

# **Atlanta Urban Debate League**

Poverty AFF

High School JV

SY 2023 - 2024



**Find us online at:**

[youtube.com/atlantadebate](https://www.youtube.com/atlantadebate)  
[facebook.com/atlantadebate](https://www.facebook.com/atlantadebate)  
[instagram.com/atlantadebate](https://www.instagram.com/atlantadebate)  
[twitter.com/atlantadebate](https://www.twitter.com/atlantadebate)

# Table of Contents

## Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
Poverty 1AC (Argument Overview).....	4
Economy Disadvantage (Argument Overview).....	5
Federalism Disadvantage (Argument Overview).....	6
States Counterplan (Argument Overview).....	7
Capitalism Kritik (Argument Overview).....	8
Poverty Affirmative (1AC Shell).....	9
Poverty 1AC — 1/6.....	9
Poverty 1AC — 2/6.....	10
Poverty 1AC — 3/6.....	11
Poverty 1AC — 4/6.....	12
Poverty 1AC — 5/6.....	13
Poverty 1AC — 6/6.....	14
Poverty Affirmative (2AC).....	15
2AC Case (Poverty).....	15
2AC Block (Economy DA) – 1/3.....	16
2AC Block (Economy DA) – 2/3.....	17
2AC Block (Economy DA) – 3/3.....	18
2AC Block (Federalism DA) – 1/3.....	19
2AC Block (Federalism DA) – 2/3.....	20
2AC Block (Federalism DA) – 3/3.....	21
2AC Block (States CP) – 1/3.....	22
2AC Block (States CP) – 2/3.....	23
2AC Block (States CP) – 3/3.....	24
2AC Block (Capitalism Kritik) – 1/3.....	25
2AC Block (Capitalism Kritik) – 2/3.....	26
2AC Block (Capitalism Kritik) – 3/3.....	27
Poverty Negative (1NC).....	28
1NC Disadvantage (Economy) – 1/3.....	28
1NC Disadvantage (Economy) – 2/3.....	29
1NC Disadvantage (Economy) – 3/3.....	30
1NC Disadvantage (Federalism) – 1/4.....	31
1NC Disadvantage (Federalism) – 2/4.....	32
1NC Disadvantage (Federalism) – 3/4.....	33
1NC Disadvantage (Federalism) – 4/4.....	34
1NC Counterplan (States).....	35

**Poverty AFF (HS JV)**

SY 2023 - 2024 Atlanta Urban Debate League

1NC Kritik (Capitalism) – 1/2.....	36
1NC Kritik (Capitalism) – 2/2.....	37
1NC Case (Poverty) – 1/2.....	38
1NC Case (Poverty) – 2/2.....	39
1NC Case (Inequality) –1/2.....	40
1NC Case (Inequality) – 2/2.....	41
Poverty Negative (2NC / 1NR).....	42
2NC Economy DA (Turns Case).....	42
2NC Economy DA (Link & Impact).....	43
2NC Economy DA (Link).....	44
2NC Federalism DA (DA Outweighs).....	45
2NC Federalism DA (Uniqueness – AT: Status Quo Solves).....	46
2NC Federalism DA (Link).....	47
2NC States CP (Permutation).....	48
2NC States CP (Solvency).....	49
2NC Capitalism Kritik (Turns Case).....	50
2NC Capitalism Kritik (Permutation).....	51
2NC Capitalism Kritik (Link) – 1/2.....	52
2NC Capitalism Kritik (Link) – 2/2.....	53
2NC Capitalism Kritik (Alternative).....	54
1NR Case (Poverty).....	56

## **Poverty 1AC (Argument Overview)**

### **Summary**

The Poverty Affirmative contains four parts: a plan, Solvency, a Poverty Advantage, and an Inequality Advantage. The purpose of the Affirmative is to reduce poverty and economic inequality in the United States by providing a basic income (a monthly cash payment to all Americans).

**Solvency:** Solvency is proof of why the proposed plan will work and solve the harms/problems that would happen without the plan. In this 1AC, the Howard evidence cites recent figures from the Census Bureau to prove that poverty is increasing in the United States. In addition, the author concludes that a universal basic income would benefit millions of people each year and save hundreds of billions of dollars in social costs.

**Advantage (Poverty):** An advantage explains the benefits gained from doing the plan and is sometimes called “Harms” because the plan avoids something harmful that would happen in the status quo. Advantages end with an **Impact**.

In this 1AC, the Poverty Advantage makes three claims. First, the Lee evidence cites recent figures from the Census Bureau to prove that tens of millions of Americans are living in poverty. Second, the Ruizz evidence cites real-world data and experiments from across the globe to prove a basic income would reduce poverty. Finally, the Carbonaro evidence cites recent research from the University of California to prove that poverty causes over 100,000 deaths each year.

**Advantage (Inequality):** An advantage explains the benefits gained from doing the plan and is sometimes called “Harms” because the plan avoids something harmful that would happen in the status quo. Advantages end with an **Impact**.

In this 1AC, the Inequality Advantage makes two claims. First, the Hanauer and Rolf evidence cites a new paper by the RAND Corporation to prove that income inequality is increasing and costs society over two trillion dollars each year. Second, the Greenwell evidence cites research by a Nobel prize-winning economic to prove that the plan has a positive effect on racial, gender, and economic inequality.

## **Economy Disadvantage (Argument Overview)**

### **Summary**

The Economy Disadvantage contains three parts: Uniqueness, Link, and Impact. A Disadvantage argues that the costs of the Affirmative plan are more important than (outweigh) the potential benefits (advantages). In particular, the Economy Disadvantage argues that a basic income would be incredibly expensive and make poverty worse by increasing inflation.

**Uniqueness:** Uniqueness is the argument that the status quo (current state of things) is good now but could take a turn for the worse if the plan were to happen. In the Economy DA, the Duggan and Curry evidence cites recent data from the Labor Department to prove that inflation is decreasing and the economy is recovering from the pandemic.

**Link:** A link is the negative change to the status quo made by the Affirmative plan. In the Economy DA, the Hughes evidence cites a recent study from Bridgewater Associates to prove a basic income would increase inflation and cost almost 4 trillion dollars per year.

**Impact:** An Impact is the ultimate negative consequence of the change to the status quo made by the plan. In the Economy DA, the Pittinsky argues that inflation increases the cost of basic goods and service, and, as a result, has a disproportionate impact on those struggling to make ends meet.

## Federalism Disadvantage (Argument Overview)

### Summary

The Federalism Disadvantage contains four parts: Uniqueness, Link, Internal Link, and Impact. A Disadvantage argues that the costs of the Affirmative plan are more important than (outweigh) the potential benefits (advantages). In particular, the Federalism Disadvantage argues that a basic income would expand the power of the federal government and undermine cooperation between state governments. As a result, the Disadvantage concludes that states will not have the legal authority to engage in ambitious climate policy.

**Uniqueness:** Uniqueness is the argument that the status quo (current state of things) is good now but could take a turn for the worse if the plan were to happen. In the Federalism DA, the Clinton evidence cites recent Supreme Court rulings to prove that federalism (the balance of power between state and federal governments) is increasing now.

**Link:** A link is the negative change to the status quo made by the Affirmative plan. In the Federalism DA, the Katz evidence concludes that federal welfare spending imposes unsustainable legal obligations on state governments, tilting the balance of power in favor of the federal government..

**Internal Link:** An internal link is the series of events that occur between the link and the impact. In the Federalism Disadvantage, the Barnes evidence argues that the Biden-Harris administration must build on the current era of climate federalism to successfully tackle climate change. In particular, the author cites the U.S. Climate Alliance, a group of thirty-four states with climate action plans, as an example of how state-level climate policy can have international benefits..

**Impact:** An Impact is the ultimate negative consequence of the change to the status quo made by the plan. In the Federalism Disadvantage, the Torres evidence cites expert evidence, including the results of scientific studies and conclusions reached by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), to prove that climate change will have widespread negative effects that will undermine the foundation of life on planet Earth.

## **States Counterplan (Argument Overview)**

### **Summary**

The States Counterplan contains three parts: Counterplan Text, Solvency, and Net-Benefit. A counterplan proposes an alternative policy to resolve the harms identified by the Affirmative. In particular, the States Counterplan argues that that state funding and regulations are a better option to reduce poverty and income inequality.

**Text:** The Counterplan Text identifies the specific policy that the Negative will propose as an alternative means to resolve the Harms of the Affirmative. In the States Counterplan, the Counterplan Text identifies that the 50 states and relevant territories will provide a basic income.

**Solvency:** Solvency is how the counterplan will resolve the harms of the Affirmative. In the States Counterplan, the Downey evidence argues that states have historically played a critical role in testing solutions to poverty. As a result, the author argues that the lack of action at the federal level has created an opportunity for state governments to take the lead.

**Net-Benefit:** A Net-Benefit is a reason to prefer the counterplan over the plan. In the States Counterplan, the net-benefit is that the counterplan does not link to the Federalism DA. By avoiding federal welfare spending and an expansion of federal legal authority, the States Counterplan does not link to the Federalism DA.

## **Capitalism Kritik (Argument Overview)**

### **Summary**

The Capitalism Kritik contains two parts: Link & Impact, and the Alternative. A Kritik argues that the assumptions or mindset of the Affirmative are problematic and should be rejected in favor of an alternative way of thinking. In particular, the Capitalism Kritik argues that the root cause of poverty and income inequality is corporate profits and exploitation of the working class.

**Link & Impact:** A Link is an example of how the Affirmative makes problematic assumptions or has a flawed mindset. An Impact is the ultimate negative consequence of the problematic assumption made by the Affirmative. In the Capitalism Kritik, the Hogg evidence argues that a basic income is a scheme created by the political right to critically undermine social safety nets in the name of economic efficiency. As a result, the author concludes that the ultimate consequence of the plan is an increase in poverty and income inequality.

**Alternative:** An Alternative is how one should resolve the problematic mindset or assumption of the Affirmative. In the Capitalism Kritik, the Svart evidence argues that capitalism is the root cause of poverty and economic inequality. As a result, the author concludes that, rather than work within the system, we need to completely abandon capitalism.

## Poverty Affirmative (1AC Shell)

Poverty 1AC — 1/6

Greetings! My partner and I propose the following plan:

**The United States federal government should substantially increase fiscal redistribution in the United States by providing a universal basic income.**

Contention One is Solvency:

**Poverty is increasing in the status quo. The plan solves by creating a universal basic income**

### Howard 2023 – Professor of Philosophy at the University of Maine

(Michael W., Professor of Philosophy at the University of Maine. The U.S. Could Help Solve Its Poverty Problem With A Universal Basic Income. Scientific American. January 6, 2023.

<https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-u-s-could-help-solve-its-poverty-problem-with-a-universal-basic-income/>)

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? **A universal basic income, or UBI, is defined as “a periodic cash payment unconditionally delivered to all on an individual basis,** without means-test or work requirement,” according to the [Basic Income Earth Network](#). The child tax credit isn't quite the same, because it is only for families with children; it also phases out at higher income levels and essentially still forces people to prove they are “poor enough” to need help—a means test. A [more ambitious bill](#) approaching the idea of UBI introduced by Representatives Rashida Tlaib and Mondaire Jones, would eliminate the means test, thereby creating a universal child allowance. **Universal benefits have several advantages over means-tested benefits. They avoid divisions between “us” and “them,” removing the stigma associated with targeted benefits. Uptake by the needy,** a persistent problem with targeted benefits, **is improved when stigma and bureaucratic hurdles are removed. Universal benefits tend to be more popular and hence are more politically secure and better funded.** And **universal benefits, dispensing with means testing, are easier to administer.** The universal child allowance would enroll all children at birth so no child would be excluded.

## Advantage One is Poverty:

**First, tens of millions of Americans are living in poverty. Official figures underestimate the problem**

### Lee 2023 – Journalist for CNBC

(Juhohn, Journalist For CNBC. 37.9 Million Americans Are Living In Poverty, According To The U.S. Census. But The Problem Could Be Far Worse. CNBC. March 7, 2023. <https://www.cnbc.com/2023/03/07/why-poverty-might-be-far-worse-in-the-us-than-its-reported.html>)

**As of January 2021, 37.9 million Americans lived in poverty, accounting for 11.6% of the total population, according to the latest report from the United States Census Bureau.** That's despite the fact that America ranks first as the richest nation in the world in terms of GDP. **"Poverty and economic insecurity are widely common, very commonly experienced,"** said Shailly Gupta Barnes, policy director at the Kairos Center for Religions, Rights, and Social Justice. **"They are as much a part of the American story as successes to the American dream." But the number reported by the Census Bureau is based on the official poverty measure,** which has remained virtually unchanged since the mid-1960s. It's calculated by comparing pretax income against a threshold set at three times the cost of a minimum food diet in 1963. "The researcher whose work became the basis of that measure never intended it to be used in the way that it currently is," said Barnes. Grace Bonilla, president of United Way of New York City, said the official poverty measure **doesn't take very obvious indicators into consideration.** To start, it looks at pretax income instead of actual take-home pay. **It also doesn't consider factors such as family composition or the cost of child care. It has not kept up with the way life has changed for most Americans,"** said Bonilla. As a response, the Census Bureau developed the Supplemental Poverty Measure in 2011 as an improvement over the existing measure. It incorporates into the measurement both the cost of basic needs like food, clothing and utilities, but also government transfers and programs. It also takes into account geographical differences and household size. The SPM rate for 2021 sat at 7.8%, compared with the official poverty measure rate of 11.6%, mainly due to government relief during the Covid-19 pandemic. But some experts say that even the SPM falls short. "It's a step in the right direction but it falls so short of actually giving us an accurate count of poverty in the United States," said Bonilla. **"If you have a universal brush for the whole country, you're going to miss a number of people that are either at risk of falling into poverty or are already technically living in poverty but are not counted** by the measure."

## **Second, universal basic income solves poverty. Empirical research proves the plan is key**

### **Ruiz 2021 – Writer at the Harvard Political Review**

(Jorge, Writer At The Harvard Political Review. Reinventing Capitalism: Why We Need To Move Toward Guaranteed Income. Harvard Political Review. April 16, 2021. <https://harvardpolitics.com/guaranteed-income/>)

The idea of helping individuals through guaranteed cash transfers has taken many forms, but they all revolve around creating a “[capitalist](#) system where income does not start at zero.” **Universal basic income, for example, is a proposed program that aims to give all adults a regular fixed amount of cash every month, no questions asked.** Its proponents [argue](#) that these **transfers would go a long way at reducing overall poverty, relieving victims of job loss while they find employment and legitimizing non-paid work like taking care of children and community service.** It could also, in theory, [provide](#) a safety net for people to follow artistic passions or start a business without the risk of losing everything if such endeavors fail. Research into the effects of universal basic income has only begun gaining traction in recent years, but **the experimental evidence so far seems encouraging. A pilot trial of universal basic income in Finland found that a guaranteed income was linked to improved mental health and higher levels of life satisfaction. The monthly \$110 payments that Brazil established in March 2020 diminished the country’s poverty to a 40-year low. Similar results have also been observed in the United States.** The Stockton Economic Empowerment Demonstration, **a guaranteed income pilot program in California, has been giving \$500 dollars per month** to 125 residents of Stockton since 2019. **A year after the program launched, recipients reported higher levels of emotional health and were able to cover significant gaps in healthcare. They also experienced a higher increase in full-time employment than non-recipients,** as the cushion provided by guaranteed income gave them the opportunity to prepare for and effectively transition from part-time jobs to full time jobs. Universal basic income [garnered](#) tremendous support in the United States thanks in large part to Andrew Yang, who in his 2020 presidential campaign proposed granting all adults aged 18 to 64 a monthly “Freedom Dividend” of \$1000 regardless of personal income. Those in favor of making transfer payments income-blind [claim](#) that **simple lump-sum payments would make the program much cheaper by reducing administrative costs.**

Poverty 1AC — 4/6

**Third is the Impact: Poverty is a leading cause of death in America. Research proves over 100,000 people lose their lives each year**

**Carbonaro 2023 – Journalist for Newsweek**

(Giulia, Journalist For Newsweek. Poverty Is Killing Nearly 200,000 Americans A year. Newsweek. June 19, 2023. <https://www.newsweek.com/poverty-killing-nearly-200000-americans-year-1806002>)

**The land of the free is suffering from a "self-inflicted" injustice when it comes to poverty,** experts say, as the rich are getting richer while **thousands living without sufficient means die every year in the United States,** as **a recent study shows.** The issue, according to an exclusive poll conducted by [Redfield & Wilton Strategies](#) on behalf of Newsweek, worries a majority of Americans. **Research by the University of California,** Riverside (UCR) published earlier this year in the [Journal of the American Medical Association](#) **found that the death of 183,000 Americans aged 15 years old and above in 2019**—a year before the explosion of the pandemic were to make mortality rates in the country much, much worse—**could be attributed to poverty,** defined as those with incomes lower than 50 percent of the U.S. median. In 2019, the median household income was \$69,560. In the same year, about 34 million Americans—10.5 percent of the country's population—were estimated by the U.S. Census Bureau to be living in poverty. **Poverty remains a huge issue in the U.S.,** much more so than in other countries with similar levels of distributed wealth, and it is a cause of concern for a majority of Americans, as shown by the Newsweek/Redfield & Wilton Strategies poll. The poll, conducted among a sample of 1,500 eligible voters in the U.S. on May 31, found that some 53 percent of Americans are "very" concerned about the level of poverty in the country. Among Democrats—identified as people who voted for [Joe Biden](#) in 2020—the number went up to 58 percent, while among Republicans—identified as people who voted for [Donald Trump](#) in 2020—48 percent said they were "very" concerned about poverty in the U.S. Some 21 percent of Americans responding to the poll don't earn enough money from their primary job to pay bills or maintain their family's standard of living, while 52 percent are working multiple jobs to tackle the daily cost of living. More women (24 percent) than men (18 percent) said they didn't earn enough money to pay the bills, while more men (57 percent) than women (49 percent) said they were doing more than one job. The age cohort with the biggest percentage of people doing more than one job was 35-44, with 77 percent of respondents working multiple gigs. UCR researchers found that **poor people** had roughly the same survival rates as wealthier people until they hit the age of 40, after which they **died at a significantly higher rate than people with better incomes and resources.** **According to the UCR study, poverty as a risk factor can be considered the fourth leading cause of death in the U.S. after heart disease, cancer, and smoking. "As a risk factor, poverty kills more people than Alzheimer's, strokes, and diabetes."** David Brady, professor of public policy at UCR and lead researcher in the study, told Newsweek. While death is the "ultimate bad outcome," **poverty has also been linked to several negative health outcomes** including stress and depression. "Of course, there's some circularity with some health conditions," Brady said. "If you're physically disabled, you have a serious back injury and you can't work, that's probably going to make you more economically insecure, which then is going to feed into depression and so forth. These things all work together in concert." The findings of the UCR study also reveal yet another way in which **ethnic and racial minorities are disproportionately affected by issues linked to inequality, as these groups are more likely to live in poverty than white people, experts say.**

## Poverty 1AC — 5/6

**Advantage Two is Inequality:**

**First, our economy is fundamentally unequal, which uniquely impacts people of color. Every year, income inequality costs the working class over two trillion dollars. This is a matter of life and death**

**Hanauer and Rolf 2020 – Founder of Civic Ventures**

(Nick, Founder of the Public-Policy Incubator Civic Ventures. David M., Founder And President Emeritus of SEIU 775. The Top 1% of Americans Have Taken \$50 Trillion From The Bottom 90% - And That's Made the U.S. Less Secure. TIME Magazine. September 14, 2020.

