The 1990 BIEN Conference had an unprecedented number of papers and drew a record number of participants. It displayed the vigour and diversity of basic income thinking throughout Europe. See pages 3-4.

The organization of the Newsletter is being strengthened. An associate editor has been elected, and an Editorial Board set up. See p.2.

The oldest book entirely devoted to basic income is called *Higher production by a bonus on national output*. It was published in 1920 and has just been retrieved from oblivion. See page 7.

Geneva and Paris have been shortlisted for the next BIEN Conference (September 1992). The Executive Committee will decide shortly which of the two places will host the conference.
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### NEWLY ELECTED: BIEN's EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**Co-chairmen:**
- **Guy STANDING** (International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva, Phone: (41)(22)7996455, Fax: (41)(22)7988685.)
- **Edwin MORLEY-FLETCHER** (Lega Nazionale delle Cooperative e Mutue, Via Guattini 9, I-00161 Roma, Phone: (39)(6)844391, Fax: (39)(6)84439216.)

**Secretary:** Walter VAN TRIER (UFSIA, 21 Bosduifstraat, B-2018 Antwerp, phone: (32)(3) 2204182 (office), (32)(3) 2711642 (home), Fax: (32)(3) 2204420.

**Treasurer:** Alexander DE ROO (Greens in EP, REM 12, European Parliament, 97-113 rue Belliard, B-1040 Brussels, Phone: (32)(2)2843052, Fax: (32)(2) 2307837.

**Newsletter editor:** Philippe VAN PARIJS (Until June 1991: Istituto Universitario Europeo, CP 2330, I-50100 Firenze, Italy, Fax: (39)(55) 587197.)

**Associate editor:** David PURDY (University of Manchester, Department of Economics, Manchester M13 9PL, England, Phone: (44)(61) 434893.)

### NEWLY CREATED: THE EDITORIAL BOARD

**Editor:**
- Philippe VAN PARIJS (address above)

**Associate editor:**
- David PURDY (address above)

**Members:**
- Jan-Otto ANDERSSON, Sirkkalagatan 9, SF-20500 Turku, Finland.
- Serge MILANO, Service des Etudes et du Financement, Ministère de la Solidarité, 1 Place de Fontenoy, F-75700 Paris. Phone: (33)(1)47652907.
- Jan-Otto ANDERSSON, Sirkkalagatan 9, SF-20500 Turku, Finland.
- Peter TRAVERS, School of Social Sciences, Flinders University, GPO Box 2100, Adelaide 5001, Australia, Phone: (61)(8)2752325; Fax: (61)(8)2012566.
- Robert VAN DER VEE, Universiteit van Amsterdam, Vakgroep Algemene Politologie, Oudezijds Achterburgwal 237, 1012 DL Amsterdam, Netherlands; Fax: (31)(20)5252086.
- Georg VOBRUBA, Hamburger Institut für Sozialforschung, Mittelweg 36, D-2000 Hamburg 13, Phone: (49)(40)41409732; Fax: (49)(40)41409711.

---

**THIS ISSUE**

of Basic Income

has been prepared with the help of
Sue Black, Alexander de Roo, Guy Standing, Robert van der Veen, Georg Vobruba
and all those who have spontaneously sent relevant material.
Many thanks!

---

**PAST EVENTS**
With an unprecedented number of participants (over 120), an unprecedented number of papers (60), an unprecedented amount of resources channeled into it (by both the participants themselves and several sponsors, including the EEC Commission, the European University Institute, the Italian Labour Ministry, the Lega Nazionale delle Cooperative e Mutue, the Fondazione CESPE, the IRES-CGIL, the Banca Toscana and the cooperative Granarolo-Felsinea), the Third BIEN conference was a memorable event, incomparably more glamorous than its two predecessors. With the unpaid help of a handful of friends from the Lega delle Cooperativa, Edwin Morley-Fletcher organized both the fund-raising and the event itself in masterly fashion. Our network is very grateful to them all.

