

**BASIC INCOME**

**Newsletter of the  
Basic Income European Network**

**N°19      May 1994**

**Join us at the**

**FIFTH CONGRESS OF THE  
BASIC INCOME  
EUROPEAN NETWORK**

**Goldsmith College, London,  
8-10 September 1994**

A unique opportunity to update your information and exchange ideas, as basic income is gaining unprecedented attention in ever wider circles

Call for papers and further practical details on page 3.  
Programme and registration form enclosed:  
feel free to make copies and send them  
to anyone you think might be interested.

## CONTENTS

### OUR NETWORK

2	The Executive Committee
2	The Editorial Board
3	The 1994 Congress and General Assembly
11	Events past and future
12	How to join BIEN
12	Membership form

### PUBLICATIONS

4	Dutch
5	English
7	French
10	Italian
10	Spanish

### BIEN's EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

#### • Co-chairmen:

**Edwin MORLEY-FLETCHER**, Lega Nazionale delle Cooperative e Mutue, Via Guattani 9, I-00161 Roma. Tel: (39)(6)844391, Fax: 84439406.

**Guy STANDING**, International Labour Office, Mozsár utca 14, H-1066 Budapest, Hungary. Tel: (36)(1)1533520, Fax: 1533683.

• **Secretary: Walter VAN TRIER**, UFSIA, 21 Bosduifstraat, B-2018 Antwerp. Tel: (32)(3) 2204182, Fax: 2204420.

• **Treasurer: Alexander DE ROO**, Greens in the European Parliament, Rue Béliard 97-113, B-1047 Bruxelles. Tel: (32)(2)2843052, Fax: 2307837.

• **Conference organizer: Richard CLEMENTS**, Citizens Income Study Centre, St Philips Building, Sheffield Street, London WC2A 2EX, UK. Tel: (44)(71)9557453; Fax: (44)(71) 9557534.

• **Newsletter editor: Philippe VAN PARIJS**, Université Catholique de Louvain, Chaire Hoover, 3 Place Montesquieu, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve. Tel (32)(10)473951, Fax: 473952, e-mail: vanparijs@espo.ucl.ac.be.

### HOW YOU CAN HELP

**1. Keep us informed.** Send promptly to the editor any news, announcements, books, pamphlets, working papers, etc. that may interest other people in the network. *Deadline for next issue: 15 September 1994.*

**2. Circulate the Newsletter.** BIEN members can ask for back issues and additional copies, which will be sent free of charge.

**3. Recruit new members** by persuading more people to return the form on page 12.

THE EDITORIAL BOARD

- **Assistant editor: Christian ARNSPERGER**, 3 Place Montesquieu, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve. Tel (32)(10)473513; Fax: 473952.

- **Area representatives:**

**Jan-Otto ANDERSSON**, Abo Akademi, Department of Economics, SF-20500 Turku, Finland. Tel (358)(21)654162.

**Luis AYALA**, Universidad de Castilla, Facultad de Ciencias Económicas, Avenida de España, 02071 Albacete, Spain. Tel: (34)(967)228650; Fax: 505288.

**Marc HEIM**, 52 Boulevard St-Marcel, F-75005 Paris. Tel (33)(1)43314343.

**Stefano SACCONI**, Via di S. Pancrazio 5A, I-00152 Roma.

**Bill JORDAN**, Perriton Farm House, Whimple, Exeter EX5 2QY. Tel: (44)(404)822809.

**Robert VAN DER VEEN**, Universiteit van Amsterdam, Alg. Politologie, Oudezijds Achterburgwal 237, NL-1012 DL Amsterdam. Fax: (31)(20)5252086.

**Georg VOBRUBA**, Universität Leipzig, Augustusplatz 10/11, PSF 920, D-04109 Leipzig. Fax: (49)282435.

- **Overseas correspondents:**

**Rubén LO VUOLO**, CIEPP, Avda Pueyrredón 510-3A, 1032 Buenos Aires, Argentina. Tel: (34)(1) 9618153. Fax: 9633399.

**Jeff MANZA**, Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA. Tel: (1)(510) 6424766.

**Peter TRAVERS**, School of Social Sciences, Flinders University, GPO Box 2100, Adelaide 5001, Australia. Tel: (61)(8)2752325; Fax: 2012566.

---

This issue of  
*Basic Income*

was prepared with the help of Sue Black, Dick Clements, Guy Standing and all those who spontaneously sent relevant material.  
Many thanks!

**FIFTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS  
OF THE BASIC INCOME EUROPEAN NETWORK  
Goldsmith College, London, 8–10 September 1994**

The fifth BIEN Conference will take place at Goldsmith College, London, from Thursday 8 September (noon) to Saturday 10 September (1.30 pm). Goldsmith College is situated at New Cross in South East London, about 15 minutes by British Rail Network SouthEast train from Charing Cross or Waterloo East, and 5 minutes from London Bridge main line stations. Accommodation will be on campus and all meals will be provided there as well. There will be a wide range of meals, including vegetarian. The fee (which covers all meals) is £100 without and £125 with accommodation. **The registration form is enclosed with this issue of the Newsletter.** Please make copies and send to anyone you think might be interested! For more practical details, contact Richard Clements, Citizens Income Study Centre, St Philips Building, Sheffield Street, London WC2A 2EX, telephone: 071-9557453, fax: 9557534.

