

Definitions:

marriam webster-

Strike: to stop work in order to force an employer to comply with demands

UBI CP [2:50]

CP Text: A just government ought to provide universal basic income

Striking can't solve layoffs when the employer doesn't need their workers anymore – UBI would give workers a cushion to survive unemployment AND increase their ability to strike by providing a strike fund. Shahriari-Parsa 21.

Tascha **Shahriari-Parsa, 21** [Tascha Shahriari-Parsa is a student at Harvard Law School.] ("Why Universal Basic Income is a Labor Issue," OnLabor, 4-30-2021, <https://onlabor.org/why-universal-basic-income-is-a-labor-issue/>)/va

For both Stern and Yang, **UBI is**, at least in large part, **a solution to** growing concerns over the role that **automation** will play in creating mass unemployment. As Yang pointed out on his campaign trail, self-driving truck technology could easily render millions of Americans without a job in the blink of an eye. And it's not just truck drivers: a **2016 federal report** found that **83% of jobs making less than \$20 per hour could be lost** due to automation. This doesn't mean that labor will become obsolete—jobs displaced by technology will eventually be replaced by jobs in other areas. But what are you supposed to do if you've been driving trucks your whole life? Learn how to code? How would you survive in the interim? Perhaps unions can mitigate the 'side-effects' of technology. In 1812, the Luddites famously smashed textile machinery, giving rise to the modern usage of the term "luddite" to refer to a person opposed to technological progress. But contrary to the common myth, the Luddites **were not** against machinery. They were against their terrible labor conditions, demanding that whoever runs the machines should receive sufficient training and be paid a fair wage. In that sense, the Luddites' demands were comparable to those of **UNITE HERE** hotel workers who went on strike throughout the country in 2018, **winning** mandated training for workers affected by new technology as well as a say over how new technology would be implemented. ¶ Collective bargaining over the implementation of technology is an important part of the solution. But **even if we organized the entire U.S. workforce into unions** with enough power to negotiate such agreements, **we wouldn't stop mass layoffs. The key source of workers' leverage** over their employer—**the ability to withhold labor—is predicated on the employer's need for their labor in the first place. UBI** isn't a replacement for a union, but it **can help fill a gap** where labor otherwise has very little power. And it's not just about technology. **When Marriot workers were negotiating their agreements in 2018**, what **they** likely **weren't expecting** was **that 98% of their members would be out of work** not **as a consequence of** automation, but rather, **a global pandemic**. Moreover, mass unemployment has always been endemic to capitalism. Even in the absence of crisis, **there will always be millions** of Americans **without a job**. In a society as rich as ours, **UBI is a declaration that everyone is entitled to an income**, whether they work or not. UBI is also **a proclamation that** the poor should have the right to use their money as they see fit—that **poverty is itself the issue, rather than a symptom of a lack of character** or a **'poor gene'**. And given how wealth and power go hand in hand, **UBI gives the working class a fighting chance to counter the power of the elite**. Moreover, a UBI would substantially alter the landscape of labor. **If everyone is guaranteed a paycheck** whether they show up to work or not, **workers will have far more bargaining power** than they do in the present. **A \$1,000/month UBI is** not a living wage, but it's **a cushion that would give workers more power to leave a bad job—and thus more power to** negotiate to **make that job better. Serving the function of a strike fund**, a UBI would also make it easier for workers to go on strike. Additionally, **UBI would raise minimum standards on top of prevailing wages, allowing workers to save** more of their **bargaining leverage for everything else** that matters.

A Universal Basic Income solves poverty. Wright 17.

