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BIEN REORGANIZED

As basic income is attracting unprecedented attention in several European countries and as the preparation of BIEN’s 6th Congress is gaining momentum, BIEN’s Executive Committee is delighted to welcome you to this (exceptionally big) first internet issue of the network’s newsletter.

Two reasons have led us to go electronic earlier than we planned. Firstly, David Purdy, appointed editor at our latest General Assembly meeting, has had to postpone and eventually give up his editorial job, owing to the unforeseen weight of his other commitments. His job will be taken over, for the time being, by BIEN’s secretary, Philippe Van Parijs. Secondly, the proportion of our members who are accessible by e-mail has been increasing exponentially in the course of this year, thus making the advantages of moving onto the net overwhelmingly weightier than the disadvantages. This decision has important consequences for the way in which our network will henceforth be run.

1. GETTING THE NEWSLETTER TO BIEN MEMBERS. All subscribing members of BIEN with an e-mail address known to us have been put on the mailing list and will receive each issue, as they have received this one, by e-mail. BIEN members without an e-mail address will receive a printed version of each issue by post, as they have received this one. If anyone with easy access to an e-mail address has received the present issue by post, please send to vanparijs@espo.ucl.ac.be (Subject: BIEN member) the following message: "Newsletter for [your name], member of BIEN, henceforth to the following e-mail address: [XXX@XXX]."

2. BEYOND MEMBERS. Given the negligible cost of sending the e-mail version of the newsletter to more people, we shall send the newsletter to anyone expressing an interest in receiving it (by e-mailing "subscribe BIEN" to: majordomo@iddz1ux.iddz.ucl.ac.be). Further, we shall not regard it as improper if BIEN members forward the newsletter to other interested people and would welcome suggestions for the inclusion of further e-mail addresses on this list. As from January 1996, BIEN should also have a page on the World Wide Net (at http://www.etes.ucl.ac.be). It will present the contents (events and publications) of all previous newsletters (from 1988 onwards) in an integrated form. An interactive internet forum might also be created if someone volunteers to coordinate it. Further information in the newsletter in due course.

3. MEMBERS’ PRIVILEGES. The previous dispositions effectively amount to extending our network beyond the inner circle of fee-paying BIEN members. The latter, however, will retain some exclusive prerogatives, such as the guarantee that they will receive the newsletter even if their e-mail is out of order, entitlement to a printed version if they so wish, voting rights at BIEN’s General Assembly meetings, access to the minutes of BIEN’s business meetings and to its accounts, discounts on publications and conference fees and the free mailing of a (regularly updated) brochure about basic income and the network which we intend producing in several languages.

4. FUNDING. Given the above dispositions, we shall have to rely more than ever on an inner circle of people wishing to contribute financially out of commitment to the promotion of a discussion they find important. Since its inception, BIEN has relied entirely on voluntary work and will continue to do so. But despite the economies made possible by internet, there will remain administrative costs which will be light to bear if they are spread widely but fatal if many opt for a free ride. The fees and modes of payment are unchanged (see instructions at the end of this newsletter). Readers who are not yet members for 1995-96 are most welcome to join.
5. CONTENTS OF THE NEWSLETTER. Each issue of the newsletter will consist in two parts. The first part will contain (1) a short editorial statement, (2) announcements of relevant future events, (3) reports on relevant past events, (4) an annotated list of recent publications, (5) an inventory of relevant recent academic work. The second part will provide updated general information including (1) a presentation of the idea of basic income, (2) a general bibliography, (3) a presentation of BIEN and (4) a presentation of related networks and associations.

6. EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTIONS. Owing to the ever greater bulk of material to be covered, bibliographical notes will generally be shorter, as from the next issue, than those provided so far. The coverage will also be more uneven in length and less unified in style. Whenever you witness, discover, or publish yourself, some item which should be of interest to other members in the network, please send a copy to BIEN’s secretary and also, if at all possible a brief account (in English, however imperfect) of the content of the item and its significance. Make sure the full references are included and, if possible, the postal and e-mail address of the authors. Similarly, if you are informed about a forthcoming relevant event, organize one yourself or have attended one, please mail the information to BIEN’s secretary with all the references of the organizers and, if possible, a brief account. Do not assume that someone else will have seen the same item and done the job (check with BIEN’s secretary if you want to be sure you won’t do the job for nothing), try to deal with it straight after seeing the thing for the first time and use e-mail whenever possible.

We strongly believe that these new arrangements will greatly contribute to the efficiency of our network. Do not hesitate to contact us if you have any comment, query or suggestion.

The Executive Committee, meeting in Louvain-la-Neuve on 19.11.95
BIEN’S 6TH CONGRESS
Vienna, 12-14 September 1996

BIEN’s 10th anniversary Congress will be held in Vienna’s United Nations Building, located on an island between the Old and the New Danube, close to the city centre and within easy reach from Vienna’s train stations and airport. It will be jointly organized by the Katholische Sozialakademie Österreich (Michael Tepser, Lieselotte Wohlgenannt, Alois Riedlsperger and Herwig Büchele), the European Centre for Social Welfare Policy and Research (Bernd Marin and Edith Scherr) and BIEN’s Executive Committee.

The provisional schedule comprises a sequence of plenary sessions and parallel workshops held in the UN building (starting at 10 on the Thursday morning and finishing at 5.30 on the Friday evening), a reception at the City Hall on the Thursday night, a General Assembly meeting on the Friday evening, a more Austria-focused public meeting in the City centre on the Saturday (10 am to 4pm) and a social event on the Saturday night.

Cheap accommodation can be provided to those who register early enough in convenient locations, and cheap meals will be available on the premises.

A provisional programme, a registration form and all practical information will be sent in the course of April. Those who wish to receive it are advised to send their name and address to

Edith Scherr, European Centre for Social Welfare Policy and Research, Berggasse 17, A-1090 Wien, tel.: 43-1-319450521; fax: 43-1-319450519,
E-mail: Scherr@euro.centre.org

BIEN’s 6th CONGRESS: CALL FOR PAPERS

Those who wish to present a paper should send a short abstract (max. 10 lines) as soon as possible, and no later than 15 April to BIEN’s secretary. Contributions are particularly welcome around the following questions.

(1) PAINE AND BEYOND. Various justifications that have been offered for an unconditional basic income rest on the notion of an equal of fair share of the value of (morally speaking) common resources, whether nature, unowned goods in a broader sense including bequests and genetic information, technology, productivity as expressed by the value of time, pollution rights, or jobs viewed as assets. Do such justifications make any sense? What is their relevance to the current debates on the welfare state? Which of the many versions is the most coherent and plausible one?

(2) BASIC INCOME VERSUS EMPLOYMENT SUBSIDIES. All over Europe (and beyond), people are beginning to argue in favour of permanent employment subsidies as a strategy for reestablishing access to employment for the low-skilled. A basic income (especially when coupled with a lowering of the minimum net wage) can also be viewed as an employment subsidy, though one given to the potentially employed rather than to the employer. What is known, and what can be intelligently conjectured, about the differential impact of these two distinct alternatives to the current welfare state’s “exclusive subsidizing of idleness”, as regards for example the nature of work, the incentives to build up human capital, the (re)integration of categories of people who have been alienated from labour market participation for a long time and/or are subject to systematic discrimination, the balance between waged and self employment, allocative efficiency and the economy’s overall performance.

(3) BASIC INCOME VERSUS WORKING TIME REDUCTION. The advocates of a general reduction of maximum working time are beginning to realize the heavy economic cost a large reduction of this type would involve (controls, bottlenecks, hiring and training costs). Basic income is sometimes presented as an alternative and softer way of sharing jobs and lowering average working time, by making more part-time jobs viable and by enabling and/or encouraging workers, whether individually or collectively, to reduce their working time. But this type of reduction too might have a negative impact on economic performance (through higher training costs for example). And it may, moreover, have the disadvantage of decreasing the homogeneity and solidarity of the work force, and of deepening the gap between the rates of labour force participation and career patterns of women and men. What is known, and what can intelligently be conjectured on the basis of relevant actual
experiments, about the differential impact of the hard and soft approaches to working time reduction?

(4) WHAT PARTIAL BASIC INCOME? A fully individualized and unconditional basic income at the guaranteed minimum income level for a single person, even if judged desirable, could not be introduced in one big-bang operation, if only because of the massive way in which it could not help upsetting the current distribution of incomes and because of the uncertainty of its effects on the supply of labour. As regards the population at working age, there seems to be a growing consensus that one should not proceed by cohorts or by categories, but start with a very modest ("partial") basic income that would not be a full substitute for existing guaranteed minimum income provisions (when they exist). In several countries, serious costing exercises are under way and lead to questions — that may call for different answers in different places — about the most promising way forward. Could and should the introduction of a partial basic income be accompanied by a matching cut in both other benefits and gross wages, by a cut in other benefits only and higher taxes on wages, or by a higher uniform taxation of other benefits and labour income? Should the basic income be added to the taxable income, should current tax exemptions on the lower range of labour come be kept as it is, reduced, abolished? Should the unavoidable increase in the lower marginal tax rates quickly lead to a proportional personal income tax? Is there any short-term prospect for alternative funding (generalized social security contribution, energy tax, VAT, gross profits of enterprises)? Should the level of the partial basic income be explicitly indexed to the cost of living, or to GDP per capita?

(5) BASIC INCOME AND THE ORGANIZED WORKERS. The political parties which have felt confident about the virtues of a basic income to the point of including some version of it, more or less discreetly, in their electoral platforms, have first been Green parties, now joined by various liberal parties (the Liberal-Democrats in the UK, the FDP in Germany, Democratie 66 in the Netherlands). How can the idea of a basic income convince the worker organizations and the political parties more or less closely linked to them, whether socialist or Christian-democratic? What can be learned from the few cases in which Trade Unions have become interested in basic income or have even actively supported it (the Italian CGIL, the Irish TPGU and above all the Dutch Voedingsbond FNV are interesting examples)? What are the misunderstandings (if any) which make for a blockage? Can any policy package that incorporates a basic income ever become attractive to Unions and related organizations?

(6) BASIC INCOME BEYOND BORDERS? Should non-resident citizens (say, Austrians living very cheaply in the nearby Slovakian countryside) and/or non-citizen residents (for example EU civil servants in Brussels) be entitled to the basic income introduced in one country? What are the legal constraints and what would be the economic consequences? What is the relevance of basic income for the countries of Eastern Europe, as a way of better managing the "transition" than more conventional social transfer schemes and/or as a way of better organizing cross-border West-East solidarity? How does this compare with the potential relevance of basic income in Latin America, where a debate is under way?

Around all these questions, contributions would be particularly welcome. Further relevant topics are not excluded, however. Do send your paper proposal and a short abstract to BIEN’s secretary, and encourage others to do so.
OTHER FUTURE EVENTS

CONGRES BASISINKOMEN
Noordwijk (NL), 23-24 February 1996
A major conference organized by the Dutch basic Income Network. The first day will focus on the significance of basic income for business, social insurance, environmental policy and poverty. The second day will focus on a simulation model of the financing of a basic income and its labour market effects. Speakers will include Wouter van Dieren, Greetje Lubbi and Jan Stroeken.
For further information: Saar Boerlage, Herman Heijermansweg 20, NL-1077 WL Amsterdam. Tél.: 31-20-5731803.

THE DISTRIBUTIVE DIMENSIONS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY:
EUROPEAN POLITICS AND SOCIETY IN THE HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT AGE
Harvard University, 1-2 March 1996
Conference for doctoral students from Europe and North America.
The object of this workshop is to bring together graduate students with research interests in the political economy of Western Europe, comparative social policy, or macroeconomic policy and unemployment from political science, sociology, and economics to discuss their work and to join a general discussion about the distributive dimensions of economic and social policy-making in Western Europe.
To request an application form, please contact Lisa Eschenbach, Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies, Harvard University, 27 Kirkland Street, Cambridge MA 02138, (617) 495-4303 x231, lmeschen@fas.harvard.edu. Applications (in quadruplicate), must be received by 6 December 1995. Travel expenses and accommodation for participants will be covered.

