

The Basics of an Economic Rights Movement: A Public Economy

Kelly Ernst, Ph.D.

Senior Program Director, Sheldon Chumir Foundation for Ethics in Leadership &

September, 2012

Abstract

Various rights movements brought equal rights to many groups across the world. Women's rights, gay rights, aboriginal rights and other rights have all advanced. Such advances in the human situation did not occur without the help of one organization or one person alone, but with the help of broader movements. Such movements still resonate with people today and their impact continues well beyond the initiation of the movements themselves. Could an economic rights movement be the rights movement of the 21st Century? This presentation addresses this question. It will describe a broad vision and outlines how a movement could point toward a different world, a world that includes a basic income. It is possible that one of the core principles of an economic rights movement includes the right to a basic income. Such movements do not exist in a vacuum and are not sparked by ideas alone. It takes infrastructure, planning, champions, action, and sustained effort. A broad world-wide movement could be the precursor to many jurisdictions adopting basic incomes, one that includes a basic income within the context of broader economic rights.

The Basics of an Economic Rights Movement: A Public Economy

Introduction

The economic malaise of the past decade may be reversed by inserting community mindedness into our economies and democracies. This community mindedness, or return to the idea of the public, is counter to the current polarization of the economy and democratic life. Such a change will likely require a strong social movement to push a different direction. The following paper suggests a sense of public needs to be reinserted back into economic mindset, with basic income as one of its success measures. The identification of this ideal cannot be advocated in isolation to key processes that might be required to implement it. Consequently, the paper also notes some principles that might be needed to press forward on a new movement. It requires more than moral outrage, it will require the mobilization of movements to re-democratize the economy.

Background

Something seems amiss in today's world. Since the 2008 economic meltdown, news articles have spewed forth on the growing gap between rich and poor across the globe. In many countries, the middle class is shrinking and social mobility in some of the richest countries is declining. The occupy movement of 2011 solidified the notion something is amiss with many camps setting up right next to the offices of major decision-makers. The top 1% typically did not leave their offices to sit in those camps, but a wide range of other people did. In many cases, these "occupiers" were simply people struggling to make ends meet and determined to get their message across. These voices will ultimately grow if the dysfunction that brands the 2008 meltdown is not reversed.

We know from a wide range of research that when disparity begins to grow in societies an assortment of harmful effects begin to spread within the society.¹ Where poverty rates are high, crime and imprisonment rates tend to be higher, health outcomes for everyone are lower, and addictions and mental illnesses are more common. It is visible on the streets of cities where homeless and the mentally ill accumulate. Where an extremely contrasting rich class exists, these visible effects to society tend to be accentuated and condemnation of the poor often follows.

Wealthy people are not immune to the impacts of disparity. They too feel the effect, they begin to segregate from others, gate themselves into communities, and fear their neighbours. Their world becomes smaller and even their life cycle is shortened. Rich and poor begin to pit themselves against one another, and civil strife grows.

¹ Wilkinson, R & Pickett, K. (2009). *The Spirit Level: Why Equality is Better for Everyone*. London: Penguin Books.

Historically, such disharmony is the fuel for revolutions.² Support for revolt is higher when incomes are widely different and when inequality is high.³ Thus, the societal consequences can be grave for allowing economic disparity to grow. Before revolution takes hold, other dissent occurs in a society. Uprisings have the power to turn the course of a society toward less extreme change. Revolutions can be avoided and gradual change that is less disruptive can occur when dissent is allowed and authorities incrementally assimilate changes into existing society.⁴

Most rights movements are examples of such gradual changes. In the adoption of rights, there is typically a lag between the introduction of new possible rights and the solutions for their legal adoption. Once adopted, legal rights themselves do not indicate success. Rather, other societal indicators note advancement. It is possible that re-democratizing the economy is such a scenario with basic income as one of its indicators of success. Some countries have started adopting various means for minimal incomes, but no full-scale revolution toward re-democratizing economies has occurred and basic income is not yet widespread. This paper discusses the basis for encouraging a movement that could result in a basic income for all.