Erik Olin Wright, American analytical Marxist sociologist, author, and educator 2-14-2017, "Can the universal basic income solve global inequalities?," UNESCO Inclusive Policy Lab,

<https://en.unesco.org/inclusivepolicylab/news/can-universal-basic-income-solve-global-inequalities/> JRG

The universal basic income (UBI) is spreading and becoming front and centre in the public discussion. What if this idea, suggesting a flat income given to every citizen regardless of employment or social status, was part of the solution to today's inequalities? In his contribution to the World Social Science Report 2016, renowned sociology Professor Erik Olin Wright explored the concept for us: The idea of an unconditional basic income (UBI) is quite simple: every legal resident in a country receives a monthly stipend sufficient to live above the poverty line. Let's call this the 'no frills culturally respectable standard of living'. The grant is unconditional on the performance of any labour or other form of contribution, and it is universal – everyone receives the grant, rich and poor alike. Grants go to individuals, not families. Parents are the custodians of under-age children's grants, which may be smaller than the grants for adults. Universalistic programmes such as public education and healthcare, that provide services to people rather than cash, continue alongside UBI, but most other redistributive transfers are eliminated since the UBI provides everyone with a decent subsistence. This means that in welfare systems that already provide generous anti-poverty income support through a patchwork of specialized programmes, the net increase in cost represented by UBI is not large. Special needs subsidies of various sorts continue – for example, for people with disabilities – but they are also smaller than now since the basic cost of living is covered by UBI. Minimum wage rules are relaxed, since there is little need to prohibit below-subsistence wages if all earnings in effect generate discretionary income. While everyone receives the grant, most people at any given point in time are probably net contributors since their taxes rise by more than the basic income they receive. UBI has potentially profound ramifications for inequality. Poverty is eliminated, the labour contract becomes more nearly voluntary, and the power relations between workers and employers become less unequal since workers have the option of exit. The possibility of people forming cooperative associations to produce goods and services to serve human need outside the market increases since such activity no longer needs to provide the basic standard of living for participants. Sceptics of basic income typically raise two main objections: that UBI would reduce incentives to work and reduce the supply of labour, and that the tax rates needed to fund UBI would be prohibitively high. Two things can be said about the incentive issue. First, means-tested income support programmes are plagued by poverty traps in which people lose their benefits when their earned income crosses some threshold. By contrast, a UBI creates no disincentive to work. Paid work always increases the discretionary income of people with a UBI. Second, while no country has adopted a full basic income, there have been a few limited experiments in various places in the world which enable us to examine the effects of UBI on labour force participation. In the United States and Canada in the 1970s there were a number of randomized controlled trials, most notably in Seattle and Denver, in which randomly selected low-income individuals received a UBI. More recently, in India in 2011, eight villages were selected in which all residents were given a basic income. In all of these experiments, receiving a UBI significantly improved the lives of people while having at most a modest effect on labour force participation. The level of taxation needed to pay for a basic income is, of course, an important issue. But the sustainable level of taxation in any country is not mainly an economic issue. It is a political issue that depends on the administrative capacity to extract taxes and the political will to do so.

Solves the aff

Aff justifies an unconditional right to strike on the basis that it leads to higher wages and thus solves income inequality. However, there are better ways to solve economic inequality. A just government should raise the minimum wage to a level sufficient to raise workers out of poverty, and implement a universal basic income.

UBI solves economic inequality and improves the economy Hinh 20.

Ken Hinh is a sophomore undergraduate student at UC Berkeley. "Poverty in a crisis: Why we need UBI during Covid-19."

Published by the Daily Californian on May 12, 2020.

(<https://www.dailycal.org/2020/05/12/poverty-in-a-crisis-why-we-need-ubi-during-covid-19/>) - AP

