# 1NC

### 1-UBI CP

Counterplan text: just governments ought to abolish minimum wage laws and institute a universal basic income. I’ll clarify.

Don’t let them screw around in the 1AR. Living wage is wage increases, not UBI.

RTMW 11 “Minimum Wage Question and Answer” June 3rd 2011 Raise the Minimum Wage http://www.raisetheminimumwage.com/pages/qanda

What’s the difference between the minimum wage and a living wage? It is generally understood that the minimum wage – even in states with higher-than-federal rates - is inadequate to support a family of any size. As a result, the concept of a “living wage” has gained popularity, as advocates, academics, and policymakers have explored other ways of defining a wage level adequate to support a decent standard of living in America. Examples of these alternative standards include the Economic Policy Institute’s “Family Budget Calculator,” which compile the costs of essentials such as housing, food, child care, transportation and health care in different regions of the country and different family sizes to estimate the income required for families to meet basic needs at a minimally adequate level. The term “living wage” has also come to describe local ordinances that require employers that benefit from publicly funded service contracts and/or economic development subsidies to pay higher wages and/or offer health care coverage to their employees. Generally, living wage ordinances require wages that are significantly higher than federal or state minimum wages – typically $10.00-$14.00 an hour (sometimes set at the poverty level for a family of 4). After years of grassroots advocacy starting in the early 1990s, more than 120 cities across the nation currently have living wage laws. NELP has compiled a list of these ordinances and their provisions here.

Solves the aff’s value re-orientation. Martin Luther King wanted UBI. This is their own curry evidence.

Curry 14 Dr. Tommy J. Curry “The Cost of a Thing: A Kingian Reformulation of a Living Wage Argument in the 21st Century” Victory Briefs 2014

King argues that thinkers erroneously “have proceeded from a premise that poverty is a consequence of multiple evils: lack of education restricting job opportunities; poor housing which stultified home life and suppressed initiative; fragile family relationships which distorted personality development. The logic of this approach suggested that each of these causes be attacked one by one.”13 This moment-realization is important for how King aims to resolve the phenomenon of poverty through policy which reorients our values towards workers in our society more generally. King points out that as discrete programs our remedies do little to address the wholeness of the workers Black or white dealing with the social consequences of poverty. Each program while embodying both a value and call towards the political fails because the self which is the object of program is still lacking. A living wage however is more effective because it gives substance to the frail social self aiming to be empowered by education, housing, and family structure. As King says “While none of these remedies in itself is unsound, all have a fatal disadvantage. The programs have never proceeded on a coordinated basis or at similar rates of development. . . In addition to the absence of coordination and sufficiency, the programs of the past all have another common failing—they are indirect. Each seeks to solve poverty by first solving something else.”14 King concludes then that a living wage is the only way to deal with poverty, he says: “I am now convinced that the simplest approach will prove to be the most effective—the solution to poverty is to abolish it directly by a now widely discussed measure: the guaranteed income.

Curry just puts “living wage” as his own rhetoric in the article, not that of MLKs. They need to win living wage-specific evidence; otherwise there’s no reason the perm’s net beneficial.

More evidence-King advocated for a universal basic income.

**Weissmann 13** Jordan Weissmann. Martin Luther King's Economic Dream: A Guaranteed Income for All Americans. August 28th, 2013. http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2013/08/martin-luther-kings-economic-dream-a-guaranteed-income-for-all-americans/279147/ JORDAN WEISSMANN is a senior associate editor at The Atlantic.

So what, exactly, was **King**'s economic dream? In short, he **wanted the government to eradicate poverty by providing** every American **a guaranteed, middle-class income**—an idea that, while light-years beyond the realm of mainstream political conversation today, had actually come into vogue by the late 1960s. To be crystal clear, **a** guaranteed income—or a **universal basic income,** as it's sometimes called today—**is** not the same as a higher minimum wage. Instead, it's **a policy designed to make sure each American has a certain concrete sum of money to spend each year. One** [modern **version**](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2012/08/08/obama-doesnt-want-to-just-write-welfare-recipients-checks-but-what-if-we-did/)of the policy **would give every adult a** **tax credit that would essentially become a cash payment for families that don't pay much tax.** Conservative thinker Charles Murray [has advocated](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/05/11/thinking-utopian-how-about-a-universal-basic-income/)replacing the whole welfare state by handing every grown American a full $10,000. King had an even more expansive vision. He laid out [the case](http://www.progress.org/democrat/mlking.html) for the guaranteed income in his final book, 1967's Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community? Washington's previous efforts to fight poverty, he concluded, had been "piecemeal and pygmy." The government believed it could lift up the poor by attacking the root causes of their impoverishment one by one—by providing better housing, better education, and better support for families. But these efforts had been too small and too disorganized. Moreover, **he wrote, "the programs of the past all have another common failing—they are indirect. Each seeks to solve poverty by first solving something else."** It was time**, he believed**, for a more straightforward approach**: the government needed to make sure every American had a reasonable income**.  In part, King's thinking seemed to stem from a sense that no matter how strongly the economy might grow, it would never eliminate poverty entirely, or provide jobs for all.