<https://time.com/5888024/50-trillion-income-inequality-america/>)

Like many of the virus's hardest hit victims, the United States went into the [COVID-19 pandemic](#) wracked by preexisting conditions. A fraying public health infrastructure, inadequate medical supplies, an employer-based health insurance system perversely unsuited to the moment—these and other afflictions are surely [contributing to the death toll](#). But in addressing the [causes and consequences of this pandemic](#)—and its cruelly uneven impact—**the elephant in the room is extreme income inequality. How big is this elephant? A**

**staggering \$50 trillion**. That is how much the upward redistribution of income has cost American workers over the past several decades.

This is not some back-of-the-napkin approximation. **According to a groundbreaking new working paper by Carter C. Price and Kathryn Edwards of the RAND Corporation, had the more equitable income distributions of the three decades following World War II (1945 through 1974) merely held steady, the aggregate annual income of Americans earning below the 90th percentile would have been \$2.5 trillion higher in the year 2018 alone. That is an amount equal to nearly 12 percent of GDP—enough to more than double median income—enough to pay every single working American in the bottom nine deciles an additional \$1,144 a month.** Every month. Every single year. Price and Edwards calculate that **the cumulative tab for our four-decade-long experiment in radical inequality had grown to over \$47 trillion from 1975 through 2018. At a recent pace of about \$2.5 trillion a year, that number we estimate crossed the \$50 trillion mark by early 2020. That's \$50 trillion that would have gone into the paychecks of working Americans had inequality held constant—\$50 trillion that would have built a far larger and more prosperous economy—\$50 trillion that would have enabled the vast majority of Americans to enter this pandemic far more healthy, resilient, and financially secure.** As the RAND report [whose research was funded by the [Fair Work Center](#) which co-author David Rolf is a board member of] demonstrates, **a rising tide most definitely did not lift all boats**. It didn't even lift most of them, as nearly all of the benefits of growth these past 45 years were captured by those at the very top. And as the American economy grows radically unequal it is holding back economic growth itself. **Even inequality is meted out unequally. Low-wage workers and their families, disproportionately people of color, suffer from far higher rates of asthma, hypertension, diabetes,** and other COVID-19 comorbidities; **yet they are also far less likely to have health insurance, and far more likely to work in “essential” industries with the highest rates of coronavirus exposure and transmission**. It is no surprise then, [according to the CDC](#), that **COVID-19 inflicts “a disproportionate burden of illness and death among racial and ethnic minority groups.”** But imagine how much safer, healthier, and empowered all American workers might be if that \$50 trillion had been paid out in wages instead of being funneled into corporate profits and the offshore accounts of the super-rich. **Imagine how much richer and more resilient the American people would be. Imagine how many more lives would have been saved had our people been more resilient.**

## **Second, universal basic income is key to solve the income inequality created by decades of racial discrimination and failed policies**

### **Greenwell 2022 – Journalist for the Washington Post**

(Megan, Journalist For The Washington Post . Universal Basic Income Has Been Tested Repeatedly. It Works. Will America Ever Embrace It? The Washington Post. October 24, 2022. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/magazine/2022/10/24/universal-basic-income/>)

### **Without a radical solution – like, say, giving people money with no strings attached – America will continue to be home to one of the worst rates of income inequality of any rich nation in the world**

And from city to city, there is massive energy and momentum to keep expanding this experiment. But true believers also harbor a sense of anxiety about what the future holds. "I'm worried," says Sean Kline, the associate director of Stanford University's Basic Income Lab, "that these guaranteed income demonstrations are going to sunset and then it's just going to go quiet." For as long as America has had a poverty problem — which is to say, for its entire history — a small group of dreamers has proposed guaranteed income as a solution. The idea dates to the year the country was founded: Thomas Paine proposed a type of basic income in his 1776 pamphlet "Common Sense." In the mid-20th century, it gained traction among Black American thinkers: In 1966, the Black Panthers' Ten-Point Program demanded "employment or a guaranteed income" for everyone. A year later, the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. wrote in his last book — "[Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community?](#)" — that government aid programs all have a "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 effective — the solution to poverty is to abolish it directly by a now widely discussed measure: the guaranteed income." The first official proposal for a federal basic income program, though, came not from a paragon of progressivism, but from Richard Nixon. In 1969, Nixon introduced the Family Assistance Plan, which would have provided additional cash to poor families through a negative income tax — cutting checks to the poorest Americans instead of them paying the government — of \$1,600 (about \$13,000 today) for a family of four. The proposal was motivated by Nixon's desire to replace the welfare system, which was unpopular with White blue-collar voters, but it never made it out of the Senate Finance Committee. Many skeptical politicians and voters feared that giving people cash would allow them to quit their jobs, stop looking for work or work less. Around the same time, a series of negative-income-tax experiments benefiting about 7,500 people in six states appeared to confirm those concerns: In Seattle and Denver, where the two largest programs took place, married men worked an average of 7 percent fewer hours after three years of the program, while married and single women worked 17 percent fewer hours. And while researchers didn't look at any other measures of stability — whether participants were more likely to seek medical care, for example, or whether their children missed fewer days of school — they *did* observe a modest increase in the divorce rate. Those two factors were enough to destroy widespread interest in guaranteed-income experiments for several decades. Over time, however, interpretations of the 1970s experiments have morphed. Participants don't seem to have dropped out of the labor force entirely, suggesting that the money may have given them the luxury of waiting a little longer for the right job to come around instead of rushing into the first available option. And working less sometimes means getting more education, which is almost always a net positive for the economy. An uptick in divorces can be a good thing too: Studies show that financial insecurity is a major contributor to keeping women in failing relationships, as in Everett's case. In retrospect, the legacy of the first significant guaranteed-income pilots was a whole lot of complicated questions and limited information with which to answer them. Meanwhile, the concept of *conditional* cash-transfer programs — in other words, paying poor people for desirable behavior — was gaining steam in middle-income countries like Mexico and Brazil. In 2007, New York Mayor Mike Bloomberg launched a program called Opportunity NYC, which rewarded parents for tasks like taking their children to the doctor and completing job-training courses. The experiment had a moderate positive effect on families' overall finances but did not boost academic performance among elementary-schoolers or increase families' likelihood to seek preventive medical care, researchers found. Bloomberg did not extend the program when it expired in 2010. Among many poverty scholars and activists, conditional cash transfers are seen as a step in the right direction, but

only a small one. **To maximize the impact on poor people's lives, they say, money must be a right, not a reward, because that's the only way to empower people to make their own choices.** "There are positive outcomes from conditional cash, there are positive outcomes from unconditional cash," Kline says. "But I think for me, making it conditional misses a really fundamental value around trust, dignity, agency, freedom." The word "dignity" comes up a lot among guaranteed-income advocates. Research shows that the vast majority of people don't "waste" cash on vices like drugs and alcohol, but rather use even

small amounts to improve their life circumstances dramatically. **In a 2019 working paper, Nobel Prize-winning development economist**

**Abhijit Banerjee** and two co-authors **concluded that the distribution of unconditional cash in low-income countries had positive effects on "income, assets, savings, borrowing, total expenditure, food expenditure, dietary diversity, school attendance, test scores, cognitive development, use of health facilities, labor force participation, child labor migration, domestic violence, women's empowerment, marriage, fertility, and use of contraception, among others."** Banerjee is part of the research team studying the world's largest basic-income program, which is midway through a 12-year run across 300 rural villages in Kenya. For about 5,000 people, that means an extra \$22 a month for more than a decade. Thus far, the researchers have found, participants have been less likely to get sick or go hungry, and more likely to start a business. In the United States, which has the world's largest gross domestic product, the basic-income calculus is different than in places like Kenya, where a significant minority of people live on less than a

dollar a day. But **America has its own unique factors, like that inequality rate and a history of racist policies that have left a disproportionate number of people of color at the bottom of the income scale.** Indeed, Tubbs and his counterparts frame **basic income as something akin to reparations – a way to alleviate harm done to marginalized people by decades of biased and ineffective policy.** The SEED recipients were struggling to survive because society had let them down, Tubbs argues, and the conventional methods of helping them were paternalistic and inadequate. In Baltimore, where more than 1 in 5 residents live below the federal poverty line, a new guaranteed-income pilot gives \$1,000 a month to 200 recipients, all of them parents in high-crime neighborhoods. "We're like the birthplace of racial redlining, right?" Scott says.

**"You're not going to erase inequality, inequity that was caused by policy, without creating policy to do the opposite."**

**"You're not going to erase inequality, inequity that was caused by policy, without creating policy to do the opposite."**

## Poverty Affirmative (2AC)

### 2AC Case (Poverty)

**Status quo programs fail and create a poverty trap. The plan is key to solve**

#### Flowers 2016 – Journalist at FiveThirtyEight

(Andrew, Journalist At FiveThirtyEight. What Would Happen If We Just Gave People Money. FiveThirtyEight. April 25, 2016.

<https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/universal-basic-income/>)

**In the U.S., we're left with a patchwork benefits system, an indecipherable alphabet soup of programs: SNAP, TANF, CHIP, Section 8, EITC, WIC, SSDI. The U.S. government spends nearly \$1 trillion across dozens of separate programs** at the state and federal level,<sup>2</sup> as this byzantine [diagram](#) from the House Ways and Means Committee shows. **This all requires enormous administrative oversight on the part of the government, and it requires the ability to navigate multiple agencies on the part of recipients.** The problems with this system go beyond its complicated structure. **Because eligibility for most social assistance is based on income** (or is "[means-tested](#)"), **recipients lose their benefits as they earn more income — this is** often labeled **the** "welfare trap" or "**poverty trap**." For example: A family of four [can't qualify for food stamps](#) if it earns more than \$31,536. These benefit phase-outs, or "cliffs," essentially create steep marginal tax rates on the poor. Even welfare advocates are critical of the incentives embedded in this system. **"If you're a dollar over, you can't get assistance,"** said Wessita McKinley, founder and director of Sistas United, a nonprofit working with individuals in poverty around the Washington, D.C., area. **"Sometimes it feels like a governmental control; you're on a leash, and you can only go so far."** **Basic income promises an escape from the welfare trap — all the benefits would be the same, regardless of circumstance. And by cutting a single check for the same amount of money, it could dramatically reduce administrative costs. "The money we spend on welfare will be better spent — more productive for the kind of ends we want — if we spend it through a basic income,"** said Matt Zwolinski, a philosophy professor at the University of San Diego and one of the [most prominent libertarian advocates](#) for basic income. Despite squeamishness at the idea of government "handouts," some libertarians see **basic income** as a more efficient replacement for current social programs, one that **would streamline the welfare bureaucracy and reduce costs overall.**

**First, the case outweighs the disadvantage. Poverty has unique physical and psychological impacts, which cost society over a trillion dollars each year**

### **Rank 2018 – Professor of Social Welfare at Washington University**

(Mark R., Professor of Social Welfare At Washington University. The Cost of Keeping Children Poor. New York Times. April 15, 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/15/opinion/children-poverty-cost.html>)

Clearly, **poverty extracts a heavy toll** upon those who fall into its ranks, particularly children. **Countless studies have demonstrated the physical and psychological health costs** for children experiencing poverty. **Yet a more difficult question** to answer **is: What are the economic costs to society as a whole?** [Over the past 40 years](#), there have been two attempts to answer this question, with the most recent analysis conducted more than 10 years ago. My colleague Michael McLaughlin and I recently decided it was time to revisit this question. We relied on the latest government data and social science research in making our cost estimates. In particular, as a result of we examined the effect that childhood poverty has upon future economic productivity, health care and criminal justice costs, and **increased expenses** child homelessness and maltreatment. **In a study published in Social Work Research, we determined that childhood poverty cost the nation \$1.03 trillion in 2015.** This number represented [5.4 percent of the G.D.P.](#) **Impoverished children grow up possessing fewer skills and are thus less able to contribute to the productivity of the economy. They are also more likely to experience frequent health care problems and to engage in crime. These costs are borne by the children themselves, but ultimately by the wider society as well.** An even clearer way of gauging the magnitude of these costs is to compare their total with the total amount of federal spending in 2015. [According to the Congressional Budget Office](#), the federal government spent \$3.7 trillion that year, meaning that **the annual cost of childhood poverty represented 28 percent of the entire federal budget.** Equally important, we calculated what the cost savings would be for poverty reduction. Our analysis indicated that [for each dollar spent on reducing childhood poverty](#), the country would save at least \$7 with respect to the economic costs of poverty. The bottom line is that **reducing poverty is justified not only from a social justice perspective, but from a cost-benefit perspective as well.** Investing in programs that reduce childhood poverty is both smart and efficient economic policy.

**Second, no link and turn:**

**A. The economic benefits of the plan outweigh the costs**

**Ruiz 2021 – Writer at the Harvard Political Review**

(Jorge, Writer At The Harvard Political Review. Reinventing Capitalism: Why We Need To Move Toward Guaranteed Income. Harvard Political Review. April 16, 2021. <https://harvardpolitics.com/guaranteed-income/>)

**The high nominal cost of this one-time policy has sparked concern that extending it beyond this fiscal year would be too expensive, but research has shown that these expansions in transfers are self-financing to a significant extent. By leading to lower crime, better health and better outcomes for children in the long-term, cash transfers practically “pay for themselves” by reducing future government spending in areas like incarceration and healthcare.** While making this extended child tax credit permanent is still far from a true guaranteed income, it would be an important first step. We often joke that the government’s solution to any given problem is to simply throw money at the issue and call it a day. However, **when it comes to extreme poverty, homelessness, and lack of social mobility, investing directly in the American people is the best course of action. A guaranteed income program would reduce the unjust financial burdens of our most disenfranchised and give people power over their own futures. And while the on-paper cost of large transfer payments seems large, the aggregate benefits of reducing poverty at its root will pay for itself in the long run.** Whether such a system should end up being universal or targeted is still up for debate, but it is clear that **guaranteed income is the most effective way the government can uphold its promise to give every single person — regardless of their economic background, race, or residence — an equal shot at pursuing happiness.**

**Specifically, studies prove the plan outweighs the link**

**Rank 2018 – Professor of Social Welfare at Washington University**

(Mark R., Professor of Social Welfare At Washington University. The Cost of Keeping Children Poor. New York Times. April 15, 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/15/opinion/children-poverty-cost.html>)

Equally important, we calculated what the cost savings would be for poverty reduction. **Our analysis indicated that for each dollar spent on reducing childhood poverty, the country would save at least \$7 with respect to the economic costs of poverty.** The bottom line is that **reducing poverty is justified** not only from a social justice perspective, but **from a cost-benefit perspective** as well. **Investing in programs that reduce childhood poverty is both smart and efficient economic policy.** Most of us are familiar with the saying, “An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.” It turns out that this is particularly true in the case of poverty. **It is not a question of paying or not paying. Rather, it is a question of how we pay,** which then affects the amount we end up spending. **In making an investment up front to alleviate poverty, the evidence suggests, we will be repaid many times over by lowering the enormous costs associated with a host of interrelated problems.** Recognizing the sizable costs of childhood poverty is an important first step toward summoning the political will to address this economic and societal blight. **Instead of slashing an already weakened safety net, we should be following the example of most leading countries, which have built effective support systems that prevent poverty. By doing so, we would give our children a much better chance of reaching their full potential, which benefits us all.**

## **Third, no impact: Fears of inflation are grossly exaggerated**

### **Karabell 2021 – Commentator for TIME Magazine**

(Zachary, Investor and Commentator For TIME Magazine. Why We Should Stop Freaking Out About Inflation. TIME Magazine. November 23, 2021. <https://time.com/6122867/inflation-fears/>)

But **some inflation is not the same as scary, runaway hyperinflation that will destabilize the financial system** and reduce the living standards of wage earners. In fact, **rising wages have** in many places **been higher than rising costs**. Take the recent hike of \$21 a month by the federal government in Medicare premiums, the largest dollar increase in history. That got all the headlines because it spoke to inflation fears. At the same time, however, the government announced that Social Security premium would **increase 5.9%**, which more than cover the Medicare increases and still leave a healthy extra amount in people's pockets. **Not all inflation erodes lifestyle; wages rising, social security increases, modest rises in interest rate can add to middle-class savings and disposable incomes. For years, largely because of the proliferation of new technologies, prices have been dropping everywhere. Deflation, not inflation, has been the dominant trend,** and in terms of costs of services and many goods, that tech-fueled trend has not been altered. The rise in the cost of sofas and refrigerators and gas is a product of demand, not intrinsic changes in how much it costs to make those goods. **Once supply adjusts to increased demand,** and once the surge of post-COVID-19 pent up demand levels off, we **will be largely in the same world we have been in: a world where technology pushes costs lower**. Of course, it may be that the long-awaited inflation shoe is indeed dropping. You can't disprove a future fear, and the memory of destructive inflation runs so deep that even a hint of it is sufficient to spook markets and nations. But **it is far more likely that our current inflation fear is more a product of the past than of the present and the future, and that the larger danger is not that prices are inflating for good but that our fears are inflated.** We've had enough fear over the past two years; let's not succumb to another wave.