REAL FREEDOM FOR ALL
University of Warwick, Coventry, 4 May, 1996
A one-day workshop organized around Philippe Van Parijs's Real Freedom for All (Oxford University Press, 1995), with the participation of Prof. Brian Barry (L.S.E.), Prof. Ian Gough (Bath), Dr Andrew Reeve (Warwick), Prof. Hillel Steiner (Manchester), Prof. Peter Vallentyne (Virginia), Dr. Robert J. van der Veen (Amsterdam), Dr Stuart White (Oxford), Dr Andrew Williams (Warwick) and Prof. Philippe Van Parijs (Louvain) and others.
For further information: Andrew Reeve (E-mail: PORCF@SNOW.CSV.WARWICK.AC.UK) and Andrew Williams (University of Warwick, Departments of Philosophy and Politics, COVENTRY CV4 7AL, fax: 00-44-1203–524.221)

SOCIO-ECONOMIC FOUNDATIONS OF A JUST SOCIETY
8th International Conference on Socio-Economics
Geneva, 12-14 July 1996
The program organizers encourage sessions and papers that focus on the building of trust and institutions that promote the development of just and fair societies.
For further general information: SASE, 2808 Central Avenue SE, Albuquerque, NM 87106 USA, E-MAIL: SASE@UNM.EDU.
Prof. Charles Clarke would like to organize a session on basic income.
If interested, please contact him at the College of Business Administration, St. John’s University, 8000 Utopia Parkway, Jamaica, NY 11439, USA, e-mail: ycleco@sjumusic.stjohns.edu.
REPENSER (RADICALEMENT) LA SOLIDARITÉ
Louvain-la-Neuve (Belgium), 19-21 December 1996
An international conference that will mark the fifth anniversary of the creation of the Hoover Chair in Economic and Social Ethics. It will focus on various innovative proposals for restructuring European welfare states (including in their territorial dimension) and the normative issues such proposals raise.
Requests for further information (in due course) and offers to present papers should be addressed to: Philippe Van Parijs, Université catholique de Louvain, Chaîre Hoover d’éthique économique et sociale, 3 Place Montesquieu, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Fax: 32-10-473952, E-mail: vanparijs@espo.ucl.ac.be.

PAST EVENTS

LE REVENU MINIMUM: UN MINIMUM DE JUSTICE ?
Genève, 20-21 January 1995
Organized by the Chair of Ethics of the University of Geneva and particularly well attended and well covered by the Journal de Genève, this conference aimed to combine a concrete discussion on the "revenu minimum d’aide sociale", a generous means-tested guaranteed minimum income scheme just introduced in the canton of Geneva and a philosophical discussion on basic income as a further step beyond this scheme. With the participation of Chantal Euzéby (Grenoble), Jean-Marc Ferry (Brussels), Martino Rossi (Bellinzona) and Philippe Van Parijs (Louvain).
Organizer: Dr. Mark Hunyadi, GREFAT, Université de Genève, Place de l’Université 3, CH 1211 Genève, Suisse; e-mail: hunyadi@uni2a.unige.ch.

FROM SOCIAL EXCLUSION TO SOCIAL COHESION
University of Roskilde (DK), 2-4 March 1995
Past of this academic prelude to the World Summit on Social Development made ample room for a discussion of basic income, with pleas by Niels Meyer (Danish Technical University) and Philippe Van Parijs (Louvain), thoughtful and sympathetic reactions by Ignacy Sachs (Ecole des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris) and Louis Emmerij (Inter-American Bank, Washington) and tough criticism by Bent Greven (Roskilde).

WORLD SUMMIT ON SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT
Copenhagen (DK), 6-12 March 1995
It cannot exactly be said that the World Summit came out in favour of an unconditional citizen’s income. But here are some items in the Programme of Action that "outlines policies, actions and measures to implement the principles and fulfil the commitments enunciated in the Declaration adopted by the Summit".
• "Creating public awareness that the satisfaction of basic human needs is an essential element of poverty eradication” (35b)
• "Designing social protection and support programmes to help people become self-sufficient as fully and quickly as possible (...) and to prevent social isolation or stigmatization of those needing protection" (38d)
• "Expanding and strengthening social protection programmes to protect working people” (38g)
• "promoting and pursuing active policies for full, productive, appropriately remunerated and freely chosen employment” (48a)
• "promoting and supporting (...) the development of cooperative enterprises (...) and promote entrepreneurship” (51e)
• "acknowledging the important contribution of unremunerated work to societal well-being and bringing respect, dignity and value to social perceptions of such work and the people who do it” (64a)
• "examining a range of policies and programmes, including social security legislation and taxation systems, to ascertain how to facilitate flexibility in the way people divide their time between education and training, paid unemployment, family responsibilities, volunteer activity and other socially useful forms of work, leisure and retirement (...)” (64e)
• "promoting socially useful volunteer work and allocating appropriate resources to support such work without diluting the objectives regarding employment expansion” (64f)
People who mean business about this wide range of noble objectives should not despair. They should take the time to think about basic income.
REFORM DES SOZIALSTAATES UND PERSPEKTIVEN SEINES WANDELS.
LA REFORME DE L’ETAT SOCIAL ET LA PERSPECTIVE DE SON DEPASSEMENT
Locarno-Muralto (Switzerland), 9-10 October 1995.
A well-attended trilingual (D-F-I) conference of the Swiss Association for Social Policy. The last session was entirely devoted to a discussion of basic income. It was introduced by a lecture by Ph. Van Parijs (Louvain) and an extensive comment by M.H. Soulet (Fribourg and Neuchâtel). Proceedings are available in the form of a Documento di Lavoro (68p.) of the Istituto di Ricerche Economiche, Stabile Torretta, CH-6501 Bellinzona, Tel. 41-91-8043502, Fax: 41-91-8044425.

THE FUTURE OF WORK
Lund (Sweden), 26-28 October 1995
This small-scale but intense “Carrefour de la science et de la culture” gathered around the President of the European Commission Jacques Santer a few members of his “Forward Studies Unit” and a motley group of European intellectuals interested in the future of work. This was, among other things, a nice opportunity for BIEN co-chairman Guy Standing and BIEN secretary Philippe Van Parijs (powerfully backed, among others, by James Robertson) to explain the case for basic income to the European President and his forward looking staff. A report is being prepared by Marjorie Jouen, Forward Studies Unit, Rue de la Loi 200, B – 1049 BRUXELLES, tel. 32-2-295.59.92; fax: 32-2-295.23.05.

In this supplement to the magazine of one of Spain’s main business schools, André Gorz ("El futur de l’ocupació") argues that the reduced need for waged labour should not lead to a desperate attempt to create more waged labour, whether in the public or private sector, but should be used as a source of freedom through making it possible for people to take parental or study leave without loss of income. Philippe Van Parijs ("Dues utopies lovainistes sobre el treball i la renda"), on the other hand, contrasts the strong obligation to work incorporated in the first elaborate proposal for a minimum guaranteed income by Spanish-born Louvain Professor Juan Luis Vives’s (1526) with the emancipation from the compulsion to work that is being pursued in the prize-winning universal basic income scenario through which a group of Louvain economists launched the first French-language debate on basic income (1984).

(Authors’ addresses: F-10130 VOSNON, France and Chaire Hoover, 3 Place Montesquieu, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, e-mail: vanparijs@espo.ucl.ac.be.)

AGALEV, De losgelaten tijger bedwingen. Vernieuwend denken over natuur, arbeid en produktiviteit, Brussels: AGALEV (Tweekerkenstraat 78, B-1040 Brussels) & De Groenen in het Europees Parlement (Belliardstraat 113, B-1047 Brussels), 80p.

A firm reassertion of the Flemish Green Party's commitment to basic income as a floor ("sokkel") under all other incomes and a central ingredient of a social and ecological platform.

(Authors: Christ Steenwegen, Geert Vandenbroucke & Veerle Van Reusel, c/o AGALEV, as above.)


Co-authored by a mathematical economist at Tilburg University (Bovenberg) and a professor of political economy at Amsterdam University and Labour Member of the Dutch Parliament (van der Ploeg), this dense but non-technical article in the widely spread weekly of the Dutch Economic Institute is probably the best piece ever published against basic income. The authors examine a fully individualized unconditional basic income meant to replace in due course all existing social insurance benefits and administered, for the sake of minimizing implementation costs, in the form of a negative income tax. They start off by giving a succinct but comprehensive list of arguments in favour of basic income, including what they regard as "perhaps the most important" among them: that it abolishes all sorts of poverty traps for the low-skilled which stem from means-tested benefits". They distinguish a right-wing variant which solves the funding problem by lowering (to half the minimum wage) the level of the income guarantee, and a left-wing variant which solves it by raising marginal tax rates for middle and high incomes. The former variant is simply a disguised way of worsening the situation of the most vulnerable groups which have no way of topping up their basic income, and it would generate strong pressure to reintroduce additional social insurance schemes, with all their implementation costs. The left-wing variant implies that the incentive to train will be negatively affected, as young people will prefer to supplement their basic income with little, possibly undeclared jobs, instead of investing in the acquisition of qualifications. This process will "threaten the most important capital good in a knowledge-intensive society: the human capital anf work discipline of the younger generations". It will further lead to a greater dualization of society, as low-skilled people are kept in a situation of reliance on their basic incomes and small jobs by the conjunction of high reservations wages and lack of human capital. When the full size of the damage will become apparent, it will be too late, as many people will have failed to accumulate adequate human capital and will exert strong political pressure to protect their vested rights. All this will happen ever more at the expense of other uses of public money (on health, education, the environment and the elderly for example). At the same time, high marginal tax rates on middle and high incomes will attach unprecedented rewards to tax fraud (by hiding income) and tax evasion (by moving abroad) on the part of people who know how to do it. The authors’ conclusion is an updated and toughened version
of George Akerlof’s old critique of the negative income tax (in American Economic Review 1978): By refusing to make use of some information (household situation, health, willingness to work), a basic income worsens the trade off between justice and efficiency. The alternative is a broad package of measures that include financial incentives, workfare policies, lower social security contributions for the employers and a better integration between schooling and business.

(Second author’s address: Tweede Kamer, PvdA Fractie, Den Haag, The Netherlands)


A useful contribution to the rethinking of the welfare state in the form of a volume edited by the study centre of the Dutch Labour Party. The useful synthetic introduction by Paul de Beer emphasize two central challenges that face the current collectivist-materialist conception of the welfare state: a demand for more freedom of choice (individualism) and a demand for the revaluation of unpaid activity (post-materialism). The streamlined social security system (“ministelsel”), which consists essentially in targeted minimal provisions, while the bulk of citizens obtain security through a wide range of public and private insurance schemes, responds to the former demand. The generalization of parental leaves and the like responds to the second one. Paul Kalma (the centre’s director), Paul de Beer (economist at the Social Planning Bureau) and Jet Bussemaker (political scientist at Amsterdam’s Calvinist University) suggest that a (partial) basic income should be a way of responding to both. But not all contributors agree that this is the way to go. For example, Romke van de Veen (of Utrecht University) points out that “it is precisely the absence of an adequate reciprocity between rights and obligations in the current implementation of the social security system that causes the decline in the legitimacy of the welfare state. The lack of any reciprocity in the idea of basic income will probably weaken the solidarity between citizens and foster an individualistic morality.” This criticism would definitely not apply to the proposal of a citizen’s wage (“burgerloon”) made by Joop Roebroek (of Tilburg University): each adult should be entitled to an individual income that suffices to support a sober life (DFl. 900 to 1000 per month), on condition that (s)he performs a minimum of 15 hours per week of ”social participation” (ranging from study and housework to child theatre and spirituality) and lives a healthy and environment-friendly life. Earnings can be added to the citizen’s income for those who fulfil these conditions. But people can also decide not to bother with the citizen’s income and rely exclusively on what they can get from the market.

