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.
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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.

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


• 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.
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!
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 Brittan (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


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.

(Editors’ address: Robert Crivit, IMAVO, Stalingradlaan 18-20, B–1000 Brussel.)


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.)


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
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 tests’ 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.)
There is not much left that "dividend" would fit perfectly into the list of standard of material equality (as opposed to must be based on a "strongly universal" accordance). How does this fit into collective wealth? This would be wrong, no scope for claims to a minimum share in a free society. But should a minimal state leave and intellectually respectable concern for redistributive purposes are based on a morally "criticisms of government intervention for state. The author's point of departure is that within the framework of a so-system a "realistic libertarian" would accept tackles the question of what type of distributive 

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."

(Publisher's address: Department of Philosophy, Universität Duisburg, D-41 Duisburg.)


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.)


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.)


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 Philippe 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.)


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.)


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.)

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.)


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 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.)

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.


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**


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.)


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 Quentelier (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 Introduction d’un Revenu d’Existence. With the participation of Yolanda 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, Yolanda 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: Martin 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: 4000FB; 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:
O Standard (BF1000 or equivalent)
O Institutional (BF4000 or equivalent)
O Reduced (BF500 or equivalent)

Mode of payment:
O Cash
O Eurocheque (made out in Belgian Francs)

O US Cashier’s check
O Transfer to bank account (institutional rate and donations only)