
West Coast Publishing

LD March-April 2018 Basic Income Pt 2

Edited by Jim Hanson

Research Assistance by
Matt Stannard

Thanks for using our Policy, LD, Public Forum, and Extemp Materials.

**Please don't share this material with anyone outside
of your school**

including via print, email, dropbox, google drive, the web, etc.
We're a small non-profit; please help us continue to provide our products.

Contact us at jim@wcdebate.com

www.wcdebate.com

WEST COAST DEBATE

LD March-April 2018

Basic Income Pt 2

Finding Arguments in this File

Use the table of contents on the next pages to find the evidence you need or the navigation bar on the left. We have tried to make the table of contents as easy to use as possible.

Using the arguments in this File

We encourage you to be familiar with the evidence you use. Highlight (underline) the key lines you will use in the evidence. Cut evidence from our files, incorporate your and others' research and make new files. File the evidence so that you can easily retrieve it when you need it in debate rounds. Practice reading the evidence out-loud; Practice applying the arguments to your opponents' positions; Practice defending your evidence in rebuttal speeches.

Use West Coast Evidence as a Beginning

We hope you enjoy our evidence files and find them useful. In saying this, we want to make a strong statement that we make when we coach and that we believe is vitally important to your success: DO NOT USE THIS EVIDENCE AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR YOUR OWN RESEARCH. Instead, let it serve as a beginning. Let it inform you of important arguments, of how to tag and organize your arguments, and to offer citations for further research. Don't stagnate in these files-- build upon them by doing your own research for updates, new strategies, and arguments that specifically apply to your opponents. In doing so, you'll use our evidence to become a better debater.

Copying West Coast Evidence

Our policy gives you the freedom to use our evidence for educational purposes without violating our hard work.

- You may print and copy this evidence for those on your team.
- You may not electronically share nor distribute this evidence with anyone other than those on your team unless you very substantially change each page of material that you share.

For unusual situations, you can e-mail us at jim@wcdebate.com and seek our consent.

Ordering West Coast Materials

1. Visit the West Coast Web Page at www.wcdebate.com
2. E-mail us at jim@wcdebate.com
3. Fax us at 877-781-5058

Copyright 2017. West Coast Publishing. All Rights Reserved.

Visit our web page!

www.wcdebate.com

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

WEST COAST DEBATE 2

Affirmative Evidence 5

 Basic Income Generally Good..... 6

 Basic Income Good: Solves Automation Job Loss..... 7

 Basic Income Good: Improves Society/Quality of Life 8

 Basic Income Good: Creativity & Innovation..... 9

 Basic Income Good: Widespread Support..... 10

 Basic Income Good: Decreases Crime 11

 Cooperative Solutions Key to Solving Capitalism 12

 Cooperativism Good: Solves Conflict..... 13

 Automation = Job Loss..... 14

 Inequality Bad..... 15

 Inequality & Insecurity Undermine Health..... 16

 Inequality & Insecurity Undermine Health..... 17

 Inequality & Insecurity Undermine Health..... 18

 Economic Insecurity Bad..... 19

 Capitalism Bad: Fascism..... 20

 Capitalism Bad: Must Find Post-Capitalist Solutions..... 21

 Capitalism Bad: Pro-Capitalist Evidence Faulty 22

 Capitalism Bad: Destroys Democracy & Society..... 23

 Capitalism Bad: Instability 24

 Capitalism Bad: Consumption & Growth..... 25

 Collapse of Capitalism Inevitable..... 26

 Answers to “Basic Income Causes Laziness” Arguments..... 27

 Answers to “Stops People from Working” Arguments..... 28

 Answers to “Markets Good” Arguments 29

 Answers to “Marxism/Socialism Oppressive” Arguments 30

 Answers to “Means Testing/Just Helping Poor is Better” Arguments 31

 Answers to “Welfare Proves Basic Income is Bad” Arguments..... 32

 Answers to “Basic Income = Unfair Taxation” Arguments 33

Negative Evidence 34

 Basic Income Bad: Hurts the Poor 35

 Basic Income Bad: Hurts Women and Immigrants..... 36

 Basic Income Bad: Capitalism Link Turns..... 37

Basic Income Bad: Capitalism Link Turns..... 38

Basic Income Bad: Discourages Work..... 39

Basic Income Bad: Drug Morbidity 40

Basic Income Bad: Poverty 41

Basic Income Bad: Disempowers Workers 42

Basic Income Bad: No Solvency, Destroys Governments 43

Basic Income Bad: No Solvency 44

Basic Income Bad: Will Fail 45

Basic Income Bad: Will Fail 46

Basic Income Bad: Hurts Disabled 47

Basic Income Bad: Hurts Workers 48

Basic Income Bad: Destroys Innovation 49

Capitalism Generally Good 50

Capitalism Generally Good 51

Capitalism Generally Good 52

Training Solves Unemployment..... 53

Training Solves Unemployment..... 54

Answers to “Need Total Basic Income” Arguments 55

Answers to “Capitalism Causes Inequality” Arguments 56

Answers to “Inequality Bad” Arguments..... 57

Answers to “Capitalism and Neoliberalism Violent” Arguments 58

Answers to “Neoliberalism Bad” Arguments..... 59

Answers to “Automation Increases Unemployment” Arguments 60

Answers to “Technology Bad” Arguments 61

Affirmative Evidence

Basic Income Generally Good

Basic income instills egalitarianism and community, removes the stigma of material sharing, and builds solidarity

Felix **Ling**, Labour staffer for British Parliament, January 29, **2018**

"The revolutionary potential of a universal basic income cannot be over-estimated" Labour List, <https://labourlist.org/2018/01/140223/> (accessed 2/13/2018)

The universality of the basic income is inherently egalitarian, as it emphasises community and sharing. The stigma attached to means-tested welfare is palpable and can place the recipient in a category separate to their peers. For example, the provision of free school meals for all children reduces the stigma around receiving free school lunches. The universality of the basic income therefore produces consent for the overall system. Everyone benefits and so everyone is willing to defend the right to keep the benefit. For those who do not receive a benefit, they do not feel the pain when parliament vote to reduce it and so providing benefits universally ensures right-wing governments struggle to remove them by attempting to divide and rule.

Basic income increases self-sufficiency and grassroots activism, creating a healthier society

John **Harris**, columnist for The Guardian, January 16, **2018**

"What happens when the jobs dry up in the new world? The left must have an answer," The Guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/jan/16/jobs-left-automation-power> (accessed 2/13/2018)

A basic income also goes with the grain of a digitally assisted world in which people have ever more capacity to do things for themselves. The modern profusion of things that are collective without being state-dependent (witness everything from Mumsnet, through memory cafes for people with Alzheimer's, to after-school coding clubs) attests to people's talent for making things happen; and the solutions they come up with tend to have deeper roots than most things imposed from the top. This element of how we live points to the future, and the empowered, self-organising impulse it represents will need to be incorporated into health, education, social care and more.

Basic Income Good: Solves Automation Job Loss

Basic income can solve any problems with technologization of jobs and help fulfill the utopian promises of technological development

Ewan **McGaughey**, lecturer in law at King's College, **2018**

"Will Robots Automate Your Job Away? Full Employment, Basic Income, and Economic Democracy," Centre for Business Research, University of Cambridge, Working Paper no. 496, https://www.cbr.cam.ac.uk/fileadmin/user_upload/centre-for-business-research/downloads/working-papers/wp496.pdf (accessed 2/13/2018)

The promises of technology are astounding, and deliver humankind the capacity to live in a way that nobody could have once imagined. The industrial revolution of the 19th century brought people past subsistence agriculture. It became possible to live, not just from hand to mouth, bonded to lords and masters, but to win freedom from servitude through solidarity. The corporate revolution of the 20th century enabled mass production and social distribution of wealth, for human and democratic development across the globe. A third economic revolution has often been pronounced or predicted, but it will not only be one of technology. The next revolution will be social. It must be universal. Universal prosperity with democracy and social justice, on a living planet, is achievable not in centuries, but in years and decades. It did not begin with technology, but with education. Once people can see and understand the institutions that shape their lives, and vote in shaping them too, the robots will not automate your job away. There will be full employment, fair incomes, and a thriving economy democracy.

Basic Income Good: Improves Society/Quality of Life

Basic income improves quality of life for all by steering people into caregiving and knowledge-seeking professions

Steven **Strehl**, Platform Engineer and Digital Campaigner at Mein Grundeinkommen, January 15, **2018**
"HOW UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME CAN CHANGE THE WAY WE THINK ABOUT WORK (AND MONEY),"
Ouishare, <http://magazine.ouishare.net/2018/01/how-basic-income-can-change-the-way-we-think-about-work-and-money/> (accessed 2/14/2018)

We need to realise how much society is losing by driving people with the wrong incentives. How many teachers, philosophers, linguists or caregivers have we lost for the sake of making money, for the sake of surviving? I have been lucky in my life so far, but I do not want this to be the default in our society — that you need to be lucky to have a minimum of dignity. This is an enormous paradigm shift and it might take some time, but it will come from the increasing demands of the people for a better life. Whatever that means for each individual.

Basic Income Good: Creativity & Innovation

Basic income is freedom to breathe, create, and revolt

Oshan **Jarow**, Curator at MusingMind.org, January 25, **2018**

"Would Camus's Sisyphus Want Basic Income?" Musing Mind, <https://www.musingmind.org/camus-basic-income/> (accessed 2/12/2018)

Wealth is a floor upon which we can confront the absurd. Existing beneath that floor, in poverty where the air is thick with grime, all one can do is scratch towards the surface, gasping for oxygen. Like looking up through the dense canopy of a teeming jungle, the view from down under is short. The view above can be breathtaking. UBI could afford everyone a chance for the lucid view, a life free for the making. Free to draw our own conclusions, which may, if we're lucky, resemble Camus': I draw from the absurd three consequences, which are my revolt, my freedom, and my passion."

Basic income allows technological advances to improve life rather than destroy jobs

Matt **Kilcoyne**, communications director at Adam Smith Institute, January 19, **2018**

"Rising Evidence for Universal Basic Income," Adam Smith Institute, <https://www.adamsmith.org/news/rising-evidence-basic-income> (accessed 2/14/2018)

Technological advances, such as driverless trucks, could disrupt the haulage industry but also reduce emissions, road accidents and prices for ordinary people. Basic Income is both politically feasible and financially sustainable, the report argues, smoothing the transition for workers displaced by automation. Short-termist regulations designed to protect jobs from competition risk economic stagnation and mass retraining schemes rarely live up to their lofty promises.

Basic Income Good: Widespread Support

Basic income unites the right and left and brings all stakeholders together

Noah **Smith**, Bloomberg economics writer and former professor at SUNY Stony Brook, January 23, **2018**

"A Basic Income for Everyone? It's Not a Crazy Idea," Bloomberg View,

<https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2018-01-23/a-basic-income-for-everyone-it-s-not-a-crazy-idea> (accessed 2/14/2018)

If there's one policy that can unite socialists and Silicon Valley libertarians, it's universal basic income -- a regular payment from the government to each and every adult, regardless of income. Many socialists like the unconditional nature of the program -- like Social Security, it has the potential to avoid arousing the anger of higher-earning people who feel they're being forced to pay for those who don't work. Indeed, polls reveal a plurality supports the idea in the U.S. and a majority supports it in Europe. Meanwhile, some in the tech industry believe that as machine learning and other technologies continue to replace human labor, basic income will be the only way to guarantee large portions of the human race a decent standard of living.

The outcomes of basic income satisfy conservatives while solving economic insecurity and spurring innovation

Tony **Mecia**, senior writer at Weekly Standard, February 10, **2018**

"The Case for Free Money," The Weekly Standard, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/the-case-for-free-money/article/2011427> (accessed 2/14/2018)

Issuing all adults regular payments straight to their bank accounts would, he adds, have all kinds of positive effects conservatives find palatable. More people would get married, as it becomes possible to live a middle-class lifestyle by sharing distributions and combining them with a little bit of income. Women in bad relationships would have financial independence from ne'er-do-well boyfriends. The middle class could save for retirement. Workers wouldn't be tied to soul-crushing jobs. Entrepreneurs would have a cushion to try something new.

Basic Income Good: Decreases Crime

Basic income decreases property crimes

Brett **Watson**, post-doctoral researcher in economics at University of Alaska, et al, January 23, **2018**

"Behavioral Effects of a Cash Transfer: Evidence from the World's Only Continuous Universal Income Program," Researchgate.net,

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Matthew_Reimer2/publication/322665448_Behavioral_Effects_of_a_Cash_Transfer_Evidence_from_the_World%27s_Only_Continuous_Universal_Income_Program/links/5a678a870f7e9b76ea8f030a/Behavioral-Effects-of-a-Cash-Transfer-Evidence-from-the-Worlds-Only-Continuous-Universal-Income-Program.pdf (accessed 2/13/2018)

We find with an extended time window (one week) property-crime calls see a decline following PFD distribution. Average daily calls related to property crime experience a significant decline for the first two weeks after the PFD is issued, with a decrease of approximately 12% and 8% in weeks one and two, respectively, relative to the sample mean. The significant week-after effect is largely driven by decreased calls during days that experience above-average property crimes (i.e., Monday to Wednesday). Like substance calls, this effect is not offset in the later periods. This decline is consistent with past findings of declines in property crime associated with the timing of benefit payments. For example, Foley (2011) finds a significant decrease in such calls in the ten-day period following distribution of food stamp payments.

