
Any connection between basic income and perfume? Yes there is, and of an unexpected kind. A book just published in Paris by the chairman of Yves Saint Laurent contains a passionate plea for an unconditional guaranteed income. It is reviewed on page 9.

Toward a European citizenship income? The Social Affairs Committee of the European Parliament has recently approved a report which includes the proposal of a European citizenship income. But we are not there yet … Further details on page 3.

The political philosophy of basic income is discussed in three books published in Paris this Autumn. The most recent books by André Gorz, Jean-Marc Ferry and Philippe Van Parijs are reviewed on pages 9-10.
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EVENTS
CONFERENCE ANNOUNCEMENT
AU-DELA DU R.M.I. / BEYOND THE WELFARE STATE
(PARIS, 18-19 SEPTEMBER, 1992)

A BIEN conference will be organized in Paris in 1992, as planned, with the evaluation of the new French guaranteed minimum income scheme as a point of departure. The date, however, will not be 3-4 April, as previously announced, but—more in tune with BIEN’s habits—18-19 September. Further details will be given in the next Newsletter. Those interested in presenting a paper on (1) whether and how a basic income could solve the problems revealed by the operation of RMI-like schemes; (2) socio-historical or ethical aspects of the transition from RMI-like schemes to a BI; and (3) institutional, legal, and political aspects of this transition, whether on a national or European scale, are invited to contact Yoland Bresson (Faculté des Sciences Economiques et de Gestion, 58 avenue Didier, F-94210 La Varenne Saint-Hilaire, phone: (33)(1)49768000, fax: (33)(1)48852993) who will forward the proposal to the organizing committee.

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY
REPORT ON SOCIAL ASSISTANCE AND CITIZENSHIP INCOME
(EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, NOVEMBER 1991)

In May 1991, the European Council presented to the Commission a draft of a proposal, entitled "Recommendation on common criteria concerning sufficient resources and social assistance in the social protection system", in which homogenization of the criteria for welfare provisions in EC member states was advocated. The central problem raised in this proposal is the existence of large discrepancies between states. The Council’s main recommendations are, first, that the four less advanced member states should make efforts to match the more developed systems existing elsewhere in the EC, most notably by introducing guaranteed minimum income schemes; second, that the more developed systems should themselves be reformed in several ways. In November 1991, Birgit Cramon Daiber (of the German Green party) wrote a report in which she makes suggestions for the reformulation or extension of several portions of the Council’s proposal. An unconditional basic income based on citizenship is part of her suggestions: "It is necessary in the medium and long run to redefine the social security systems as general and individual legal entitlements of citizens, and to work towards the creation of a general citizenship income." She suggests to amend the Council’s proposal by a new article (no. B7) in which the more developed member states are encouraged to experiment with such a citizenship-income. In the proposed text of the article, this income is described as reflecting the idea that "every individual with a legal right of residence is entitled to protection, irrespective of his availability for work." The level of the income guarantee, according to Mrs Cramon Daiber, should not be set at an absolute minimum subsistence level, but rather at about 40 percent of each country’s per capita income, because "in our Western societies, an absolute existence minimum does not allow to lead a life respecting human dignity." In mid-November, Cramon Daiber’s report was approved by the Social Affairs Committee (12 votes against 9), but raised strong objections at the plenary session—mainly because the 40 percent clause seemed excessive to many parties, both on the right and on the left. To avoid losing the vote in plenary, the report was taken back to the Social Affairs Committee, which will organise hearings on the subject. It will take at least another six months until the report is back in plenary.

(Publisher’s address: Birgit Cramon Daiber MEP, Greens in European Parliament, Rue Belliard 79-113, B-1047 Bruxelles.)

PUBLICATIONS

- 3 -
The curious title of this set of background papers ("Peeling Tulip Bulbs and Other Work") reflects the current mood of social security implementation in the Netherlands, in which financial constraints and the newly revived ethic of paid work lead local labour offices to try to compel unemployed skilled industrial workers, against existing practices, to accept unskilled agricultural labour in remote places. Among the papers, there is a clear exposition by Alexander de Roo and Nel van Dijk (of the Green Group in the European Parliament), that contrary to what is often thought, there will exist in 1992 no legal or statutory barriers at EC level to prevent a member-state from adopting a policy of radical labour time reduction or a basic income.