There will be participants from all over Europe, and also from Canada and the United States. As you can see from the outline below and from the detailed programme enclosed, there will be plenty of room for interaction among participants. In particular, there will be **four parallel study groups** (with Brian Barry, Bill Jordan, Ilona Ostner, Guy Standing, a team from the Dutch Planning Bureau and many others) around the following themes:

1. Citizens Income and its impact on employment
2. Political feasibility of basic income schemes and implications for the European Union
3. Costing and implementing basic income
4. The history and philosophy of basic income

**Anyone interested in presenting a paper** at one of these study groups should send its title (and a brief abstract) to Richard Clements (address above) as soon as possible, and **no later than 31 July**. Papers accepted and sent well in time will be circulated at the conference (print on one side of the page only).

### PROGRAMME OUTLINE

#### THURSDAY 8 SEPTEMBER

- 12 noon Registration and lunch
- 2.30 pm Welcome and introduction
- 3.00 pm Reports on progress of the concept of basic income from country representatives
- 4.30 pm Plenary session with Sir Samuel BRITAN (Assistant editor of the *Financial Times* and advocate of basic income for over twenty years) and Lord Meghnad DESAI (Professor of Economics at the London School of Economics and until recently member of the Labour Party's shadow cabinet)
- 5.30 pm Political presentation by representatives of main UK parties
- 7.00 pm Supper, followed by a free evening

#### FRIDAY 9 SEPTEMBER

- 9.00 am Parallel study groups
- 11.30 am Plenary session with Lionel STOLERU (author in 1973 of the first French book discussing basic income, minister in charge of the introduction of the guaranteed minimum income in 1988, and currently chief economic adviser to the Ukrainian President).
- 2.00 pm Plenary session with Hermione PARKER (Founding member of BIRG and editor of its Bulletin, author of *Instead of the Dole*, and currently director of the Family Budget Unit)
- 3.30 pm Plenary session with Christopher MONCKTON (director of a public administration consultancy firm and former member of the Policy Unit under Margaret Thatcher) and Dr David PURDY (Lecturer in economics and social policy at the University of Manchester and author of a forthcoming book on basic income)
- 4.30 pm BIEN General Assembly. This session will examine and discuss the work of BIEN since the last Congress in Paris in 1992 and seek ways in which the work of the executive can be strengthened and co-operation between national networks increased. It will elect a new executive committee, including a new editor for the *BIEN Newsletter*, and choose the date and place of the sixth BIEN Conference to be held in 1996
- 7.00 pm Special BIEN supper hosted by the Citizens Income Trust

#### SATURDAY 10 SEPTEMBER

- 9.00 am Plenary session to discuss the work of the study groups
- 10.00 am Plenary session with Ken MAYHEW (Fellow of Pembroke College, Oxford) and Jack JONES (former General Secretary of the Transport and General Workers' Union)
- 11.30 am Summing-up of the Congress by BIEN co-chairmen Guy STANDING and Edwin MORLEY-FLETCHER
- 12.45 pm Lunch, followed by departure

## PUBLICATIONS

### DUTCH

**CRIVIT, Robert (ed.).** *Basisinkomen*, topic issue of *Vlaams Marxistisch Tijdschrift*, vol. 28, n°1, March 1994, pp. 17-58.

This collection of papers for and against basic income derives from a conference organized at the University of Gent by the Flemish Marxist educational institute (IMAVO). In addition to Dutch translations of two previously published pieces by Gorz (in *Arguing for Basic Income*, Verso, 1992) and Van Parijs (in *Mensuel M*, Paris, 1994), it contains a feminist critique of basic income by Kitty Roggeman (basic income would have the effect of sending women back home, working time reduction and adequate child care provide a better alternative) and a historical-materialist one by Guy Quintelier (basic income rests on exploitation, and there is no power basis to extract it from capitalists, waged workers and the self-employed). Clearly no unanimous enthusiasm for basic income among the Flemish Left. And plenty of room (and need) for clarification and further discussion.

(Editor's address: Robert Crivit, IMAVO, Stalingradlaan 18-20, B-1000 Brussel.)

**VAN BERKEL, Rik, VAN HEEREVELD, Ellen, VAN KLAVEREN, Inge-Marie & MINNAARD, Herma.** *Met z'n allen zwijgen in de woestijn. Een onderzoek naar het basisinkomen binnen de Voedingsbond FNV*, Universiteit Utrecht: Vakgroep Algemene Sociale Wetenschappen, October 1993, 103p., DFI 12.50.

