# BACKGROUND

A universal basic income (or UBI) is the idea that everyone* should receive a check every month that can be spent on whatever they want and/or need just like income. This differs from how most of our fiscal redistribution programs work in a few key ways:

1. There are no eligibility requirements. A UBI isn't targeted at only those making below a certain amount. The wealthiest Americans receive the same check as those living in poverty do.
2. There are no stipulations on how the money can be spent. A UBI isn't like SNAP benefits (food stamps) where assistance can only be spent on specific items.

These differences are important for several reasons. If everyone gets the benefit, it's much harder to take it away later. We see that in Social Security - it's hard to cut social security benefits because everyone over the age of 65 (more or less) gets those benefits, so it's much harder to get public support to take them away. Also, everyone getting the benefit means that we don't have to spend as much money figuring out who is eligible to receive benefits and who isn't. There wouldn't be people who "shouldn't" receive benefits tricking the system. Everyone gets it.

The unrestricted nature of the check is important, as well. If someone who qualifies for SNAP benefits doesn't need food, but gets a flat tire and needs to replace it or else risks losing their job, their SNAP benefits aren't as helpful as a UBI check would be. Some things to consider - who is "everyone?" Is it all adults or all citizens or all residents? These differences may allow different negative strategies in response.

**POVERTY / INEQUALITY**

The inherency and solvency of the case focus on the destructive nature of income inequality and poverty. Poverty is at dangerous levels in the US. In history, when we see poverty running out of control, that tends to be a precursor to unrest. Nations fall when inequality gets out of control, because at some point, the majority of people don't have access to the things they need for survival. A UBI can help prevent that. But I would also advise focusing on the human costs of poverty. Even if the nation doesn't fall, poverty has many negative effects for people. Shorter life spans, less happiness, and other effects are highlighted in the inherency and solvency.

**ECONOMIC RESILIENCE ADVANTAGE**

Economic downturns like what happened in the great depression of 1929 and the great recession of 2007 (just to name two) happen. This advantage points out that when a recession happens and gets really bad, it weakens the stability of the nation, and that can lead to global instability and conflict (WW2 was caused in part by the great depression, for example). One of the major factors in a recession is that no one has money to spend, so the economy sort of just stops. Making sure that everyone has at least something to spend no matter what can prevent these recessions from becoming as big, and therefore act as a preventative measure against these kinds of recessions and therefore make the world a safer place.

# KEY DEBATE TERMS

**Affirmative Case:** In a debate, the affirmative team will propose to do something to change the world for the better. This proposal will be related to the "resolution," or the topic that year. These affirmative cases will have three parts:

**What (Plan):** This is a very specific statement of what you want to do. This is the focus of the debate -- the judge will vote for the affirmative if the plan is a good idea, and for the negative if the plan is a bad idea. You can't change your plan once a debate starts.
**How (Solvency):** Once you say what you are going to do, you need to explain how it works -- what are the key details?
**Why (Advantage):** Once you've said what you are going to and how it works, we need the why-- what are the benefits of doing the plan?

Example:

- Plan: We should get Chinese Food for dinner
- How: We'll get it from Wok and Roll carryout, which is affordable, open now, and closeby
- Why: Chinese food tastes good and brings us joy. Furthermore, we'll starve if we don't eat something

When we talk about the "Why (Advantages)" there are three terms you'll come across:
**Uniqueness:** Uniqueness describes how things are now, or how they are going to be in the future.

Uniqueness is important to demonstrate cause and effect. If outcome X happens, and action Y happens, you can't assume X causes Y. X could be inevitable, regardless of Y.

**Link:** This is the cause and effect resulting from the plan. Actions have reactions, intentional or unintentional, which can be good or bad.

**Impact:** This is the outcome of the Link -- what happens as a result of the link's action. Impacts are either positive things (economic growth), or avoiding negative things (saving lives, the environment, etc.)

When discussing impacts, you'll need 3 ideas to compare them.
**Magnitude:** How big? How Important? This is all about the size of something -- such as X lives saved.

**Probability:** How likely is it that the impact will happen? 100%? 50%? 5%?

**Timeframe:** When does the impact happen? Sooner is generally better, because long term impacts are less likely / harder to predict / we can fix them later

**Framework:** How should the judge think? Framework identifies what is important and what a judge should value in the debate, and should make your arguments look good.

For example: The affirmative plan reduces racism, and their framework is that fighting racism should come first, regardless of the costs

# ORDER OF A DEBATE

## The Speeches

Four things happen in a debate:

- **Speaking:** You (and your partner) speak twice each
- **Listening:** You listen (and take notes) on what your opponents have to say
- **Questioning:** You (and your partner) will ask, and be asked questions by the other team
- **Preparing:** You prepare your speeches in response to the other team

There are also three phases to a debate:

- **Opening Statements**
  - The affirmative team will present the What, Why, and How of their case, including a specific plan of action, aka “the plan,” reasons why the plan is good, or “advantages,” and details about how the plan will work, aka “solvency.”
  - The negative team will also outline their objections to the affirmative team’s case, usually including a mixture of direct responses (on case), and developing their own ideas (off case).
- **Clash:**
  - Once both teams have laid out their big ideas for the round, it's time to disagree about the details. Both teams add extra evidence, make comparative claims about whose evidence is better, what we should value, and what is true.
- **Closing Statements:**
  - After 6 speeches and 4 cross examination periods, there are a lot of complex ideas floating around. The last speech needs to pull all of these ideas together and explain why their side should win.

**Prep Time:** Each team gets 8 minutes to gather their thoughts and evidence, used whenever they’d like during the debate

**Taking Notes in debate—aka Flowing:**
During all the speeches in the debate, you want to be taking the best, more detailed notes that you can. We call this *flowing*. It will make your life so much easier when it is your turn to give a speech! We organize our “flows” by speeches. For each speech, we write down the arguments made and pieces of evidence read. When you are planning your team’s speeches, you should try your best to line up your responses to their arguments next to their arguments on your flow.