The economic repercussions of the COVID-19 pandemic are far-reaching, ravaging families, businesses and communities across the country. Almost every business, charity and nonprofit nationwide has been affected by the pandemic, and millions of individuals and families have been left in financial ruin. In my eyes, the present remedies provided by the government will do nothing for the millions of Americans who are living paycheck to paycheck. The most effective way to provide immediate relief to the people most impacted by COVID-19 is to put money directly into their hands. Before the COVID-19 pandemic ravaged our communities, there was support of a universal basic income, or UBI, by prominent figures and organizations — such as professor Robert Reich, Andrew Yang and 293 members of UC Berkeley's Forward club — to combat job losses due to automation. But instead of automation, it is a global disaster that has inarguably destroyed our economy on a massive scale. However, we must not forget that smaller-scale "disasters" occur every moment of our lives; someone could lose their job, get evicted, come down with an illness or receive an unexpected bill that they can't afford. We live in a society in which 59% of Americans cannot pay an unexpected \$400 bill. In addition, every single citizen struggles with time, empathy or money in some form or another; these struggles are the most pervasive problems of our era. Notably, we live in a time in which many of our social safety nets should solve these problems. Instead, our mental health as a society is declining, suicides and drug overdoses are increasing and income inequality is at an all-time high. A UBI would provide the financial safety net that so many people desperately need to guard against these issues. Furthermore, as the coronavirus continues to wreak havoc on the very fabric of our society, our unemployment infrastructure is being overwhelmed. More than 30 million Americans have filed for unemployment since March, and the April unemployment rate skyrocketed to 14.7%. How much aid will all of these people really receive? Even before COVID-19, our welfare system was not effective — the pandemic has simply revealed the inadequacies of our political and economic infrastructure. There are more than 38.1 million Americans who live in poverty. Current social safety nets, such as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, or TANF, do an extremely poor job of reducing poverty. Poverty is killing people every day. And after the coronavirus pandemic, we will no longer be able to ignore it. Moreover, in no single state does TANF provide the benefits of even half the poverty level. What's more, the racial inequities with all states' use of funds account for 15% of the Black-white child poverty gap. In no way do our current safety nets protect our most vulnerable populations. But why should our society choose UBI over our current welfare system? In my eyes, it comes down to speed, universality and security. First, a UBI would allow our government to put money directly into people's hands with the utmost speed. There would be no time whatsoever being wasted on bureaucracy — individuals would already have the necessary funds in their pockets. Second, universality

— or doing away with means testing — would ensure that everyone is included and no one is excluded. Currently, the Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security Act does not provide payments to undocumented immigrants, international students and families of mixed immigration status. We need to ensure that everyone who needs help will get help without having to jump over any additional hurdles. With universality, determining who is eligible is simpler and the cost of administering is reduced. Lastly, security. People need to feel secure in their financial positions before they can thrive, and a UBI would provide that economic foundation. In addition, a Finnish basic income experiment found that recipients experienced improved mental health, confidence and life satisfaction. Although it is not an end-all-be-all solution to all of our country's problems, it's a start — a start toward leveling the playing field among the haves and the have-nots. Policymakers in Spain, Canada and the United States are acknowledging the importance of emergency UBI in this crisis. On Friday, Senators, Kamala Harris, D-California, Bernie Sanders, I-Vt., and Ed Markey, D-Mass., proposed legislation that would send a \$2,000 monthly check to everyone who makes less than \$120,000. However, they're ignoring the impact that a UBI would have during more normal times. In addition to protecting those left behind by our welfare system, a UBI would produce economic growth by putting money into people's pockets to spend. Personally, I know an extra \$2,000 a month would help my mom, who lost her job as a result of COVID-19. According to a study by the Roosevelt Institute, a UBI would expand the United States' GDP by \$2.5 trillion. When people are given direct cash, they will inject that money directly into their communities, spending it on food, groceries, utility bills and auto repairs. A temporary UBI will be essential during this pandemic to combat the looming recession, but a permanent one will be needed to ensure that every single American can have the chance to thrive. The fight for UBI will live on. The pandemic has opened a door, however, giving us a glimpse into the vast inequities of our current safety net system. We need a UBI to ensure that everyone has financial security no matter what and to provide an economic foundation for all. Hopefully, one day, we will be able to say with confidence that we've eradicated poverty.

UBI solves better -- covers workers and also those who are unable to work. Farrell 20.