Since 1981, the Food Workers' Union in the main Dutch trade union federation (FNV) has been at the forefront of the campaign for the introduction of a basic income in the Netherlands. With over 60.000 members (of whom 13.000 are unemployed), it is probably the largest organization anywhere which has been resolutely promoting the idea, and has therefore provided a major source of support for weaker or more hesitant organizations. But questions have regularly come up about the effectiveness of the Union's actions and the extent to which the rank and file shared the leadership's commitment to this goal. Hence the

present thorough research commissioned by the Union itself in order to retrace the history of the Union's action and to inquire into the feelings of the Union's members as regards income and work. About 60 percent of the membership, it appears, is aware of the Union's backing of basic income. When asked about it, about 20 percent fully support this position while another 20 percent are against basic income and about 50 percent find it a good idea but have some doubts about its financial and/or social feasibility. Awareness of the Union's position and full support for basic income are significantly more frequent and outright opposition less frequent, among unemployed members than among those employed. No significant differences have been found in this respect between the young and the old, or between men and women. The report concludes with recommendations on how to breathe new life into the Union's activity around basic income. Further discussion on income- and work-related rights and duties and around alternative variants of a (partial) basic income form crucial parts of what the membership appears to expect.

(First author's address: Universiteit Utrecht, Vakgroep Algemene Sociale Wetenschappen, Postbus 80.140, NL-3508 TC Utrecht.)

**VAN PARIJS, Philippe.** "Radicale ecologie en deep ecology voorbij. Impasses en beloftes van politieke ecologie", in C. Vanstraelen (ed.), *Rimpels in het water. Milieufilosofie tussen vraag en antwoord*, Leuven/ Amersfoort: ACCO, 1994, pp. 177-195.

An interpretation of the essence of political ecology (versus liberalism and socialism) as the struggle for the expansion of an autonomous activity sector (versus the market and the state, respectively) through the introduction of a basic income.

(Author's address: Chaire Hoover, 3 Place Montesquieu, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve.)

### ENGLISH

**ATKINSON, Anthony.** *On targeting social security: Theory and Western experience with family benefits*, London School of Economics, STICERD Welfare State Programme, Working Paper WSP/99, December 1993, ISSN 0969-4463, 69p.

If the aim is to alleviate poverty, the case for means-tested (as against universal) benefits seems overwhelming. The *vertical* target efficiency of a transfer scheme is given by the proportion of the total transfer budget that goes to people below the poverty line. The *horizontal* target efficiency of a scheme is given by the proportion of the poverty gap (i.e., of the total amount needed to bring all the poor up to the poverty line) that is actually filled by the transfer scheme. With a given budget, universal benefits fare far worse than means-tested benefits on both scores: they are worse at reaching only the target population, and worse at reaching the whole target population. And they fare even worse if greater weight is given, in the evaluation of target efficiency, to reaching the poorest among the poor. Or at least they do, Professor Atkinson points out, if no account is taken of incentive and information problems. First, the administration of means-tested schemes requires beneficiaries to be informed about their entitlements, to make themselves known to (or be identified by) the officials in charge and to provide the evidence required for verification of their entitlements. This can lead to a rate of take-up far lower than 100% (around 70% in the case of the UK's means-tested family credit scheme), thus reducing the means test's advantage in terms of (at least horizontal) target efficiency. It is possible to increase the rate of take-up through publicity and social work, but this involves a cost (in the UK, for example, the administrative cost per recipient family is £0.30 for universal child benefits and £1.80 for means-tested family credit) which reduces the portion of the budget actually available for transfers, and hence (both vertical and horizontal) target efficiency. Second, means-tested benefits often entail prohibitively high effective rates of taxation at the lower end of the income scale. This can be the case even when each means-tested scheme withdraws far less than £1 for each £1 earned, because of the cumulative effect of various schemes. (In the UK, for example, the combination of family credit, community charge benefit and housing benefit generates a marginal rate of tax of 96 percent.) This disincentive effect lowers the pre-transfer income of the poor below what it would be in the absence of the scheme, and hence deepens the poverty gap to be filled. This second type of consideration is likely to further reduce (but still unlikely to annul) the advantage of means-tested schemes

in terms of target efficiency. Both types of considerations invite to caution the well-intentioned people who lament the fact that large transfers are wasted on the non-poor. Even assuming (absurdly) a given budget and no other objective than poverty alleviation, the higher efficiency of targeted transfers is not as obvious as it seems. Any advocate of basic income and other universal benefits should understand the strength of the case for targeting and be able to show its weaknesses. There can hardly be a better point of departure than this characteristically well-informed and lucid piece by Professor Atkinson.

(Author's address: Nuffield College, GB-Oxford OX1 1NF.)

**"CANADA: NEW-FOUND PLANS"**, in *The Economist*, 7 January 1994, p. 60.

The government of the Canadian province of Newfoundland has unveiled a bold reform for social welfare. Along with tighter rules on unemployment insurance, it introduces a "basic income supplement" (C\$ 3000 annually for any adult with no other income), which *increases* by 20 cents per dollar earned (up to a gross wage of C\$ 27.500). A particularly work-friendly negative income tax scheme!

**CI BULLETIN n°17**, January 1994 (Citizens Income Research Group, St Philips Building, Sheffield Street, UK-London WC2A 2EX), 36p., ISSN 0954-8246, £3.00.