A lengthy and sympathetically critical review article of recent dissertations by Raf Janssen ("Armoede of Soberheid") and Robert van der Veen ("Between Exploitation and Communism") (see BI 8:5 and BI 10:7, respectively). Economist Paul de Beer notes, first, how both authors advocate closely similar and radical views of a society in which the importance of paid work has been reduced due to a high share of basic income in national income. But, second, while Janssen justifies his view by an argument which depends on basic income's capacity to reduce the harmful effects of a growth-oriented market economy (an argument that links unconditional coverage of basic needs with the adoption of a frugal and ecologically sensitive lifestyle), van der Veen praises the market economy as the fountainhead of productivity growth, which would enable the state to dampen the growth of per capita output, and then impose, through taxation, an ever-rising basic income share, thus inducing a choice for more leisure and less consumption on the part of rational agents, whatever their lifestyles. This redistributive policy is supposed to be ethically justified, according to van der Veen's liberal reinterpretation of the Marxian tradition, because it alone ensures that the interests of the most disadvantaged members of society (those having the least access to both income and leisure) will be taken care of as well as possible. De Beer dissects these lines of argument in order to assess their potential for the renewal of social democratic theory, and concludes that, however challenging, neither provides a cogent case for a zero-growth basic income regime.

A lengthy and sympathetically critical review article of recent dissertations by Raf Janssen ("Armoede of Soberheid") and Robert van der Veen ("Between Exploitation and Communism") (see BI 8:5 and BI 10:7, respectively). Economist Paul de Beer notes, first, how both authors advocate closely similar and radical views of a society in which the importance of paid work has been reduced due to a high share of basic income in national income. But, second, while Janssen justifies his view by an argument which depends on basic income's capacity to reduce the harmful effects of a growth-oriented market economy (an argument that links unconditional coverage of basic needs with the adoption of a frugal and ecologically sensitive lifestyle), van der Veen praises the market economy as the fountainhead of productivity growth, which would enable the state to dampen the growth of per capita output, and then impose, through taxation, an ever-rising basic income share, thus inducing a choice for more leisure and less consumption on the part of rational agents, whatever their lifestyles. This redistributive policy is supposed to be ethically justified, according to van der Veen's liberal reinterpretation of the Marxian tradition, because it alone ensures that the interests of the most disadvantaged members of society (those having the least access to both income and leisure) will be taken care of as well as possible. De Beer dissects these lines of argument in order to assess their potential for the renewal of social democratic theory, and concludes that, however challenging, neither provides a cogent case for a zero-growth basic income regime.

"Basic income does not threaten employment, quite the contrary": this quote by Nobel laureate Jan Tinbergen opens a dense, well-documented discussion paper prepared by economist den Broeder and European Parliament collaborator de Roo for the basic income discussion within the Dutch Green-Left Party. They want the latter to go, as a medium-term aim, for a full unconditional income of DFl. 900 (£300) per month, financed by a 34 per cent tax on value added, and coupled with a uniform tax rate (on all personal and corporate income) at 25 per cent. They show that marginal tax rates on wages would go down on the whole range, that no household at the bottom would lose out and that on average part-time workers and families with one earner will gain at the expense of single persons and two-earner families. Stigmatization and bureaucracy, they argue, will go down, while employment will increase significantly as existing firms and new initiatives respond to the lowering of the relative cost of labour. The Green Left, they conclude, must stand squarely for a proposal of this type, as other progressive parties have done before in Europe and elsewhere.

(Second author's address: Rue Dupont 74 I, 1210 Schaerbeek, Brussels, Belgium.)
This most recent issue of the Dutch network's newsletter contains, as usual, reports on various events and publications, in addition to some short articles. Of particular interest, this time, a forceful plea for basic income from the standpoint of single parents by Jeanne van den Heuvel, a single mother of three and active collaborator of the Dutch Council of Churches. Also an interesting report by Paul de Beer on the June 1991 Conference of the Young Socialists (the Labour Party's youth section), which rejected basic income as a long-term aim by a narrow majority, and adopted instead a long-term policy package with employment subsidies at its core.

In this paper, which served in the preparation of the Green Left Party's February 1991 conference on the labour market and social security, the party goes some way towards making good its electoral promise to discuss, and then decide on, the principles regarding "the tie between labour and income". At a time when, in the Netherlands at least, the ideology of paid work has strongly reasserted itself (see WRR, below), Green Left is the only party in which basic income would stand a chance of being officially adopted. But as this discussion paper shows, a large and active section of the party (itself an amalgam of rather diverse political parties formerly on the radical Left, and still divided on this issue) is far more interested in a Swedish-type model which aims at "more people [to have] an own income from work, less people dependent on a grant", and which has in common with the Party's basic income alternative a strong reliance on reduction in standard labor time. Also, the latter policy alternative is worded very cautiously indeed and even admits the possibility of instituting a kind of citizens' corvee, should too many basic income recipients opt out of the labour market.