Cooperative Solutions Key to Solving Capitalism

We must turn the market-cooperation hierarchy upside down and make market relations a subset of cooperative relations—this is necessary to create a world that respects the limits to growth; some kind of shift is inevitable; cooperative solutions are key to solidarity

Michel **Bauwens**, Belgian Peer-to-Peer theorist at P2P foundation, **2008**

"Notes on the horizontality of peer to peer relationships in the context of the verticality of a hierarchy of values," Pursuing the Common Good: How Solidarity and Subsidiarity Can Work Together Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences, Acta 14, Vatican City, <http://www.pass.va/content/dam/scienzesociali/pdf/acta14/acta14-bauwens.pdf> (accessed 2/13/2018)

In the longer term we have to ask the question about moving from a political economy where peer to peer is a subset of market relations in a context of infinite-growth capitalism, to a political economy where the market for scarce goods is a subset of a peer to peer economy and a civilization centered around the notions of the commons and direct value creation through civil society. If infinite growth is indeed a logical and physical impossibility in the context of finite natural resources; and when the artificial scarcities currently impeding social cooperation and innovation will be increasingly seen as counterproductive, then such a shift might be seen as a conditional inevitability. If we find a solution for the solidarity issue, and the right interface and combination between non-reciprocal peer production in the immaterial field; and cost-recovery mechanisms for the production of scarce rival goods, then the resulting society would be seen to be a more adequate expression of the value system expressed by the social doctrine.

Including unpaid work is necessary to re-shape economic discourse

Alan **Cottey**, physicist at University of East Anglia, February 6, **2018**

"Environment change, economy change and reducing conflict at source," AI & Society, <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00146-018-0816-x> (accessed 2/13/2018)

In this complex web of concern, one problem has received insufficient notice and is a sticking point that impedes general progress. This obstacle is public economic discourse, that is, the language in which economic matters are defined and publicly presented by economists, bankers, politicians, administrators, business leaders and the mass media. The language shapes a public consensus about what is normal and practical. The present paper challenges that consensus and proposes a distinction between economic change (minor quantitative changes within an economy-as-usual) and economy change (a radical change, of whatever kind, to a completely different economy). In particular, reconnection of the term economy with its Greek root—oikonomia, meaning management or household—is advocated. With such an expanded usage, important contributions which are not counted in the usual economy, such as unpaid work, are included. In view of the rapid changes underway in the physical and living environment, economy change is to be expected, and indeed on a short timescale, possibly very short and surely no more than a few decades. And if economy change, of some kind, is to be expected, it makes sense to try to make it positive, rather than, as is all too common at present, to deny it or to deny that humans can choose.

Cooperativism Good: Solves Conflict

Economic structures are key to conflict—instilling cooperative values through material sharing creates peace

Alan **Cottey**, physicist at University of East Anglia, February 6, **2018**

"Environment change, economy change and reducing conflict at source," AI & Society,

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00146-018-0816-x> (accessed 2/13/2018)

The economic structure of a society, and of societies with which it interacts, is a major factor influencing the manner in which conflicts of interest play out. This paper avoids advocating any blueprint for an economy-as-a-whole or for world peace. It does, however, propose that respect for the physical and living environment, justice, cooperation, and restraint are values that would promote a more peaceful world, in which conflicts of interest were acknowledged realistically and resolved in a proportionate manner. Several features that could contribute to a peaceful oikonomia are described briefly—the necessities for a dignified life available to all people as of right; wealth recapturing its meaning surrounding such words as commonweal, etc; work defined so as to include all useful activity; limits to the accumulation of property.

Automation = Job Loss

Between 45 and 47 percent of all jobs are at risk from tech advances in the next 20 years

Tony **Mecia**, senior writer at Weekly Standard, February 10, **2018**

"The Case for Free Money," The Weekly Standard, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/the-case-for-free-money/article/2011427> (accessed 2/14/2018)

A much-cited 2013 study by two Oxford professors (an economist and an engineer) showed that 47 percent of U.S. jobs are at high risk of being replaced by computers "over some unspecified number of years, perhaps a decade or two." The fields most at risk are office work, sales, service, construction, and manufacturing; the jobs that seem safer are in health care, education, the arts, computers, and the sciences. A 2015 study by McKinsey & Co. found that 45 percent of work tasks could be done by existing technology, especially predictable physical work, data collection, and data processing.

Technological innovation creates short-term gains in employment at best, followed by long-term structural unemployment

Austan **Goolsbee**, professor at University of Chicago Booth School of Business, **2017**

"Public Policy in an AI Economy," Chapter in forthcoming NBER book Economics of Artificial Intelligence, Ajay K. Agrawal, Joshua Gans, and Avi Goldfarb, editors; Conference held September 13-14, 2017, <http://www.nber.org/chapters/c14030.pdf> (accessed 2/13/2018)

As the research and comments in this volume suggest, economists have generally been less pessimistic when thinking about the role of AI on jobs. They highlight the historical record of job creation despite job displacement, documented the way technological advances have eliminated jobs in some sectors but expanded jobs and increased wages in the economy overall and highlighted the advantages that the new technologies will likely have in the future (insert literature cites *** Brynjolfsson and McAfee, Autor ***, Mokyr **). The pessimistic case has come more from technology/business sector. Perhaps seeing the advances in technology up close, they worry that the machines may soon be so good that they could replace almost anyone. A major survey across industries by McKinsey Global Institute (McKinsey, 2017) argues that 73 million jobs could be destroyed by automation by 2030 because of the rise of the new technologies.

Inequality Bad

Inequality undermines shared social values

Victor **Patel**, researcher in Department of Global Health and Social Medicine, Harvard Medical School, et al, January 19, **2018**

"Income inequality and depression: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the association and a scoping review of mechanisms," World Psychiatry, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/wps.20492/full> (accessed 2/14/2018)

Perceptions of fairness and trust are also consistent with Merton's anomie disjunction between society's goals and normative structures governing the means to attain that goal[42]. This is more exaggerated in societies with higher levels of inequality, where the means of attaining upward social mobility are severely constrained, and therefore there is a disjunction between society's goals or aspirations (for example of acquiring wealth) and the means to attain that goal, which are not accessible to those who are lower on the socio-economic hierarchy.

Even rich are hurt by income inequality

Victor **Patel**, researcher in Department of Global Health and Social Medicine, Harvard Medical School, et al, January 19, **2018**

"Income inequality and depression: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the association and a scoping review of mechanisms," World Psychiatry, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/wps.20492/full> (accessed 2/14/2018)

A third consideration is the effect of income inequality on low- vs. high-income groups. Within countries, the effect of inequality on depression appears to be more pronounced among low-income groups[12]. This is consistent with the hypothesized role of upward social mobility, the constraints of which are more likely to be experienced by low-income groups. The hypothesis that inequality is deleterious for high-income groups too is proposed by other authors[3]. Kawachi et al[45] argue that the wealthy in highly unequal societies cannot escape the "pathologies of poverty", including crime, violence and exposure to some infectious diseases.

Inequality & Insecurity Undermine Health

Studies demonstrate link between income inequality and physical and mental health

Victor **Patel**, researcher in Department of Global Health and Social Medicine, Harvard Medical School, et al, January 19, **2018**

"Income inequality and depression: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the association and a scoping review of mechanisms," World Psychiatry, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/wps.20492/full> (accessed 2/14/2018)

There is a robust body of evidence linking inequality and health outcomes, ranging from infant mortality and life expectancy to obesity. A compelling case for a causal relationship between inequality and a number of negative health outcomes has been recently presented[3]. Not surprisingly, there is also evidence linking income inequality with mental health outcomes. A significant positive relationship has been reported between the incidence rate of schizophrenia and country-level Gini coefficient, a widely used measure of the distribution of income or wealth in a population. A possible mechanism proposed for this association was that inequality impacts negatively on social cohesion and capital, and increases chronic stress, placing individuals at a heightened risk of schizophrenia[4].

Inequality undermines social capital, destroys mental health and increases suicide

Victor **Patel**, researcher in Department of Global Health and Social Medicine, Harvard Medical School, et al, January 19, **2018**

"Income inequality and depression: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the association and a scoping review of mechanisms," World Psychiatry, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/wps.20492/full> (accessed 2/14/2018)

Social capital is critical, because it facilitates social integration (a dynamic process by which members of a social group participate in dialogue or collaborate to achieve a shared social goal). Income inequality therefore undermines social capital and social integration, promoting social isolation, alienation and loneliness. It also undermines perceptions of fairness (a component of trust)[37]. Ichida et al[40] confirmed the social capital hypothesis in Japan, showing that social capital (measured as social trust) mediated the effect of inequality on self-rated health. This is supported by Durkheim's theory of social integration and social regulation[41], the failure of which he linked to suicide.

Inequality & Insecurity Undermine Health

Economic inequality destroys mental health; only collective action to move beyond growth-oriented thinking will solve

Anna **Macintyre**, scholar at Centre for Health Policy, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, et al, **2018**

"What has economics got to do with it? The impact of socioeconomic factors on mental health and the case for collective action," Nature.com and Palgrave Communications, <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-018-0063-2> (accessed 2/13/2018)

A clear link exists between social and economic inequality and poor mental health. There is a social gradient in mental health, and higher levels of income inequality are linked to higher prevalence of mental illness.

Despite this, in the late 20th and early 21st century, psychiatric and psychological perspectives have dominated mental health research and policy, obscuring root socioeconomic contributors. Drawing on contemporary research on the social determinants of mental health, with particular reference to Europe and the U.S., this paper argues that a sharper focus on socioeconomic factors is required in research and policy to address inequalities in mental health. Current attempts to move this direction include: evaluation of the impact of economic policies on mental health, community-based partnerships, increased professional awareness and advocacy on socioeconomic factors. This necessitates greater understanding of the barriers to such actions. This paper argues that advancing 'upstream' approaches to population mental health requires an interdisciplinary research vision that supports greater understanding of the role of socioeconomic factors. It also demands collective cross-sectoral action through changes in social and economic policy, as well as economic frameworks that move beyond an exclusive focus on economic growth to embrace collective and societal wellbeing.

Lack of resources and financial expenditures undermines mental health treatment

Anna **Macintyre**, scholar at Centre for Health Policy, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, et al, **2018**

"What has economics got to do with it? The impact of socioeconomic factors on mental health and the case for collective action," Nature.com and Palgrave Communications, <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-018-0063-2> (accessed 2/13/2018)

In the United States, funding of prevention constitutes a notoriously small percentage of overall healthcare expenditures (Miller et al., 2012). Yet the economic cost of treatment and lost productivity related to mental health and substance use disorder is well documented. While the National Institute for Mental Health named prevention as a core objective in its strategic plan for research (National Institute for Mental Health, 2015), there is not a clear picture of the scope and scale of investment in mental health prevention across government and philanthropy. It is likely there has been even less investment in research on the social determinants of mental health, and socioeconomic factors in particular. Thus, there is a need for greater research capacity (Wahlbeck and McDaid, 2012).

Inequality & Insecurity Undermine Health

Prioritizing growth over collective health destroys social relations

Anna **Macintyre**, scholar at Centre for Health Policy, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, et al, **2018**

"What has economics got to do with it? The impact of socioeconomic factors on mental health and the case for collective action," Nature.com and Palgrave Communications, <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-018-0063-2> (accessed 2/13/2018)

Population mental health is intimately connected to societal economic conditions. The (poor) mental health of modern societies offers a stark indication of the consequences of not taking action: 'economic growth at the cost of social recession' (Friedli, 2009, p. IV). Socioeconomic inequality may be 'the enemy between us' (Wilkinson and Pickett, 2017, p. 11), increasing status competition, undermining the quality of social relations, increasing stress and impacting on health, mental health, and wellbeing. In response to this, there is a need to build an economic system that tackles these inequalities in mental health.

Economic Insecurity Bad

We have all become Sisyphus, pushing the boulder of economic survival up the hill, terrified to stop; multiple economic insecurity scenarios demonstrate this

Oshan **Jarow**, Curator at MusingMind.org, January 25, **2018**

"Would Camus's Sisyphus Want Basic Income?" Musing Mind, <https://www.musingmind.org/camus-basic-income/> (accessed 2/12/2018)

Many of us can see ourselves in Sisyphus. The American middle class has been fruitlessly pushing a boulder that hasn't budged since the 1970's. What is the mechanism chaining Sisyphus to his useless task? The middle class — not to mention lower-income groups — to their toil? We can imagine it this way: should Sisyphus cease pushing the boulder, it would roll back and kill him. This is the ugly locomotive force behind the work ethic of so many Americans: survival, fear. We get out of bed in the morning and work from fear of what would happen otherwise. Consequences range from missed student loan payments, hungry children, to nihilism, but so long as we're motivated by fear to enact our lives, afflictions from depression to suicide compound. If this sounds morose, take note that American suicide rates are at a 30-year high.

Capitalism Bad: Fascism

Capitalism spurs patriarchal fascism, reinforcing oppressive racial and gender hierarchies

Erik **Forman**, Practitioner Fellow at the Kalmanovitz Initiative for Labor and the Working Poor at Georgetown University, April 15, **2017**

"Fascism Is Possible Not in Spite of Liberal Capitalism, but Because of It," Truthout, <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/40197-fascism-is-possible-not-in-spite-of-liberal-capitalism-but-because-of-it> (accessed 2/14/2018)

The fascist enforcement of gender norms is a grotesque exaggeration of the patriarchal division of labor engendered by one form of capitalism. Fascism's celebration of hierarchy and legitimization of class society is an extreme form of the twin lies of liberalism: "meritocracy" (barely distinguishable as a concept from Social Darwinism) and racist essentialism. Racism itself was born of the Western project of colonialism, and given a stamp of legitimacy by Enlightenment science that sought to taxonomize all things, plants, animals and people.

