

Johannes Hanel, Goethestr. 23, 99817 Eisenach, Germany, 0049 3691-708 262

# Legal, Economic and other Aspects of the Basic Income Discussion

## Basic Income as Human Right and Market Framework

### How Basic Income Clarifies the Relation Between Law and Economics

## Table of Contents

I. From the Welfare State to Basic Income (Definitions).....	1
II. Human Rights and Basic Income .....	3
II.1) Realizing Human Rights by Means of Basic Income.....	3
II 2) The Right to a Standard of Living as Universal Human Right.....	6
II 3) The Individual as Basic Income Receiver .....	6
III. Economic Aspects of Basic Income .....	7
III. 1) Basic Income in the Present Welfare State.....	7
III 2) Financing Basic Income .....	8
III 3) Basic Income in a Dynamic World Economy .....	9
IV. Cultural Dimensions of Basic Income.....	10

Basic Income is an essential aspect of human rights. It also stabilizes the economic process including business cycles by helping to balance consumption with production. Furthermore, basic income improves the relation between the individual and institutions, be they economic firms or those of the state (courts, administrations, governments etc.). This is beneficial the working conditions or the relations between employees and employers and for democracy. The more we vote or work out of fear the less courageous and creative we are and the less we consume. Last but not least, basic income is like education: It allows the individual to develop her talents and work according to her abilities. On a methodological level, basic income allows science to analyse clearly the relation between legal and financial aspects of society.

This paper wants to show why it is worthwhile that social scientists cooperate to find ways to deal with the transition from somewhat arbitrary to basic income. Can we as scientists become part of the social process or of civil society? How can we overcome the abyss between science and life or society? Basic income is a means to liberalize science from religious, political and economic preasures. It allows scientists to bring together their personal and scientific life. Research work on basic income is part of the philosophy of science that brings to light the conditions for finding (scientific) truth. It does not answer the question how science is best financed but is is part of the answer.

### ***I. From the Welfare State to Basic Income (Definitions)***

Economists often study how we choose. The legislature and the constitution set the basic

conditions on which we can choose. If we respect the UN-declaration of human rights, we cannot choose between having the right to a decent state of living (cf. the citation of article 25 below) or freezing to death. We can choose, however, between the welfare state and basic income. These two possibilities for providing the material means for exercising human rights can in reality overlap. Child allowances, pensions and certain other welfare measures can be considered to be rudiments of basic income. For conceptual clarity I will oppose these two institutional arrangements. This does not imply that in reality it might reduce transition costs if the welfare state changes gradually into a basic income society.

Because a large variety exists and because most of them are changing their institutions frequently, it is difficult to describe their common essence. The three main interpretations of the idea of a „Welfare State“ according to Wikipedia (March 17, 2008) are a helpful starting point. A Welfare State is

- the provision of welfare services by the [state](#). [political aspect]
- an [ideal](#) model in which the state assumes primary responsibility for the [welfare](#) of its [citizens](#). This responsibility in theory ought to be comprehensive[[citation needed](#)], because all aspects of welfare are considered and universally applied to citizens as a right. 'Welfare state' can also mean the creation of a "safety net" of minimum standards[[citation needed](#)] of varying forms of welfare. Here is found some confusion between a "welfare state" and a "welfare society" (see below) in common debate about the definition of the term. [scientific aspect]
- the provision of welfare in society. In many "welfare states", especially in continental Europe, welfare is not actually provided by the state, but by a combination of independent, voluntary, mutualist and government services. The functional provider of benefits and services may be a [central](#) or [state government](#), a state-sponsored company or agency, a private [corporation](#), a [charity](#) or another form of non-profit organisation. However, this phenomenon has been more appropriately termed a "welfare society," and the term "welfare system" has been used to describe the range of welfare state and welfare society mixes that are found.[1] [social aspect]

The term „welfare system“ does not mean that the various social expenditures complement each other systematically. Looking at the over 100 kinds of social welfare provisions in Germany (Althaus 2007, 7), it is not easy to systematize them in a meaningful way. However, already the notion of basic income helps to clarify what welfare society is all about. Let us take as starting point the definition of BIEN<sup>1</sup> to which Wikipedia refers.