Reinserting “Public” into the Economy

If disparity is to be challenged, then the polarization that fuels inequality must also be challenged. Some writers have suggested a new economic and political model. Even debate about these models is polarized. Often writers either reject group interests and structures (calling it socialism) or self-interested structures (calling it capitalism), while simultaneously calling for a new system.⁵ Re-democratizing our societies is quite different. It means addressing the problem in a different way by injecting “the public” back into economic discourse.⁶ This perspective suggests a community mindedness that uses a “both-and” perspective: it includes acknowledgement that both the interests of community and of individual agency must be addressed simultaneously. It allows people and organizations to pursue their interests in a minimally restrictive environment while recognizing the need for common minimum standards of accountability.

One of the key concepts missing in the mindset of many societies is the notion that the economy as has public interest; a concept intimately tied to the notion of community. Another way to describe

² Davies, J. C. (1962) “Towards a Theory of Revolution,” *American Sociological Review*, 27 (February): 5-19.

³ MacCulloch, R. (2001). *What Makes a Revolution?* London: London School of Economics and Political Science.

⁴ Tilley, C & Wood, L. (2012). *Social Movements 1768 - 2012*, 3rd Edition. London: Paradigm Publishers.

⁵ Albert, M. (2012). *Beyond Class Rule Is Parecon*. Paper presented at the American Sociological Association 2012 Annual Meeting: Real Utopias, Denver.

⁶ Bell, J. (2002). *Community Values in an Age of Globalization*. Calgary, Alberta: Sheldon Chumir Foundation for Ethics in Leadership.

community is that of common public concern, a concern for all humanity. From this perspective, the economy can be defined as having common public concern, of interest to everyone, not owned by anyone, and its use does not deter from anyone else's use of it.

Two measures of the decline of public interest in the economy are the decline of organized labour (peaking in the 1950's and reducing to now having similar levels to just prior to the 1930's depression⁷), and the decline of system regulation, as evidenced in banking, to the point of some suggesting that such sectors are no longer regulatory.^{8 9}

Redefining Economy

The first most basic notion to assist in redefining the economy is to remind our societies that *the economy is inherently of public interest*, that of the community. We must insert community mindedness back into the daily discourse of the economy. With market liberalism as the official doctrine of our day, we often hear of the private sector, private industry, or private markets as good and anything referring to public as inefficient or bad.¹⁰ However, such a polarizing view of the marketplace is simply inaccurate. If correctly described, the marketplace is closer to the idea of a public economy wherein all people participate. When people are equitably participating everyone does well, and when people are not equitably participating, humanity is much worse off. The idea that the marketplace is a private place, for private interests, without individuals affecting one another is simply inaccurate.

The polarizing flaw. Given the flaw that suggests the economy is a concept of self-interest, and its corollary that public interest does not exist or is bad; it is not enough for individuals to interact economically within a society solely based on one's individuality. Individual rights and responsibilities are not enough, but rather society is held together by something greater than this, a community and fraternity with the other.¹¹ A more accurate conception of an economy is related to self-in-relation nature of humanity and community.¹² A hallmark of this global community of communities is that it is perpetually in flux. Any market indicator shows that they change from one day to the next.

If the invisible hand is truly fluid, then it is an innately entropic force, not a truly free and perpetually expanding force as we are led to believe. The implications for this are that we live in an economy that when left to be completely unaccountable (or truly self-interested) then the forces of

⁷ OECD (2012). Trade Union Density. StatExtracts.

⁸ Ackerman, B. (2010). The Decline and Fall of the American Republic. Boston: Harvard University Press.

⁹ Block, F. (2012). Democratizing Finance. Paper presented at the American Sociological Association 2012 Annual Meeting: Real Utopias, Denver.

¹⁰ Stien, J. (2001). The cult of efficiency. Toronto: House of Anansi Press.

¹¹ Gereluk, D. (2006). Education and Community. London: Continuum.

¹² Frazer, E (1999). The Problems of Communitarian Politics: Unity and Conflict.

entropy will eventually push it to unwind, rather than expand. From an entropic viewpoint, another type of economy may arise in its place (this might be called revolutionary), but the economic destruction and re-emergence would be very disruptive and extremely harmful. As evidence of this entropic nature of the “free market” economy, the 2008 meltdown is summarized by Alan Greenspan,

Referring to his free-market ideology, Mr. Greenspan added: “I have found a flaw. I don’t know how significant or permanent it is. But I have been very distressed by that fact.”