**First, the status quo solves. The U.S. is already taking federal action on climate**

### **Colon et al. 2022 — Researchers at the Center for American Progress**

(Frances, Senior Director of International Climate Policy. Anne Christianson, Director of International Climate Policy. Cassidy Childs, Research Associate On International Climate Policy. How The Inflation Reduction Act Will Drive Global Climate Action. Center For American Progress. August 17, 2022. <https://www.americanprogress.org/article/how-the-inflation-reduction-act-will-drive-global-climate-action/>)

**When President Joe Biden rejoined the Paris Agreement** on his inauguration day, **the United States indicated its intent to lead the world in tackling climate change. Yet until the Inflation Reduction Act** was signed into law on August 16, 2022, **the United States had not taken the meaningful domestic action** needed to reduce its emissions, which grew by 6.2 percent in 2021 relative to 2020 and overall remain second only to China. **The Inflation Reduction Act may change this** reality. Although it is domestically focused—and includes several harmful provisions on drilling that demonstrate the ongoing power of the oil and gas industry—**this law represents the single-largest investment in climate action in U.S. history and will profoundly alter the international landscape**. Indeed, **this historic legislation will help the United States reach its emission reduction commitments, increase U.S. competitiveness and spur a “race to the top” in the clean energy economy, reshape the security landscape, and, crucially, restore trust and legitimacy for the United States within the global climate community.**

## Second, federalism is resilient. Two warrants:

### A. It's not zero-sum

#### Rodríguez 2014 — Professor of Law At Yale Law School

(Cristina, Leighton Homer Surbeck Professor of Law At Yale Law School. Negotiating Conflict Through Federalism: Institutional And Popular Perspectives. Yale Law Journal. Vol. 124 (No. 6). <https://www.yalelawjournal.org/article/negotiating-conflict-through-federalism-institutional-and-popular-perspectives>)

Though pursuit of their interests by each player may often lead to conflict, particularly over which institutions should control any given policy domain, I argue that **the value of the system** common to all of its participants **is the framework it creates for the ongoing negotiation of disagreements large and small**—a value that requires regular attention by all participants to the integrity of federalism's institutions. It is in this sense that I think **federalism constitutes a framework for national integration**, in the spirit of this Feature. **It creates a multiplicity of institutions with lawmaking power through which to develop national consensus, while establishing a system of government that allows for meaningful expressions of disagreement** when consensus fractures or proves elusive—a value that transcends perspective. In what follows, I attempt to establish these conclusions by considering how the negotiations required by federalism have structured our national debates over a number of pressing social welfare issues, including immigration, marriage equality, drug policy, education and health care reform, and law enforcement. I focus on how **these debates play out in** what I call **the discretionary spaces of federalism**, which consist of the policy conversations and bureaucratic negotiations that actors within the system must have to figure out how to interact with one another both vertically and horizontally. Indeed, within existing legal constraints, state and local actors will have considerable room to maneuver, and the federal government considerable discretion to refrain from taking preemptive action. I highlight questions of administration and enforcement, because it is in these domains that the system's actors construct one another's powers and interests on an ongoing basis, based on the value they seek to derive from the system. In these discretionary spaces, **"winners" must sometimes emerge** from discrete conflicts, whether through judicial resolution or political concession, **and** the parameters set by courts and Congress obviously define the terrain of negotiation. **But the intergovernmental relationships and overlapping political communities the system creates are neither locked in zero-sum competition nor bound by fixed rules of engagement, precisely what makes federalism productive regardless of perspective**. pg. 2097-2098

### B. The pandemic

#### Tribe 2020 — Professor Emeritus of Law At Harvard University

(Laurence, Professor Emeritus of Law At Harvard. Don't Let Coronavirus Shake Your Faith In Federalism. The Boston Globe. April 29, 2020. <https://www.bostonglobe.com/2020/04/27/opinion/not-learning-wrong-lessons-coronavirus/>)

In times as dark as these, **it can be tempting to wonder whether the American experiment has failed**. New York digs mass graves as though out of Boccaccio's most ashen imaginings; the president of the United States just recommended we all inject cleaning solvent. More than a crisis of the times, this episode feels like a calamitous failure of government. How is it that our national stockpiles were left to languish, our Centers for Disease Control and Prevention was slashed and left to ossify, and our experts' wise counsel ignored, our alarm bells silenced? For some, this is symptomatic of a federal system already broken — "outdated," as Richard Krietner recently opined, an 18th-century dream more papier-mâché than proper governance. As Krietner bewails, "Neither the paralyzed, sclerotic central government" nor our "arbitrarily determined States" have been able to tackle the crisis laid at our feet. He recommends a radical overhaul of the system — disintegration into loosely cooperative regional networks à la the failed Articles of Confederation — and, in effect, its abandonment altogether. Such radical solutions might be mere doomsayings, but their premise simply isn't true. **To misconstrue this moment as the death knell of federalism dangerously misunderstands how the pandemic has showcased federalism's versatility, resilience, and strength**. As these endless months have stretched on, **American federalism has flexed its institutional muscles not in a hapless rendering of Trump's ego projects, but squarely in the common defense**.

**Third, there's no impact. Climate change is not an existential threat. We can adapt**

## **Lomborg 2022 — Visiting Fellow at the Hoover Institution**

(Bjorn, Visiting Fellow At The Hoover Institution. Turning Down The Climate-Change Heat. National Review. March 3, 2022. <https://www.nationalreview.com/magazine/2022/03/21/turning-down-the-climate-change-heat/>)

As a species, **we are not on the brink of imminent extinction.** In fact, quite the opposite. **The rhetoric of impending doom belies an absolutely essential point: In almost every way we can measure, life on earth is better now than it was at any time in history. Since 1900, we have more than doubled our life expectancy.** In 1900, the average life span was just 33 years — today it is more than 71. The increase has had the most dramatic impact on the world's worst-off. Health inequality has diminished significantly. The world is more literate; child labor has been dropping; we are living in one of the most peaceful times in history. Between 1990 and 2015, the percentage of people in the world practicing open defecation dropped from 30 to 15 percent. **The planet is getting healthier,** too. In the past half century, **we have made substantial cuts in indoor air pollution,** previously the biggest environmental killer. In 1990, pollution caused more than 8 percent of deaths; this has almost halved, to 4.7 percent, meaning that 1.2 million people survive each year who would have died. Higher agricultural yields and changing attitudes to the environment have meant that rich countries are increasingly preserving forests and reforestation. And since 1990, 2.6 billion more people have gained access to improved water sources, bringing the global total of people with access to improved water to 91 percent. Many of these improvements have come about because we have gotten richer, both as individuals and as nations. Over the past 30 years, **the average global income per person has almost doubled.** That has driven massive cuts in poverty. In 1990, nearly four in ten people on the planet were poor, meaning they made less than \$1.90 per day. Today, it is less than one in ten. **When we are richer, we live longer and have better lives.** We live with less indoor air pollution. **Governments provide more health care, build better safety nets, and enact stronger laws and regulations to battle pollution and protect the environment.** Significantly, progress has not ended. The world has been radically transformed for the better in the last century, and it will continue to improve in the century to come. **Analysis by experts shows that we are likely to become much, much better off in the future.** Researchers working for the United Nations suggest that **by 2100, average incomes will greatly increase, perhaps to 450 percent of today's incomes.** Life expectancy will continue to increase, to 82 years or possibly beyond 100. As countries and individuals get richer, air pollution will reduce even further. **Climate change will have a negative impact on the world, but it will pale in comparison with all the positive gains** that we have seen so far and that we will continue to see **in the century ahead.** These gains that we both have seen and will see come **from** the general **economic development** described above. The best current research shows that **the cost of climate change by the end of the century, if we do nothing, will be less than 4 percent of global GDP.** This includes all the negative impacts — not just the increased costs from stronger storms but also the costs of increased deaths from heat waves and the lost wetlands from rising sea levels. This means that instead of seeing incomes rise by 450 percent by 2100, they might increase by “only” 434 percent. That's clearly a problem. But it's also clearly not a catastrophe. As the members of the U.N. Climate Panel put it themselves: **For most economic sectors, the impact of climate change will be small** relative to the impacts of other drivers [such as] changes in population, age, income, technology, relative prices, lifestyle, regulation, governance, and many other aspects of socioeconomic development” (italics added).

## First, Permutation: Do Both. Cooperative federalism solves best

### Fahey 2023 — Assistant Professor of Law at the University of Chicago

(Bridget A., Assistant Professor of Law At The University of Chicago. Coordinated Rulemaking And Cooperative Federalism's Administrative Law. The Yale Law Journal. Vol. 132 (No. 5): 1213-1599. <https://www.yalelawjournal.org/article/coordinated-rulemaking>)

**“Cooperative federalism”** is not just a model of federalism; it **is a model of administration.**<sup>1</sup> **Many of our nation’s largest** regulatory **programs—from government health insurance to** pollution control to transportation, public education, **social welfare**, disaster relief, policing, immigration enforcement, **and more—are administered jointly by federal and state bureaucracies.** Scholars have critically evaluated how cooperative federalism advances policy goals,<sup>2</sup> whether cooperative federalism is consistent with federalism values<sup>3</sup> and democratic principles, and how the Constitution enables and constrains cooperative federalism.<sup>4</sup> But despite the scale and sweep of these programs, our understanding of how they work at a more basic administrative level is stubbornly thin. We have yet to conceptualize a cooperative administrative law for our cooperative federalism programs. As this Article shows, however, **our governments have**, in practice, **forged intricate forms of administrative coordination to bring cooperative programs to fruition.** But that coordination is not centrally structured by the federal Administrative Procedure Act (APA) or its like; there is no cross-jurisdictional equivalent of the APA. Rather, the coordination I document in this Article has arisen organically over time, program by program and interaction by interaction. The practices that comprise cooperative federalism’s administrative law exist, but we lack the terms and templates to recognize them. This Article focuses on just one part of cooperative federalism’s administrative law: the cooperative equivalent of binding legislative rules—the workhorse of administrative practice.<sup>5</sup> In the federal system, agencies enact legislative rules pursuant to the APA’s straightforward notice-and-comment process.<sup>6</sup> **In cooperative programs,** I show that **our governments have devised** an alternative form of rulemaking, which I term **“coordinated rulemaking.”** Distinctive and widely used, **coordinated rulemaking stitches together federal and state agency action to produce rules binding on both those governments and the third parties they regulate.** Because it crosses governmental boundaries, however, it has a legal logic, process, and form of “codification” that diverges from the more familiar legislative rulemaking familiar to observers of the federal administrative state. To take just one profound difference: I show that notice and comment, the process so central to federal rulemaking and a chief determinant of whether it is binding, is neither necessary nor sufficient to give coordinated rules the force and effect of law. Instead, coordinated rules are binding because of a logic distinct to the constitutional structure of federal-state interactions but not previously articulated, which I call “promulgation by concurrence.”<sup>7</sup> To see the unusual administrative form that coordinated rulemaking can take, **consider Medicaid—not only one of the largest cooperative federalism programs but also among our nation’s largest regulatory programs of any form. Some aspects** of Medicaid **are brought to fruition by federal or state regulations.** But many of the binding rules that serve the function of regulations in the Medicaid context—the rules that shape the basic medical benefits to which millions of Americans are entitled—are not codified in either the Code of Federal Regulations or a state equivalent. Neither are they made through a process prescribed by the APA. Rather, **they are agreed to by federal and state agencies** in a more diffuse manner.<sup>8</sup> **And only once they have achieved that concurrence do they become binding on the governmental counterparties** to Medicaid’s bargain and, more importantly, on the program’s millions of beneficiaries and service providers. Those rules are, in turn, codified, but in an unorthodox location. Each state’s Medicaid partnership with the federal government is initiated through an intergovernmental agreement—a treaty-like document between the federal government and each state—called the “Medicaid state plan.”<sup>9</sup> Coordinated rules are codified as “addenda” to those state plans. Medicaid is not unique. Many other major and minor cooperative programs use a similar form of coordinated rulemaking to implement their joint programs.<sup>10</sup>

## Second, the states can't solve. Three warrants:

### A. No risk of federal follow-on

#### Joyce 2017 — Staff Writer at The Gate

(Samuel, Staff Writer At The Gate. Cassidy-Graham's Single-Payer Trap. The Gate. September 24, 2017.  
<http://uchicagogate.com/articles/2017/9/24/cassidy-grahams-single-payer-trap/>)

**The Political Cost of Failure** The problems of state-level single-payer may not be immediately fatal, but **any state-based system would depend on a complex web of federal waivers, new taxes and new layers of bureaucracy. This sort of patchwork health insurance system would be unstable, vulnerable at every moment to one part of the system failing and bringing down the rest of it with it. Even the best-designed state system will carry with it a substantial risk of failure. Such a risk is unaffordable** for the single-payer movement. **Any sort of public debacle** surrounding a single-payer system **would effectively destroy the future of the movement,** with the failure of single-payer in California or New York used as an excuse to avoid pursuing the policy at the federal level.

### B. Resources. State budgets are in crisis

#### Schleicher 2023 — Professor of Law at Yale

(David, Professor Of Law At Yale. The Era of Flush State Budgets Is Over. The Atlantic. June 4, 2023.  
<https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2023/06/state-budgets-federal-funding-california-new-york/674264/>)

As part of the deal to extend the debt limit, President Joe Biden and Congress agreed to [rescind about \\$30 billion that had originally been allocated](#) in 2021's American Rescue Plan, some of which was going to be sent to state and local governments for a variety of projects. The amount isn't that large, at least by federal-budget standards, but it is indicative of a huge change in policy. **The federal response to COVID-19 included enormous amounts of mostly unconditional fiscal aid to states,** cities, and other local governments. **But this era of huge federal aid, and the flush state and local budgets** it helped create, **is over. In its place will be a period of state fiscal retrenchment.** Between the huge buckets of federal aid and the strong economy of the past few years, state budgets have never been healthier. Some states and cities have used this time to address long-standing fiscal problems and to [sock away significant "rainy day" funds](#), which will ease the coming crunch. But others have not, instead using the money to build out new government programs or cut taxes, policies that will prove hard to reverse even when budgets get tighter. And they are getting tighter. **Across the country, state and local tax and other revenues are declining,** and the outcome will be particularly bad for transit agencies dependent on farebox revenue where many fewer people are riding transit and for cities reliant on downtown commercial property taxes where more people are working from home. **When the flow of federal money** to state and local budgets **runs out, some jurisdictions—including California, Illinois, and New York City—will face enormous budget gaps.** People have become used to the state and local politics that were ushered in by the full budgets written amid the growing economy of the late 2010s, and the boom in state revenue around COVID. During these flush years, even some liberal politicians supported tax cuts and even some conservative ones supported increasing pay for teachers. The next few years will not look like that. **Rather than new programs and tax reductions, we are going to see a number of states and localities forced to cut back.** Police departments will be partially defunded not because of political preferences but because of fiscal necessity, despite worries about crime; class sizes in public schools will increase because fewer teachers will be hired. Federal efforts to encourage green infrastructure will be partially frustrated by declining state and local investment. Some places will raise taxes. And, **in the medium term, we are likely to see severe fiscal crises in at least a few jurisdictions,** like what we saw in Detroit in 2013.

### C. Fiscal Policy. The counterplan increases inequality

#### Rocco 2020 — Associate Professor of Political Science at Marquette

(Philip B., Associate Professor of Political Science At Marquette University. Ending Federalism As We Know It: Review Of The Divided States of America By Donald F. Kettl. November 9, 2020. Marquette University Press.

[https://epublications.marquette.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1096&context=polisci\\_fac](https://epublications.marquette.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1096&context=polisci_fac))

**Paeans to decentralized government sit at odds with bleak realities in the states. As recent research has suggested, states' decisions about social distancing didn't reflect local conditions so much as the partisan identity of the governor and the state legislature.** Moreover, as soon as social-distancing measures were imposed, most states quickly reopened their economies, despite lacking adequate test-and-trace infrastructures. In several Republican-led states, most notably Arizona, Florida, and Texas, new viral hot spots have appeared. As the public-health emergency cascaded into an economic crisis, state and local governments were set to experience combined revenue shortfalls of at least \$500 billion between 2020 and 2022. Constrained by balanced-budget provisions in state constitutions and abandoned by Congress, governors have prepared to make excruciating budget cuts. Amid a pandemic, one of the first programs on the chopping block is Medicaid, which provides health insurance to one in five Americans and may cover nearly half of all those losing employer-sponsored insurance due to COVID-19-related job losses. With the prospect of a pandemic election looming, political crises join fiscal and humanitarian ones. Many states seem primed to repeat the experience of Wisconsin's disastrous spring primary, which disenfranchised thousands of voters and likely contributed to the spread of the virus. Slide decks and press conferences notwithstanding, **COVID-19 exposes** not merely failures of leadership, but **the structural defects of America's brand of federalism** as well. **The allocation of critical responsibilities to state governments — from the financing of social programs to the administration of elections — has left civil and social rights dependent on one's state of residence. States' limited fiscal capacities make them particularly ill-suited for financing key responsibilities,** including and especially public health, **in the midst of an economic crisis.** Furthermore, **interstate competition for capital investment incentivizes states to decrease tax stringency and weaken labor protections.** As Harold Laski put it in 1938, **for states to compete with "the integrated power of giant capitalism is to invite defeat in every element of social life."** Given federalism's impact on the COVID-19 response, the publication of Donald F. Kettl's *The Divided States of America: Why Federalism Doesn't Work* could hardly be more timely. A renowned scholar of public administration and intergovernmental relations, Kettl offers a lucid, searing critique of American federalism as a contributor to growing socioeconomic inequalities, both within and among states. Moreover, this inequality, he argues, has fueled a broader decline in Americans' trust in government, as well as polarization and dysfunction in Washington, DC. **Reversing these outcomes,** Kettl suggests, **will require major changes** to the fiscal and administrative relationships among federal, state, and local governments. **Yet in the absence of a more fundamental political reconstruction** — including a restoration of the right to vote, a recovery of the right to organize and join a union, and the abolition of the carceral state — **the structural inequalities of American federalism are likely to endure.**

## First, Permutation: Do Both. A basic income is key to build anti-capitalist coalitions

### Battistoni 2017 — Assistant Professor of Political Science at Barnard College

(Alyssa, Assistant Professor of Political Science At Barnard College. The False Promise Of Universal Basic Income. Dissent Magazine. Spring 2017. <https://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/false-promise-universal-basic-income-andy-stern-ruger-bregman/>)