# 1st AFFIRMATIVE CONSTRUCTIVE

# CONTENTION 1 INHERENCY

**CONTENTION 1 IS INHERENCY**
**INCOME INEQUALITY IN THE UNITED STATES IS RISING AND SHOWS NO SIGNS OF SLOWING.**

**SIRIPURAPU 22**, Anshu: Writer/Editor of Economics for the Council on Foreign Relations ("The U.S Inequality Debate," *Council on Foreign Relations*, 4/20/2022, https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/us-inequality-debate, date accessed: 6/16/2023, TDL-SS)

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office [PDF]**, income inequality in the United States has been rising for decades, with the incomes of the highest echelon of earners rapidly outpacing the rest of the population.** Even among high earners, income gains have been heavily skewed toward the top of that bracket. **The growth of CEO pay is illustrative of this trend. In 1965, a typical corporate CEO earned about twenty times that earned by a typical worker; by 2018, the ratio was 278:1,** according to the Economic Policy Institute, a progressive think tank. Between 1978 and 2018, CEO compensation increased by more than 900 percent while worker compensation increased by just 11.9 percent. **The picture is much the same when looking at wealth—that is, total net worth rather than yearly income. In 2021, the top 10 percent of Americans held nearly 70 percent of U.S. wealth, up from about 61 percent at the end of 1989. T**he share held by the next 40 percent fell correspondingly over that period. **The bottom 50 percent** (roughly sixty-three million families) **owned about 2.5 percent** of wealth in 2021. **Moreover, inequality in the United States outpaces that of other rich nations. This is captured by the steady rise in the U.S. Gini coefficient,** a measure of a country's economic inequality that ranges from zero (completely equal) to one hundred (completely unequal). **The United States' Gini coefficient was forty in 2019—the same as Bulgaria's and Turkey's, and significantly higher than that of Canada, France, and Germany**—according to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), a group of advanced economies. **Recent economic shocks have deepened these trends. The so-called Great Recession from 2007 to 2009 caused incomes to fall, and even when they recovered to pre-recession levels in 2015, the median income was the same as it was in 2000: $70,200. The recovery was also unequal: by 2016, the top 10 percent had more wealth than they did in 2007 while the bottom 90 percent had less.** Experts say **the economic turmoil caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, including the largest spike in unemployment in modern history, will similarly exacerbate inequality. Low-wage workers were far more likely to be laid off and less likely to be rehired,** though massive government stimulus helped blunt the impact. **Meanwhile, a boom in stock and home prices primarily benefited wealthy Americans, who own more of these assets. Though wages rose at the fastest pace in decades, so did prices, and this inflation effectively canceled out wage gains.**

**POVERTY HAS MANY NEGATIVE EFFECTS ON PEOPLE, ESPECIALLY CHILDREN.**

**AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. (2022**, October). *Effects of poverty, hunger and homelessness on children and Youth*. American Psychological Association. https://www.apa.org/topics/socioeconomic-status/poverty-hunger-homelessness-children

**The impact of poverty on young children is significant and long lasting. Poverty is associated with substandard housing, hunger, homelessness, inadequate childcare, unsafe neighborhoods, and under-resourced schools.** In addition, low-income children are at greater risk than higher-income children for a range of **cognitive, emotional, and health-related problems, including detrimental effects on executive functioning, below average academic achievement, poor social emotional functioning, developmental delays, behavioral problems, asthma, inadequate nutrition, low birth weight, and higher rates of pneumonia.** Psychological research also shows that **living in poverty is associated with differences in structural and functional brain development in children and adolescents in areas related to cognitive processes that are critical for learning, communication, and academic achievement, including social emotional processing, memory, language, and executive functioning.** Children and families living in poverty often attend under-resourced, overcrowded schools that lack educational opportunities, books, supplies, and appropriate technology due to local funding policies. In addition, **families living below the poverty line often live in school districts** without adequate equal learning experiences for both gifted and special needs students with learning differences and **where high school dropout rates are high.**

# PLAN

**THEREFORE WE PRESENT THE FOLLOWING PLAN IN DEFENSE OF THIS YEAR'S RESOLUTION: RESOLVED:THE UNITED STATES FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE FISCAL REDISTRIBUTION IN THE UNITED STATES BY ADOPTING A FEDERAL JOBS GUARANTEE, EXPANDING SOCIAL SECURITY, AND/OR PROVIDING A BASIC INCOME.**

**THE UNITED STATES FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE FISCAL REDISTRIBUTION BY ENACTING A UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME TO ALL CITIZENS OVER THE AGE OF 18.**

# CONTENTION 2 SOLVENCY

**OBSERVATION 2 IS SOLVENCY**

**A UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME WILL LESSEN INCOME INEQUALITY AND DECIMATE POVERTY.**

**THE BORGEN PROJECT 4/27/2023** ("UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME AS A SOLUTION TO END POVERTY," *The Borgen Project*, 4/27/2023, https://borgenproject.org/solution-to-end-poverty/#:~:text=One%20of%20the%20key%20benefits,a%20basic%20level%20of%20income., date accessed: 6/13/2023, TDL-SS)

