

BIEN - Basic Income Earth Network - NEWSFLASH 39, May 2006

www.basicincome.org

The *Basic Income Earth Network* was founded in 1986 as the Basic Income European Network. It expanded its scope from Europe to the Earth in 2004. It serves as a link between individuals and groups committed to or interested in basic income, and fosters informed discussion on this topic throughout the world.

The present NewsFlash has been prepared with the help of Jurgen De Wispelaere, David Casassas, Katrin Mohr, Paul Nollen, Paulo Ricci, Al Sheahen, Ingrid van Niekerk, and Philippe Van Parijs.

[Information about copyright](#)

CONTENTS

1. Editorial: John Kenneth Galbraith dies at 98

2. BIEN 11th CONGRESS: 2-4 November 2006, Cape Town (SA)

3. First issue of Basic Income Studies

4. Events

*LONDON (UK), 19 April 2006: The Citizen's Stake at IPPR

*BUENOS AIRES (AR), 13 May 2006: Meeting on basic income

*FRANKFURT AM MAIN (DE), 19 July 2006: Basic Income and the crisis of the wage economy

*STOCKHOLM (SE), 19 August 2006: Conference of the Green Party on basic income

5. Glimpses of national debates

*CONGO: NEW POLITICAL PARTY ADVOCATES BASIC INCOME

*NAMIBIA: GOVERNMENT REJECTS BASIC INCOME PROPOSAL BY REFFERING TO THE BIBLE

*UNITED STATES: FIRST-EVER BASIC INCOME BILL IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

6. Publications

*English

*French

*German

7. New Links

*SOCIAL CURRENCY

*A FRENCH BASIC INCOME?

*A FRENCH LIVING WAGE?

*BASIC INCOME FOR AUSTRALIA

*STRUGGLES FOR BASIC INCOME

8. About the Basic Income Earth Network

1. EDITORIAL

John Kenneth Galbraith, one of the most influential economists of the 20th century, died on April 29, 2006. Born in Ontario (CA) on October 15, 1908, he was a prominent supporter of basic income. Here is an abstract of BIEN's Newsletter 33 (Autumn 1999):

JK GALBRAITH: THREE DECADES OF SUPPORT FOR BASIC INCOME

In the address he gave on the occasion of his being awarded an honorary degree from the LSE (and reproduced in the Guardian, 29.06.1999 and in the Toronto Globe and Mail, 06.07.1999), John Kenneth Galbraith, the 90-year old critical economist and Harvard professor, started off with some thoughts on the ambivalence of work and closed with "two pieces of the unfinished business of the century and millennium that have high visibility and urgency". One is the massive stock of nuclear weapons. The other is the very large number of the very poor even in the richest of countries. "The answer or part of the answer is rather clear: everybody should be guaranteed a decent basic income. A rich country such as the US can well afford to keep everybody out of poverty. Some, it will be said, will seize upon the income and won't work. So it is now with more limited welfare, as it is called. Let us accept some resort to leisure by the poor as well as by the rich."

Galbraith cannot be said to lack consistency. In a little-known essay published over thirty years earlier ("The Starvation of the Cities" [1966], reprinted in "*A View from the Stands*"), he stated:

"There is no single cure for poverty, but we should not, in our sophistication, be afraid of the obvious. [...] So far, my approach to the problem of poverty has been strongly traditional: we should help them to help themselves. That is good, whereas merely to help them has always been considered bad. Now I venture to think the time has come to re-examine these good Calvinist tenets, which fit so well with our idea of what saves money. We need to consider the one prompt and effective solution for poverty, which is to provide everyone with a minimum income. The arguments against this proposal are numerous, but most of them are excuses for not thinking about a solution, even one that is so exceedingly plausible. It would, it is said, destroy incentives. Yet we now have a welfare system that could not be better designed to destroy incentive if we wanted it that way. We give the needy income, and we take away that income if the recipient gets even the poorest job. Thus we tax the marginal income of the welfare recipient at rates of 100 percent or more. A minimum income, it is said, would keep people out of the labor market. But we do not want all the people with inadequate income to work. In 1964, of the 14.8 million children classified by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare as poor, nearly a third were in families headed by a woman. And three fifths of the children in families headed by women were so classified. Most of those women should not be working. Idleness, we agree, is demoralizing. But even here there is a question: Why is leisure so uniformly bad for the poor and so uniformly good for the exceptionally well-to-do? We can easily afford an income floor. It would cost about \$20 billion to bring everyone up to what the Department of HEW considers a reasonable minimum. This is a third less than the amount by which personal income rose last year. It is not so much more than we will spend during the next fiscal year to restore freedom, democracy and religious liberty, as these are defined by the experts, in Vietnam. And there is no antidote for poverty that is quite so certain in its effects as the provision of income."