Fresh ideas can be reaped by re-evaluating the Left's intellectual heritage: this is the conviction of Manchester social scientist Stephen Quilley, who opens this issue with a short review of Thomas Paine's argument for a basic income financed from the "ground rents" flowing from individual appropriation of social assets. In an interview, Gordon Borrie, chairman of the Labour Party's Social Justice Commission, indicates that one of the priorities of British social policy has to be the fight against poverty and the unemployment trap. In this context, he says, "we've received a number of papers on Citizen's Income and partial Basic Income, but haven't yet had a full discussion about that option. We are trying to get round to it early in the New Year". Two systematic articles by Hermione Parker (CIRG) and Chantal Euzéby (University of Grenoble) set out various broad arguments in favour of a basic income. Euzéby argues that the current French RMI (minimum income for insertion) is flawed and outmoded and that it should be replaced by "a guaranteed basic income on which, under normal circumstances, the adults will be able to build through earnings from paid work". This set-up would help to make local social security systems

more effective, would free time for “non-productive” activities such as family life, and “would reduce unemployment and facilitate job-sharing”. Parker starts with alarming observations about rising poverty in Europe, as well as various flaws of traditional social insurance mechanisms, and tries to show how a “small but dependable Citizens Income” would help tackle these problems “which Europe ignores at its peril”. The purpose of CI, she emphasizes, “is to prevent (rather than relieve) poverty”. After a short review of various authors who have advocated basic income, she goes on to expound some variants of CI and describes a recent costing experiment for the UK. Rik van Berkel, of the University of Utrecht, presents the results of a survey conducted within the Dutch trade union Voedingsbond FNV, which has been the spearhead of the Dutch public debate on BI since the early eighties. His main conclusion is that “trade union members—be they workers or claimants—are not naturally predisposed in favour of BI”. In the author’s opinion, this internal hesitation comes from the fact that “by concentrating on winning support for BI outside the union, the Voedingsbond neglected the views of its own members”. Using an elaborate methodology, Autumn Yu (University of York) constructs low-cost budgets for three types of family and indicates that such an exercise has “the potential to raise public concern and to inform the debate about the concept and feasibility of a Citizen’s Income”.

(Editor’s address: Hermione Parker, c/o CIRG, see above.)

**KLIEMT, Hartmut. “On justifying a minimum welfare state”, in *Constitutional Political Economy*, vol. 4, n° 2, 1993, pp. 159–172.**

This paper by a German public choice theorist tackles the question of what type of distributive system a “realistic libertarian” would accept within the framework of a so-called minimal state. The author’s point of departure is that “criticisms of government intervention for redistributive purposes are based on a morally and intellectually respectable concern for maintaining the basic institutions and values of a free society.” But should a minimal state leave no scope for claims to a minimum share in collective wealth? This would be wrong, according to Kliemt: a minimal state, he argues, must be based on a “strongly universal” standard of material equality (as opposed to simply “formal” equal treatment), and a “social dividend” would fit perfectly into the list of features such a state would want to enforce. “There is not much left that—on behalf of principled political reasons—would distinguish a

claim to a share of the social dividend from other claims already incorporated in the legal order of a minimal state. Therefore, it seems that no constitutional principle is trespassed if the social dividend carries us beyond the minimal state into what may be called a *minimum welfare state*, i.e., a minimal state plus a redistributive scheme based on strongly universal rules of distribution.”

(Author’s address: Department of Philosophy, Universität Duisburg, D–41 Duisburg.)

**PURDY, David. “Citizens income and the future of the welfare State”, in *New Times*, London, 1993.**

In the wake of the budgetary crisis, the British government seems to be increasingly willing to cut welfare state arrangements to a minimum. There is little popular support for such cuts, but on the other hand, the opposition seems ill-equipped to breathe new life into the social policy debate. David Purdy argues that citizen’s income (CI) would be the most promising proposal to cure the lethargy. “Economic liberals argue that the very concept of a social right is dangerously misguided. CI rebuts this claim. It also challenges many of the shibboleths of the labour movement, especially the notion that only paid work is ‘productive’ and only earned income ‘legitimate’.” The problem, of course, is the financing. Purdy acknowledges the difficulties, but argues back: “No one *knows* what tax rate would be needed because no one knows how the economy, and hence the tax base, would be affected by the greater freedom that CI would bring.” To avoid the fear of a leap into the dark, he advocates a gradual introduction of CI. While CI is no panacea, it “could form the centre piece of a modern, dynamic and emancipatory successor to the welfare State. And in the meantime, it could play no small part in raising the sights of the centre-left and thwarting the plans of the radical right.”

(Author’s address: University of Manchester, Department of Social Policy, UK–Manchester M13 9PL.)

