

Johanna Perkiö
PhD student
School of Social Sciences and Humanities
University of Tampere
johanna.perkio@uta.fi

Paper to be presented at the 14th BIEN Congress in Munich 14-16 September 2012
Paper in progress (first draft)

The Struggle over Interpretation: Basic Income in the Finnish Public Discussion in 2006-2012

Introduction

The paper addresses the public discussion on basic income in Finland in 2006-2012 from the analytical viewpoint of historical institutionalism and studies on the role of *ideas* in policy processes. The approach is interested in the questions such as how the policy idea (e.g. basic income) has evolved over time and how it is interpreted, argued and justified by political actors. The ideas are seen as powerful drivers of political change (combined with socio-economic structures, institutional constraints and political power relations). The special interest of the paper is *framing*, i.e. the "linguistic lenses" through which the idea of basic income is viewed.

Basic income (BI) has been regularly discussed in Finland since the early 1980s.¹ All along, the idea has gained support - as well as resistance - across the political divide. The public discussion on BI was widespread during the 1980-1990s and again from 2006 onwards. In between, there was a silent period. The latter period (from 2006 onwards) can be roughly divided into two peaks: 2006-2007 and 2011-2012. The public discussion in the earlier period (~1980-2000) and in the beginning of the latter period (2006-2007) is relatively well documented (see Lahtinen 1992; Andersson 2000; Ylikahri 2007; Ikkala 2008; Julkunen 2009). In this paper, I will address the recent discussion on BI (the period of 2006-2012) by focusing on the framing of the basic income proposal in public discussion in the printed media.

In the first section, I present briefly the historical background of the discussion on basic income in the Finnish context. In the second section, I introduce my theoretical and methodological framework. After that, I go to the empirical analysis through a brief introduction to the data. I will ask the data the following questions: What kind of frames can be found in the public discussion on basic income in Finland in 2006-2012? How the problems and desired solutions are defined in each frame? What is the relation of the frames to each other?

The paper is a part of my doctoral thesis "The Political Feasibility of Basic Income in Finland". It contains a preliminary analysis for my first research article (as mapping out the dimensions of public discussion on BI in Finland). The analysis will be expanded and deepened later.

¹ In this paper, I assume the 'standard' definition of BI, that is: a basic income is a monetary benefit granted regularly on individual basis to all citizens or permanent residents of the country. Its receipt does not entail means-test, work-requirements or any other conditions and it is granted regardless of person's property or income from other sources. (see Van Parijs 1995; De Wispelaere & Stirton 2004; Noguera 2001.) In Finland, the term *citizen's wage* has also been used, especially in the 1980-1990s. The Finnish discussion on BI has mostly occurred with regard to the problems of "basic social security" and BI has usually been considered as an alternative to replace the minimum social security transfers, while the earnings related benefits and housing subsidies would remain (adjusted to BI).

A brief history of basic income in Finland

The idea of an unconditional grant appeared in Finland already in the 1970s, but the active discussion started at the beginning of the 1980s. The term *citizen's wage* (kansalaispalkka) was introduced in 1980 by Osmo Lampinen and Osmo Soininvaara in their book "*Finland in the 1980s. The road of soft development*" (Suomi 1980-luvulla. Pehmeän kehityksen tie). Osmo Soininvaara - who later became the Chairman of the Green Party in 2001-2005 and the Minister of Social Affairs and Health in 2000-2002 - continued to develop the idea of citizen's income in several books and reports. During the 1980s and 1990s the discussion on citizen's wage was relatively widespread in academic circles and among decision-makers. It was connected to the emerging crisis of the Keynesian policy and the international sociological debate on "the end of work". The citizen's wage was often discussed in relation with other social ideas such as reduction of working hours and job sharing, sabbatical leave and 'civil work' outside the labour market.

In 1988 Olli Rehn (the Centre Party) and David Pemberton (the Green Party) took the initiative to set up a cross-party "basic income working group" which included representatives from most political parties. The group's secretary, Ilpo Lahtinen, wrote a book which reflected the ideas discussed in the group and proposed the introduction of a partial BI. In the early 1990s, the labour market organizations also activated in the debate: the employers' organisation and the Central Organisation of Finnish Trade Unions (SAK) both published reports in which they took a very negative stance toward BI. Since that, especially the SAK has held a hostile attitude towards the idea. It has found BI being too costly and threatening the importance of employment and income-related benefits as primary sources of welfare, as well as contributing to the creation of low-wage labour market and fragmented society. By the mid 1990s, many concrete proposals and models on BI were published with economic calculations, among others by Osmo Soininvaara and the left-wing economist Jan Otto Andersson. Before the parliamentary elections of 1995 and 1999, the citizen's income was widely discussed. (Andersson 2000, 227-230; Julkunen 2009, 268; Ylikahri 2007, 33; Ikkala 2008, 2-3.)

At the beginning of the 21st century, the BI almost disappeared from the public agenda. After some years of silence, the idea reappeared in 2006 in a new shape. The EuroMayDay demonstration of 30 April in Helsinki led to a confrontation between police and the precarity activists, who were claiming a generous BI in order to liberate the precarious workforce from the labour market uncertainty to the 'autonomous production'. As a result of newly emerging public debate, the political parties activated again. Before the parliamentary elections of 2007 the discussion was widespread: political think tanks published reports on the topic, seminars were organized and the Green Party launched its basic income model which contained a micro-simulation analysis on its effects on the public economy and households. The term 'citizen's wage' was now replaced by 'basic income'. (Julkunen 2009, 271-273; Ikkala 2008, 6-7; Ylikahri 2007.) Also the content of the discussion had somewhat changed: whereas in the 1980-1990s, the reduction of working hours, job-sharing and "civil work" were central topics, in 2006-2012 those themes received less attention. The emerging BI-debate played an important role in the 2007 elected government's decision to set up a committee preparing a large reform in the Finnish social protection system. This "Sata-committee" was given a mandate to build a model for social security reform that would improve work incentives, reduce poverty, guarantee a sufficient level of income in all life situations and simplify the system. However, the reform was to be done in the framework of prevailing social security systems, i.e. not allowing a social security which would disengage income from work. The committee contained "a Basic Security Section" in which Osmo Soininvaara was a chairman. The committee released several drafts and reports, but due to corporatist bargaining power, conflicting interests and lack of political will it failed to propose any significant reform that would tackle the core of the problems. The only real amendment was the introduction of a guaranteed minimum

pension in 2011, which raised the smallest pensions and brought "a basic income" to all pensioners living in Finland. (Saari 2009; Roos 2011.)

From 2006 onwards, BI has continuously figured in publications, seminars, media and social media, and in 2011-2012 the interest has boomed. The 2011 formed government (including all parties except the Centre Party and the populist True Finns Party) have taken decisions to raise the minimum unemployment benefits by 100 € per month and remove the means-testing from the labour market subsidy, which can be considered reforms "along the basic income path". In May 2011 Finland's Basic Income Network was founded as an initiative of activists, researchers and members of various political parties. In March 2012, the network launched a campaign of citizens' initiative for a basic income and in May 2012 was published the pamphlet "*A Time for Basic Income*" (Perustulon aika), contributed by the network activists and edited by myself and Kaisu Suopanki. In addition to Finland's Basic Income Network, the student union of the University of Tampere and the Left Youth organization have had their own very active campaigns.

