

UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

SCHOOL OF SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL POLICY

Online Submission of Assessed Work

Student ID number	201193726
Degree programme	MA Social and Political Thought
Module code	SLSP5400M
Module title	Dissertation
Essay Title	What is the Problem with Basic Income? A Critical Evaluation of the Debates, Ideological Foundations and Perceptions of Young Adults towards the Concept
Word count	11,999

Disabled students with additional support needs agreed by Disability Services should tick the appropriate box

I have been assessed as having:

Dyslexia	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dyspraxia	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify)	<input type="text"/>

Department of Sociology and Social Policy

Social and Political Thought MA

University of Leeds

August 2018

Masters Dissertation

What is the Problem with Basic Income? A Critical Evaluation of the Debates, Ideological Foundations and Perceptions of Young Adults towards the Concept

Carlos A. Montaño García

A research dissertation submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of MA Social and Political Thought
at the University of Leeds

Abstract

Basic income constitutes an increasingly common discussion in the public debates. There is a growing sense of uncertainty derived from a combination of deregulatory policies, new technologies and climate change. Economic insecurity has been thus normalised in young people's lives. Within the European context, current experiments related to basic income struggle to attain a broader public acceptance. Therefore, by considering the perspectives of young people aged 24-29, the findings of this research show:

- ❖ The problem-resolution approach of these experiments hinders the political acceptance and broader social support of the idea of basic income.
- ❖ Universal humanism as the core ideological foundation of basic income sabotage the idea itself. The arguments of freedom are questioned by notions of young people towards human nature.
- ❖ According to the perceptions of young people, there seems to be a disconnection between the ideological conceptions of basic income and the problems of the twenty-first century.

Based on the research findings, it is evident that the universal humanism from modernity hampers the ability of policies like basic income to prosper and to have wider public support. This study proposes to rethink modernity's human-centred ideologies and reprioritise them into a comprehensible agenda for this century.

Acknowledgments

Appreciation is due to the many people that accompanied me through this journey. Firstly, I want to thank my family for all their support and for believing in me the whole time. Also, to my course mates from the Social and Political Thought MA since without them, I would have never been able to generate the ideas necessary to write this research. Special thanks also to the Bauman Institute by facilitating the economic means for me to be here through the Zygmunt Bauman Award. And to Professor Mark Davis and my supervisor Dr. Jack Palmer for their insights and intellectual support.

Table of Contents

Introduction	5
Methodology	7
Chapter I.....	9
Chapter II.....	17
Chapter III.....	26
Conclusion.....	36
Bibliography	40
Appendices.....	49
<i>Appendix 1</i>	49
<i>Appendix 2</i>	50
<i>Appendix 3</i>	58
<i>Appendix 4</i>	65
<i>Appendix 5</i>	72
<i>Appendix 6</i>	77
<i>Appendix 7</i>	82
<i>Appendix 8</i>	85
Annex	90

Introduction

Basic income – BI henceforth – is increasingly becoming a common discussion in the public debates. The reason? A growing feeling of economic uncertainty and precarity. In the past forty years, public goods have been privatised, and societies financialised (Davis & Cartwright, forthcoming, 2018). Parallel to these, subtler but equally disruptive happenings are taking place. Man-induced ecological degradation and rapid technological advancements are drastically transforming social relations. Younger generations have grown within a context of unsustainable practices – ranging from environmental, to economic and political. The result is one where the sum of deregulatory policies, has led to a reality where uncertainty is the new normal for them. (Krugman, 2012; Orton, 2015; Alberti, et al., 2018)

Overall, the combined effect of these events has resulted in the liquification of what used to be the promise of modernity (Bauman, 2000). Lives have been deferred to feed the machinery that keeps alive the obsolete and distorted notions of freedom and the individual pursuit of happiness. Cries recalling universalisms and utopias from the exile demand radical responses to attend humanity in uncertain times, and BI has attended that call.

As BI constitutes the case study of this research, it is examined through the perceptions of young people. Thus, the aim of this investigation is not to advocate for a BI – nor to dismiss it –, but to analyse its foundations and evaluate the extent to which it resonates with the concerns of younger generations, and their reality in the twenty-first century. Further research is needed on controversial initiatives such as BI, as current uncertainties make young people a vulnerable group (ILO, 2017b). Their sense of security is compromised, and this poses a threat to the possibility of building more sustainable societies in the future.

Throughout the research, the theoretical analysis is based on Zygmunt Bauman's ideas on liquid modernity. Additionally, the participants' views are constantly regarded throughout the study, as it is explained in the methodology section. Parting from the definition of BI, this investigation discusses the idea and draws on the political and intellectual debates around it. The analysis is supported by the comparative case study

of existing basic income-like projects with governmental support in Europe i.e. Utrecht and Finland.