(Editor’s address: Paul Kalma, Wiardi Beckman Stichting, Nikolaas Witsenkade 30, NL 1017 ZT Amsterdam)


This essay was awarded the Rachel Carson Environmental Prize for 1995 (a prize established to encourage beginning environmentalists by the Dutch Foundation for the Advance of Environmental Science (SBM) and the Royal Dutch Heidemij Society. Entitled ”Liberalism and the environment. The right to environmental utilisation space as the foundation for a basic income” (English version available on internet: http://www.xs4all.nl/~mdd/discus2.html), it endeavoures to update and extend Thomas Paine’s proposal to finance an unconditional basic income out of a rent on land. Today, it is not only land surface that is scarce, but the environment as a whole. The essay explains how one can design a basic income based on the right to environmental utilisation space.

(Author’s address: Centrum voor energiebesparing en schone technologie, Oude Delft 180, NL-2611 HH Delft, E-mail: mdd@xs4all.nl.)


A neatly produced quarterly journal advocating artist Pieter Kooistra’s bold plan for a United Nations sponsored Marshall Plan, whose centrepiece would be a basic income for evey human being.

(Editor’s address: c/o Stichting UNO Inkomen, aa above.


In a polemic with BIEN deputy secretary Walter Van Trier (see also De Morgen 25.10.95, 31.10.95 and 8.11.95), socialist deputy prime minister in the Belgian federal government Van de Lanotte asserts that the discussion about basic income offers no perspective and that he is pleased that it does not. The very idea of granting an income even to those who do not wish to work is ”unacceptable in [his] socialist outlook.”
The problem with it is that the people who are now unable to find a job are also those who, with a basic income, would "voluntarily" abstain from working. "As far as I am concerned, the discussion about basic income is now fortunately over, and the discussion about a basic job for all can finally start."


A short discussion of a proposal made in the weekly of the main Dutch Trade Union Federation (FNV Magazine) by three Trade Unionists (Jos Huber of AbvaKabo, Jo Urlings of the Industriebond, and Kris Douma of the Voedingsbond). What they propose is a negative income tax with an unconditional and fully individualized income guarantee at DFl. 900 (half the current guaranteed minimum for a couple) and a marginal tax rate of nearly 60%. The basic transfer ("the coffee in a cup of capuccino") can be topped up by a state-organized layer of sickness and unemployment benefits ("the cream") and voluntary insurance schemes ("the cacao"). "A social paradise at the expense of the working poor", the article comments. To cheapen the scheme, one could restrict the transfer to those who are already getting a transfer income (thus excluding housewives, for example). One would then get something quite close to the "ministelsel" defended by the FNV’s two biggest unions (Industriebond and AbvaKabo) — but quite remote from basic income.

(One of the authors’ address: Kris Douma, Voedingsbond FNV, Postbus 9750, NL3506 GT Utrecht)


This overview of the many dimensions along which basic income proposals vary, followed by a discussion of the notion of "cost" of basic income schemes was presented at a particularly well attended session of the massive congress of Flemish economists about the future of the social security system.

(Author’s address: UFOIA, 13 Prinsstraat, B-2000 Antwerpen, dse.vantrier.w@alpha.ufsia.ac.be)


This is a major contribution to the debate on basic income in the country in which it is most developed. In their crisp and comprehensive introduction, the editors connect the contents of the book to the issues raised by the major reform of the Dutch social security system envisaged for 1996, and, by doing so, substantiate their claim that it took 20 years for an unconditional basic income to become "an adult political ideal". The volume contains contributions by philosophers Jos de Beus (professor of social philosophy at the University of Groningen and writer of the latest Labour Party manifesto), Govert den Hartogh (professor of ethics at the University of Amsterdam) and Philippe Van Parijs (professor of economic and social ethics at the University of Louvain) and by social scientists Jos de Beus (economist at the Social and Cultural Planning Bureau), Bas van Stokkom (journalist and author) and Siep Stuurman (professor of politics at the University of Rotterdam). In his review of the book for the Volkskrant (18.11.95), Harry van Seumeren remains unsuaped by the book’s vindication of the no-obligation aspect of an unconditional basic income.

(First editor’s address: Vakgroep Algemene Politicologie FSW, Oudezijds Achterburgwal 237, NL – 1012 DL AMSTERDAM, e-mail: a71503rv@horus.sara.nl)

ENGLISH


"Thousands of links in a chain of development — our shared inheritance — were in fact required before Bill Gates [of Microsoft] could add his contribution. But if this is so, why do we not reflect more fully on why Gates, or any other wealthy entrepreneur, should personally benefit to such a degree? ... Plainly put, the way we allocate the benefits of present and past economic activity that stem from this technological heritage is irrational and unjust." More specifically: "If we agree that today’s technological progress is akin to a pebble resting on a mountain of previous achievements, then a substantial portion of society’s current income should go as a matter of equal right to each individual, apart from the amount he or she earns from current work or risk, or to the entire community. Public ownership of patents and copyrights after an individual’s or company’s control has expired might be one mechanism for accomplishing this. Rather than simply allowing whoever is best situated to take advantage of such knowledge for free, the national treasury would
acquire licensing revenues on the principle that the invention resulted largely from general knowledge created over time by the whole society. The government could distribute such revenues equally among all citizens or use the funds to support public institutions such as schools.” The Alaska Permanent Fund and the U.S. Earned Income Tax Credit are mentioned as more or less timid or clumsy moves in the desired direction. “Such experiments could eventually challenge the principles at the heart of both traditional capitalism and traditional socialism, perhaps one day spawning a new economic system based on the notion of common inheritance.” In an unusually numerous and vociferous set of reactions (Technology Review, January 1995), the author was accused of “stripping all individuals of the products of their work and deliver[ing] it to the mob”, his proposal was described as “antithetical to our country’s founders' vision of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness”, and Bill Gates was shown to “owe none of us a red cent”: the man has helped create an industry that employs thousands and provides vast benefits to the whole of society. So he’s garnered $8 billion... Fine by me. More power to him. We should all be so lucky.”

New technologies will eliminate vast quantities of manual and clerical work in both advanced and developing areas of the world. “Accordingly, if unwork is fated to be no longer the exception to the rule of nearly full employment, we need an entirely new approach to the social wage and, more generally, ‘welfare’ policy” which the authors sketch in their final chapter. In particular, “we need a political and social commitment to a [means-tested?] national guaranteed income that is equal to the historical level of material culture.” But “everyone would assume the responsibilities of producing and maintaining public goods, so no able citizen would be freed of the obligation to work.”

This useful book based on a set of lectures at Uppsala University is meant for students. It presents the Basic Income / Flat Tax proposal - an unconditional basic income that would replace all benefits and tax allowances and be financed out of a proportional tax on all income - and uses it in an illustrated introduction to five domains of public economics which have undergone steady development in recent years: the selection of tax and transfer schedules with a view to maximizing some social welfare function (optimum taxation), the theoretical analysis of collective decision processes (public choice), the theoretical analysis of the incidence of taxation bearing in mind the interdependence of markets (general equilibrium), the simulation of the effects of various reform proposals on the distribution of income among households (tax-benefit models) and the empirical assessment of the impact such proposals would have on the labour supply (econometrics of incentives). The central purpose of the book is to argue for the integration of these various domains of research and emphatically not "to argue for or against the Basic Income / Flat Tax proposal". This does not mean that the proposal has been chosen at random. Atkinson recalls that he has been interested in basic income (initially at James Meade's prompting) since the late sixties. In his view, "it should definitely be on the agenda for public discussion, and there are certainly circumstances in which it would be, in [his] judgement, the best way to develop the tax and social security system in the European Union.” His concern in this book, however, has only been with "the contribution that public economics can make to identifying these circumstances".
(Author's address: The Warden, Nuffield College, Oxford OX1 1NF)

A bold statement by the Australian Labour Minister of Social Security about the fundamental objectives of modern social policy (fighting capability failures in Amartya Sen’s sense) and its implications, including “a [means-tested] single generic payment for those of work force age, subsuming the existing myriad of payments” with varying levels and conditions of entitlement depending on age, work force experience, disability, parental responsibilities, etc.

LSE Professor Brian Barry is one of the world’s most prominent political philosophers. His contribution to the collection on the ethical foundations of basic income (Ph. Van Parijs ed., Arguing for Basic Income, Verso, 1992) was entitled “Equality yes, basic income no”. These
are two good reasons for paying special attention to the central thesis of this conference paper: "under contemporary conditions justice and freedom would best be realised by the provision of a basic income to the citizens and permanent residents of countries in which the appropriate conditions exist". These conditions are not only economic. They include "an effective and uncorrupt public administration and a citizenry among whom a norm of paying taxes is well established. The case for a basic income owes much of its strength to the collapse of the conditions on which the effectiveness of the conventional welfare state rested (stable full-time male employment with adequate pay and stable families) and even more to the constraint of sustainability, which makes it truer than ever before that those who take a bigger slice of the cake do so at the expense of those with a smaller slice. For these reasons, in both rich and poor countries, "incomes derived from work are less and less reliable and adequate as a method of supporting the population". True, a generous basic income would reduce economic incentives. But to some extent this should be welcomed, given the sustainability constraint. To some extent too, the importance of economic incentives depends on alterable social conditions: "the feasibility of a society with [a full] basic income turns on the possibility of creating a 'moral economy' in which money is kept far more firmly in its place than it is in the typical market society". And if a full basic income turned out to be out of reach, "would this mean that it would be a bad idea to move towards it? Not in the least. The beauty of basic income is that even its partial implementation would gain part of the advantages". There will be some losers, no doubt, but "the advantages of living in a society with basic income would be such that the gainers would greatly outnumber them." Is there any sign of political support? "The most fertile ground has until now been offered by Green parties", but "Social Democratic parties, currently without exception drifting with no sense of direction, could revitalize themselves around a programme with a basic income at its centre." Barry's contribution is followed by a rather feeble comment by the British libertarian social philosopher Anthony de Jasay (pp. 90-98), who has little to say on basic income and is left to wonder: "How do we get enough production to allow mankind to enjoy the income it is 'entitled' to without working for it?" NB. The editor of the volume (H. Siebert) is one of the most articulate German opponent to basic income from a neo-liberal perspective (see below).

In the penultimate chapter of this collection of essays ("Basic income and the welfare state"), Brittan sums up his present position on basic income. He has been advocating basic income since the early 1970s as an effective response to those criticizing capitalism on the ground that it one-sidedly fostered puritanism and/or consumerism. With a basic income in place, people can be told: "You can opt out if you wish... Alternatively, you can work and go after much larger material prizes. Or you can try to find your own compromise — for instance, using the basic income to allow you to take part-time or badly rewarded work, which you might, nevertheless, find more fulfilling to pursue." A second argument in favour of basic income rose to prominence with the rise of unemployment in the 1980s: "It is often said that a basic income [would] encourage employers to reduce wages in the knowledge that the state will fill the gap. This is not a criticism but a ground for hope. For one of the ideas is to make it easier for people to price themselves into work without driving them into abject poverty." The big obstacle is the tax burden a basic income would involve. But "it might be possible to achieve some features of BI incrementally without committing oneself to going the whole hog. It should not be seen as a messianic movement whose aims have to be achieved in total or not at all." One should therefore deconstruct basic income into its component features such as: sufficient to live on, fully individual, paid out to all without means test, unconditional (as regards ability and unwillingness to work), implying a withdrawal rate equal to the positive rate of tax. This last feature is definitely one Brittan would be willing to put on the back burner, leading to what he calls a 'modified basic income'. But abandoning the first feature, as in the "partial basic income" advocated by Hermione Parker and (in 1992) the Liberal-Democrats, is also well worth considering. One is thus "led to envisage a three-deck structure. First, there will be a partial Basic Income for all, unconditional and not means-tested. Secondly, there will be income-related benefits intended to bring people up to a conventional minimum... Thirdly, over and above these supports, people will make their own arrangements."