**ROBERTSON, James. *Benefits and taxes: A radical strategy*, Discussion paper of the New Economics Foundation ( Universal House, 88-94 Wentworth Street, UK–London E1 7SA), March 1994, 67p., £9 institutions, £5 individuals.**

In this long and thorough essay, James Robertson, of the New Economics Foundation, analyzes a four-component policy proposal aimed at reforming the welfare state without sacrificing efficiency, equity or ecological imperatives. In his proposal, all income and profit taxes would be replaced by a land-rent tax

and an energy tax, with the proceeds serving to finance an unconditional Citizens Income. He discusses the four components in great detail and then describes a thirteen-year implementation scenario. At the end, the CI would be £308 per month for pensioners, £220 for adults and £60 for children. The scheme would impose an additional cost of £108 billion. Moreover, £160 billion would be lost in "traditional" tax revenue. These losses would, however, be largely compensated by the revenue from the new taxes and by savings in public expenditure. The author analyzes various points of impact of CI and reformed taxes. He argues that a CI will help to smooth out economic cycles and will keep people away from lousy, low-paid jobs. It is also likely to

create disinflationary pressures and, overall, help Western societies in "shifting to an economy in which progress depended more on finding ways to save expenditure than on ways to increase income". The strategy to follow, Robertson claims, is one of support build-up: "Not much is likely to be gained at this stage by direct efforts to persuade opponents of the proposals to change their minds. It will be more useful to identify which sectoral interests and which strands of political opinion are likely to be favourable, to involve them in discussion, and to build a cross-sector and cross-party coalition of support".

(Author's address: c/o New Economics Foundation, see above.)

## FRENCH

**AIRE, *Lettre de liaison* n°4, printemps 1994, 13p.**

The newsletter of the French basic income network is getting more substantive. This issue includes the summary of a discussion that took place at the Sorbonne on 4 February 1994 (with Philipper Riché, Yoland Bresson and Philippe Lavagne) and a brief list of recent French publications.

(Address: c/o H. Boussatha, Fac. des Sciences Economiques, 58 avenue Didier, F-94210 La Varenne Saint-Hilaire. Fax: (33)(1) 48852993.)

**CAILLÉ, Alain. *Temps choisi et revenu de citoyenneté. Au-delà du salariat universel*, Caen: Démosthène & Paris: MAUSS (3 avenue du Maine, F-75015 Paris), March 1994, 62p., FF20.**

In a lecture given to an audience of nearly 500 people, Alain Caillé, professor of sociology at the University of Caen and leader of the "anti-utilitarian movement in the social sciences" (M.A.U.S.S.) denounces the hypocrisy involved in the operation of France's minimum income scheme (RMI): it is absurd to demand that claimants should give evidence of their desire to "reinsert" themselves through training and employment, when there is no job for most of them. The solution is not to create a modern analogue of state-run workhouses. Rather, give people a monthly citizens' income of FF2400 (half the minimum wage) without requiring anything in exchange, but with the possibility of supplementing this basic income with income from other sources. Such a gift is far more likely to motivate claimants to act, take initiatives, effectively reinsert themselves (by way of voluntary "countergift"), Caillé claims, than by subjecting them to forced labour. In a comment that followed the lecture, Jean-Marc Dupuis,

professor of economics at the University of Le Havre, contrasts the standard basic income proposal ("allocation universelle") with Alain Caillé's (which he interprets as a negative income tax), rejects the former as utopian and anti-redistributive and the latter because it would favour the underground economy and discourage unskilled employment. In these difficult times, he reckons, effective targeting is what we should go for.

(Author's address: c/o M.A.U.S.S., as above.)

**GAMEL, Claude. "Les bas salaires dans la pensée libérale. De l'opposition au salaire minimum à son dépassement?",** to be published in *Les bas salaires et les effets du salaire minimum*, Paris: L'Harmattan.

Liberal thought, Gamel argues in this paper, does not just lead to recommending the abolition of minimum wage legislation on grounds of efficiency. Far more radically, it leads to advocating the replacement of such legislation by an unconditional basic income. The argument is based on a reconstruction of John Rawls's suggestions in favour of a negative income tax and on Philippe Van Parijs's "real-libertarian" case for a genuine basic income (see *BI 12: 8*). "It is the task of the most advanced economies," Gamel concludes, "to explore new avenues for social life, in order to offer the countries of both East and South an alternative to massive 'affluence' unemployment."

(Author's address: Université d'Aix-Marseille, RIFE, 3 avenue Robert Schumann, F-13628 Aix-en-Provence.)

**GORZ, André. "Le Revenu Minimum Garanti, version allemande",** note de réflexion circulated at a meeting organized by *Futuribles* (Paris), March 1994, 5p.



The German economist Joachim Mitschke has recently proposed to turn the German social assistance system (about DM500 per month for a single adult plus a housing subsidy) into a negative income tax system by allowing those earning less than the social minimum to add these earnings (taxed at a 50 percent rate) to the full benefits. This proposal has apparently been taken up by the German Liberal party (FDP) and is arousing interest among some christian-democrats, social-democrats and greens. Several justifications are adduced in favour of it. According to social theorist Claus Offe's reasoning (which Gorz finds "to say the least strange"), for example, "whoever withdraws from the labour market helps the others by giving them greater chances of success in the economic competition. He is therefore entitled to compensation in the form of a citizens income." Symmetrically, according to sociologist Fritz Scharpf, making all employment (be it ill-paid or part-time) possible for the low-skilled is essential to reinsert them into society and rebuild their self-esteem. Gorz himself, however, remains cautious. He points out, for example, that an exclusive focus on the low-skilled is inadequate when 60.000 German engineers are also out of work. He recognizes that "when work will become an intermittent activity, half of it performed by self-employed people (which might be the case in 5 or 10 years), the introduction of a universal benefit, guaranteeing a basic income to all, could appear as the simplest and most rational formula." But the distribution of much of the purchasing power will then have to be performed by the state, not through classic fiscal means but through money creation. Moreover, the problem of securing everyone access to (and preventing definitive expulsion from) formal employment remains unsolved, and so does the problem of providing a space and status for unwaged activities. The solution can only be political.