BIEN's Executive Committee

2. BIEN 11th CONGRESS: 2-4 November 2006, Cape Town (SA)

The Economic Policy Research Institute (EPRI) is hosting the ELEVENTH BIEN CONGRESS on 2-4 November 2006 at the University of Cape Town in Cape Town, South Africa. All information and forms are available on the website: www.epri.org.za (also accessible via www.basicincome.org). **Please forward any questions to:** infobien@epri.org.za

3. FIRST ISSUE OF BASIC INCOME STUDIES

The Editors of *Basic Income Studies* (BIS), the new international academic journal for basic income research, are pleased to announce the imminent publication of their inaugural issue. BIS, volume 1, issue 1 will be published in June 2006 at www.bepress.com/bis, with the following contributions:

Research Articles:

*Joel Handler and Amanda Sheela Babcock, "The Failure of Workfare: Another Reason for a Basic Income Guarantee"

*Michael Howard, "Basic Income and Migration Policy: A Moral Dilemma?"

*Yannick Vanderborght, "Why Trade Unions Oppose Basic Income"

Retrospective: "A Capitalist Road to Communism – Twenty Years After"

*reprint of Robert van der Veen and Philippe Van Parijs, "A Capitalist Road to Communism", with

*a new set of comments by G.A. Cohen, Andrew Williams, Doris Schroeder, Catriona McKinnon, Harry F. Dahms, and Erik Olin Wright, and

*two new replies by Robert van der Veen and Philippe Van Parijs.

Book Reviews:

*Richard Caputo reviews "John Cunliffe and Guido Erreygers, The Origins of Universal Grants"

*Alexandra Couto reviews "Tony Fitzpatrick and Michael Cahill, Environment and Welfare: Towards a Green Social Policy"

*Colin Farelly reviews "Brian Barry, Why Social Justice Matters"

*Cristian Pérez Muñoz reviews "Guy Standing, Beyond the New Paternalism: Basic Security as Equality"

BIS is constantly on the look-out for research articles and book reviews. Please get in touch with the editors at bis-editors@bepress.com or the book review editor at bis-bookreviews@bepress.com if you are interested in contributing.

BIS is published by The Berkeley Electronic Press (bepress), sponsored by Red Renta Basica (RRB) and supported by BIEN and USBIG.

4. EVENTS

*LONDON (UK), 19 April 2006: The Citizen's Stake at IPPR

On April 19, 2006, the *Institute for Public Policy Research* (ippr) and *The Children's Mutual* organized a Conference on *Citizens Stake: Exploring the future of universal asset policies*.

This event examined asset-based welfare in connection with a wide range of issues, from tax policy to childcare. Key questions that this event asked included: How far can an asset-based approach replace existing welfare provision? Can asset-based policies be paid for from taxing

"common assets", inheritance, or land value? How and should the state promote the responsible use of universal capital grant schemes? How can and should the state promote the responsible use of universal capital grants? How might asset-based welfare improve the work-life balance and support carers? The main speakers were: Nick Pearce, Director, Institute for Public Policy Research; Sue Regan, Chief Executive, Resolution Foundation; Dr Stuart White, Tutorial Fellow in Politics, Jesus College, University of Oxford; David White, Chief Executive, The Children's Mutual.

For further information: Ruth Eldridge r.eldridge@ippr.org

***BUENOS AIRES (AR)**, 13 May 2006: Meeting on basic income

The Red Argentina de Ingreso Ciudadano (REDAIC, Argentine Basic Income Network) held its second Annual Meeting on May 13th. It was an open meeting to discuss key issues regarding the Basic Income debate in Argentina. The meeting was in three parts: a presentation, a round table and an open discussion. The first part consisted of a presentation by Rubén Lo Vuolo to explain what REDAIC is. The round table developed the topics Ingreso Ciudadano, Trabajo y Movimientos Sociales (Basic Income, Employment and Social Movements) with the participation of Pablo Bergel from REDAIC, Joaquín from the Movimiento Teresa Rodríguez and Tomás Raffo from CTA (Argentinean Workers Central). Most of the meeting consisted of an open discussion about Basic Income in Argentina, its possibilities and its difficulties; the fight for a Basic Income and the fight for employment; Basic Income as a step towards social change and Basic Income in the context of other social movements such as gender or environmental movements. The main conclusions from the meeting's debates will soon be available on www.ingresociudadano.org.