Basic income, even at an initially modest level, will open up opportunities for finding more flexible and suitable answers to crisis situations. But it is more than an instrument for alleviating distress. It is "part of an offensive aimed at creating a hospitable society of partners participating in the development of a new basic order". This short piece in the bimonthly of the European jesuits summarizes the plea for basic income developed by Father Büchele, Dean of Innsbruck’s Theology Faculty, in two earlier books published jointly with Lieselotte Wohlgenannt.

CALLAN, Tim, O’DONOGHUE, Cathal & O’NEILL Ciaran . Analysis of Basic Income Schemes for Ireland (Dublin: Economic and Social Research Institute, Policy Research Series Paper No. 21, 1994)

This report was commissioned by the Irish Department of Social Welfare for its Expert Working Group on the Integration of the Tax and Social Welfare Systems. It distinguishes 'pure basic income' (individual payment to all funded by single-rate income tax) from 'basic family income' (= lower rates for couples), basic income with two tax rates (the higher rate for lower incomes), partial basic income, and basic income for children only (i.e. higher child benefit, either untaxed or ‘integrated’ into taxation). Using a survey-based model, it makes a static calculation for each alternative of the tax rates necessary and the pattern of gainers and losers across income deciles and family types, and analyses dynamic effects in terms of the 'replacement rates' (ratio of unemployment income to employment income) for each alternative. It concludes that full basic income would require unacceptably high tax rates, and that a number of reform options, including a partial basic income, basic income for children, and an integrated child benefit could achieve some of the objectives of a full basic income scheme at lower tax rates.


A vigorous introduction to basic income in the British Labour Party’s new magazine by the Director of the Citizen’s Income Study Centre: “The current benefits system discourages self-help and is based on out-moded needs. A basic universal income is more dignified, positive and relevant to society today.”


Co-authored by a Conservative Member of Parliament, this book contains ‘among other things a thoughtful and creative exploration of the possibilities of a Basic Income as an alternative to existing welfare institutions’. (See also the review by John Gray in the Guardian 19/6/95.)


Capitalism may have ‘won’, but it still needs to be reconciled with morality. How? No doubt, in part, by becoming a "capitalism without poverty". Under this title, chapter 6 of this new book at the intersection of ethics and economics delineates what the author believes to be the best anti-poverty package. The current US package of minimum wage legislation and welfare in cash for the jobless (mainly AFDC) should be abolished and replaced by a much expanded Earned Income Tax Credit scheme. As people start earning, they should not receive less (as with AFDC or a negative income tax) but more (up to a pre-tax annual income of $6000) in the form of a refundable credit, so as to discourage idleness. What about the jobless? Without minimum wages, the involuntarily unemployed should be very few. As to those who don’t want to work, they will have to content themselves with “the soup kitchens, old clothes, and so on, of local programmes and private efforts”. For the author...
does not "think the answer is in terms of a 'free ride' from governmental welfare, which will likely change few attitudes while bleeding the country dry". He "know[s] of no way of providing full, long-term governmental benefits to those [who don't want to work] without the number of people falling into th[is] category immediately expanding to an unacceptable amount". Capitalism with morality, it seems, must remain capitalism with wage slavery.

(Author's address: University of Delaware, Department of Philosophy, USA)

In this red-green contribution to Christian political theology, the Chaplain of St John's College, Oxford, advocates a shift of taxation to land, polluting activities and international trade and takes over James Robertson's idea of a basic income for all financed by the new tax system.

(Author's address: St John's College, Oxford OX1 3JP)

If jobs are permanently scarce, why not give everyone of working age an equal tradeable right to the jobs available, in the form, say, of vouchers corresponding to the total number of hours on offer divided by the number of people. Let an equilibrium price be established for these vouchers through letting people trade with full freedom and perfect information. The equilibrium price of the voucher will reveal the unit value of the corresponding job, and the total price of the vouchers given to each person determines what a person is entitled to if (s)he chooses not to work. The keener people are to work, the larger this entitlement, and the more work-shy they are, the stingier the amount. Doesn't this interesting speculation by Dutch economist and philosopher Hamminga have much to tell us about the legitimate level of an unconditional basic income?

(Author's address: University of Tilburg, PO Box 90153, NL – 5000 LE TILBURG, B.hamminga@kub.nl)

In the final section of this public-choice inspired critique of the British Conservative Government's social policy, one of the main contributors to the UK's debate on basic income (currently European professor of social policy at the University of Bratislava) urges the Labour party to stop courting the same coalition of interests as the Conservatives and to turn to citizen's income as a radical way of dealing with deepening poverty traps and soaring transaction costs.

(Author's permanent address: Perriton Farm House, Whimple, Exeter EX5 2QY.)

This socio-economic review, with recommendations for the 1995 Budget, proposes a fully costed, integrated policy for an unconditional, untaxed basic income guarantee (IRL£ 20, 54, 73, 78 per week according to age), supplemented by a Social Solidarity Fund to ensure a minimum income of 67 (single), 107 (couple). Funding is by removal of tax allowances and reliefs plus single-rate income tax at 50%. Basic income is proposed on the grounds of the impossibility of achieving full-time jobs for all, backed up by an appeal to Christian values. There are also proposals on socially useful work, rural development, the environment, housing, education, health care, and foreign policy.

(Author's address: CORI Justice Office, Tabor House, Milltown Park, Dublin 6, Ireland)

A rigorous discussion, based on arithmetic simulations, of different variants of the negative income tax proposals currently discussed in Germany. These variants are characterized by an income guarantee is DM 1000 per month for the first adult, DM 1000 or DM 500 for the second and DM 400 per child, different tax exemptions and different rates of negative taxation (50 and 75%). The authors' central message is that the enthusiasm of their advocates
should be dampe. They argue that the system would be more complicated to administer than they think (because of the advance payments that would need to be made), that it would not be a proper substitute to the social assistance system in its "help towards self-help" function, that it would increase moral hazard (especially on the part of the small self-employed who would have a strong incentive to hide part of their income) and above all that it would imply a very heavy cost (mainly in foregone taxation between the current guaranteed income level and the new break-even point) to be compensated by higher taxation elsewhere. However, meaningful steps can be taken in order to achieve the NIT's declared objectives, such as raising child benefits for workers to the level applying to households on social assistance, or transferring the cost of social assistance to the federal budget.

(Authors' address: c/o Deutscher Institut für Wirtschaft.)

A politically fascinating and methodologically sophisticated account of the crucial moment that never returned at which the US failed to make a key step towards a basic income. The Nixon-Moynihan Family Assistance Plan was defeated (despite a majority in both Houses apparently backing it) in the 1969–1970 session because some liberals insisted on a bill that made none of the poor worse off in income transfer terms, and Senate conservatives — dominating the Finance Committee and with the filibuster power — were strong enough to block such a bill.

(Author's address: 72 Addington Road, Brookline MA 02146, E-mail: neuberg@jimmy.harvard.edu.)

A detailed analysis of the interactions of the UK's tax and benefit systems and of the various adverse effects on work effort and family life they generate. The whole system needs radical reform, providing each person with a basic income.

(Author's address: Nettlefield, Pirbright, Woking, Surrey GU24 OJN, UK.

A discussion of various ways of making the Australian income support system simpler and fairer. An unconditional "basic income", a means tested but not activity-tested "guaranteed minimum income" and a means-tested and activity-tested "conditional minimum income" are usefully compared and assessed, and the third formula is recommended as the most feasible way forward out of the complex system of categorical schemes currently in place. "Perhaps the most compelling reason not to introduce [a basic income system] is that it would redistribute the tax burden from low-to-middle income earners to middle-to-high income earners, assuming a flat or progressive income tax. A radical change in tax liabilities is not likely to be publicly acceptable, particularly among those whose taxes would increase."

(p.40)

This article surveys recent debate about whether basic income is morally justified, economically viable and politically feasible. Having distinguished between libertarian, communitarian and "liberal-socialist" arguments for some form of universal grant, the author discusses the finance and management of social transfers and asks what kind of policy regime offers the greatest scope for securing public allegiance to the ideal of social citizenship and raising the ceiling of tax tolerance to the point where basic income can be sustained. The key requirement, he argues, is to develop the potential of Citizens' Income as a focus for social negotiation about both the management of the economy and the distribution of income and work.

(Author's address: Manchester University, Department of Social Policy, Manchester M13 9PL, United Kingdom, e-mail: msrasdp@fs1.ec.man.ac.uk)

A brief presentation of Senator Suplicy’s proposal for a negative income tax in Brazil (see BI 20), followed by an input-output analysis of the impact of the proposal on the demand for various categories of goods.

(First author’s address: Senado Federal, Edificio Principal Terreo, Praça dos Três Poderes, Brasilia DF Cep 70.160 900, Brazil.)


For several years, the Justice Commission of the Conference of Religious of Ireland (CORI) has been playing a central role in pushing basic income onto the agenda of Irish politics, as part of an attempt to foster a public debate that is urgently needed "if everyone in Ireland is to be enabled to live a full life with dignity". The book contains written versions of the papers presented at a conference organized in Dublin on 20 September 1995. In the first chapter, the editors (and codirectors of CORI's Justice Office) outline three recent Basic Income proposals made in Ireland. Next, Francis O'Toole (Economics Department, Trinity College Dublin) examines the financial feasibility of CORI's proposal by providing new estimates of the tax yield resulting from the abolition of all tax allowances, deductions and reliefs. Charles Clarke (College of Business Administration, St John's University, New York) and Catherine Kavanagh (Department of Economics, University College Cork) explore the impact a basic income would have on the Irish labour market. This is followed by a precise costing of CORI's own proposal (about IRL£ 200 per month for each adult at working age, about 40% more for older people and 60% less for younger people) and a set of reactions by the full range of political parties represented in the Irish Parliament. No doubt an unprecedented achievement in any country.

(Editors' address: c/o CORI, as above.)


In this pamphlet published in a series sponsored by the "New Party" (recently set up in the US by people to the left of the Democratic Party), Harvard economist (and author of the best-selling The Overworked American, 1992) presents her vision of an appropriate socio-economic regime. It includes what "is called a basic income grant and is being discussed in Europe". It "would allow people to opt out of the labor market for a while, to raise their children or pursue activities that are not lucrative... It would enable them to retire when they feel ready, or to pursue schooling or retraining". However, "the length of eligibility for receiving the basic income grant would be tied to past work and participation in unpaid community service, as well as child and elder care"). "As labor market status and family composition become increasingly precarious, our basic systems of providing income are proving inadequate. We need a comprehensive social security system which guarantees stability in the face of family breakup, labor market displacement, and other unpredictable events... Basic income would be that system. We're not sold on it. But we definitely think it should be on the table."

(Author’s address: Tilburg University, Dept of Leisure Studies, P.O. Box 90153, NL – 5000 LE Tilburg, email: j.b.schor@kub.nl).


A sophisticated philosophical discussion of the Rawls-Van Parijs discussion on whether liberal justice requires that Malibu surfers be fed. "If societies with a substantial unconditional basic income provide too great an opportunity for individuals to act as strangers while still playing the role of members, devaluing the boundaries of liberal society, liberal communities may not possess the political consensus needed to ramin societies. Thus Van Parijs's substantial unconditional basic income cannot rest on a Rawlsian conception of liberal neutrality..."