Both presentations and discussions showed how extensive and varied European thinking about basic income has become, and how people from very different cultural, linguistic, professional and political backgrounds are beginning to find a language in which they can communicate on the subject without too many misunderstandings. Practical constraints prevented the organization of parallel workshops, which would have allowed for wider active participation, more focused debates and above all an in-depth discussion of both fundamental objections and practical difficulties. The organization of the Fourth International Conference should pay special attention to this.

**OVERVIEWS**

Parker, Hermione. "Basic income or minimum income", 16p.

**BI & CITIZENSHIP**

Jordan, Bill. "What is a sustainable society?", 8p.
Walter, Tony. "Basic income and active citizenship", 10p.

**BI & SOCIAL OWNERSHIP**

Liska, Tibor, "The reform of property relations. A proposal for entrepreneurial socialism based on personal-social property relations", 22p.
Liska, Tibor, "Opportunities for the spreading of entrepreneurship in the context of labour market reform in Eastern transitions", 18p.
Meade, James, "What can we learn from the Agathotopians?", 15p.
Morley-Fletcher, Edwin, "Comments on James Meade’s Agathotopia", 29p.
Nuti, Domenico Mario, "James Meade, the cooperative enterprise and market socialism", 16p.

**BI & WORK**

Andersson, Jan-Otto, "A citizenship income or a citizenship wage", 6p.
Chilosi, Alberto, "A general workfare solution to the basic income problem", 5p.
Cocilovo, Luigi, "Uguaglianza di opportunità e reddito di cittadinanza", 7p.
Ormerod, Paul, "Basic income and the right to training", 8p.
Ravaïoli, Carla. “Citizenship as everyone’s right to equal opportunity”, 12p.
Sacconi, Stefano. "Un’analisi critica del concetto di occupazione come base per una nuova strategia d’intervento", 12p.

**BI & women**
Mullarney, Maire, "A justification of basic income hitherto unremarked", 9p.

**BI & ecology**
Soininvaara, Osmo. "Basic income as part of a green economic policy", 3p.

**BI & the third world**
Rinaldi, Vanni. "Esiste un ruolo per un’ipotesi di reddito minimo garantito per i paesi in via di sviluppo?", 18p.

**Discussions of prospective BI schemes**
Ferrière, Gilberte, "Scenario for a basic income in Belgium", 7p.
George, Robley, "Socioeconomic democracy", 30p.

**Assessments of existing GMI schemes**

**Philosophical & theological contributions**
Mayr, Albert, "Citizenship income and social space-times", 7p.

**Historical contributions**
Ferrero, Marco, "Un modello di socialismo intergenerazionale", 14p.
Tanghe, Fernand. "Land redistribution schemes under the French revolution: an anticipation of basic income", 7p.
Van Trier, Walter. "State bonus or basic income in the age of social reconstruction", 46p.

**Side issues**
BIEN’s SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
(ANTWERP, SEPTEMBER 1988)

The proceedings are now available. They contain contributions on the political feasibility of basic income (by Hermione Parker, Alexander de Roo and David Purdy), on its ethical justification (by Erik van der Hoeven and Philippe Van Parijs), on its labor supply effects (by Stefan Kesenne and Patrick Van Durme) and on various ways of funding it (by David Chapman, Marie-Louise Duboin, Anne Miller and Jan Stroeken).

Edited by Walter Van Trier. 192 pages. Available for BF 250 from BIEN (21 Bosduifstraat, B-2018 Antwerpen, Belgium) or for £4 from BIRG (102 Pepys Road, London SE14 6SG, UK).

BASISINKOMEN EN MILIEU
(UTRECHT, 2 NOVEMBER 1990)

A one-day conference, jointly organized by the environmentalist organization Landelijk Milieuoeverleg, the food workers' Union (Voedingsbond FNV) and the Werkplaats Basisinkomen, in order to examine the relations between basic income and the environment. One central issue was whether the introduction of a BI might help the pursuit of environmental objectives, for example by increasing the willingness of low income groups to pay the taxes required for cleaning up the soil and preventing further pollution; by fostering the struggle for environmentally sound working conditions; or, more speculatively, by nurturing ecologically responsible attitudes within families, thanks to a redistribution of both paid and unpaid work. The other main issue was the design of the best way of financing a basic income from an ecological standpoint. Is the introduction of a basic income essential for an effective environmental policy? The general conclusion was that it is not, but that it does help, albeit indirectly.