Jurgen De Wispelaere (2012) defines the greatest problems of BI's realization "the cheap political support" and "persistent political divisions of the advocates". BI has often figured as an initiative of "entrepreneurs of alternative policies" without much political power, whereas more powerful groups (though sometimes supportive) have lacked commitment for promoting the policy. In Finland, BI has mainly gathered support from the medium-sized Green Party and Left Alliance², but the bigger Centre Party has also supported the idea in one form or another. The right-wing Coalition Party has never taken a stance, but a growing number of (mostly young) right-wing politicians have been promoting the idea within the party and in public. The greatest opponents all the way have been the Social Democrats (though some individual politicians have held positive attitudes) and trade unions. However, despite a relatively large public discussion, there have been very few attempts to promote BI in parliamentary proceedings. The problem of political divisions features clearly in Finland: since BI gathers support across the political divide, disagreements about interpretation of the idea, as well as on any policy details, tend to arise. On the other hand, contradictions arise also *within* the parties between those who support the BI and those who do not. With regard to the "political feasibility" of BI, another important issue is the one of legitimacy and desirability, or in De Wispelaere & Noguera's (2012) terms, *psychological feasibility*. Although the welfare state enjoys a high support among the Finns, the labourist ideology and reciprocity norm ("no rights without responsibilities") have a strong foothold (Andersson & Kangas 2002; see also Birnbaum 2012). In the few questionnaire studies that have been conducted, the citizens' support for the BI-scheme has varied according to choice of terminology of the question. In their academic enquiry in 2002, Andersson and Kangas found a noticeably high 76 % support for negative income tax, 63 % for basic income and 59 % for citizen's wage.³

² The Left Alliance is divided in its support for BI. Its trade union wing has been critical about the idea and for that reason the party has sometimes emphasized "decent basic social security" over unconditional BI. However, currently BI appears in its "program of political objectives" and before the parliamentary elections of 2011 the party's "basic security and basic income working group" published a model of basic income.

³ In the enquiry conducted by Suomen Kuvalehti Magazine in 2001 the support of citizen's wage was as low as 32 %, and in the enquiry by the Coalition Party in 2005, 58 % said yes to basic income "if it would simplify the social security system".

Institutions, ideas and frames

My study draws on the historical institutionalist⁴ approach and especially its newer traditions to look at the role of the ideas and discourses and their interplay with institutions when addressing the welfare state development (e.g. Hall 1993; Béland 2005; Schmidt 2002 & 2008; Kananen & Saari 2009; Kangas 2006). The concept of *policy idea* may refer to specific policy alternatives and programs, as well as mental models or causal beliefs in which these proposals are embedded. Ideas provide us with interpretive frameworks through which the facts, interests and connections between things, events and people are viewed. (Béland 2005; Béland & Cox 2011; Kananen & Saari 2009.)

According to the institutionalist interpretation, the mature welfare systems appear very resistant to new alternative policy schemes like BI. Raija Julkunen (2009) states that the Nordic social democratic welfare model is particularly reluctant to BI: the institutional rigidity, corporatist bargaining power and a strong commitment to the labourist ideology have effectively prevented its breakthrough on the political agenda. The Nordic countries vary on the extent they have shown interest in the idea of BI. In Denmark and Finland - where the role of the last-resort social security has been larger and the unemployment rates higher - BI has received relatively much attention. In Sweden (often considered as the "puriest" representative of the Nordic model), as well as in Norway, BI has been almost a non-issue. (Andersson 2000, 224.)

However, the welfare institutions do change. Practically all industrial countries have witnessed to some degree a radical shift in their social and economic policies since the beginning of 1970s⁵. That change was initiated as a result of a culmination of problems and failures in the preceding Keynesian paradigm. In the process, the ideas and discourses played an important role. (Hall 1993; Schmidt 2002; Saari 2011; Kananen & Saari 2009.) The shift from Keynesian to neo-liberal paradigm⁶ in economic and social policy represents in Peter Hall's (1993) terms a "third order change". While the first and second order changes can be seen as cases of "normal policymaking", the third order change challenges the overall terms of a given policy paradigm. The first order change signifies the routinized decision-making of the everyday policy process, when the overall goals and instruments remain the same. In the second order change instead, the overall goals of policy remain the same, but the instruments as well as their settings are altered. Third order change, by contrast, entails simultaneous changes in all three components of policy: the instrument settings, the instruments themselves, and the hierarchy of goals behind policy. Such wholesale changes in policy occur relatively rarely, normally as a result of appearance of anomalies in the given policy paradigm and a reflection on political failures in the past. (Ibid., 278-280.)

When the existing paradigm is threatened, a "policy window" might open up for the new ideas to enter the political agenda. (Saari 2011, 10; Tirronen 2011, 26-28.) The ideas are like prisms through which the world is viewed. A coherent system of ideas specifies what the society is like, which goals are attainable through policy, and what instruments should be used to attain them. (Hall 1993,

⁴ Historical institutionalism is a research tradition to look at the institutions, their stability and change over time. From the beginning of the 1980s, it has been one of the most influential theoretical perspectives in social policy studies. (see e.g. Béland 2005, Hall 1993, Schmidt 2008.)

⁵ In social policy literature, this change has been described as shift from "welfare" to "workfare", which means incorporating work requirements in the welfare system and increasing conditionalities of the benefits (Cantillon 2010). Many Finnish researchers (e.g. Kananen & Kantola 2009) have stated that during the 1990s Finland withdrew from the ideas of Nordic welfare model. The principles like social protection and redistribution were replaced by activation and economic competitiveness.

⁶ Hall (1993, 279) defines the concept of policy paradigm as "a framework of ideas and standards that specifies not only the goals of policy and kind of instruments that can be used to attain them, but also the very nature of the problems they are meant to be addressing". Both technical and ideological in content, paradigms constitute the pragmatic "world view" of bureaucrats, policy experts and elected politicians who struggle within institutional structures. (see also Béland 2005, 5-6.)

278-280.) The ideas are both cognitive and normative in their nature. Cognitive ideas elucidate "what is and what to do" whereas normative ideas indicate "what is good or bad about what is". (Schmidt 2008. 306.) The ideas create paradigms which are based on cognitive and normative assumptions of how the world functions and how it should function. The change in politics is possible only when the way of thinking is altered, and in this process, the "battle over interpretation" plays a decisive role. (Hiilamo & Kangas 2009, 65-69.) Päivi Uljas' (2012) study on the "breakthrough of the welfare state" in Finland in the late 1950s illustrates the importance of the shift in political hegemony as a prerequisite for new ideas favourable to the welfare state to emerge. That shift materialized also in political power relations: it produced a new power structure where the left parties became an effective political force.

Thus, the political struggle is not only about arguing the facts or interests, but even predominantly a struggle over cultural interpretation. "Organized interests, political parties, and policy experts do not simply "exert power"; they acquire power in part by trying to influence the political discourse of their day" (Hall 1993, 289-290). By using phrases, symbols and metaphors, both the the political establishment and new entrepreneurs try to legitimize their ideas and political alternatives; to demonstrate that the given reform is both necessary and desirable. (Béland 2005, 6-10; Schmidt 2002.) In that process, *framing* - the way to present and argue the idea - becomes a decisive aspect. The frames can be understood as different lenses through which a policy issue is viewed. When trying to appeal the public, they draw on existing culturally accepted ideological repertoires. The frames are used both to convince the audience on the superiority of the supported idea, as well as to (preventively) undermine the support of alternative ideas or existing programmes. In a policy process, one can find many competitive frames and the one which may succeed in giving a definition to a policy issue dominates the discussion. (Tirronen 2011, 35-36; Béland 2005, 9-12; Kangas et al. 2011, 144-145; Aaltio 2009.)

Empirical studies have shown the important role of the frames in the success of some policy alternatives and the failure of others. Pekka Kuusi in his "*Social policy of the 60s*" (60-luvun sosiaalipolitiikka) framed the Finnish social policy as "growth-oriented, human-centered and comprehensive" in a way that directed the interpretations of the welfare state for the coming decades. (Saari & Bergholm 2009, 57.) Another well-known example of framing is the discussion on "the home care allowance" in Finland and Sweden. In Finland, the home care allowance was interpreted in "freedom to choose" frame, which entailed that it would give families a free choice between kindergarten and home care. In Sweden instead, the "women trap" metaphor took a dominant position: the home care allowance was interpreted as a regressive idea which binds women at home (instead of freeing them to work). (Hiilamo & Kangas 2009.) In questionnaire studies, the phenomenon known as "framing effects" occurs when (often small) changes in the presentation of an issue produce (sometimes large) changes of opinion (Chong & Druckman 2007). The framing effects have been studied by Kangas et al. (2011) with regard to administration of the last resort social assistance in Finland⁷ and by Andersson & Kangas (2002) with regard to public opinion on basic income. In Kangas et al.'s study, four different frames were tested in the questionnaires. Two of the frames presented the issue in a positive light and two of them in a negative light. The framing of question showed a significant effect on the results. Some frames were more effective than others: the abstract frames appealing to moral sentiments showed stronger effects than frames that relied on factual arguments. However, the authors argued that successful framing alone would not be enough to bring about a policy change if powerful actors were not

⁷ Administration of the last resort social assistance in Finland is a municipal function. The political debate concerning centralisation of the administration of the social assistance (i.e. transferring it from municipalities to the Insurance Institution of Finland (Kela), which is the provider of basic social security benefits) has continued with varying intensity for over 20 years and experiments have been conducted in various municipalities, but so far the reform has not been carried out.

supportive to the idea. In Andersson & Kangas' study, the public opinions on basic income and related schemes were tested by varying the terminology of questionnaires. Some variation occurred in the relatively high support of BI schemes, when different frames were used.