Potential Benefits of Universal Basic Income. In many countries, **poverty is a complex issue** that is **influenced by a range of factors, including unemployment, low wages, inadequate social services and discrimination. UBI aims to address some of these underlying causes of poverty by providing people with a stable source of income to rely on.** According to the World Bank, as of March 2023, **659 million people across the world live in extreme poverty,** which is defined as living on less than $2.15 per day. **UBI aims to provide these people with a basic level of income that can help them meet their basic needs and improve their standards of living. One of the key benefits of UBI is income inequality reduction**. In many countries, there is a widening gap between the rich and poor and **UBI can help to narrow this gap by providing everyone with a basic level of income.** Studies and Pilot Projects **Studies have shown that UBI can reduce poverty rates, particularly among vulnerable groups such as children and the elderly.** Research shows that **a UBI pilot project introduced in the 1970s in the Canadian town of Dauphin led to a reduction in poverty rates and improved health outcomes as hospitalization rates declined by 8.5% in four years, mental health improved and more students completed secondary school. UBI can also stand as a solution to end poverty by stimulating the economy. When people have more money to spend, they are more likely to invest in local businesses and contribute to economic growth.** A study conducted by the Roosevelt Institute found that **implementing UBI in the United States could boost the country's GDP by as much as $2.5 trillion by 2025 by introducing an annual $12,000 per person basic income and this would increase the labor force by 4.5 to 4.7 million people. In Finland, a two-year basic income pilot project that ran in 2017 and 2018 noted positive benefits. Participants reported improved well-being and mental health** but no distinct benefits in terms of employment and productivity. Researchers at Helsinki University concluded, "**The basic income recipients were more satisfied with their lives and experienced less mental strain than the control group. They also had a more positive perception of their economic welfare."**

**A UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME WOULD LIFT MILLIONS OUT OF POVERTY BETTER THAN MEANS TESTED PROGRAMS.**

**HOWARD 1/6/23,** Michael: Professor Emeritus of Philosophy at the University of Maine and former president of the U.S Basic Income Guarantee Network ("The U.S. Could Help Solve Its Poverty Problem with a Universal Basic Income," *Scientific American*, 1/6/2023, https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-u-s-could-help-solve-its-poverty-problem-with-a-universal-basic-income/, date accessed: 6/13/2023, TDL-SS)

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

# ADVANTAGE 1 ECONOMIC RESILIENCE

**ADVANTAGE 1 - ECONOMIC RESILIENCE**

**A UBI HELPS THE US WITHSTAND ECONOMIC RECESSIONS.**

**DYLAN MATTHEWS 8-30-2017.** (Dylan Matthews is a senior correspondent and head writer for Vox's Future Perfect section and has worked at Vox since 2014. He is particularly interested in global health and pandemic prevention, anti-poverty efforts, economic policy and theory, and conflicts about the right way to do philanthropy., . "Study: a universal basic income would grow the economy." Vox. Web. accessed 5-10-2023 < https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2017/8/30/16220134/universal-basic-income-roosevelt-institute-economic-growth >.)MSUCB

**A universal basic income could make the US economy trillions of dollars larger, permanently**, according to a new study by the left-leaning Roosevelt Institute. Basic income, a proposal in which every American would be given a basic stipend from the government no strings attached, is often brought up as a potential solution to widespread automation reducing demand for labor in the future. But in the meantime, its critics typically allege that it is far too expensive to be practical, or else that it would spur millions of Americans to drop out of the labor force, wrecking the economy and depriving the government of a tax base for funding the plan. The Roosevelt study, written by Roosevelt research director Marshall Steinbaum, Michalis Nikiforos at Bard College's Levy Institute, and Gennaro Zezza at the University of Cassino and Southern Lazio in Italy, comes to a dramatically different conclusion. And it does so using some notably rosy assumptions about the effects of large-scale increases to government spending, taxes, and deficits, assumptions that other analysts would dispute vociferously. Their paper analyzes three different models for a universal basic income: **A full universal basic income, in which every adult gets $1,000 a month** ($12,000 a year) A partial basic income, in which every adult gets $500 a month ($6,000 a year) A child allowance, in which every child gets $250 a month ($3,000 a year) They find that enacting any of these policies by growing the federal debt — that is, without raising taxes to pay for it — would substantially grow the economy. The effect fades away within eight years, but GDP is left permanently higher. The big, $12,000 per year per adult policy, they find, **would permanently grow the economy by 12.56 to 13.10 percent — or about $2.5 trillion** come 2025. It would also, they find, increase the percentage of Americans with jobs by about 2 percent, and expand the labor force to the tune of 4.5 to 4.7 million people. They also model the impact of the plan if it's paid for with taxes. That amounts to large-scale income redistribution, which, the authors argue, would stimulate the economy, because lower-income people are likelier to spend their money in the near-term than rich people are. Thus, they find that a full $12,000 a year per adult basic income, paid for with progressive income taxes, would grow the economy by about 2.62 percent ($515 billion) and expand the labor force by about 1.1 million people. These are extremely contentious estimates, borne of controversial assumptions about the way the economy works and the effects that a basic income would have on it. Many, if not most, economic modelers would come to very different conclusions: that a basic income discourages work, that raising taxes to pay for it could have profound negative economic impacts, and that not paying for it and exploding the deficit is a recipe for fiscal and economic ruin. But the authors argue that the economic model they're using, run by the Bard College Levy Economics Institute, uses more realistic assumptions than alternative models, and is particularly well-suited for predicting a UBI's impact. If nothing else, the paper should provoke other analysts with less rosy models to come up with their own predictions of what a large-scale basic income would do. The predictions driving the model Predicting how policies will change the economy is difficult, and requires making tricky and contestable assumptions about the way the economy current works. And the Levy Institute model and Roosevelt Institute researchers make some big assumptions that many macroeconomists and public finance economists are likely to disagree with. Perhaps the single most important assumption is that the economy is suffering from **a lack of demand** — consumers and businesses aren't buying enough stuff. This **is traditionally the problem in recessions**, and it's typically addressed through monetary or fiscal policies meant to boost demand. Governments can spend a bunch of money on infrastructure or tax breaks, which juices demand by having the government buy more or giving consumers more money to spend; this was the approach of the 2009 stimulus package. Or central banks can print a bunch of money and bring down interest rates, which makes it easier for businesses and individuals to borrow and spend money.But in recent years **there's** been **growing concern that this might be a** "secular" **problem** — one **that persists even after the economy has seemingly recovered from a downturn.** Larry Summers, the former Obama adviser, Harvard president, Treasury secretary, and eminent economist, has since 2013 warned of an ongoing "secular stagnation," borrowing the term from the early 20th century economist Alvin Hansen, who coined it in the 1930s. Thomas Piketty's book Capital in the 21st Century has prompted research tying this decline in aggregate demand to the surge in high-end inequality; if the rich control more and more money, and aren't spending it, that helps explain sluggish demand. The Roosevelt Institute has done a bunch of work on this theme, arguing that **a shortfall in aggregate demand, tied to inequality, is strangling the economy**. Roosevelt's JW Mason argued in a June 2017 paper that the US economy is still quite far from full employment, and GDP is falling below its potential level, largely because of low demand; he argues for more