Another lively pamphlet by the trade union that has done most since 1980 to propagate the idea of basic income on the Dutch Left. Initially, as the pamphlet puts it, it was like swearing in Church. Now the majority in the Trade Union Movement is still hostile to a basic income. But individualizing the right to an income or exempting at least some categories of claimants from the duty to apply for employment are proposals that are widely discussed. "You need not call it basic income, but the link between work and income must be severed."

In September 1990, the Dutch government asked the Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR) to report on policy options that would dramatically raise the Dutch rate of labour participation, which is among the lowest in Western Europe, and which the government considers to stand in the way of both economic welfare and full citizenship. The report explains the causes of low labour participation (the high rate of long-term unemployment, the low, though rising, proportion of women in the labour force, and the dramatically high proportion of disabled persons, as assessed by current legislation (WAIO)) and then comments at length on the social value of a high participation rate, emphasizing the integrative functions of paid work (access to the social goods of power, health and self-respect) in close connection with the economic functions (preventing a decline in benefit entitlements in a progressively ageing population, and preserving international competitiveness). The report notes the existence of a downward spiral in which high marginal rates of taxation and social insurance contributions raise wage costs, lowering employment and making existing jobs depend on ever higher levels of productivity, thereby causing a high and increasing disability rate, through the stress
connected with "normal" work performance, and finally producing both a continually upward pressure on taxes and contributions, as well as a declining willingness on the part of workers and firms to shoulder this burden. In this context, the WRR repudiates the approach of its famous 1985 Report ("Safeguarding Social Security") in which high productivity is utilized to finance a scheme of partial basic incomes. Instead, the WRR proposes a policy package including a lower statutory minimum wage, facilitation of flexible labour contracts, increased facilities for child care and the retraining of women, and finally a major tightening of access to disability benefits in order to obtain a much lower average size and period of disability entitlement.

(Address: Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid, Plein 1813 no.2, 2514 JN, The Hague, Netherlands.)

---

**ENGLISH**

**BIRG BULLETIN**, no.13, August 1991 (Basic Income Research Group, 102 Pepys Road, GB-London SE14 5SG), 32p., ISSN 0954-8246.

This issue opens with the translation of an article by French senator Marc Boeuf (see BI 10:10) on the necessity of reforming the French child benefit system to embody the idea that a child is a full-fledged citizen, with a right to means of existence distinct from its parents' income. Next, British economist James Meade discusses various scenarios for the implementation of basic income in the EC, and stresses the importance of harmonisation to avoid a two-tier system in which low-skilled labour and unproductive capital concentrate in those countries which enjoy a basic income.

In an interview, German-born sociologist Sir Ralph Dahrendorf voices his conviction that the cornerstone of basic income is the notion of citizenship, that it must be introduced across the board (for instance, using new ideas such as a "machine or computer tax"), but that in a world where ethnic groups regain importance basic income may be in jeopardy. A different sort of pessimism is expressed by Czech economist Jiri Vecernik, who explains that social policymakers in eastern Europe are not yet ready to envisage basic income because distributive criteria are not well-defined and administrative institutions are still ill-adapted. Hermione Parker and Holly Sutherland present a summary of an earlier report on the future of child benefits (see BI 10:6-7). Georg Vobruba presents a short version of his earlier work on the link between the institution of basic income and the emergence of "a modern, decentralised, 'bottom-up,' self-regulating economy" (see BI 11:11-12).


These are the proceedings of a conference organized in Oxford in 1989 by the National Economic Development Office. They include contributions by Anthony Atkinson and Holly Sutherland and by Hermione Parker which touch on the question of how the introduction of a (partial) basic income could help solve the problem which low paid jobs create for both the economy (because of the bias towards specialization in "low quality" production they involve) and for the people concerned (poverty, unemployment traps). (Second editor's address: Pembroke College, Oxford, England.)

**BRITTAN, Samuel. "Minimum income vs minimum pay", in Financial Times, 11 July 1991, p.13.**

Another no-nonsense plea for basic income by the author of A Restatement of Economic Liberalism (see BI 10:5). The proposal, Brittan concedes, "accepts the legitimacy of people—whether hippies, wandering scholars or non-aspiring contemplatives—opting to live on a very modest income if that is their desire. But those who talk of the work-shy and scroungers never pause to ask themselves if they are also opposed to inherited income, which gives rise to similar temptations". Is there not a risk that employers will be encouraged to offer many more low-paid jobs? Brittan very much hopes so. For "the introduction of new, simple low-paid jobs is the most promising quick method of reducing involuntary unemployment quickly towards the levels we were used to up to the 1970s. Misplaced moralistic indignation at employers who create such jobs should not stand in the way. Most of their excess profits would in any case soon disappear as they competed with each other."
creation of economic democracy has much to recommend it, especially in the Soviet Union where it is essential to focus on the twin need to increase economic growth and to maintain, or regain, social solidarity by compensating the more vulnerable segments of the population suffering from the consequences of restructuring or unable to take advantage of the new income-earning opportunities. [...] Whatever the way the State finances it, some such guarantee is almost essential in a situation where a period of steep price rises and labour market restructuring will leave millions without effective social protection.”