Of course, the above model, based on postwar growth in the United States and Western Europe, is now a fantasy here too. Donald Trump will fail to make America great again in the way he's promised. The factory jobs aren't coming back, and neither are 4 percent growth rates. Even the desperate deals to keep individual plants running won't stave off the robots: Carrier, for example, has already said it will put most of the money it promised to invest in its Indiana plant into automation. Which is why, **despite the dangers of UBI, it remains an important time for the left to develop a view of a society less oriented around work**: as the futility of Fordist nostalgia becomes more and more apparent, both here and around the globe, the left should seize the opportunity to push for a different view of what work should be, how much of it we should do, and what role it should play in our lives. **That will take time and a broad coalition**—but not the one that Stern describes between the ultra-rich and the masses of gig workers, or even of post-ideological rationalists described by Bregman. Instead, the elements of a staunchly left and genuinely political coalition—**comprised of workers who need more leverage and the unemployed, those fighting for a sustainable environment and racial justice, care workers both waged and unwaged**—are nascent but increasingly visible. The left hasn't seriously organized around welfare rights for years. But in the coming years it will be more important than ever to defend what remains of U.S. social provision from Paul Ryan and company, particularly given the nasty racial tack that fight will undoubtedly take. And we can't defend welfare just as a backstop for vulnerable and unlucky members of society, or as a handout to the benighted poor, but as a fundamental and universal good for all. In other words, **we should advocate for** the exact opposite of the Clintonian welfare reform programs of the 1990s, and **the only kind of welfare program that can build a broad and universal constituency for social provision rather than marking out the undeserving poor**. A recent New York Times op-ed argued for **UBI as a kind of reparations for decades of unpaid work done by women**, echoing socialist-feminist arguments about the value of social reproduction. **The Movement for Black Lives endorsed basic income as part of a reparations program**, in the model of a new Freedom Budget. The labor movement in the United States has understandably focused on higher wages, but it can—and must—also revive the demand for shorter hours and more leisure. **Basic income isn't the only way to make that demand**, and it isn't even a necessary part of it—**but its utopian elements can help drive a more visionary agenda for labor**. None of **the UBI proposals we hear today**—in Canada, the United Kingdom, or in France—is likely to be quite the basic income imagined by luxury communists (there aren't enough of them to win an election yet), but **they're a start. Utopia is possible. If we want it, though, we'll need to make it a part of the demands and visions of the left movements we build over the next few years. Because we can't just invent the future—we're going to have to fight for it.**

## Second, no link and turn:

### A. Basic income is key to reforming capitalism

#### Standing 2020 — Professorial Research Associate at the University of London

(Guy, Professorial Research Associate At The University of London. The Case for A Basic Income. Great Transition Initiative. November 2020. <https://greattransition.org/gti-forum/basic-income-standing>)

The COVID-19 pandemic has brought into sharp relief the irretrievable breakdown of the post-war **income distribution** system **in the West** that essentially **ties income and benefits to employment**. **The past four decades have seen income, wealth, and power flowing increasingly to rentiers**—owners of physical, financial, and so-called intellectual property—**while the ranks of the global precariat swell, consigning workers to unstable jobs, low and erratic incomes, and insecure lives**. But the pandemic may prove the undoing of that system, as paying people to stay home—indeed, to not do paid work—has become essential to survival. **As long as income depends on jobs, workers will feel a need to return to unsafe conditions**. And as long as economic power remains concentrated at the top, companies will have every incentive to make workers come back. Even if we manage to weather the current pandemic, our system lacks the resilience to be ready for the next one—let alone other crises. The glimmer of hope amidst the tragedy is that **the economic recession triggered by the pandemic is a potentially transformative crisis**. Many on the left were puzzled by the reversion to the neoliberal status quo following the 2007/2008 financial crash. **However, a hegemonic paradigm will only be displaced if it cannot answer the questions that preoccupy people and if an alternative paradigm is ready**. For too long, that second condition has been missing. Fortunately, **an alternative economic vision has been emerging, and a basic income system is an essential component of it. A basic income is not a panacea, merely a necessary pillar of the reimagining of work and economic security in our crisis-ridden world. As resolutely against old-style “laborist” social democracy as against neoliberal capitalism, it will foster greater freedom while helping us tackle the worsening crises of inequality, climate change, and authoritarian populism.**

### B. The plan empowers labor while reducing racial and gender inequality

#### O’Boyle 2021 — Lecturer of Economics at St. Angela’s College

(Brian, Lecturer Of Economics At St. Angela’s College. A Socialist Case Against Universal Basic Income. Rebel News. July 5, 2021. <http://www.rebelnews.ie/2021/07/05/universal-basic-income-socialist-case-against/>. Note: The Author is summarizing an argument made by proponents of UBI)

**By ensuring that everyone has enough to live on** irrespective of their role in the capitalist economy, Standing argues that **a UBI would encourage individual freedom and human flourishing, enhance security for all, reduce the inequalities associated with gender and race; deny space for the far right** and decouple our lives from economic growth. **If people at the lower end of the socio-economic spectrum had a guaranteed basic income, they would be less vulnerable to poverty and predatory employers** — particularly relevant in the era of zero-hour contracts and increased automation. People at the lower end of the income scale would also gain relatively more from a UBI as the marginal benefits of a hundred euro are much higher when someone has less to begin with. **This would allow people to reach more of their potential whilst avoiding dependency relationships that are unsafe, exploitative, or degrading. A UBI sourced through progressive taxation would also begin to rebalance the inequalities that capitalism creates around race and gender. Because women and people of colour are structurally disadvantaged through the market economy,** Standing argues that **these groups would benefit disproportionately by breaking the link between well-being and employment** — supporting women who need to exit abusive relationships for example. **A progressive UBI would also reduce the despair and anger created by neoliberalism which has acted as a recruiting sergeant for the hate-filled politics of the far right**. Finally, by recycling unpopular carbon taxes to every person as a UBI, Standing feels governments could better convince their populations to take the difficult medicine associated with a Just Transition to a sustainable economy.

## Third, the alternative fails: We must work within the system

### Bryant 2012 — Professor of Philosophy at Collin College

(Levi, Professor of philosophy At collin College. We'll Never Do Better Than A Politician: Climate Change And Purity. Larval Subjects. May 11, 2012. <https://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/05/11/well-never-do-better-than-a-politician-climate-change-and-purity/>)

However, pointing this out and **deriding market based solutions doesn't get us very far**. In fact, such a response to proposed market-based solutions is downright dangerous and irresponsible. The fact of the matter is that 1) **we currently live in a market based world**, 2) **there is not, in the foreseeable future an alternative system on the horizon, and** 3), above all, **we need to do something now**. We can't afford to reject interventions simply because they don't meet our ideal conceptions of how things should be. **We have to work with the world that is here, not the one that we would like to be here**. And here it's crucial to note that pointing this out does not entail that we shouldn't work for producing that other world. It just means that **we have to grapple with the world that is actually there before us**. It pains me to write this post because I remember, with great bitterness, the diatribes hardcore Obama supporters leveled against legitimate leftist criticisms on the grounds that these critics were completely unrealistic idealists who, in their demand for "purity", were asking for "ponies and unicorns". This rejoinder always seemed to ignore that words have power and that Obama, through his profound power of rhetoric, had, at least the power to shift public debates and frames, opening a path to making new forms of policy and new priorities possible. The tragedy was that he didn't use that power, though he has gotten better. I do not wish to denounce others and dismiss their claims on these sorts of grounds. As a Marxist anarchist, I do believe that we should fight for the creation of an alternative hominid ecology or social world. I think that the call to commit and fight, to put alternatives on the table, has been one of the most powerful contributions of thinkers like Zizek and Badiou. If we don't commit and fight for alternatives those alternatives will never appear in the world. Nonetheless, we still have to grapple with the world we find ourselves in. And it is here, **in my encounters with some Militant Marxists**, that I sometimes **find it difficult to avoid the conclusion that they are unintentionally aiding and abetting the very things they claim to be fighting**. **In their refusal to become impure, to work with situations** or assemblages as we find them, to sully their hands, **they end up reproducing the very system they wish to topple and change**. Narcissistically they get to sit there, smug in their superiority and purity, while everything continues as it did before because they've refused to become politicians or engage in the difficult concrete work of assembling human and nonhuman actors to render another world possible. As a consequence, they occupy the position of Hegel's beautiful soul that denounces the horrors of the world, celebrate the beauty of their soul, while depending on those horrors of the world to sustain their own position. **To engage in politics is to engage in networks** or ecologies of relations between humans and nonhumans. To engage in ecologies is to descend into networks of causal relations and feedback loops **that you cannot completely master** and that will modify your own commitments and actions. **But there's no other way, there's no way around this, and we do need to act now**.

## **Poverty Negative (1NC)**

### **1NC Disadvantage (Economy) – 1/3**

**First is Uniqueness: Inflation is declining now. The Economy is recovering from the pandemic**

### **Duggan and Curry 7/12 — Contributors at Forbes**

(Wayne, Contributor To Forbes. Benjamin, Editor At Forbes. The Price Is Right: U.S. Inflation Hits Two-Year Lows In June. Forbes Magazine. July 12, 2023. <https://www.forbes.com/advisor/investing/current-inflation-rate/>)

Remember inflation? **The most recent data on prices suggests** that **the spike in U.S. inflation** seen over the last two years **is finally going away**. On Wednesday, **the Labor Department reported the consumer price index rose 3% on an annual basis in June**, down from a 4% annualized gain in May. **On a monthly basis, the CPI gained 0.2%**. The latest CPI data is further evidence that **aggressive Federal Reserve rate hikes finally have inflation trending steadily lower. Year-over-year CPI inflation hit a 40-year high of 9.1% in June 2022, but it has now fallen for 12 consecutive months**. June CPI by the Numbers Prior to 2022, the consumer price index hadn't gained more than 8.3% on a year-over-year basis in any month since 1982. However, post-Covid 19 supply chain disruptions, pent-up consumer demand and the tight labor market drove prices sharply higher. In June, core CPI, which excludes volatile food and energy prices, was up 0.2% on a monthly basis and 4.8% from a year ago. Economists had projected a 5% annual gain. Food prices were up 0.1% month-over-month and 5.7% compared to a year ago. Energy prices were up 0.6% on a monthly basis but were still down 16.7% over the prior 12 months. Shelter costs kept rising, gaining 0.4% compared to May and 7.8% compared to June 2022. The latest CPI numbers come after the Labor Department reported **the U.S. economy added 209,000 jobs in June**, missing economist expectations for 240,000 new jobs. The Labor Department reported **U.S. wages were up 4.4% year-over-year in June, while the unemployment rate dropped to 3.6%**. The June CPI data confirms that the U.S. inflation problem may finally be in the rear-view mirror. In late June, the Commerce Department reported the core **personal consumption expenditures price index** was up 4.6% on an annual basis in May, down from a 4.7% year-over-year gain in April. Core PCE is the Federal Reserve's preferred inflation measure. **The Fed Has Nearly Won the War on Inflation**

## Second is the Link: The plan leads to runaway inflation. A basic income would cost trillions of dollars and destroy the economy

### Hughes 2023 — Founder of Bull Oak Capital

(Ryan A., Founder of Bull Oak Capital / Investment Banker. Universal Basic Income Is A Bad Idea. Bull Oak Capital. January 27, 2023.

<https://bulloakcapital.com/blog/universal-basic-income-is-a-bad-idea/>)

**UBI is expensive. Very expensive.** As an add on, without simultaneously trimming government programs, it would require a significant tax increase. Following the Finnish study results, Kari Hamalainen, chief researcher at the VATT Institute for Economic Research, [said](#) implementing a universal basic income for all citizens “would be expensive. If we had a universal basic income, we’d have to incorporate taxation”, and based on these results, **“it would be unsustainable.”** **Bridgewater Associates conducted a study in 2018, which found the cost of a \$1,000/mo stipend to every adult in the U.S. would run approximately \$3.81 trillion per year. This amount represented 21% of US GDP or 78% of tax revenue in 2018.** (Source: [CNBC](#)) Yes, the stipend

would help to make people feel more financially secure, but as the Finnish study proved, it would not meaningfully increase employment or production. **It would merely be an enormous expense, one that would likely cripple the U.S. economy.** A UBI program will require a massive tax overhaul and an in-depth evaluation of existing social programs. Some believe the cost would be partially offset by the removal of other social programs and the diminished administration costs that come from running a program without a “means test.” This would be a concept that requires program administrators to ensure recipients meet specific qualification standards. While in the pure UBI, the payment goes to all citizens. Disadvantages of UBI Naval Ravikant, co-founder, chairman, and former CEO of AngelList outlines other reasons we should be avoiding Universal Basic Income. He believes that those who are down on their luck don’t want handouts. Naval believes that it is better to help lower-income individuals gain meaningful lives through education and success. “You have to teach a man to fish, not basically throw your rod and leftover carcasses at him and tell him ‘here, eat the scraps,’” he continues. Others believe that there are better uses of government funds than the “handouts” of UBI. In a recent [Financial Times](#) article, Ian Goldin, a professor of globalization and development at the University of Oxford, claims that “Individuals gain not only income but also meaning, status, skills, networks, and friendships through work. Delinking income and work, while rewarding people for staying at home, is what lies behind social decay.” Joseph Stiglitz, Nobel laureate in economics, professor at the Columbia Business School, and Chief Economist at the Roosevelt Institute believes that people have a desire to work and gain dignity from doing so. This previous statements strike a chord with me. [Self-sufficiency](#) is an essential aspect of well-being. Steve Taylor, Ph.D., says, “Self-sufficiency is the quality of feeling secure and content with oneself, a deep-rooted sense of inner completeness and stability.” What would be the knockoff effects if we take this away from an entire populace? Will we see a drop in production? Would there be higher levels of unhappiness and self-worth? Will Reduce Pay While some economists argue that UBI could drive up wages, others believe it will drive them down. Why would an employer pay more if UBI gives citizens enough money to live on? They will most likely try to get away with paying them less, as these individuals have another source of income. What is happening in the gig economy is proof enough that this can be the case. Many gig workers are willing to work for low wages as they have other sources of income. Automation Will Not Reduce Jobs As stated earlier, Andrew Yang believes that robots and automation will purge America of countless jobs. Will automation replace some jobs? Yes. It is almost guaranteed that some jobs will be phased out. But other, more meaningful jobs will be created in its place. This has been the case since the rise of humanity. Automation is not a new concept. Since the earliest times, tools and machines have been invented to make a task easier. In 1722, the lathe was invented, a tool designed to hold a section of material to be carved, cut, or shaped. The lathe is credited with being the first machine tool that led to the invention of all subsequent machine tools. Think of the invention of the automobile (an automated mobile). The need for relying on horses to do the heavy lifting of daily work, pulling trolleys, carriages, delivery carts, etc., severely diminished with the rise of the automobile. Many industries collapsed as a result: streetcar operators, carriage manufacturers, blacksmiths, horse breeders, stable keepers, etc. However, the number of new jobs created because of the rise of the automobile more than made up for this. Workers were [needed](#) for assembly lines, road construction, oil and steel industries (including vulcanized rubber), and even motels for long trips. Today, there is little need for blacksmiths, cobblers, VCR repair shops, or milk truck delivery drivers. Yet jobs for computer programmers, online security specialists, plumbers, and HVAC repair workers continue. Although retraining may be needed in certain fields to counteract the changing economy, implementing a UBI is like a societal band-aid, perhaps a drag, and not a viable solution to economic disparity. Societal and economic change is constant, and allocating free money to the public won’t change this fact. Increases Taxes or Federal Deficit? In the U.S., the Roosevelt Institute think tank says that a \$1,000 a month payment would [grow the economy by \\$2.5 trillion by 2025](#) if paid for by increasing the federal deficit. On the other hand, if the UBI were paid for with taxes, there would be no net benefit to the economy. However, net wealth is not created by simply redistributing money from one class of people to another. Wealth is created by increased labor, trade, and innovation. As such, I have difficulty believing that UBI could grow the economy by \$2.5T. As stated earlier, Bridgewater Associates conducted a study in 2018, which found the cost of a \$1,000/mo stipend to every adult in the U.S. would run approximately \$3.81T per year. The simple math of taxing Americans \$3.81 annually to gain zero economic boost does not add up. Pesky Inflation If UBI were to be financed by increasing the federal

deficit, it would most undoubtedly fuel inflation. As a reminder, **inflation is caused by a more rapid increase in the quantity of money than the quantity of goods or services produced during the same time period.** In other words, **if the nation’s printing press produces money at a greater rate than its economy can produce, the result will be higher inflation levels. Printing an extra \$3.8T yearly will surely cause inflation to roar. If our irresponsible fiscal spending habits during 2020 and 2021 taught us anything, it is that handing out money to anybody and everybody does not contribute to low inflation levels.** Conclusion The idea behind Universal Basic Income comes from the heart. It is a human-centric policy that aims to help those who could use it. However, the policy does not make logical sense. As with anything related to finance, emotions should not rule the decision-making process. Data should be relied upon, and in this case, **the data says that we should avoid UBI.** While UBI helps people feel happier (who wouldn’t want free money?), it does not boost the job market, nor does it show that it would encourage those at the lower ranks of society to seek self-reliance (which is the populace UBI seeks to help out). The old adage, **“if it seems too good to be true, it probably is”** applies here. The laws of the universe apply no matter who or where you are. There is a price for **everything.** Society cannot receive something if nothing is given in return, no matter the intent behind it. If we really want to help out those at the lower ranks of society, training our young people to succeed in today’s world will be far more effective in the long run than simply throwing money at the problem. **Yes, we need a social safety net, but paying every citizen \$1,000+ per month is not a social safety net. It would cause extreme inflation and destroy our society’s very fabric.** Best to move on from this idea.

**Third is the Impact: Disadvantage turns the case. Inflation uniquely impacts the poor. The plan causes economic injustice**

### **Pittinsky 6/20 – Professor of Technology**

(Todd, Professor of Technology At SUNY Stony Brook. Inflation Disproportionately Hurts the Poor. Wall Street Journal. June 20, 2021.