***FRANKFURT AM MAIN (DE)**, 14 July 2006: Basic Income and the crisis of the wage economy

A big conference on basic income at the University Frankfurt Am Main, with the following speakers: Philippe Van Parijs (Louvain & Harvard), Claus Offe (Berlin), Ulrich Oevermann (Frankfurt), Georg Vobruba (Leipzig), and businessman Götz Werner (Karlsruhe).

For further information: <http://www.bedingungsloses-grundeinkommen.de/>

***STOCKHOLM (SE)**, 19 August 2006: Conference of the Green Party on basic income

The Green Party of Sweden is organizing a major seminar on basic income in Stockholm on August 19th, by initiative of Euro MP Carl Schlyter.

For further information: Valter Mutt, assistant to Carl Schlyter, MEP (Green), valter.mutt@mp.se

5. GLIMPSES OF NATIONAL DEBATES

***CONGO: NEW POLITICAL PARTY ADVOCATES BASIC INCOME**

The "Parti Réformateur Pour le Congo" (PRPC), a small Kinshasa-based political party, has signed an agreement with the Belgian political movement Vivant, led by businessman and BIEN Life-member Roland Duchâtelet. Now officially called PRPC-Vivant, this party has designed a platform which includes the proposal of introducing a modest basic income in Congo. In the implementation stage, the level of this so-called "Revenu de Base" should be established at EUR200 yearly (100.000 Congolese Franks).

For further information: <http://www.vivant.org>

***NAMIBIA: GOVERNMENT REJECTS BASIC INCOME PROPOSAL BY REFERRING**

TO THE BIBLE

On May 22, 2006, the daily "The Namibian" (Windhoek) reported on previous discussions between the Namibian Basic Income Grant (BIG) Coalition and the Prime Minister. "The Namibian" reported that Bishop Zephania Kameeta, representing the coalition, took issue with Prime Minister Nahas Angula's use of the biblical verse "in the sweat of your face shall you eat bread" (Genesis 3:19), as justification for not accepting the BIG idea.

"Where are the Ramatex workers from Katutura or the people on the DRC dump (site) going to work with sweat on their face for their bread? Where are they going to get the modest resources from the start to take their economic life into their own hands?" he asked, referring to the Malaysian-owned textile factory's threats of leaving Namibia, and a report on the same news broadcast of people living on the DRC dumpsite in Swakopmund, searching for food amongst medical waste dumped there.

"Namibians are not lazy to work with sweat on their face," he continued. "The question is rather, when are we prepared to change the structural injustices of the economy by giving resources to the people directly instead of giving them to exploitative foreign investors building and dumping sweatshops?" He reminded media practitioners present that the idea for a BIG was in fact formed by Government's own tax consortium, the Namtax Commission. Namtax said in 2002 that "following an extensive review of the relevant literature and an analysis of possible alternative strategies, we found that by far the best method of addressing poverty and inequality would be a universal income grant."

For this reason, Kameeta said Government's response that such a grant would make no economic sense stood in contrast to the findings of Namtax and the BIG Coalition. Government said implementing the BIG could only become a reality if either the coalition raised a fraction of the funds needed, or if Government abolished the many social grants it already has in place. These include social pensions, war veterans' grants, foster parents' allowances, places-of-safety allowances and housing grants. Kameeta said the coalition rejected this idea of re-prioritising funds from the poor, as special needs would still exist despite the introduction of BIG. The coalition said other ways of funding the idea could be considered, for example through value-added tax (VAT) and donor funding.

*UNITED STATES: FIRST-EVER BASIC INCOME BILL IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The first-ever Basic Income Guarantee Bill was introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives by Congressman Bob Filner (D-CA) on May 2, 2006. It is numbered HR 5257, and can be found at http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getpage.cgi?dbname=2006_record&page=E688&position=all

The bill would transform the standard income tax deduction into a standard tax credit of US\$2000 per adult and US\$1000 per child. For the first time, it would give a "refundable tax credit" to everyone who filed an income tax return, even if the person had no income. The current "Earned Income Tax Credit" (EITC) provides a small refundable tax credit, but only to those who have some earned income. Anyone who earns zero is ineligible. Bill HR 5257 would change that. It would also provide a tax cut for virtually everyone who earns less than about \$60,000 a year.

