We negate. Resolved: A just government ought to provide a universal basic income to its citizens.

**Framework:** UBI’s funding and alternatives.

**Definition:**

A basic income is a periodic cash payment unconditionally delivered to all/ on an individual basis, without a means-test or work requirement.

Defining “just” in terms of Aristotle, “justice”, or “giving each their due”, means that we should ensure governments provide what citizens deserve.

**Contention One is Massive Spending**

#### In order to fund a Universal Basic Income, economist estimates that it would cost between 1.5 to 3.2 trillion dollars in the US alone. Thus, ‘Sandra Kilhof writes in 2014 that the case for a UBI fails most financial feasibility tax as it would likely result in a huge increase in federal debt as well as a major increase in taxes. In many ways, whatever governments decide to do, they inflict massive negative exter’nalities on the people resulting in a situation that no one desires.

Sub Point A: Taxes

#### Sandra Kilhof write in 2014 that in order to fund a UBI the government will likely need to increase taxes. In fact, David Morris estimates that in order to fully fund a Universal Basic Income it would require a tax increase from 21% to 35% for the top 10% of earners. This is a problem as Kilhof furthers that higher taxes are discouraging to innovation and business, increasing poverty and reduce incentives to work. For that reason, Romer and Romer of UC Berkeley explain in 2010 that tax changes have very large effects on output. In fact, they estimate that for every one percent increase in an e’xogenous tax real Gross Do’mestic Product falls by almost three percentage points.

Sub Point B: Deficit Spending

The next likely scenario for funding a UBI is through Deficit Spending. Jacob Davidson of Time Magazine explains in 2016 that the metric to weigh whether or not debt impacts a countries fiscal stability is through the debt to GDP ratio. Fortunately, he finds that countries like the US currently have this ratio under control, yet a significant increase in spending could push us over the edge. A UBI would likely to do so as Boccia explains in 2013 that growing federal debt drastically increases the probability of a sudden fiscal crisis during which investors lose confidence in the government’s ability to manage the budget and the government would lose its ability to borrow money at an affordable rate. This would have a very significant negative impact on the country.

**Contention Two: The Alternatives are more desirable**

Apart from the ridiculous cost, UBI would damage social co’hesion. People work not only for income, but also meaning, self-respect, networks and friendship. Paying the entire workforce to stay at home would spark widespread sloth, ill health and rancour. Crime, drug use and other socially destructive outcomes would spiral. Our welfare state, while a’lleviating poverty, should also encourage participation in society. Helping people to find work, retraining if needs be, not paying them to opt-out. Smart welfare offers a hand-up, not a lifetime of dependence.

Another objection is that it is merely an easy way out. AI and ro’botics clearly present challenges. There is a need to support more part-time "gig" work, while better preparing school-leavers and graduates to cope in a hi-tech world. The answer is to meet those challenges, not pay people to stay idle. UBI advocates from Silicon Valley could help by paying more of their fair share of general taxation.