Data

My data consists of all kinds of texts related to basic income published in the journals listed below in the period of 2006-2012. I have counted hits on terms "basic income" or "citizens' wage" which can be found in the journals' web archive or by "Aleksi" search engine. The web archive of Helsingin Sanomat (the biggest daily newspaper) provides an access to all published articles of the whole period. In many texts however, basic income is not the main topic but mentioned in relation to another issue.

The analyzed texts represent all journalistic genres: news, reports, editorials, columns, and opinion writings. A considerable number of the texts are either columns or opinion writings. Thus, the target of my research is not to look at the "journalistic framing" as such, but *how those who participate the discussion in the given journal (be they politicians, researchers, journalists or ordinary people) frame the issue*. Different types of journals are included: the biggest (liberal) daily newspaper, a weekly magazine concerned on politics and culture, five party journals and two student union's journals.

Table 1. the data

Newspapers and magazines			
<i>The journal</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Data available</i>	<i>Number of texts</i>
Helsingin Sanomat (HS)	The biggest daily newspaper	2006-2012	243
Suomen Kuvalehti (SK)	A weekly magazine concerned on politics and culture	2007-2012	11
Party press			
Kansan Uutiset (KU)	the Left Alliance	2009-2012	92
Vihreä Lanka (VL)	the Green Party	2007-2012	74
Demari (D)	the Social Democratic Party (SDP)	2012	6
Suomenmaa (SM)	the Centre Party	2010-2012	5
Verkkouutiset (VU)	the National Coalition Party	2009-2012	26
Student union journals			
Ylioppilaslehti (YL)	University of Helsinki	2006-2012	25
Aviisi (A)	University of Tampere	2009-2012	10

The majority of the analyzed texts had either positive or neutral stance toward basic income and the number of negative texts was relatively small. Only in the Social Democratic "Demari" all 6 texts

(available only from 2012) were negative. All representatives of the trade unions who participated the discussion held a critical stance towards BI. Besides, there were critics from both the right-wing and left-wing political groups. The supporters of BI came from all political groups, including the Social Democrats. Of the student unions' journals, I selected only those two which had actively discussed about basic income. The "Perussuomalainen" journal the populist True Finns party (currently the second biggest party of Finland) has been omitted since there was only one text which shortly mentioned basic income (in a negative tone) available in the journal's website. The BI-discussion in the social media (which has also been active) is not included in this analysis. Many of those who participated the discussion were well-known politicians, researchers or other public figures. Since all data has already been published, I present the writers by name and position when the information is available. The data extracts are translated from Finnish to English (see the original extracts in Appendix 1.).

The Frames

A major part of the discussion on basic income in my data can be located to three thematic dimensions. I have named those dimensions "*Work and activity*", "*Poverty and social exclusion*" and "*Past vs. present*". Within the first and second dimension, I found two competing frames which both had a positive orientation towards BI but were in a conflicting relation to each other. In the third dimension, there was no such a clear confrontation. In the opposing arguments, I could not find similar divisions, mainly because major part of the argumentation was presented from the trade-unionist perspective. I have named those struggling frames: "*Work incentives*", "*New forms of work*" and "*End of work*" (Work and activity dimension), "*Routes out of poverty*", "*Redistribution of wealth and income*" and "*Worsening the poverty*" (Poverty and social exclusion dimension) and "*Necessary and inevitable*" and "*Unrealistic and ineligible*" (Past vs. present dimension).

Table 2. The dimensions and frames of the BI-discussion

Work and activity	Poverty and social exclusion	Past vs. present
Work incentives	Routes out of poverty	Necessary and inevitable
New forms of work	Redistribution of wealth and income	Necessary and inevitable
End of work	Worsening the poverty	Unrealistic and ineligible

Work and activity

Work was a dominant theme in the discussion on BI. In BI-favouring arguments there were two distinct orientations on basic income and work: the first one emphasized the importance of removing incentive traps and increasing labour market participation and the second one contested the first frame by defending the right to refuse work and emphasizing the new forms of production (such as workers' co-operatives). I have named those frames "*Work incentives*" and "*New forms of work*". The former was the most typical for the green and right-wing participants, whereas the latter dominated the notions of the left-wing and especially the precarity activists. Both frames generally agreed on the diagnosis of the problems of the prevailing welfare system, such that it forces people to apathy and passivity due to its complex bureaucracy and cuts in benefits in the cases of irregular income. The system was described by metaphors like "jungle" (viidakko), "tangle" (ryteikkö), "fish trap" (katiska), "patchwork quilt" (tilkkutäkki) or "counter rally" (luukkuralli). Against that background, BI appeared clear, transparent, unambiguous and rational. Both pro-BI frames also emphasized BI's alleged positive effects on people's activity, but in different ways. The critics

instead, understood BI by definition as an opposite to work and argued in favour of "employment" against "unconditional money". I call this frame "*End of work*".

- (1) "The best way to remove the obstacles of employment would be to switch from the present bureaucratic and marginalizing tangle of social security to the basic income. The unemployed who need overlapping subsidies fall into the bureaucracy trap, which operates like a fish trap: it is almost impossible to get out of it by one's own effort. However, the Finns want to work." (the Green politicians Outi Alanko-Kahiluoto & Ville Niinistö, HS guest column 28 Mar 2012)
- (2) "The Left Youth of Vantaa demand a clearer social security instead of the present counter rally. In Finland, the social security has been made a bureaucratic mess, in which it is hard to apply the benefits, and they do not suffice living." (KU news, 28 Nov 2011)
- (3) "The incentive problem has emerged since the social security has been developed for decades like a patchwork quilt: every time a section has frayed, a new patch has been sewed in its place. The clarity has disappeared and perceiving of the wholeness has become nearly impossible." (The right-wing politicians Lasse Männistö & Petteri Orpo, SK 4 May 2012)

Work incentives

This frame was used to argue for removing the income traps and facilitating the combination of small incomes with social security benefits. It entailed an assumption that there is work to be done which is not profitable in the present conditions, as well as latent desire to work which can not actualize in the prevailing system. Some participants argued for a rather modest basic income and lowering the salaries in less productive works in order to maintain the work incentives and economic sustainability of the system. The main objective of this frame was to increase the employment rate - free people "to work" instead of freeing them "from work" - which was believed to happen automatically once a proper BI-scheme is in place.

- (4) "The party (*the Greens*, JP) estimates that basic income would free the desire for work and entrepreneurship which is hidden in the society better than the contemporary social benefits. The jungle of subsidies may push people into the income trap or otherwise passivate them." (HS editorial 9 Feb 2007, titled "A good opening to the election debate")
- (5) "The problem is both in the individual incentive traps and in the structure of the whole basic security. For the unemployed, it does not make sense to try return gradually to the employment, as the earned incomes cut the social benefits. The impact of a monthly salary less than 1200 eur to the net income is almost zero. However, the return from unemployment to the full-time employment usually happens just gradually through part-time or short-term jobs. So the structure of social security reduces work desire." (The right-wing politicians Lasse Männistö & Petteri Orpo, SK 4 May 2012)
- (6) "Still there is work and things to do for those who do it, as well as good ideas: therefore a reform like basic income is needed: to liberate all currently hibernating creative potential from the yoke of excessive economic risk, social bureaucracy and uncertainty of work." (HS opinion 1 Mar 2007)
- (7) "Eventually, the question is not about whether we can afford basic income, but rather, whether we can afford not to switch to the basic income and the full employment it enables." (The Green politicians Outi Alanko-Kahiluoto & Ville Niinistö, HS guest column 28 Mar 2012)

New forms of work

This frame was often used to challenge the "*Work incentive*" frame's pursuit to increase the employment in the low-paid sector by the introduction of BI. It entailed that, instead of encouraging people to accept "any job on any terms", BI should be regarded as a means to enhance workers' bargaining power in the labour market and to refuse the poor terms of employment. However, the

frame held that refusing work is not in order "to be lazy", but to bargain for better terms of employment or to spend one's time in meaningful activities and "autonomous work". The precarity activists argued that since a significant part of the production already takes place outside the formal labour market, a BI would be just a fair remuneration for that. In some cases, the frame was used in addition to the "*Work incentive*" frame by arguing, that besides making work always beneficial the BI would enable meaningful activities in the civil society.