Capitalism forces a choice between neoliberal everyone-for-themselves, or regressive fascist nationalism

Erik **Forman**, Practitioner Fellow at the Kalmanovitz Initiative for Labor and the Working Poor at Georgetown University, April 15, **2017**

"Fascism Is Possible Not in Spite of Liberal Capitalism, but Because of It," Truthout, <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/40197-fascism-is-possible-not-in-spite-of-liberal-capitalism-but-because-of-it> (accessed 2/14/2018)

Neoliberalism promises more of the same, fascism promises "economic nationalism" and a return to a mythologized past, a democratic socialist revival bids for a return to some form of social democracy. But once again, the discontinuities of these ideologies with liberalism are not as strong as their continuities. Both the fascist ideology of Trump and Brexit, and the social-democratic revivalism of Bernie Sanders and Jeremy Corbyn are post-liberal, in that they are symptomatic of the breakdown of the liberal order. But they are also post-liberal, in that they fail to break with the fundamentals of liberal capitalism: private ownership of the means of production, wage labor and markets as a means of distribution. It is these fundamentals of capitalism which brought us to the crisis of neoliberalism, and any movement that is unwilling to challenge these fundamentals will ultimately bring us more of the same.

Fascism undermines legal protections for workers and others

Erik **Forman**, Practitioner Fellow at the Kalmanovitz Initiative for Labor and the Working Poor at Georgetown University, April 15, **2017**

"Fascism Is Possible Not in Spite of Liberal Capitalism, but Because of It," Truthout, <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/40197-fascism-is-possible-not-in-spite-of-liberal-capitalism-but-because-of-it> (accessed 2/14/2018)

Under Trump, the labor movement has gladly divided and conquered itself, with the heads of building trade unions meeting with Trump and sycophantically glowing over the "respect" he showed them, while he prepares orders to deport millions of immigrant workers and deprive millions more citizens of their rights. Many unions simply seem to be hoping for the best, while failing to prepare for the worst. Others refuse to publicly attack Trump in the hopes of cutting some sort of deal. But no matter how close some unions get to the boss, they cannot escape the fact that their organizations are in the crosshairs more than ever. Trump's fascism seeks to finish off the legal framework of labor relations under postwar liberalism, dealing the coup de grâce to an institutional labor movement that has long been hemorrhaging members.

Capitalism Bad: Must Find Post-Capitalist Solutions

Failure of capitalism means we should embrace radical solutions

Miriam **Ronzoni**, lecturer in political theory at University of Manchester, **2015**

"How social democrats may become reluctant radicals: Thomas Piketty's Capital and Wolfgang Streeck's Buying Time," European Journal of Political Theory, <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.873.2288&rep=rep1&type=pdf> (accessed 2/14/2018)

Whereas many classical social democrats supported social democracy as a second-best to socialism proper, but a second-best to be preferred on grounds of feasibility, contemporary liberal egalitarians might be forced to face the dilemma that, even if social democracy is the ideal, political reality might push them in more radical directions (for a congenial view, see Rossi 2015). To put it as clearly as possible: tamed capitalism might be the best (because it balances different values rather than choosing one abother all others), but if taming capital and forcing it to serve public ends is impossible or cannot be a stable equilibrium, liberal egalitarians must choose whether to take a more radical anti-capitalist stand or not.

Solving globalization means embracing public needs over the market

Miriam **Ronzoni**, lecturer in political theory at University of Manchester, **2015**

"How social democrats may become reluctant radicals: Thomas Piketty's Capital and Wolfgang Streeck's Buying Time," European Journal of Political Theory, <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.873.2288&rep=rep1&type=pdf> (accessed 2/14/2018)

It may well be true that we need – roughly speaking – to 'de-globalise': but in order to de-globalise in the right way, we need sufficiently powerful progressive political agents backing up the project. This is crucial if a European Bretton Woods is to play a similar role to the original Bretton Woods and ensure that public ends are prioritised over market openness.

Embracing a political anti-capitalist movement is key to putting egalitarian policies back on the agenda

Miriam **Ronzoni**, lecturer in political theory at University of Manchester, **2015**

"How social democrats may become reluctant radicals: Thomas Piketty's Capital and Wolfgang Streeck's Buying Time," European Journal of Political Theory, <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.873.2288&rep=rep1&type=pdf> (accessed 2/14/2018)

If patrimonial capitalism is back, then surely its determination and capacity to influence political power is too – as Streeck so eloquently argues. And if this is the case, then surely the problem is not to identify the optimal policy, but to think about how to gather the sufficient counter-power to put any progressive policy back on the agenda to begin with. In other words, we need less policy and more politics: the emphasis should be more on political action and political processes than on which cure to put forward once the political power to put forward a cure at all has been achieved.

Capitalism Bad: Pro-Capitalist Evidence Faulty

All “capitalism good” evidence assumes the past; current neoliberal ideology negates any past benefits of capitalism, and serves as a method of imperialist domination of weaker nations

Mohamed **Rabie**, professor of public policy at Ecole de Gouvernance et d'Economie, **2018**

"Capitalism and Democracy," The Global Debt Crisis and Its Socioeconomic Implications,

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mohamed_Rabie6/publication/304717740_Saving_Capitalism_and_Democracy/links/57784d5e08ae4645d61012cb/Saving-Capitalism-and-Democracy.pdf (accessed 2/14/2018)

Capitalism is a system of economic production and management that served many nations well for many decades; it helped economies to grow and opened new opportunities for workers, as it improved the living standards of billions of people worldwide. However, capitalism was hijacked around the middle of the 1980s by the so-called “free market system,” causing traditional capitalism to lose its dynamism and economic and social mission. And under pressure from the United States, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, the free market system was imposed on most other nations, particularly the indebted and poor Third World states. But the prescribed “economic restructuring” programs devised by the IMF to fix the underperforming and stagnating Third World economies have failed; restructuring programs had only negative consequences; they caused the rich to get richer, the poor to get poorer, and national economies to become more dependent on imports, and thus on foreign aid and loans to survive.

Capitalism can’t provide jobs and the means of survival for everyone; pro-capitalist arguments reflect the ingrained consciousness of past economic beliefs

Mohamed **Rabie**, professor of public policy at Ecole de Gouvernance et d'Economie, **2018**

"Capitalism and Democracy," The Global Debt Crisis and Its Socioeconomic Implications,

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mohamed_Rabie6/publication/304717740_Saving_Capitalism_and_Democracy/links/57784d5e08ae4645d61012cb/Saving-Capitalism-and-Democracy.pdf (accessed 2/14/2018)

The Great Recession and the financial crisis of 2008 exposed the limits of the free market system and its many shortcomings; they proved that the system was incapable of creating enough jobs for the unemployed or distributing the fruits of economic growth and scientific knowledge fairly among social classes and nations.

In response to the Great Recession, all affected states used the tools of the classical economic theory to revive their economies. Some states adopted expansionist policies to grow their national economies, which required the borrowing of tens of billions of dollars; others adopted policies to cut spending and reduce budget deficits and restructure their economies to make them more efficient and competitive. However, as will be explained later, both policies have failed to achieve their desired objectives; instead, they caused the public debt of almost all nations to skyrocket. A few years later, the ‘free market’ concept was changed to ‘market capitalism’ in order to keep the name that had acquired a good reputation, while emptying it of its social and economic mission. The positive role which capitalism played in the life of western societies over the last century had caused capitalism to be ingrained in the brains of western people in general and the American people in particular as an integral part of their philosophy and way of life.

Capitalism Bad: Destroys Democracy & Society

Capitalism destroys social responsibility, resulting in poverty, crime, homelessness, drug addiction, and racism—and disrespect for all life

Mohamed **Rabie**, professor of public policy at Ecole de Gouvernance et d'Economie, **2018**

"Capitalism and Democracy," The Global Debt Crisis and Its Socioeconomic Implications,

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mohamed_Rabie6/publication/304717740_Saving_Capitalism_and_Democracy/links/57784d5e08ae4645d61012cb/Saving-Capitalism-and-Democracy.pdf (accessed 2/14/2018)

Under the influence of the free market system, and because of the pressure applied by special interest groups on behalf of the rich, the western welfare state began to retreat. Social responsibility toward the poor and the elderly and even toward the nation at large began to lose its appeal. "The fortunate and the favored, it is more than evident, do not contemplate and respond to their own longer-run well being. Rather, they respond, and powerfully, to immediate comfort and contentment. This is the controlling mood," wrote Galbraith. (Galbraith, The Culture of Contentment 6-7) it is this mood that caused poverty and all of the social ills associated with it such as crime, homelessness, drug addiction, ignorance, racism, violence, and disrespect for human life to spread slowly and become endemic.

Capitalism destroys democracy

Mohamed **Rabie**, professor of public policy at Ecole de Gouvernance et d'Economie, **2018**

"Capitalism and Democracy," The Global Debt Crisis and Its Socioeconomic Implications,

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mohamed_Rabie6/publication/304717740_Saving_Capitalism_and_Democracy/links/57784d5e08ae4645d61012cb/Saving-Capitalism-and-Democracy.pdf (accessed 2/14/2018)

Democracy in the West in general and in the U.S. in particular has largely become a game played by the affluent for their own benefits and according to rules they have developed to exclude others. "The rich and comfortable have influence and money. And they vote. The concerned and the poor have numbers, but many of the poor, alas, do not vote. There is democracy, but in no slight measure, it is a democracy of the fortunate," wrote John Kenneth Galbraith twenty years ago. (Galbraith, Good Society, 8) President Abraham Lincoln said in 1863 that democracy is "government of the people, by the people, for the people," not knowing that it will become within 150 years "government of the rich, by the rich, for the rich." In other words, American democracy has become democracy of the masters, where the masters of society rule unchallenged, and their subjects merely serve. I believe that the old democracy has become a "monecracy," a word coined from democracy and money.

Capitalism Bad: Instability

Capitalism creates instability; pro-capitalist evidence ignores empirics on impacts by covering them up with abstractions

Alan **Cottey**, physicist at University of East Anglia, February 6, **2018**

"Environment change, economy change and reducing conflict at source," AI & Society,

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00146-018-0816-x> (accessed 2/13/2018)

Several decades ago, Hyman Minsky proposed (pp 173–175 of Minsky 1986) that capitalism is inherently prone to financial instability. The FIH (financial instability hypothesis) did not gain much support from orthodox economists until the economic events of 2007 and 2008. Even then, the environmental and ecological limitations did not become salient. There is a chasm between economics-as-usual discourse on stability and the discourse found in environment and ecology oriented studies. One indication of the frustration induced in scholars deeply concerned with the global predicament appears almost at the end (p 210) of 'an environmental history of the Anthropocene since 1945', when the authors (McNeill and Engelke 2014) break from their normal magisterial tone to declare that economists have "jilted reality in favour of a different fantasy, one of ever-more-abstract modelling based on universalizing assumptions of individual behaviour and state conduct, casually ripped from all historical and cultural, not to mention ecological, context."

Economic inequality causes violent rich/poor gaps and makes conflict inevitable

Alan **Cottey**, physicist at University of East Anglia, February 6, **2018**

"Environment change, economy change and reducing conflict at source," AI & Society,

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00146-018-0816-x> (accessed 2/13/2018)

In general, economic inequality fell during the first two-thirds of the last century but then started to rise and in recent decades is rising spectacularly (Dorling 2014; Drèze and Sen 2013). There is a strong polarisation into winners and losers. The recent political discourse (see, for example, Smith 2017) about 'rust belts' and 'left-behind' people is the current expression of a half-century trend. The separation of the rich behind walls and private green belts, the 'squeezing' of the middle class (Ho 2016) and the frustration of the humiliated poor (Laverty and Loach 2016) all contribute to conflict. Extreme inequality is not confined to the richest nations, nor to the West. Forbes Staff (2017) report that in Malaysia, with a population of 31 millions, 12 billionaires have a combined 'net worth' equal to 15% of the country's GDP. And in Nepal, with a population of 29 millions, a single billionaire has a net worth equal to 6% of the country's GDP.

Capitalism Bad: Consumption & Growth

Capitalism requires a model of endless growth and consumption

Alan **Cotley**, physicist at University of East Anglia, February 6, **2018**

"Environment change, economy change and reducing conflict at source," AI & Society,
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00146-018-0816-x> (accessed 2/13/2018)

Against the extreme nature of prolonged exponential growth, faith is placed by economics-as-usual in technical efficiency. Yet in general growth has exceeded technical efficiency gains in the economy-as-usual era. This is the nature of the economy-as-usual, which requires ever-expanding markets (Foster 2000). The 'paradox' that an improvement in the efficiency of processing a resource may lead to an increase, not a decrease, in the use of that resource was noted already by William Stanley Jevons (1865) who observed (for example at p 112) that more efficient steam engines led to a greatly increased consumption of coal.