„A basic income is an income unconditionally granted to all on an individual basis, without means test or work requirement. It is a form of minimum income guarantee that differs from those that now exist in various European countries in three important ways:

- it is being paid to individuals rather than households;
- it is paid irrespective of any income from other sources;
- it is paid without requiring the performance of any work or the willingness to accept a job if offered.“

For an analysis of basic income it is helpful to systematize the main reasons that support this policy measure (mostly according to BIEN):

---

1 BIEN has been standing for „Basic Income Earth Network“ since 2004. Before, it stood for „basic income european network“.

- I. General Reasons: Liberty and equality, autonomy from bosses, husbands and bureaucrats, community and common ownership of the Earth, health care and prevention, the promotion of (adult) education, and especially the dignity of the poor and of all human beings;
- II. Economic Reasons: efficiency and equal sharing in the benefits of technical progress, the flexibility of the labour market and the fight against inhumane working conditions, the viability of cooperatives and the furthering of entrepreneurship;
- III. Political Reasons: against the desertification of the countryside and against interregional inequalities, for better relations between the state and the individual, for democratic participation and voluntary work etc.

Both the market economy and the Welfare State survived a lot of changes and reforms, even wars and natural catastrophes. The constant increase in unemployment, however, brought both into difficulties. More and more scholars and politicians try to synthesize social and economic policy in order to find an equilibria on commodity and factor markets, between those who are overworked and those who cannot work, between those who get richer and those who get poorer at an increasing speed.

Before looking at the economic implications of basic income, I want to show its relation to the universal and German human rights. This will make clear that basic income is as little suited for power struggles between political parties as human rights are.

## ***II. Human Rights and Basic Income***

For some, basic income is a human right. For me it is implied in all human rights. Just as dignity is the mental aspect of all human rights, basic income is their material aspect. This I exemplify looking at a few articles of the German constitution of May 23, 1949 and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of December 10, 1948.

### **II.1) Realizing Human Rights by Means of Basic Income**

According to article 1 of the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany (German constitution), „[h]uman dignity shall be inviolable. To respect and protect it shall be the duty of all state authority.“ Together with article 2, this clearly identifies the individual as the bearer of dignity and of human rights. Families, trade unions and other institutions or associations are secondary. In clause 2 of article 1, the human rights that follow in articles 2 to 19 are announced. In section 3 these basic rights are said to „bind the legislature, the executive, and the judiciary as directly applicable law“.<sup>2</sup> From this it follows that dignity is not a right but the precondition for the formulation and enforcement of human rights.<sup>3</sup>

This precondition of human rights justifies basic income. In its memorable decision of May 29, 1990, the German Supreme Court (GSC) ruled that human dignity is violated if the state taxes the existential minimum.<sup>4</sup> Here for the first time, the future president of the

---

<sup>2</sup> I cite according to Basic Law (2000)

<sup>3</sup> In his judgments on advertisements by Benneton, the German Supreme Court (GSC) explicates this view. Cf. „Urteile vom 6. Juli 1995, Gz: I ZR 180/94 und I ZR 110/93, Fundstelle: [BGHZ](#) 130, 196“.

<sup>4</sup> Bis zum Kindergeld-Beschluß des BVerfG vom 29. Mai 1990 hätte die Frage, ob unsere Rechtsordnung eine staatliche Garantie des Existenzminimums kennt, im Ergebnis verneint werden müssen.“ Thus Prof. Neumann in his

Federal Republic wrote that human dignity implies that everybody disposes of a socio-cultural minimum in order to be able to claim her or his human rights. It is not enough that the state gives back in welfare donations what it first taxed away. It is unworthy to have to claim what is needed as a minimum. The dignity of each individual is unconditional. Consequently, the existential minimum must also be unconditional according to line of thought the German Supreme Court published between the fall of the Berlin wall and Germany became reunified on October 3, 1990.