Getting the Bill to this point has been a true team effort by the U.S. Basic Income Guarantee

Network USBIG. The [final 8-page proposal](#) was presented by Al Sheahen and Karl Widerquist at the 2005 USBIG Conference (New York City).

Below is Bob Filner's statement (from Congressional Record-Extension of remarks, May 2, 2006).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, the ``Tax Cut for the Rest of Us" Act of 2006 (H.R. 5257) transforms the standard income tax deduction into a ``refundable" standard tax credit. Doing so will not only simplify the tax code, but put more money into the pockets of poor Americans.

For 25 years, refundable tax credits--such as the Earned Income Tax Credit and the ``additional child tax credit"--have proven to be simple, effective ways to help the poor. The logical next step is to transform the standard deduction and personal exemptions into a refundable standard tax credit (STC) of \$2,000 for each adult and \$1,000 for each child. The STC will provide all the poor with a small but badly needed tax credit, and give a tax cut to virtually everyone who chooses not to itemize their deductions.

Transforming the standard deduction into a refundable tax credit will not eliminate poverty, but it will be an enormous benefit to the poor who were completely overlooked by the Bush tax cuts. The poor pay sales taxes, property taxes, and many other taxes, but because they do not pay very much in income tax, they have little to gain from tax simplification unless it includes something like the STC.

Transforming the standard deduction into a standard tax credit will give a tax cut to those who need it most. Now is the time to pass a ``Tax Cut for the Rest of Us."

For further information, please write to Al Sheahen : alsheahen@prodigy.net, or go to the [USBIG website](#).

6. PUBLICATIONS

*ENGLISH

GAMEL Claude, BALSAN Didier & VERO Josiane, "The impact of basic income on the propensity to work : Theoretical issues and microeconomic results", *Journal of Socio-Economics*, volume 35, Issue 3, June 2006, pp. 476-497. First author's address: claud.gamel@univ-cezanne.fr

In France, there is much debate about "minimum social benefits", and basic income is still perceived as too daring a proposal, in particular because it is believed to encourage idleness. How can we predict how individuals would use this unconditional income? As regards low wage earners, we look first at the uncertainties surrounding the economic theory as to the behavioural changes that this could induce. This is followed by an econometric study of answers given in 2000 by a panel of poorly qualified young adults who had recently become employed : this indicates that the payment of a monthly allowance of approximately 300 Euros would not result in a massive withdrawal from work. Integration through employment means more than just receiving a wage, and disconnecting work from income rarely encourages individuals to "experiment" with other types of social integration. The first version of this paper had been presented at BIEN 2002 Congress in Geneva, and has been published in G. STANDING (ed.), *Promoting Income Security as a Right: Europe and North America*, Londres, Anthem Press, 2004.

MATSAGANIS, Manos, O'DONOGHUE, Cathal, LEVY, Horacio & al. (2006), "Reforming Family Transfers in Southern Europe: Is there a Role for Universal Child Benefits?", *Social*

The drive to reduce child poverty is of particular interest in southern Europe, where public assistance to low-income families with children is often meagre or not available at all. The paper examines the effect of income transfers to families in Greece, Italy, Spain and Portugal using a benefit-tax model. The distributional impact of actual programmes is shown to be weak, hence the scope for reform great. As an illustration, the European benefit-tax model EUROMOD is used to simulate universal child benefits equivalent to those in Britain, Denmark and Sweden. The anti-poverty effect of such benefits is found to be in proportion to their fiscal cost.