aggressive Federal Reserve policy to correct the problem. Roosevelt's Steinbaum and Mike Konczal argued in 2016 that low levels of demand have led to less labor mobility (fewer people switching jobs and moving for work), less entrepreneurship, and more concentration of profits in a handful of companies at the expense of competitors and potential new challengers. So the Levy model used in the basic income paper, building off this research, assumes that **demand is well below where it could be. That helps explain why big, unfunded increases in spending, like a basic income not funded by taxes, could be stimulative**. Many economists would agree that in, say, 2009, **when unemployment is surging and the economy's in recession, it makes sense to do big** deficit **spending to get demand up again.**

**RECESSIONS ARE INEVITABLE. IT'S NOT IF, BUT WHEN THEY HAPPEN. ADAM HAYES 22**

Hayes, A. (2022, December 1). *Are economic recessions inevitable?*. Investopedia. https://www.investopedia.com/ask/answers/032015/are-economic-recessions-inevitable.asp#toc-recessions-are-probably-inevitable

AdamHayes received his bachelor's from Cornell University, a Master's in Economics from The New School for Social Research, and a PhD in sociology from the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Adam is also a CFA charterholder.

Recessions Are (Probably) Inevitable In the end, **once the process of the artificial boom in the economy by the issuance of credit is set in motion, then the ensuing bust and recession that follows is indeed inevitable.** But this does not mean that recessions are always and generally inevitable, other than after episodes of inappropriate creation of money and credit. Recessions are not logically inevitable in any economy, but are contingent upon the monetary practices and institutions a society adopts. However, for better or for worse, **all modern, capitalist economies include banking systems based on** fractional reserve **lending coordinated by central banks** that routinely and continuously issue new fiduciary media into the economy. **As long as this is the case, then the cycles of boom-and-bust that we regularly experience**, as described by ABCT, **will** unfortunately **be inevitable.** Given the ubiquity and entrenched position of the current monetary arrangements, for now, **recessions are just part and parcel of the way our economy works**.Why Are There Always Booms and Busts in the Economy?There are natural tendencies for the economy to experience booms and busts **due to the way that modern capitalism functions. During periods of growth and expansion, firms may begin overproducing goods, increasing aggregate supply relative to actual demand. Banks, likewise, may overextend credit to borrowers who might have gotten in over their heads. This leads to businesses going bankrupt and/or having to sell assets at low prices to raise cash to pay their debts. As prices fall across the board in response to excess supply or excessive debts in the business sector, this sets off a chain reaction throughout the economy as producers cut back production in the face of falling prices, leading to layoffs and more bankruptcies. Eventually, the economy contracts** back to something closer to a normal level of production and employment.

**ECONOMIC DECLINE CASCADES AND RISKS NUCLEAR WAR.**

**MAAVAK 21** – Dr. Mathew, PhD in Risk Foresight from the Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, External Researcher (PLATBIDAFO) at the Kazimieras Simonavicius University, Expert and Regular Commentator on Risk-Related Geostrategic Issues at the Russian International Affairs Council. "Horizon 2030: Will Emerging Risks Unravel Our Global Systems?", Salus Journal, The Australian Journal for Law Enforcement, Security and Intelligence Professionals, Vol. 9, No. 1, pg. 2-8, https://search.informit.org/doi/abs/10.3316/informit.673954589035546, 04-14-2021