Limits to capitalist growth are inevitable; the only question is whether this is active or passive change; you should vote for solutions that marshal the human spirit

Alan **Cotley**, physicist at University of East Anglia, February 6, **2018**

"Environment change, economy change and reducing conflict at source," AI & Society,
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00146-018-0816-x> (accessed 2/13/2018)

Conventional language makes the economy-as-usual seem natural and inevitable. Starting from that place, alternative ideas are harder to generate and they seem less practical. Yet the growth argument shows that the economy-as-usual is unsustainable. Radical change will happen, and on a timescale that matters to people living today. Rather than wait passively for the economy-as-usual to fail in a chaotic manner, it is better to marshal human imagination and resourcefulness in consideration of alternative economies, appropriate to the new conditions.

Collapse of Capitalism Inevitable

Capitalism will inevitably collapse; buyout of capital proves

Tom **Embury-Dennis**, economics reporter, October 18, **2017**

"Capitalism is ending because it has made itself obsolete, former Greek finance minister Yannis Varoufakis says," The Independent, <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/yannis-varoufakis-capitalism-ending-obsolete-former-greek-finance-minister-artificial-intelligence-a8006826.html> (accessed 2/12/2018) Former Greek finance minister Yanis Varoufakis has claimed capitalism is coming to an end because it is making itself obsolete. The former economics professor told an audience at University College London that the rise of giant technology corporations and artificial intelligence will cause the current economic system to undermine itself. Mr Varoufakis, who took on EU institutions over Greek debt repayments in 2015, said companies such as Google and Facebook, for the first time ever, are having their capital bought and produced by consumers.

As capitalism collapses, an unprecedented number of jobs will be destroyed

Tom **Embury-Dennis**, economics reporter, October 18, **2017**

"Capitalism is ending because it has made itself obsolete, former Greek finance minister Yannis Varoufakis says," The Independent, <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/yannis-varoufakis-capitalism-ending-obsolete-former-greek-finance-minister-artificial-intelligence-a8006826.html> (accessed 2/12/2018) "So now there is no doubt capital is being socially produced, and the returns are being privatised. This with artificial intelligence is going to be the end of capitalism." Warning Karl Marx "will have his revenge", the 56-year-old said for the first time since capitalism started, new technology "is going to destroy a lot more jobs than it creates".

Answers to “Basic Income Causes Laziness” Arguments

Multiple studies prove the positive effects of dividend income and refute the argument that is causes laziness

Michelle **Chen**, contributing writer for The Nation, August 15, **2017**

"Could Universal Basic Income Work in the US?" The Nation, <https://www.thenation.com/article/could-a-universal-basic-income-work-in-the-us/> (accessed 2/13/2018)

According to a comparative analysis of programs by Ioana Marinescu of the Roosevelt Institute, the data from several UBI pilots in North America show the complex and, overall, positive impact of a social wage. The studies analyzed included the Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend, which redistributes oil revenue through an annual payment to every resident—about \$1,000–\$2,000 annually; the Eastern Band of Cherokees casino-dividend program, which divides income generated from the reservation’s gambling industry and issues payments of several thousand dollars to each member annually; and “negative income tax” programs piloted in select Canadian and US communities in the 1960s and 1970s, in which local authorities provided taxpayer-funded household rebates that covered basic living expenses. Defying the stereotype of beneficiaries spoiled by a nanny state, generally, the RI analysis finds “no effect on labor market supply,” and concludes that “evidence does not suggest an average worker will drop out of the labor force when provided with unconditional cash, even when the transfer is large.”

Empirically dividend income doesn’t decrease employment or decrease work ethic

Michael J. **Coren**, reporter for Quartz Media, February 13, **2018**

"When you give Alaskans a universal basic income, they still keep working," Quartz Media, <https://qz.com/1205591/a-universal-basic-income-experiment-in-alaska-shows-employment-didnt-drop/> (accessed 2/14/2018)

The study examining the Alaska Permanent Fund calls this into question. The \$60.1-billion state fund, established in 1976, collects revenue from Alaska’s oil and mineral leases to fund an annual stipend to Alaskans. Since 1982, the fund has sent a dividend check to every Alaskan resident. In recent years, its been up to \$2,072 per person, or \$8,288 for a family of four (it was reduced in 2016 amid a budget crisis). Alaska’s system set up an ideal experiment. Researchers from the University of Chicago and the University of Pennsylvania compared residents’ behavior before and after the dividend to decide what effect the payments had on workforce participation. They found that full-time employment did not change at all, and the share of Alaskans who worked part-time jobs increased by 17%.

The negative assumes people have to be forced to work.

The affirmative argument is that this mindset is part of the problem: work is conceived as a penance or something we have to do, rather than creative energy to build the world we want. Basic income changes this paradigm.

Answers to “Stops People from Working” Arguments

Basic income is not welfare but an investment in human cooperation and creativity

Michel **Bauwens**, Belgian Peer-to-Peer theorist at P2P foundation, **2008**

"Notes on the horizontality of peer to peer relationships in the context of the verticality of a hierarchy of values," Pursuing the Common Good: How Solidarity and Subsidiarity Can Work Together Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences, Acta 14, Vatican City, <http://www.pass.va/content/dam/scienze-sociali/pdf/acta14/acta14-bauwens.pdf> (accessed 2/13/2018)

Such a basic income should not be seen as welfare, but as recognition by society and the market that social innovation has become the primary vehicle for value creation, and it would, in a transitory period, allow citizens to move more easily in and out of the market sphere, and manage their careers over the longer term, so that periods of peer production could be more easily inserted. Europe is already moving in that direction, through transitional labour market policies being developed in various countries, but it is still based on the premise that transitional periods are less productive than formal labour, while the new emerging realities point to the opposite, namely that value creation is highest through peer production, and not in the market sphere, which is becoming increasingly derivate vis-à-vis social innovation in the P2P sphere.

Iran experiment proves basic income increases rather than decreases incentives to work

Jeff **Ihaza**, writer for GQ and other magazines, May 31, **2018**

"Here's what happened when Iran introduced a basic income," The Outline,

<https://theoutline.com/post/1613/iran-introduces-basic-income?zd=1&zi=cvaqrzqd> (accessed 2/12/2018)

In 2011, in response to heavy cuts to oil and bread subsidies, Iran implemented a program that guaranteed citizens cash payments of 29 percent of the nation's median income. Now, six years later, the results of that measure were released in a report by economists Djavad Salehi-Isfahani and Mohammad H. Mostafavi-Dehzoefrom for the Economic Research Forum. The report found no evidence for the idea that people will work less under a universal income, and found that in some cases, like in the service industry, people worked more, expanding their businesses or pursuing more satisfying lines of work.

People stop working or trying to work when they lose hope—not when their lives are hopeful.

Multiple studies conclude that providing support incentivizes people to make a greater effort to be productive in society.

Answers to “Markets Good” Arguments

The market can't adjust to social evolution; it doesn't truly reward creativity and destroys solidarity

Michel **Bauwens**, Belgian Peer-to-Peer theorist at P2P foundation, **2008**

"Notes on the horizontality of peer to peer relationships in the context of the verticality of a hierarchy of values," Pursuing the Common Good: How Solidarity and Subsidiarity Can Work Together Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences, Acta 14, Vatican City, <http://www.pass.va/content/dam/scienze-sociali/pdf/acta14/acta14-bauwens.pdf> (accessed 2/13/2018)

This poses not just a problem for the individual, but for society, as it creates a 'crisis of value' for present market society. Indeed, as increasing numbers of individuals choose passionate production, and the infrastructure for peer production continues to improve, the ability to directly create use value increases exponentially, but the ability of the market to monetize such social utility only rises linearly, creating a huge gap between the desire and potential for peer production, and the ability of individuals to sustain such choices. This is, in our opinion, one of the constitutive causes of precarity and precariousness amongst the new generations.

We need a new mechanism of solidarity that transcends markets

Michel **Bauwens**, Belgian Peer-to-Peer theorist at P2P foundation, **2008**

"Notes on the horizontality of peer to peer relationships in the context of the verticality of a hierarchy of values," Pursuing the Common Good: How Solidarity and Subsidiarity Can Work Together Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences, Acta 14, Vatican City, <http://www.pass.va/content/dam/scienze-sociali/pdf/acta14/acta14-bauwens.pdf> (accessed 2/13/2018)

Society therefore needs a new mechanism of solidarity, but which cannot be a monetization based on profit-sharing, as this would simply 'crowd out' the willingness for non-reciprocal contributions. The solution then, would seem to be very similar to the one familiar to the Catholic Church in the Middle Ages, when nearly one quarter of the male population was supported in their spiritual production, through gifts to the Church. In contemporary terms this would mean a unconditional form of support in the form of a basic income.

Market logic can't adequately measure social utility.

Since not all productive or necessary work creates short-term profit, the market excludes all kinds of necessary work like caregiving. Basic income solves this by rewarding work that meets needs, not just work that generates shareholder profit.

Answers to “Marxism/Socialism Oppressive” Arguments

Opponents of capitalism aren’t just Marxists and hardcore socialists

Rafael **Behr**, Guardian columnist, January 23, **2018**

"Even at Davos, capitalism’s critics are now centre stage," The Guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/jan/23/davos-capitalism-corbynites> (accessed 2/13/2018)

To develop the analogy further, capiscepticism’s relationship to hardline Marxism is rather like the relationship between Euroscepticism and Ukip-style xenophobic nationalism. There is overlap. But there are also adherents of the former view who despise the latter. They are offended when critics lump them together. Just as remainers did their cause no favours by depicting every leaver as a Farage-fancying maniac, today’s defenders of free markets are wrong to treat capisceptic voters as hollow-eyed, Lenin-loving cultists.

Basic income solves threats to democracy by tying public influence to citizenship rather than wealth

Ewan **McGaughey**, lecturer in law at King's College, **2018**

"Will Robots Automate Your Job Away? Full Employment, Basic Income, and Economic Democracy," Centre for Business Research, University of Cambridge, Working Paper no. 496, https://www.cbr.cam.ac.uk/fileadmin/user_upload/centre-for-business-research/downloads/working-papers/wp496.pdf (accessed 2/13/2018)

The progressive democratisation of the economy will mean both a reduction in the extremes of income inequality, and an end to investment volatility. With votes at work,²³⁷ staff will no longer tolerate directors who keep paying themselves more,²³⁸ as everyone else’s income declines. With votes on capital, through democratic (and diversified) pension funds, it will no longer be possible for asset managers and banks to use their conflicted positions to inflate their salaries on ‘other people’s money’.²³⁹ With votes as a citizen, the long-term customers of networked services will no longer be exploited for their private data or held like hostages with no other train to catch. Most crucially, as the votes in the economy come to reflect people’s real preferences (not what a tiny handful of billionaires, board members and banks prefer) the patterns of investment will reflect long-term sustainable objectives (not quarterly profits and a golden parachute before a slump). People will want to see their savings used to maintain full employment, social justice and a living planet. The private sector’s short-term volatility will disappear. As countries around the world develop their own models of economic democracy, trade will become regular, stable and just.

Basic income isn’t Marxist or socialist.

Some of the leading proponents of UBI are libertarians and fiscal conservatives. If you find Marxism distasteful, vote affirmative, because basic income brings together a broad non-Marxist coalition of conservatives and liberals to solve the problems of capitalism without a communist revolution.

Answers to “Means Testing/Just Helping Poor is Better” Arguments

Limiting aid to poor causes stigmatization and fails to gain equality and efficiency impacts

Steven **Strehl**, Platform Engineer and Digital Campaigner at Mein Grundeinkommen, January 15, **2018**

"HOW UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME CAN CHANGE THE WAY WE THINK ABOUT WORK (AND MONEY),"

Ouishare, <http://magazine.ouishare.net/2018/01/how-basic-income-can-change-the-way-we-think-about-work-and-money/> (accessed 2/14/2018)

The first thing is that targeting ‘poor people’, whatever that means, would make basic income a marker in society that you do not have enough money, so it is discriminating. The second thing is that you would need an administration to define parameters of poverty. The problem is that poverty can be a very personal feeling, that depends on more things than just net income. Moreover, the idea of not having any administration to redistribute the money, but just give 1.000 Euros to everyone in society is the most cost-efficient and money saving as well.

Only universal distribution gains benefits and solves stigmatization and inequality

Tony **Mecia**, senior writer at Weekly Standard, February 10, **2018**

"The Case for Free Money," The Weekly Standard, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/the-case-for-free-money/article/2011427> (accessed 2/14/2018)

With such high costs associated with a basic income program, it might seem logical to limit the payouts of money to those who need it. Why give \$1,000 a month to Jeff Bezos, Warren Buffett, and millions of others who are thriving economically? Advocates insist that the idea works only if everybody receives the money. This is not charity. It is an equitable way to compensate everybody for being part of a wealthy society. And as a practical matter, it greatly simplifies the distribution of money, with no applications or income tests. It also removes any stigma attached to receiving government benefits and limits the disincentive to work that comes with benefits tied to income thresholds.

Non-universal approaches always cause somebody to fall through the cracks, or somebody to feel left out.

UBI solves this by making everyone a stakeholder in the distribution of surplus income. This accelerates solvency by building solidarity and eliminating divisions.

Answers to “Welfare Proves Basic Income is Bad” Arguments

Findings from research on normal welfare don't apply

Brett **Watson**, post-doctoral researcher in economics at University of Alaska, et al, January 23, **2018**

"Behavioral Effects of a Cash Transfer: Evidence from the World's Only Continuous Universal Income Program," Researchgate.net,

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Matthew_Reimer2/publication/322665448_Behavioral_Effects_of_a_Cash_Transfer_Evidence_from_the_World%27s_Only_Continuous_Universal_Income_Program/links/5a678a870f7e9b76ea8f030a/Behavioral-Effects-of-a-Cash-Transfer-Evidence-from-the-Worlds-Only-Continuous-Universal-Income-Program.pdf (accessed 2/13/2018)

The results of this comparison provide quantitative evidence about the fundamentally different nature of universal payments from payments such as food stamps or social security that have been the subject of many past studies. As such, generalizing the findings of conditional, non-universal, and in-kind transfer literature to more universal payments may be problematic due to the differences in the average recipients' response.