A key finding is that replacing current policies by universal child benefits may not reduce the number of children in poverty by much, and could even raise it. This can happen if current policy provides relatively generous assistance to a large number of low-income families (as in Italy, where family allowance is income tested and categorically targeted). Is this surprising? In the first place, universal benefits were never intended as the only ingredient of anti-poverty policy. The case for universality rests on wider considerations: embodying social citizenship, promoting individual autonomy, preventing poverty traps. Universal child benefits in particular are instruments of horizontal redistribution, from single taxpayers to families with children. If children are viewed as a partly public good, then shifting to society at large some of the costs involved will enhance social welfare. This is not to say that universal child benefits are irrelevant as anti-poverty instruments. Where existing policies leave coverage gaps, as in the countries examined here, such benefits will improve the position of families at the bottom of the income scale (often ineligible for assistance under current policies). Headcount poverty rates, concerned with movements across the poverty line, cannot capture such improvement, but other indicators can. Moreover, this contest of universal child benefits vs. existing family transfers is less than fully fair due to imperfect targeting. A 100% rate of benefit take up is assumed here – a reasonable approximation of the real world with respect to universal benefits, but not to means-tested ones. Allowing for imperfect targeting would tilt the balance of the assessment firmly in favour of universal child benefits. The same holds for other features associated with universal programmes, such as lower administrative costs compared to means-tested benefits etc. In any case, combining a universal (if low) income base with targeted policies could be an effective way to reduce child poverty in southern Europe at a reasonable cost to the tax payer. But not if targeted policies remain categorical. A key element of an inclusive social safety net, potentially open to all poor families irrespective of their characteristics, is a guaranteed minimum income scheme. Sadly, with the exception of Portugal, recent initiatives to that purpose in southern Europe have been inconclusive.

Journal's website:

<http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayIssue?jid=SPS&volumeId=5&issueId=02>

NEUBECK, Kenneth J. (2006), *When Welfare Disappears: The Case for Economic Human Rights*, New York, Routledge, 2006, ISBN 0415947804

While welfare rolls have dramatically dropped across the United States during the last decade, the high poverty for mothers and their children has not. In fact many of new welfare reform initiatives pose increasingly negative effects on poor children and youth. As these startling statistics mount, federal and state governments continue to cut back on the very services and funds on which impoverished families rely.

This book offers a history of welfare, a portrayal of welfare recipients and an understanding of the diverse characteristics of lone-mother-headed families affected by welfare reform. Through detailed research, Kenneth J. Neubeck offers a comparison of other industrialized

nation's welfare policies, and presents a new argument for curtailing the so-called "end of welfare as we know it": the case for respecting economic human rights.

What the American civil rights movement was to the 1960s, the human rights movement is in the 1990s and today. Just as many doctors have campaigned to have health considered a human right, Kenneth J. Neubeck suggests that people should be entitled to economic human rights. *When Welfare Disappears* examines the important ways in which our government has refused to recognize the rights of its most impoverished and vulnerable citizens.

The author devotes a full page (p145) to basic income as proposed by Philippe Van Parijs, he mentions the existence of BIEN, and also discusses Richard Nixon's Family Assistance Plan (FAP).

TOMLINSON, John (2006), "Faint Praise for a Chimera: Selectivity versus Universalism in Social Policy", *New Community Quarterly*, volume 4, Issue 1, pp 54-60.

This article investigates current Australian social policy directions by looking beneath the stated intent of the Government's programs. In recent years, the Australian Federal Government has announced: the "work till you drop" policy which is supposed to stave off the demographic tyranny of an aging Australia; an expanded mutual obligation program which would, in Minister Mal Brough's (2001) words, "flush out dole bludgers"; compelling single parents to work instead of staying home to look after their children; slashing the Community Development Employment Program (CDEP) combined with forcing young Aborigines to leave their remote homelands to get training (Karvelas 2005); and plans to stamp out 'malingerers' from amongst the ranks of disability support pensioners.

The article interrogates the ideological, metaphorical, mythological and the present-day aspects of this Government's "social policy chimera". It uses the insights gained to argue for a Basic Income supplemented with a Job Guarantee.

Journal's website: <http://www.borderlands.org.au/ncq/>

Author's address: j.tomlinson@qut.edu.au

***FRENCH**

GAMEL Claude, BALSAN Didier & VERO Josiane (2005), "L'incidence de l'allocation universelle sur la propension à travailler - Enjeux théoriques et résultats microéconométriques", *Economies et Sociétés*, série « Socio-économie du travail », AB, n° 26, 8/2005, août 2005, pp.1411-1441.

First author's address: claud.gamel@univ-cezanne.fr

In France, there is much debate about "minimum social benefits", and basic income is still perceived as too daring a proposal, in particular because it is believed to encourage idleness. How can we predict how individuals would use this unconditional income? As regards low wage earners, we look first at the uncertainties surrounding the economic theory as to the behavioural changes that this could induce. This is followed by an econometric study of answers given in 2000 by a panel of poorly qualified young adults who had recently become employed : this indicates that the payment of a monthly allowance of approximately 300 Euros would not result in a massive withdrawal from work. Integration through employment means more than just receiving a wage, and disconnecting work from income rarely encourages individuals to "experiment" with other types of social integration. The first version of this paper had been presented at BIEN 2002 Congress in Geneva, and has been published in G. STANDING (ed.), *Promoting Income Security as a Right: Europe and North America*, Londres, Anthem Press, 2004.