Minimum wage laws increase unemployment and outsourcing. This discriminates against the poorest. The CP solves.

**Aziz 13** John Aziz, economics and business correspondent at TheWeek.com and associate editor at Pieria.co.uk, He has previously written for Business Insider, Zero Hedge, and Noahpinion, “There is a better alternative to raising the minimum wage.” December 6, 2013. http://theweek.com/article/index/253795/there-is-a-better-alternative-to-raising-the-minimum-wage

The minimum wage is a factor in creating unemployment. Despite what's often said to the contrary, it's true: **Countries with no minimum wage tend to have much lower unemployment**. Right now, America is suffering a serious deficit of jobs, with over three jobseekers for every available job. We need all the jobs we can get. So how does the minimum wage create unemployment? **Minimum wage laws are a price control**. They dictate the minimum level that a company can pay a worker. If the minimum wage is $10, and a company wants to take on a new employee that they determine will be worth $8 an hour, they have a choice — either pay $10 an hour, or not hire the employee. **Sometimes, the company will accept a hit to their profit margin**, and pay the employee $10 an hour. **Sometimes they will just not hire a new employee** at all. **Or**, increasingly, sometimes they will **go overseas and hire** an employee **elsewhere** — like China — where wages are far lower. **This** is a particularly cruel scenario because it **discriminates most against the poorest** and youngest workers in society. Empirically, the minimum wage has failed to reach its goal of ensuring a fair wage for low wage workers. Worker productivity in America has risen and risen, yet the minimum wage has not. As this chart via Dean Baker shows, it has severely stagnated: [ cepr.net ] **I propose abolishing the minimum wage, and replacing it with a basic income** policy , a version of which was first advocated in America by Thomas Paine . Individuals would be able to work for whatever wage they can secure, meaning that low-skilled individuals — especially the young, who currently face a particularly high rate of employment — would have an easier time finding work. And the level of basic income could be tied to the level of productivity, to reduce inequality. There are two kinds of basic income policy. The first is a negative income tax — if an individual’s income level falls beneath a certain threshold (say, $1,500 a month) the government makes up the difference. Funds for this could be accessed by consolidating existing welfare programs like state-run pension schemes and unemployment benefits, and by closing tax loopholes and raising taxes on corporate profits and high-income earners. Germany has enacted a similar policy — called the "Kurzabeit" — and it's been credited with shielding the German labor force from the worst of the recession and keeping their unemployment rate low since. The second is a universal income policy, where everyone receives a payment irrespective of their income. This would obviously require more funds — meaning higher taxes — but in a future where corporations are making larger and larger profits while requiring fewer and fewer workers due to automation, such policies may become increasingly feasible. There are already very serious proposals to initiate such a scheme in Switzerland .

UBI solves poverty and income inequality from inevitable displacement of human labor by robots.

**Dvorsky 14** George Dvorsky. “How Universal Basic Income Will Save Us From the Robot Uprising.” Kinja. October 31st, 2014. http://io9.com/how-universal-basic-income-will-save-us-from-the-robot-1653303459