Mr. Waxman pressed the former Fed chair to clarify his words. “In other words, you found that your view of the world, your ideology, was not right, it was not working,” Mr. Waxman said. “Absolutely, precisely,” Mr. Greenspan replied. “You know, that’s precisely the reason I was shocked, because I have been going for 40 years or more with very considerable evidence that it was working exceptionally well.”¹³

Just as the economic collapse of the Soviet Union taught the world that central planning of communism did not work, the market collapse of 2008 taught the world that unabated self-interested markets were ultimately just as unstable. Greenspan’s realization of his flaw may be evidence that a new approach is required.

Greenspan’s comments are also telling in reference to the 40 years he assumed the markets were working well (perhaps this was due to a fundamental attribution bias, we will never know). The period after the Second World War in Western Europe and in North America until the 1990’s saw a relatively stable period, decreasing disparity in most regions, and with few economic upheavals remotely close to revolution. It was only after the Thatcher/Regan economic forces took hold of unabated self-regulated liberalized economies, which Greenspan helped to push forward and which disproportionately helped a small elite, did the stability unwind.

It was ultimately the unrestricted self-interest of a few that led to the decline of markets for all. The markets ending in 2008 highlighted that the economy was not working for the public interest. A market void of public interest, ultimately led to the near collapse of the elite’s own wealth and the wellbeing of millions.

The 2011 Occupy movements pointed toward rising economic disparity and a call for accountability on unregulated private interests, superseding public interest, in the economy. The Arab Spring was another example, albeit more extreme. First sparked in Tunisia by unemployed youth

¹³ Leonhardt, D. (2008, October 23). Greenspan’s Mea Culpa. New York Times. On-line: <http://economix.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/10/23/greenspan-me-culpa/>

wanting economic involvement, and which spread throughout the Middle East where disparity and unemployment was endemic. The revolutions in Egypt and now in Syria may point toward what we can all expect should we not do something now to turn the tide.

Now some European countries are in crisis. Some have suggested a focus on receiving self-entitlements with a lack of focus on one's responsibility to contributing to these rewards. In a sense, self-indulging greed and hubris are at the core of both the disparity of market liberalism and entitlement of socialism. The history playing out before us is perhaps telling the world polarized economic extremes have not served humanity well.

A truly public economy is not based on models of polarized economic ideology. It neither is extremities of socialism, nor is it extreme individualist capitalism that will move our economy forward. Instead, a community minded public market is best described as one that truly serves us all. It is a market philosophy whereby one is free to achieve but acknowledges one's responsibilities to do so within a larger community. It understands that pushing toward a polarized ideology of any sort is ultimately harmful and as such has no ethical basis.

Basic Income and the Public Economy

One of the best measures of success of an economy is not its lack of controls, or the number of billionaires that exist within it, but distribution of wealth to all of its members. When the most disadvantaged are least dissimilar to those with the most advantage, then a society is most egalitarian; the disparity within the economy is the least. For example, if using the GINI measure, it approaches a GINI of 0 when approaching complete equality and 1.0 when approaching completely unequal. Another way of viewing this measure is that in equal societies all citizens within a public have a basic income. It requires a distribution of wealth among the public, and not to just some of its citizens or skewed toward an elite. Obviously, a GINI of 0 is an idealized and unrealistic scenario. However, the distribution of wealth toward more equal scenarios is not unrealistic or extreme. There are many countries and jurisdictions with low GINI ratios.

To achieve such measures, a community mindedness is needed about the economy. As I argued earlier, it starts with a philosophical mindset of the economy as a "public economy" or marketplace, rather than a polarized marketplace. It also requires public involvement to be moved from that of a purveyor of "public goods" or institutions and toward a public economy in which the public is involved in all variations of interaction, (goods and institutions are merely outputs and expressions of the public involvement). In a sense, the private sector has a public foundation and the public sector has the same

public foundation, so both variations on economic expression are based on a public basis of the market place.

From this perspective, any economic involvement is accountable to the public, as both serve the public. Both aim to ensure a basic income for all. Obviously this is not guaranteed, so accountability structures must be in place to ensure the basic income is available to all. This does not mean that a priori the means to the basic income is defined. It simply means that basic income becomes a success measure for a well-functioning public economy.

Moving the Public Economy Forward

The Occupy movement taught that economic disparity is a worldwide problem which left unabated risks creating great harm. It raised the profile of economic disparity and pushed the media to talk about it. Unlike other movements, it did not propose a solution, identify a clear champion, or propose a set of actions to resolve the issue. Much seemed missing from the movement; most evident was the lack of any demonstrable results. However, it is possible that the movement may have been a spark or the marker of a larger process; it may be too early to conclude.