WRIGHT Erik Olin (2006), "Le revenu inconditionnel: un pas vers le socialisme?", *La Grande Relève*, issue 1063, March 2006, pp.3-5.

A summary of E.O. Wright's "The Basic Income Guarantee as a Socialist Project", as presented during the 2005 Congress of USBIG in New York City (March 2005).

For further information: <http://economiedistributive.free.fr>

***GERMAN**

STRAUBHAAR, Thomas (2006), "Mindestsicherung statt Mindestlohn", *Wirtschaftsdienst Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftspolitik*, vol.86, issue 4, pp.210-211.

In a short article for the monthly journal of the "Hamburgische Weltwirtschaftsarchiv (HWWA)" – one of the most important economic think tanks in Germany – its head, Thomas Straubhaar, advocates the introduction of an unconditional basic income of 7.500 EUR per year for every German citizen. The BI is to provide a minimum safety net and to be paid without a means-test and obligation to work. In exchange, Straubhaar wants to abolish all other social security systems and labour market regulations as in his view they are economically inefficient and socially unjust. While in this he is close to other neoliberal economists, the unconditionality sets his basic income concept apart from other proposals discussed in this spectrum.

The paper can be downloaded at

http://www.hwwa.de/Forschung/Publikationen/Wirtschaftsdienst/2006/wd_docs2006/wd0604-straubhaar.pdf

VOBRUBA, Georg (2006), *Entkoppelung von Arbeit und Einkommen. Das Grundeinkommen in der Arbeitsgesellschaft*, Wiesbaden: VS Verlag, 211 pp., ISBN: 3531149342

It is unnecessary to argue in favor for the decoupling of work and income, for this process takes place anyway. But there is still a remarkable deficit of understanding as well as regulating it. The book aims at reducing these deficits. In order to do so it offers a sociological theory of the labour market, stressing its peculiarities compared to other markets, it analyses the improbability of full employment and different historical and systematical aspects of a guaranteed basic income. The book contains a collection of the authors' main contributions to the debate on the end of full employment and a guaranteed basic income over the last 25 years (partly published, partly unpublished material).

7. NEW LINKS

***SOCIAL CURRENCY**

In December 2005 EU leaders asked the European Commission to propose a new system for financing the European Union in 2008. On this occasion a non-official website has been recently launched. It is constructed around a proposal which was originally conceived as one of the possible means to finance a Basic Income developed by Joseph Huber and James Robertson. Although there is currently no direct link with Basic Income, it remains in accordance with the general principle that profits from the use of common good, in this case the profit of the creation of money, also called seignorage, belongs to all the people, in one way or another. It is also a

technical proposal that aims for more financial stability and social justice. All members of the European parliament have been contacted by the webmasters. For further information: www.socialcurrency.be

*A FRENCH BASIC INCOME?

Starting from a strong critique of the so-called "Modèle social français" (the French Social Model), BIEN Life-member Marc de Basquiat has developed a model for the introduction of a basic income in France. It can be downloaded via his website: www.feodalite-sociale.com
M. de Basquiat welcomes any suggestion or comment at: marc@de-basquiat.com

*A FRENCH LIVING WAGE?

Jean-Pierre Baron has designed a model called "Le Salaire de Vie", which he sees as a form of a participation income.

It is presented on <http://www.e-monsite.com/sdviste/>

*BASIC INCOME FOR AUSTRALIA by John Tomlinson

Because a Basic Income is paid to all permanent residents, irrespective of employment or any other social status, it is superior to the existing targeted, means-tested income support system, Tomlinson argues in his article for "Online Opinion" (<http://www.onlineopinion.com.au/view.asp?article=4419>). It is more efficient than Earned Income Tax Credit schemes, which penalise families when their hours of employment drop below 20 hours per week. Because it is paid up front rather than in inverse proportion to other earned income, it is more streamlined than Negative Income Tax and Guaranteed Minimum Income schemes. A Basic Income is a simple, easy-to-administer scheme. A smart treasurer, Tomlinson concludes, would introduce this in the 2007-8 Budget.