UBI is distinct from other aid and those arguments don't apply: broader socioeconomic inclusion, more money going into the economy, no restrictions on spending

Brett **Watson**, post-doctoral researcher in economics at University of Alaska, et al, January 23, **2018**

"Behavioral Effects of a Cash Transfer: Evidence from the World's Only Continuous Universal Income Program," Researchgate.net,

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Matthew_Reimer2/publication/322665448_Behavioral_Effects_of_a_Cash_Transfer_Evidence_from_the_World%27s_Only_Continuous_Universal_Income_Program/links/5a678a870f7e9b76ea8f030a/Behavioral-Effects-of-a-Cash-Transfer-Evidence-from-the-Worlds-Only-Continuous-Universal-Income-Program.pdf (accessed 2/13/2018)

UBI cash transfers are distinct from previously studied payment types in at least three respects. First, a broader and more diverse socioeconomic group is receiving the transfer. This distinction is important for considering behavioral effects beyond segments of the population previously considered, such as the elderly (pension/social security payments) or low-income earners (welfare payments), which likely differ in their consumption behaviors from those of different ages or income levels. Second, the entire population is receiving an income payment and thus a greater amount of money has the potential to “hit the street” at once.¹ This distinction is important for considering behavioral effects induced by broader economic spillovers from a large, economy-wide cash injection. Third, there are no restrictions on how the payments are spent by the recipients, which is important to consider if in-kind cash transfers, such as food stamp (SNAP) payments, limit the ways in which recipients can respond to the transfer. Altogether, the distinct nature of UBI may induce different behavioral responses to cash transfers than those estimated in previous studies.

UBI is a rejection of traditional welfare.

Basic income rejects complicated or alienating qualification tests and paternalistic guidelines on how aid is to be spent. Also, more money hits the streets, meaning a faster stimulation of the economy.

Answers to “Basic Income = Unfair Taxation” Arguments

Basic income tax regime can be made fair

Ewan **McGaughey**, lecturer in law at King's College, **2018**

"Will Robots Automate Your Job Away? Full Employment, Basic Income, and Economic Democracy," Centre for Business Research, University of Cambridge, Working Paper no. 496,

https://www.cbr.cam.ac.uk/fileadmin/user_upload/centre-for-business-research/downloads/working-papers/wp496.pdf (accessed 2/13/2018)

The credible forms of basic income proposal (indeed, the only credible proposals) understand in detail behavioural psychology, tax and welfare law.²⁴⁶ In fact, introducing a ‘personal allowance’ in social security taxes (so that contributions are only made after a threshold) has the same economic effect as a basic income transfer for an employed person, but without the subsidy effect for employers.²⁴⁷ It also negates the bureaucracy. An essential principle, which upholds the universal right to ‘just and favourable remuneration’,²⁴⁸ is that tax is levied proportionately to the means to pay. For everyone not paying income tax the legal right to income replacement, by auto-enrolment, would mean a tremendous advance in social prosperity. Most importantly, it would help ensure incomes are not just basic, but fair.

It’s fair to make most successful corporate actors pay

Ewan **McGaughey**, lecturer in law at King's College, **2018**

"Will Robots Automate Your Job Away? Full Employment, Basic Income, and Economic Democracy," Centre for Business Research, University of Cambridge, Working Paper no. 496,

https://www.cbr.cam.ac.uk/fileadmin/user_upload/centre-for-business-research/downloads/working-papers/wp496.pdf (accessed 2/13/2018)

Though personifying robots is tempting, this should be seen as a call for corporations and the rich to pay a fair share of tax. If a future Bill or Melinda Gates profits from labour displacing technology, they should pay more in income and capital gains tax. A future Microsoft should pay more in corporate tax, because their profits bear some relation to their work, more to luck, and most to legal support.²⁵⁸ A basic principle of tax policy is to pay tax on wealth in whatever form that wealth is held. So taxes should not be hypothecated to specific computers or robots, instead of all asset owners paying their fair share. If everyone contributes proportionately to their means, there will be a truly ‘sharing economy.’

The social benefits of basic income outweigh the perceptions of unfair taxation

Basic income solves alienation and inequality on several levels; affirmative evidence suggests that the impacts of social dislocation, poor health, community collapse, are all very severe. There’s no terminal impact to unfair taxation.

Negative Evidence

Basic Income Bad: Hurts the Poor

UBI transfers funds from poor and vulnerable populations to privileged ones

Robert **Rector** and Mimi **Teixeira**, research fellows at Heritage Foundation, February 14, **2018**

"Universal Basic Income Harms Recipients and Increases Dependence on Government,"

<https://www.heritage.org/sites/default/files/2018-02/IB4817.pdf> (accessed 2/14/2018)

Additionally, a comprehensive UBI policy would: Transfer funds away from the vulnerable to affluent persons capable of self-support. A comprehensive UBI policy directs money to those who do not need it, including relatively affluent families and young adults without dependents.

UBI decreases aid to the poor and spreads it around to those who don't need it—this ends up being a regressive policy for those in poverty

Austan **Goosbee**, professor at University of Chicago Booth School of Business, **2017**

"Public Policy in an AI Economy," Chapter in forthcoming NBER book Economics of Artificial Intelligence, Ajay

K. Agrawal, Joshua Gans, and Avi Goldfarb, editors; Conference held September 13-14, 2017,

<http://www.nber.org/chapters/c14030.pdf> (accessed 2/13/2018)

Second, for a given amount of money to be used on redistribution, UBI likely shifts money away from the very poor. In other words, if you have \$50B to alleviate poverty, the targeting approach followed in most countries today might use the \$50B to help the poorest/sickest 25m people and give them the equivalent of \$25,000 of benefits each. With a broad-based UBI, the same \$50B would be spread over many more people.

It might involve 100m people getting \$5000 each, say. Perhaps a UBI could change the total taste for redistribution in a society—leaving the most disadvantaged people with the same amount and upping the total amount spent—but for the UBI to not end up more regressive than the current system necessarily entails greater amounts of public funds.

UBI would undermine compassion for the poor by highlighting people's freedom to blow the money they receive, encouraging institutions to turn away those who suffer

Austan **Goosbee**, professor at University of Chicago Booth School of Business, **2017**

"Public Policy in an AI Economy," Chapter in forthcoming NBER book Economics of Artificial Intelligence, Ajay

K. Agrawal, Joshua Gans, and Avi Goldfarb, editors; Conference held September 13-14, 2017,

<http://www.nber.org/chapters/c14030.pdf> (accessed 2/13/2018)

Third, the conception of the UBI as a replacement for a myriad of other in-kind transfers and safety net programs seems not to pay much mind to the origins of that safety net. Fundamentally, the in-kind safety net exists today because rich societies are fundamentally not comfortable with letting people come to the hospital and be turned away to die because they don't have money or letting kids go hungry because their parents do not have the money to feed them, and so on. Converting things to a UBI and getting rid of the in-kind safety net will lead to a situation in which, even if among a small share of UBI recipients, SOME people will blow their money in unsympathetic ways—gambling, drugs, junk food, Ponzi schemes, whatever. And now those people will come to the emergency room or their kids will be hungry and by the rules, they will be out of luck. That's what they were supposed to have used their UBI for. That society has an in-kind safety net now in order to avoid this circumstance makes me think that enforcing "UBI-discipline" and replacing the safety net with a straight transfer would require extraordinary changes in how society functions.

Basic Income Bad: Hurts Women and Immigrants

Basic income disempowers women and refugees because cultural pressures will discourage them from participating in labor and public life

Anke **Hassel**, Professor of Public Policy at the Hertie School of Governance and Academic Director of the Hans Böckler Foundation's Institute of Economic and Social Research, January 23, **2018**

"Basic income's biggest losers," International Politics and Society, <http://www.ips-journal.eu/in-focus/basic-income/article/show/basic-incomes-biggest-losers-2536/> (accessed 2/14/2018)

As with women, offering immigrants and refugees an unconditional basic income would have some serious knock-on effects. Employment rates would rise more slowly. Women in particular would face pressure to stay at home rather than go to work. This would adversely affect their children's performance at school, while their own language acquisition and social mobility would suffer. Instead of achieving its stated aim of greater social justice, a universal basic income would marginalise those groups that already struggle to get a good job – women and migrants.

Basic income will pressure women to leave the work force, disempowering them and increasing gender inequality

Luke **Martinelli**, Institute for Policy Research Associate, University of Bath, September **2017**

"Assessing the Case for a Universal Basic Income in the UK," IPR Policy Brief, http://www.bath.ac.uk/publications/assessing-the-case-for-a-universal-basic-income-in-the-uk/attachments/basic_income_policy_brief.pdf (accessed 2/13/2018)

Following Van Parijs and Vanderborght (ibid.), women are another potential constituency of support; to the extent that they are involved disproportionately in low-paid and part-time employment and unpaid care, UBI would "reduce the pro-male bias in the distribution of earnings and of social insurance benefits". But as well as not representing all women (in the sense that some women do not identify as such or oppose the gendered division of labour per se), even the feminist movement is not unambiguously in favour of basic income. Feminist critics (e.g. Gheaus, 2008) have argued that given women's already weaker attachment to the labour market, it is women and not men who would withdraw from the labour market to do more domestic and care work. Thus, an unconditional income paid to men and women alike might reinforce existing gender roles, exacerbating issues relating to dependence, intra-household inequality, and labour market disadvantage.

Basic Income Bad: Capitalism Link Turns

UBI promotes individualism and capitalism, ignores underlying causes of poverty, and diverts from better collective solutions

Anna **Coote**, head of social policy for the New Economics Foundation, February 14, **2018**

"Don't Buy The Hype, Universal Basic Income Won't Tackle Poverty Or Inequality," Huffington Post, https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/opinion-coote-universal-basic-income_us_5a830188e4b01467fcf1df2f (accessed 2/14/2018)

UBI is an individualistic, monetary intervention that undermines social solidarity and fails to tackle the underlying causes of poverty, unemployment and inequality. These are systemic problems that need to be addressed by people getting together and building shared control over local economic development, wage bargaining and decisions about national investment in industry and infrastructure, not by governments giving individuals small amounts of money.

Basic Income Bad: Capitalism Link Turns

UBI is merely giving poor people an allowance so they won't revolt against the rich

Michael K. **Spencer**, futurist at The Journal Blog, January 15, **2018**

"How Basic Income is an Automation Economy Fraud," Medium,

https://medium.com/@Michael_Spencer/how-basic-income-is-an-automation-economy-fraud-b9873359584f (accessed 2/13/2018)

Make no mistake, UBI is the greedy man's solution to wealth inequality. Give the peasants a minimum allowance so they don't shoot the bourgeoisie. History repeats itself unless you found a new system that's in sync with the values of young people. You cannot decouple income from work unless you build a new more ethical system than Capitalism and the current system where privilege belongs to less than 1% of the population.

UBI is a conservative response to problems needing radical solutions—it creates further labor instability and is an attempt to soften the impacts of neoliberal capitalism

Daniel **Zamora**, postdoctoral sociologist at the Université Libre de Bruxelles and Cambridge University, January 17, **2018**

"The Case Against a Basic Income," Black Agenda Report, <https://www.blackagendareport.com/case-against-basic-income> (accessed 2/13/2018)

Paradoxically, then, UBI seems to be a crisis demand, brandished in moments of social retreat and austerity. As politics moves to the right and social movements go on the defensive, UBI gains ground. The more social gains seem unreachable, the more UBI makes sense. It's what botanists would call a "bioindicator": it indexes neoliberalism's progress. Support for basic incomes proliferates where neoliberal reforms have been the most devastating. In this sense, UBI isn't an alternative to neoliberalism, but an ideological capitulation to it. In fact, the most viable forms of basic income would universalize precarious labor and extend the sphere of the market — just as the gurus of Silicon Valley hope.

Basic Income Bad: Discourages Work

UBI will discourage employment and productivity

Austan **Goalsbee**, professor at University of Chicago Booth School of Business, **2017**

"Public Policy in an AI Economy," Chapter in forthcoming NBER book Economics of Artificial Intelligence, Ajay K. Agrawal, Joshua Gans, and Avi Goldfarb, editors; Conference held September 13-14, 2017, <http://www.nber.org/chapters/c14030.pdf> (accessed 2/13/2018)

First, if you accept the economists' basic labor supply model (that people value leisure and, at least in most cases, need to be paid to work) then there are likely to be some sizable number of people who are working only because they absolutely have to. In a world where AI induced unemployment is already high, separating work and income is an advantage. In a world like the one we are in now, offering a basic income will likely cause a sizable drop in labor market participation by low wage groups. To the extent that non-participation in exactly that segment of the labor force is already viewed as a problem, the UBI would likely make things worse.