- (8) "It is true, that a low basic income would "activate" people to sell their labour to the employers and invent work to themselves. In practice, it would be a question of compulsion which holds a risk of increasing the number of working poor which is already becoming common in Europe." (precarity activists Jukka Peltokoski & Tero Toivanen, HS opinion 12 Apr 2012)
- (9) "Central in the question of precarity is that work has extended beyond employment all over the society and people's lives. Outside the employment, we innovate and network, we are lifelong learners and brand our own personalities to be more productive. In the conditions of the present-day work, employment is a means to pay a remuneration only for a part of the work one does." (HS opinion 22 May 2009)
- (10) "Does the refusal of work mean idling? As far as I can see not, because it, on the contrary, opens time to such ways of working which can be called autonomous, or are sometimes talked about as a civil society or social economy." (precarity activist Jukka Peltokoski, KU opinion, 20 Jan 2011)
- (11) "So that the employees could work as autonomously as possible, the different entrepreneurship must also be brought up in connection with the basic income. The basic income which guarantees a sufficient livelihood gives to an increasing number of workers an opportunity to organize their own working in a democratic, fair and socially responsible way." (Ville-Veikko Pulkka, the chair of the Left Youth BI-working group, KU opinions 31 Mar 2012)

End of work

Many of those who opposed basic income seemed to have an implicit assumption that basic income and work are contradictory to each other and BI would automatically lead to "the end of work". They defended work as a foundation of the society and claimed that without work the entire welfare system would collapse. Many of them admitted that there are problems in combining the social benefits with small incomes, but proposed solving the problems by minor reforms. The trade-unionists were suspicious about BI's power to increase employment rates. They argued that the problem is rather the lack of demand for (especially low-educated) labour force than on the supply side (work incentives). Instead of large reforms in the social security, they proposed creating more full-time jobs by productive investments.

- (12) "The economic foundation of the welfare state is high employment, work and entrepreneurship. Vital business activity is inseparably connected to it. Basic income does not fit into this pattern." (Aulis Ruuth, the municipal secretary of the Left Alliance, KU opinion 17 Dec 2010)
- (13) "The Central Organisation of Finnish Trade Unions is not the supporter of citizen's wage for several reasons. Our view starts from the assumption that working is the starting point for everything. Prosperity and welfare are created by work in Finland, work gives people the content of life and the social security is also financed by work - both the earnings-related security and basic security. Thus, the more people are at work the better welfare society we have." (Lauri Lyly, the Chairman of the Central Organisation of Finnish Trade Unions, SM column 4 Jun 2012)
- (14) "Risikko (*the Minister of Social Affairs and Health from the Coalition Party*, JP) estimates that the unconditionality of basic income does not necessarily encourage people to improve their situation for example with an active job search, education and rehabilitation." (VU news 11 May 2012)
- (15) "From the point of view of the labour union movement, the most central cause of the unemployment is the lack of jobs and the widespread incapacity for work. Essential from the point of view of creating jobs is to

provide favorable preconditions for the business activity, since the changes in social security are hardly effective measures in creating new jobs. The problems of the long-term unemployed and those unable to work are often based on outdated skills or inadequate control of life. Some have substance abuse problems in the background. These problems can be solved by developing the services, not by distributing free money." (Esa Suominen, administrative manager in the Service Union United PAM, VL column 2 Oct 2011)

- (16) "In the basic income models of the Greens and the Left Alliance, the housing allowance, subsistence subsidy and earnings-related unemployment benefits would be retained. Since the housing allowance and subsistence subsidy are some of the most significant reasons for the incentive traps, there is no guarantee of the fact that basic income would make work always profitable." (economist Olli Kärkkäinen, A 3/2012)

Poverty and social exclusion

All proponents associated BI with the alleviation of poverty and social exclusion, but the further considerations differed along the same lines as in the *"Work and activity"* dimension. The first frame, which I call *"Routes out of poverty"* was used to argue for BI as a modest base of livelihood which gives people a possibility to improve their standard of living by working. The second frame, which I call *"Redistribution of wealth and income"* had a very different orientation: it argued that BI itself should be used as a sharing mechanism of unevenly distributed wealth. In general, the BI-proponents agreed that the contemporary system is humiliating people by arbitrary categories and conditionalities and gaps in the social security network. Against that background, BI was regarded as a means to remove non-take-up problems, increase people's sense of belonging and enhance their personal autonomy. The critics instead, argued that BI would make the problems of poverty and marginalization even worse by eroding the lowest salaries and leaving people alone with their problems. I call the opposing frame *"Worsening the poverty"*.

- (17) "Instead of helping, the social security and job-search system have become systems which classify people and produce marginalization, long-term unemployment and social cases. In practise, the system is rotating those people who, because of the economic structures, do not fit into wage labour from one counter to another." (researcher Mikko Jakonen, KU 20 Mar 2011)
- (18) "Even those who do not manage to apply the benefits would not be left aside from it (*basic income*, JP). The time of welfare authorities would be released for active helping of the customers." (Tapio Laakso, the Chair of the Green Youth, interview YL 19 Jan 2007)
- (19) "Jouko Kajanoja wants a basic income to Finland, because it would promote people's economic security and freedom to plan their lives by themselves. Furthermore, it would reduce the bureaucracy and control directed at the unemployed, students and recipients of the subsistence subsidy." (KU news 25 Apr 2009)
- (20) "The humiliation often concomitant to means-testing and terms of the subsidies will be shifted to the invitation to build one's own life worth living." (Professor Jorma Kalela, HS guest column 27 Aug 2006)

Routes out of poverty

In this frame, BI was regarded not as a sole means to reduce poverty and marginalization, but as a modest secure basis on which livelihood can be built by working. Instead of providing the means of subsistence as such, BI would help those who are active by providing them with "a ladder to climb out of poverty". Since the employment is one of the main factors which divides people to "insiders" and "outsiders", the increased employment rate would also reduce marginalization.

- (21) "Basic income which would be economically reasonable is not enough for the permanent livelihood. Anyway,

it would guarantee a moderate basic security to all when people could concentrate on acquiring additional income and education." (the Green politician Ville Niinistö, HS guest column 4 Aug 2009)

- (22) "Basic income would improve the possibilities to accept a short-term job. Hence it would create routes out of unemployment and poverty for the long-term unemployed and those who are excluded from work because of the income traps." (the Green politicians Outi Alanko-Kahiluoto & Ville Niinistö, HS guest column 28 Mar 2012)
- (23) "The social bum does not benefit from basic income. He or she may even lose a little, if the terms of the conditional social security will be tightened." (the Green politician Osmo Soininvaara, YL interview 16 Mar 2012)

Redistribution of wealth and income

In this frame, BI was interpreted not only as a new way of organising the social security, but also as a means to redistribute wealth and income. According to this view, it should be high enough to provide a decent standard of living without income from other sources and enable living and working outside the formal labour market. Providing a sufficient livelihood, it would improve the economic situation of the poor and enhance their bargaining power in the labour market. It was also considered as an investment in the new autonomous forms of production. It would enhance people's sense of belonging not only by employment, but by any meaningful social activities which become possible as the conditions of the social security are removed.