Julie Farrell is a disabled writer and accessibility consultant based in Edinburgh. "Dying from Inequality - Why Universal Basic Income is the Solution." Published by Disability Arts Online on June 22, 2020. Available here:

(<https://disabilityarts.online/magazine/opinion/dying-from-inequality-why-universal-basic-income-is-the-solution/>) - AP

'It is the peculiar lowness of poverty that you discover first.' Wrote George Orwell in his memoir, *Down and Out in Paris and London* (1933). The peculiar lowness. These words powerfully convey the ever-present sinking feeling of poverty. It doesn't level out. It doesn't go away. You go fathoms deep but you keep on sinking. If anything can wake us up to our own inequality crisis, it's a global pandemic which threatens the very foundations of a capitalist economy that we are built on. The systemic injustices faced by the poor, disabled and elderly are now being faced collectively by the nation in the face of Covid-19 — and we're waking up to the possibility of something better. 'People living in the poorest, most disadvantaged communities face the highest risk of dying by suicide', the Samaritans cited in their 2017 report, *Dying from Inequality*. They found that 'financial instability and poverty can increase suicide risk.' And that 'Suicide is a major inequality issue.' It comes as no surprise that unmanageable debt, unemployment, poor housing conditions, and other socioeconomic factors all contribute to high suicide rates. 'Tackling inequality should be central to suicide prevention' reads the report summary. So how do we do that? In a world of systemic inequality, where poverty and homelessness have never been

eradicated, the welfare state has become increasingly punitive – and workers are still punished for sickness – is equality even possible? In a world where the UK has seen suicide rates increase by 10.9% in the last year alone. Where thousands of low-skilled, but equally – if not more so – valuable workers are struggling to make ends meet, thanks to low wages and flimsy worker protections. The report addresses the factors which lead to poverty on a societal, community and individual level; with much emphasis placed on “weak social protection (especially inadequate employment benefits); poor (or non-existent) active labour market programmes; weak (or non-existent) employment protection; austerity measures; cuts in mental healthcare spending”. A mixed race woman and two white women stand among packed shelves of food at a foodbank Three women at a foodbank in Vauxhall. Photograph: Newfrontiers [licensed under CC BY-NC-ND 2.0] Disabled people who find themselves reliant on government support to live have seen a drastic decrease in access to this support, and if they do receive it, bureaucratic processes cause months of delays, reduced payments and expedient recoup of payments with little to no warning. Just this year, Errol Graham died from starvation after his benefits were cut – his body was found by bailiff’s coming to evict him. His needs were not understood nor adequately supported, Assistant Coroner Dr Elizabeth Didcock said: “The sudden loss of all income, and the threat of eviction that followed from it, will have caused huge distress and worry, and significant financial hardship... Likely, this loss of income, and housing, were the final and devastating stressors, that had a significant effect on his mental health... The safety net that should surround vulnerable people like Errol in our society has holes in it.” Tougher ‘fit to work’ assessments have now been linked to 590 additional suicides by the University of Liverpool. An average of 9,700 deaths are caused every year by living in a cold house, as Errol Graham did. Homeless deaths have been steadily rising over the last couple of decades as have deaths from malnourishment. The causes are intersectional. Living with chronic illness might make it harder for someone to work enough hours to pay the bills, but the government may deem them as ‘fit to work’ – with a huge impact on their mental health when they don’t receive support from the state. Older people may find their pensions aren’t sufficient to afford the cost of additional fuel to heat their homes through the winter. Disturbingly, 22% of the UK population are now living in poverty – 34% are children. The Trussell Trust is the largest food bank network in the UK – it handed out around 41,000 food packs in 2010 compared to 1.2 million in 2017. One in three premature deaths in the UK is attributable to socioeconomic inequality. There is one simple solution or at least a very good attempt at the beginnings of it – pay every individual a basic living wage. No matter what their situation. Lift the poor out of poverty. It’s not difficult to understand. It’s much cheaper to do this than to continue with the welfare state we currently have. No more bureaucracy, or administrative costs, or untrained and non-specialist staff assessing the medical needs of applicants.

These steps would solve AC impacts but would not link to the disadvantages of an unconditional right to strike. Gives workers bargaining power, they can leave jobs.