(Author's address: F-10130 Vosnon, France.)

**POUR OU CONTRE LE REVENU MINIMUM, L'ALLOCATION UNIVERSELLE, LE REVENU D'EXISTENCE ?**, special issue of *Futuribles* (55, rue de Varenne, 75341 Paris Cédex), n° 184, February 1994, 112p.

*Futuribles*, a journal primarily devoted to forward studies and founded by the French political philosopher Bertrand de Jouvenel, has long been receptive to the idea of basic income. It published, for example, Philippe Van Parijs's synthesis of BIEN's founding congress (n° 106, January 1987) and, more recently, Chantal Euzéby's case for moving from the RMI to a basic income (n° 177, June 1993; see *BI* 17: 10). It has now moved one step further by devoting

one whole issue to a discussion of basic income. After a piece on the contrasting ethical foundations of the welfare state and basic income—a revised version of Van Parijs's opening lecture at the Paris BIEN Conference (see *BI* 16: 11)—, the issue gathers an interesting collection of French contributions to the debate. Philippe Riché, one of the most active members of the Association pour l'Introduction d'un Revenu d'Existence, restates as didactically as possible Yoland Bresson's still rather opaque justification of basic income as the embodiment of the "value of time" in a particular society. Jean-Marie Fisch and René-François Ripoll (from the Institut La Boétie, close to the French employers' organizations) argue in favour of a form of negative income tax (with an income guarantee equal to half the statutory minimum wage) as a way of fighting the assistance logic inherent in the RMI. André Gorz stresses the ambivalence of a basic income—its emancipatory potential and its possible contribution to an expansion of lousy jobs—and restates his case for an income guarantee (all the more important as work becomes an intermittent activity for most) that does not get rid of either the right or the duty to work. Guy Aznar (until recently Secretary General of the political movement Génération Écologie) starts off by claiming that basic income is "one of the most pernicious, dangerous and destructive ideas one could imagine" and spends the rest of his article developing arguments that quickly lead (via a correction of the unviable distortions generated by the "second check" he proposes to pay to those who reduce their labor time) to nothing but a basic income. Further, the group ACTE formed within the Association of French Employers proposes a "minimum citizenship income" that would be placed "upstream" and work as a "trampoline" (whereas the current RMI is placed "downstream" and works as a "net") and would require its beneficiaries in working age to perform either paid work, or unpaid work whose usefulness is socially recognized. Finally, Denis Clerc (director of the monthly *Alternatives Économiques*) expresses in a thoughtful article both his conviction that the RMI is quickly running into problems that a basic income may help solve, and his concern that a basic income, if low, would lead to the expansion of low-paid jobs and, if high, to the confinement of many into idle isolation. (Editor's address: Hughes de Jouvenel, *Futuribles*, address above.)

**RIGAUDIAT, Jacques & CLERC, Denis.** "Le RMI est-il dépassé ?", in *Alternatives Économiques*, n°116, April 1994, pp. 25-31.

In this interesting dossier published in a widely circulated economic monthly, a top economic adviser of socialist party chairman Michel Rocard and the monthly's director Denis Clerc discuss the future of France's minimum income in the light of the experience with the RMI, the "minimum insertion income" introduced in 1988 under Michel Rocard's government, a minimum income which is explicitly restricted to "those people whose resources fall short of the minimum income and who commit themselves to participating in actions or activities determined with them and necessary to their social or professional insertion". According to Rigaudiat, it is high time for the French to shed their collective hypocrisy. In over 50 per cent of the cases, no insertion contract is ever drawn up, while the benefit keeps being given—fortunately, but illegally. Moreover, in an ever growing proportion of cases, the RMI cannot be viewed as a transitional situation. The number of beneficiaries has now increased to well over half a million, and nearly half of them have been receiving the RMI for over two years. The way forward, according to Rigaudiat, consists in transforming the welfare system away from its focus on employment, both by shifting to general taxation as its source of revenue and by turning the RMI into a genuine "right to claim a share in society's wealth, without counterpart". In his own thoughtful and well-informed contribution (reprinted in the special issue of *Futuribles*, see above), Denis Clerc emphasizes, in the same spirit as André Gorz, the ambivalence of an unconditional basic income: depending on the framework within which it is proposed, it can either foster economic liberalism or introduce a dynamics totally opposed to it.

(Authors' address: c/o *Alternatives Économiques*, 39 rue du Sentier, F-75002 Paris.)