- (24) "The arising discussion on basic income is at risk of remaining only a debate on the social security reform and activation of the unemployed. However, it is also a question of income distribution. A well-organized basic income would equalize the income distribution, since the income inequality has grown large also in Finland." (precarity activists Jukka Peltokoski & Tero Toivanen, HS opinion 12 Apr 2012)
- (25) "We must demand more than a mere rationalization of the present social security system. A basic income which guarantees a sufficient livelihood will define anew what is people's minimum livelihood and the premises for its organization. It will challenge the present income distribution policy which allows the rich to get richer and the poor to live on minimum subsistence, which takes them away the prerequisites for full social agency." (Li Andersson, the Chair of the Left Youth, KU column 3 Dec 2011)
- (26) "Essential about basic income is its adequate level. Basic income does not automatically mean an improvement in the present social security system. For instance, the models advocated by the right-wingers would entail deterioration of the subsistence of the most low-income groups, outlines Heli Mahkonen, the newly elected Chair of the Left Youth of Southern Finland." (KU news 5 Mar 2012)

Worsening the poverty

The critics of BI argued, that since the living situations and people's needs are different, one universal benefit for all would be an ineffective means to solve the problems of poverty and social exclusion. Instead, they advocated targeted benefits and personal assistance for those in need. The economically feasible level of BI would be disastrous for the poor and mean "wasting money" for those who do not need it. The trade unionists worried about BI's effects on the lowest salaries and collective bargaining system by insisting that BI would make the situation of the precarious workers even worse by "institutionalizing" the irregular employment. They claimed that in the long run BI would deepen the social divisions between people by institutionalizing the low paid jobs, creating two-tier labour market and leaving people alone with their problems.

- (27) "The level of the citizen's wage paid to all would inevitably remain low. This is not the advantage of the most unfortunate and it reinforces poverty and marginalization." (Lauri Lyly, the Chairman of The Central Organisation of Finnish Trade Unions, SM column 4 Jun 2012)

- (28) "The help of society has to be given to those who really need economic support, for example because of unemployment or illness. So doing the common money suffice better benefits than the basic income. The equal-size basic income does not give attention to the individual needs. Therefore the basic security benefits have to be designed according to recipient's living situation and needs, Risikko (*the Minister of Social Affairs and Health from the Coalition Party, JP*) said." (VU news 11 May 2012)
- (29) "Furthermore, this may have unexpected political implications, which at its worst would further transfer the bargaining power on the labour market to the employers: if a basic income did not guarantee an adequate livelihood, and if people had to supplement it more or less by the earned income, a large number of flexible labour force who would have to accept almost any job in order to secure their livelihood would enter the labour market, according to the above mentioned example. This would further reduce employers' interest to negotiate on fair salaries and other terms of employment. In the long run this might also threaten the general applicability of the collective agreements." (Esa Suominen, administrative manager in the Service Union United PAM, column VL 22 Nov 2011)
- (30) "It would be important to think also about how that kind of income-transfer system would affect, for instance, the life of a twenty-year-old who has lost his or her motivation to study and suffer from substance abuse problems? The money would drop on the bank account without any kind of activity. Nowadays many subsidies, like the labour market subsidy or rehabilitation allowance require at least some kind of building one's own life as a counterbalance of receiving benefits. Basic income would leave many people on their own." (SDP economist Ville Kopra, HS opinion 2 Apr 2007)

Past vs. present

Necessary and inevitable

By the proponents, BI was considered as a necessary, inevitable and rational consequence of the changed social reality. The change has occurred in the economy (from the closed national economy to the open global economy), in the production (from the centralized industrial production to the network-based information society) and in the labour market (from the stable long-term employment to the short-term, irregular and independent work). In this frame, the prevailing welfare system represented "a rigid relic", whereas BI was associated with positive concepts and ideas such as flexibility, creativity and innovativeness. BI was considered an inevitable part of the future. In this frame, there was no large differences between the BI-favouring discourses.

- (31) "The Finnish welfare society has been built on the basis of the 1970s industrial society. Our social security is based on the stable employment of that time. However, the work has changed so that our social security does not respond to the people's needs anymore." (the Green politician Ville Niinistö, HS guest column 4 Aug 2009)
- (32) "The basic income granted to all creates a basis for a new form of livelihood as a part of the new conditions where the earnings are acquired by many parallel, often occasional works." (professor Jorma Kalela, HS guest column 27 Aug 2006)
- (33) "Basic income is a small slice of the wider discussion on economic and social policy. It is an attempt to adapt the systems to correspond the changed economic reality. And let us emphasize another time: the objective of the basic income scheme is not to preserve the welfare state, but on the contrary, save it." (Jukka Relander, esseist, columnist and TV/radio host, VL column 13 Jan 2011)
- (34) "However, the starting point for the basic income is not steering people to take any given job, but the producer's right claim for the means of production. The most important productive power of the agricultural society was the land, in the industrial society the workers struggled for the control of factory machines. The productive power of the information society is information, which is produced in cooperation between human minds." (HS opinion 1 Sep 2006)
- (35) "The meaning of wage work is in transition, because the production is being transferred from the factories to the informational basis. In that case production is not necessarily attached to the employment as it used to be,

and work becomes more entrepreneurial, free and independent." (HS opinion 8 Feb 2010)

Unrealistic and ineligible

In the opposing argumentation, BI appeared as an impossible paradox: though some critics admitted that the objectives behind the idea of BI are "good", the conclusion was that a good BI model would be impossible to create. In any case, the disadvantages of BI would be greater than its advantages and its implications for economy and labour market would be unpredictable. The trade unionists insisted that BI would either be too low and hence disastrous for the poor, or too high and economically unsustainable. They considered the growing number of irregular jobs as a development that can still be turned back and appealed to the legitimacy of the existing social security system and people's desire for secure full-time employment.

- (36) "Ilkka Kaukoranta, the economist of the Central Organisation of Finnish Trade Unions crushes basic income. In his view, all models are, in brief, "ineligible". Kaukoranta divides in his blog in the Central Organisation of Finnish Trade Unions' website the basic income models into the excessively expensive ones, useless ones and caning the poor ones. According to Kaukoranta, all basic income models have their own sides, but a common thing is that they are all bad. - Encouraging people to work and cutting of the bureaucracy are beautiful objectives, but without violent cuts in the social security they are impossible to obtain by basic income." (D news 31 May 2012)
- (37) "It can be supposed that the level of basic income would either stay low and thus deepen the poverty, or being too high it would become unsustainable for public finance." (Esa Suominen, administrative manager in the Service Union United PAM, VL column 2 Oct 2011)
- (38) "The central lines are also determined according to whether one wants to consider the irregularity of work as a natural force or as an operation that can be intervened, and whether one wants the accumulation of the social security and the basic logic of the welfare state to be based on work or not." (Esa Suominen, administrative manager in the Service Union United PAM, VL column 22 Oct 2011)
- (39) "The unconditional citizen's wage would collapse Finland's public economy. We would be very soon on Greece's road because the basic alternatives for implementing the expensive citizen's wage would be in practice increasing the public debt or raising the tax degree considerably. Neither alternative is reasonable." (Lauri Lyly, the Chairman of the Central Organisation of Finnish Trade Unions, SM column 4 Jun 2012)

Conclusions

Three different orientations toward BI can be formed on the basis of the preliminary analysis:

Orientation 1. *Work incentives - Routes out of poverty - Necessary and inevitable*: Advocates basic income by appealing to the existing hegemonic values and policy paradigms.

Orientation 2. *New forms of work - Redistribution of wealth and income - Necessary and inevitable*: Advocates basic income by challenging the prevailing social order, power and economic relations.

Orientation 3. *End of work - Worsening the poverty - Unrealistic and ineligible*: Opposes basic income by leaning strongly to the prevailing state of affairs and traditional welfare solutions.

Besides the struggle between proponents and opponents of the BI-idea, there is a considerable tension between orientations 1. and 2., both in favour of BI. The most recent data indicates that the BI-favouring interpretations are achieving a dominant position in the discussion, but further analysis is needed. However, it has to be kept in mind, that the group that participate the discussion is still rather small - the vast majority of individuals and organizations do not have a clear stance either for or against the BI. Though the idea of BI is still somewhat evolving, certain front lines

seem to be well-established. The diversity of perspectives is certainly a richness in the discussion, but in the further attempts to concretise the proposal and promote its implementation, the incoherence of the discourse might prove to be a problem (see De Wispelaere 2012).

