**COUNTERPLAN VERSION**

First off is the Counterplan

Text--just governments ought to guarantee a universal basic income and mandate a minimum wage sufficient to lift workers out of poverty

Theory

A CP not topical--it does not recognize unconditional right to strike

Also, topical CPs are OK, they provide alternative to aff’s advocacy

B CP competes on net benefits--CP alone solves aff harms as well as or better than aff, and doesn’t link to neg offense; perm would have solvency deficit and would cause disads

Solvency

Raising minimum wage solves earnings inequality

**Lin & Yun ‘16** (Carl Lin, research fellow @ Bucknell Univ., & Myeong-Su Yun, research fellow @ Inha Univ., “The Effects of the Minimum Wage on Earnings Inequality:  Evidence from China,” Research in Labor Economics 2016, <https://www.iza.org/publications/dp/9715/the-effects-of-the-minimum-wage-on-earnings-inequality-evidence-from-china>)

The minimum wage has been regarded as an important element of public policy for reducing poverty and inequality. Increasing the minimum wage is supposed to raise earnings for millions of low-wage workers and therefore lower earnings inequality. However, there is no consensus in the existing literature from industrialized countries regarding whether increasing the minimum wage has helped lower earnings inequality. China has recently exhibited rapid economic growth and widening earnings inequality. Since China promulgated new minimum wage regulations in 2004, the magnitude and frequency of changes in the minimum wage have been substantial, both over time and across jurisdictions. The growing importance of research on the relationship between the minimum wage and earnings inequality and its controversial nature have sparked heated debate in China, highlighting the importance of rigorous research to inform evidence-based policy making. We investigate the contribution of the minimum wage to the well-documented rise in earnings inequality in China over the period from 2004 to 2009 by using city-level minimum wage panel data and a representative Chinese household survey, and we find that increasing the minimum wage reduces inequality – by decreasing the earnings gap between the median and the bottom decile – over the analysis period.

UBI solves economic inequality and improves the economy

**Hinh 20** Ken Hinh is a sophmore 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. Available here: (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.

**NC VERSION**

**Framework**

Neg wins under aff framework--I will solve AC impacts best and thus achieve aff’s value

Judge must weigh additional impacts, policy-makers must be utilitarian

**Goodin’ 90 (**Goodin, Robert, fellow in philosophy, Australian National Defense University, THE UTILITARIAN RESPONSE, 1990, p. 141-2)

My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more probable for them than private individuals. Before proceeding with the large argument, I must therefore say what it is that makes it so special about public officials and their situations that make it both more necessary and more desirable for them to adopt a more credible form of utilitarianism. Consider, first, the argument from necessity. Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices – public and private alike – are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, [they] are relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices, but that is all. That is enough to allow[s] public policy-makers to use the utilitarian calculus – assuming they want to use it at all – to chose general rules or conduct.

**Contention 1--Neg best solves economic inequality**

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.

Raising minimum wage solves earnings inequality

**Lin & Yun ‘16** (Carl Lin, research fellow @ Bucknell Univ., & Myeong-Su Yun, research fellow @ Inha Univ., “The Effects of the Minimum Wage on Earnings Inequality:  Evidence from China,” Research in Labor Economics 2016, <https://www.iza.org/publications/dp/9715/the-effects-of-the-minimum-wage-on-earnings-inequality-evidence-from-china>)

The minimum wage has been regarded as an important element of public policy for reducing poverty and inequality. Increasing the minimum wage is supposed to raise earnings for millions of low-wage workers and therefore lower earnings inequality. However, there is no consensus in the existing literature from industrialized countries regarding whether increasing the minimum wage has helped lower earnings inequality. China has recently exhibited rapid economic growth and widening earnings inequality. Since China promulgated new minimum wage regulations in 2004, the magnitude and frequency of changes in the minimum wage have been substantial, both over time and across jurisdictions. The growing importance of research on the relationship between the minimum wage and earnings inequality and its controversial nature have sparked heated debate in China, highlighting the importance of rigorous research to inform evidence-based policy making. We investigate the contribution of the minimum wage to the well-documented rise in earnings inequality in China over the period from 2004 to 2009 by using city-level minimum wage panel data and a representative Chinese household survey, and we find that increasing the minimum wage reduces inequality – by decreasing the earnings gap between the median and the bottom decile – over the analysis period.

UBI solves economic inequality and improves the economy

**Hinh 20** Ken Hinh is a sophmore 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. Available here: (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, which are presented in the next contention(s).