This Supreme Court decision implies that whoever has an income below the existential minimum cannot live in dignity. This is especially obvious for those who cannot engage in gainful activity like ill, handicapped, or old people and especially children. Moreover, since in late capitalism the relation between work and income becomes less and less determinable or more and more arbitrary (Opielka 1994), this is true for everybody. Even the top earners can claim this right that their existential minimum is tax exempt.

In article two of the German constitution the primacy of the individual over any kind of community, group or state is stressed: „Every person shall have the right to free development of his personality...“ This implies most other human rights: the freedom of faith, of consciousness and of creed (article 4), the freedom of expression (5), the freedom of movement (11) etc. How can I realize these rights without some basic income? Although a lot of rich people do not lead a healthy life, it is also true that „the right to life and physical integrity“ needs some financial means.

Now it is true that Article 3 [Equality before the law] does not mention poverty as a discriminating feature: „(1) All persons shall be equal before the law.

(2) Men and women shall have equal rights. The state shall promote the actual implementation of equal rights for women and men and take steps to eliminate disadvantages that now exist.

(3) No person shall be favored or disfavored because of sex, parentage, race, language, homeland and origin, faith, or religious or political opinions. No person shall be disfavored because of disability.“ However, as I can obtain equality before the law only actively by fighting against the mentioned possible reasons for discrimination, I need financial means to get legal advice in order to take the right steps to eliminate possible disadvantages. More fundamentally, I need an education and some spare time to perceive discrimination and act upon it.

Already the ideal of equality before the law implies that I develop my personality always in relation with other people. It follows that according to article 8

„(1) All Germans shall have the right to assemble peacefully and unarmed without prior notification or permission.“ Another „social right“ is guaranteed in article 9:

„(1) All Germans shall have the right to form corporations and other associations.“ Thus I have not only the right to survive in society but also to shape society by socializing. This is not possible without financial means in a market economy with universal division of labor.

In order for mankind to survive my generation, to care for children is not only a right but also a duty according to article 6:

---

inaugural address of 19. Mai 1994 at the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. He refers to the Supreme Court Decisions BVerfGE 82, 60 und zum Kinderfreibetrag des Einkommenssteuergesetzes der Beschluß vom 12. 6. 1990 E 82, 198. Instrukтив H. H. Bowitz, Zur Übertragbarkeit des rechtlichen Ansatzes des Bundesverfassungsgerichts in den Beschlüssen vom 29. 5. 1990 und 12. 6. 1990 auf andere Fallgestaltungen, in: Deutscher Caritasverband (Hrsg.), „Alle Menschen sind vor dem Gesetz gleich“, 1992, S. 59 und D. Giese, Steuerpflicht und Sozialhilfebedürftigkeit, ZfF 1991, 151.“

(2) The care and upbringing of children is the natural right of parents and a duty primarily incumbent upon them. The state shall watch over them in the performance of this duty.“

The last provision of art. 6 lead to the increase of the existential minimum for children:

„(5) Children born outside of marriage shall be provided by legislation with the same opportunities for physical and mental development and for their position in society as are enjoyed by those born within marriage.“ It follows that the government helps parents in bearing the costs of raising and educating children.

The first time the German Supreme Court ruled that an institutionen is entitled to subsidies because of a basic right was with regard to article 7 on schools in 1987:

„(4) The right to establish private schools shall be guaranteed. Private schools that serve as alternatives to state schools shall require the approval of the State and shall be subject to the laws of the Länder. Such approval shall be given when private schools are not inferior to the state schools in terms of their educational aims, their facilities, or the professional training of their teaching staff, and when segregation of pupils according to the means of their parents will not be encouraged thereby. Approval shall be withheld if the economic and legal position of the teaching staff is not adequately assured.“ If non-state schools have to assure the economic position of the teachers and cannot choose pupils according to the means of their parents, the Länder have to fund at least the existential minimum of such free schools. This institutional minimum is as controversial as the individual minimum.