Applying Peter Hall's (1993) theoretical framework, would BI require ideological and paradigmatic (third order) changes or could it be accommodated to the prevailing policy paradigms as a large scale second order institutional change (when the overall goals of policy would remain the same but the instruments to achieve those goals would be altered)? There is a clear attempt by the right-wing politicians to assimilate it to the neoliberal paradigm (see also Groot & van der Veen 2000; Jordan 2012). That has, to some extent, brought it from the margins to the mainstream discussion and raised new interest toward the idea. However, in the right-wing parties and interest groups the proponents of BI are still in the minority and the resistance is strong. Since the left and most of the green BI-proponents are strongly against very neoliberal notions of BI, it does not seem very feasible. On the other hand, BI is often argued as an alternative to the neoliberal policies and a new paradigm of welfare (see Christensen 2008; Julkunen 2009; Birnbaum 2012; Offe 2008). As far as the discussion is going on within the prevailing economic paradigm, the counter-arguments of expensiveness and high marginal tax rates might prove to be insurmountable obstacles for a more generous BI. Minor reforms toward BI (such as streamlining the system and facilitating the combination of social benefits with small incomes) seem highly probable in Finland in the coming years, but disengaging income from work would probably encounter too much institutional and political resistance (supposing that the current economic paradigm and power relations would remain). A more robust notion of BI could perhaps build only on the grounds of a new economic paradigm. One interesting perspective can be found from the neo-keynesian theories which understand the role of the state and limits of public spending in very different ways from the monetary theory (see Ahokas 2012).

Appendix 1.

The data extracts in Finnish

- (1) "Paras tapa poistaa työllisyyden esteitä olisi siirtyä nykyisestä byrokraattisesta ja syrjäyttävästä sosiaaliturvavarteiköstä perustuloon. Pällekkäisiä tukia tarvitsevat työttömät putoavat byrokraatialoukkuun, joka toimii kuin katiska: siitä on miltei mahdoton päästä omin voimin ulos. Suomalaiset kuitenkin haluavat tehdä työtä."
- (2) "Vantaan Vasemmistonuoret vaatii selkeämpää sosiaaliturvaa nykyisen luokkurallin sijaan. Suomessa sosiaaliturvasta on luotu byrokraattinen sekasotku, jossa tukia on vaikea hakea, eivätkä ne riitä elämiseen."
- (3) "Kannustinongelma on syntynyt, kun sosiaaliturvaa on kehitetty vuosikymmeniä tilkkutäkin tavoin: aina jonkin kohdan rispaantuessa on ommeltu päälle uusi paikka. Selkeys on kadonnut ja kokonaisuuden hahmottaminen on muuttunut lähes mahdottomaksi."
- (4) "Puolue arvioi, että perustulo vapauttaisi yhteiskunnassa piilevää työhalua ja yrittäjyyttä paremmin kuin nykyiset sosiaalietuudet. Tukiviidakko saattaa ajaa tuloukkuun tai muuten passivoida ihmistä."
- (5) "Ongelma on sekä yksittäisissä kannustinloukuissa että koko perusturvan rakenteessa. Työttömän ei kannata pyrkiä palaamaan asteittain työelämään, sillä palkkatulot leikkaavat sosiaaliturvaa. Alle 1200 euron kuukausitulojen vaikutus nettoansioihin on melko olematon. Paluu työttömyydestä täysipäiväiseen työhön tapahtuu kuitenkin usein juuri asteittain osa-aikaisen tai lyhytaikaisen työnteon kautta. Sosiaaliturvan rakenne siis vähentää työhalua."
- (6) "Silti työtä ja tekemistä kyllä riittää tekeville, samoin hyviä ideoita: siksi tarvitaan perustulon kaltainen uudistus vapauttamaan kaikki tällä hetkellä talvehtiva luova potentiaali liiallisen taloudellisen riskin, sosiaalibyrokratian ja työn epävarmuuden ikeestä."

- (7) "Kysymys ei lopulta ole niinkään siitä, onko meillä varaa perustuloon, kuin siitä, onko meillä varaa olla siirtymättä perustuloon ja täystyöllisyyteen jonka se mahdollistaa."
- (8) "Totta on, että matala perustulo "aktivoisi" ihmisiä kauppaamaan työvoimaansa työnantajille ja keksimään itselleen töitä. Käytännössä kyse olisi pakotuksesta, jonka vaarana on Euroopassa nopeasti yleistyvän työtätekevän köyhälistön lisääntyminen."
- (9) "Keskeistä kysymyksessä prekaarisuudesta onkin se, että työ on levinnyt palkkatyösuhteiden ulkopuolelle koko yhteiskuntaan ja ihmisten koko elämään. Työsuhteiden ulkopuolella innovoidaan, verkostoidutaan, ollaan elinikäisiä oppijoita ja brändätään omia persooniamme entistä tuottavammiksi. Nykytyön olosuhteissa palkkatyösuhde on keino maksaa ihmiselle korvaus vain osasta hänen tekemäänsä työtä."
- (10) "Tarkoittaako työstä kieltäytyminen siis laiskottelua? Nähdäkseni ei, sillä se päinvastoin avaa aikaa sellaisille työn teon tavoille, joita voidaan kutsua autonomisiksi tai joista joskus puhutaan kansalaisyhteiskuntana tai yhteisötaloutena."
- (11) "Jotta työntekijät voisivat työskennellä mahdollisimman omaehtoisesti, on perustulon yhteydessä nostettava esille myös toisenlainen yrittäjäyys. Riittävän toimeentulon takaava perustulo antaa yhä useammille työntekijöille mahdollisuuden järjestää oma työskentely demokraattisesti, oikeudenmukaisesti ja yhteiskunnallista vastuuta kantaen."
- (12) "Hyvinvointivaltion taloudellinen perusta on hyvä työllisyys, työnteko ja yrittäminen. Siihen liittyy erottamattomasti vireä elinkeinotoiminta. Tähän kuvioon ei perustulo istu."
- (13) "SAK ei ole kansalaispalkan kannattaja useasta eri syystä. Ajatuksemme lähtee siitä, että työn tekeminen on kaiken lähtökohta. Työllä luodaan Suomeen vaurautta ja hyvinvointia, työ antaa ihmiselle sisältöä elämään ja työllä myös rahoitetaan sosiaaliturvaa - sekä ansioon perustuva turva että perusturva. Eli mitä useampi on työssä, sitä parempi hyvinvointiyhteiskunta meillä on."
- (14) "Risikko arvioi, että perustulon vastikkeettomuus ei välttämättä kannusta ihmisiä parantamaan tilannettaan esimerkiksi aktiivisella työhaulla, koulutuksella ja kuntoutuksella."
- (15) "Ammattiyhdistysliikkeen näkökulmasta keskeisin työttömyyden aiheuttaja on työpaikkojen puute sekä laajalle levinnyt työkyvyttömyys. Työpaikkojen syntymisen kannalta oleellista on luoda otollisia edellytyksiä elinkeinotoiminnalle, sosiaaliturvamuuokset kun tuskin ovat tehokkaita uusien työpaikkojen luoja. Pitkäaikaistyöttömien ja työkyvyttömien ongelmat taas pohjautuvat usein vanhentuneeseen osaamiseen tai puutteelliseen elämänhallintaan. Joillakin on taustallaan myös päihdeongelmia. Näitä ongelmia voidaan ratkoa kehittämällä palveluita, ei jakamalla vastikkeetonta rahaa."
- (16) "Vihreiden ja vasemmistoliiiton perustulomalleissa säilytettäisiin esimerkiksi asumistuki, toimeentulotuki ja ansiosidonnainen työttömyysturva. Koska asumistuki ja toimeentulotuki ovat merkittävimpiä syitä kannustinloukkuihin, ei ole mitään takeita siitä, että perustulouudistus tekisi työnteosta aina kannattavaa."
- (17) "Auttamisen sijaan sosiaaliturva- ja työnhakujärjestelmä on muodostunut ihmisiä luokittelevaksi järjestelmäksi, joka tuottaa syrjäytyneitä, pitkäaikaistyöttömiä ja sosiaalitapauksia. Käytännössä järjestelmä pyörittää luukulta toiselle niitä ihmisiä, jotka eivät talouspoliittisten rakenteiden vuoksi sovi mukaan palkkatyöhön."
- (18) "Sen ulkopuolelle eivät jäisi nekään, jotka eivät nyt jaksa tai hakea tukia. Sosiaaliviranomaisten aika vapautuisi asiakkaiden aktiiviseen auttamiseen."
- (19) "Jouko Kajanoja haluaa Suomeen perustulon, koska se edistäisi ihmisten taloudellista turvallisuutta sekä vapautta suunnitella itse elämänsä. Lisäksi se vähentäisi työttömiin, opiskelijoihin sekä toimeentulotuen saajiin kohdistuvaa byrokratiaa ja kontrollia."
- (20) "Tarveharkintaan ja tukien ehtoihin usein liittyvä nöyryyttäminen vaihtuu kehotukseen rakentaa oma elämä elämisen arvoiseksi."
- (21) "Perustulo, joka olisi kansantaloudellisesti järkevä, ei riitä pysyvään toimeentuloon. Se takaisi kuitenkin kohtuullisen perusturvan kaikille, jolloin ihminen voisi keskittyä lisäansioden ja koulutuksen hankkimiseen."
- (22) "Perustulo parantaisi mahdollisuutta ottaa lyhytaikaistakin työtä vastaan. Siten se loisi pitkäaikaistyöttömille ja tuloloukkujen takia työelämästä syrjäytyneille reittejä ulos työttömyydestä ja köyhyydestä."
- (23) "Sosiaalipummi ei perustulosta hyödy. Hän saattaa jopa hieman menettää, jos syyperustaisen sosiaaliturvan ehtoja kiristetään."
- (24) "Virinnyt perustulokeskustelu uhkaa jäädä väittelyksi sosiaaliturvauudistuksesta ja työttömien aktivoinnista. Kyse on kuitenkin myös tulonjaosta. Hyvin järjestetty perustulo tasoittaisi Suomessakin mittaviksi kasvaneita tuloeroja."