Further information and background papers (in Dutch) from Kris Douma, Voedingsbond FNV, Postbus 3750, NL-3506 GT Utrecht.

(LOUVAIN-LA-NEUVE, SEPTEMBER 1986)

There are still a few copies available of the proceedings of this historical event at which BIEN was founded. Contributions by Nooteboom, Standing, Vobruba, Boulanger, Parker, Wegner, de Beer, Raes, Roland, Adler-Karlsson, Andersson, Duboin Dekkers, Duben, Fox, Meyer, de Roo, Miller, Hogenboom, Janssen, Jordan, van Oijen, Callender, Hall, Van Trier, van der Veen and Van Parijs.

Edited by Anne Miller. 325 pages. Same prices and places as 1988 Proceedings.

BASISINKOMEN EN INDIVIDUALISERING
(UTRECHT, 17 NOVEMBER 1990)

Should a basic income system take the household or the individual as the unit of entitlement? This old issue was chosen as the theme of the Werkplaats Basisinkomen for its 1990 Annual Meeting, with invited representatives from single persons' organizations. Based on a position paper (by Paul de Beer, from the Labour Party, and Saar Boerlage, from the University of Amsterdam) and introduced by two talks (by Kris Douma, from the Food Workers' Union, and Robert van der Veen, from the University of Amsterdam), the discussion led to the following conclusions: (1) The current Dutch tax and social security system strongly discriminates against single people and should be reformed in a neutral direction, irrespective of the basic income issue. (2) BI should not be differentiated in order to compensate for the higher cost of living in a single household, but should be adequate to meet this cost too. (3) As long as there is no BI at this level or no adequate provision of public and private housing for low-income single-adult households, the latter should receive (higher) housing subsidies.

Further information from Werkplaats Basisinkomen (H. Heijermansweg 20, NL-1077 WL Amsterdam, Netherlands).
Unlike its 1985 controversial predecessor, this preparatory document for the second economic conference of the Flemish green party AGALEV contains no extensive discussion of basic income (which is not to be discussed at the conference). There is only a brief restatement of AGALEV's commitment to BI, and a brief reference to the fact that whereas other aspects of the 1985 programme (such as the proposal for a uniform reduction in working time) could no longer be upheld, the basic income proposal is one on which the party has progressed by working it out in more detail.

(DE BEER's address: Wiardi Beckman Stichting, Nicolaas Witsenkade, NL 1017 ZT Amsterdam, Netherlands)

An entertaining and sympathetic review, by Amsterdam University political theorist Jos de Beus, of Roebroek and Hoogenboom's recent book on basic income (see BI 8: 6). "Will the current Christian Democrat - Socialist Government introduce a basic income?", he asks. It probably won't. But it will further pave the way.

(Author's address: University of Amsterdam, Department of Economics, Jodenbreestraat 23, 1011 NH Amsterdam, Netherlands)

A green plea for basic income in an ecological magazine by the Director of the "Nederlands Instituut voor Volksontwikkeling en Natuurvriendenwerk". Basic income, he argues, will reduce the obsession with work and consumption, foster a service- and repair economy and reduce the incentive to earn even more.

(Author's address: c/o NIVON, P.C. Hoofdstraat 163, NL-1071 BV Amsterdam)

Drawing on the work of Rawls, Dworkin and Ackerman, the paper argues that social justice, conceived as the most defensible articulation of freedom and equality, demands the introduction of a basic income at the highest level that can sustainably be reached without violating two constraints: "self ownership" (to rule out forced labour) and "undominated diversity" (to protect the handicapped).
EARLIER BY GERD GÖTZINGER (IN M. OPIELKA & HANS-GEORG PETERSEN EDs.), FRANKFURT & NEW YORK: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1989, 232P.