Author's address: j.tomlinson@qut.edu.au

*STRUGGLES FOR BASIC INCOME by Toru Yamamori

On April 30th, 2006 at Keynes Hall, King's College, Cambridge (UK), BIEN Life-member Toru Yamamori has presented a paper entitled "*Una sola multitude*: Struggles for Basic Income and the common logic that emerged from Italy, the UK and Japan". It is now available on the web at: <http://www.geocities.com/immateriallabour/yamamoripaper2006.html>

Abstract: "All of us are guaranteed to Basic Income without any condition!" This is the demand called by various names: Basic Income / Renta Basica, Citizen's Income / Reddito di Cittadinanza / Guaranteed Income / Revenu Garanti / Revenu D'Existence / Allocation Universelle, etc. Michel Hardt and Antonio Negri describe this demand as one of three programmes of the multitude. This paper is written as a response to the three following situations:

First, critiques against Hardt and Negri do not understand this demand properly. Second, while recent developments within academic literature concerning this demand should be welcomed, the fact that one of roots of the demand is radical grassroots' movements in 1970s is usually ignored with a few exceptions. Third, while experiences of *Lotta Femminista*, *Autonomia Operaia* and other spontaneous movements in Italy are recognized as an example of people making such demands among participants of this conference, experiences outside of Italy are might not recognised as such.

The argument goes as follows: the author starts by introducing current academic discourses on this demand (Section 2). This helps to point out misunderstandings within the critiques against Hardt and Negri. Then the argument by Hardt and Negri are introduced with a brief reference to struggles in Italy in 1970's (Section 3). Then some points of scepticism concerning Basic Income are overviewed (Section 4). Is Basic Income the cunning of

Empire? It might be, so the context of the introduction of Basic Income is crucial. Thus we can learn from the struggles for Basic Income. The author looks at the experience in the U.K. (Section 5), and in Japan (Section 6).

8. ABOUT THE BASIC INCOME EARTH NETWORK

Co-chair:

Eduardo SUPPLY, Federal Senator, Sao Paulo, Brazil

Guy STANDING, Director of the Social and Economic Security Programme, ILO, Geneva, Switzerland

Further details about BIEN's Executive Committee and International Board can be found [on our website](#), as well as further details about the [Recognised National Networks](#).

MEMBERSHIP

All life members of the Basic Income European Network, many of whom were non-Europeans, have automatically become life members of the Basic Income Earth Network. To join them, just send your name and address (postal and electronic) to David Casassas <dacasassas@ub.edu> Secretary of BIEN, and transfer EUR 100 to BIEN's account 001 2204356 10 at FORTIS BANK (IBAN: BE41 0012 2043 5610), 10 Rond-Point Schuman, B-1040 Brussels, Belgium. An acknowledgement will be sent upon receipt.

BIEN Life-members can become “B(I)ENEFACTORS” by giving another 100 Euros or more to the Network. The funds collected will facilitate the participation of promising BI advocates coming from developing countries or from disadvantaged groups.

B(I)ENEFACTORS:

Joel Handler (US), Philippe Van Parijs (BE), Helmut Pelzer (DE), Guy Standing (UK)

BIEN's Life Members:

James Meade (+), Gunnar Adler-Karlsson (SE), Maria Ozanira da Silva (BR), Ronald Dore (UK), Alexander de Roo (NL), Edouard Dommen (CH), Philippe Van Parijs (BE), P.J. Verberne (NL), Tony Walter (UK), Philippe Grosjean (BE), Malcolm Torry (UK), Wouter van Ginneken (CH), Andrew Williams (UK), Roland Duchâtelet (BE), Manfred Fuellsack (AT), Anne-Marie Prieels (BE), Philippe Desguin (BE), Joel Handler (US), Sally Lerner (CA), David Macarov (IL), Paul Metz (NL), Claus Offe (DE), Guy Standing (UK), Hillel Steiner (UK), Werner Govaerts (BE), Robley George (US), Yoland Bresson (FR), Richard Hauser (DE), Eduardo Matarazzo Suplicy (BR), Jan-Otto Andersson (FI), Ingrid Robeyns (UK), John Baker (IE), Rolf Kuettel (CH), Michael Murray (US), Carlos Farinha Rodrigues (PT), Yann Moulier Boutang (FR), Joachim Mitschke (DE), Rik van Berkel (NL), François Blais (CA), Katrin Töns (DE), Almaz Zelleke (US), Gerard Degrez (BE), Michael Opielka (DE), Lena Lavinas (BR), Julien Dubouchet (CH), Jeanne Hrdina (CH), Joseph Huber (DE), Markku Ikkala (FI), Luis Moreno (ES), Rafael Pinilla (ES), Graham Taylor (UK), W. Robert Needham (CA), Tom Borsen Hansen (DK), Ian Murray (US), Peter Molgaard Nielsen (DK), Fernanda Rodrigues (PT), Helmut Pelzer (DE), Rod Dobell (CA), Walter Van Trier (BE), Loek Groot (NL), Andrea Fumagalli (IT), Bernard Berteloot (FR), Jean-Pierre Mon (FR), Angelika Krebs (DE), Ahmet Insel (FR), Alberto Barbeito (AR), Rubén Lo Vuolo (AR), Manos Matsaganis (GR), Jose Iglesias Fernandez (ES), Daniel Eichler (DE), Cristovam Buarque (BR), Michael Lewis (US), Clive Lord (UK), Jean Morier-Genoud (FR), Eri Noguchi (US), Michael Samson (ZA), Ingrid van Niekerk (ZA), Karl Widerquist (US), Al