(Author’s address: Bowling Green State University, Department of Philosophy, Bowling Green, Ohio 43403-0222, USA. E-mail: etorisk@opie.bgsu.edu)

Give every citizen an unconditional basic income. At what level? At the highest sustainable level, subject to respecting fundamental liberties and securing the allocation of additional resources to those with special needs. This is roughly what social justice requires, when understood as "real freedom for all". This is also what can justify capitalism, if anything can. While started as an attempt to fundamentally reassess the debate between capitalism and socialism in the light of recent historical experience and academic discussions, this book has unexpectedly turned out to offer a systematic, closely argued justification of a market economy with a maximal basic income. The underlying conception of justice is one that requires the real freedom (i.e. the means, not just the right to do what one might wish to do with one's life) of those with least real freedom to be as extensive as is durably possible. It claims to appropriately express the importance we intuitively attach to freedom, equality and efficiency and to justify, under contemporary conditions, a substantive basic income. Much of the book is devoted to a careful discussion of powerful objections to these claims. Is a substantive basic income consistent with due weight being given to the real freedom of the handicapped, for example, or to the real freedom to earn a high income? And can a conception of justice expressed in terms of real freedom accommodate the ethical importance of exploitation? Each chapter opens with a dialogue that sums up the argument, and the book ends with a formulation of the three central tenets of progressive thought and action in today's world: steps towards an unconditional basic income, democratic scale-lifting and solidaristic patriotism.

(VAN PARIJS@espo.ucl.ac.be.)

VAN TRIER, Walter. Everyone a King. An Investigation into the Meaning and Significance of the Debate on Basic Incomes with Special Reference to Three Episodes from the British Inter-War Experience.

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven: Fakulteit politieke en sociale wetenschappen, PhD thesis (Dir. Prof. A. Martens), 1995, 504p, BF 850 [available from the author].

A fascinating contribution to the prehistory of the current debate on basic income, in the form of an articulated sequence of three studies on the debates triggered off, respectively by Dennis Milner's and Bertram Pickard's proposal of a "state bonus", of C.D. Douglas and A.R. Orage's proposal of a "social credit" and of G.D.H. Cole and James Meade's proposal of a "social dividend".

(Author's address: UFSIA, 13 Prinsstraat, B-2000 Antwerpen, dse.vantrier.w@alpha.ufsia.ac.be)

FINNISH


In February 1992 Briitta Hiltunen, from the municipal workers union (KTV) in Finland, asked the Finnish Confederation of Trade Unions (SAK) to study the advantages and disadvantages of a basic income. She was inspired by a report written for the Ministry of Social Affairs by Osmo Soininvaara. (See BI 18.) A working group consisting of four persons from the SAK staff was given the task of writing a report on basic income. The title of the report is almost untranslatable but it reflects a disapproving attitude towards the idea. The report compares three different types of social security systems: income related, needs based (or targeted) and equal-size benefits. It sticks to some income related benefits as the best from a trade union perspective, and recalls the past disputes in which equal-size benefits have been pushed by the farmers' interests against the trade union position. Wage earners pay disproportionately much, in fees or taxes, even for the income-related systems. The study shows that there are substantial poverty traps due to three types of needs-based benefits - social assistance, housing support and day care subsidies - and due to income taxes and social security fees. It wants to reduce these traps, not through a basic income, but through incremental adjustments in the existing system. The report expresses the belief that full employment can be restored through rapid and sustained economic growth, through reductions in working time and work sharing as well as through better education and training. If a BI-scheme was introduced, society would develop towards a low-wage and low-skill 'boot-cleaner' society. It would threaten the existing income-related benefits, and contribute to the creation of a divided and fragmented society.

FRENCH
AIRE (Association pour l’Instauration d’un Revenu d’Existence), Lettre de Laison n°9, été 1995, 11 p; n°10, automne 1995, 10 p. (Subscription: FF 200/year, 4 issues.)

The editorial of n°9 by Yoland Bresson mentions that in the course of the recent campaign that led up to the election of Jacques Chirac, an appeal in favour of basic income was sent to all presidential candidates but got only one response (by the green candidate Dominique Voynet). Most of the two issues consist in short pieces by members of Bresson’s group, including reviews of JM Ferry’s L’Allocation universelle and Ph. Van Paris’s Sauver la solidarité. The network’s next General Assembly will be held at Futuribles on 20 December at 2:30 pm.

Address: AIRE, c/o Mme Boussatha, Faculté des sciences économiques et de gestion, 58 Avenue Didier, F-94210 La Varenne Saint-Hilaire.

BRESSON, Yoland. Le Partage du temps et des revenus, Paris: Economica, 1994, 105p, ISBN 2-7178-2612-2, FF 65. Yoland Bresson, the intellectual leader of the Association for the Introduction of a Basic Income (L’Après-salaire. Une nouvelle approche de l’économie. Paris: Economica, 1984). Ten years later, he makes his proposal far more precise and his argument somewhat more intelligible. According to Bresson, the (uniform) level of the basic income paid unconditionally to all members of a national community, whatever his or her age) must correspond to the use value of each person’s time. Unlike the exchange value of a person’s time, which is affected by her training, health, age, effort, etc., its use value is homogeneous and depends exclusively on the community’s overall level of productivity. It does not constitute a fixed percentage of per capita GNP, however, but can be (rather opaquely) derived from a country’s interpersonal distribution of factor income. In the case of France, this would amount to FF 1575 (or ECU 250) per person and per month, to be phased in in five years as a full substitute for all benefits which do not exceed this level and a partial substitute for higher transfers, whose remaining parts would fully regain their functions of insurance (e.g. unemployment benefits, professional pensions) or solidarity (e.g. disability allowance). The funding would come partly from these savings, partly from (forced) credit from the banks at a 1% rate of interest. If it turns out that the level is so high that laziness spreads, the level will automatically be adjusted downwards. But the expectation is that, thanks to its reliability more than to its level, basic income will gradually eliminate the very notion of unemployment, by simultaneously enabling those currently excluded to work out and realize their projects and by inducing those currently privileged to relax and share out the jobs they hold. In our ever more global economy, it makes sense to think of a basic income at a European level — though Bresson hovers somewhat between ascribing each member state or the European Union the task of providing social cohesion by paying the basic income — and even on a world scale: development aid would be far more effective if the money spent on it were used to irrigate in depth all developing economies in the form of a basic income paid to all its (adult) citizens. The moment will come when each human being “will receive, as an individual and inalienable right, an unconditional cash endowment which will enable him to be part of the human community, to participate in the network of material and immaterial exchanges, in a common worldwide adventure”.

Author’s address: Faculté des sciences économiques et de gestion, 58 Avenue Didier, F-94210 La Varenne Saint-Hilaire.

CAILLE, Alain & al., Chômage: appel au débat, Le Monde (Paris), 28.06.1995

At the initiative of Nanterre sociology professor Alain Caillé, a number of French intellectuals actively involved in the debate around basic income (Aznar, Belorgey, Bresson, Euzéby, Ferry, Gorz, Insel, Lipietz, Pagat, Passet, Perret, Rigaudiat, Robin, Roustang, Sue, Viveret, etc.) have gathered to sign a call for simultaneous action in three areas: working time reduction, employment in a third sector and guaranteed minimum income. In this last area, they all agree that one should go beyond the RMI (the means- and insertion-tested minimum income scheme introduced in 1988). How? “It is probably on this issue that the signers of this declaration diverge most from one another. Some are very reluctant to condone the idea that income might be distributed without a counterpart in the form of work. Others believe that a new citizenship must rest on the allocation of a minimum income, irrespective of other income, age and marital status.” But in the short term all agree that the RMI should be granted even in cases in which insertion cannot succeed, that it should be extended to adults of less than 25 and that the possibilities for receiving it while earning should be expanded. Such a policy package is perfectly possible, technically, economically and morally, “providing its necessity and urgency is fully perceived, and the interdependency of its three components well understood”.

(Coordinator’s address: Revue du MAUSS, 3 Avenue du Maine, F-75015 Paris)

A former mayor, member of Parliament and government minister, Québéquois businessman Robert Dutil presents in this elaborate essay his conception of where our advanced societies are coming from and of where they should be heading for. A whole chapter is devoted to the proposal of an unconditional basic income ("revenu minimum garanti inconditionnel") pitched at about 20% of GDP and meant as a full substitute to existing transfers. Such a tax-financed and slowly growing floor under all other incomes is far more consistent than the present conditional system with the promotion of people’s self-respect. It is perfectly compatible with sufficient incentives to perform paid and unpaid work. Indeed it would provide the complex engine of modern production with the lubricating oil it needs. The arguments presented closely resemble several of those discussed in the current European debate, of which the author seems unaware. His references are to Major Douglas’s Social Credit (wrongly thought to be fundable without taxation) and to George Mac Govern’s demogrant (pitched at a prohibitively high level for the time).


At the end of an elaborate plea for the individualization of rights and the wider distribution of employment as a strategy for fighting the discrimination against women in our welfare states, basic income is cautiously brought in with the proviso that it should be coupled with "work sharing and the development of social activities".

(Author’s address: Département des sciences économiques, Université Pierre Mendès-France, B.P. 47X, F-38040 Grenoble)


In this little book, the French philosopher J.M. Ferry, one of Jürgen Habermas’s most prominent disciples, presents a forceful defence of basic income against those (like Pierre Rosanvallon and Esprit’s editor Olivier Mangin) who view it as a way of consolidating the "dual" nature of our societies. Basic income, he argues, does not only offer the negative freedom not to accept waged work (or at least to be choosier among the jobs on offer). Above all, it spreads the positive freedom to take new initiatives - whether in a self-employed, cooperative or voluntary capacity, in a "quaternary" sphere of activities that are not predefined by capitalist firms or the government and cannot be mechanized. Basic income, therefore, cannot be contrasted with working time reduction or wage subsidies like granting the right to an income versus granting the right to work. If coupled with the development of this quaternary sector (which could not develop without it), it constitutes a realistic strategy for achieving the right to (meaningful) work. Those who believe that, relative to workfare policies, basic income is an expensive and inefficient strategy towards this aim should first reflect on the huge difference between the gross cost and the net cost of basic income (taking the suppression of many other transfers, the lower administrative costs and the inclusion of basic income in the tax base into account). And above all, they should think about the massive cost of forcing unmotivated people into full-time work: quite apart from the training, supervision and dismissal costs inflicted on the employers, there are plenty of ways in which reluctant workers can make society pay for their conscription: in medicines and psychiatric care, in retraining sessions and early retirements.

Author’s address: Université libre de Bruxelles, Faculté des sciences sociales, Avenue Jeanne 44, B-1050 Bruxelles.


Claude Gamel advocates basic income as a utopia which should become realistic and even desirable, to get out of the dilemma the European Community is currently facing: how to cope with high and lasting unemployment and a decreased international competitiveness with respect to the newly industrialised countries? He explains that, in this context, ‘waiting for the recovery’, ‘stimulate demand’ or ‘share labour time’ are no real solutions. The way the welfare state is organised has to be revised. The fusion of all existing social benefits into one single unconditional basic income, goes in the right direction, essentially by reducing demand for traditional jobs and by securing the viability of low paid jobs that are valuable to the individuals (both those working and those benefiting from the work) such as ‘proximity services’, and by allowing unpaid socializing activities such as the education of children at
home, or voluntary tasks for social associations. At the same time, Gamel proposes to change the financing of the welfare state by replacing all social contributions by a tax on consumption he calls ‘social VAT’, which would come about through a substantial increase in current VAT rates.


