Topic: Universal Basic Income as a policy response to automation-driven job displacement.

I. Introduction

- Hook: By 2030, McKinsey Global Institute projects that up to 375 million workers globally will need to change occupational categories due to automation.
- Context: Define UBI; summarise the current policy landscape (Finland trial, US proposals, Kenya GiveDirectly studies).
- Research question: Can universal basic income effectively mitigate the economic displacement caused by automation?
- Thesis: The available evidence from controlled UBI trials suggests it reduces poverty, maintains or improves workforce participation, and produces measurable improvements in health and education outcomes , making it a credible policy response to automation-driven displacement.

II. Literature Review

- Early UBI proposals and theoretical frameworks (Friedman's negative income tax; Van Parijs's real libertarianism)
- Summary of major empirical trials: Finland (2017–18), Stockton SEED (2019–21), GiveDirectly Kenya (2016–ongoing)
- Identified gaps in current research: long-run labour market effects, inflationary risk under full-scale implementation, cross-cultural transferability

III. Argument 1 , UBI Reduces Poverty Without Reducing Work

- Topic sentence: Contrary to the standard critique that unconditional income reduces work incentive, empirical data from UBI trials consistently shows stable or increased workforce participation.
- Evidence , Finland trial: Employment rates among recipients were statistically indistinguishable from the control group at 12 months; wellbeing scores significantly higher.
- Evidence , Stockton SEED: Full-time employment among recipients increased from 28% to 40% over 24 months, versus 25% to 37% in the control group.
- Analysis: The work-disincentive assumption relies on a model of human motivation that the trial data does not support.

IV. Argument 2 , Health and Education Co-Benefits

- Topic sentence: UBI's value is not limited to income replacement , trials document secondary gains in health outcomes, educational attainment, and child development that compound over time.
- Evidence: GiveDirectly longitudinal data shows reduced hospitalisation rates, improved primary school attendance, and lower reported domestic conflict among recipient households.
- Analysis: These co-benefits suggest UBI should be evaluated not as a welfare line item but as a public health investment.

V. Counterargument and Rebuttal

- Counterargument: Critics argue UBI is fiscally unsustainable at national scale, inflationary, and a politically convenient substitute for structural labour market reform.
- Rebuttal: Fiscal modelling from the Roosevelt Institute (2017) found that a $1,000/month UBI funded by progressive taxation would increase GDP by approximately $2.5 trillion over 8 years via stimulated consumer spending. Inflation risk depends on funding mechanism , deficit-financed UBI carries risk; tax-funded does not. The structural reform objection is valid but does not negate UBI's value as a complementary mechanism.

VI. Conclusion

- Summary of findings
- Restate thesis in light of the evidence reviewed
- Limitations of current research and directions for further study
- Policy recommendation: pilot expansion in automation-affected industrial regions before federal-level implementation