Robots are poised to eliminate millions of jobs over the coming decades. We have to address the coming epidemic of "technological unemployment" if we're to avoid crippling levels of poverty and societal collapse. Here's how a guaranteed basic income will help — and why it's absolutely inevitable. Illustration by Tara Jacoby The idea of a guaranteed basic income, also referred to as unconditional or universal basic income, is starting to gain traction in many parts of the world, both in developed and developing nations. It's actually a very simple idea: Everyone in society receives a single basic income to provide for a comfortable living whether they choose to work or not. Importantly, it's only intended to be enough for a person to survive on. The money for this social welfare scheme could come from the government or some other public institution, in addition to funds or income received from other sources. It could be taxable, or non-taxable, and divvyed up on a continual basis, monthly, or annually. Advocates argue that a **basic income is essential** to a comprehensive strategy **for reducing poverty because it offers extra income with no strings attached**. But looking ahead to the future, we may have little choice but to implement it. Given the ever-increasing concentration of wealth and the frightening prospect of technological unemployment, **it will be required to prevent complete social and economic collapse. It's not a question of if, but how soon.** A BIG Idea Whose Time Has Come As a concept, a basic income guarantee (BIG) has been bantered around for quite some time now. As early as 1795, American revolutionary Thomas Paine called for a Citizen's Dividend to all U.S. citizens for "loss of his or her natural inheritance, by the introduction of the system of landed property." Even Napoleon Bonaparte agreed that "man is entitled by birthright to a share of the Earth's produce sufficient to fill the needs of his existence." In his 1967 speech, "Where Do We Go From Here," Martin Luther King Jr. said: "I am now convinced that the simplest approach will prove to be the most effective — the solution to poverty is to abolish it directly by a now widely discussed measure: the guaranteed income." The idea has also been supported by the esteemed economists Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman, the latter of whom advocated for a minimum guaranteed income via a "negative income tax." A number of countries are currently considering, or even implementing, various basic income schemes, such as Brazil, Switzerland, Canada, and Germany. Even conservatives are on board. A noted by Noah Gorden in The Atlantic, creating a wage floor would be an effective way to fight poverty and to reduce government spending and intrusion. Fewer and Fewer Jobs As we head deeper into the 21st century, it's becoming painfully obvious that there are fewer and fewer jobs available. As noted by Marshall Brain, founder of How Stuff Works and author of Manna, there are more working-age people in the U.S. receiving some form of welfare than there are working-age people who do not. He adds that Another interesting fact about the United States is that **a surprisingly large portion of working age adults are not working**, primarily **because there are too few jobs** to go around. This may not be obvious, because the declared unemployment rate in the United States seems low, at consistently less than 10% over a long period of time. The problem is that the official unemployment rate hides the huge number of working-age Americans who are no longer considered a part of the workforce. Currently, only 63% of working-age adults are actually working. Owing to technologically-induced unemployment, it's a problem that's only set to get worse. As noted in Brain's article, "Robotic Nation," this is a small sampling of what we have to look forward to: **Driverless cars** are improving rapidly, and it is easy to understand that they **will** begin to **eliminate** all the jobs held by **truck drivers**, taxi drivers, etc. That is a million or more jobs that will be lost. **Tablets** and kiosks in restaurants **will** be **eliminat**ing many of the jobs currently held by **waiters and waitresses**. There are currently 3.7 million full-time K-12 teachers in the United States. Yet there is a host of new tools, including MOOCs, apps, computer-aided instruction, etc. that will start eliminating teaching positions in the near future. The pressure to reduce the cost of public education is relentless, and so is the advancement in the technology. Combine those trends with similar trends in factories, the construction industry, retail, etc. Another prominent thinker who has given this considerable thought is James Hughes, a sociologist from Trinity College in Connecticut. "We are now entering the beginning of an era in which technology has started to destroy employment faster than it creates it," he told io9. "The advance of information technology, **a**rtificial **i**ntelligence **and robotics will eventually reduce** the **demand for all** forms of **human labor**, including those dependent on 'human skills' like empathy and creativity." He offers the example of Expedia. The online program may not be as creative at travel planning as an experienced travel agent, but it still displaces travel agents because it's considerably cheaper and more accessible. It's also an example of another impact of information technology, that of cutting out the middle man. "Eventually 3D printing and desktop manufacturing will cut out most of the work between inventors and consumers," says Hughes. "**Alongside growing tech**nological **unemployment, we will** also **be living** much **longer, and** will **need** to figure out **a**nequitable **solution to the growing ratio of retirees to workers** and tax-payers. **Basic income is the logical re-negotiation of the social contract to ensure that we don't spiral into widespread poverty and inequality**."

Canada proves. UBI reduces poverty and doesn’t kill work ethic.

**MacQueen 13** Ken MacQueen (Vancouver bureau chief for Maclean’s, and a reformed Ottawa Parliamentary reporter and columnist. He prefers B.C., where stories hang fat and juicy from the trees, waiting to be shared. He’s also covered the highs and lows of the royal family, and eight Olympic Games). “Is it time to chuck welfare?” Macleans. April 19th, 2013. http://www.macleans.ca/news/canada/time-to-chuck-welfare/