Basic Income Bad: Drug Morbidity

Basic income will cause overall increase in drug use and drug morbidity

Brett **Watson**, post-doctoral researcher in economics at University of Alaska, et al, January 23, **2018**

"Behavioral Effects of a Cash Transfer: Evidence from the World's Only Continuous Universal Income Program," Researchgate.net,

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Matthew_Reimer2/publication/322665448_Behavioral_Effects_of_a_Cash_Transfer_Evidence_from_the_World%27s_Only_Continuous_Universal_Income_Program/links/5a678a870f7e9b76ea8f030a/Behavioral-Effects-of-a-Cash-Transfer-Evidence-from-the-Worlds-Only-Continuous-Universal-Income-Program.pdf (accessed 2/13/2018)

We examine the behavioral responses to a cash transfer using the world's only continuous universal income program, Alaska's Permanent Fund Dividend, using the universe of police call-logs for the state's largest city, Anchorage. Our findings provide several new insights for the impact of cash transfers on the behavior of recipients. We show that the recipient population is responsive to an unconditional and anticipated income receipt across several dimensions of interest. We find an increase in police calls associated with abuse of controlled substances that last approximately two weeks after the distribution. During the same period, we observe decreases in property crimes. These effects, unlike some previous findings, are not followed by subsequent declines, indicating an overall net positive (negative) effect on substance abuse (property crime), as opposed to a displacement effect. Our substance abuse results confirm the mechanisms underlying previous work that finds increases in substance abuse-related morbidity and mortality following cash transfers from SSI and welfare programs (Dobkin and Puller, 2007; Riddell and Riddell, 2006).

Basic Income Bad: Poverty

UBI increases inequality and poverty, and makes billionaires richer

Ian **Goldin**, Professor of Globalization and Development at Oxford University, February 11, **2018**

"Five Reasons Why Universal Basic Income is a Bad Idea," Financial Times,

<https://www.ft.com/content/100137b4-0cdf-11e8-bacb-2958fde95e5e> (accessed 2/13/2018)

Second, UBI will lead to higher inequality and poverty. It typically aims to replace existing unemployment and other benefits with a simple universal grant. As shown by the OECD, the Paris-based club of mostly rich nations, by reallocating welfare payments from targeted transfers (such as unemployment, disability or housing benefits) to a generalised transfer to everyone, the amount that goes to the most deserving is lower. Billionaires get a little more.

No guarantee that basic income will address the level of structural unemployment we're about to experience

Michael K. **Spencer**, futurist at The Journal Blog, January 15, **2018**

"How Basic Income is an Automation Economy Fraud," Medium,

https://medium.com/@Michael_Spencer/how-basic-income-is-an-automation-economy-fraud-b9873359584f (accessed 2/13/2018)

Support for traditional Capitalism has never been lower in the United States. Silicon Valley and publications like the World Economic Forum push "Basic Income" as some save all sell-all solution to the unemployment crisis and the Middle class handling of impending job automation. But there's some research that supports the idea that neither job-retraining or basic income can work on the scale of unemployment we are going to witness in the next forty years. Too many of the experiments with UBI today are nothing much more than publicity stunts. We know that several tech Billionaires support the idea of a UBI. That in itself should be a red flag to all of us.

Basic Income Bad: Disempowers Workers

UBI will spur weakened labor regulations and disempower workers

Daniel **Zamora**, postdoctoral sociologist at the Université Libre de Bruxelles and Cambridge University, January 17, **2018**

"The Case Against a Basic Income," Black Agenda Report, <https://www.blackagendareport.com/case-against-basic-income> (accessed 2/13/2018)

If UBI does take shape, current power relations will favor those who have economic power and want to profit by weakening the existing system of social protection and labor market regulations. Who will decide the monthly amount and who will dictate its terms and condition? Who do today's power relations favor? Certainly not the worker.

UBI causes pacification and political disempowerment

Ben **Kunkler**, PhD Candidate in Writing at the University of Melbourne, February 7, **2018**

"Against a universal basic income," Overland, <https://overland.org.au/2018/02/against-universal-basic-income/> (accessed 2/13/2018)

UBI pacifies a propertyless mass, encouraging agnosticism toward a state that underwrites property relations as they currently stand. Where Daniel Ravetos argues that UBI could act as a wealth reserve for strike action, it could just as easily signal the death knell of a weak union movement in Australia. Here, a UBI would come at a historical juncture when the Hawke-Keating centralisation of the union movement, in 'consensus' with the state's apparatuses, has severely weakened it. Where strike action must be legal, where union density is dipping below fifteen per cent, where what is 'legal' strike action has become more and more narrowly defined by the state apparatus, where the 'uberisation' of the workforce is becoming the norm, it's difficult to see how UBI wouldn't just render workers further disempowered and apathetic. (Witness the choice of the Fair Work Commission to suspend the proposed twenty-four-hour strike scheduled for a Monday by Sydney and NSW train drivers).

Basic Income Bad: No Solvency, Destroys Governments

No solvency, ever: UBI will just force land prices to increase, offsetting any gains in income

Emily **Sims**, researcher for Prosper Australia Research Institute, February 14, **2018**

"Why universal basic income will fail," Prosper.org, <https://www.prosper.org.au/2018/02/14/why-universal-basic-income-will-fail/> (accessed 2/14/2018)

In a country where the rent is collected on behalf of the community, UBI becomes everyone's birth right. You see echoes of this in places like Norway and Alaska which collect oil rents on behalf of the community and hold them in trust in perpetuity, and can afford to pay citizens an annual dividend. Under our present system of land monopoly capitalism, UBI will simply raise the price of land everywhere. So what is gained in income is lost through higher rents. In fact, a UBI will ultimately end up being a massive transfer of wealth from taxpayers to landowners.

Basic income won't solve poverty—gains are minimal even at 6.5 percent of GDP spent

Daniel **Zamora**, postdoctoral sociologist at the Université Libre de Bruxelles and Cambridge University, January 17, **2018**

"The Case Against a Basic Income," Black Agenda Report, <https://www.blackagendareport.com/case-against-basic-income> (accessed 2/13/2018)

Despite the fiscal effort that would go into implementing the new system — 6.5 percent of GDP, or nearly twice the share of GDP that the US currently spends on its military — the results are rather disappointing. Child poverty shrinks from 16 to 9 percent, but for working-age people it decreases less than 2 points (13.9 to 12 percent), and among pensioners it declines only 1 point (14.9 to 14.1 percent). The considerable sum of money mobilized has only a modest effect on poverty and doesn't specifically benefit those who need it most. As economist Ian Gough writes, the idea looks like "a powerful new tax engine" that "pull[s] along a tiny cart."

Basic Income Bad: No Solvency

Basic income will require the defunding of the rest of the government

Daniel **Zamora**, postdoctoral sociologist at the Université Libre de Bruxelles and Cambridge University, January 17, **2018**

"The Case Against a Basic Income," Black Agenda Report, <https://www.blackagendareport.com/case-against-basic-income> (accessed 2/13/2018)

No existing economy can pay for a generous basic income without defunding everything else. We would either have to settle for the minimalist version — whose effects would be highly suspect — or we'd have to eliminate all other social expenditures, in effect creating Milton Friedman's paradise. Faced with these facts, we should question UBI's rationality; as Luke Martinelli put it: "an affordable UBI is inadequate, and an adequate UBI is unaffordable."

Current welfare system reduces inequality and provide more value for the money than privatized services that would follow basic income

Anna **Coote**, head of social policy for the New Economics Foundation, February 14, **2018**

"Don't Buy The Hype, Universal Basic Income Won't Tackle Poverty Or Inequality," Huffington Post, https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/opinion-coote-universal-basic-income_us_5a830188e4b01467fcf1df2f (accessed 2/14/2018)

One of the most dangerous aspects of this "radical" idea is that it can help to dismantle welfare states — both by supporting the ideology of privatization and monetization, and by draining huge amounts of money from the public purse. But collectively provided public services, available to all according to need, give far better value for money than commercialized services. They are more likely to be inclusive and egalitarian, and to encourage solidarity. They represent a very substantial virtual income that is also highly redistributive. It is estimated that this "social wage" reduces income inequality by 20 percent.

Basic Income Bad: Will Fail

Basic income is massively expensive and provides only minimal benefits over the status quo

Dan **McGee**, Canadian writer on economics, March 12, **2017**

"A Liberal Case Against Universal Basic Income," Medium, <https://medium.com/@danmcgee/a-liberal-case-against-universal-basic-income-5aa6d2399af5> (accessed 2/13/2018)

First, basic income programs are expensive. A benefit of \$1000 per month to each American over 18, approximately 240 million people, would cost \$240 billion per month or \$2.88 trillion per year. By comparison, total consolidated (federal, state, and local) American welfare spending is \$2.7 trillion per year, including all Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, family and child support, unemployment insurance, and housing support. Therefore, even if the government eliminated all other welfare spending, it would need to raise new taxes or cut non-welfare spending to pay \$1000 per month. This expenditure would help beneficiaries, but less than basic income's proponents claim. Per the Bureau of Labor Statistics, average monthly household expenditures on shelter are \$840, comprising rent payments and mortgage payments, but excluding utilities. Thus, the complete elimination of every other form of welfare would suffice to cover each adult's housing costs. Even accounting for shared housing among families, covering housing and utilities alone would still cost \$1.7 trillion.

Basic income will fail because governments will be unable to maintain its political support

Dan **McGee**, Canadian writer on economics, March 12, **2017**

"A Liberal Case Against Universal Basic Income," Medium, <https://medium.com/@danmcgee/a-liberal-case-against-universal-basic-income-5aa6d2399af5> (accessed 2/13/2018)

Per public choice economics, a small group of people, each receiving a large benefit or facing a large cost, will be more motivated to advocate for themselves than a large group of people, each receiving a small benefit or facing a small cost. Since the idea behind a basic income program is that there are more net beneficiaries than net contributors, unlike traditional welfare programs, the net contributors may be highly motivated to oppose steep tax increases to fund the program.

Basic Income Bad: Will Fail

Basic income turns humans into sheep and will eventually run out of productive workers to subsidize it

Mark **Kincheloe**, financial analyst, February 17, **2017**

"A Universal Basic Income is Not the Solution," Singularity Weblog, <https://www.singularityweblog.com/a-universal-basic-income-is-not-the-solution/> (accessed 2/13/2018)

Humans should never be relegated to the equivalent of a heard of sheep being corralled and controlled by a tiny portion of the government and corporate elite who pay them off with a small paycheck each month. Any member of society is capable of transforming their life to new heights as well as the lives of many others if they are motivated and driven by earning a living and being a productive member of society. Some people who would take the small check and start a business, engage in other productive forms of self-employment, or work part-time depending on their situation. There would also be far too many people who would simply take the government handout and sit in front of a TV all day or go fishing or engage in some other leisurely activity that would not add much value to the general economy. As the years went by, fewer and fewer people would engage in meaningful occupations creating a larger pool of people requiring small monthly checks which would create a greater strain on the tax-payer funded entitlement program. The pool of tax-payers funding the program would dwindle each year, eventually leading to insolvency. Then where would we be? Does Greece ring a bell? Only this time – Imagine Greece on a global scale, with no entity large enough to bail out a multitrillion dollar welfare system.

No support for basic income: it's seen as anti-community and weakens collective action, violates widespread notions of fairness

Luke **Martinelli**, Institute for Policy Research Associate, University of Bath, September **2017**

"Assessing the Case for a Universal Basic Income in the UK," IPR Policy Brief, http://www.bath.ac.uk/publications/assessing-the-case-for-a-universal-basic-income-in-the-uk/attachments/basic_income_policy_brief.pdf (accessed 2/13/2018)

According to Pearce (2015), communitarians are distrustful of UBI precisely because it carries with it the potential to weaken collective and civic institutions and social bonds: it is seen to (further) diminish the concept of reciprocity on which social security has traditionally been based, and – whether warranted or not – it has become connected to conservative agendas of welfare spending cuts, 'laissez-faire' labour market policies, and the erosion and privatisation of public services. The implications of this critique are quite profound, and certainly seriously limit the political feasibility of UBI – for although the political philosophical concept of communitarianism may be fairly unfamiliar to the layperson, the ideas it conveys are not. Across the left-right spectrum, we encounter the widespread perception that 'fairness' requires that rights are coupled with responsibilities, perhaps the most important of which is the responsibility of those who are able to work.

Basic Income Bad: Hurts Disabled

Basic income leaves disabled people at a disadvantage and doesn't efficiently allocate resources

Luke **Martinelli**, Institute for Policy Research Associate, University of Bath, September **2017**

"Assessing the Case for a Universal Basic Income in the UK," IPR Policy Brief,

http://www.bath.ac.uk/publications/assessing-the-case-for-a-universal-basic-income-in-the-uk/attachments/basic_income_policy_brief.pdf (accessed 2/13/2018)

In the case of the latter, even if UBI were an effective means of redistributing income and therefore promoting greater equality of resources – as is claimed, for example due to improved 'target efficiency' and the removal of poverty and unemployment traps that disproportionately affect the poor, as discussed below – it does not follow that UBI would be an effective means to equalise welfare or opportunity, since those with more extensive needs (for example arising from disability) would be disadvantaged. Furthermore, egalitarianism is usually concerned with equalising individuals' opportunities to attain a given level of income or welfare in the context of "undeserved bad luck – being born with poor native endowments, bad parents, and disagreeable personalities, suffering from accidents and illness, and so forth" (Anderson, 1999) – but acknowledges that work effort should be recognised and rewarded. It is therefore consistent with the conception of equality which considers that resources and welfare should vary in proportion to 'deserts'; this idea appears to conflict with UBI's unconditional (and non-reciprocal) character.