In the last part of this sequel to his earlier writings on rationality (Ulysses and the Sirens, 1979; Sour Grapes, 1983), Norwegian "analytical Marxist" and University of Chicago political scientist Jon Elster examines "the possibility of rational politics". The last few pages contain a critical discussion of "proposals for a social dividend or guaranteed income at a level sufficient to provide a decent living without any obligation to work in return". Such proposals, he argues, "are engineering blueprints for utopias - technological dreams or nightmares without the potential for animating a social movement. Attempts to implement them would meet with massive resistance". Why? Not just because of obvious objections to the economic feasibility of such proposals. More fundamentally, "any such proposal would fail because it would be perceived as unfair, indeed as exploitative. People who chose to work for an income rather than to live in a commune on the universal state bonus, to use Milner's terminology would have to pay higher taxes in order to support those who took the other option. They would think, correctly, in my view, that they are being exploited by the other group."

(Author's address: Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 60637, USA)


A simulation model of the FRG's tax and transfer system is here used (1) to discuss alternative tax bases (should it be income or consumption?) and (2) to discuss proposals for harmonizing tax and transfer policies. One of these is a version of the conventional Sozialhilfe (a means-tested minimum income system). The other is a basic income in the version worked out earlier by Gerd Grözinger (in M. Opielka & G. Vobruba Eds., Das garantierte Grundeinkommen, Frankfurt: Fischer, 1986).


The fourth volume in a series of national case studies aiming to encourage ILO member States "to adopt and implement active policies and projects designed to promote full, productive and freely chosen employment and to reduce poverty", this study of the Finnish case consists mainly in a systematic description of trends in both employment and unemployment and a survey of employment policies developed by the Finnish government. The final chapter discusses "options for the 1990's". One of them, which the authors find particularly congenial if made part of an appropriate package of measures, is a citizen's income. "Essentially it is a different way of organizing income support in the context of a more flexible labour market in which employment and job security are being weakened in the interests of efficiency and labour mobility". Contrary to what is often suggested by its opponents, such a citizen's income is perfectly compatible with full employment properly understood, i.e. as "work opportunities for as many as want them".

MILNER, DENNIS, HIGHER PRODUCTION BY A BONUS ON NATIONAL OUTPUT. A PROPOSAL FOR A MINIMUM INCOME FOR ALL VARYING WITH NATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY, LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN, 1920, 127P.

Not exactly a recent publication but one that makes for amazing reading seventy years after its appearance. Name (nearly) any recent argument for (or objection to) basic income, from the most familiar to the fanciest, from the unemployment trap to labour market flexibility, from low rates of take up to the ideal complement of profit sharing, and you will find it here. Though a case can be made for basic income - or a state bonus, to use Milner's terminology - in terms of justice or humanity, the proposal (20% of Britain's GNP distributed equally among all citizens) can also be defended on grounds of efficiency alone. Whereas Milner's earlier pamphlet (Scheme
for a state bonus, published one year earlier jointly with his wife: see BI 5: 8) used the widest possible range of arguments, his book spells out the ramifications of the "productivist" argument. In his contribution to the Florence BIEN conference, Van Trier summarizes the book, quotes it extensively and offers some reflections on the sense in which this forgotten book was nevertheless a success.

OLSON, Dennis O. & O'BRIEN, Patrick O., "The great Alaskan money give away program", Economic Inquiry 27, July 1990, 604-15.

As reported earlier (BI 7: 4), the State of Alaska has saved about one fifth of its oil revenues in a permanent trust fund consisting of income-producing investments. Since 1982, a portion of the interests on these investments has been distributed to each Alaskan resident in the form of a dividend. Another portion is reinvested, so as to swell the potential for future distribution. What the balance between these two potential uses should be depends on Alaska's social rate of discount (the extent to which the present is given more importance than the future by the "representative Alaskan"). The question addressed in this short technical paper is essentially whether the choices Alaskan authorities actually made in successive years between distribution and reinvestment can conceivably be interpreted as maximizing the representative Alaskan's welfare, assuming an unchanged social discount rate. The outcome of this (small) contribution to the debate on Alaska's controversial scheme is a negative answer to this question. Incidentally, the authors mention in passing that opinion polls conducted between 1984 and 1987 showed 60 to 90% public support for continuation of the dividend program.
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DUBOIN, Marie-Louise, "Se battre pour le revenu de base?", in La Grande Relève des hommes par la science (BP 108, F-78110 Le Vésinet, France) 894, novembre 1990, 3.
In this editorial of the "distributist" monthly, Marie-Louise Duboin (daughter of the "distributist" movement's founder Jacques Duboin and editor of the journal) recalls the nature of basic income, as understood within BIEN, and some of the main arguments for it, and announces a survey to be conducted among the journal's readers in order to find out whether they are in favour of the introduction of such a basic income independently of the other components of the distributist project (mainly, a social service and a far-reaching monetary reform), and, if so, how they would like to see it financed.
(Author's address: La Grande Relève, as above.)