As mentioned before, the debate on basic income broadened before the background of increasing unemployment even in times of (slight) economic growth. This is not only a sad externality of increasing productivity but a human right violation. In Article 12 the German Basic law garantees occupational freedom and prohibits forced labor:

„(1) All Germans shall have the right freely to choose their occupation or profession, their place of work, and their place of training. ...

(2) No person may be required to perform work of a particular kind except within the framework of a traditional duty of community service that applies generally and equally to all.

(3) Forced labor may be imposed only on persons deprived of their liberty

by the judgment of a court.“

I do not have the right to be gainfully employed in the profession I choose but I have the right to perform it. At the same time, no law like Hartz IV (Sozialgesetzbuch II) can force me to work. Therefore only a basic income without work requirement can realize this „professional right“.

That all these rights can only be exercised by those human beings who are aware of their dignity is stipulated in many provisions I omitted here. That they are void if the state does not fund the individual is implied in the first article that follows the human rights' section:

Article 20: „The Federal Republic of Germany is a democratic and social federal state.“

The state is both democratic and social. These two attributes seem to imply each other. If the social state has to respect human rights as much as the democratic state, the state has to pay some basic income.

## II 2) The Right to a Standard of Living as Universal Human Right

In the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of December 10, 1948, the relation between basic human rights and basic minimum income is even more explicit than in the German Basic Law that came into force half a year later. Article 25 does not refer to a minimum but to an adequate standard of living: „(1) Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control. In section (2) this is extended to mothers and in article 26 to education.

Whoever calls for a socio-cultural minimum can refer to „*Article 27*:

- (1) Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.
- (2) Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.

All these human rights are void if there are (world) wars. Therefore it a peaceful social and international order is a human right according to article 28. The next article related the rights to duties. „*Article 29*.

- (1) Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.
- (2) In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.“

## II 3) The Individual as Basic Income Receiver

If basic income is the material aspect of all human rights and if the bearer of human rights is in most cases the individual, it follows that basic income is paid to each individual. Paying a household minimum does not work anymore in our individualistic society.

It is quite well-known that people who are partners have two flats because then they receive more Harz IV or social welfare/benefits. Prime Minister Althaus tells his audience in Thuringia about the consequences of not paying social benefits to adult children that move out of their parents' flats: now the parents move out. This is not prohibited.

Götz Werner (2007a, 25) tells his audience about a finance minister of a German federal state who said in advance he was well prepared for a tv-debate on basic income. During the debate this politician suddenly remarked: What happens if two people live together, have ten children and live merrily of basic income? Werner suggests that people arguing in this way have a problem of how he thinks about work. Studies show that to raise three children is (like) a full-time job.

If the individual receives basic income people are induced to live together, be it as family

or flat-sharing community. They need less domestic appliances etc. Such living communities have more money for cultural goods like theaters, books etc. They can take care of children better than single parents in an apartment by themselves. Last but not least bigger households save a lot of natural resources including electricity. Paying the basic income to individuals has a similar effect as eco-taxes.

All indirect taxes are paid by individuals, no matter in what kind of households they live. In general, in order to meet the just requirements of the general welfare I have to pay taxes. This brings us to the economic aspect of basic income. Taxes need not be harmful for the individual and the (global) economy, however. It depends how they are raised and justified.

### **III. Economic Aspects of Basic Income**

Reforming the welfare state that comprises 1/3 to 1/2 of the economy requires patience, sensitivity for economic and social habits, and the power to assert oneself. Moreover it requires knowledge of the economic effects that are likely to follow from an increase in purchasing power, in a changing tax system etc. As the preceding section suggests, this economic analysis is not merely based on the *homo economicus* but also on what might be called the *homo dignitus*. Thus they are based on a picture of human beings as realistic as possible. (More on it will be found in the next section of this paper.) Because human habits seem to change scarcely compared to human ideas and feelings, the dynamic research will be preceded by a static analysis.