Fresh **research by** University of Manitoba **health economist** Evelyn **Forget on an experiment in**to **guaranteed income**, conducted **in** the farming community of Dauphin, **Man[itoba]**., between 1974-79, **found that** evenmodest financial security cut hospital visits by 8.5 per cent compared to similar Manitoba communities.“When you realize that Canada is spending something like $50 billion a year on hospitals,” Forget says of the potential reduction, “that’s a lot of money.” There was a decline in accidents and injuries, and significantly fewer visits to doctors or hospitals for mental health reasons, perhaps because a measure of financial security reduced anxiety or depression, researchers concluded. Forget admits she was surprised at the social impact of the modest income security experiment when her team analyzed the neglected data from four decades past. She found the program “put to rest the myth that if you introduced a guaranteed income everybody will stop working.” **The only groups inclined to stay out of the workforce longer were teen boys**, who were less likely to be pulled out of school before graduation to help support the family. And married mothers had the chance to spend longer with their newborns at a time when maternity leaves were measured in weeks. **Since people kept a share of earnings above the benefit level**, which was no higher than welfare rates of the day, **there was an incentive to work** all the **harder**, says Forget. Amy Richardson, a mother of six who operated a modest beauty salon from her home in Dauphin back then, said the money went for essentials like school books. “It was enough to add some cream to the coffee,” she told the Winnipeg Free Press years later. “Everybody was the same so there was no shame.” While Dauphin was a short-lived 1970s experiment, **that era** also **spawned the Guaranteed Income Supplement for seniors**, an innovation that continues to improve lives for millions. The idea was born in the Ontario hothouse of a minority government when premier Bill Davis’s Conservatives were attacked by the opposition for the high rate of poverty among the elderly, many of them single women. Segal, then an adviser to Davis, recalls the plan was created within weeks. **Rates of poverty as high as 30 per cent fell to five per cent**. It eventually became a national program administered under the federal tax system. Hospital visits for younger retirees fell, longevity increased and seniors were more socially engaged, says Segal. “Why? Because they could actually live a reasonably comfortable life.” **Canadian poverty rates for the elderly are now among the lowest** among peer nations of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). By contrast, Canada has among the worst scores (15th of 17 countries) in rates of child and working-age poverty. While critics say a guaranteed income is an incentive to “sit home and eat popcorn,” almost 68 per cent of those below the poverty line have jobs, says Segal. “They are working, they’re just not making enough to make their core requirements.”

Minimum wage increases marginalize a “missing class” of poor people who are unaffected by the aff. A minimum standard like the counterplan ensures collective responsibility for people that avoids valorizing the work ethic.

**Brucato 14** Ben Brucato. “Raising the minimum wage: What does it mean to be “lifted out of poverty”?” January 3rd, 2014. http://www.benbrucato.com/?p=500

In the present economic environment, “**lifting 5 million out of poverty**” **will bloat** what Newman and Chen call **the “missing class,” those** who are **“decidedly not middle-class** Americans**”** and **yet “beyond the reach of most policies that speak to** the **conditions of** life among **the poor**.” Newman defines the nearly poor as “people with household incomes between $20,000 and $40,000 a year for a family of four, or 100 to 200 percent of the poverty line.” Writing in 2007, there were about twice as many of near poor as there were people under the poverty line — at that time, about 57 million in the US. This has increased sharply since the Great Recession. As an aside, the “disappearing middle class” that we have incessantly heard about since then refers to two different groups, depending on who’s speaking. Some centrist-liberals are referencing the slide of working class people into the “near poor.” Those are a result of a loss in union jobs, often in manufacturing, that have been off-shored and replaced with ‘knowledge workers’ domestically, those who possess levels and kinds of education most working class people lacked. Technological changes and globalization increased the size of the missing class considerably. But this is old news, and an established discourse. Most recent references to the “disappearing middle class” are paradoxical, because they are in fact referencing the wealthy, six-figure earners with investment portfolios losing most of their capital and joining the middle class. These are the people who watch the news, often for hours a day, paying close attention to this discourse of the “disappearing middle class”, but they also paying very close attention to those stock reports that the rest of us poor slobs could care less about. These are the petty bourgeois, the managerial class, and small-business owning people who were in the top 20% income bracket (but not the top 1%) who have seen their real income decline sharply since 2007. This is the so-called “disappearing middle class” we hear about. But, I digress… Newman explains **the new poor represent “the promise of upward mobility.” However, their lives are precarious. “They truly are one paycheck**, one lost job, one divorce or one sick child **away from falling below the poverty line.”** For the majority of the past decade, I have vacillated between “missing class” and poor, and this position of precarity was often frightening even without a family. Like most “near poor” people, I managed to piece together state and federal benefits, occasional work well below my past income, and odd jobs. I learned to significantly reduce my “quality of life” –or, in other words, I learned to be less healthy and happy by neglecting health care, eating lower-quality food, and doing without “leisure” activities. Instead of going out to bars with friends, I worked in them. I rented a house in a neighborhood where I heard gunshots daily (and found shell casings in my yard) so I could sublet an apartment above the garage. I was far from destitution, but just as far from stability and comfort. With a family, the anxieties of being “missing class” can be crippling. Over the last few years, my income changes three times a year, requiring multiple trips to state benefits offices to update paperwork, go to interviews with caseworkers, and wait for weeks worrying about whether we’ll be able to eat healthy food or toxic plastic for the next months. Some months, we received hundreds in food stamps and a healthy cash benefit, others we received nothing because our paychecks put us over thresholds by as little as a few dollars. When my daughter was born, she was fortunately on the Arizona state health care plan, because she required weeks of intensive care to survive. The bill would have at least cost hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions. We don’t know, because we never got that bill. That’s what medical care should be like for everyone, and especially in a country where we are surrounded by opulence. When my daughter was just months old, however, my partner made about a hundred dollars more that quarter, which pushed us $27 over the threshold for state benefits. Our family immediately went from having full health coverage to having no coverage, without notice, and without any back-up plan offered. We spent the next six months without any insurance, a frightening situation while poor and with a newborn. Lifting “5 million out of poverty” in the present environment means casting a large chunk of the poor into a shadowy area where needed benefits may not shine. **Many of these families will see wage** income**s increase slightly, but benefits reduced sharply**. This is partly because the Federal government and many states are slashing benefits as part of austerity measures. But it’s also because **the “missing class” is neglected by social welfare policies**. In the United State, the safety net is set very low, and has many rips and tears in it. This is the case **in part because most policy makers**, the wealthy conservatives who vote them in, and the corporations who own them **hate poor people.** **There’s a reason why minimum wage reform** is becoming more popular: it still places the emphasis on the individual to make life work in a community that has forsaken them, in a policy environment that detests them. It **maintains** the **valorization of work, instead of**, for instance, the **assurance of a respectable minimum standard** for all members of a community. **It emphasizes individual** responsibility **rather than** the **collective responsibility** to each person. Even the father of modern conservatism, Edmund Burke, expressed a view contrary to the actions of even centrist-liberal legislators, when he wrote in 1748: The riches of a nation are not to be estimated by the splendid appearance or luxurious lives of its gentry; it is the uniform plenty diffused through a people, of which the meanest as well as greatest partake, that makes them happy, and the nation powerful. When this is wanting, the splendor of the great is rather a reproach than honour to them… The idea of robust minimum standards is common to all modern political ideology with the exceptions of fascism and the contemporary American brand of neoconservatism. These are far from radical ideas, and this is one reason why it’s important to be very specific about the methods of assuring they are met. They should not valorize work and toil, nor should they place the burden on the individual. Burke’s concern for the poor is rooted in crass nationalism and maintaining the stability in a highly stratified society. But his conservatism seems radical compared against the American neocons of today.