Since the publication of “La Crise de l’Etat-Providence” (1981), Pierre Rosanvallon is probably the most notorious and influential French writer on social policy. In this new book (foreshadowed in some earlier
essays; see BI 17), he argues that the passive welfare state, whose chief role consists in handing out benefits to economically inactive people, has now reached its limits. This opens a "philosophical crisis" of the welfare state, which urgently calls for major rethinking. The idea of an unconditional basic income is at the heart of this debate. But it constitutes the "perverse and paradoxical" culmination of the classical, passive welfare state, rather than an incipient new form of the active sort of welfare state that is urgently needed. When the French basic income network (AIRE) or Jean-Marc Ferry insist that full employment is an idea of the past, they overlook the fact that belonging to some community does not only imply a principle of solidarity, and hence a right to food, clothes and housing, but also a "principle of mutual utility", and hence the right to a socially useful activity. What is needed is an "active welfare state", which subsidizes activity rather than passivity. This should not take the form of "strict workfare", as advocated for example by (the early) Lawrence Mead and (the somewhat milder) Mickey Kaus in the U.S., because a massive creation of public sector jobs is undesirable. Nor should it take the form of subsidized jobs in the private sector, because of the undesirable competition with standard jobs this would involve. Subsidies should rather be targeted to young or low-skilled workers in a "third sector" of non-market services in which they would get professional training and be expected to remain for a limited period only. This will amount to shifting public resources from "passive spending on unemployment benefits" to "active spending on the performance of new services". Perhaps Rosanvallon and other advocates of an active welfare state would do well to reflect somewhat more on one key feature of basic income: that unlike the benefits of the "passive welfare state" it can be used by its beneficiary as a subsidy to her/his own activity, whether waged, self-employed, cooperative or unpaid. They may then realize that basic income is not the dead end they think it is, but an essential component of any effective strategy for achieving their central objective.

(Author's address: Fondation Saint Simon, 91 bis rue du Cherche-Midi, F-75006 Paris.)


In this non-technical piece, labour economist Van der Linden looks at various strategies for tackling the high unemployment of the low-skilled and discusses a partial basic income as a road well worth exploring, even though he emphasizes how little is (or can easily be) known about the precise effects of such a measure.

(Author's address: IRES, 3 Place Montesquieu, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, e-mail: vanderlinden@ires.ucl.ac.be.)


Left-wing thinking for our times must be of the liberal-egalitarian brand illustrated by John Rawls. But it can be used to legitimize the dismantling of our welfare state if it fails to incorporate, against Rawls himself, the three defining features of "Left Rawlsism": a commitment to non-selective benefits (including an unconditional basic income), a commitment to a territorial dilatation of democracy (including a stronger European Union with wider redistributive powers) and a rehabilitation of (solidarity-focused) patriotism. This is the central claim of this short and accessible book.

(Author's address: Chaire Hoover, 3 Place Montesquieu, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, e-mail: vanparijs@espo.ucl.ac.be.)


What a world of difference between the strong obligation to work incorporated in the first elaborate proposal for a minimum guaranteed income by Spanish-born Louvain professor and humanist Juan Luis Vives's (1526) and the emancipation from the compulsion to work that is being advocated in the prize-winning universal basic income scenario through which a group of Louvain economists launched the first French-language debate on basic income (1984) !

(Author's address: see above)

An in-depth interview for the magazine of the left Christian-democratic movement "Démocratie et créativité" led by Belgium's Finance Minister Philippe Maystadt.

(Author's address: see above)

GERMAN


This tightly argued article on social policy and poverty includes a critique of the negative income tax (with an income guarantee at the current level of social assistance, a 50% marginal rate and the disappearance of a number of existing transfer schemes) as a strategy for subsidizing low-paid jobs (see esp. F. Scharpf, "Von der Finanzierung der Arbeitslosigkeit zur Subventionierung niedriger Erwerbseinkommen", in Gewerkschaftliche Monatsschlefe 7, 1993, and "Für eine Subventionierung niedriger Erwerbseinkommen", in Wirtschaftsdienst 3, 1994). The main objections to the NIT proposal are that it would lead to a general lowering of the wage level (and hence of the yield from social security contributions and taxation), that it would substitute bad jobs for some good jobs, that it would generate a category of working poor just as marginalized as the unemployed, that its level would be decided by fiscal authorities in a way that would largely escape public debate and that it would be complicated to implement, owing to the different definitions of income for tax and benefit purposes. Hanesch's own solution is a more active labour-market policy that would get more people into normal jobs.

(Author's address: Lehrstuhl für Sozialverwaltung, Fachbereich Sozialpädagogik, Fachhochschule Darmstadt, Germany.)


The work-centred society is and will be generating ever more violence. Avoiding these disastrous consequences requires a strategy that combines a basic income providing security to all, a labour market with shorter jobs and a framework that greatly facilitates meaningful activities outside the realm of paid work.

(Author's address: Hohenbergstraße 5, A-8061St Radegund, Fax 43-3132-25194.)

MEINHARDT, Volker, TEICHMANN, Dieter & WAGNER, Gert G. "Bürgergeld: Kein sozial- und arbeitsmarktpolitischer deus ex machina", in WSI-Mitteilungen 12, 1994, 62435.

Longer version of the English paper by the same authors reviewed above and discussing various simulations of a negative income tax for Germany.


Published in a journal linked to the Swiss socialist party, this is a defence of basic income for Switzerland in the spirit of the German eco-libertarian tradition (Thomas Schmid 1986). The author is particularly concerned about feminist objections and argues strongly in favour of the introduction of a basic income being accompanied by a "new labour policy" that would turn part-time work into the normal case, also for high-skill jobs, and promote professional training for all.


In this tightly argued article, the influential neo-liberal economist Horst Siebert (member of the Sachverständigungsarzt, something like a German equivalent to the US Council of Economic Advisers) takes a firm stand against citizen's income (Bürgergeld) understood as a negative income tax with an annual income guarantee of DM 1.000 for a single person (the current level of social assistance) and a rate of clawback of 50% (which means that one-person households would get net transfers up to an earnings level of DM 2.000 per month, and two-person households up to a level of DM 4.000. Such a system would be prohibitively expensive, as it would raise the number of welfare benefit recipients from 5 to 15 million. It
would also have a detrimental effect on the economy, as it would reduce the overall supply of labour, accustom the youth to state benefits, raise the level of wage settlements (as would massive wage subsidies) owing to the reduced threat of unemployment, and weaken the extent to which the family can be relied on to solve social problems. Moreover, once in place, electoral competition for the median vote will put its level under upward pressure. When discussing social policy options, these long-term effects must be taken into account. An adequate causal therapy would involve keeping the rate of growth of social assistance below that of net wages and actually implementing the rule that the able-bodied between 18 and 50 should be available for work.

(Author's address: Kieler Institut für Weltwirtschaft)


Our transfer systems are premised on the assumption of full-employment. To tackle their worsening dysfunctioning as a result of high persistent unemployment, one can either endeavour to bring back full employment — which is an illusion — or adjust our transfer systems to the new situation. The latter attempt comes in three variants: (1) a basic insurance (in the pension realm for example) that does not obey the equivalence principle; (2) an assimilation of unpaid care work to employment for the sake of social security rights; and most radically (3) the abolition of the sharp dichotomy between reliance on wages and dependency on transfers by allowing workers to combine their wages with some transfers or, conversely, by allowing claimants to combine their benefits with some labour income. The current 'cheating' of individuals only reflects the failure of the system to provide adequate legal incentives. This diagnosis has led, since the early 1980's to the proposal of a basic income in the form of a negative income tax. But different expectations about the extent to which the widespread combination of labour income and benefits would increase the incentive/pressure to relinquish paid work or the incentive/pressure to take on paid work have led to an unusual opposition between some greens, liberals, and Union-remote social-democrats on the one hand, the German Employers Association and Trade Union spokesmen on the other. According to Vobruba, basic income is the way to go because, although it does not abolish the central role of work as an integration mechanism, it dedramatizes the integration problems of our work-centred societies by making it possible to fight poverty with work.

(Author's address: Universität Leipzig, Augustusplatz 10/11, PSF 920, D – 04109 Leipzig)


A short synthesis of the author's conception of basic income as a key component of an eco-social transformation, as formulated in earlier books with Herwig Büchele (see BI 9).

(Author's address: Katholische Sozialakademie, Schottenring 35 / 0, A – 1010 Wien 1, E-mail: ksoe@ping.at)


Starting with an analysis of the situation of the self-employed, this article argues the Swiss socialist party's proposal for some slight unification of existing categorical minimum income schemes is far too modest. More radical schemes such as an unconditional basic income or a negative income tax have the advantage of administrative simplification and de-stigmatization. They should not be rejected as neo-liberal schemes but used to increase autonomy and freedom of choice without loss of social protection. In particular, they would strengthen organized solidarity between the richer and the poorer among the self-employed, and, as the Geneva sociologist Christian Lalivé d’Epina (1991) puts it, by making it possible to "try the adventure of founding a small business without needing immediate profitability."

ITALIAN

According to Pierre Carniti, former Secretary General of the CISL (Italy’s Catholic trade union), a "guaranteed minimum income for everyone, independent of work performed" does not constitute an effective remedy to the irreversible process that has led to modern unemployment and by now implies the end of "old-fashioned work (8 hours a day, 5 days a week, 48 weeks a year, for the whole of your life)". This process is rooted in the increase in the productivity of work itself, which no economy can forgo without being overwhelmed by international competition. The proposal of "making work optional" is "unacceptable" because it fails to see that work is not just a "factor of income" but primarily a "factor of identity". Instead of the "liberation from work", the author proposes the re-invention and above all the reorganization of work, on the basis of a reduction of working hours of the sort implemented by Volkswagen.

DORE, Ronald, La disoccupazione moderna: un male incurabile ?, Il Mulino (bimonthly cultural and political review), n° 352, March–April 1994.

Ronald Dore, one of the leading Western authorities on the Japanese economic system, indicates in this short essay a number of reforms which he regards as necessary to deal effectively with the dramatic phenomenon of unemployment. Among other things, he discusses the institution of a "basic social income" which should absorb up to 40% of GDP and, being the fruit not of work but a Meade-type accumulation of public capital, should make it possible to "sever the bond between respect for the citizen and participation in paid unemployment". "A redefinition of the citizen’s duties would also constitute an essential ingredient in a new concept of a social entitlement to income». In this context, "the adoption of some form of compulsory community service for all" would represent "a simultaneously necessary measure".

(fAuthor’s address: JEIRC, Imperial College, Exhibition Road, LONDON SW7 2BX)


The opening sections of the article examine the social phenomenon of poverty and address issues of definition and research methodology. Ferrucci then goes on to provide a descriptive critique of the "citizenship income" in Europe and in Italy on the basis of related concrete experiences and of proposals for implementation.


In the third chapter, which examines the "promises and pitfalls of the citizenship income", Gorz uses his critique of the wage-earning society to expose what he sees as the strengths and limitations of the various proposals for an income unrelated to the work performed. In the case of Friedman’s proposal for an "insufficient" guaranteed income, he claims that this would make it possible for marginalized workers to accept otherwise underpaid jobs and therefore has an explicitly class-based character in that its purpose is to prolong historically superseded forms of labour organization and to make the corresponding economic activities profitable once again for entrepreneurs. On the other hand, a "sufficient" guaranteed income would foster the diffusion of discontinuous, informal and variable forms of work and hence a restructuring of the economic and social system that would confer new dignity upon activities with no intrinsic market value.

(Author’s address: F – 10130 VOSNON, France)


The author, a TV journalist presents an original overview of the fundamental issues regarding mankind and the modern era. In proposing "a more adequate relationship between nature and spirit" to be established institutionally within the framework of a "World Democratic Union", Pirarba explicitly refers to the need to ensure a "guaranteed minimum income for every individual". As one of the possible schemes, he refers to the "social dividend" paid to each citizen out of the revenues of public assets, as outlined in James Meade’s Agathotopia (Feltrinelli, 1989).