#### **III. 1) Basic Income in the Present Welfare State**

At present, there are more than 100 different social expenditures in Germany. They amount to more than 700 billion € in 2005. They are not only financed by contributions to the five social insurance types but also by 53 types of taxes and some new debt. The tax revenue amounts almost 500bn€. Only 1/3 of the population of 82 million pay contributions to the social insurances. Because there are only 1,4 children per woman, the population grows older and declines. Both the social and the income tax state have reached their limits.

The present situation is part of a vicious circle: The less people have to pay social security contributions and income taxes, the more expensive labor gets. This induces firms to build factories in so-called low-labor-cost countries. Real unemployment rises and even the cleverest statistical tricks cannot change the relation between those who pay and those who receive social security benefits.

The main problem is not really economic but social and individual. From the point of view of the world economy, there is enough production. However, many people cannot realize their human rights to live a decent life and to choose and execute their profession because the places of work tend to be in a foreign country.

According to the entrepreneur Götz Werner (2007) and others, there are enough work places, but not enough income places. How can we pay for the education and (health) care needed? The answer is a basic income financed by an increasing value added tax (VAT) and decreasing direct taxes and social security contributions. To understand this proposal, a dynamic approach is necessary.

### III 2) Financing Basic Income

Like all state expenditure, basic income can be financed by taxes, mandatory social security contributions or government dept. Although there might be some reasons why the present world economy needs a higher growth rate of the quantity of money than of the value of goods, I will focus on the alternative between burdening labor or consumption.

Mandatory social security contributions can be paid only by those employed. Since they are clearly less than half of any population, this would increase labor costs to such an extent as to surely increase unemployment. To avoid this vicious circle, some like Prime Minister Althaus (2007, p.12) from Thuringia suggest a simpler income tax. Everybody would pay 25% income tax, but would receive 800€ a month „Solidary Citizen Income“ (SCI). This is a kind of „combination wage“ for everybody. (Opielka according to Althaus 2007, 29).

Of the 800€ for adults and 500€ for children up to age 18, everybody has to pay 200€ in health insurance premium; the rest of Dieter Althaus' SCI is unconditional. This can be financed according to Thomas Straubhaar, Ingrid Hohenleitner, Michael Opielka and Michael Schramm (Althaus 2007, p.27). The director of the Hamburg Institut for World Economy, Thomas Straubhaar and his collaborator Ingrid Hohenleitner believe that the citizen income (CI) will create more than one million jobs especially in the low wage sector. If this comes true, introducing a CI might result in a surplus of over 100 billion €. <sup>5</sup>

Taking up the proposal of his friend Dr. Benediktus Hardorp (2007), Prof. Götz Werner goes all the way in reducing labor costs. Both argue that a global market economy presupposes a value added tax (VAT) with various tax scales. What are the possible effects of basic income financed by a value added tax on the purely economic factors like production, circulation and consumption?

a) If there are no profit and income taxes (Erwerbsteuern), there are less reasons for enterprises to produce abroad and more reasons for foreigners to invest in the home country. Thus, production will be basically limited by consumption, be it at home or abroad. Exports, however, will be cheaper if their prices do not include any taxes on incomes and profits.

b) The difference between a sales and a value added tax is that the latter is only due at the end of the value chain (Wertschöpfungskette, Werner 207). Income and profit taxes are added at each stage of the value chain. Therefore a value added tax is neutral with regard to the circulation of goods. It allows for the most efficient allocation of resources and outlets.

c) It is a common view that a high value added tax hurts consumption. If we look at the incident of total taxation, this view will turn out to be wrong. All firms pass on most taxes, they price them in. In a fairly competitive market, it is the consumer that pays all taxes. In 2007, the German Uncle Peer (Steinbrück) received about €170bn in income and €170bn in value added taxes (including import tax) <sup>6</sup> If the income tax was abolished and the value added tax doubled, Uncle Peer would receive the same amount and consumers could purchase the same amount of goods. In a static environment, the net-prices would sink