Minimum wage increases are subservient to the interests of the rich. Discourse on minimum wage proves.

**Brucato 14** Ben Brucato. “Raising the minimum wage: What does it mean to be “lifted out of poverty”?” January 3rd, 2014. http://www.benbrucato.com/?p=500

**The problem is that the plan is not to eliminate poverty** and create an exuberant community where everyone thrives. The problem is that **the people making the decisions are serving the rich**, seducing those who have even marginal influence with blind moralism, and turning millions of Americans who are better off into mean, spiteful hoarders of imaginary wealth who hate the poor. This is where the earlier digression about the “disappearing middle class” becomes relevant. This is code to focus attention away from the missing class and those slipping into it, and to keep the attention on **the interests of the top 20%**. Their interests **fully occupy the shaping of all mainstream political discourse. Problems are defined in terms that cater to their interests. Raising the minimum wage,** particularly **how it has been discussed in the popular press** in the past months**, is** very much **part of this discourse**. We need more than just attention to evidence-based policy. Policy and discussions thereof should be predicated on it. Those policies that have increased poverty and precarity should be entirely off the table. The **talk of individual responsibility needs to be regarded as the silly moralizing as it is,** as **the spitefully classist discourse that it is**, and those advancing it should be no part of determining economic and other entitlements.

### 2-Life Changing CP

Counterplan: just governments ought to require that employers pay a life-changing wage.

Davies 11 Will Davis (Senior Lecturer at Goldsmiths, University of London) “the 'life-changing wage'” Potlach January 4th 2011http://potlatch.typepad.com/weblog/2011/01/the-life-changing-wage.html JW 3/15

So the question is, what is a life-changing wage? How much would someone need to earn in a year, in order to de-couple their life from economic institutions and rules? What are the economic costs of opting out of the constraints that make up 'society'? One could start by working out what the average household mortgage debt is in the UK - being able to pay off this amount instantly would be life-changing. Add to this the annual cost of top private school fees: around £50k a year of taxed income, per child (so £120k once multiplied by 2.4 children). Then one could look at the transaction costs involved in moving one's wealth to a tax haven. Those who earn enough for major tax avoidance to be 'efficient' can be considered rich enough to have escaped the 'social contract' on which modern liberalism is based. Finally, there should be some way of calculating how much one should be able to save in a year, in order to build up a life-changing amount of additional capital within a decade. Life-changing, in this respect, means never having to work again. Of course there would be no perfect way of calculating what a life-changing wage would be. But there is no perfect way of calculating what a living wage is either. The point in each case is to return to life, to biological possibility and necessity, as the basic unit of economics and politics. Surely the gravest offence of ultra-high wages is that they offer (or at least hint at) an exit route from what Heidegger viewed as the existential fact of Being-With others. Whether or not hell is other people, even bankers should be forced to tolerate them as a condition of being human.