In order to tackle growing poverty in wealthy Switzerland, a research team at the Institute for Economic Research of Canton Ticino proposes a "Scandinavian-inspired" reform that would give a far more important role to basic benefits financed by taxation and available irrespective of people’s careers. However, the authors recognize that this would make no contribution to solving the unemployment problem that is at the root of the upsurge in poverty. One proposed solution that has attracted many very stimulating contributions in recent years is that of a basic income (“assegno universale”). After presenting
the analysis of sociologist Roger Sue, philosopher Philippe Van Parijs and economist Guy Standing, the book concludes: "We do not know whether and when the prospect of a basic income will seem desirable and feasible to a majority of citizens and whether it will therefore emerge as the new paradigm of "postindustrial" and "postmodern" societies. We are in any event convinced that this prospect deserves consideration and discussion", while the more immediate proposals presented in the bulk of the book are being implemented

(Author's address: Istituto di Ricerche Economiche, Stabile Torretta, CH – 6501 Bellinzona, Switzerland)

SALSANO, Alfredo. "Reddito di cittadinanza", Reset (monthly cultural and political review), April 1994. A concise but comprehensive overview of the debate on the subject over the last few years, by way of postscript to the translation of a paper ("Como finisce la società dei salariati") in which André Gorz argues for a « second paycheque » to compensate for the loss of individual income brought about by the redistribution of working hours in the manufacturing sector.

Bruno Trentin is the former Secretary General of the CGIL (the largest Italian trade union) and one of the leading figures in the trade–union movement over the last twenty–five years. In this slim volume, he expresses "reservations" as regards the hypothesis of a general reduction of working hours ("possibly sustained by the introduction of equally generalized systems of income integration") as a way of tackling unemployment. He "never agreed with the recurrent proposals to introduce a guaranteed minimum income wholly unrelated to the quantity of work performed" and gives the following three reasons for his opposition: such proposals have proved unsuccessful, they would lead to "experiments involving the exclusion and marginalization of unemployed workers" and, above all, they are based on the ideological assumption of the "inalterability of the Taylor–Ford system" and the present division of labour. In opposition to a guaranteed minimum income, the author proposes a complex system of reforms including a "public agency for labour organization".

Italian edition of a critical introduction to the main contemporary answers to the question "What is a just society?"(initially published in French by le Seuil, 1991; already available in Spanish from Ariel, 1993 and soon in Portuguese from Atica). Starting from Rawls's theory of justice, chapters 8 and 9 sketch the case for making an unconditional basic income a central component of a defensible conception of a just society under contemporary conditions. (Author's address: Chaire Hoover, 3 Place Montesquieu, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, e-mail: vanparijs@espo.ucl.ac.be.)

PORTUGUESE

An old text that constitutes the first plea for a basic income (in its negative income tax variant) in the Latin-American discussion, with references to R. Theobald and M. Friedman.

In this Portuguese version of an article previously published in Ethics (Chicago), it is argued that alternative socio-economic regimes should be assessed using as a standard the highest unconditional income they can sustainably guarantee. In a short comment, Dr. Nelson Schwarz (Unicamp) argues that assuming that a basic income can be introduced in a capitalist economy begs the crucial question. (Author's address: Chaire Hoover, 3 Place Montesquieu, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, e-mail: vanparijs@espo.ucl.ac.be.)
SPANISH

This supplement to the Spanish version of the magazine of one of Spain's main business schools replicates its catalan version reviewed above. It incorporates a contribution by Gorz ("El futuro del empleo") originally published in October 1993 and one by Van Parijs ("Dos utopías lovanistas en torno al trabajo y a la renta") originally published in May 1995.
(Authors' addresses: F-10130 VOSNON, France and Chaire Hoover, 3 Place Montesquieu, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, e-mail: vanparijs@espo.ucl.ac.be.)

This is so far the most important Latin American publication on the proposal of an unconditional basic income. A competent introduction by CIEPP's director and social policy specialist Ruben Lo Vuolo is followed by translations of Philippe Van Parijs's "Beyond Solidarity" (Futuribles 1994) and Claus Offe's "A non-productivist design for social policy (in Arguing for Basic Income, 1992). Next, Ruben Lo Vuolo investigates the "political economy of a citizen's income", Alberto Barbeito (professor at the Universidad Nacional de Rio Cuarto) discusses the integration of tax and benefit systems as an instrument of social integration, Laura Pautassi (researcher at the CIEPP) scrutinizes the impact a citizen's income would have on the situation of women, Félix Ovejero Luca (professor at the University of Barcelona) discusses the link between basic income and emancipatory projects, and the book closes with a contribution by Roberto Gargarella (researcher at CIEPP and author of a previous book on representative democracy) about citizen's income as an egalitarian policy.
Editor's address: Centro Interdisciplinario para el Estudio de Políticas Públicas (CIEPP), Avda Pueyrredón 510, piso 3, Dpto A, 1032 Buenos Aires, Argentina, e-mail: rplovuol@criba.edu.ar)

MARTINEZ, Francisco José. "El ingreso garantizado como alternativa a la insuficiencia de la relación salarial, Sistema 126, 1995, 97-103.
A plea for basic income in job-poor welfare capitalism, with the proviso that its political feasibility requires a widespread commitment to solidarity and to a sober way of life hardly compatible with the individualistic and consumerist spirit nurtured by capitalism.
(Author's address: UNED, Depto de Filosofía y Filos. Moral y Política, Edificio Humanidades, Despacho 307, C/ Senda del Rey s/n, E – 28040 MADRID)

SWEDISH

A reform with a low citizens income supplemented with a citizens wage scheme is presented. The citizens wage is a grant which one can apply for in order to study, take care of others, work for associations, practice cultural or sport activities etc in a "third sector". The effects on justice and incentives are discussed by use of six dimensions: non-labour incomes, value in the labour market, intrinsic value of work to the person herself, practical skills, household tasks, and consumption demands. In a society with a CI supplemented with a CW it would be less advantageous to value consumption and wealth highly. It would be more advantageous to engage in work that one values per se, to acquire broad practical skills, and to produce more for oneself and the local community. A version of the paper was presented in English at the fifth BIEN congress.
(Author's e-mail address: janderss@abo.fi)
ACADEMIC THESES ON BASIC INCOME

BELGIUM
GENET Michel, Calcul d’un mode de financement d’une allocation universelle européenne, mémoire de maîtrise, Université catholique de Louvain, Département des sciences économiques (Dir.: Prof. P. Van Parijs), 1991, 134p.
GUENE, Christophe, Financement d’un revenu de citoyenneté européen par l’impôt immobilier, mémoire de maîtrise, Université catholique de Louvain, Département des sciences économiques (Dir.: Prof. P. Van Parijs), septembre 1994, 48p.
STAINIER Bernard, La légitimité de l’allocation universelle, mémoire de maîtrise, Université catholique de Louvain, Département des sciences économiques (Dir.: Prof. P. Van Parijs), 1987, 65p.


FRANCE

IRELAND
BYRNE Steven E., A Rawlsian argument for basic income, M.A. thesis, University College (Dublin), Department of politics, M.A. thesis (Dir.: Dr. Attracta Ingram), August 1993, 62 p.

NETHERLANDS

SWITZERLAND
MOTTU, Eric A. La Progressivité des impôts: Théorie et applications aux impôts directs et à la TVA en Suisse (chapters 7, 8 and 10), PhD thesis in political economy, Université de Genève: Faculté des sciences économiques et sociales (Dir.: Prof. L. Weber), 1994, 420 p.
UPDATED GENERAL INFORMATION

BASIC INCOME

WHAT IS IT?
A basic income is an income unconditionally granted to all on an individual basis, without means test or work requirement.
In other words, it is a form of minimum income guarantee that differs from those that now exist in various European countries through its being paid (1) to individuals rather than households; (2) irrespective of any income from other sources; and (3) without requiring the performance of any work or the willingness to accept a job if offered.
Under a variety of names - state bonus and social credit, social wage and social dividend, guaranteed income and citizen’s wage, citizenship income and demogrant, existence income and universal grant -, basic income has been advocated using the widest range of arguments since it was first proposed by Thomas Paine in 1796 to the French Directoire.

WHY?
Liberty and equality, efficiency and community, common ownership of the Earth and equal sharing in the benefits of technical progress, the flexibility of the labour market and the dignity of the poor, the fight against inhumane working conditions, against the desertification of the countryside and against interregional inequalities, the viability of cooperatives and the promotion of adult education, autonomy from bosses, husbands and bureaucrats, have all been invoked in its favour.
But it is the inability to tackle unemployment with conventional means that has led in the last decade or so to the idea being taken seriously throughout Europe by a growing number of scholars and organizations. Social policy and economic policy can no longer be conceived separately, and basic income is increasingly viewed as the only viable way of reconciling two of their respective central objectives: poverty relief and full employment.

HOW MUCH?
There is a wide variety of proposals around. They differ according to the amounts involved, the source of funding, the nature and size of the reductions in other transfers, and along many other dimensions. As far as short-term proposals are concerned, however, the current discussion is focusing increasingly on so-called partial basic income schemes which would not be full substitutes for present guaranteed income schemes but would provide a low - and slowly increasing - basis to which other incomes, including the remaining social security benefits and means-tested guaranteed income supplements, could be added.

WHO SUPPORTS IT?
Many prominent European social scientists have now come out in favour of basic income - among them two Nobel laureates in economics. In a few countries some major politicians, including from parties in government, are also beginning to stick their necks out in support of it. At the same time, the relevant literature - on the economic, ethical, political and legal aspects - is gradually expanding and those promoting the idea, or just interested in it, in various European countries have started organizing into an active network.
BOOKS ON BASIC INCOME

FOUR MILESTONES

1526
The first detailed proposal for a guaranteed minimum scheme, presented to the Mayor of Bruges by a Valencia-born humanist philosopher who studied in Paris and taught at Louvain and Oxford.

1796
Thomas PAINÉ, Agrarian Justice.
The first plea for a genuinely unconditional grant presented to the French Directoire by the English-born ideologue of the American and French Revolutions.

1920
The first detailed proposal for a basic income published by an English Quaker and Labour Party member, backed by surprisingly modern arguments.

1985
The first official proposal for a basic income as a key component of a new social security system presented to (and rejected by) the Dutch government.

DUTCH

1985
Werkgroep Arbeid & Milieu, Breughelstraat 31, B-2018 Antwerpen. 57p., BF. 85

1986

1988
A small book focusing on the 1985 WRR proposal, and written by two of its supporters.

1990
A comprehensive account of the basic income discussion in the country in which it has been most active.

1993
VAN DER VEEN, Robert J. (ed.). Basisinkomen in drievoud, Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis (Ouderzijds Achterburgwal 185, NL–1012 DK Amsterdam), ISSN 0928-8716, 213p.
Contributors: Jan-Jaap Heij, Erik van Kempen, Tobias Kwakkelstein, Anthony Stigter, Robert van der Veen.

1994
CRIVIT, Robert (ed.). Naar een basisinkomen?, IMAVO & Masereelfonds (Snoekstraat 107, 9000 Gent), 1994, 72p.

1995
Contributors: Paul de Beer, Jos de Beus, Dick Pels, Philippe Van Parijs, Robert van der Veen, Bas van Stokkom.

ENGLISH

1986

1986

1988

1989
An authoritative work on why a basic income would make sense in the UK and how much it would cost.

1989
The most readable book-length general introduction to basic income.

1990
A presentation of the basic arguments behind basic income from a free-market perspective and of the obstacles to its implementation.

1992

1994

1995
An illustrated introduction to five lively domains of public economics in the form of a discussion of a basic income financed out of a proportional tax on all personal income.

1995
A systematic ethical defence of an unconditional basic income at the highest sustainable level.

FRENCH

1985
BOULANGER, Paul-Marie, DEFEYT, Philippe & VAN PARIJS, Philippe (eds.), L'Allocation Universelle: une idée pour vivre autrement?, special issue of La Revue Nouvelle (Boulevard Général Jacques 126, 1050-Bruxelles), volume 41, n°4, April 1985, 125p., ISSN 0035-3809, BFr. 250.

1986
A short introduction to basic income in the form of an alternation of theoretical considerations and down-to-earth arguments.