Sheahen (US), Christopher Balfour (UK), Jurgen De Wispelaere (UK), Wolf-Dieter Just (DE), Zsuzsa Ferge (HU), Paul Friesen (CA), Nicolas Bourgeon (FR), Marja A. Pijl (NL), Matthias Spielkamp (DE), Frédéric Jourdin (FR), Daniel Raventós (ES), Andrés Hernández (CO), Guido Erreygers (BE), Alain Tonnet (BE), Stephen C. Clark (US), Wolfgang Mundstein (AT), Evert Voogd (NL), Frank Thompson (US), Lieselotte Wohlgenannt (AT), Jose Luis Rey Pérez (ES), Jose Antonio Noguera (ES), Esther Brunner (CH), Irv Garfinkel (US), Claude Macquet (BE), Bernard Guibert (FR), Margit Appel (AT), Simo Aho (FI), Francisco Ramos Martin (ES), Brigid Reynolds (IE), Sean Healy (IE), Maire Mullarney (IE), Patrick Lovesse (CH), Jean-Paul Zoyem (FR), GianCarlo Moiso (IT), Martino Rossi (CH), Pierre Herold (CH), Steven Shafarman (US), Leonardo Fernando Cruz Basso (BR), Wolfgang Strenmann-Kuhn (DE), Anne Glenda Miller (UK), Lowell Manning (NZ), Dimitris Ballas (GR), Gilberte Ferrière (BE), Louise Haagh (DK), Michael Howard (US), Simon Wigley (TR), Erik Christensen (DK), David Casassas (ES), Paul Nollen (BE), Vriend(inn)en Basisinkomen (NL), Christophe Guené (BE), Alain Massot (CA), Marcel Bertrand Paradis (CA), NN (Geneve, CH), Marc Vandenberghe (BE), Gianluca Busilacchi (IT), Robert F. Clark (US), Theresa Funciello (US), Al Boag & Sue Williams (AU), Josef Meyer (BE), Alain Boyer (CH), Jos Janssen (NL), Collectif Charles Fourier (+), Bruce Ackerman (US), Victor Lau (CA), Konstantinos Geormas (GR), Pierre Feray (FR), Christian Brütsch (CH), Phil Harvey (US), Toru Yamamori (JP), René Keersemaeker (NL), Manuel Franzmann (DE), Ovidio Carlos de Brito (BR), Bernard De Crum (NL), Katja Kipping (DE), Jan Beaufort (DE), Christopher Mueller (DE), Bradley Nelson (US), Marc de Basquiat (FR), James Robertson (UK), Infoxoa Rivista (IT), Eric Patry (CH), Vianney Angles (FR), Isabel Ortiz (US) [162].

BIEN's NewsFlash is mailed electronically every two months to over 1000 subscribers throughout the world.

Requests for free subscription are to be sent to bien@basicincome.org

Items for inclusion or review in future NewsFlashes are to be sent to Yannick Vanderborght, newsletter editor, UCL, Chaire Hoover, 3 Place Montesquieu, 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium, vanderborght@etes.ucl.ac.be

The items included in BIEN NewsFlashes are not protected by any copyright. They can be reproduced and translated at will. But if you use them, please mention the existence and address of the Basic Income Earth Network (including its web site www.basisincome.org) and the exact references of the events or publications concerned. Thank you.