<https://www.wsj.com/articles/inflation-disproportionately-hurts-the-poor-11624207206>)

**Inflation**, always a key economic metric, is especially important to watch now as it **threatens to undermine**, if not completely erode, the Biden administration's **gargantuan spending thus far on behalf of poor and working-class Americans**—its **“economic justice”** agenda (**“Inflation Jumps to 13-Year High,”** Page One, June 11). **The effects of inflation** not only **are** greater, but **disproportionately greater, for poorer people. Those with higher incomes often offset price increases** (goods, services) **with increased income**. Furthermore, **prices often increase more for basic needs** than for luxury items, **a phenomenon economists call “inflation inequality.”** **Simply put, low-income families’ budgets will stress and strain as they confront** the coming **rising costs of the essentials** they need (food, energy, transport, child care). The economic well-being of the most economically vulnerable Americans too often tends to be discussed as a matter of the latest Washington program or policy. **Those acting in the name of “economic justice” need to pay more attention to basic economic indicators such as** employment rates by demographic group, incomes and, yes, **inflation, if we want to truly understand what’s happening not just to the economy** in a general sense **but specifically to the most vulnerable within it.** As coming waves of inflation will demonstrate, **the fundamentals**—and not the latest federal government initiative—**will most directly** characterize and **affect the economic well-being of the most economically vulnerable in our country.**

**First is Uniqueness: Federalism is high now. Recent Supreme Court decisions are a game changer**

## **Clinton 2022 – Professor Emeritus at Southern Illinois University**

(Robert Lowry, Professor Emeritus At Southern Illinois University Carbondale. Dobbs And The Renewal Of Federalism Public Discourse: The Journal of the Witherspoon Institute. November 22, 2022. <https://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2022/11/85914/>)

**Conservatives** throughout the country and the world **have celebrated** in the aftermath of **the Supreme Court's** historic **decision in Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization**. If **the ruling** holds, it **will certainly become one of the "landmark" rulings** in the Court's history. In his Public Discourse essay on Dobbs, Michael Stokes Paulsen [concluded that](#) "Dobbs may be the most important, magnificent, rightly decided Supreme Court case of all time. **It is restorative of constitutional principle**. It upholds the values of representative, democratic self-government, and the rule of law, at the same time that it supports the protection of fundamental human rights." Paulsen adds that Dobbs is also potentially "a positive, transformative moment for American society," laying "the legal groundwork for social and moral change." Everything that Paulsen says is true: **the potential effect of Dobbs is large**. In addition to the millions of lives spared, **the decision may also be an early step toward restoring federalism, which has been steadily eroding for the past century. America needs a strong sense of the constitutional federalism that Dobbs portends in order for abortion to remain a state-level issue. Two concepts—Sphere Sovereignty and Subsidiarity—can buttress federalism, even after more than a century of centralization with unaccountable judges and bureaucrats making decisions that—constitutionally speaking—are the responsibility of the people themselves.**

## 1NC Disadvantage (Federalism) – 2/4

### Second is the Link: Welfare spending wrecks federalism. The plan expands federal power

#### Katz 2021 – Senior Research Fellow at the Heritage Foundation

(Diane, Senior Research Fellow At The Heritage Foundation. Federalism In Crisis: Urgent Action Required To Preserve Self-Government. The Heritage Foundation. November 30, 2021. <https://www.heritage.org/conservatism/report/federalism-crisis-urgent-action-required-preserve-self-government>)

**Federal intrusion in states' affairs has taken a variety of forms**, including mandates, funding obligations, pre-emptions, and regulation.<sup>40</sup> Federal Intergovernmental Mandates. The term **"federal intergovernmental mandate"** refers to a provision in statute or regulation, or federal court ruling that **imposes an "enforceable duty" on state**, local, or tribal governments (excluding a condition of federal assistance or a duty arising from participation in a voluntary federal program).<sup>41</sup> As defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, other exceptions apply. The term "federal intergovernmental mandate" is applicable to entitlement programs only in instances when the provision would increase the stringency of conditions of assistance to state, local, or tribal governments or would place caps on, or otherwise decrease, the federal government's responsibility to provide funding to state, local, or tribal governments under the program. The term also applies when state, local, or tribal governments that participate in the federal program lack authority to amend their financial or responsibilities to continue providing required services that are affected by the legislation, statute, or regulation. Also excluded from the UMRA requirements are (1) civil rights laws; (2) individual constitutional rights; (3) rules against waste, fraud, and abuse in grant programs; (4) requested emergency assistance or relief; (5) national security and treaty matters; and (6) emergency legislation. **Growth in the number and**

**scope of federal mandates is largely a modern phenomenon**. Researchers have documented one instance of Congress enacting a major mandate in 1931, one in 1940, none in the 1950s, nine in the 1960s, 25 in the 1970s, and 27 in the 1980s.<sup>42</sup> Since 2000, Congress and various Presidents have approved more than 190 statutes<sup>43</sup> with intergovernmental mandates, according to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). Collectively, the laws have imposed more than 1,000 separate directives. Even that figure is artificially low because the definition of "mandate" applied by the CBO is exceedingly narrow. For example, many of the costly obligations linked to entitlements are not categorized as mandates because the funding is considered "voluntary." That rationale may have seemed plausible when federal support for Medicaid and other entitlements constituted a relatively small portion of state and local revenues, but that is certainly no longer the case. The conditions of entitlement funding are only considered to be mandates if the federal grants exceed \$500 million or more annually and state, local, or tribal governments lack authority to adjust services when the federal government introduces new, onerous conditions." State reliance on federal funds has vastly increased. As noted by the U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental

Relations, **"Many grant conditions have become more integral to state and local activities—and far less subject to voluntary forbearance—than originally suggested by the contractual model."**<sup>45</sup>

**States have been protesting the burden for more than two decades**. During a 2007 summit, for example, legislators from 50 states boarded a schooner to re-enact the Boston Tea Party in opposition to an estimated \$100 billion in unfunded mandates imposed over four fiscal years.<sup>47</sup> In some instances, Congress has appropriated funds to states to cover mandate costs, but state officials insist that most mandates are either inadequately funded or wholly unfunded. Then-Governor of Tennessee Bill Haslam (R), for example, informed the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform that his state received

only 8 percent of the \$32 million it cost to implement programs under the Clean Water Act.<sup>48</sup> **Even when states support federal policy goals, mandate overreach makes a mess of federalism. The centralization of federal power inhibits the policy innovation and local expertise that state autonomy provides**. There is no way that federal mandates can accommodate the multitude of conditions in a nation of 320 million people located across 3.8 million square miles of urban, rural, and frontier areas. As explained by New Mexico Governor Susana Martinez, "What works in South Carolina may not work in Virginia. And what works in New Mexico may not work even for our neighbors in Utah, which is precisely why it is imperative the federal government recognize the sovereignty of states."<sup>49</sup> Testifying on behalf of the Council of State Governments, Utah Senate President Wayne Niederhauser told the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: "Goals behind federal mandates are often admirable, but we have our own local goals which are just as admirable, more important to local citizens, more likely to be effective and less expensive."<sup>50</sup> For example, the Endangered Species Act authorizes the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to write management plans, designate critical habitat, and impose land-use restrictions. But former Utah Governor Gary R. Herbert (R) points out that "Utah's Division of Wildlife Resources is staffed with some of the best biologists in the field who have a profound knowledge of Utah's ecology and wildlife. There is no good reason states shouldn't take the lead in

species recovery."<sup>51</sup> **The concentration of policymaking in Washington also undermines opportunities for citizen involvement**—which is the essence of self-government. Individual voters wield greater influence at the local level, where their preferences are far less diluted than at the federal level. As noted by Gregory Gleason and Viktor Rudenko, "Distant rule-making bureaucracies are immune from local pressure; Congress is overrun with powerful and well-heeled interest groups; and enormous coalitions of citizens are required to get even rudimentary

attention from Washington."<sup>52</sup> Grants-in-Aid. From 132 programs in 1960, to 387 in 1968, and 664 in 1998, **the number of grant programs funded by federal**

**dollars now totals a whopping 1,274**.<sup>53</sup> Grants-in-aid were relatively rare until the 1960s, when President Lyndon Johnson employed them for his War on Poverty. Medicaid, instituted in 1966, is the single largest federal grants-in-aid program.<sup>54</sup> The three types of federal grants—categorical grants, block grants, and general-revenue-sharing—vary in the degree of spending discretion.<sup>55</sup> According to the Congressional Research Service, "Categorical grants can be used only for a specifically aided program and usually are limited to narrowly defined activities. Block grants can be used only for a specifically aided set of programs and usually are not limited to narrowly

defined activities. General revenue sharing can be used for any purpose not expressly prohibited by federal or state law and is not limited to narrowly defined activities." **Virtually all require state expenditures or legislative action to fulfill the federal conditions of funding. The various conditions attached to the grants are set by Congress in statute** (unless lawmakers delegate the task to agency regulators), **and inject federal involvement in virtually every type of public policy**. The volume of red tape is massive. **To obtain or retain funding for social welfare programs, state and local governments must submit to 979 federal "information collections"** (with an additional 95 pending). **Other federal programs involve 351 mandatory information collections encompassing 1,328 forms** (and 53 pending requests for an additional 169 forms). In 2019, the

federal government allotted \$721 billion in aid to state and local governments for a wide range of programs, including health care, transportation, income security, education, job training, social services, community development, and environmental protection.<sup>56</sup> Such spending has increased as a percentage of federal outlays from 10.7 percent in 1989 to 16.2 percent in 2019.<sup>57</sup> Even more troubling, federal grants-in-aid comprised 32.4 percent of total state spending in FY 2020 (an estimated \$2.3 trillion), according to the National Association of State Budget Officers.

## Third is the Internal Link: Federalism is key to solve global warming

### Barnes 11/14 — Senior Adviser On Climate Change

(Aimee, Senior Advisor On Climate Change To Former California Governor Jerry Brown. The Secret Weapon In Biden's Fight Against Climate Change. The Hill. November 14, 2020. <https://thehill.com/opinion/energy-environment/525939-the-secret-weapon-in-bidens-fight-against-climate-change>)

After running and winning on the most ambitious presidential [platform](#) on climate change in history, President-elect **Joe Biden is now faced with delivering on his commitments.** [Speculation](#) has already begun regarding how this can be achieved, particularly if Republicans maintain a majority in the Senate. **Yet most analyses** to date **have overlooked one of the most important tools** at their disposal: **building on the leadership of U.S. state and local governments in a new** unprecedented **era of climate federalism.** Over the past four years, **U.S. states and local governments have played a critical role in filling the leadership void left by the Trump administration. The U.S. Climate Alliance,** a bipartisan group of governors committed to meeting their share of the U.S. commitment under the Paris Agreement, **now includes 25 states and represents over half of the U.S. population and over a \$11 trillion-dollar collective economy. Over 3,000 states, cities and businesses signed on to the “We Are Still In” pledge in support of the Paris Agreement.** [States attorneys general](#) and [NGOs](#) have filed [over 100 lawsuits](#) against the Trump administration; the [EPA has been sued](#) more than any other government agency. According to this year's [America's Pledge](#) report — an initiative co-chaired by former New York City Mayor [Michael Bloomberg](#) and former California Gov. [Jerry Brown](#) to quantify the efforts of U.S. state and local climate action — it is possible to get within spitting distance of 50 percent emissions reductions below 2005 levels by 2030 with aggressive federal reengagement starting in 2021, that supports and buoys the actions of U.S. cities, states and businesses. Looking forward, one of the quickest and easiest things a Biden-Harris administration can do to support subnational climate action is to drop Trump-era actions against state policies, particularly those focused on Harris's home state of California. These would include [challenges](#) to California's carbon market, and restoring California's [waiver](#) and ability to create more protective clean car standards. Instead, the Department of Justice (DOJ) under a Biden-Harris administration should partner with state attorneys general to advance climate action and hold polluters accountable for undermining climate action and environmental justice. **Biden and Vice President-elect Kamala Harris should also look to build on subnational action as they reestablish U.S. participation in the Paris Agreement and its international standing on climate more generally.** On day one, a Biden-Harris administration could host a virtual convening of governors, mayors and tribal leaders from across the country in support of a new, more ambitious and science-aligned nationally determined contribution (NDC) — the commitment that countries must submit under the Paris Agreement. Participating governors and mayors would be expected to bring to the table their own clear, science-aligned targets and new commitments to action, in line with the administration's 2050 net zero goal and ideally in support of an ambitious midterm target on the order of 50 percent by 2035. To ensure that the commitments and announcements are more than just talk, the White House could launch a process to meaningfully cooperate with state, local and tribal leaders, creating a virtuous cycle of enhanced ambition and positive competition amongst U.S. states and cities to see which can decarbonize mostly quickly. To support such a process, the [Climate Cabinet](#) that has been proposed within the White House should create a State and Local Action Task Force, and the Administration should hire senior staff with significant subnational experience and expertise. To support that process, a Biden-Harris administration — even with a Republican Senate — can and should create incentives for state and local climate leadership, as well as set policy floors for laggards. For example, the administration could provide funding to states to develop Climate Action Plans and reward state local and tribal governments that design and implement ambitious policies. Per Biden's campaign commitment, 40 percent of such funding could be targeted to support disadvantaged communities. The Biden administration should also review and bolster other types of financial assistance to state, local and tribal governments to support climate action — including ensuring that federal transportation funds are disbursed in a way that supports the reduction of vehicle miles travelled. And, it can and should also consider innovative financing mechanisms to support subnational climate action — for example, setting up a pre-development fund to support community-led climate and resiliency-focused infrastructure projects. To solve the climate crisis, we will need all levels of government across the U.S. cooperating as actively and seamlessly as possible towards a climate-safe future. **State and local climate action can and should be seen as the Biden-Harris administration's secret weapon in the fight against climate change.**

## Fourth is the Impact: Warming causes extinction

### Torres 2016 — Scholar At The Institute For Ethics & Emerging Technologies

(Phil, Affiliate Scholar At The Institute For Ethics And Emerging Technologies. Op-ed: Climate Change Is The Most Urgent Existential Risk. Future of Life Institute. July 22, 2016. <http://futureoflife.org/2016/07/22/climate-change-is-the-most-urgent-existential-risk/>)

For example, according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the effects of climate change will be “severe,” “pervasive,” and “irreversible.” Or, as a 2016 study published in Nature and authored by over twenty scientists puts it, the consequences of climate change “will extend longer than the entire history of human civilization thus far.” Furthermore, a recent article in Science Advances confirms that humanity has already escorted the biosphere into the sixth mass extinction event in life’s 3.8 billion year history on Earth. Yet another study suggests that we could be approaching a sudden, irreversible, catastrophic collapse of the global ecosystem. If this were to occur, it could result in “widespread social unrest, economic instability and loss of human life.” Given the potential for environmental degradation to elevate the likelihood of nuclear wars, nuclear terrorism, engineered pandemics, a superintelligence takeover, and perhaps even an impact winter, it ought to take precedence over all other risk concerns — at least in the near-term. Let’s make sure we get our priorities straight.

1NC Counterplan (States)

**Text: The fifty states and relevant territories of the United States should increase fiscal redistribution in the United States by providing a universal basic income.**

**States are critical actors on economic inequality. The counterplan solves and leads to federal follow-on**

**Downey 2022 — Staff Attorney at the Shriver Center on Poverty Law**

(Nolan, Staff Attorney At The Shriver Center On Poverty Law. Guaranteed Income: States Lead The Water In Reimagining The Social Safety Net. Economic Security Project. April 13, 2022. <https://economicsecurityproject.org/resource/states-lead/>)

Every person deserves to live with dignity and have their basic needs met. After decades of rollbacks and disinvestment, our current social safety net is insufficient given the economic situation we face. In the United States there is unconscionable and accelerating wealth inequality,<sup>1</sup> wages have been stagnant for 40 years<sup>2</sup> and, both before<sup>3</sup> and throughout<sup>4</sup> the coronavirus pandemic, many Americans struggle to meet their basic needs. In the richest country on Earth, elimination of deep poverty is attainable and long overdue. **Historically, states have played a critical role in testing concepts to improve the lives of low-income residents and created a blueprint for anti-poverty measures that can be implemented nationwide.<sup>5</sup> It is time to boldly reimagine and revitalize an eroded social safety net, and states have an opportunity to lead by example.** The devastation of the COVID-19 pandemic prompted mitigation strategies intended to get cash to people who were impacted. Federal policies such as increased unemployment insurance, an expanded and fully refundable Child Tax Credit (CTC), and stimulus checks have led to burgeoning support for permanent cash transfer programs like a guaranteed income. Additionally, state and local governments added to relief efforts by using federal dollars provided by both the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act and the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) to fund cash transfer programs of their own.<sup>6</sup> At the same time, **an increasing number of municipalities and other units of local government** across the country **are exploring guaranteed income** demonstrations in their community, and **states should seize this opportunity to build upon this work. Local guaranteed income programs, though limited in scope, produce incredibly valuable data to prove the efficacy of unconditional cash programs, which are critical for states to obtain buy-in from the necessary stakeholders.** One limitation of local programs, however, is that they often aren't scaled to study the potential for community-level change or other broader economic impacts. At the federal level, the expanded CTC being debated as part of President Biden's American Families Plan represents a form of guaranteed income for 39 million households.<sup>7</sup> Unfortunately, **federal conversations around nationwide cash transfer programs – like an expanded CTC - have been underwhelming.** As of December 2021, the Build Back Better Act does maintain the fully refundable nature of the expanded-CTC, allowing low- and no-income families excluded pre-pandemic to continue to receive a credit, but only a temporary extension is being considered for the increased amounts families received during the pandemic. While the Build Back Better Act has not yet passed, the stimulus checks and expanded CTC have moved the needle, breaking down barriers to moving cash policies at any level of government. We now have a much better sense of what is possible when it comes to distributing monthly cash payments, and we have data and stories of the impact these policies have in the lives of low- and middle-income earning families. **In light of the current limits at the local and federal level, there is an opportunity for state governments to explore ambitious, publicly funded cash transfer policies that:**

- promote dignity and greatly improve the lives of their low-income residents;**
- add to a growing body of research with assessments of larger scale positive impacts across geographically and racially diverse areas;**
- utilize the revenue raising powers of state government; and**
- could be a model for a permanent federal program.**

**We need a permanent federal guaranteed income, but political gridlock and polarization threaten to frustrate attempts at a federal program** in the immediate term. **States have an opportunity to push closer to that ideal with large scale, publicly funded, permanent programs of their own that will provide essential data and experience toward the realization of a federal program.** This guide seeks to arm state-level advocates and policymakers with information regarding the choice points in program design, the positive impacts shown by existing research, and special considerations for states including options for guaranteed income implementation, interactions with existing public benefits programs, opportunities for public funding, and promoting racial equity.