1987

1991
Contributors: Y. Bot, Y. Bresson, H. Guitton, P. Lavagne, F. Perdrizet, R. Macaire, B. Valentin.

1992

1993

1994

1994
A popular version of the theoretical justification of basic income as an expression of the value of time.

1995
A short plea for basic income as a way of restring the right to (meaningful) work, in conjunction with the development of a "quaternary" sector.
GERMAN
1984
1985
A systematic argument for basic income from a progressive Christian perspective.
1986
1987
1990
Two essays on basic income as part of the response to the ecological crisis of world society.
1991

ITALIAN
1988
Contributors: C. Euzéby, Collectif Charles Fourier, A. Gorz, B. Trentin, and others
1991
Contributors: M.-L. Mirabile, P. Negro.

SPANISH
1988
1991
1995
Contributors: Alberto Barbeito, Roberto Gargarella, Claus Offe, Félix Ovejero Luca, Laura Pautassi, Philippe Van Parijs.
RELATED NETWORKS AND ASSOCIATIONS

United Kingdom
CITIZENS’ INCOME
The Basic Income Research Group was set up in 1984, under the auspices of the National Council for Voluntary Organizations, to "research all aspects of reform along the lines of a basic income”. It was renamed "Citizens' Income Study Centre" at the end of 1992. Its current director is Richard Clements. Its activities are financed by subscriptions and donations (mainly from the Rowntree Charitable Trust). It organizes various seminars and conferences, and publishes twice a year the Citizen’s Income Bulletin edited by Hermione Parker, which deals increasingly with issues with are just as relevant to other European countries as to the UK, and keenly opens its columns to foreign contributors.
Address: Citizens Income Study Centre, St Philips Building, Sheffield Street, UK–London WC2A 2EX [next door to the London School of Economics], tel.: 44-171-9557453; fax: 44-171-9557534.
Citizens' Income has a regional branch in the North-West (coordinated by Kevin Donnelly, 20 Nan Nook Road, Manchester M23 OBZ, 44-61-9984791

Netherlands
VERENIGING BASISINKOMEN
The "Werkplaats Basisinkomen" was founded in October 1987 at the initiative of the food workers' Union Voedingsbond FNV to coordinate thinking and action on basic income in the Netherlands (where the debate goes back to the mid-seventies). The Werkplaats, which had only corporate members (Unions, claimants’ associations, etc.), was supplemented in September 1991 by an association of "friends of basic income based on individual membership. Both merged in 1993 to form the current Vereniging Basisinkomen. In June 1993, the latter defined its strategy as follows: (1) The network aims at establishing a full basic income in the long run but supports other associations which propagate a partial basic income; (2) it views a partial basic income as a temporary goal; (3) it aims at a better distribution of paid and unpaid work; (4) it supports those who want to establish a basic income via a negative income tax.
The association has organized many meetings. It publishes occasional brochures and a regular newsletter (which until 1991 was oddly called "Het werkt niet meer").
Address: Herman Heijermansweg 20, NL-1077 WL Amsterdam. Tel.: 31-20-5731803.
In collaboration with the Vereniging, the Faculty of Politics of Amsterdam University has a documentation centre on basic income, which contains all the most significant Dutch publications on the subject. Once a year, an updated catalogue is available on request. Address: c/o Dr Robert J. van der Veen, Algemene Politicologie FSW, Binnengasthuis, Oudezijds Achterburgwal 237, NL–1012 DL Amsterdam, Netherlands.

France:
ASSOCIATION POUR L'INSTAURATION D'UN REVENU D'EXISTENCE (AIRE)
AIRE was created in January 1989 out of a discussion group on basic income started up by economists Henri Guitton and Yoland Bresson. It organized BIEN’s 1992 Congress, holds regular meetings and publishes a "Lettre de liaison". The subscription fee is FF200 per year.
Address: c/o Madame H. Boussatha, Université de Paris-Saint-Maur, Faculté des Sciences économiques et de gestion, 58, avenue Didier, F–94210 La Varenne Saint–Hilaire. Tel.: 33-1-49768098; fax: 33-1-48852993
Ireland
BIEN IRELAND
The Irish branch of BIEN was set up at the beginning of 1995 at the initiative of John Baker and Maire Mullarney. It helps spread information about basic income in Ireland and informs the wider network about the current Irish debate.
Address: c/o John Baker, Equality Studies Centre, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4, tel.: 353-1-706.8365, fax: 353-1-706.1171, e-mail: bakerjm@ollamh.ucd.ie

Belgium
COLLECTIF CHARLES FOURIER
Set up in February 1984 to prepare the special issue of La Revue Nouvelle (Brussels, April 1995) that launched the first French-language debate on basic income, the Collectif Charles Fourier consisted mainly of economists connected to the Catholic University of Louvain. It would no longer exist, had it not won a prize, in November 1984, in a scenario competition organized by the King Baudouin Foundation about the future of work.
The money helped fund the conference at which BIEN was founded (Louvain-la-Neuve, September 1986).
It also helped build up a comprehensive archive on basic income in several European languages, including most of the items reviewed in the BIEN newsletter.
The Archive is accessible on appointment (weekdays only). Prospective visitors are requested to contact Annick Dabeye, Chaire Hoover d’Ethique Economique et Sociale, 3 place Montesquieu, B–1348 Louvain-la-Neuve. Tel.: 32-10-473951; fax: 473952; e-mail: dabeye@espo.ucl.ac.be.

Internet interactive forum
FUTUREWORK
RE-DESIGNING WORK, INCOME DISTRIBUTION, EDUCATION
The listserv FUTUREWORK is an international e-mail forum for discussion of how to deal with the new realities created by economic globalization and technological change. What would a large permanent reduction in the number of secure, adequately-waged jobs mean for communities, families and individuals? This is not being adequately discussed, nor are the implications for income distribution and education. Even less adequately addressed are questions of how to take back control of these events, how to turn technological change into the opportunity for a richer life rather than the recipe for a bladerunner society. Our objective in creating this listserv was to involve as many people as possible in re-designing for the new realities. We hoped that this list would help to move these issues to a prominent place on public and political agendas worldwide, and there has been some very lively discussion on the list since its initiation in December 1994.
The FUTUREWORK listserv is hosted by Communications for a Sustainable Future (CSF) located at the University of Colorado at Boulder. It is an unmoderated and open list, so all messages posted to the list will be redistributed around the world. To subscribe to FUTUREWORK, send the following message to listserv@csf.colorado.edu:
"SUB FUTUREWORK Yourfirstname Yourlastname"
To post directly to the list (once you are subscribed), send your message to: FUTUREWORK@csf.colorado.edu.
For further information, contact Sally Lerner at the University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada (lerner@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca).
THE BASIC INCOME EUROPEAN NETWORK

BIEN’S OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES

The Basic Income European Network (BIEN) aims to serve as a link between individuals and groups committed to or interested in basic income, and to foster informed discussion on this topic throughout Europe.

BIEN holds an international conference every second year. The first five took place in Louvain-la-Neuve (September 1986), Antwerp (September 1988), Florence (September 1990), Paris (September 1992) and London (September 1994). The next one will be held on 12-14 September 1996 in Vienna.

Since 1988, BIEN publishes a newsletter that is now also available on internet. As from January 1996, it will have a page on World Wide Net which will incorporate most of the information contained in earlier newsletters.

BIEN has subscribing members in 14 countries. Its governing body is a General Assembly consisting of all its subscribing members. It meets every second year on the occasion of the international conference and elects an executive committee.

BIEN’S EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

• Co-chairmen:
  Edwin MORLEY-FLETCHER, Lega Nazionale delle Cooperative e Mutue, Via Guattani 9, I-00161 Roma, Italy. Tel: 39-6-844391, Fax: 39-6-84439406
  Guy STANDING, Labour Market Policies Branch, International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva, Switzerland. Tel: 41-22-7996433, Fax: 41-22-997657,
  E-mail: 100263.534@compuserve.com

• Conference Organizers:
  Michael TEPSE (with Lieselotte Wohlgenannt), Katholische Sozialakademie, Schottenring 35/0, A – 1010 WIEN 1, Tel.: 43-1-3105159–76, Fax: 43-1-3106828,
  E-mail: ksoe@ping.at
  Bernd MARIN (with Edith Scherr), European Centre for Social Welfare Policy and Research, Berggasse 17, A-1090 Wien, tel.: 43-1-319450521; fax: 43-1-319450519,
  E-mail: riemer@euro.centre.org

• Research Coordinator:
  Ilona OSTNER (with Stefan Lessenich), Georg-August Universität, Institut für Sozialpolitik, Platz der Göttinger Sieben 3, D-37073 Göttingen, Germany, Tel 49-551-397243, Fax: 49-551-397834, E-mail: iostner@gwdg.de

• Treasurer:
  Alexander DE ROO, Greens in the European Parliament, Rue Béliard 97–113, B–1047 Brussels, Belgium, Tel: 32-2-2843052, Fax: 32-2-2307837, E-mail: epggenv@gn.apc.org

• Deputy Secretary:
  Walter VAN TRIER, UFSIA, 13 Prinsstraat, B-2000 Antwerpen, Belgium, Tel: (32)(3) 2204182, Fax: 2204420, E-mail: dse.vantrier.w@alpha.ufsia.ac.be

• Secretary:
  Philippe VAN PARIJS (with Annick Dabeye and Christian Arnsperger), Université Catholique de Louvain, Chaire Hoover d’éthique économique et sociale, 3 Place Montesquieu, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium, Tel. 32-10-473951, Fax: 32-10-473952,
  E-mail: vanparijs@espo.ucl.ac.be.
BIEN’S NETWORK OF RESEARCH CENTRES

BIEN’s General Assembly decided at its London meeting (September 1994) that it would apply for EU funds in order to strengthen research around basic income. Professor Ilona Ostner (Göttingen) was appointed Research coordinator and entered a project (prepared with the assistance of Dr Stefan Lessenich) within the framework of the Programme “Targeted socio-economic research”. The latter attracted a total of 548 applications. Our project received an “A” mark, which made it fundable within the programme. However, it was not among the few that were selected in the end. We intend to reapply with a further improved version of our initial proposal.

Membership in the prospective network of research centres is not restricted to academic institutions, nor to institutions located in the member countries. If you would like your research centre to benefit from membership in this (potential) network please send to BIEN’s research coordinator and to its secretary (addresses above) a brief presentation of your centre, a list of its basic-income-related publications and activities, and the name and function of a contact person.

PRACTICAL INFORMATION

IF YOU WISH TO KNOW MORE ABOUT BASIC INCOME OR BIEN, write to BIEN’s secretary (Ph. Van Parijs, Chaire Hoover, 3 Place Montesquieu, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Phone: 32-10-473952, E-mail: vanparijs@espo.ucl.ac.be), with your full name and address.

IF YOU WISH TO BECOME A MEMBER OF BIEN (until 31 December 1996) and receive systematically BIEN’s newsletter and other publications, please

1. MAIL TO BIEN’S SECRETARY (address above) the following information:
Surname:
Name:
Institution (if any):
Full postal address:
Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Mode of payment:

AND

2. PAY A MINIMUM OF BF 1000 or equivalent (£ 20, DM 50, Dfl 50, LIT 50.000, FF 200, US $ 35, etc.)
   • either in cash in a well-sealed envelope to BIEN’s secretary
   • or into BIEN’s account (001-2204356-10 at the CGER, Brussels)
   • or by US Cashier’s cheque to BIEN’s secretary (if from the US)
   • or into the giro-number 1890919 of the Vereniging Basisinkomen (if from the Netherlands)
   • or by cheque to Citizen’s Income Study Centre, St Philip’s Building, Sheffield Street, London WC2A 2EX (if from the UK)
   • or by cheque to BIEN-Ireland, c/o John Baker, Equality Studies Centre, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4 (if from Ireland)

[For institutional membership, the fee is 4 times the amount mentioned above and should be sent straight into BIEN’s account (001-2204356-10 at the CGER, Brussels)]

In all cases, an acknowledgement will be sent upon receipt.

We look forward to welcoming you to our network.