Another way of interpreting the Occupy movement is that it pointed toward the idea that revolutionary change is possible when the public is excluded and inequality problems not addressed. Of course such change is highly disruptive and potentially harmful to a great many in the short term. It is also not necessarily the most common way change is achieved. The majority of change sparked by past social movements suggests societies change slowly and over time, without the disruption of full-scale revolution. Readjustment may be required and not a revolution. If 2011 was the start of a new movement, perhaps Occupy was just one event in the start of a new public economy where far greater democratization occurs.

Key Factors for Democratizing the Economy

If such democratization of the economy is to take hold, the public will need to be inspired to support inserting the public back into the economy. There are certain democratic elements that may need to be stimulated and sustained if the basic income is to become a success indicator of this movement. It is useful to look at these factors from the perspective of social movements.

Social movements that have historically succeeded can be described as sustained and organized public efforts to target authorities for a specific purpose using the support of concerned citizens to assist in its aims.¹⁴ They have a few common elements which any new movements can build upon.

Moral spark and elites. Many successful social movements ultimately touch the elites in a society.¹⁵ They do not simply urge outrage in a contained community of people affected by misfortune. Elites are mobilized, either because they are directly affected by the harm the social movement is trying to avoid, or they react against a coming threat and thus avoid harm before it occurs.

It may be that for an economic movement to begin another moral spark is needed. For example, it may require another financial crisis that impacts non-home household wealth holders. The top 1% own 43% of the non-home household wealth in the U.S. and the top 20% own 93%. Based on this non-home household wealth, the U.S. has a GINI rate of .89 to .93.¹⁶ A financial crisis whereby corporations once termed “too big to fail” are allowed to fail would impact the wealth of the top 1% to 20% of wealth holders. Such a crisis might stir the top elites enough that they begin to call for more accountability structures within democratic and economic structures.

Public language. One factor may relate to acknowledging the public nature of the marketplace. The continual use of language such as “free market” (and variants of this) with concepts of self-interest associates the two concepts without necessarily being justified or descriptive of a healthy economy. This must be challenged.

A variety of research notes that countries that are economically successful are able to provide citizens opportunities for social mobility.¹⁷ The economy, market, and marketplace need to be described reflecting the relational and co-operative nature of humanity. “Public economy” can be used to more correctly describe the nature of the interrelated human economy. Stressing that the economy is ultimately public in nature is at the core of a new movement. The financial crisis of 2008 has demonstrated that polarizing the state versus private economies as somehow so vastly different that both elements together do not serve the public has proven to be destructive to public wellbeing.

A part of the language that needs to change acknowledges that the human self contributes to and within the relationships that surround us. The idea that any achievement, entrepreneurship, private

¹⁴ Tilley, C & Wood, L. (2012). *Social Movements 1768-2012*, 3rd Edition. London: Paradigm Publishers.

¹⁵ 385. *Elites in Social Movements*. American Sociological Society Annual Conference. Denver, Colorado.

¹⁶ Wolff, E. (2010). *Recent Trends in Household Wealth in the United States: Rising Debt and the Middle-Class Squeeze—an Update to 2007*. Annandale-on-Hudson, NY: Levy Economics Institute of Bard College.

¹⁷ Musai, M., Abhari, M., & Fakhr, S. (2011). *Effects of Social Capital on Economic Growth (International Comparison)*. *American Journal of Scientific Research*, 16, 107-116.

enterprise, or free enterprise occurs exclusively from individual effort is incorrect. Jurisdictions with high social capital are the same places where people flourish in a wide variety of ways¹⁸. We must acknowledge that all human achievement exists in a community. Just as we can ask the rhetorical question “if a tree feel in a forest does anyone hear?” we can also question, “if you achieve in isolation, does anyone take notice or buy it?” “The other” who takes notice of achievement and creates an economic transaction is fundamental to a healthy economy. Achievement can only occur in a network of relationships, within a community.