**VAN PARIJS, Philippe (with Michel GENET).** "Allocation universelle et plein emploi", in *Mensuel M* (Paris), 67-68, January-February 1994, pp. 30-35. Also in *Reflets et Perspectives de la vie économique* (Bruxelles) 32, February 1994, pp. 121-134.

"For all those who wish to overcome unemployment without dismantling the welfare state, for all those who want a return to 'full employment' while refusing any social regression, the question today is no longer whether one must introduce a basic income, but rather when it will be possible and expedient to do so, at what level, in which variant and along with what accompanying measures." In this non-technical piece, which integrates two short articles requested by the Belgian daily *Le Soir* and the French quarterly *Le Monde des Débats*, Van Parijs argues for this claim and sketches the two directions in which he believes discussion and research is urgently needed: (1) national partial basic income schemes at about half the individual social minimum with a matching reduction of all other transfers and (2) an even lower EU-wide basic income funded out of a uniform tax on energy and/or capital income.

(Author's address: Chaire Hoover, 3 Place Montesquieu, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve.)

**VILROKX, Jacques.** "Un revenu sans travailler", in *Labor Tribune* (Brussels), volume 93, n°2, December 1993, pp. 16-23.

In this special issue (entitled "Changing work to find employment") of a magazine published by a major temp work agency, the director of Brussels University's research centre on technological change and labour markets rigorously restates his case for basic income as a way of coping with jobless growth. The main alternative, dramatic working time reduction, faces decisive objections. In particular, the most dynamic and skilled would soon find ways of getting hold, through second or third jobs, of many of the employment opportunities which the measure was meant to spread. Basic income, on the other hand, will accompany in a far more effective way the unavoidable socio-economic changes which more traditional and rigid conceptions of work cannot accommodate.

(Author's address: Vrije Universiteit Brussel, TESA, Pleinlaan 2, B-1050 Brussels.)

## ITALIAN

**DONATI, Pierpaolo & SGRITTA, Giovanni B. (eds).** *Cittadinanza e nuove politiche sociali*, special issue of *La Ricerca Sociale* (c/o Dipartimento di Sociologia, Università di Bologna, Strada Maggiore 45, I-40125 Bologna) n° 46, 1992, 246p. ISBN 88-204-7792-0, LIT 21.000.

A collective volume on citizenship and new developments in various areas of social policy (health care, the elderly, the family, etc.). Two

contributions—one by Ivo Colozzi (associate professor at Bologna's faculty of political science) and one by Fabio Ferrucci (postgraduate student at Bologna's sociology department)—focus on minimum income guarantees and contain a substantial and sympathetic presentation of the European debate on basic income. Yet, Ferrucci shows how the logic behind current attempts at welfare reform in Italy is still assuming the centrality of

the “labour society”. Moreover, according to Colozzi, a basic income “can only become realistically possible if it is simultaneously adopted by all member states of the European

community as the foundation of a common ‘new’ welfare model”.

(Contributors’ address: see above.)

## SPANISH

**CARABAÑA, Julio & DE FRANCISCO, Andrés,** eds. *Teorías contemporáneas de las clases sociales*, Madrid: Editorial Pablo Iglesias, 1993, 265 p.

The final chapter of this reader on contemporary approaches to class analysis is Ph. Van Parijs’s “A revolution in class theory” (in his *Marxism Recycled*, Cambridge, 1993), in which he identifies the cleavage between the (stably) employed and the unemployed as the main class divide of welfare state capitalism and advocates the redistribution of employment rents through an unconditional basic income as the key objective of the new class struggle. But Enrique Gil Calvo, who reviewed the book for the daily *El País* (11.12.1993), did not appreciate this “frivolous” way in which the editors chose to conclude their otherwise excellent book. One should not be led astray by Van Parijs’s “distracting manoeuvres”: instead of “pleading once more for an unconditional grant,” he should heed “the alarming voices which alert us to the fiscal crisis of the welfare state.”

(Editors’ address: c/o Fundación Pablo Iglesias, Monte Esquinza 30, E-28010 Madrid.)

**MARTÍNEZ, F. J. (ed.).** *Una vía capitalista al comunismo: el salario social garantizado*, Madrid: Fundación de Investigaciones Marxistas (Alameda 5, 2a Izda, E-28014 Madrid), 1991, 106p.

A collective volume which has just come to our attention, with contributions by T. Doménech (Barcelona), A. de Francisco (Madrid), F. Aguiar (Córdoba), F. José Martínez (Madrid) and the Collectif Charles Fourier (Louvain).

(Address: see above.)

## EVENTS PAST AND FUTURE

### **CITIZENS INCOME AND THE LEFT LONDON, OCTOBER 1993**

A booklet gathering the documents for this conference organized by the Socialist Society should still be available from the organizers. (Address: Stephen Quilley, c/o Socialist Society, 25 Horsell Road, UK-London N5 1XL, 24p.)