(Author’s address: Katholieke Hogeschool Tilburg, Centrale Interfaculteit, PB 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg, Netherlands.)

PARKER, Hermione. "A different way ahead", in Progress (DIG, Millmead Business Centre Millmead Road, London N17 9QU, England), 1990.

A comment on the British Government’s White Paper on reform of benefits for the disabled (The way ahead: benefits for disabled people) and a case for basic income from the point of view of people with disabilities, published in the journal of the Disablement Income Group.

(Author’s address: c/o BIRG, 102 Pepys Road, London SE14 5SG, England.)


This is the end result of a conference jointly organized in October 1990 by the I.L.O. and the USSR State Committee for Labour and Social Affairs, on employment aspects of the transition from a centrally planned to a market economy. Most of the book’s nineteen chapters consist in informative descriptions of the USSR’s labour market and relevant new legislation by Soviet specialists, including Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Shcherbakov. They also include contributions by Western specialists, for example a chapter on the role of new cooperatives in the USSR by D.M. Nuti and another on the role and potential of active labour market policy by Rudolph Meidner. In the penultimate chapter (“Towards economic democracy and labour flexibility? An era of experimentation”), Guy Standing pulls the threads together and argues, in particular, that the current situation in East European countries calls for something like a basic income: ‘In that context, a ‘social dividend’ approach to the
being made in this article, a written version of a lecture at Harvard University.  
(Author’s address: see above.)

Included in a green reader with contributions from sixteen European countries, this is a plea for the relevance of basic income in the political and economic context of contemporary Europe.  
Previously published in French (see Bi 6: 9).  
(Author’s address: see above.)

A much expanded version of Van Trier’s contribution to the latest BIEN conference (see Bi 9: 8) telling the stunning story of the basic income proposal meticulously elaborated and enthusiastically advocated by Dennis Milner, Bertram Pickard and their friends in the immediate aftermath of World War I. Reads like a detective story.  
(Author’s address: 21 Bosduifstraat, B-2018 Antwerpen.)

As the chairman of Yves Saint Laurent, Pierre Bergé is said to be France’s 69th richest man. But he has also become known as a prominent supporter of the Paris Opera, the anti-racist association and President Mitterrand. Since he claims to belong to the libertarian left, it is perhaps not very surprising that the idea of a basic income should have appealed to him. Chapter 14 of his recent book of opinions and reflections is devoted to the “right to income.” The introduction of the RMI (revenu minimum d’insertion) in 1988 was a step in the right direction. But what Bergé wants is “a RMI without M and without I.” Not an income as a counterpart for training or employment, but simply an income “because everyone needs money to live,” not limited to one year as is the RMI but granted to every individual and for as long as he or she has no other resources “by virtue of a right inscribed in the constitution.” Would this not encourage laziness? “Let’s be serious. Who can be made to believe that FF 2,500 or 3,000 a month can be a mattress on which it is comfortable to sleep?” Life for the poor is hard enough for us the rich not to make things worse by asking whether this meagre subsidy would not by any chance foster idleness. The money, of course, will have to come from somewhere. Bergé favours a capital tax, an equal treatment of income from capital and income from work and would, moreover, not be shocked if 2.5 percent of all wages were used to fund an income for the unemployed. The main thing, at the moment, is that our governments should assert the principle of a right to income and get down to the business of implementing it, thus proving that totalitarian or communist societies are not the only ones which can protect their poorest members from destitution.

Author’s address: c/o Grasset, see above.

DE ROOSE, Frank & VAN PARIJS, Philippe (eds.), La pensée écologiste. Essai d’inventaire à l’usage de ceux qui la pratiquent comme de ceux qui la craignent.