Fundamental rights. The advancement of basic democratic rights is foundational to a public economy; the right to achieve within his/her community, basic civil liberties, equality, and democratic involvement are basic to a public economy. The United Nations acknowledges this idea in their Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights¹⁹. For example, without freedom of association, freedom of expression, and so on, creative and entrepreneurial achievement is ultimately restricted. Without equality, then minorities are not able to fully participate in the economy. A public economy cannot be advanced without these basic rights also being supported. It has been suggested that economic social movements advance with such democratization of societies, whereas they fail when de-democratization occur.²⁰

It should be noted that attention to rights is not relative. Relativistic freedom is unworkable or even harmful. Relativistic rights do not truly acknowledge the rights of all others, they typically identify the rights of some over others. Even Ayn Rand acknowledged this point in pointing out that no person has the right to enslave another.²¹ She ultimately contradicts her view of extreme libertarianism by noting such a limit. Rights are normative and intimately tied to the community. Freedom is necessary but not sufficient, and it is not exclusive, for a public economy to exist within any community.

Responsibility and accountability. Rights come with responsibilities or duties to others to mitigate potential harms. The financial meltdown of 2008 was a reminder that accountability structures must be in place to protect citizens from harm.²² Protecting basic rights ultimately requires responsibility to contribute within your community, or responsibility to the other. In advanced democracies, these

¹⁸ Putman, R. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The collapse and revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

¹⁹ OHCHR (1976, January 3). *The United Nations International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights*. Geneva: Office for the United Nation High Commissioner for Human Rights.

²⁰ Tilley, C & Wood, L. (2012).

²¹ Rand, A.(1966). “Man’s Rights,” In Ayn Rand, eds. *Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal*. New York: Signet Books.

²² Steward, G. (2010). *Wasted Potential: Students and New Canadians Talk Frankly about the Impact of the Economic Downturn*. Calgary, Alberta: Sheldon Chumir Foundation for Ethics in Leadership.

responsibilities are often actualized through reliable and well established the rule of law.²³ From a financial perspective, regulation of markets is one essential element of rule of law.

Once community responsibilities take hold, then they give rise to new types of higher-order rights. For example, accountability in the form of oversight to ensure lack of corruption gives rise to the right to be free from corruption. The responsibility of the state to protect its citizens from offensive wealth (one that encourages poverty, slavery, etc.) gives rise to the right of access to a democratic economy. The responsibility or obligation of states to create sovereign wealth gives rise to the possibility and even right to a basic income.

Individual responsibilities, in the form of rule of law, lead to community accountability which in turn give rise to these additional societal privileges. A focus on self-interested rights without calling for accountability and the rule of law, invites coercion, corruption, exploitation and other societal asymmetries.

Clear purpose. The financial issues of the past few years may also need to be framed clearly so that the public may to respond to it. Impactful movements can identify the problem they are trying to address and the end goal they wish to achieve. It is what defines the possibilities for collective action.²⁴ The suffrage movement identified women getting the vote. The AIDS movement knew finding a cure for AIDS was its goal. The civil rights movement clearly hoped to instill equal rights. Without a clear purpose, protests do not shift beyond a simple dissent event to become a movement.

A new public economy movement could identify economic inequality and suffering to fire its outrage, but it could be that basic income for all could act as its ultimate success indicator. The strategies to get there could be highly varied, but adoption of basic income using any method could mark the movement's purpose.

If instilling community mindedness into the economy is part of a new movement, then common social capital must always present in defining any economic achievement. As a public, sovereign wealth accumulation is as important as is wealth accumulation for an individual. Public wealth accumulation ensures all within a society have access to some sort of wealth, basic income included. Sovereign wealth accumulation goes hand in hand with a basic income for all.

Networks and social infrastructure. To enact any goal, institutions are required to collectively seek its achievement. Social movements have infrastructures to enact their stated purpose. This includes philosophical and academic literature describing various alternatives, but also networks and

²³ Tilley, C & Wood, L. (2012).

²⁴ Klandermans, B. (1992). The social construction of protest and multiorganizational fields. In A. Morris & C. Mueller, eds., Frontiers in Social Movement Theory. New Haven: Yale University Press.

groups necessary to implement these alternatives. In times past these included a wide variety of formal organizations.²⁵ It now includes informal networks and social networks based on various 21st century technologies.²⁶ These networks help attract supporters and they need constant attention to reinvigorated them, ensuring a sustained following.

Successful movements, have networks that can sustain well defined activity on a short-term and local basis, but also work with other like-minded organizations to take collective objectives further²⁷. They not only have on-line and technological aspects to them, but also have capacity for face-to-face meetings. Regular sustained activity and development of relationships help to define a common identity and cause. With respect to a public economy movement, Occupy can be viewed a simply one defined project, not the entirety of a movement. The Occupy movement was a good example of a social movement occurring at a local level but having international reach. Similar additional network projects and events would be required to sustain a new movement.