## **First is the Link and Impact: The plan is a ‘Trojan Horse’ for capitalism. Universal basic income is a regressive policy designed to abolish the welfare state and critically undermine the working class**

### **Hogg 2022 — Social Policy Postgraduate Researcher**

(David James, Social Policy Postgraduate Researcher. ‘The Left Will Find That It Has Bought A Trojan Horse’: The Dialectics Of Universal Basic Income. Critical Social Policy. Vol. 43 (Issue 1): April 25, 2022. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/02610183221092151#con>)

**A ‘Trojan Horse’?** Throughout British political history, **UBI has primarily been an interest of the ‘free-market right’** and the ‘pragmatic centre’ rather than the Left (Sloman, 2015: 9). Despite the idealism of the Enlightenment thinkers who first introduced the concept, the **most** influential of basic income **proposals have been regressive, seeking to resist or weaken the welfare state.** For example, Rhys-Williams’ scheme, emerging as it did amidst the post-war consensus, ‘might plausibly be **read as an attempt to resist the growth of progressive taxation and the rising bargaining power of the organised working class’** (Sloman, 2018: 629). Such an impression is reinforced by her ‘ambivalence’ regarding the sum that would constitute a basic income and her concerns about ‘conditionality’ (Sloman, 2018: 629). **There is a moralising of work within the Right’s support of UBI, one of the key components that make it antithetical to any Leftist variation.** Following the publication of the Beveridge Report - which made the key recommendations on which the British welfare state was based - Beveridge’s ideas, and the Labour government’s willingness to implement them, inspired an anxiety in Rhys-Williams and her fellow **conservatives** that ‘[n]ot only will the idle get as much from the State as will the industrious workers, they will get a great deal more’, which would result in an ‘undermining [of] the will to work’ (Rhys-Williams, 2004: 164). In order to combat this, Rhys-Williams **argued for a “new social contract”**, ‘expressed by the actual signature of a contract between the individual [...] and the State’, **in which the recipient of a basic income would be obliged to ‘devote his best efforts’ to societal wealth creation** in exchange for a basic safety net (2004: 167). **A UBI on these terms would essentially be a form of workfare**, and a comparatively timid solution when contrasted with what actually emerged as the post-war consensus. This concern for protecting “the will to work” is implicit within the UBI pilot scheme carried out in Finland in 2017–2018. The pilot consisted of 2000 unemployed people being given a mere 560 euros a month to live on throughout the trial period, indicative of the moderate sum likely to be introduced (Keja, 2020). In simulating UBI models before the actual trial began, the academics involved found that such a low sum, despite offering more disposable income for social groups such as students and lower paid workers, would mean that ‘individuals with unemployment benefits would be the largest group of losers’, as ‘the basic income would only partially replace their existing benefits’ (Kangas et al., 2017: 90). These **benefits would** of course **be abolished to make way for a UBI, as ‘[d]istributing a basic income to all beneficiaries on top of their current benefits would not be economically sustainable’** (Simanainen and Kangas, 2018: n.p.). Such a narrow conception of UBI should not be surprising, given Finland’s Centre-Right coalition government at the time - which included the Right-wing populist Finns Party - hoped the trial would help ‘diminish disincentives to working, [...] reduce bureaucracy and [...] simplify the overly complex tax-benefit system’, rather than provide more security for its poorest citizens (Kangas et al., 2017: 87). Such concerns with efficiency and bureaucracy are central to many conservative interpretations of UBI. **Many of its supporters** on the Right **are ‘attracted to the idea as a pragmatic solution to the failings of the existing safety-net or as a free-market alternative to wage regulation and state welfare provision’** (Sloman, 2018: 627). **In other words,** this version of **UBI represents little more than a continuation of the neoliberal dismantling of the welfare state and its attack on workers’ security.** American economists Milton and Rose Friedman were key architects of this neoliberal revolution of course, and in Capitalism and Freedom advocated a basic income in order to ‘reduce the need for the social safety net and [...] its expensive, inefficient bureaucracy’ (Friedman and Friedman, 2002; Stern and Kravitz, 2016: 174). The Friedmans saw their “negative income tax” as the most efficient way of ‘dismantling [...] government interferences with the market’, typically positing this anti-welfare stance as one concerned with ‘individual liberty’ (Friedman, 2013: n.p.). **Under this system, all state benefits would be abolished and replaced by a mechanism whereby above a certain threshold ‘you pay tax** to the Inland Revenue; **below it, they pay you’** (Gorz, 1985: 41). **This would enable governments to cut off all support for those earning above an arbitrary figure** which would ‘bring substantial savings’ and streamline welfare provision in the way the Friedmans and their fellow ideologues wished (Gorz, 1985: 41). The system would also tax those above the threshold at a flat rate rather than through progressive taxation, meaning the plans would also allow inequality to increase.

## **Second is the Alternative: Capitalism locks in poverty and mass exploitation of labor globally. Only an anti-capitalist revolution can save the planet**

### **Svart 2019 — National Director of the Democratic Socialists of America**

(Maria, National Director of the Democratic Socialists of America. Capitalism Isn't 'Broken'. It's Working All too Well – And We're The Worse For It. The Guardian. June 12, 2019.

<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/jun/12/capitalism-isnt-broken-its-working-all-too-well-and-were-the-worse-for-it>)

**Capitalism is not broken. It is working all too well, concentrating money in the hands of the few by exploiting the work of the many. Runaway climate change, war, mass migration, widespread poverty and ever-increasing authoritarianism are the inevitable results of an economic system that rewards corporate actors for their absolute commitment to profit, regardless of the broader consequences.** Richard Reeves, guest editor of this series, [suggests](#) we can simply “fight to crowbar the doors open for women and people of color,” allowing them to benefit from market capitalism alongside white men. But that misses the point. **A job with “a decent wage ... some satisfaction and security” is quickly becoming a thing of the past,** including for those of us in the wealthiest countries. It's not just that **“corporations hoard power and extract value from workers,** without letting those workers share in the massive wealth they help create”, as Cory Booker [argues](#); it's that **these dynamics** at the individual level, felt by each of us, **are also at play globally, felt by whole countries and regions. Exploitation is not a bug in capitalism, it is a feature.** That giant sucking sound we can all hear is capital benefiting from decades of political, economic and ideological war against the rest of us. **We must** invest in public health and education infrastructure at home and abroad to increase community resiliency in a climate-fractured world, and **build a global economy based on democratic control of production. When the system incentivizes** making quarterly **profits, rather than long-term balance and safety** for all, **it jeopardizes our very survival.** We also need to democratize energy production and disband **the dirty fossil fuel industry** that **is driving us off the climate cliff.** Some billionaires are finally [expressing](#) concern about the status quo. But even they can't escape a system where **the ease of externalizing costs and exploiting labor makes it impossible to be both competitive and sustainable. There has only been one period in which the fruits of labor were shared relatively equally: the post-second world war capital-labor compromise. Strong worker movements fought for robust welfare states under unique economic and political circumstances.** But this arrangement could not hold. In response to François Mitterrand's move to massively expand labor rights and nationalize a quarter of French industry, business interests launched a capital strike which spurred recession and became a portent of things to come. The threat of real working-class power was too great, and the system self-corrected. **Today, we have as few as 12 years to transform our economic system and reverse the climate crisis.** Yet just last month Donald Trump signed two executive orders to make it easier for fossil fuel corporations to build oil and gas pipelines and limit our ability to block them. This has been a bipartisan betrayal, however: in 2015 President Obama granted Shell Oil a permit to drill in the Arctic four days after declaring that the US would be a leader against the climate crisis. **Desperate times call for radical measures. This starts with upending a system that was built to redistribute wealth and power from the many to the few.** Working people and our families will not only survive, but thrive, from the jobs created by massive public investment in restructuring our energy grid and transforming our world. And we know the only ones willing to make that demand are those of us who are currently being squeezed by private interests for every last drop of profit. Young people know this, especially, but it will take all of us. **Rather than trying to fix capitalism, we should be seeking to replace it.**

## 1NC Case (Poverty) – 1/2

**First, the plan doesn't solve. There is no evidence basic income reduces poverty. Be skeptical of AFF research**

### Flowers 2016 — Journalist at FiveThirtyEight

(Andrew, Journalist At FiveThirtyEight. What Would Happen If We Just Gave People Money. FiveThirtyEight. April 25, 2016. <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/universal-basic-income/>)

**The U.S.** negative income tax **experiments and the Canadian MINCOME pilot**, while useful, can only tell us so much about what happens when you give people free money. One reason is that they **don't meet rigorous modern standards for randomized control trials, the gold-standard of experiments**. A number of basic income experiments popping up around the world are designed to get better data. Give Directly, which is launching the basic income pilot in Kenya, has previously run RCTs to examine the effects of giving cash unconditionally; those experiments have shown that [cash works wonders](#), and the [peer-reviewed results](#) have won over economists. The children of recipients are healthier and get more education; adults earn more income by using the cash to plan investments over a longer horizon; spending on alcohol and other vices — a worry some critics of cash grants raise — stays flat or even declines. Give Directly's work has gained [broad acclaim](#) as a more efficient and effective form of charity. "We have learned a lot about the positive impacts of cash transfer programs," Faye, the group's executive chairman, said. But taking the next step requires addressing **many more questions that haven't even begun to be answered: "Should the transfer be one-time or recurrent? How long should the transfer last? What is the right amount?"** Give Directly's analysis of previous basic income experiments finds them coming up short. **A bullet-proof experiment on basic income should be universal, randomized, long term and basic** (that is, the income should be sufficient to live on). **No experiment has met all four: Some are basic, but not randomized; some are randomized, but not universal; and so on.** The MINCOME pilot, for instance, was randomized and basic but lasted less than five years. The U.S. negative income tax experiments were similarly limited. **Some highly touted experiments,** including in Namibia and India, **either weren't randomized or didn't provide enough income to be called basic.** ([Give Directly](#) has a detailed breakdown of why every basic income experiment attempted so far has failed to be rigorous.) With basic income's credibility on the line, Faye worries **a flimsy study could be worse than none at all.** He points to the excitement over microfinance as an instance where evidence later [disappointed expectations](#). **Basic income should avoid letting anecdote get ahead of the data.** **"There is no empirical evidence on whether basic income works or not,"** said Markus Kanerva, the founder of Tänk, a think tank working with the Finnish government's social security agency to design and prepare the implementation of a basic income pilot. The study has been promised 20 million euros over two years and could provide a partial basic income up to 750 euros per month to more than 1,000 Finnish citizens.

1NC Case (Poverty) – 2/2

**Second, the plan increases poverty. Universal basic income would trade off with targeted programs**

**Greenstein 2019 — President of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities**

(Robert, President Emeritus Of The Center On Budget And Policy Priorities. Commentary: Universal Basic Income May Sound Attractive But, If It Occurred, Would Likelier Increase Poverty Than Reduce It. Center On Budget And Policy Priorities. June 13, 2019.

<https://www.cbpp.org/research/poverty-and-opportunity/commentary-universal-basic-income-may-sound-attractive-but-if-it>)

UBI's daunting financing challenges raise fundamental questions about its political feasibility, both now and in coming decades. Proponents often speak of an emerging left-right coalition to support it. But consider what UBI's **supporters** on the right advocate. They **generally propose UBI as a replacement for the current "welfare state."** That is, they would finance UBI **by eliminating all or most programs for people with low or modest incomes.** Consider what that would mean. **If you take the dollars targeted on people in the bottom fifth or two-fifths of the population and convert them to universal payments to people all the way up the income scale, you're redistributing income upward. That would increase poverty and inequality rather than reduce them.** Yet that's the platform on which the (limited) support for UBI on the right largely rests. **It entails abolishing programs from SNAP (food stamps) — which largely eliminated the severe child malnutrition found in parts of the Southern "black belt" and Appalachia in the late 1960s — to the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), Section 8 rental vouchers, Medicaid, Head Start, child care assistance, and many others. These programs lift tens of millions of people, including millions of children, out of poverty each year and make tens of millions more less poor.** Some UBI proponents may argue that by ending current programs, we'd reap large administrative savings that we could convert into UBI payments. But that's mistaken. For the major **means-tested programs** — SNAP, Medicaid, the EITC, housing vouchers, Supplemental Security Income (SSI), and school meals — administrative costs consume only 1 to 9 percent of program resources, as a CBPP analysis explains.<sup>[1]</sup> Their **funding goes overwhelmingly to boost the incomes and purchasing power of low-income families.** Moreover, as the Roosevelt Institute's Mike Konczal has noted, **eliminating Medicaid, SNAP, the EITC, housing vouchers, and the like would still leave you far short of what's needed to finance a meaningful UBI.**<sup>[2]</sup> **Would we also end Pell Grants that help low-income students afford college? Would we terminate support for children in foster care, for mental health services, and for job training?** Ed Dolan, who favors UBI, has calculated that we could finance it by using the proceeds from eliminating all means-tested programs outside health care — including Pell Grants, job training, Head Start, free school lunches, and the like, as well as refundable tax credits, SNAP, SSI, low-income housing programs, etc. The result, Dolan found, would be an annual UBI of \$1,582 per person, well below the level of support most low-income families (especially working-poor families with children) now receive. **The increase in poverty and hardship would be very large.**<sup>[3]</sup> That's why the risk is high that **under any UBI** that could conceivably gain traction politically, **tens of millions of poor people would likely end up worse off.**

1NC Case (Inequality) –1/2

## Inequality is decreasing now. Recent data proves

### Samuels 2023 — Journalist for TIME Magazine

(Alana, Journalist for TIME Magazine. American Inequality Is (Finally) Lessening. TIME Magazine. March 31, 2023. <https://time.com/6267552/falling-american-inequality/>)

If 2022 was the year the U.S. economy came roaring back like a lion, 2023 is more of a lamb. Modest job growth, consistent inflation, falling home prices, slowing GDP growth—meh. February was another month of meh, [the government reported Friday](#), with personal incomes increasing 0.3% in February after growing 0.6% in January. In addition, consumer spending grew 0.2% in February. But **there's some pretty good news** that doesn't readily appear in the steady stream of government data released each week. **After decades in which the gap between the richest and poorest Americans grew by leaps and bounds, the strange rebound from the pandemic has led to something different: a slow reduction in inequality across the economy. Incomes of people in the bottom half of income distribution grew by 4.5% in the last calendar year, much faster than the 1.2% average income growth of all Americans, according to Realtime Inequality, a tool launched by economists at the University of California, Berkeley** to show a more holistic picture of how the U.S. economy is faring, as compared to GDP. While lower-income households struggled following the Great Recession, taking more than eight years to reach pre-crisis income levels, they have done much better in the pandemic's aftermath. **Between February 2020 and September 2022, average income for the lowest-earning 50% of Americans increased by more than 10%, faster than all groups of population except for the top 1%**, according to a [paper](#) by the Realtime Inequality economists, Thomas Blanchet, Emmanuel Saez, and Gabriel Zucman. **This reduction in inequality breaks from a long-running trend** in which the rich were getting richer and the poor were stagnating. Since 1980, the top 10% of earners have seen income grow 144%, while the bottom half of earners saw just 20% growth in income. **What we're witnessing since the late 2010s—significant growth rates for low-wage workers—is a notable break** from the trend that has prevailed since the 1980s," Zucman says, in an email.

**The plan increases income inequality. A universal basic income would re-direct spending to well-off families, putting the poor and elderly at risk**

### **Gunn 2019 — Contributing Writer at Pacific Standard**

(Dwyer, Contributing Writer At Pacific Standard. A Universal Basic Income Might Hurt Poor People More Than Help. The Pacific Standard. February 15, 2019. <https://psmag.com/economics/a-universal-basic-income-might-hurt-poor-people-more-than-help>)

**In a new working paper, economists Hilary W. Hoynes and Jesse Rothstein, both of whom have extensively studied the social safety net in America, take a look at the costs, distributional effects, and possible labor-market effects of UBI programs in advanced economies with existing social safety nets. They find, in line with many of the most prominent criticisms of the UBI, that such programs, if they were truly universal, would indeed be very expensive and, in comparison to the existing social safety net, would likely redirect spending to better-off families, potentially leaving low-income families worse off than they currently are. The researchers start by calculating the cost of a UBI in the United States. They estimate that providing a \$12,000 payment—approximately equivalent to the poverty line for a single adult—to every U.S. adult over the age of 18 would cost about \$3 trillion per year. This is, to put it simply, an enormous sum. "This is about 75 percent of current total federal expenditures, including all on- and off-budget items," the researchers conclude. "Thus, implementing this UBI without cuts to other programs would require nearly doubling federal tax revenue." Hoynes and Rothstein note that even cutting all existing transfer programs—like food stamps, welfare, and the Earned Income Tax Credit—which account for half of federal expenditures, would make only a dent in the cost of a UBI. If a UBI in the U.S. were to replace other safety net programs, as some have proposed, such a program would also result in a big distributional shift. This chart, from the paper, illustrates the current distribution of federal safety net spending, by family type: Current U.S. safety net spending is also heavily targeted to lower-income families, as the chart below, also from the paper, makes clear: Replacing all current U.S. safety net programs, including those aimed at senior citizens, with a truly universal basic income would result in "a massive distribution up the earnings distribution, along with a redistribution from the elderly and disabled towards those who are neither, primarily but not exclusively those without children." The elderly, in particular, would lose out—the average U.S. senior currently receives \$17,400 in Social Security and about \$12,900 in in-kind Medicaid and Medicare benefits. Preserving Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid would, of course, enable the elderly to maintain their standards of living, but eliminating the rest of the social safety net programs—the EITC, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, etc.—would cover only about 20 percent of the cost of a UBI. (While the exact calculations are specific to the U.S., the authors note that their conclusions are generalizable to other advanced economies.)**

## Poverty Negative (2NC / 1NR)

### 2NC Economy DA (Turns Case)

**The Disadvantage turns the case: The plan reduces incentives to work, which makes the AFF economically unsustainable**

### Hudakova 2015 — Masters of Science in Development Economics

(Veronika, Financial Analyst / Master Of Science In Development Economics. The Impact Of A Basic Income On Labour Supply and Work Performance. Wageningen University. Master's Thesis. <https://edepot.wur.nl/373885>)

3.3.1 Economic Sustainability **The problematic part about the basic income is** that there isn't a country which implemented a basic income scheme as utopians envisioned it. **Economists lack concrete and specific data** about what would be the exact consequences of the implementation of a basic income on a large scale. However, experiments on the Negative Income Tax show striking similarities with a basic income scheme that can be helpful for the assessment of the effects of a basic income as described in Section 3.4.5 (Marx and Peeters 2008: 3). Nonetheless, researchers can only draw conclusions based on simple theoretical models, when it comes to macro-economic impacts of the different components of a basic income. To be more precise, economic sustainability of the basic income scheme and its features can be investigated based on economic models that aim to capture income effects and substitution effects of the basic income scheme on the supply of labour. According to Van Parijs, the entire or partial substitution of the benefits of a basic income, would increase labour supply due to the reduction of the poverty trap (Van Parijs 2013: 176). People would be able to keep their basic income while working what could enable people who are worst off and who would be willing to work for low earnings to accept a job without concerning themselves with the potential loss of the benefits. However, receiving a basic income might not make much of a difference for people with very small earning power. Henceforth, educating people to improve and to gain new skills would be a crucial step for escaping the poverty trap. Nonetheless, **the benefit of the potential reduction in poverty** and the increase in labour supply of people with low incomes **can be cancelled out by other elements**. First element is based on the assumption that the marginal tax rate on income above a certain threshold would increase what would have a negative substitution effect for people with higher earnings. In this case, **a basic income scheme would have a negative effect not only on the supply of labour of people with higher earnings but also on their incentives to work** hard and to keep educating and acquiring more skills (Ibid. 177). It can cause lack of workers with the ambition to be promoted and with a certain level of skills required for the position. A second element refers to the income effect. **If people's priority is to achieve and to maintain a certain level of income, once they receive a basic income their incentive to increase their level of income would be reduced, if their income is within a range in which the increase in income tax falls short** (Ibid.). **Thereafter, people's behaviour largely influences the economic sustainability of a basic income scheme**. For example, there is the issue of immigration and emigration. Whether a basic income is implemented at the municipality level or at the country level, **it does not avoid the issue of the opportunistic exit of net contributors to the basic income and the opportunistic entry of net beneficiaries from a basic income** (Van Parijs 2013: 178). This problem also would not be caused simply by income differentials. There are other social factors that would affect people's decision to stay or to immigrate, or to emigrate. It is the economists' and sociologists' job to research the appropriate approaches to a basic income that would address people's concerns about economic unsustainability. However, **if many net contributors to the basic income would decide to leave the country, it would cause a major capital flight and disinvestment**. **Such a scenario could only happen if capital would be heavily taxed in order to fund a basic income** and if there would be increases in cost of production due to higher wages (Wright 2000: 151). Therefore, it is advisable to carefully consider all the potential ways of funding a basic income. In order to minimize the negative impact on citizens' behaviour, other sources of government revenue than income tax would be more preferable.