Basic Income Bad: Hurts Workers

Basic income undermines worker solidarity, entrenches low pay and bad working conditions

Luke **Martinelli**, Institute for Policy Research Associate, University of Bath, September **2017**

"Assessing the Case for a Universal Basic Income in the UK," IPR Policy Brief,

http://www.bath.ac.uk/publications/assessing-the-case-for-a-universal-basic-income-in-the-uk/attachments/basic_income_policy_brief.pdf (accessed 2/13/2018)

Furthermore, because of the way that a basic income would strengthen the hand of heterogeneously-advantaged workers unequally, it might drive "a wedge in between different workers' factions, thereby harming collective solidarity in ways that are particularly damaging to vulnerable workers" (ibid.: 8). The lack of an exit option for such workers, and their weak bargaining position with respect to employers, means that basic income could end up exacerbating poor pay and conditions if other workers were willing to reduce their wage demands as a result of the unconditional payment. Thus as Parker (1991) notes there is the danger that basic income "would aggravate the problem of low pay and subsidise inefficient employers" (Parker, 1991: 13) leading to a proliferation of 'lousy' jobs. As Kenworthy (2015: 17) notes in relation to explicit wage subsidies, "employers might offer a lower wage than they otherwise would, and workers may be willing to accept a lower wage. Also, the subsidy may increase the supply of less-educated people seeking jobs, and without an increase in employer demand for such workers, this rise in supply is likely to push wages down".

Basic income undermines worker solidarity and entrenches the gig economy

Andy **Newman**, telecommunications engineer, February 17, **2017**

"A socialist case against Basic Income Guarantee," Socialist Unity, <http://socialistunity.com/socialist-case-basic-income-guarantee/> (accessed 2/13/2018)

In contrast to the collective orientation of organized labour, the Basic Income Guarantee is predicated not upon creating communities of solidarity but upon citizens with individual entitlement. It is pessimistic about the possibility of successful political action to achieve a shift of wealth and power to working people, and the possibility of working people democratically shaping society; and instead is fatalistic in seeking to provide ballast against poverty for dis-empowered individuals at the mercy of the gig economy.

Basic income divides the working class by removing people from the work force and forcing immigrants to work to subsidize the benefits of natural citizens

Andy **Newman**, telecommunications engineer, February 17, **2017**

"A socialist case against Basic Income Guarantee," Socialist Unity, <http://socialistunity.com/socialist-case-basic-income-guarantee/> (accessed 2/13/2018)

A Basic Income Guarantee would withdraw a number of citizens from the workforce, particularly at the unskilled, low paid end of the job market, whose work would inevitably need to be filled by immigrants. These non-citizen workers would not be entitled to BIG, and therefore the working class would be divided down the middle in such a way as to irrevocably weaken the possibility of trade union organisation.

Basic Income Bad: Destroys Innovation

Basic income destroys economic opportunity and risk-taking, turning everyone into passive consumers

Robert **Romano**, senior editor of Americans for Limited Government, June 2, **2017**

"Mark Zuckerberg's 'universal basic income' would herald the end of capitalism," Net Right Daily, <http://netrightdaily.com/2017/06/mark-zuckerbergs-universal-basic-income-herald-end-capitalism/> (accessed 2/13/2018)

Instead, guaranteed income would crowd out other potential opportunities in the economy, disincentivize risk-taking and reward complacency — wrecking individuals' sense of purpose. Individuals, working less, would transition to simply being consumers.

Basic income decreases consumer spending, increases government intervention into private lives, and replaces capitalism with dependence on subsidies

Robert **Romano**, senior editor of Americans for Limited Government, June 2, **2017**

"Mark Zuckerberg's 'universal basic income' would herald the end of capitalism," Net Right Daily, <http://netrightdaily.com/2017/06/mark-zuckerbergs-universal-basic-income-herald-end-capitalism/> (accessed 2/13/2018)

or to the extent that as universal income gradually replaces a significant percent work, to the extent that individuals wind up making less than if they had been working, it would reduce consumer expenditures — becoming a net drag on the economy. It would truly be the nanny state, forevermore, with declining standards of living. Then, elections would revolve around not how to best grow the economy or create jobs in the private sector, but how much everyone's annual stipend should be increased. Both businesses and individuals would clamor for more, since then more goods and services could be bought and sold — a vicious cycle of ever-increasing dependency. Ultimately, individual welfare will become corporate welfare, affirming the end of capitalism as we know it and confirming that the American system is no longer one of innovation, but of subsidy.

Capitalism Generally Good

Capitalist progress ensures workers have to work less for goods over time

Sheldon **Richman**, executive editor of The Libertarian Institute and chairman of the board of trustees of the Center for a Stateless Society, July 16, **2017**

"We Are The Economy They Want to Regulate," Reason, <http://reason.com/archives/2017/07/16/we-are-the-economy-they-want-to-regulate> (accessed 2/14/2018)

If the average worker had to work two hours, 40 minutes, to buy a chicken in 1900, but only 14 minutes as the 21st century approached (actual statistics), Bastiat would say the chicken "is obtained for less expenditure of human effort; less service is performed as it passes from hand to hand; ... in a word, it has become gratis, [though] not completely." In other words, most of the utility that had to be paid for with painful effort in 1900 was free by 2000.

Rich/poor gap is a myth; capitalism creates prosperity

Estanislao Fuentes **Benítez**, intern at the Austrian Economics Center, February 7, **2018**

"Do Rich People Benefit More from Capitalism than the Poor?" Austrian Economics Center, <http://www.austriancenter.com/do-rich-people-benefit-more-capitalism-poor/> (accessed 2/14/2018)

For many decades, the myth that in a capitalist country the rich become richer while the poor become poorer has been spreading all over the world – despite the fact that a quick glance over the facts would show that the economically freer the country, the less poor it is. It actually is no news that countries that have more economic freedom are richer and its citizens live better than those states which isolate themselves from the world, tax high, and regulate heavily. According to the Heritage Foundation's Index of Economic Freedom, the five countries with the most economic freedom are in fact Hong Kong, Singapore, New Zealand, Switzerland, and Australia, while the bottom five are (of course known as being paradises incarnate) Yemen, North Korea, Venezuela, Cuba, and the Republic of Congo. An easy way to figure out where it is better to live no matter the social class is to see where people move to: Are people moving to North Korea, or to Australia? Exactly.

Capitalism is becoming sustainable

Jon **Hale**, consultant with Morningstar Institutional Investment Consulting, January 23, **2018**

"Has the Era of Sustainable Capitalism Arrived?" Morningstar, <http://www.morningstar.co.uk/uk/news/164541/has-the-era-of-sustainable-capitalism-arrived.aspx> (accessed 2/14/2018)

We're entering a new era of "sustainable capitalism": an attempt to make the global economy more resilient and work for more people over the long run. The evolution of global capitalism since the end of the Cold War has resulted in the world's largest corporations growing to almost unimaginable proportions, conferring on them enormous influence on the world today, while reducing the capacity of sovereign governments to regulate corporate activity in consistent and effective ways.

Capitalism Generally Good

Corporate social responsibility is solving the harms of capitalism and moving beyond shareholder focus

Jon **Hale**, consultant with Morningstar Institutional Investment Consulting, January 23, **2018**

"Has the Era of Sustainable Capitalism Arrived?" Morningstar,

<http://www.morningstar.co.uk/uk/news/164541/has-the-era-of-sustainable-capitalism-arrived.aspx>
(accessed 2/14/2018)

Global capitalism is a system in which the power of sovereign governments is weaker and that of large corporations greater. Against that backdrop, corporate leadership is increasingly aware that corporate actions have consequences not just for shareholders but for society as a whole and even for the health of the planet. In the absence of effective government regulation to set forth the rules of global capitalism, they have little choice but to make decisions based on the demands of all relevant stakeholders, including shareholders but not only shareholders, and on their own sense of responsibility.

Capitalism has cut global poverty by two-thirds

Anthony B. **Kim**, Research Manager and Editor of the Index of Economic Freedom at Heritage Foundation, **and** Patrick **Tyrrell**, Research Coordinator at Heritage Foundation, February 13, **2018**

"Economic Freedom Enables Great Escape From Poverty," Heritage Foundation,

<https://www.heritage.org/poverty-and-inequality/commentary/economic-freedom-enables-great-escape-poverty>
(accessed 2/14/2018)

Unquestionably, the free-market system that is rooted in the principles of economic freedom—empowerment of the individual, nondiscrimination, and open competition—has fueled unprecedented economic growth around the world. As the nearby chart illustrates, over the life of the Index, as the global economy has moved toward greater economic freedom, world GDP has nearly doubled. This progress has lifted hundreds of millions of people out of poverty and cut the global poverty rate by two-thirds.

Capitalism Generally Good

Chinese transition proves capitalism is superior to state control

Noah **Smith**, Bloomberg economics writer and former professor at SUNY Stonybrook, November 15, **2017**
"Free Market Failure Has Been Greatly Exaggerated," Bloomberg View,
<https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2017-11-15/free-markets-improved-more-lives-than-anything-ever> (accessed 2/14/2018)

Take China. In the 1980s, after decades of economic and social disaster under Mao Zedong, China started experimenting with a market economy under party leader Deng Xiaoping. The regime began to allow small businesses and granted limited land rights. State-owned enterprises were partially privatized. The country opened to foreign investment, and went from a state of isolation to the world's biggest trading economy. By 2005, China's market economy passed its state-run economy in size. What happened after China's market reforms is now well-known -- the most dramatic explosion of economic growth in world history.

Training Solves Unemployment

Training initiatives solve unemployment

Enzo **Weber**, Chair of Empirical Economics at University of Regensburg, December **2017**

"Employment and the Welfare State in the Era of Digitalisation," CESifo Forum vol. 18, <http://www.cesifo-group.de/DocDL/Cesifo-forum-2017-4-weber-digitalisation-welfare-state-december.pdf> (accessed 2/13/2018)

Against this background, Weber (2017) argues that a labour market policy awaiting job losses and inflows into unemployment is unlikely to be able to master the critical effects of digital change on its own. After all, as soon as unemployment occurs, labour market policy has to deal with it singlehandedly (plus the collaboration of the unemployed), i.e. policy can only draw on its own resources and measures. Looking upstream, however, there are cooperation options in terms of further corporate training initiatives. Companies have information on their concrete needs from a production and market perspective, which makes them central players on the further training stage.

Job training is the superior public policy for long-term economic adaptation

Enzo **Weber**, Chair of Empirical Economics at University of Regensburg, December **2017**

"Employment and the Welfare State in the Era of Digitalisation," CESifo Forum vol. 18, <http://www.cesifo-group.de/DocDL/Cesifo-forum-2017-4-weber-digitalisation-welfare-state-december.pdf> (accessed 2/13/2018)

Public politics, however, should undertake the support and funding of further training activities in the form of qualification consulting for companies and employees or a share in the costs of measures and work loss. After all, further training not only helps employees and their company, it is also an important macroeconomic factor: investments in further training help them to master digital change, i.e. to develop high-quality employment on a broad base as the core of a digital business model.

Training Solves Unemployment

Plenty of potential jobs; training is key

Enzo **Weber**, Chair of Empirical Economics at University of Regensburg, December **2017**

"Employment and the Welfare State in the Era of Digitalisation," CESifo Forum vol. 18, <http://www.cesifo-group.de/DocDL/Cesifo-forum-2017-4-weber-digitalisation-welfare-state-december.pdf> (accessed 2/13/2018)

The advent of smart, interconnected digitalisation is accompanied by major challenges. The welfare state will not have to adapt to an economy largely operating without jobs. On the contrary, the world is full of undone work. The effects on the labour market will mainly take place in the well-known field of tension of economic adaptability to technological change and structural problems. Importantly, the institutions of the welfare state face enormous challenges.

Changing labor market policies solves

Enzo **Weber**, Chair of Empirical Economics at University of Regensburg, December **2017**

"Employment and the Welfare State in the Era of Digitalisation," CESifo Forum vol. 18, <http://www.cesifo-group.de/DocDL/Cesifo-forum-2017-4-weber-digitalisation-welfare-state-december.pdf> (accessed 2/13/2018)

There is a pressing need for measures in economic, educational and labour market policy that will support and advance a digital economic and labour market model. Further developing vocational training, designing a policy of comprehensive further training, and organising social security and corporate flexibility are key steps forward in this endeavour.

Answers to “Need Total Basic Income” Arguments

Incremental steps better—if we can achieve poverty reduction with steps short of total basic income we should prefer those

Luke **Martinelli**, Institute for Policy Research Associate, University of Bath, September **2017**

"Assessing the Case for a Universal Basic Income in the UK," IPR Policy Brief,

http://www.bath.ac.uk/publications/assessing-the-case-for-a-universal-basic-income-in-the-uk/attachments/basic_income_policy_brief.pdf (accessed 2/13/2018)

So the argument goes, the danger is that in pushing for incremental improvements ‘the good’ (reigning in the excesses of conditionality) may be the enemy of ‘the best’ (an unconditional basic income). We reject this view. Supporters of basic income should be motivated by a desire to improve lives, not by slavish devotion to an abstract idea. If it happens that elements of basic income can be actualised more readily in part than in totality, then we must accept this political reality.