Various scholars and institutions regard **global social instability as the greatest threat facing this decade.** The catalyst has been postulated to be **a Second Great Depression** which, in turn, **will have profound implications for global security and national integrity.** This paper, written from a broad systems perspective, illustrates how emerging risks are getting more complex and intertwined; blurring boundaries between the economic, environmental, geopolitical, societal and technological taxonomy used by the World Economic Forum for its annual global risk forecasts. Tight couplings in our global systems have also enabled risks accrued in one area to snowball into a full-blown crisis elsewhere. **The COVID-19 pandemic and its socioeconomic fallouts exemplify this systemic chain-reaction. Once inexorable forces of globalization are rupturing as the current global system can no longer be sustained due to poor governance and runaway wealth fractionation**. The coronavirus pandemic is also enabling Big Tech to expropriate the levers of governments and mass communications worldwide. This paper concludes by highlighting how this development poses a dilemma for security professionals. Key Words: Global Systems, Emergence, VUCA, COVID-9, Social Instability, Big Tech, Great Reset INTRODUCTION The new decade is witnessing rising volatility across global systems. Pick any random "system" today and chart out its trajectory: Are our education systems becoming more robust and affordable? What about food security? Are our healthcare systems improving? Are our pension systems sound? Wherever one looks, there are dark clouds gathering on a global horizon marked by volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity (VUCA). But what exactly is a global system? Our planet itself is an autonomous and self-sustaining mega-system, marked by periodic cycles and elemental vagaries. Human activities within however are not system isolates as our banking, utility, farming, healthcare and retail sectors etc. are increasingly entwined. Risks accrued in one system may cascade into an unforeseen crisis within and/or without (Choo, Smith & McCusker, 2007). Scholars call this phenomenon "emergence"; one where the behavior of intersecting systems is determined by complex and largely invisible interactions at the substratum (Goldstein, 1999; Holland, 1998). The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic is a case in point. While experts remain divided over the source and morphology of the virus, the contagion has ramified into a global health crisis and supply chain nightmare. It is also tilting the geopolitical balance. China is the largest exporter of intermediate products, and had generated nearly 20% of global imports in 2015 alone (Cousin, 2020). The pharmaceutical sector is particularly vulnerable. Nearly "85% of medicines in the U.S. strategic national stockpile" sources components from China (Owens, 2020). An initial run on respiratory masks has now been eclipsed by rowdy queues at supermarkets and the bankruptcy of small businesses. The entire global population – save for major pockets such as Sweden, Belarus, Taiwan and Japan – have been subjected to cyclical lockdowns and quarantines. Never before in history have humans faced such a systemic, borderless calamity. COVID-19 represents a classic emergent crisis that necessitates real-time response and adaptivity in a real-time world, particularly since the global Just-in-Time (JIT) production and delivery system serves as both an enabler and vector for transboundary risks. From a systems thinking perspective, emerging risk management should therefore address a whole spectrum of activity across the economic, environmental, geopolitical, societal and technological (EEGST) taxonomy. Every emerging threat can be slotted into this taxonomy – a reason why it is used by the World Economic Forum (WEF) for its annual global risk exercises (Maavak, 2019a). As traditional forces of globalization unravel, security professionals should take cognizance of emerging threats through a systems thinking approach. METHODOLOGY An EEGST sectional breakdown was adopted to illustrate a sampling of extreme risks facing the world for the 2020-2030 decade. The transcendental quality of emerging risks, as outlined on Figure 1, below, was primarily informed by the following pillars of systems thinking (Rickards, 2020): • Diminishing diversity (or increasing homogeneity) of actors in the global system (Boli & Thomas, 1997; Meyer, 2000; Young et al, 2006); • Interconnections in the global system (Homer-Dixon et al, 2015; Lee & Preston, 2012); • Interactions of actors, events and components in the global system (Buldyrev et al, 2010; Bashan et al, 2013; Homer-Dixon et al, 2015); and • Adaptive qualities in particular systems (Bodin & Norberg, 2005; Scheffer et al, 2012) Since scholastic material on this topic remains somewhat inchoate, this paper buttresses many of its contentions through secondary (i.e. news/institutional) sources. ECONOMY According to Professor Stanislaw Drozdz (2018) of the Polish Academy of Sciences, "**a global financial crash** of a previously unprecedented scale is highly probable" by the mid- 2020s. This **will lead to a trickle-down meltdown, impacting all areas of human activity.** The economist John Mauldin (2018) similarly warns that the "2020s might be the worst decade in US history" and may lead to a Second Great Depression. Other forecasts are equally alarming. According to the International Institute of Finance, global debt may have surpassed $255 trillion by 2020 (IIF, 2019). Yet another study revealed that global debts and liabilities amounted to a staggering $2.5 quadrillion (Ausman, 2018). The reader should note that these figures were tabulated before the COVID-19 outbreak. **The IMF singles out widening income**