2NC Economy DA (Link & Impact)

**The plan leads to runaway inflation. By increasing the costs of basic goods and services, a universal basic income would increase poverty and income inequality**

**Tcherneva 2019 — Associate Professor of Economics at Bard College**

(Pavlina R., Associate Professor of Economics At Bard College. The High Costs Of UBI Are Not Financial. Eastern Economic Journal. Spring 2019. Vol. 45 (No. 2). Spring 2019. P. 327 – 330. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/48702881>)

If the program is implemented as an “add-on,” rather than a replacement for existing government programs, **spending on UBI could be as high as 20–35% of GDP annually** (Tcherneva 2017). UBI would be an enormous fiscal impulse by any measure. The worry is not that it would compromise the government’s budget, but that **the expenditure represents vast purchasing power and command over real resources, equivalent to a fifth or more of the US economy. Would the economy produce the needed additional output to satisfy this new demand?** If not, how would the resulting real resources be distributed and priced, in order to soak up the additional purchasing power? **If output does not adjust sufficiently, the program would prove to be inflationary.** Worse, according to UBI advocates, we should expect a sizable fall in labor supply. **One of the presumed benefits of the grant** is that it **empowers the recipients to refuse poorly paid or otherwise “bad” jobs. If** UBI advocates (e.g., Standing 2011) are correct and **there is a mass exodus from precarious working arrangements, the inflationary effect of the grant would be exacerbated.** Once the value of the grant drops, recipients at the bottom of the income distribution will be once again compelled to work. And if the economy continues to provide poorly paid and precarious work arrangement, they will not be “liberated” from their “bad jobs.” Worse still, the grant may accelerate the Uberization of jobs since it represents a large subsidy to firms. **Why should an employer offer a living wage, if the government has “promised” to do so via UBI?** If we were to adopt David Colander’s proposed tax schema, the negative labor supply effect would be even larger, because (as he points out) **households receiving labor income below UBI would pay a marginal tax rate of 100%, effectively earning nothing from working.** Many households earning slightly above the UBI grant, according to Colander, would also withdraw from the labor market. Suppose, however, that labor supply does not collapse and those at the bottom of the income distribution continue to work in their poorly paid jobs to supplement their UBI grant. **Would the UBI recipients be able to acquire the needed real resources to make for a decent living, such as childcare, healthcare, housing, and education** (the costliest—and increasingly so—items in a household’s budget)? Would the slumlord raise rent and extract some of that basic income in the form of higher prices? Would rising college tuition grind to a halt to allow UBI recipients to access already expensive college education? Would households be able to negotiate cheaper health insurance with insurance companies? **All this seems highly unlikely. And would \$20,000/year per person be sufficient to make these basic necessities truly affordable in the face of considerable market power from their providers?** Families with decent incomes already have trouble accessing affordable childcare, education, and healthcare. As it is with other income support programs, **the issue is not one of inadequate income alone, but also of inadequate provisioning of essential and affordable goods and services that constitute a basic minimum standard of living. These problems can be made worse if UBI is used to reduce or altogether replace existing welfare programs,** such as housing assistance, TANF, Social Security, and Medicare (see Murray 2016, among others)—**programs that are carefully targeted to specific dimensions of poverty. This will reduce the provisioning of specific basic necessities, such as affordable food, housing, or healthcare.** Taking into account the likely price pressures that would erode the value of the grant, the under-provisioning of needed goods and services, the threat of replacing existing anti-poverty programs, one could argue that **the UBI grant may even unintentionally harm precisely those who need it most—households at the bottom of the income distribution.** And if wealthier families deposit their basic income grant into their retirement portfolios, while poorer households spend theirs, UBI may worsen the already skewed distribution of wealth and incomes.

2NC Economy DA (Link)

## The plan would cost 3 trillion a year. Here's the math

### Greenstein 2019 — President of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities

(Robert, President Emeritus Of The Center On Budget And Policy Priorities. Commentary: Universal Basic Income May Sound Attractive But, If It Occurred, Would Likelier Increase Poverty Than Reduce It. Center On Budget And Policy Priorities. June 13, 2019.

<https://www.cbpp.org/research/poverty-and-opportunity/commentary-universal-basic-income-may-sound-attractive-but-if-it>)

The Cost There are over 300 million Americans today. **Suppose UBI provided everyone with \$10,000 a year. That would cost more than \$3 trillion a year** — and \$30 trillion to \$40 trillion over ten years. **This single-year figure equals more than three-fourths of the entire yearly federal budget** — and double the entire budget outside Social Security, Medicare, defense, and interest payments. **It's also equal to close to 100 percent of all tax revenue the federal government collects. Or, consider UBI that gives everyone \$5,000 a year. That would provide income equal to about two-fifths of the poverty line for an individual** (which is a projected \$12,700 in 2016) and less than the poverty line for a family of four (\$24,800). **But it would cost as much as the entire federal budget** outside Social Security, Medicare, defense, and interest payments. **Some UBI proponents respond that policymakers could make the UBI payments taxable. But the savings from doing so would be relatively modest**, because the vast bulk of Americans either owe no federal income tax or are in the 10% or 15% tax brackets. For example, if you gave all 328 million Americans a \$10,000 UBI and the cost was \$3.28 trillion a year (about \$33 trillion over ten years) before taxes, then making the UBI payments taxable would reduce that cost only to something like \$2.5 trillion or \$2.75 trillion (or \$25 trillion to \$27.5 trillion over ten years).

## 2NC Federalism DA (DA Outweighs)

### The disadvantage outweighs. The climate emergency risks a global catastrophe

#### Roberts 2019 — Editor-in-Chief of Horizon

(Joanna, Editor-in-Chief Of Horizon. 'I Would Like People To Panic' – Top Scientist Unveils Equation Showing World In Climate Emergency. Horizon – EU Research & Innovation Magazine Published By The European Commission. September 24, 2019.

<https://ec.europa.eu/research-and-innovation/en/horizon-magazine/i-would-people-panic-top-scientist-unveils-equation-showing-world-climate-emergency>)

**'Based on sober scientific analysis, we are deeply within a climate emergency** state but people are not aware of it,' he told Horizon on the sidelines of the European Research and Innovation Days event in Brussels, Belgium. 'We don't want to see the truth. As Greta Thunberg would say, I would like people to panic and take action according to the state of emergency we are in.' **To make his assessment, Prof. Schellnhuber, founder of the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research**, Germany, **has devised a formula that defines the level of emergency as risk multiplied by urgency**. To calculate risk, he used the insurance industry's approach of multiplying the amount of damage done by the probability of the event. For urgency, he followed the model used by air traffic controllers, which divides the time needed to react by time left for intervention. **'If we go into a runaway climate effect, the damage may be between €100 trillion and the loss of civilisation,'** he said. **'The probability, I would say, is about 10% that this is going to happen. And when it comes to the urgency of decarbonising society and keeping the forests alive, we need at least 20 years. We have only 30 years left to do this. 'It simply means that we are in a deep state of climate emergency. If you trust the numbers from science.'** Healthy Prof. Schellnhuber's declaration came as part of a discussion on how to make our planet healthy again, one of the first sessions of the inaugural European Research and Innovation Days event, which is taking place from 24 to 26 September. The idea of the conference is to provide a forum for policymakers, researchers, academics, non-governmental organisations and other interested parties to get together for three days of intensive talks to finalise priorities for European research over the next four years. When it comes to climate change, Prof. Schellnhuber recommended two priorities for Europe. The first is to decarbonise, reducing emissions to zero. The second is to take care of the natural carbon sinks to try and avert runaway climate effects. He proposed three 'outrageous suggestions' for achieving these goals: build wooden skyscrapers rather than using concrete and steel for construction; create so-called 'transition super-labs' by decarbonising three or four entire regions; and paying to lease forests elsewhere in the world so they are not burnt down for economic purposes. The need for climate change action is not lost on Europe's political leaders. In her [agenda for Europe](#), the next European Commission president, Ursula von der Leyen, has called for Europe to become the first climate-neutral continent. Her European Green Deal, which she has committed to proposing during her first 100 days in office, promises to enshrine the 2050 climate neutrality target into law. 'President-elect von der Leyen was very clear on that, the number one priority will be the green deal,' said European Commission vice-president Maroš Šefčovič, who was speaking at the same session. He says the EU needs to lead by example. 'We also proved that if you do it right, it works,' he said. 'We are the only major economy that has managed to split the economic growth and decouple it from the CO2 emissions.' Prof. Schellnhuber believes that as the industrial revolution started in Europe, the bloc should show further leadership by bringing the decarbonisation target forward to 2040. Echoed The importance of Europe taking the lead on climate change and science in general was a theme echoed throughout the first day of the conference, notably by Carlos Moedas, European Commissioner for Research, Science and Innovation, at the conference opening. '(A [recent Eurobarometer survey](#) says) that 93% of Europeans really consider the problem of climate change is very serious and they believe we have to do something. Can you believe that it is a 16-year-old European girl that is leading the way on climate change? This gives me a huge hope for the future.' The next funding programme for European research and innovation, [Horizon Europe](#), is anticipated to be worth €100 billion between 2021 and 2027. As well as setting aside funding for basic research and promoting innovation, it will be designed around clusters of challenges where research and innovation could help find solutions. Some of the other challenges under discussion on day one of the conference included [undocumented migrants](#), emerging technologies, mobility and clean energy. Work also began to define concrete goals for Horizon Europe's 'missions', which will shape research and innovation to achieve targets in five areas: adaptation to climate change including societal transformation; cancer; healthy oceans, seas, coastal and inland waters; climate-neutral and smart cities; and soil health and food. In the end, according to Prof. Schellnhuber, climate change cuts across all of Europe's future challenges. **'It is always a question – why do you always talk about climate and not about anything else?' he said. 'If we don't solve the climate crisis, we can forget about the rest.'**

## 2NC Federalism DA (Uniqueness – AT: Status Quo Solves)

### The U.S. is falling behind on climate. Drastic action is needed to lower carbon emissions and prevent a climate crisis

#### Cohen 2023 — Journalist for CBS News

(Li, Journalist For CBS News. U.S. Still Off-Track For Climate Goals As Greenhouse Gas Emissions Rise For Second Straight Year, New Report Says. CBS News. January 10, 2023.

<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/u-s-still-off-track-for-climate-goals-as-greenhouse-gas-emissions-rise-for-second-straight-year-new-report-says/>

Last year began with a warning that **the world needs to get on track in tackling the climate crisis as average global temperatures hit a new record.** It ended with yet another increase in emissions that trap that heat and add to the dramatic conditions already being felt worldwide. **U.S. greenhouse gas emissions increased for the second consecutive year in 2022,** by 1.3% compared to the previous year, [preliminary data](#) published by nonpartisan research organization the Rhodium Group on Tuesday revealed. That increase isn't nearly as dramatic as the one seen in 2021, which saw a rise of 6.5% after the onset of the pandemic a year prior caused a major emissions decline, but it is still higher than 2019 pre-pandemic levels. **Of the major emitting sectors, only one saw a decline** in emissions. Electric power, the nation's sector responsible for the second-most emissions, made up 28% of all U.S. emissions last year. However, its emissions were slightly lower compared to the year prior as researchers estimate coal usage declined by 8%, making up a total of only 20% of the power sector. Meanwhile, natural gas usage increased by 2% as [renewable energy](#) usage seemed to become more popular. Solar, wind and hydropower made up an increase of 12% compared to 2021, the report found, was used to generate 22% of total electric power. That preliminary data marks "the first time in over 60 years" that renewable energy surpassed coal in the country, the report said, noting that prior to the 1960s, hydropower surpassed the generation of coal. Nuclear energy, on the other hand, continues to constitute a smaller share of power generation in the country, going from 20% yearly from 2019 to 2021, to 19% in 2022. That slight improvement in the power sector, however, is at least somewhat overshadowed by what's happening elsewhere. Buildings, which encompass businesses and homes that mostly emit greenhouse gases through heating, saw the largest increase – 6% – as the Rhodium Group said 2022 saw below-average winter temperatures that forced people to [consume more energy](#). It's also the only sector to rebound to levels seen before the pandemic, the research says. **Transportation and industry, the sectors that make up two-thirds of total U.S. emissions, saw an increase in emissions** by 1.3% and 1.5%, respectively. This preliminary report shows that while the year saw some improvement when it comes to its energy sourcing, an overall increase in emissions indicates that **the U.S. "continues to fall behind" in its climate targets,** the report says. The lagging is specifically **in** regards to **the country's Paris Climate Agreement goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 50 to 52% below 2005 levels by the year 2030, an amount that would seemingly help the need to limit global warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius** compared to pre-industrial levels. As part of that plan, the U.S. planned to hit between 26 and 28% below 2005 levels within the next two years. But according to the Rhodium Group's data, **the U.S. is far from making that happen.** It only hit 15.5% below 2005 levels in 2022, and in fact, has yet to meet its 2020 goal of being 17% below 2005 levels. **In order to meet the 2025 target ... the US needs to significantly increase its efforts.**" the report says. Researchers noted that **the Inflation Reduction Act passed last year** – which invests billions into energy security and proposals that would help cut carbon emissions by 40% by 2030 – is a "significant turning point." **But it might not be enough. "More aggressive policies are needed,"** the report says, suggesting that there need to be "aggressive regulations" and changes among private sectors.

## **Basic income is a massive expansion of government power and critically undermines federalism**

### **Boyce 2019 — Business Economics Graduate**

(Paul, Business Economics Graduate. Universal Basic Income Is A Pandora's Box. Foundation For Economic Education. May 5, 2019. <https://fee.org/articles/universal-basic-income-is-a-pandora-s-box/>)

Inability to Limit Government Perhaps **one of the most important arguments against a UBI is the control it gives government**. Once it is enacted, **what restricts government from increasing it further?** After all, \$12,000 is only on the poverty line. What is to prevent government from increasing this to \$15,000 to win more votes? **The constitution itself does not sufficiently restrict government overreach, so there is little hope for other legislation.** Those in and around the middle class will most likely be paying more taxes. However, they will receive this money back—so no harm done, right? Well, **this actually gives even greater power to the state. Even though the government may take \$12,000 to give it back, it has control.** There is nothing to ensure that \$12,000 will still be offered in two years. **Government has the ability to withdraw it whenever the political tide turns.** We are living during a period where calls to tax the “rich” are becoming increasingly popular. **Are we also to expect that a \$12,000 UBI to the rich would continue to remain for long?** Perhaps, but perhaps not. Yang may call his proposal the “Freedom Dividend,” but it, in fact, does the opposite. **It hands even more income from the individual to the government.** For **example, when inflation takes place, the government may not increase the UBI's value.** It may take in more through taxes but not distribute that money. The new funds may then be used to fund the latest project. **Old government programs are often underfunded because they have already served their purpose** of getting officials elected. **In the UK, the NHS and education system are always in need of additional funding.** They are neglected because they no longer serve any political purpose. **There is nothing to demonstrate that a UBI won't be the same.**

## 2NC States CP (Permutation)

**The permutation fails. Federal action critically undermines state-level policies****Mason 2011 — Visiting Professor of Law at Yale**

(Ruth, Visting Professor of Law At Yale. Federalism And the Taxing Power. California Law Review 99.4 (2011): 975-1035.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/23018617>)

If Congress uses tax expenditures and penalties to regulate areas traditionally or constitutionally reserved to the states, then such tax regulation raises federalism concerns similar to those raised when Congress makes conditional grants to the states.<sup>95</sup> Thus, to the extent that we are concerned about the federalism impact of conditional grants, arguably **we also should be concerned about the federalism impact of tax expenditures** and penalties. Among the values that **federalism promotes is horizontal competition among the states** for residents who are free to move to any state in the Union. **Competition forces state governments to respond to the political preferences of their residents.**<sup>96</sup> The states' smaller size compared to that of the nation also may facilitate political participation,<sup>97</sup> at least when a single voter's voice carries more weight in state than federal elections.<sup>98</sup> Similarly, the smaller size of states, coupled with uneven distribution of voter preferences across the country, facilitates policy diversity: each state can adopt policies that reflect the preferences of its residents, which may differ from national preferences or from preferences of residents of other states.<sup>99</sup> Closely related to this is the idea that **states may devise different ways to pursue similar policy goals, thus serving**, in Justice Brandeis' famous words, **as "laborator[ies]" for "social and economic experiments."**<sup>100</sup> **Federalism also promotes vertical competition between the federal and state governments.** Although the federal and state governments do not compete for residents, James Madison predicted that they would compete for the affections of the governed.<sup>101</sup> For any regulatory area not exclusively assigned to the federal or state governments by the Constitution, Madison envisioned that the people would choose their regulator.<sup>102</sup> If they trusted the federal government more, the people would invest more power with the federal government, or vice versa. <sup>103</sup> In this way, Madison believed that the federal and state governments would check each other, so that neither would become oppressive.<sup>104</sup> It is not necessary to repeat at length here the well-known claim that conditional federal spending jeopardizes federalism values.<sup>105</sup> Instead, it should suffice to draw the analogy between federal grant spending and federal tax spending. **When it conditions grants upon states' implementation of particular policies, the federal government thereby reduces the scope for state policy experimentation and competition. Similarly, when the federal government uses federal tax law to reach past the states** to regulate private taxpayer behavior through tax expenditures and penalties, **it may leave less room for states to implement different or contrary policies.** Where federal tax incentives reward taxpayers for engaging in particular activities, such as education,<sup>106</sup> home ownership,<sup>107</sup> and the purchase of private health insurance,<sup>108</sup> those tax incentives may displace the expression of local values and local political preferences. Similarly, to at least some extent the federal government may override local political decisions when it uses tax penalties to discourage certain activities, such as smoking, gambling, and driving. If, in order to secure federal subsidies or avoid federal penalties, taxpayers strive to meet federal (rather than local) standards, then the taxing power raises concerns similar to those raised by the spending power.<sup>109</sup> Specifically, **if the federal government uses its taxing power to enlarge the scope of its regulatory** influence beyond its constitutionally enumerated powers, **it reduces the areas in which the states can compete with the federal government and with each other.** Thus, just as commentators have accused Congress of using conditional federal grants to crowd out state regulation,<sup>110</sup> so too may Congress use federal taxes to crowd out state regulation. Ultimately, the extent of this problem depends on unanswered empirical questions regarding the extent to which federal taxing and spending displaces state and local regulation in similar substantive areas. The impact of federal taxes on state legislative choices also depends on legal questions, such as whether the federal government may use taxes to achieve ends that lie beyond its other constitutionally enumerated powers, and whether such regulation can preempt state taxes and regulations. Parts II and III consider these legal issues.