---

5 Das Hamburgische Weltwirtschaftsinstitut (HWWI) hält „Überschüsse von bis zu über 100 Mrd. Euro durch die Einführung des Solidarischen Bürgergeldes für möglich...“. (Althaus 2007, p. 29)

6 Einfuhrumsatzsteuer. Cf. [www.bundesfinanzministerium.de](http://www.bundesfinanzministerium.de) In Germany, a total of €494bn was paid in taxes in 2007.



and the higher value added tax would bring them to their previous level. (In imperfect markets, this might be different, but over the world economy, the dynamic effect of changing to consumer taxation will most probably outweigh any distortions in less than perfect markets.)

From the point of view of tax psychology, it is better to levy consumer taxes than income taxes. When I receive money after I worked hard, I am less ready to share what I just got than when I consume. When I buy necessary things, I find that the value added tax is lower than when I buy things that please me. I am more ready to pay a 50% tax on chocolate than on bread. Any Uncle Peer who wants to levy enough taxes to pay a decent basic income will watch how consumers react to which tax scale. If we tax only consumption, we can share between us and society in a way that does not harm the economy and the relation between the state and the economy. More important, the relation between the state and its citizens is not stressed by 53 taxes and 1000 loopholes alone in the income tax chaos. When taxes are clear and unavoidable, I am more ready to pay them, especially if I know that they are used for basic income and I receive it like everybody else. Taxing is always a way of sharing, as Werner (2007) stresses.

Now I can answer the often heard question why basic income should be paid irrespective of any income from other sources. If there is not basic exemption (Grundfreibetrag) to exempt the existential minimum from taxes, there has to be a basic income for everybody. Even the very rich are entitled to dignity and therefore to a basic income. As soon as they buy luxury goods they will more than finance their basic income. If many are stinchy, they will invest or save their money. This increase in capital will lower interest rates or increase productivity. Both measures will lower prices of most products and services.

What would be an appropriate basic income? This is a political question only the sovereign of a country can answer. Here I can say only that basic income to cover at least the existential minimum. Since 2005, the basic tax exemption that is equal to the existential minimum has amounted to €7664.-- for each adult. For children, €3648 have been exempt plus 2160 € for child care and education<sup>7</sup>, i.e. 5708€. These amounts can easily be financed as the studies cited by Althaus (2007) showed (cf. above).

These tax exemptions are based on a report on the existential minimum to the government. The basic income could also change according to the price level or the average income. Then it could always be financed.

### III 3) Basic Income in a Dynamic World Economy

Even the opponents of basic income suppose that this way of enhancing human rights will make a country more attractive. They suppose, however, that basic income will attract the wrong people, whoever they are. This is not as evident as bias suggests.

The above argument about the advantages of a value added tax for production and circulation showed that production and trade will increase and hence the demand for labor. So it might be helpful if more people than now ask to receive a work permit in the country that introduces a basic income financed by the value added tax.

---

<sup>7</sup> Zur Steuerfreistellung des Kinderexistenzminimums wird nach § 32 Abs. 6 EStG zusätzlich zum Kinderfreibetrag in den Jahren 2000 und 2001 ein Betreuungsfreibetrag von 1.546 € und seit dem Jahr 2002 ein Freibetrag für den Betreuungs- und Erziehungs- oder Ausbildungsbedarf von 2.160 € gewährt. Cf. „Grundfreibetrag“ in Wikipedia 3/18/08.

There is no need, however, to change immigration laws and regulations on work permits. Whoever wants to receive basic income might have to reside in the country that grants it for several years. It might also be attached to some language and citizen tests. Even great differences in the standard of living between countries have not led to unsolvable problems in migration.