Solves economic oppression better than the aff. Living wage creates ruse of solvency.

Davies 11 Will Davis (Senior Lecturer at Goldsmiths, University of London) “the 'life-changing wage'” Potlach January 4th 2011http://potlatch.typepad.com/weblog/2011/01/the-life-changing-wage.html JW 3/15

The success of living wage campaigns could be viewed as an example of what Hardt and Negri view as the biopolitical nature of contemporary economic production. As they argue in Empire and Multitude, contemporary capitalism now harnesses and produces our most primitive human capabilities - sociability, speech, care, health, thinking, bio-matter. To be alive is to be a potential source of value (and hence also of resistance) under contemporary relations of production, which is why they define the revolutionary class as a 'multitude' far broader than just the working class. It's interesting that a just wage is now classed as a living wage. It's as if alternative metrics of justice or economic desert have broken down, so we fall back on bare life as our entitlement - but also, Hardt and Negri would add, what capitalism requires in order to continue. Offices will not be cleaned by people who cannot live. To recognise the compatibility of living wage campaigns with contemporary bio-politics is in no way to denigrate the former; Hardt and Negri themselves would agree that bioproduction and immaterial labour can be harnessed in pursuit of justice, merely by following their own logic. Might the centre-left (as opposed to Hardt and Negri's more revolutionary left) be able to articulate something similar at the opposite end of the wage scale? As bonus season approaches, could there be such a thing as a life-changing wage, and might it not also be calculable? The life-changing wage is something that the left could then mobilise against. This must be an important issue for financial regulation, as the focus on bonuses (and different types of bonus) now indicates. Problems of incentives in banking abound, a key one being that the gamblers are using other people's money. But one of the largest incentive problems must be existential and biopolitical - the fact that short-term rewards are potentially life-changing, thereby eliminating accountability and grossly undermining the capacity to calculate risks in a prudent, rational fashion. Bankruptcy and redundancy are only worth risking if the alternative outcomes mean, potentially, never having to work again. Just as tourism, at its worst, incentivises people to behave in ways they would never do at home, a job which promises the reward of eternal holiday incentivises people to behave in ways that no ordinary (or, for the matter, rational) economic agent ever would. The apocalyptic emails of Fabulous Fab read like the last words of a suicide bomber who believes that they have 1,000 virgins waiting for them on the other side. "If this bet comes off, it will destroy all betting shops once and for all!" And so it proved. Just as very low wages and unemployment make life virtually impossible (where 'life' includes raising children, basic nutrition, adequate economic security to remain in one's home and sleep at night), so very high wages potentially release life from all forms of economic and political constraint. Where the former prevent one from honouring the basic commitments that life requires, the latter offer a degree of freedom in which life is without any limit whatsoever. If every day of work could literally be my last, if only one of my bets comes off, then I cannot be trusted to behave responsibly in the interests of my employers or anyone else.

### 3-Standard Spec

*[this shell was largely extemped but I wrote down notes for it as well as the interp text during prep time]*

A. debaters must read a standard text that clarifies what offense links to the aff framework.

B.

C. prefer

1. stratskew

2. clash

D. Fairness outweighs the K.

1. it’s most specific to your role as a judge.

Desai 14 Shrey Desai (participated in elimination rounds of College Prep, Stanford, Cal, and other local tournaments) “Fairness vs. Critical Arguments” October 21st 2014 VBriefly <http://vbriefly.com/2014/10/21/fairness-vs-critical-arguments/> JW 2/24/15

First, the most important reason why fairness should come before critical arguments is because it is most pertinent to the judge’s obligations. Pay close attention to a ballot the next time you see one – tournaments often print something along the lines of, “The aff/neg is the winner because they did the better debating”, where the judge has to indicate the winner of the round. Therefore, the question here is whether fairness or critical arguments best cohere[s] with the role of the judge. There are two reasons why fairness is better in line with the judge’s obligations. 1) The judge, as a gatekeeper to this educational activity, must ensure that debaters are on equal footing and can properly engage each other. Obviously, if one debater had ten minutes to speak as opposed to another debater that had three, there would be an obvious incongruence because the latter debater would not be able to develop his or her arguments as well. Similar fairness claims also apply to this situation because some strategies put debaters in a harder spot, so the judge must ensure that each debater has an equal shot at winning the round. Theory shells tell the judge that because there is sufficient abuse in the round, the judge should drop the debater as a proportional response to the loss of substantive engagement. For example, if the alternative of a K is not a post-fiat policy option, it would probably moot a plan’s offense because the aff just spent 6 minutes setting up a policy framework. This is problematic because it makes the aff restart in the 1AR, which is already tough considering the unequivocal time constraint. 2) If critical debaters endorse role of the ballots that encompass touchy subjects such as oppression, their opponent may feel extremely uncomfortable in responding to this argument in a proper, intellectual way. For example, the opponent would not have arguments such as “the evidence supporting their role of the ballot has no warrant”, or “resisting oppression is not a priority” because these arguments can be seen as repugnant, or at the least, unintuitive and unconvincing. If the role of the ballot of “resisting oppression” is advanced at the expense of qualitative ground for the other debater, the judge should side with the latter because in weighing educational benefits, judges ought to endorse the in-round impacts derived from excluding the other debater from the discussion rather than resisting oppression in some utopia that people have never heard about. Critical debaters would disagree and say that they recontextualize the role of the judge and their obligations, but this is irrelevant for two reasons: a) this violates tournament rules where they asked the judge to determine who did the better debating as per the current resolution; this can make the debate extremely unpredictable since the role of the ballot can shift from something like resisting oppression to winning Mario Kart and b) this violates common usage because the intuitive conception of debate shared by the majority of people is that debate is a clash between competitive philosophies or ideologies rather than a forum for initiating resistance or implementing Wildersen’s plan of burning down society; this is important because if debate prepares us to be social advocates, we should take our education to apply to important topics as governmental policies rather than impacts such as resisting oppression that might not spillover outside the debate community.