## 2NC States CP (Solvency)

### A federal basic income fails. States are key sites of experimentation and competition

#### Tanner 2015 — Senior Fellow at the CATO Institute

(Michael, Senior Fellow At The CATO Institute. The Pros And Cons of A Guaranteed National Income. Policy Analysis – CATO Institute. May 12, 2015. Number 773. <https://www.cato.org/policy-analysis/pros-cons-guaranteed-national-income#>)

**Any guaranteed income proposal** would, of course, involve both coercion and redistribution. It **would** also **represent a federally imposed one-size-fits-all approach**. As such, it should be approached with caution and skepticism. In an ideal world, private charity would be the primary mechanism for assisting the poor. Certainly private charity has a much stronger track record of providing the type of assistance that offers a route out of poverty. And, because charity is voluntary, it comes without the moral questions inherent in any redistribution scheme. At the very least, **welfare should be a function of state and/or local governments, not the federal government. States can**, in Justice Brandeis' words, **"serve as a laboratory; and try novel and social experiments without risk to the rest of the country."**<sup>12</sup> **Putting states and localities in charge of welfare**, as was the case for much of this country's history, **would allow greater experimentation and competition.**

### States have the resources to create a basic income. Independently, the counterplan leads to federal follow-on

#### Howard 2018 — Professor of Philosophy at the University of Maine

(Michael W., Professor of Philosophy At The University of Maine. Universal Basic Income: Policy Options At National, State, And Local Levels. Maine Policy Review. Vol. 27. Issue 2. 2018. <https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/mpr/vol27/iss2/5/>)

**Are basic-income policy proposals relevant at the state or local level? Alaska's Permanent Fund Dividend illustrates how states can create dividends from sovereign wealth funds, or more directly from taxation** of the use of common assets. But what about resource-poor states like Maine? Gary Flomenhaft (2012) calculated that **even** Vermont, also **a resource-poor state, has enough resources that**, if all the rents were taxed, and the revenue distributed as dividends, **every citizen could receive between \$1,900 and over \$10,000 annually**. Of course, clawing back these resources after having turned them over to private companies would face major political challenges. A more modest, partial basic income could be created at the state level in several ways. **A state-level carbon tax**, desirable as a way to reduce fossil-fuel emissions, **could yield a significant universal dividend**, and the dividend would rectify an otherwise regressive and unpopular consumption tax. A carbon tax with progressive tax reductions has been implemented successfully in British Columbia (Durning and Bauman 2014). **The earned income tax credit**, which exists at the state as well as the federal level, **could be made refundable**. That is, those without earned income would receive a credit, increasing their income when it falls below a minimum. It is unlikely that refundable tax credits or carbon taxes at the state level could be large enough to adequately address either the environmental requirements or the income needs, but **policies at the state level can pave the way for more adequate policies at the federal level, when the political environment there becomes more favorable**. Other policies that could be introduced at the state level are a universal child allowance or a refundable child tax credit. Universal child allowances are minimum incomes that go to all children regardless of means or behavioral conditions. Lastly, **at the municipal or state level, pilot projects** such as those discussed earlier can **generate public discussion of minimum-income policies and empirical evidence to inform policy making**. Any Maine city, particularly with grant support, could launch similar experiments.

2NC Capitalism Kritik (Turns Case)

**Kritik turns the case: Capitalism makes poverty inevitable. Government spending cannot overcome market forces**

**Desmond 2023 — Professor of Sociology at Princeton University**

(Matthew, Professor of Sociology At Princeton University. Why Poverty Persists In America. New York Times. April 3, 2023. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/03/09/magazine/poverty-by-america-matthew-desmond.html>)

This makes the country's stalled progress on poverty even more baffling. **Decade after decade, the poverty rate has remained flat even as federal relief has surged. If we have more than doubled government spending on poverty and achieved so little, one reason is that the American welfare state is a leaky bucket.** Take welfare, for example: When it was administered through the Aid to Families With Dependent Children program, almost all of its funds were used to provide single-parent families with cash assistance. But when President Bill Clinton reformed welfare in 1996, replacing the old model with Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), he transformed the program into a block grant that gives states considerable leeway in deciding how to distribute the money. As a result, states have come up with rather creative ways to spend TANF dollars. Arizona has used welfare money to pay for abstinence-only sex education. Pennsylvania diverted TANF funds to anti-abortion crisis-pregnancy centers. Maine used the money to support a Christian summer camp. **Nationwide, for every dollar budgeted for TANF in 2020, poor families directly received just 22 cents. A fair amount of government aid earmarked for the poor never reaches them. But this does not fully solve the puzzle of why poverty has been so stubbornly persistent, because many of the country's largest social-welfare programs distribute funds directly to people.** Roughly 85 percent of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program budget is dedicated to funding food stamps themselves, and almost 93 percent of Medicaid dollars flow directly to beneficiaries. **There are, it would seem, deeper structural forces at play, ones that have to do with the way the American poor are routinely taken advantage of. The primary reason for our stalled progress on poverty reduction has to do with the fact that we have not confronted the unrelenting exploitation of the poor in the labor, housing and financial markets.**

## 2NC Capitalism Kritik (Permutation)

### The permutation fails. Capitalism will co-opt the plan

#### Hogg 2022 — Social Policy Postgraduate Researcher

(David James, Social Policy Postgraduate Researcher. 'The Left Will Find That It Has Bought A Trojan Horse': The Dialectics Of Universal Basic Income. Critical Social Policy. Vol. 43 (Issue 1): April 25, 2022. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/02610183221092151#con>)

In order **to implement a more progressive UBI**, such **a mass movement must be able to overcome**, at least temporarily, **the limitations of the capitalist state. As a result of capital's dominance over the** supposedly neutral **state** apparatus, **'[m]ajor shifts** in the forms of government intervention in the economy **are adopted only under massive social pressure'** (Benanav, 2019a: 14). It is for this precise reason that Benanav expresses disappointment at the automation discourse by and large for its overlooking of the importance of social movements. Marx and Engels described the state as the 'committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie' (2015: 5). While more modern state theorists such as Nicos Poulantzas and Ralph Miliband have advanced this conception of **the state**, its apparatus **is nevertheless skewed in capital's favour, and is therefore able to shape and alter the nature of policies that are implemented** (Poulantzas, 2014; Miliband, 2009). When assessing the Labour Party's relative impotence in power, David Coates suggests party leaders 'have repeatedly overestimated both the degree of class neutrality that they could legitimately expect from various sections of the State machine', while simultaneously underestimating 'the extent to which the **close connections between the civil service and** the senior managerial hierarchies of **private business'** have served as **stumbling blocks for policies that challenge** these **vested interests** (1975: 148). **In other words, the day-to-day business of managing the state is shaped by class relations, which dictate just how radical a programme a government can introduce.** It is perhaps natural then to be pessimistic about the kind of UBI which could be introduced. **Given the influence of capital on legislation, '[a] basic income that was acceptable to business would thus be a version that expunged its most salient feature': the potential freedom from wage labour** (Calnitsky, 2018: 308). Indeed, as John Marlow writes in the New Socialist, **'[t]he possibility of a UBI in a capitalist economy is conditional on it being low enough not to provide a viable alternative to wage labour for most people'** (2018: n.p.). An analysis of any of the various UBI pilot schemes emphasises this constrained approach. Returning again to the UBI trial in Finland, researchers found that '[d]uring the first year of the experiment [...] the basic income did not have any employment effects for the basic income recipients at group level', and that the overall effects for the entire two years were 'small' (Kela, 2020: n.p.). While recipients reported an improvement in their wellbeing and sense of autonomy, this seems largely reliant on the social conditions of the group prior to taking part; 'for those who were in a challenging life situation before the experiment, the basic income does not seem to have solved their problems' (Kela, 2020: n.p.). Respondents also reported feeling increased 'pressure to find a job' as a result of the experiment, which was of course conceived with the objective of getting these people back into work rather than liberating them from it (Kela, 2020: n.p.). **A UBI on capitalist terms risks normalising a rise in** what Mestrum and Wilson both term **"mini-jobs"** (Mestrum, 2018: 24; Wilson, 2018: 64). Again, this is one of the reasons for its support among **certain sectors of capital**, who **see the policy as a wage subsidy that increases profits and the prevalence of insecure employment contracts. The visions of UBI at a rate large enough for recipients to live on 'belong strictly in a post-capitalist world', while UBI alone could not possibly bring about such a revolutionary transition** (Marlow, 2018: n.p.). A UBI that frees us from work while leaving capitalism otherwise untouched is therefore an impossible contradiction.

## The plan is a tool of the bourgeois elite. UBI will reduce wages and critically undermine political resistance to late stage capitalism

### Hogg 2022 — Social Policy Postgraduate Researcher

(David James, Social Policy Postgraduate Researcher. 'The Left Will Find That It Has Bought A Trojan Horse': The Dialectics Of Universal Basic Income. Critical Social Policy. Vol. 43 (Issue 1): April 25, 2022. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/02610183221092151#con>)

**Bourgeois support for UBI is** not just historic however. In the modern age, support is **strong among** those Zizek terms **the 'socially conscious billionaire'** (2015: 39). In his estimation, such figures 'stand for global capital at its most seductive and "progressive" – in short, at its most dangerous' (Zizek, 2015: 39). **This most advanced faction of capital 'ha[s] embraced UBI as a way of defusing political resistance to automation and technological change'** (Benanav, 2019a: 7). **Techno-capitalists** like Mark Zuckerberg and Elon Musk view such changes as both desirable and inevitable, and indeed both **have publicly shared their support for UBI** at one time or another. Marxist political economy shows the importance of technological advances to the accumulation of capital. Marx demonstrates that **capitalist growth relies fundamentally on the 'surplus labour' of its workers**, which is the value produced beyond that which is covered by the worker's wages. The rate at which this occurs is 'therefore an exact expression for the degree of exploitation of labour power by capital' (Marx, 2013: 151). But **capital's endless search for further growth makes the invention of labour-saving technology vital to the increase in the rate of surplus value relative to the value the worker is paid for**. This increase in 'the productiveness of labour' therefore means a decrease in the 'labour-time required for the production of an article', meaning capital is able to shorten the "necessary labour time" for which the worker is remunerated, and in turn 'lengthen the other part of the day, during which he [sic] is at liberty to work gratis for the capitalist' (Marx, 2013: 21; 222). Just as working hours are not limited to those of necessary labour time, the fact that the labourer is able to produce their "means of subsistence" – the value equivalent to their wages - in a shorter space of time as a result of a particular advancement in production does not then lead to a reduction in hours, but rather the opposite. **Capital is able to use this new technology to squeeze the wages of those who remain in post following its introduction, as the threat of unemployment now looms large for those 'rendered superfluous' by this innovation** (Marx, 2013: 297). The work in which this technology is employed is therefore de-valued as "unskilled" - for much of it is completed by machinery with human supervision – which again spells wage cuts. **In this way, even the very threat of technology – regardless of whether it is actually deployed in production - ensures the employer is able to reduce wage costs, while any workplace radicalism is quelled by the insecurity such innovation inspires**. For those whose jobs are lost to automation, they either 'flood[...] all the more easily accessible branches of industry' or join the ranks of the jobless; what Marx terms the 'reserve army of labour'. Either way, the result 'sinks the price of labour below its value' (Marx, 2013: 297). **A UBI in conjunction with technological advancement is therefore entirely consistent with the demands of capital, which often repurposes reforms for its own development**. In assessing the impact of the post-war welfare state, John Saville writes that it emerged not only through 'the struggle of the working class against their exploitation', but also as a result of 'the requirements of industrial capitalism [...] for a more efficient environment', in other words a healthier and more educated workforce (1957: n.p.). Similarly, **UBI serves to create this "more efficient environment" through a liberating of employers from the constraints of paying full wages. Not only does the policy force the state - or rather the tax payer - to top-up these wages, but it continues to maintain the labour force for a comparatively lower rate. This combination of UBI and automation could well allow capital to continue increasing its profit margins while throwing at least some of its workers - now guaranteed a basic income - on the scrapheap.**

## **UBI is a tool of capitalism. The plan undermines social safety nets**

### **Hogg 2022 — Social Policy Postgraduate Researcher**

(David James, Social Policy Postgraduate Researcher. 'The Left Will Find That It Has Bought A Trojan Horse': The Dialectics Of Universal Basic Income. Critical Social Policy. Vol. 43 (Issue 1): April 25, 2022. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/02610183221092151#con>)

**While UBI's** contradictions mean it **appeals to both the Right and the Left, a Marxist understanding of the capitalist state shows it is much more likely to appear in its regressive form** - if at all - which is exemplified by the meagre figures that have been posited. **Indeed**, the **British politicians who signalled support for the policy during the pandemic suggested 'an initial £48 per week payment', a negligible sum** (Partington, 2020: n.p.). **Basic income risks aggravating the precarious nature of modern work and undermining our already imperfect welfare system**, hence its traditional support among the neoliberal Right. But it does also offer potential as the first step in a revolutionary process that would reimagine the world of work. **Ultimately, the success of this process is dependent on the strength of the movement that the demand can inspire**, as well as its "performative" and "provocative" potential. **Without such a movement willing to expand UBI's reach and content, the policy is unlikely to be very radical in nature, and could even prove to be rather dangerous.** The Left should therefore be mindful of these dangers before excitedly hailing basic income as emancipatory.

## 2NC Capitalism Kritik (Alternative)

**Capitalism maintains itself by controlling our understanding of political possibility. Only by imagining a world outside of capital can we escape the system**

### **McCarragher 2019 – Professor of Humanities at Villanova University**

(Eugene, Associate Professor of Humanities At Villanova University. The Enchantments of Mammon: How Capitalism Became The Religion of Modernity, p. 15 – 18.)

Words such as “paradise” or “love” or “communion” are certainly absent from our political vernacular, excluded on account of their “utopian” connotations or their lack of steely-eyed “realism.” Although this is a book about the past, I have always kept before me its larger contemporary religious, philosophical, and political implications. The book should make these clear enough; I will only say here that one of my broader intentions is to challenge the canons of “realism,” especially as defined in the “science” of economics. **As the master science of desire in advanced capitalist nations, economics and its acolytes define the parameters of our moral and political imaginations, patrolling the boundaries of possibility and censoring any more generous conception of human affairs. Under the regime of neoliberalism, it has been the chief weapon in the arsenal of what David Graeber has characterized as “a war on the imagination,” a relentless assault on our capacity to envision an end to the despotism of money.**<sup>24</sup> **Insistent,** in Margaret Thatcher’s ominous ukase, that **“there is no alternative” to capitalism, our corporate plutocracy has been busy imposing its own beatific vision on the world: the empire of capital, with an imperial aristocracy enriched by the labor of a fearful, overburdened, and cheerfully servile population of human resources. Every avenue of escape from accumulation and wage servitude must be closed, or better yet, rendered inconceivable; any map of the world that includes utopia must be burned before it can be glanced at.** Better to follow Miller’s wisdom: we already inhabit paradise, and we can never make ourselves fit to live in it if we obey the avaricious and punitive sophistry professed in the dismal pseudoscience. **The grotesque ontology of scarcity and money, the tawdry humanism of acquisitiveness and conflict, the reduction of rationality to the mercenary principles of pecuniary reason—this ensemble of falsehoods that comprise the foundation of economics must be resisted and supplanted. Economics must be challenged,** not only as a sanction for injustice but also as a specious portrayal of human beings and a fictional account of their history.

**Poverty AFF (HS JV)**

SY 2023 - 2024 Atlanta Urban Debate League

## 1NR Case (Poverty)

**Specifically, the plan would trade off with food stamps and child tax credits. The impact is an increase in childhood poverty**

### **Gunn 2019 — Contributing Writer at Pacific Standard**

(Dwyer, Contributing Writer At Pacific Standard. A Universal Basic Income Might Hurt Poor People More Than Help. The Pacific Standard. February 15, 2019. <https://psmag.com/economics/a-universal-basic-income-might-hurt-poor-people-more-than-help>)

The labor market effects of a UBI are a bit more complicated to assess. The researchers conclude that providing every citizen an income would likely lower labor supply in the short run but may, as advocates argue, encourage some recipients to seek out additional training or education. The researchers also point out that it might improve educational and labor market outcomes for the children of recipients. This latter effect is a particularly important one as **a substantial body of research confirms that increasing family resources during early childhood improves outcomes for children**. Researchers have found that U.S. children whose mothers participated in a cash-transfer program during the early part of the 20th century lived longer, obtained more schooling, and had higher earnings in adulthood than children whose mothers were rejected from the program. Hoynes (with co-authors [Diane Whitmore Schanzenbach](#) and [Douglas Almond](#)) has demonstrated that **childhood access to nutritional assistance** (i.e., food stamps) **leads to better health in adulthood and improved economic outcomes** for women. Likewise, researchers, [including Hoynes](#), have found that **the EITC improves both infant health and children’s educational outcomes**. Similarly, economists who studied an unconditional-cash-transfer program, funded by casino profits, among a Native American tribe [have found](#) that children whose families received the payments exhibited better educational and behavioral health outcomes and lower incidences of arrests, and that the effects were largest for the poorest families. Indeed, **one of the most compelling arguments against a UBI to emerge from this paper may be that, at the most likely funding levels, it would redistribute resources away from low-income families with children**. As the first chart above illustrates, families with children already seem to be a low priority in the U.S., [despite strong evidence that investing in early childhood is sound policy](#).