- (25) "On vaadittava enemmän kuin pelkkää nykyisen sosiaaliturvajärjestelmän järkevöittämistä. Riittävän toimeentulon takaava perustulo määrittelee uudelleen sen, mikä on ihmisten minimitoimeentulo ja sen järjestämisen lähtökohdat. Se haastaa nykyisen tulonjakopolitiikan, joka sallii rikkaiden rikastumisen ja köyhien elämisen minimitoimeentulolla, joka vie heiltä edellytykset täysvaltaiseen yhteiskunnalliseen toimijuuteen."
- (26) "Olennaisinta perustulossa on sen riittävä taso. Perustulo ei automaattisesti tarkoita parannusta nykyiseen sosiaaliturvajärjestelmään. Esimerkiksi oikeistolaisten esiin nostamat mallit tarkoittaisivat heikennyksiä kaikista pienituloisimpien toimeentuloon, linjaa Etelä-Suomen Vasemmistonuorten vastavalittu puheenjohtaja Heli Mahkonen."
- (27) "Jokaiselle maksettavan kansalaispalkan taso jäisi myös väistämättä alhaiseksi. Tämä ei ole huono-osaisimpien etu ja lisää köyhyyttä sekä syrjäytymistä."
- (28) "Yhteiskunnan apu on annettava niille, jotka todella tarvitsevat taloudellista tukea esimerkiksi työttömyyden tai sairauden vuoksi. Näin yhteiset rahat riittävät perustuloa parempiin etuuksiin. Samansuuruinen perustulo ei huomioi yksilöllisiä tarpeita. Siksi perusturvaetuudet tulee mitoittaa etuuden saajan elämäntilanteen ja tarpeen mukaan, Risikko sanoi."
- (29) "Lisäksi tällä voi olla arvaamattomia yhteiskuntapoliittisia seurauksia, jotka pahimmillaan edelleen siirtävät työmarkkinoilla neuvotteluvoimaa työnantajalle: jos perustulo ei takaisi kohtuullista toimeentuloa, ja ihmisten olisi enemmän tai vähemmän pakko täydentää sitä palkkatuloilla, työmarkkinoille tulisi, edellä mainitun esimerkin mukaisesti, suuri joukko joustavaa työvoimaa, jonka olisi otettava vastaan lähes mitä tahansa työtä turvatakseen toimeentulonsa. Tämä edelleen vähentäisi työnantajien kiinnostusta neuvotella kohtuullisista palkoista ja muista työehdoista. Pitkälle edettyään tämä voisi olla uhka myös työehtosopimusten yleissovutuille."
- (30) "Olisi silti tärkeää miettiä myös sitä, miten tämänkaltainen tulonsiirtojärjestelmä vaikuttaisi vaikkapa opiskelumotivaationsa hukanneen, päihdeongelmista kärsineen kaksikymppisen elämässä? Raha tippuisi pankkitilille ilman minkäänlaista omaa aktiivisuutta. Nykyisin monet tuet kuten työmarkkinatuki tai kuntoutustuki edellyttävät edes jonkinlaista elämän rakennustyötä tuen saannin vastapainoksi. Perustulo jättäisi monet oman onnensa nojaan."
- (31) "Suomalainen hyvinvointiyhteiskunta on rakennettu 1970-luvun teollisen yhteiskunnan lähtökohdista. Sosiaaliturvamme perustuu senaikaisiin vakaisiin palkkatyösuhteisiin. Työelämä on kuitenkin muuttunut niin, ettei sosiaaliturvamme enää vastaa ihmisten tarpeisiin."
- (32) "Kaikille myönnettävä perustulo luo myös pohjaa uusiin olosuhteisiin kuuluvalla toimeentulon tavalla, jossa ansiot hankitaan useilla rinnakkaisilla, ajoittain satunnaisillakin töillä."
- (33) "Perustulo on pieni siivu laajempaa talous- ja sosiaalipoliittista keskustelua. Se on yritys sopeuttaa järjestelmiä vastaamaan talouden muuttunutta todellisuutta. Ja korostettakoon vielä erikseen: perustulomallin tavoitteena ei ole hyvinvointivaltion säilyttäminen, vaan päinvastoin, sen pelastaminen."
- (34) "Perustulon lähtökohdista ei kuitenkaan ole ohjaaminen mihin tahansa töihin, vaan tuottajan oikeusvaade tuotantovälineeseensä. Maatalousyhteiskunnan tärkein tuotantovoima oli maa, teollisessa yhteiskunnassa työläiset kappailivat tehdaskoneiden hallinnasta. Tietoyhteiskunnan tuotantovoima on tieto, jota tuottuu ihmisaivojen välisenä yhteistyönä."
- (35) "Palkkatyön merkitys on kuitenkin murroksessa, sillä tuotanto on siirtymässä tehtaista tiedolliselle pohjalle. Tällöin tuotanto ei välttämättä kiinnity entiseen tapaan työsuhteisiin, ja työ yrittäjämäistyy, vapautuu ja itsenäistyy."
- (36) "SAK:n ekonomisti Ilkka Kaukoranta lyttää perustulon. Hänestä eri mallit ovat sanalla sanoen "kelvottomia". Kaukoranta jakaa perustulomallit tuhoamaan kalliisiin, turhiin ja köyhiä kepittäviin blogissa SAK:n verkkosivuilla. Kaukorannan mukaan eri perustulomalleilla on omat puolensa, mutta yhteistä niille on kuitenkin se, että jokainen on huono.- Työhön kannustaminen ja byrokratian karsiminen ovat kauniita tavoitteita, mutta ilman sosiaaliturvan rajua leikkausta niihin ei perustulon avulla päästä."
- (37) "Onkin oletettavaa, että perustulo jäisi joko tasoltaan matalaksi ja siten syventäisi köyhyyttä, tai sitten korkeana kävisi kestävämmäksi julkiselle taloudelle."
- (38) "Keskeiset linjat määrittävät myös sen mukaan halutaanko työelämän silppuuntumista pitää luonnonvoimana vai toimintana, johon on mahdollista vaikuttaa, ja halutaanko sosiaaliturvan kertymis- sekä hyvinvointivaltion peruslogiikan perustuvan työnteolle vai ei."
- (39) "Vastikkeeton kansalaispalkka romahduttaisi Suomen julkisen sektorin talouden. Olisimme hyvin pian Kreikan tiellä, koska kalliin kansalaispalkan toteuttamisen perusvaihtoehdot olisivat käytännössä valtionvelan lisääminen tai veroasteen huomattava korotus. Kumpikaan vaihtoehto ei ole järjevä."

