bodies.¶ They have been piecemeal and pygmy. Educational reforms¶ have been even more sluggish and entangled in bureaucratic¶ stalling and economy-dominated decisions. Family assistance¶ stagnated in neglect and then suddenly was discovered to¶ be the central issue on the basis of hasty and superficial¶ studies. At no time has a total, coordinated and fully adequate¶ program been conceived. As a consequence, fragmentary¶ and spasmodic reforms have failed to reach down to the¶ profoundest needs of the poor.¶ In addition to the absence of coordination and su¤ciency,¶ the programs of the past all have another common failing—¶ they are indirect. Each seeks to solve poverty by first solving¶ something else.¶ I am now convinced that the simplest approach will¶ prove to be the most eƒective—the solution to poverty is¶ to abolish it directly by a now widely discussed measure: the¶ guaranteed income.¶

### Turns

#### The minimum wage is rooted in a history of racial segregation. You can’t separate the policy.

Bartlett 13 [Held senior policy roles in the Reagan and George H.W. Bush administrations and served on the staffs of Representatives Jack Kemp and Ron Paul., Bruce. "The Minimum-Wage Cure for Illegal Immigration." Economix The MinimumWage Cure for Illegal Immigration Comments. N.p., 03 Dec. 2013.]

Last week, Ron Unz, a California businessman, submitted a [ballot initiative](http://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/ballot-measures/attorney-general-information.htm) to the California secretary of state that would raise the state minimum wage to $12 an hour in 2016 from the current $8. The federal minimum wage is $7.25. Many states have [minimum wages above the federal rate](http://www.dol.gov/whd/minwage/america.htm). Democrats and progressives have been pushing for higher minimum wages at the [state and local level](http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/dc-politics/push-for-minimum-wage-hike-led-by-localities-democrats/2013/11/28/5b2c7dc4-5795-11e3-8304-caf30787c0a9_story.html), encountering opposition much less intense than in Congress, where Republicans are adamantly opposed to any increase, saying it would lead to a loss of jobs. Polls show [strong public support for a higher minimum wage](http://pollingreport.com/work.htm). What is curious about the Unz initiative is that he is a conservative who defends a higher minimum wage on conservative grounds. In[an interview](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/11/26/us/conservative-leads-effort-to-raise-minimum-wage-in-california.html) with The New York Times, he said it would reduce government spending on welfare. A [recent study](http://laborcenter.berkeley.edu/publiccosts/fastfoodpovertywages.shtml) from the University of California, Berkeley, estimated that welfare benefits for low-wage workers amount to $7 billion a year. More controversially, Mr. Unz also contends that a higher minimum wage would curb illegal immigration. He has [made this argument](http://www.ronunz.org/tag/minimum-wage/) for some years in a variety of liberal and conservative publications. Cleverly, Mr. Unz has turned the principal conservative argument against a higher minimum wage – that it would reduce jobs by making employment more expensive – into a virtue. As he wrote in a [2011 article](http://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/immigration-republicans-and-the-end-of-white-america-singlepage/) in The American Conservative magazine, of which he was then the publisher: **The automatic rejoinder to proposals for hiking the minimum wage is that “jobs will be lost.” But in today’s America a huge fraction of jobs at or near the minimum wage are held by immigrants, often illegal ones. Eliminating those jobs is a central goal of the plan**, a feature not a bug. He asserted that those affected would primarily be newly arrived immigrants, those with the weakest ties to American society. Those who have been in the United States for a while, who have mastered English and put down roots, would likely be “grandfathered in” and not lose their jobs. “In effect, **a** much **higher minimum wage serves to remove the lowest rungs in the employment ladder, thus preventing** newly arrived **immigrants from gaining** their initial **foothold in the economy**,” Mr. Unz wrote. Once this fact became known, it would discourage low-skilled immigrants from coming in the first place. Interestingly, liberals have made this same argument. Writing in The New York Times in 2006, the former Massachusetts governor and 1988 Democratic presidential nominee Michael S. Dukakis and Daniel J.B. Mitchell, an economist at the University of California, Los Angeles, also [defended a higher minimum wage](http://www.nytimes.com/2006/07/25/opinion/25Duk.html) partially on the grounds that it would disemploy illegal immigrants. As they explained: If we want to reduce illegal immigration, it makes sense to reduce the abundance of extremely low-paying jobs that fuels it. If we raise the minimum wage, it’s possible some low-end jobs may be lost; but more Americans would also be willing to work in such jobs, thereby denying them to people who aren’t supposed to be here in the first place. The idea that there are beneficial effects to excluding certain classes of workers from employment by having a minimum wage is not a new one. Indeed, early support for a minimum wage during the Progressive Era was based heavily on the expectation that it would price women out of the market. As the Middlebury College economist Robert E. Prasch detailed in a[1999 academic article](http://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1257/jep.13.2.221), progressives in the early 20th century had a very paternalistic attitude toward women. The first state minimum wages affected only women. This was often justified by the need to keep them from being tempted by prostitution, a point that was often made euphemistically. During debate on the minimum wage in 1912, the [Public Service Corporation of New Jersey referred](http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F00D14FB3B5813738DDDAD0A94DA415B828DF1D3) to “the pitfalls and temptations which beset young women who are thrown in contact with the world.” The Princeton economist Thomas C. Leonard notes that another goal of minimum wages for women was to price them out of the labor market, thus reducing competition for jobs and raising wages for men. “A woman whose wages contributed to her family’s income was ordinarily scorned as a parasite and a usurper of wages that rightfully belonged to the male head of household,” he wrote in a[2005 academic paper](http://www.princeton.edu/~tleonard/papers/Womenswork.pdf). In [another paper](http://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1257/089533005775196642), Professor Leonard points out that **early supporters of the minimum wage were motivated by the idea of “eugenics**” **– that public policy ought to improve the quality of the human race, biologically. One way the minimum wage served this purpose was by** making those considered mentally defective unemployable. Without jobs, it was thought, it would be impossible for them to marry and reproduce, thus serving a eugenic purpose. Keeping native-born women out of the labor force also served the eugenic purpose of encouraging them to marry and have children. In [a 1907 letter that was widely circulated](http://books.google.com/books?id=3D95IcBkIPwC&pg=PA550&lpg=PA550#v=onepage&q&f=false), President Theodore Roosevelt was highly critical of those of “native American descent” who failed to reproduce sufficiently, saying they were contributing to “race suicide.” **Pricing immigrants out of jobs** served a eugenic purpose as well. **Many immigrants of that era were viewed as racially inferior.** This view led to adoption of the [Immigration Act of 1924](https://history.state.gov/milestones/1921-1936/immigration-act), which encouraged immigration from regions view as racially superior and set strict quotas on those from places where the people were seen as racially inferior. Consequently, it is not surprising that the Unz proposal has gotten strong support from those who strongly oppose immigration for racial reasons. The website VDARE.com (named for Virginia Dare, the first white child born in the New World) strongly supports it. A[Feb. 20, 2013, commentary](http://www.vdare.com/posts/ron-unz-s-minimum-wage-proposal-make-illegal-immigration-unprofitable) said a higher minimum wage would keep out “wetback labor.” There are good arguments for raising the minimum wage. For example, an [August study](http://www.chicagofed.org/webpages/publications/chicago_fed_letter/2013/august_313.cfm) from the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago said an increase in the federal minimum wage would raise aggregate spending in the economy and, hence, the real gross domestic product. A higher minimum wage may also discourage some employment of illegal immigrants. But making an inadvertent side effect of the minimum wage its principal purpose may do more to divide potential allies than bring them together.