### **STUDIEDAG BASISINKOMEN GENT (B), 27 NOVEMBER 1993**

A one-day conference organized at the philosophy department of the University of Gent by the Marxist Educational Institute IMAVO. With the participation of Raf Janssen (Nijmegen), Boudewijn Bouckaert (Gent), Guy Quentelie (Gent), Walter Van Trier (Antwerp) and Philippe Van Parijs (Louvain). A special issue of the Vlaams Marxistisch Tijdschrift has now been published on its basis (reviewed above). (Address: Robert Crivit, IMAVO, Stalingradlaan 18, B-1000 Brussel.)

### **REVENU D'EXISTENCE: ARGUMENTS ET OBJECTIONS PARIS, 4 FEBRUARY 1994**

A public meeting held at the Sorbonne by the Association pour l'Introduction d'un Revenu d'Existence. With the participation of Yoland Bresson, Pierre Lavagne, Philippe Riché, André Romieu and others. The proceedings can be obtained at the cost of FF 50 from H. Boussatha, Faculté des sciences économiques, 58 avenue Didier, F-94210 La Varenne Saint-Hilaire, Fax: 33-1-48852993.

### **POUR OU CONTRE LE REVENU MINIMUM ? PARIS, 30 MARCH 1994**

This seminar was organized by the monthly *Futuribles* on the occasion of the publication of a special issue focusing on basic income (reviewed above), with the participation of Hugues de Jouvenel, Michel Albert, Guy Aznar, Yoland Bresson, Jacques Robin, Philippe Riché, Philippe Van Parijs and others. A rather select meeting, though, as the participation fee for non-

members of the Association *Futuribles* was FF 948 !

(For further information: Hugues de Jouvenel, *Futuribles International*, 55 rue de Varenne, F-75341 Paris Cedex 07.)

### **L'ASSEGNO UNIVERSALE BELLINZONA (CH), 12 APRIL 1994**

This meeting organized by the Institute of economic research of the Swiss Canton of Ticino was a model of what should be organized throughout Europe. On the basis of precirculated material, a lively, well structured discussion took place on the ethics, economics and politics of basic income, not only with the Institute's researchers, but also with interested local businessmen, social administrators, political activists and secondary school teachers. (Organizer: Martino Rossi, Istituto di Ricerche Economiche, Stabile Torretta, CH-6501 Bellinzona, tel: (41)(92) 243502; Fax: 244425.)

### **UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE ABOLITION OF WAGE SLAVERY CAPRI, 4-9 JULY 1994**

A one-week summer course hosted by Swedish social scientist and prominent basic income advocate Gunnar Adler-Karlsson and his wife. The background is Professor Adler-Karlsson's reflection on a new theory of human needs. In contemporary societies, unemployment seems to be an unavoidable instrument in an economy whose functioning is based on human suffering. How to change that? For further details, please contact Gunnar Adler-Karlsson, Capri Institute for International Social Philosophy at CP 79, I-80071 Anacapri, fax: (39)(81)8373314.

### **PLACE ET SIGNIFICATION DU TRAVAIL ET DU TEMPS LIBÉRÉ DANS LA SOCIÉTÉ POST-INDUSTRIELLE THIVIERS, 1-14 SEPTEMBER 1994**

A two-week summer organized by the French Unemployed Union, with the participation of Roger Sue, Jacques Robin, Yoland Bresson, Michel Godet, Denis Clerc, Guy Aznar, etc. Further information and registration form: Partage, 54 rue des Entrepôts, F-93400 Saint-Ouen, tel: 40120500.

**WHAT IS BIEN?**

**The Basic Income European Network was founded in September 1986 to serve as a link between individuals and groups committed to, or interested in, basic income, i.e. an income unconditionally granted to all on an individual basis, without means test or work requirement, and to foster informed discussion on this topic throughout Europe.**

Address:  
**Walter Van Trier**  
**BIEN Secretary**  
**Bosduifstraat 21**  
**B-2018 Antwerpen, Belgium**  
**phone: (32)(3) 2204182**  
**fax: (32)(3) 2204420**  
**Bank account: 001-2204356-10**  
**at the CGER, 21 rue Archimède, 1040 Brussels**

**TO BECOME A MEMBER OF BIEN**

You need to pay your membership fee (standard: 1000BF; unwaged: 500BF; institutional: 4000BF; or equivalent amounts in your country's currency, e.g. £ 20, DM 50, Dfl 55, LIT 40000, FF 150 for the standard rate) and return the form below to the address indicated.

Unless you have a strong reason for doing otherwise, we strongly recommend that *you simply put the required amount of money (no coins!) in a well sealed envelope* and send it, along with the form overleaf, to BIEN's secretary. Otherwise, use either a Eurocheque (made out in Belgian Francs and in a Belgian town) or a US Cashier's check.

-----  
Please fill in and return to BIEN, c/o W. Van Trier, Bosduifstraat 21, B-2018, Antwerpen.

Surname:

First name:

Full mailing address:

Phone:

Fax:

**Membership fee:**

- Standard (BF1000 or equivalent)
- Institutional (BF4000 or equivalent)
- Reduced (BF500 or equivalent)

- US Cashier's check
- Transfer to bank account (*institutional rate and donations only*)

**Mode of payment:**

- Cash
- Eurocheque (*made out in Belgian Francs*)