If basic income makes a country attractive, there is no reason why other countries will not introduce it themselves. There might be as many basic incomes and ways of financing as there are now social security schemes. To say that the wrong people will be attracted by basic income is to fear its success or that most people will stop working. In the following final section I will look at these cultural arguments.

#### ***IV. Cultural Dimensions of Basic Income***

The main cultural reasons for basic income I mentioned above. It enhances freedom, it introduces equality and it furthers solidarity.

If I am free to work I can best serve society because then I work according to my abilities. Therefore most lists of human rights reject the compulsory work required by some social security schemes. When my motives for work are less money or subsistence, I am more creative. Because many more services will be recognized as work, unemployment will be reduced and dismissals are reduced.

If everybody receives the same amount from the government, there will be less greed or that one might know a trick to get more than another. Transfer payments will either increase for everybody or not at all. For those who cannot live of the regular basic income Althaus (2007, 12) suggests a supplement which is not unconditional.

If nobody is needy anymore, solidarity in society could decrease. However, if there is no supplement by the state for the handicapped or single parents, these could go to individuals or charitable institutions for a supplement. If everybody knows what everybody else gets it is easier to donate money than when it is not clear who receives what amount for having a handicap or a chronic illness. Furthermore, on the international level, the poor and needy will stay with us, probably until the end of our planet.

The most common argument against basic income is that then too few people would work. This implies that most people work only in order to survive. There is plenty of empirical evidence that this is not true. In Germany, the famous HarzIV law allows people to work 30 hours a week for €1 to 1,50. There are more people looking for such a 1-Euro-Job than there such jobs in government or non-profit institutions. There are also many people who work voluntarily. In fact, without such 'work for nothing', babies would not be born or starve to death, many theatres and orchestras could not survive and a lot of political bodies would be out of representatives.

Most people believe of themselves to keep on working, even when they would win a lot of money in a lottery. They are afraid, however, that others will probably stop working when they receive 50 or 60% of the average income. It is strange indeed that most people have a better picture of themselves than of those surrounding them. Nevertheless, they consult them as physicians, lawyers, send their children to their schools and buy their food, houses and even cars.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> For utterings of what people would do if they received a basic income, cf. [www.waswuerdensietun.de](http://www.waswuerdensietun.de)

For children, basic income would mean that they are no longer a financial burden for their parents. (cf. Krollmann 2008) For adults it would mean that they could realize better their human rights. For pensioners it would mean that they have means like everybody else plus what they saved during their working life. For society basic income would be a change to address the important problems and tackle the exciting tasks like saving the planet and becoming a self-determined individual. (Rehn 2007) Clearly, basic income would further the dignity of human beings.