2. Fairness is a prerequisite because without it debaters quit.

Desai 2 Shrey Desai (participated in elimination rounds of College Prep, Stanford, Cal, and other local tournaments) “Fairness vs. Critical Arguments” October 21st 2014 VBriefly <http://vbriefly.com/2014/10/21/fairness-vs-critical-arguments/> JW 2/24/15

Second, fairness should outweigh critical arguments because it is a necessary gateway to evaluating critical arguments in the first place. Ask any debater why they joined the activity – you’ll get responses such as, “looks good on the résumé”, “I like to argue”, “winning is fun”; the element that all these responses have in common is competitive success. Therefore, competitive success is the biggest reason people debate and if people ceased to win rounds, they would probably quit the activity because it would be a waste of time and money. Fairness is crucial here because, if, for example, a debater always lost to a role of the ballot of “resisting oppression” because [t]he[y] did not have equitable arguments, [t]he[y] would get flustered and quit the activity. Therefore, fairness is conceptually a prerequisite to critical discussion because it allows debaters to engage each other on equitable footing before they can discuss important impacts such as oppression. Critical debaters might respond to this by arguing that relatively small losses of fairness do not outweigh huge losses of education, but this is untrue. If debaters cannot engage a position because of a lack of arguments or reciprocal burden structures, that would be a huge blow to fairness because it would give the other debater a head start in presenting their arguments. Fairness is also necessary to prevent chaos in the debate space because, if, for example, people started to rip up their opponent’s flows or continue their speeches beyond the time limit, debate would quickly turn into a jungle rather than a constructive space for the exchange of scholarly arguments. At the end of the day, debate is fundamentally a competitive activity, that must be constrained by rules, just as any other activity, like basketball or football. Without these rules to keep people in check, there would be havoc, which would ultimately cutting down on the benefits the activity is supposed to sponsor.

3. Unfairness means I can’t engage in the ff. Allowing me equal ground lets me answer the aff so we can have real discourse on a level playing field which ensures better oppression resistance-link turns your role of the ballot.

Drop the debater 1. To rectify time lost running theory and 2. To deter future abuse—empirically proven by shells like a prioris bad. 3. Drop the arg skews my strat since debaters will read lots of unfair args in the AC and force me to waste time with lots of theory killing substantive education.

Competing interps since 1. Any brightline is arbitrary and bites judge intervention 2. Reasonability causes a race to the bottom to see who can be the most abusive under the given brightline 3. Competing interps forces a race to the top-an offense defense paradigm fosters good norms for the activity.

No RVIs. 1. Illogical. Just because you are fair doesn’t mean you should win. If that were true, both debaters would win rounds without theory, which would be irresolvable, and resolvability comes first since every debate needs a winner. 2. Chilling effect. Either I read theory and you beat me with your 4 minute prep out or I don’t read theory and abusive practices prevail-both kill fairness. 3. Topical clash. RVIs kill substantive debate. Once theory is initiated we can never go back to substance, because it’s unnecessary so nobody will engage in the topic. 4. Norm setting. I can’t concede that the counter-interp is better even if I come to that realization in the middle of the round, so the RVI forces debaters to argue for bad debate practices, which is inimical to the most fair and educational interps in the long run.

### 4-Country Spec

A. Interpretation: On the January February 2015 topic the aff must specify a single country to implement a living wage in the form of a delineated text in the AC.