**inequality as the trigger for the next Great Depression** (Georgieva, 2020). The wealthiest 1% now own more than twice as much wealth as 6.9 billion people (Coffey et al, 2020) and this chasm is widening with each passing month. COVID-19 had, in fact, boosted global billionaire wealth to an unprecedented $10.2 trillion by July 2020 (UBS-PWC, 2020). Global GDP, worth $88 trillion in 2019, may have contracted by 5.2% in 2020 (World Bank, 2020). As the Greek historian Plutarch warned in the 1st century AD: "An imbalance between rich and poor is the oldest and most fatal ailment of all republics" (Mauldin, 2014). **The stability of a society**, as Aristotle argued even earlier, **depends on a robust** middle element or **middle class**. At the rate **the global middle class is facing catastrophic debt and unemployment levels, widespread social disaffection may morph into outright anarchy** (Maavak, 2012; DCDC, 2007). Economic stressors, in transcendent VUCA fashion, may also induce radical geopolitical realignments. Bullions now carry more weight than NATO's security guarantees in Eastern Europe. After Poland repatriated 100 tons of gold from the Bank of England in 2019, Slovakia, Serbia and Hungary quickly followed suit. According to former Slovak Premier Robert Fico, this erosion in regional trust was based on historical precedents – in particular the 1938 Munich Agreement which ceded Czechoslovakia's Sudetenland to Nazi Germany. As Fico reiterated (Dudik & Tomek, 2019): "You can hardly trust even the closest allies after the Munich Agreement… I guarantee that if something happens, we won't see a single gram of this (offshore-held) gold. Let's do it (repatriation) as quickly as possible." (Parenthesis added by author). President Aleksandar Vucic of Serbia (a non-NATO nation) justified his central bank's gold-repatriation program by hinting at economic headwinds ahead: "We see in which direction the crisis in the world is moving" (Dudik & Tomek, 2019). Indeed, with two global Titanics – the United States and China – set on a collision course with a quadrillions-denominated iceberg in the middle, and a viral outbreak on its tip, the seismic ripples will be felt far, wide and for a considerable period. A reality check is nonetheless needed here: Can additional bullions realistically circumvallate the economies of 80 million plus peoples in these Eastern European nations, worth a collective $1.8 trillion by purchasing power parity? Gold however is a potent psychological symbol as it represents national sovereignty and economic reassurance in a potentially hyperinflationary world. The portents are clear: **The current global economic system will be weakened by rising nationalism** and autarkic demands. Much uncertainty remains ahead. Mauldin (2018) proposes the introduction of Old Testament-style debt jubilees to facilitate gradual national recoveries. The World Economic Forum, on the other hand, has long proposed a "Great Reset" by 2030; a socialist utopia where "you'll own nothing and you'll be happy" (WEF, 2016). In the final analysis, COVID-19 is not the root cause of the current global economic turmoil; it is merely an accelerant to a burning house of cards that was left smouldering since the 2008 Great Recession (Maavak, 2020a). We also see how the four main pillars of systems thinking (diversity, interconnectivity, interactivity and "adaptivity") form the mise en scene in a VUCA decade. ENVIRONMENTAL What happens to the environment when our economies implode? Think of a debt-laden workforce at sensitive nuclear and chemical plants, along with a concomitant surge in industrial accidents? Economic stressors, workforce demoralization and rampant profiteering – rather than man made climate change – arguably pose the biggest threats to the environment. In a WEF report, Buehler et al (2017) made the following pre-COVID-19 observation: The ILO estimates that the annual cost to the global economy from accidents and work-related diseases alone is a staggering $3 trillion. Moreover, a recent report suggests the world's 3.2 billion workers are increasingly unwell, with the vast majority facing significant economic insecurity: 77% work in part-time, temporary, "vulnerable" or unpaid jobs. Shouldn't this phenomenon be better categorized as a societal or economic risk rather than an environmental one? In line with the systems thinking approach, however, global risks can no longer be boxed into a taxonomical silo. Frazzled workforces may precipitate another Bhopal (1984), Chernobyl (1986), Deepwater Horizon (2010) or Flint water crisis (2014). These disasters were notably not the result of manmade climate change. Neither was the Fukushima nuclear disaster (2011) nor the Indian Ocean tsunami (2004). Indeed, the combustion of a long-overlooked cargo of 2,750 tonnes of ammonium nitrate had nearly levelled the city of Beirut, Lebanon, on Aug 4 2020. The explosion left 204 dead; 7,500 injured; US$15 billion in property damages; and an estimated 300,000 people homeless (Urbina, 2020). The environmental costs have yet to be adequately tabulated. Environmental disasters are more attributable to Black Swan events, systems breakdowns and corporate greed rather than to mundane human activity. Our JIT world aggravates the cascading potential of risks (Korowicz, 2012). Production and delivery delays, caused by the COVID-19 outbreak, will eventually require industrial overcompensation. This will further stress senior executives, workers, machines and a variety of computerized systems. The trickle-down effects will likely include substandard products, contaminated food and a general lowering in health and safety standards (Maavak, 2019a). Unpaid or demoralized sanitation workers may also resort to indiscriminate waste dumping. Many cities across the United States (and elsewhere in the world) are no longer recycling wastes due to prohibitive costs in the global corona-economy (Liacko, 2021). Even in good times, strict protocols on waste disposals were routinely ignored. While Sweden championed the global climate change narrative, its clothing flagship H&M was busy covering up toxic effluences disgorged by vendors along the Citarum River in Java, Indonesia. As a result, countless children among 14 million Indonesians straddling the "world's most polluted river" began to suffer from dermatitis, intestinal problems, developmental disorders, renal failure, chronic bronchitis and cancer (DW, 2020). It is also in cauldrons like the Citarum River where pathogens may mutate with emergent ramifications. On an equally alarming note, depressed economic conditions have traditionally provided a waste disposal boon for organized crime elements. Throughout 1980s, the Calabriabased 'Ndrangheta mafia – in collusion with governments in Europe and North America – began to dump radioactive wastes along the coast of Somalia. Reeling from pollution and revenue loss, Somali fisherman eventually resorted to mass piracy (Knaup, 2008). The coast of Somalia is now a maritime hotspot, and exemplifies an entwined form of economic-environmental-geopolitical-societal emergence. In a VUCA world, indiscriminate waste dumping can unexpectedly morph into a Black Hawk Down incident. The laws of unintended consequences are governed by actors, interconnections, interactions and adaptations in a system under study – as

outlined in the methodology section. Environmentally-devastating industrial sabotages – whether by disgruntled workers, industrial competitors, ideological maniacs or terrorist groups – cannot be discounted in a VUCA world. Immiserated societies, in stark defiance of climate change diktats, may resort to dirty coal plants and wood stoves for survival. Interlinked ecosystems, particularly water resources, may be hijacked by nationalist sentiments. The environmental fallouts of critical infrastructure (CI) breakdowns loom like a Sword of Damocles over this decade. GEOPOLITICAL **The primary catalyst behind WWII was the Great Depression. Since history often repeats itself, expect familiar bogeymen to reappear in societies roiling with impoverishment and ideological clefts.** Anti-Semitism – a societal risk on its own – may reach alarming proportions in the West (Reuters, 2019), possibly forcing Israel to undertake reprisal operations inside allied nations. If that happens, how will affected nations react? Will security resources be reallocated to protect certain minorities (or the Top 1%) while larger segments of society are exposed to restive forces? Balloon effects like these present a classic VUCA problematic. C**ontemporary geopolitical risks include a possible Iran-Israel war; US-China military confrontation over Taiwan or the South China Sea; North Korean proliferation of nuclear and missile technologies; an India-Pakistan nuclear war; an Iranian closure of the Straits of Hormuz; fundamentalist-driven implosion in the Islamic world; or a nuclear confrontation between NATO and Russia.**

# 2AC/1AR EXTENSIONS

**UBI SOLVES INEQUALITY---PILOT PROJECTS PROVE.**

**PETER H. DIAMANDIS 16.** Founder and Executive Chairman of the XPRIZE Foundation, executive founder of Singularity, 12-12-16. "Is Universal Basic Income the Answer to an Automated Future?" https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/universal-basic-income-peter-diamandis/