References

- Aaltio, Elina (2009) *Vapaaksi marginaalista - marginaalista vapautta. Naisliikkeen ja prostituoitujen etuliikkeen kamppailu seksin oston kriminalisoinnista 2002-2006*. Helsinki: Tasa-arvoasiain neuvottelukunta.
- Ahokas, Jussi (2012) "Perustulo ja funktionaalisen rahoituksen malli" in Perkiö, Johanna & Suopanki, Kaisu (eds.) *Perustulon aika*. Into:Helsinki.
- Andersson, Jan Otto (2000) "The History of an Idea. Why did Basic Income Thrill the Finns, but not the Swedes?" in van der Veen, Robert and Groot, Loek (eds.) *Basic income on the agenda: policy objectives and political chances*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press; London: Eurospan.
- Andersson, Jan Otto & Kangas, Olli (2002) Perustulon kannatus Suomessa. *Yhteiskuntapolitiikka* 67/4
- Béland, Daniel (2005) "Ideas and Social Policy: An Institutionalist Perspective" in *Social Policy & Administration*. Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 1-18.
- Béland, Daniel & Cox, Robert Henry (2011) "Introduction. Ideas and Politics" in Béland, Daniel & Cox, Robert Henry (eds.) *Ideas and Politics in Social Science Research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Birnbaum, Simon (2012) *Basic Income Reconsidered. Social Justice, Liberalism, and the Demands of Equality*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cantillon, Bea (2010) *Crisis and Welfare State: The Need for a New Distributional Agenda*. (<http://fljs.org/uploads/documents/Cantillon%231%23.pdf>, checked 20 Jun 2012)
- Christensen, Erik (2008) *The Heretical Political Discourse - a Discourse Analysis of the Danish Debate on Basic Income*. Aalborg University Press
- Chong, Dennis & Druckman, James N. (2007) "Framing Theory" *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.* 2007. 10:103–26
- De Wispelaere, Jurgen (2012) *The Struggle for Strategy: On the Politics of the Basic Income Proposal*, forthcoming
- De Wispelaere, Jurgen & Noguera, José (2012) "On the Political Feasibility of a Universal Basic Income" in Richard Caputo (ed.), *Basic Income Guarantee and Politics: International Experiences and Perspectives on the Viability of Income Guarantee*. New York: Palgrave
- De Wispelaere, Jurgen & Stirton, Lindsay (2004) "The Many Faces of Universal Basic Income" *The Political Quarterly* 75.3: 266-274.
- Groot, Loek & van der Veen, Robert (2000). "How Attractive is a Basic Income for European Welfare States?" in van der Veen, Robert and Groot, Loek (eds.) *Basic income on the agenda: policy objectives and political chances*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press; London: Eurospan.
- Hall, Peter A. (1993) "Policy Paradigms, Social Learning, and the State: The Case of Economic

Policymaking in Britain" *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 275-296

Hiilamo, Heikki ja Kangas, Olli 2009: Lasten kotihoidon tuki – Miksi idea menestyi Suomessa mutta ei Ruotsissa? Teoksessa Johannes Kananen ja Juho Saari (toim.) *Ajatuksen voima. Ideat hyvinvointivaltion uudistamisessa*. Minerva, Helsinki.

Ikkala, Markku (2008) "Basic Income Discussion in Finland." A paper presented in the 12th BIEN Congress in Dublin.

Jordan, Bill (2012). "The Low Road to Basic Income? Tax-Benefit Integration in the UK." *Journal of Social Policy*, 41 , pp 1-17

Julkunen, Raija (2009) Perustulo – kuinka sama idea toistuvasti kohtaa sosiaalidemokraattisen hyvinvointivaltion. Teoksessa Kananen, Johannes & Saari, Juho (toim.) *Ajatuksen voima. Ideat hyvinvointivaltion uudistamisessa*. Helsinki: Minerva

Kananen, Johannes & Kantola, Anu (2009) "Kilpailukyky ja tuottavuus – Kuinka uudet käsitteet saavuttivat hallitsevan aseman hyvinvointivaltion muutoksessa?" In Kananen, Johannes & Saari, Juho (eds.) *Ajatuksen voima. Ideat hyvinvointivaltion uudistamisessa*. Helsinki: Minerva.

Kangas, Olli (2006) Poliitiikka ja sosiaaliturva Suomessa. In Paavonen, Tapani & Kangas, Olli: *Eduskunta hyvinvointivaltion rakentajana*. Helsinki: Edita

Kangas, Olli, Niemelä, Mikko & Varjonen, Sampo (2011) "Toimeentulotuen Kela-siirron kehykset politiikan asialistoilla ja kansalaismielipide" in Niemelä, Mikko & Saari, Juho (eds.) *Politiikan polut ja hyvinvointivaltion muutos*. Helsinki: Kela.

Kopra, Ville (2007) *Perustulo. Kova vai pehmeä paketti?* Helsinki: Kalevi Sorsa säätiö

Lahtinen, Ilpo (1992) *Perustulo. Kansalaisen palkka*. Helsinki: Hanki ja jää

Lampinen, Osmo & Soininvaara, Osmo (1980) *Suomi 1980-luvulla. Pehmeän kehityksen tie*. Helsinki: WSOY.

Noguera, José A. (2001) "Some Prospects for a Basic Income Scheme in Spain," *South European Society and Politics*, 6:3, 83-102

Offe, Claus (2008) "Basic Income and the Labor Contract," *Basic Income Studies*: Vol. 3 : Iss. 1, Article 4.

Perkiö, Johanna & Suopanki, Kaisu (eds., 2012) *Perustulon aika*. Helsinki: Into.

Roos, J.P. (2011) "Sata-komitean lyhyt ja surullinen historia". *Yhteiskuntapolitiikka* 76:1.

Saari, Juho (2011a) "Pienten askelten politiikka ja hyvinvointivaltion muutos" & (2011b) "Sosiaaliturvan kokonaisuudistus. Tapahtumarakennanalyysi syksystä 2007 syksyyn 2010", in Niemelä, Mikko & Saari, Juho (eds.) *Politiikan polut ja hyvinvointivaltion muutos*. Helsinki: Kela.

Saari, Juho (2009) "Harvinainen hetki - tammikuu 2009 ja suomalaisen sosiaalipolitiikan tulevaisuus". *Yhteiskuntapolitiikka* 74:3.

Saari, Juho & Bergholm, Tapio (2009) "Paradigmat, agendat ja kehykset - miten Pekka Kuusen 60-luvun sosiaalipolitiikka on vaikuttanut suomalaisen hyvinvointivaltion kehitykseen?" in Kananen,

- Johannes & Saari, Juho (toim.) *Ajatuksen voima. Ideat hyvinvointivaltion uudistamisessa*. Helsinki: Minerva
- Saari, Juho & Kananen, Johannes (2009) "Sosiaalipolitiikan ideat" in Kananen, Johannes & Saari, Juho (toim.) *Ajatuksen voima. Ideat hyvinvointivaltion uudistamisessa*. Helsinki: Minerva
- Schmidt, Vivien A. (2002) "Does Discourse Matter in the Politics of Welfare State Adjustment?" *Comparative Political Studies* 35: 168
- Schmidt, Vivien A. (2008) "Discursive Institutionalism: The Explanatory Power of Ideas and Discourse." *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.* 2008. 11:303–26
- Soininvaara, Osmo (1994) *Hyvinvointivaltion eloonjäätymisoppi*. Helsinki: WSOY
- Tirronen, Jarkko (2011) "Politiikkaprosessin sisällä. Polkuriippuvuus, agendan asettaminen ja innovaatioiden leviäminen" in Niemelä, Mikko & Saari, Juho (eds.) *Politiikan polut ja hyvinvointivaltion muutos*. Helsinki: Kela.
- Uljas, Päivi (2012) *Hyvinvointivaltion läpimurto*. Helsinki: Into.
- Vanderborght, Yannick (2006) "Why Trade Unions Oppose Basic Income," *Basic Income Studies*: Vol. 1 : Iss. 1, Article 5.
- Van Parijs, Philippe (1995) *Real Freedom for All. What (if anything) can justify capitalism?* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ylikahri, Ville (2007) "Kohti perustuloa - perustulokeskustelua Suomessa ja maailmalla" in Honkanen, Pertti, Soininvaara, Osmo and Ylikahri, Ville: *Perustulo. Kohti toimivaa perusturvaa*. Helsinki: Vihreä sivistysliitto.