Basic income’s broad support also makes it a constant political target—policymakers won’t be able to make coalitions work together to implement it

Luke **Martinelli**, Institute for Policy Research Associate, University of Bath, September **2017**

"Assessing the Case for a Universal Basic Income in the UK." IPR Policy Brief,

http://www.bath.ac.uk/publications/assessing-the-case-for-a-universal-basic-income-in-the-uk/attachments/basic_income_policy_brief.pdf (accessed 2/13/2018)

Thus, while basic income has supporters across the political landscape, it also has detractors – and the large family of basic income proposals provides a wide target at which to direct criticism. The fact that basic income represents a large family of schemes – incorporating residual, libertarian proposals such as Murray (2006) as well as generous, progressive schemes – enables detractors to criticise the least desirable type of basic income (from their particular perspective). Thus, basic income’s association with ‘undesirable’ political views permits left-wing parties opposed to basic income to speak to their constituencies of support (workers, unions, labour market outsiders, and welfare recipients) of UBI as a project to dismantle the welfare state. At the same time, right-wing parties can play to their support base (employers and relatively wealthy individuals) by claiming UBI would inflate the role of government in welfare provision and dampen incentives for self-provision.

Political realism is good here

We should favor solutions that will actually happen—even if they’re smaller steps—because people’s lives will actually improve, rather than us just standing around demanding universal income.

Answers to “Capitalism Causes Inequality” Arguments

Global inequality declining now; reversing global capitalism would be a disaster, impoverishing nations on periphery

Terrence **Casey**, professor of political science at Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology, March **2016**
 "In Defense of Neoliberalism," Paper presented at the Political Studies Association Annual Conference, Brighton, England, 21-23 March 2016,
https://www.psa.ac.uk/sites/default/files/conference/papers/2016/Casey-In%20Defense%20of%20Neoliberalism%20%28PSA%202016%29_1.pdf (accessed 12/20/2017)

The worst approach would be to reverse globalization, as the experience of the 1930s demonstrated. Global inequality, moreover, has been declining from the rise of the BRICs and other developing nations. Reversing globalization now would protect western wages at the expense of workers in less-developed countries. Alternately progressives favor aggressive redistribution, jacking up taxes on the rich to confiscatory rates (80% is favored by Piketty) and using the windfall to increase welfare spending. In an era of austerity, it is certainly reasonable to consider raising taxes on the wealthiest. It is important though, to recognize the practical limitations. There is one pattern is common to pretty much every dataset on changes in inequality of the last century, including Piketty's (See Figure 1.1, p. 24): the concentrations of income built up in the 19th century declined precipitously in the first half of the 20th century, before the major policies and institutions of the postwar welfare state were established.²² Those datasets equally show a rise in inequality since 1980, a change manifest in welfare states vast and paltry.²³ Economic redistribution can blunt underlying trends more than erase them. For welfare systems facing long-term problems of entitlement deficits, demographic shifts, and rising state debt, that seems like more heavy lifting than they can likely bear.

Capitalism lifts nations out of poverty and grows income for everyone

Corey **Iacono**, Thorpe Fellow at Foundation for Economic Education, November 21, **2017**
 "Is Free Market Capitalism Bad Economics?" Foundation for Economic Education, <https://fee.org/articles/is-free-market-capitalism-bad-economics/> (accessed 2/13/2018)
 Estevadeordal and Taylor (2008) find that, on average, countries that engage in free trade reforms see considerable accelerations in economic development relative to the control group, such that the income per capita of the liberalizers is 25% higher after a quarter-century.

Prefer the long-term historical trajectory

The only way to truly evaluate and compare economic systems is looking at their long-term effects, because short-term data is always unreliable and changing. Long-term tendencies of capitalism are to improve the quality of life, life expectancy, and other measures.

Answers to “Inequality Bad” Arguments

Studies on income inequality and mental health vary in results

Victor **Patel**, researcher in Department of Global Health and Social Medicine, Harvard Medical School, et al, January 19, **2018**

"Income inequality and depression: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the association and a scoping review of mechanisms," World Psychiatry, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/wps.20492/full> (accessed 2/14/2018)

A review of studies on the association of income inequality and a range of mental health related outcomes reported heterogeneous findings, with about one third of studies observing a positive association between income inequality and the prevalence or incidence of mental health problems, one third observing mixed results for different subgroups, and one third observing no association[5].

Inequality arguments are dubious, retraining and entrepreneurialism can solve

Terrence **Casey**, professor of political science at Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology, March **2016**

"In Defense of Neoliberalism," Paper presented at the Political Studies Association Annual Conference, Brighton, England, 21-23 March 2016,

[https://www.psa.ac.uk/sites/default/files/conference/papers/2016/Casey-](https://www.psa.ac.uk/sites/default/files/conference/papers/2016/Casey-In%20Defense%20of%20Neoliberalism%20%28PSA%202016%29_1.pdf)

[In%20Defense%20of%20Neoliberalism%20%28PSA%202016%29_1.pdf](https://www.psa.ac.uk/sites/default/files/conference/papers/2016/Casey-In%20Defense%20of%20Neoliberalism%20%28PSA%202016%29_1.pdf) (accessed 12/20/2017)

The rewards of growth, it is argued, now accrue only to those at the top while the rest of us are left to

stagnate. Whether a fully accurate characterization of our times is a point of dispute. Still, many find themselves

locked out of employment commensurate with a middle-class lifestyle. The optimal solution is not redistribution, but providing

workers the skills and training needed to earn a good wage. Policies of human capital formation is the main mechanism for

combatting inequality. Finally, digging out from under the wreckage of the crash and reinvigorating the economy requires balanced deleveraging,

reducing the overhang of private and public debt without strangling the nascent recovery. Assuming these three problems can be resolved, the

culmination should be a “non-reform” – reviving the sort of supply-side encouragements to investment and

entrepreneurship with which neoliberalism succeeded in the past.

Don't throw the baby out with the bathwater

American progress has happened because capitalists take chances on new technologies as others become obsolete. Workforces adjust to this through natural steps like relocation and retraining. There is no predicting how UBI will change that landscape—it could undermine innovation.

Answers to “Capitalism and Neoliberalism Violent” Arguments

Even when neoliberalism is violent, it still results in wealth and freedom

Corey **lacono**, Thorpe Fellow at Foundation for Economic Education, November 21, **2017**

"Is Free Market Capitalism Bad Economics?" Foundation for Economic Education, <https://fee.org/articles/is-free-market-capitalism-bad-economics/> (accessed 12/20/2017)

And while Chile’s free-market reforms imposed under the violent rule of Augusto Pinochet in the 1970’s initially produced disaster, the liberalization process did, in fact, continue, resulting in Chile becoming not only the freest economy in Latin America but one of the wealthiest as well.

Economic competition and cooperation are two sides of the same coin—capitalism guarantees we are free to cooperate with whom we want

Sheldon **Richman**, executive editor of The Libertarian Institute and chairman of the board of trustees of the Center for a Stateless Society, July 16, **2017**

"We Are The Economy They Want to Regulate," Reason, <http://reason.com/archives/2017/07/16/we-are-the-economy-they-want-to-regulate> (accessed 2/14/2018)

Those who think cooperation is preferable to competition should realize they are two sides of the same coin. Competition is what happens when we’re free to choose with whom we wish to cooperate. Two shoe stores compete, each hoping to be the one that cooperates with me in my quest for new shoes.

Reject coercion in favor of voluntary association—that’s the real key to rejecting violence

UBI requires massive violent seizure of wealth from some for the benefit of others. That’s inherently coercive.

Answers to “Neoliberalism Bad” Arguments

Neoliberal economies outperform others, free markets don’t get out of control, and problems can be repaired

Terrence **Casey**, professor of political science at Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology, March **2016**

"In Defense of Neoliberalism," Paper presented at the Political Studies Association Annual Conference, Brighton, England, 21-23 March 2016,

<https://www.psa.ac.uk/sites/default/files/conference/papers/2016/Casey->

[In%20Defense%20of%20Neoliberalism%20%28PSA%202016%29_1.pdf](https://www.psa.ac.uk/sites/default/files/conference/papers/2016/Casey-In%20Defense%20of%20Neoliberalism%20%28PSA%202016%29_1.pdf) (accessed 12/20/2017)

A clear-eyed examination show that neoliberal economies have generally outperformed their competitors, albeit with more volatile growth (a two steps forward, one step back pattern). Private debt rose in the years prior to the crash, yet the evidence that this was indicative of a pathological dynamic in the neoliberal growth model is not compelling. Finally, an objective analysis of the global financial crisis highlights many factors that do not conform to the “free markets run amok” narrative. Taken together, the case that the neoliberal growth model “...is irretrievably and irreversibly compromised” (Hay, 2010, pp. 25-26.) is far from proven. With reform, it is reparable.

Neoliberalism has massively reduced global poverty

Corey **Iacono**, Thorpe Fellow at Foundation for Economic Education, November 21, **2017**

"Is Free Market Capitalism Bad Economics?" Foundation for Economic Education, <https://fee.org/articles/is-free-market-capitalism-bad-economics/> (accessed 12/20/2017)

Perhaps neoliberals do need to engage in a little introspection and be more open to the idea that free markets aren’t perfect and can even lead to calamity, but any honest examination of the evidence strongly suggests that, in general, the movement towards free markets has produced meaningful and beneficial results across the world. It isn’t a coincidence that the global shift towards the embrace of ‘neoliberalism’ has been accompanied by unparalleled reductions in global poverty, particularly in China and India.

You should prefer the system that has solved structural, global poverty

All the evidence against neoliberalism and capitalism talks about specific instances of poverty or deprivation, but ignores the universal, categorical way that neoliberalism has lifted entire nations up from poverty. This is a classic example of not seeing the forest for the trees.

Answers to “Automation Increases Unemployment” Arguments

Automation won't increase unemployment

Scott A. **Wolla**, senior economic education specialist at the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, January **2018**
"Will Robots Take Our Jobs?" Page One Economics, <https://research.stlouisfed.org/publications/page1-econ/2018/01/02/will-robots-take-our-jobs> (accessed 2/13/18)

Considering a world where distribution (not scarcity) is the central problem is interesting, but many economists see this as needless worry.

Productivity-enhancing technology has changed the economy in dramatic ways over the past two centuries, and it has not made human labor obsolete. Nor has it eliminated the problem of scarcity. Herbert Simon, economist, computer scientist, and Nobel laureate, wrote in the 1960s (another period of automation anxiety), "Insofar as they are economic problems at all, the world's problems in this generation and the next are problems of scarcity, not of intolerable abundance. The bogeyman of automation consumes worrying capacity that should be saved for real problems."²⁵ In short, many economists see the current wave of new technology and automation as a trend that has been occurring for most of human history, and one that will continue in the future. The challenge is in equipping future workers with the skills they need to be competitive and productive in a changing economy.

Automation-induced changes in consumption patterns outweighs loss of jobs

Scott A. **Wolla**, senior economic education specialist at the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, January **2018**
"Will Robots Take Our Jobs?" Page One Economics, <https://research.stlouisfed.org/publications/page1-econ/2018/01/02/will-robots-take-our-jobs> (accessed 2/13/18)

Remember that while robots can produce goods and services, they don't consume in the way humans do. We currently live in an economy where most people exchange their labor resources for income, and then they use their income to purchase goods and services. And we live in a world where there are not enough resources to fulfill everyone's wants; in other words, we live in a condition of scarcity. But if we're in a world where robots do the work, then goods and services are plentiful, and the demand for labor is greatly reduced (a post-scarcity world).

No threshold: somebody has to repair the robots

There is no threshold for a scenario where humans no longer need to be involved creating, repairing, and monitoring technology.

Answers to “Technology Bad” Arguments

Artificial intelligence will solve productivity and growth

Austan **Goalsbee**, professor at University of Chicago Booth School of Business, **2017**

"Public Policy in an AI Economy," Chapter in forthcoming NBER book Economics of Artificial Intelligence, Ajay K. Agrawal, Joshua Gans, and Avi Goldfarb, editors; Conference held September 13-14, 2017, <http://www.nber.org/chapters/c14030.pdf> (accessed 2/13/2018)

That’s a different way of saying that if AI succeeds, it will raise our productivity and higher productivity makes us rich. It is not a negative. Indeed, if AI succeeded in the way some fear, it would mean the exact reversal of the main problem facing growth in the last decade or more that productivity growth has been too slow. Indeed, it would decisively refute one of the central tenets of secular stagnationist thinkers like Gordon (2016) who argue that low productivity growth is a semi-permanent condition for the advanced economies because of the scarcity of path breaking ideas.

Tech won’t destroy jobs; autonomous cars example proves job growth far outpaces loss

Austan **Goalsbee**, professor at University of Chicago Booth School of Business, **2017**

"Public Policy in an AI Economy," Chapter in forthcoming NBER book Economics of Artificial Intelligence, Ajay K. Agrawal, Joshua Gans, and Avi Goldfarb, editors; Conference held September 13-14, 2017, <http://www.nber.org/chapters/c14030.pdf> (accessed 2/13/2018)

Take the much-discussed case of autonomous cars. There were about 3.5 million truck, bus, and taxi drivers in 2015. Say that every one of them were lost due to advances in self-driving car technology. If this loss takes place over 15 years, this would average a little over 19,000 per month. Compare that to the fact that in 2017 the JOLTS data show that the economy generated about 5.3 MILLION jobs per month (with 5.1 million separations per month). The complete elimination of every job in the sector would increase the increase the separation rate by less than four tenths of a percent. It would force drivers into new sectors and be disruptive to their livelihoods. But as a macroeconomic phenomenon, the impact would be small.

If the negative is right about huge job loss, this proves basic income won’t solve

Basic income is redistributive. If we are truly running out of jobs on such a massive scale, we’ll be unable to sustain that redistribution. Fewer and fewer people will be making job-related money to pay the taxes to support UBI.