## Bibliography for Basic Income Studies

- Althaus, Dieter (2007) *Solidarisches Bürgergeld. sicher – sozial – frei. Ein Konzept für den Sozialstaat von morgen.* 51pp. Thüringer Staatskanzlei. Regierungsstr. 73, 99084 Erfurt.
- Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany*. Text edition – Status: December 2000  
Publisher: German Bundestag – Administration – Public Relations section Berlin, 2001  
Overall production: Ebner Ulm. With a Foreword by the Federal President
- Friedman, Milton (1962) *Capitalism and Freedom.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hardorp, Benediktus (2007) „Ausgaben- statt Einkommenssteuer! Der Weg der Finanzierung“ in Mackay 2007, pp. 57-72
- Holzknicht, Ruth; Paulus, Wilfried (1996, Redaktion) *Dokumentation Steuern und Abgaben.* Sankt Augustin : COMDOK, 1996; 195pp. (Redaktion Gerhart Raichle) „5. Pro und Contra Negativsteuer („Bürgergeld“)“ S. 137-158.
- Kaltenborn, Bruno (1995) *Modelle der Grundsicherung: Ein systematischer Vergleich.* Baden-Baden : Nomos; 142pp. (Schriftenreihe des ZEW) (Bruno Kaltenborn, Mitarbeiter im Forschungsbereich Arbeitsmärkte, Personalmanagement und Soziale Sicherung des zentrums für Europäische Wirtschaftsforschung, Mannheim) [UB Halle A535 96.1071/01]
- Kaltenborn, Bruno (1998<sup>2</sup>) *Von der Sozialhilfe zu einer zukunftsfähigen Grundsicherung.* Baden-Baden : Nomos; 203pp. [UB Halle A535 2Ka1]
- Krollmann, Anne (2008) *Das bedingungslose Grundeinkommen.* 51pp. Projektarbeit an der Freien Waldorfschule Eisenach/Wartburgkreis e.V., Ernst-Thälmann-Str.62-64, 99817 Eisenach; Betreuer Herr Hanel ([info@waldorfschule-eisenach.de](mailto:info@waldorfschule-eisenach.de))
- Leisering, Lutz/Buhr, Petra/Traiser-Diop, Ute (2006) *Soziale Grundsicherung in der Weltgesellschaft. Monetäre Mindestsicherungssysteme in den Ländern des Südens und des Nordens. Weltweiter Survey und theoretische Verortung.* Mit einem Beitrag von Bernd Schubert. Bielefeld : transcript; 340pp.
- Mackay, Paul/Rösch, Ulrich (2007) *Grundeinkommen für jeden Menschen. Eine Herausforderung für Europa?* Mit einem Geleitwort von Paul Mackay und Beiträgen von Benediktus Hardorp, Götz E. Rehn, Ulrich Rösch, Matthias Spielkamp, Götz W. Werner. Dornach(Schweiz) : Verlag am Goetheanum; 96 pp. 14€ (Von den Vortragenden redigierte Beiträge vom Zukunftskongress zu Michaeli 29.9.-1.10.2006 am Goetheanum.)
- Neumann, Volker (1994) *Menschenwürde und Existenzminimum.* Antrittsvorlesung 19. Mai 1994 Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin Juristische Fakultät Institut für Öffentliches Recht und Völkerrecht (Der Erstabdruck dieses Textes erfolgte in: "Neue Zeitschrift für Verwaltungsrecht" (NVwZ) 1995, S. 426. Herausgeberin: Die Präsidentin der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin Prof. Dr. Marlis Dürkop. Copyright: Alle Rechte liegen beim Verfasser Redaktion: Gudrun Kramer Forschungsabteilung der Humboldt-Universität Unter den Linden 6 10099 Berlin. Heft 52. Redaktionsschluß: 14. 07. 1995
- Rehn, Götz E. (2007) „Gesellschaft neu denken: über die Neugestaltung von Wirtschafts- und Kulturleben“ pp. 73-85 in Mackay 2007.
- Schmidt, Thomas (1984, ed.) *Befreiung von falscher Arbeit.* Thesen zum garantierten Mindesteinkommen. Berlin : Klaus Wagenbach; 143pp.

*Social Security at a glance.* 156pp. Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs. Order no.: A 998. Phone: 01805-5151510/1=Fax. [info@bmas.bund.de](mailto:info@bmas.bund.de)

Vanderborght, Yannick/Van Parijs, Philippe (2005) *Ein Grundeinkommen für alle? Geschichte und Zukunft eines radikalen Vorschlags.* Mit einem Nachwort von Claus Offe. Frankfurt/New York : campus; 167pp.

Werner, Götz W. (2007) *Einkommen für alle.* Köln : Kiepenheuer & Witsch; 222pp. (Mitarbeit: Enrik Lauer, Berlin und Regine Müller, Düsseldorf)

Werner, Götz W. (2007a) „Grundeinkommen: bedingungslos – Kulturminimum: unbedingt“ pp. 25-38 in Mackay 2007.

Werner, Götz W. (2006) *Ein Grund für die Zukunft: das Grundeinkommen. Interviews und Reaktionen.* 4<sup>th</sup> edition. Stuttgart : Verlag Freies Geistesleben; 128pp. 5€