B. Violation: there is no country specified in the AC.

C. Standards

1. Debatability. Country spec is the only way we can actually analyze minimum wages.

**Herr et al 9** Prof. Dr. Hansjörg Herr (teaches Economics at the Be Prof. Dr. Hansjörg Herr rlin School of Economics. He works in the field of Financial Globalisation, Development Economics and European Integration), Milka Kazandziska (studied International Economics (M.A.) at the Berlin School of Economics. She teaches Economics at the Berlin School of Economics and is Ph.D. candidate. She specialises in Economics and Labour Markets with a focus on European Integration) and Silke Mahnkopf-Praprotnik (studied International Economics (M.A.) at the Berlin School of Economics. She teaches Economics at the Berlin School of Economics. She specialises in Economics and the German Labour Market). “The Theoretical Debate About Minimum Wages.” Global Labour University Working Papers, Paper No. 6. February 2009. http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU\_Working\_Papers/GLU\_WP\_No.6.pdf

Minimum wages were first introduced in the early 19th century. Currently about 90 per cent of all countries have statutory minimum wages. However, **minimum wages** can be set in different ways and **can have fundamentally different roles in different countries**. They can be set on an hourly or monthly basis for all employees. But minimum wages can also be differentiated according to industry, profession, age, region, etc. They can be set by governments and through the collective bargaining process if the negotiated wages are declared binding for all firms in an industry. They can be set autonomously by the government with or without consultation with trade unions and employers’ associations or automatically following a certain rule of law. **While** in some instances **they may have** only a **symbolic meaning if** they are **unrealistically low, they** also **can be effective** and important **for a substantial number of employees**. Last but not least, unions may be in favour of minimum wages or against their introduction. In short: **minimum wages must ultimately be judged as part of** general **labour market institutions which reflect a country’s specific developments and constellations.**

Debatability is key since we can’t engage in any kind of debate if we can’t debate.

2. Neg ground. Best neg ground is country specific since the general idea of poverty wages are repugnant-I need access to trade off arguments about different countries. Ground is key to fairness since we both need arguments to win.

3. Stable advocacy. There is no possibility for 1AR shift underneath my interp because you are bound to an advocacy that can be referenced during and after the round. Anything else risks nullification of 100% of my constructive ground since you can re-clarify what you defended in the 1AR to escape disads and NCs. You could de-link my US econ cards by saying it’s only one instance making it impossible for me to read any evidence. Key to fairness since it allows you to moot my positions giving you easier access to the ballot.

A text is always preferable since I can hold you to it as opposed to CX questions we don’t have memorized and can’t access later. Moreover, reasons why CX is better don’t prove that a text isn’t also good—we can still ask clarification questions in my world. But, CX is primarily for strategy, not to find out what you defend, so I shouldn’t have to ask. And this outweighs time spent outlining your advocacy—that takes seconds as opposed to a line of questioning that can last minutes.

# 2NR

## A2 Condo

### C/I

Counter interp: neg gets two conditional counterplans and the status quo if one of their counterplans is plan-plus and the other is universal basic income. Reasons to prefer:

1. Real world decision making. Condo’s most logical and is key to real world.

**Solt 03** Roger Solt (has coached debate at the University of Kentucky). “The Disposition of Counterplans and Permutations: The case for Logical, Limited Conditionality.” 2003. http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/Solt2003.htm

According to the theory of negative counterplan disposition, the negative, like the affirmative is limited to one proposal for change. **The status quo**, however, **always remains a logical option** available to the judge. According to this approach, the counterplan is always at the negative's disposition in that they can always concede the counterplan and defend the status quo, even if the affirmative has only attacked its desirability, that is, they have straight turned the counterplan. The first argument in favor of this position is that it follows from the logic of real world decision-making. **A rational decision-maker, confronted with two proposals** for change, **can almost always reject both and keep things as they are**, and indeed, s/he should do so if both changes would be inferior to the policy that now exists. Second, **this** form of limited conditionality **is also consistent with real world advocacy**. Faced with one proposal for change, opponents of a policy frequently offer a counter-proposal. In response to the Republican tax cut proposal, the Democrats will offer an alternative tax cut proposal of their own. But even if the Democrats' plan is rejected, the Republicans' need not be embraced. Democrats can still vote against the Republican plan. Indeed, this posture of **proposing an alternative**, **but still defending the status quo as superior to the policy proposed by** one's **political opponents is** so common that it is **essentially business as usual**. Thus, rejecting all forms of conditional argument is in fact less in accord with the practice of real world public advocates than is the acceptance of limited conditionality.

2. Ground. Aff overlimits neg ground by forcing me to commit entirely to one course of action in the NC, meaning I lose if the aff wins one take-out like a permutation or solvency deficit. The abuse is unique to the neg because (a) the neg is reactive, so I need the ability to adapt to aff strat, and (b) aff can check back counter-plans with multiple perms. Neg can’t. Ground is key to fairness since it ensures we are able to make arguments.