A dense, well-conducted interview with one of the main inspirers - and critics - of the basic income idea. There is no reason, Gorz argues, why we should no go back to a working year of about 1000 hours (instead of nearly 2000), which was the norm until the beginning of the 18th century. This "would enable every person to successively adopt several lifestyles, occupations, careers, types of activities, without ever ceasing to receive a full income". Does this mean that he supports the proposal for an allocation universelle or basic income, increasingly discussed throughout Europe? No, it does not, because this proposal has, in his eyes, two fundamental defects. One is that, "by introducing a right to [permanent] non-participation [in economic activities], it creates in effect two categories of citizens and entitles society to perpetuate forms of social exclusion". A basic income, therefore, does not give enough. It does not confer a right of participation in the public sphere of paid work. The second fundamental defect is that a basic income gives too much. "No one must bear the burden of necessary work on behalf of others, and no one, therefore, must be exempted from carrying his/her share. But a basic income introduces precisely such a right to exemption."
(Interviewee's address: F-10130 Vosnon, France.)

This article draws on earlier work, mainly by Edwin Morley-Fletcher (Revista Trimestrale 1980-81) to provide a useful historical sketch of guaranteed income proposals, from Paine, Hertzka, Bellamy, Kropotkin, Weitling, Ballod and Popper-Lynkeus to the social-dividend tradition in England and the personalist tradition in France (leading up to Alexandre Marc's "federalism").
(Author's address: Ministère de la Solidarité et de la Protection Sociale, Service des Etudes et du Financement, 1 Place de Fontenoy, F-75700 Paris.)

A collection of essays on minimum income, with special reference to Austria. Several articles provide useful empirical information on social problems and social policy in Austria - for example, Eder & Gall on income distribution, Loudon on female employment, Wallnher on the labour market, Wörist on pensions and Helmer on various ways of conceiving a "tax on value creation". All contributions favour some form of minimum income, but most are sceptical about a genuine basic income. The exceptions are Inge Rohwani (from the Ministry of Social Affairs) and Lieselotte Wohlenannt (from the Katholische Sozialakademie), who strongly favour it.


What is the European welfare state going to look like? Before assessing various possible scenarios, it is useful to have a look at two historical precedents of social policy integration - at the time of the first German unification (late 19th century) and of the centralization of public policy in the U.S. (early 20th century) - and to identify the specificities of the four welfare state regimes to be found in Europe - Scandinavian, Bismarckian, Anglo-saxon and Mediterranean. This is the theme that underlies these two articles in the same issue of one of the main German dailies.


This theoretical essay rests on the trichotomy market/ state/ community. Its third part argues that "the decoupling of work and income constitutes a structural presupposition of a rational communitarization of society". This decoupling, Opielka argues, should take the dual form of a basic income and a social service of 3 to 4 years for both men and women. Such a social service, he argues, would have the advantage of dampening the rise in the cost of social services (due to the breakup of families and the increase in life expectancy), of sharing the caring tasks more equally among men and women, and of meeting the objection that a basic income amounts to receiving something for nothing.


Both the German Social Democratic Party and the German Trade Union movement remain hostile to the idea of a basic income or, more generally, to a social policy that is not closely linked to waged labour. But a number of significant trends will force them to engage again and again in thinking and discussion on basic insurance as a (partial) alternative to an employment-centered social policy. This is the theme that underlies these two articles in the same issue of one of the main German dailies.