While the implementation of UBI at scale is still in its early days, the results are promising. Early results in the India experiment show nutrition was improved as measured by the average weight-for-age of young children (World Health Organization z-score), and more so among girls. In the same study, the UBI grants led to more labor and work, not less, as expected by skeptics. There was a shift from casual wage labor to more self-employed farming and business activity, with less distress-driven migration out of the region.Women gained more than men.That being said, the most compelling study demonstrating how universal basic income could work comes from a small town in Canada.From 1974 to 1979, the Canadian government partnered with the province of Manitoba to run an experiment on the idea of providing a minimum income to residents called MINCOME.MINCOME was a guaranteed annual income offered to every eligible family in Dauphin, a prairie town of about 10,000, and smaller numbers of residents in Winnipeg and some rural communities throughout the province.So what happened to families receiving MINCOME?They had fewer hospitalizations.They had fewer accidents and injuries. Mental health hospitalizations fell dramatically. High school graduation rates increased. Younger adolescent girls were less likely to give birth before age 25, and when they did, they had fewer kids. The program brought most recipients above Canada's poverty line. And the employment effects in Dauphin were modest. For primary earners — those with full-time jobs — there was virtually no decline in work. Essentially, nobody was quitting their jobs. Cash from the government eased families' economic anxiety, allowing them to invest in their health and plan over a longer horizon. MINCOME is now serving as inspiration for basic income's comeback in Canada. In its 2016 budget, the provincial government of Ontario announced plans to conduct a basic income pilot this year.Implications: I'm fairly confident that in the near future, as technology continues to eliminate traditional jobs and massive new wealth gets created, we're going to see some version of universal basic income deployed at scale.

While I think the implications of UBI are mostly positive, there are certainly many complexities associated with its rollout. There are still many questions that remain unanswered – where is the additional money coming from? Taxes? Will UBI cause problems that we can't anticipate or create more conflict than it resolves? Can governments react quickly enough, given the pace of innovation and automation in tech? Is it actually a solution to technological unemployment? Or will we still have to go through a turbulent, violent period as we redistribute our labor in a world of robots and AI? At minimum, I believe that with decreased costs of living, UBI will be one of many tools empowering self-actualization at scale – more people will be able to follow their passions, be more creative, and spend more time on higher-order, personally fulfilling tasks.

**UBI SOLVES INEQUALITY.**

**J SCULL 22.** Taught international business and international studies at two well-known universities in Beijing, 12-17-2022. "Universal Basic Income: A Solution to AI and Unemployment," https://soapboxie.com/economy/Universal-Basic-Income-A-Solution-to-AI-and-Unemployment.

Universal Basic Income

An ever-increasing number of experts, political, and industry leaders are beginning to see a day when people's usefulness in society and their ability to earn money will be greatly diminished or perhaps vanish entirely. When this time comes, society needs to implement a system of income distribution that will more adequately meet the needs of the vast majority of people. A universal basic income (UBI) could provide the means to make sure wealth continues its normal circular flow between service companies, producers and consumers. Society's Only Solution? UBI could be the solution to a largely idle population with no means to purchase food, clothing, and maintain a roof over their heads. Such a program of income distribution could be coupled with a program reminiscent of the New Deal where some of those receiving government funds could be put to work in the repair and rebuilding of decaying infrastructure. In spite of how the funds are distributed or the minimum requirements for those receiving funds, UBI would allow for those displaced by robots or AI to return to school in order to receive necessary personal retooling. These recipients of public funds could start small businesses that provide goods or services to local populations, even purchase their own robots that would help them in bringing in additional funds. The uses for a basic guaranteed income are limitless. The idea of UBI is not new. In its most basic form, it dates back to the 16th century in Europe. By the middle of the 19th century, the idea of an unconditional basic income emerged. Since its origin, various political and industry leaders have proposed some sort of unconditional guaranteed income that would ensure national prosperity and aid those in need to be productive members of society. Some of the proponents have been: Thomas Paine, political activist and philosopher who lived in the 1700s, proposed the creation of a national fund to make payments to every person upon reaching the age of 21 years. Novelist Edward Bellamy in 1887 wrote Looking Backwards about a fictional society in the year 2000 in which everyone was provided with shelter, food, education, and healthcare. Bertrand Russell, philosopher of the early 1900s called for "a certain small income, sufficient for necessities, should be secured for all, whether they work or not." Huey Long, politician who planned to run against Franklin D. Roosevelt before being assassinated, called for a $5,000 annual guaranteed income to every family. Famous economist Milton Friedman favored a negative income tax with which those who earned less than a minimum amount would, instead of paying taxes, receive a payment. ("Unconditional Basic Income Europe: A Brief History of Basic Income Ideas") In the mid-1970s, the Canadian province of Manitoba conducted an experiment in the town of Dauphin where money was handed out to some of its citizens. The project ended in 1979 by the then-conservative government. Evelyn Forget, an economist at the University of Manitoba, recently dug up the numbers, finding that life in Dauphin had improved markedly during that period of time. Some of the results were that children stayed in school longer, hospitalization rates dropped, and work rates had remained high. (The New Yorker, "The Case for Free Money," James Surowiecki, June 20, 2016)

**SOLVES INEQUALITY**

**JEREMY ROSEN 21.** Director of Economic Justice at the Shriver Center on Poverty Law, 6-21-2021. "Guaranteed Income: An Economic Support Whose Time Has Come," https://www.povertylaw.org/article/guaranteed-income/.