In this wide-ranging two-volume essay, social philosopher Jean-Marc Ferry, the most authoritative French specialist of the Frankfurt School, attempts to rethink in depth the relationship between individuals and nations in the new context created by European integration. In the first chapter of the second volume (“The socio-economic complex”), he points out that with the paramount importance now acquired by research and organization and with the growth of the redistributive welfare state, the relationship between economic contribution and income has become increasingly opaque. In this context, he argues, on both ethical and efficiency grounds, for the introduction of a genuine basic income (allocation universelle), which would provide every citizen with his/her primary income (as opposed to the secondary income now provided by the welfare state's redistributive system). By "abolishing in our societies the bad side of capitalism in order to give them back the good side of liberalism, it would realize a genuine social-liberal synthesis" and "shake one of the strongest among the irrational
aspects of political domination in our modern states."
(Author's address: CNRS, 42 rue Réaumur, F-75003 Paris.)


Socialism is dead as a system and agonizing as a movement. Its philosophy of history has been refuted by the extinction of the working class. Yet, socialism ad the radical-reformist self-critique of capitalist society is more alive than ever. It will only vanish, according to Gorz quoting Habermas, when capitalist society will be so transformed that what cannot be expressed in monetary terms is taken seriously. What Gorz’s new collection of essays (most of them originally published in German) attempts to do is to articulate socialism thus conceived. As in his previous books, a recurrent theme is that “the right to an income can no longer depend on work nor, above all, on the amount of work performed”. But it does not follow that one should favour an unconditional basic income (*allocation universelle*), to which much of chapter 8 is devoted. For the latter offers at the same time too little and too much: too little because it gives no guarantee of an integration into society through the public sphere of work; too much because it would enable some people to get away with making no contribution to the work that remains necessary. These twin defects can be corrected by subjecting the right to the basic income to the performance of a certain number of hours of work according to a quota system. The administrative difficulties involved in such a scheme, he argues, are not more formidable than those facing existing social security systems.
(Author's address: F-10130 Vosnon, France.)


A critical introduction to the main contemporary answers to the question "What is a just society?". The author's own “real-libertarian” answer is formulated and defended most explicitly in chapters 8 and 9. An unconditional basic income is a central component of the institutional framework it justifies.
(Author's address: Chaire Hoover, 3 Place Montesquieu, 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium.)

GERMAN


A useful summary of a major Dutch research on basic income (see BI 8:6).
(Author's address: Katholieke Univer-siteit Brabant, Departement Sociale Zekerheds-wetenschappen, 5000 LE Tilburg, Netherlands.)


The article describes the existing minimum incomes in the EC countries, presents a large number of socio-political EC documents and develops criteria for minimum income standards in the EC.
(Author's address: Max Planck Institut, Leopoldstraße 24, D-8000 Berlin 31.)


A useful overview of new German and Austrian books in the field of social policy, including some dealing with guaranteed minimum income schemes and basic income.
(Author's address: Gilbertstraße 18, D-2000 Hamburg.)

ITALIAN
A useful little book on guaranteed income proposals by the research centre of the CGIL Trade Union Confederation. Chapter 1 (by Maria Luisa Mirabile) draws a clear distinction between the unconditional guaranteed income schemes that are in operation in a number of European countries and a completely unconditional basic income, and surveys on that basis both the European and the Italian debates. Chapter 2 (by Paola Negro) focuses on the French "revenu minimum d’insertion", which is most directly relevant in the current Italian context. These two chapters are followed by a very substantial bibliography (about 50 pages long) and an appendix containing the legislative proposals currently discussed in Italy. (Editor’s address: IRES-CGIL, Via S. Teresa 23, I-00198 Roma.)

How you can help

How useful this Newsletter can be depends on YOU. There are three simple ways you can help.

1. Keep us informed. Send promptly to the editor (address on p.2) any news, announcement, book, pamphlet, working paper, etc. that may interest other people in the network. Deadline for the next issue: 30 March 1992.

2. Circulate the Newsletter. BIEN members can ask for free additional copies, e.g. for seminars or conferences they organize.

3. Recruit new members by asking interested people to fill in and return the form overleaf.
**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 (office)
(32)(3) 2711642 (home)
Bank account: 001-2204356-10
at the CGER, 21 rue Archimède, 1040 Brussels

---

**TO BECOME A MEMBER OF BIEN FOR THE PERIOD 1991-1994**

You need to pay your membership fee (standard: 1000BF; unwaged: 500BF; institutional: 4000BF; or equivalent amounts in your country’s currency) 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. This has proved the simplest and cheapest mode of payment in the past, and no less reliable than any other. 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:**
- O Standard (BF1000 or equivalent) 
- O Institutional (BF4000 or equivalent) 
- O Reduced (BF500 or equivalent) 
- O Transfer to bank account (institutional rate and donations only) 
- O Eurocheque (made out in Belgian Francs)

**Mode of payment:**
- O Cash 
- O Eurocheque 
- O US Cashier’s check