(Both authors’ address: Hamburger Institut für Sozialforschung, Mittelweg 36, D-2000 Hamburg 13, Germany.)
This book consists of two long essays. The first one ("About the necessity and possibility of introducing a basic income"), by active BIEN member Lieselotte Wohlgenannt, contains mainly an extensive and up-to-date survey of the international discussion, and a shorter discussion of a concrete proposal for Austria. The second one ("Basic income as a component of a socio-ecological transformation"), by social ethics professor Herwig Büchele (S.J.), is mainly concerned to show that basic income forms an essential ingredient in an adequate response to the "crisis of world society". It is not just a more efficient way of trying to make sure everyone's basic needs are satisfied. It is part of the project of a more hospitable society.

(First authors' address: Katholische Sozialakademie, Schottenring 35/1, A-1010 Wien 1. Second author's address: Universität Innsbrück, Theologische Fakultät, Innsbrück, Austria.)

---

**ITALIAN**

GARONNA, Paolo. "Diritto al reddito o diritto al lavoro?", Mondoperaio (Roma) 1, 1990, 84-90.

Yet another substantial contribution to the debate on guaranteed minimum income schemes in the Italian socialist party's theoretical journal. The author identifies three main problems with the welfare state as we know it: (1) the power exercised by the welfare administration; (2) the failure to transfer efficiently to the truly needy; (3) the undermining of incentives. And he welcomes two recent trends in thinking about welfare: the emphasizing of rights of "citizenship" and the concern with "insertion". Against this background, he argues against those who, in the Italian debate, have been appealing to a right to a minimum income. "There is no right to an income. There is, instead, a right to insertion into activities of whatever type, and only in relation to these activities, a right to some form of compensation". Phrasing entitlements in this way, he believes, has great advantages. Requiring availability for work is an efficient way of selecting the truly needy. The work actually performed reduces the net cost of the programmes. It provides training on the job. And it makes means testing unnecessary. But, he warns, a guaranteed job scheme must not be superposed to a guaranteed income scheme. To the extent that the latter exists, it must be dismantled, including, for example, the minimum pension currently given to elderly people who are still able to work. The main uncertainty about this proposal, in the author's view, is whether the civil service will prove capable to efficiently organize insertion.
WHAT IS BIEN?

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

Address:
Walter Van Trier
BIEN Secretary
Bosduifstraat 21
B-2018 Antwerpen, Belgium
phone: (32)(3) 2204182 (office)
(32)(3) 2711642 (home)
Bank account:
001-2204356-10
at the CGER
21 rue Archimède, 1040 Brussels

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

You need to
• be interested in basic income, without necessarily being committed to its introduction,
• pay your four-year membership fee in one of the ways described below,
• and return the form overleaf to the address indicated.

HOW LOW IS THE FEE?

• Standard fee: BF1000 or DM50 or DFL55 or FF150 or £15 or LIT35000 or $40 or an equivalent amount in your country’s currency.
• Institutional rate: BF4000 or DM200 or DFL220 or FF600 or £60 or LIT140000 or $160, or an equivalent amount in your country’s currency.
• Reduced rate (for those without paid work): BF500 or DM25 or DFL30 or FF100 or £10 or LIT20000 or $20, or an equivalent amount in your country’s currency.

In other words, the individual fee remains unchanged, while the period covered by it is doubled: CHEAPER THAN EVER!

Donations by both individuals and organizations above the prescribed amounts are of course most welcome.

HOW CAN YOU PAY IT?

Unless you have a powerful reason for doing otherwise, we strongly recommend that you simply put the required amount of money (no coins!) in a well sealed envelope and send it, along with the form below, to BIEN’s secretary. This has proved the simplest and cheapest mode of payment in the past, and no less reliable than any other. Otherwise, use either a Eurocheque (made out in Belgian Francs) or a US Cashier’s check. Due to heavy bank charges, direct payment into BIEN’s bank account (see above) from outside Belgium is reserved for the higher institutional fee or for donations of larger amounts.

From the moment of your payment until December 1994, you will be entitled to receive the Newsletter three times a year. Back issues and extra copies are available to BIEN members on request, without additional cost.