Champions, challengers, and other actors. Within the networks, there are champions who lead the groups and/or push opponents toward action and achieving goals. It is not enough to write about the subject and collect a base of literature on it, it also requires people (academic or not) that can champion the ideas through a variety of societal and political structures.

Champions advocate for a cause but can do so in relevant media. Successful champions have the ear of relevant media which in turn help attract an audience and following. They need challengers to spark interest in the movement on a broader scale and to help test ideas to ensure they can be defended against critical examination. Other actors are needed in a variety of ways to: model adoption of the movement, enact the proposed actions, or to forward ideas through networks which initial champions have no or little access.

Action. No major goal is reached without a strategy to get there. It is not enough to initiate moral shock. Research notes that moral shock has a limited shelf life. Even in the face of catastrophic disasters, interest fades in a subject after a short time.²⁸ People do not generally sustain their volunteering or other altruistic behaviours toward a cause if they are not continually motivated to do so.

²⁵ See, Tilley & Wood (2012).

²⁶ Kavada, A. (2010). "Activism Transforms Digital: The Social Movement Perspective" in M. Joyce (ed.) Digital Activism Decoded: The New Mechanics of Change, pp.101-118. New York & Amsterdam: International Debate Education Association.

²⁷ Kavada, A. (2010).

²⁸ Farrell, J. (Submitted for Publication). Spill, Baby, Spill: Moral Shock and Altruism in the Aftermath of the 2010 BP Oil Spill. Social Problems.

A sustained plan of action with follow-up to move a plan forward helps to continually keep people engaged and press for the end goal to be reached.²⁹

A plan of action is also not finite. Historically successful actors and organizations with movements adapt, model from one another, borrow successful actions, and move with the political and economic environments around them.³⁰ The evolution of a movement is necessary to keep it alive long enough to reach its eventual goal.

A public economy movement will have to guard against the concept of entropy. If sustained action cannot be maintained over the long-term, then the likelihood of success will be exceedingly low. Without constant infusion of new energy, networks and their campaigns erode over time until they eventually end.

Sustaining actions long enough is important to help enable public institutions to adopt the campaign goals. For example, the cancer prevention movement took decades to achieve success in committing governments to encourage citizens to stop smoking. A public economic movement will not be different. It will likely take decades of sustained planning and action before basic income becomes widespread.

Summary

The polarization of the economy into collective or private interests has not served the public well. It has meant an increasing focus on supporting self-interested economic activity with a decreasing accountability to the public. Over time, a sense of the economy and markets as solely for self-interest took hold to the point where disparity and inequity have become the new world-wide norm. As a result we are all worse off and the standard of living in a great many societies is falling.

Reversing this trend benefits everyone. Recreating healthy social mobility will require a large scale movement. It could occur with basic income as the basis of a social movement itself, or embedded into a larger cause. In either scenario, “basic income for all” ought to become its success indicator.

Disconnection of basic income as solely an academic concept, divorced from a movement, is likely to result in failure. It is not enough to be outraged about the current economic and democratic malaise to create a discourse about basic income. Development of a public purpose toward widespread basic income implementation needs to occur.

²⁹ The Democracy Collaborative (2002). What works to strengthen civic engagement in America: A guide to local action and civic innovation. Framework for Assessing Civic Innovations and Strategies. University of Maryland & Georgetown University’s Public Policy Institute.

³⁰ Tilley & Wood (2012).

One key aspect of any movement will need to be the injection of community mindedness into the economy. Some call this a re-democratization of the economy. Democratization of the economy will ensure a redistribution of wealth accumulation so that a basic income for all is possible.

Successful results can be adopted from past social movements. Some have suggested another financial crisis is coming and this could act as an additional moral outrage that initiates a new movement, even among elites. The foundation of a movement is its language. A community minded and public language needs to be used about the economy and the language of self-interest needs to be challenged. A public mindset ought to be encouraged in a context that ensures democratic rights are upheld while public accountability is forwarded.

If global basic income implementation is the goal, then the fundamental elements of social movements will need to be mobilized. Broader democratization supports social movement success. Nurturing a public economic movement may need to capitalize on this idea. Widespread implementation of basic income may depend on a movement that has the courage to use basic income as its principal success indicator.