A guaranteed income can dramatically reduce poverty and improve families' long-term well-being. Across the country, pilot programs offering a guaranteed income to local residents have measurably improved participants' financial stability. Participants in these programs are using funds in ways that benefit their families' long-term economic health—by paying for rent in a better school district, taking a community college course to improve job skills, saving to cover the expenses of starting a small business, or eliminating old debts that would otherwise trap a family in perpetual poverty. For example, in Stockton, California, 125 residents living at or below median income were given a $500 monthly stipend with no strings attached for 24 months. Not only did recipients' quality of life improve, but researchers found that their participation in full-time employment jumped from 28 to 40 percent. In the Shriver Center's home state of Illinois, several guaranteed income initiatives and pilot programs are underway. At the local level, Chicago Alderman Gilbert Villegas has proposed a pilot program to provide $500 per month for a year to 5,000 low-income residents of the city, to be funded with $30 million of the city's $1.9 billion in American Rescue Plan funds. Other pilot programs supported by private philanthropy are also underway. Cook County plans to build on a successful initiative that gave direct payments to families facing financial hardship during the pandemic with a similar program in 2021. And at the state level, a broad coalition of community-based and grass tops organizations is working together to study the results of Illinois pilot programs, educate legislators, and ultimately advocate for legislation to establish a statewide guaranteed income program. At the federal level, the Shriver Center is advocating to make temporary tax credits that help low-wage families permanent, a policy position shared by the Biden Administration. The Shriver Center strongly supports policies and programs that provide a guaranteed income floor for the lowest income people. Guaranteed income offers the best hope to provide people with resources to make important life choices that everyone wants the ability to make—where to live, how to invest in a better future through education or starting a business, and how to best support children. Where properly targeted, guaranteed income specifically gives this opportunity to people who have been systematically excluded from the financial resources to make these decisions, without imposing a massive administrative burden either to qualify or stay eligible. This is a program everyone should support.

**WE CAN AFFORD A UBI - IT WILL BUILD THE ECONOMY**

**MICHALIS NIKIFOROS 17,** PhD in Economics, Levy Institute research scholar working in the State of the US and World Economies Program, with; Marshall Steinbaum and Gennaro Zezza; August 2017, "Modeling the Macroeconomic Effects of a Universal Basic Income," https://rooseveltinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/RI-Macroeconomic-Effects-of-UBI-201708.pdf

How would a massive federal spending program like a universal basic income (UBI) affect the macroeconomy? We use the Levy Institute macroeconometric model to estimate the impact of three versions of such an unconditional cash assistance program over an eight-year time horizon. Overall, we find that the economy can not only withstand large increases in federal spending, but could also grow thanks to the stimulative effects of cash transfers on the economy. We examine three versions of unconditional cash transfers: $1,000 a month to all adults, $500 a month to all adults, and a $250 a month child allowance. For each of the three versions, we model the macroeconomic effects of these transfers using two different financing plans - increasing the federal debt, or fully funding the increased spending with increased taxes on households - and compare the effects to the Levy model's baseline growth rate forecast. Our findings include the following: For all three designs, enacting a UBI and paying for it by increasing the federal debt would grow the economy. Under the smallest spending scenario, $250 per month for each child, GDP is 0.79% larger than under the baseline forecast after eight years. According to the Levy Model, the largest cash program - $1,000 for all adults annually - expands the economy by 12.56% over the baseline after eight years. After eight years of enactment, the stimulative effects of the program dissipate and GDP growth returns to the baseline forecast, but the level of output remains permanently higher. When paying for the policy by increasing taxes on households, the Levy model forecasts no effect on the economy. In effect, it gives to households with one hand what it is takes away with the other. However, when the model is adapted to include distributional effects, the economy grows, even in the tax-financed scenarios. This occurs because the distributional model incorporates the idea that an extra dollar in the hands of lower income households leads to higher spending. In other words, the households that pay more in taxes than they receive in cash assistance have a low propensity to consume, and those that receive more in assistance than they pay in taxes have a high propensity to consume. Thus, even when the policy is tax- rather than debt-financed, there is an increase in output, employment, prices, and wages.

Levy's Keynesian model incorporates a series of assumptions based on rigorous empirical studies of the micro and macro effects of unconditional cash transfers, taxation and government net spending and borrowing (see Marinescu (2017), Mason (2017), Coibion et al (2017), and Konczal and Steinbaum (2016)). Fundamentally, the larger the size of the UBI, the larger the increase in aggregate demand and thus the larger the resulting economy is. The individual macroeconomic indicators are (qualitatively) what one would predict given an increase in aggregate demand: in addition to the increase in output, employment, labor force participation, prices, and wages all go up as well. Even in a deficit-financed policy, an increase in the government's liabilities is mitigated by the increase in aggregate demand.

Specifically, the Levy model assumes that the economy is not currently operating near potential output (Mason 2017) and makes two related microeconomic assumptions: (1) unconditional cash transfers do not reduce household labor supply; and (2) increasing government revenue by increasing taxes levied on households does not change household behavior. Other macroeconomic models would make different, likely less optimistic forecasts, because they

would disagree with these assumptions.Estimating the macroeconomic effects of UBI is a critical component of any policy evaluation, because what would appear to be a zero-sum transfer in static terms (money is simply transferred from some households to others) turns out to be positive sum in the macro simulation, thanks to the increase in aggregate demand and therefore in the size of the economy. Introduction: A policy of universal, unconditional cash assistance (Universal Basic Income, or "UBI" in general terms) would substantially alleviate extreme poverty, which has been on the rise during an era in which existing unconditional transfer policies have been scaled back and repurposed, while the labor market is proving less reliable as a source of support than it once was, especially for low-wage workers.i But what would the impact of such a policy be on the macroeconomy?To answer that question, we used the Levy Institute Macro-Econometric Model to estimate the impact of three versions of unconditional cash assistance over an eight-year horizon. The Levy Institute model is particularly well suited to answer this question, because of the emphasis it places on household balance sheets as a driver of macroeconomic outcomes. The whole aim of the policy is to render households more financially secure, therefore a model that incorporates the financial security of households into macroeconomic outcomes is critical to answering the question about how a UBI would affect the macroeconomy. The Levy Institute has been constructing and updating its model for many years in order to provide factual predictions about the macroeconomy by comparing its forecasts with realized outcomes. The approach taken in this paper uses the Levy model to forecast the macroeconomy eight years into the future, holding current policies constant. This is the "baseline" forecast, for our purposes. We then perform a series of policy counterfactuals related to enacting a UBI of different sizes and target populations, and compare the eight-year prediction for the macroeconomy given the policy counterfactuals to the baseline forecast. We report the difference in key macroeconomic and labor market indicators between these counterfactuals and the baseline as the "effect" of UBI.