Chapter I bases its analysis on Philippe van Parijs and Guy Standing's work on basic income and their notions of freedom and social justice, as these remain crucial in the debates. By expounding the current state of affairs around BI and define its practical particularities, Chapter II delves into its ideological foundations. The theoretical analysis uses a combination of post-structuralist and post-modern approaches. This, to put into perspective the potential limitations that basic income could have, pragmatically and ideologically.

One of the most important elements of the research overall, is the analysis of the universal aspect, as it further stems into concepts such as human nature, freedom, power and consumerism. The interrelation of the outcomes delineated above, is further contrasted with the findings and the analysis of the global context, to provide a better understanding of the social, political and economic interweaving. Therefore, Chapter III uses a multidisciplinary analysis drawing its theoretical framework from notions of social policy, economics and psychology.

Methodology

This research uses an abductive strategy, by placing the participants at the centre of the study, incorporating their meanings, interpretations and motives in their daily lives (Giddens cited in Blaikie, 2000). This serves to develop theories by considering the life experiences of the respondents, and drawing descriptions based on their own perceptions towards the idea of BI. In this sense, the qualitative research follows a realist methodological approach to sampling and interviewing (Emmel, 2013; Manzano, 2016). The realist approach in turn, considers a ‘zigzag’ route for research due to the relative enduring reality of the social world (Emmel, 2013, p. 19). Ideas – BI – are presented, to be tested and refined through engagement with evidence.

For the intentions of this investigation, the sample considers a multicultural selection of young adults aged 24-29 from different socio-economic backgrounds. Relevant subjects were met by using a ‘snowball’ or network sampling method (Sampieri, et al., 2010) through personal acquaintances. The importance of considering a multicultural sample lies in their impressions as a generation by contrasting their perceptions of local realities to global concerns. The profiles of each participant can be consulted in the Appendices section of this research. To protect the participants’ anonymity, information regarding clues of their identity is not found throughout the research. Though, it is important to mention that some interviews were performed in Spanish. The evidence is later translated throughout the study.

Following the abductive approach of this investigation, the aim is not to contrast their national backgrounds but to find common meanings and search for gaps in their understanding of BI (Blaikie, 2000, p. 99) from a generational standpoint. Interviews were performed in neutral settings such as cafes and other public spaces in the city centre. In the cases where subjects reside abroad, they were contacted via Skype. Documentation of data is performed by audio recording and further transcription (Flick, 2014). To better understand the perceptions of the participants, the research uses a semi-structured interviewing method (Sampieri, et al., 2010, p. 397). Therefore, a set of eight pre-elaborated questions aim to elucidate the respondents’ interpretations of the social interweaving (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) and the idea of BI.

The list of questions can be found in the Appendix section of the dissertation. In each interview, the open-ended structure of some questions led to the formulation of other questions related with either the topic or the participants' life experiences. By using a realist interviewing process, the interviewees were taught about the idea of BI for them to confirm, falsify and basically, refine the concept (Manzano, 2016, p. 344). The first part of the interview – questions 1 to 4 – intends to a) build rapport with the participant, and b) know more about his or her socio-economic reality. Following this, participants were introduced to the concept of BI to build a 'teacher-learner' cycle that could help for the aim of further testing the concept with the evidence. (Emmel, 2013, p. 19)

Evidence can be found along the research. However, in Chapter III empirical evidence is developed through triangulation (Flick, 2014, pp. 10-11) with the analysis from previous chapters, as well as qualitative and secondary quantitative data. Parting from a 'liquid' approach to the problem (Bauman, 2000), the 'macro' elements are continuously contrasted with the 'micro' components. In this sense, the macro constitutes the processes that influence the social life – e.g. economy, politics, ideology. The micro on the other hand, young people and their subjective views towards BI. This to better grasp the logic behind abstract conceptions in relation to the social intertwining.

Chapter I

Basic Income: Critical Analysis of the Debates

"The unstructured, fluid state of the immediate setting of life-politics, change the human condition in a radical way and call for a rethinking of all concepts."

- Zygmunt Bauman (1925-2017)

Philippe van Parijs (2017) defines basic income – BI henceforth – as an income regularly paid in cash to every individual in a society, irrespective of other sources of earnings he/she might have and with no strings attached. The discussions around the idea stem in many directions – ranging from philosophical to pragmatic justifications, as well as perspectives from the political left and right. It is suggested it could enhance social justice (van Parijs, 1992) and drive society to reprioritise its values. From merely economic to those related with freedom and time instead, thus challenging the current notions of social life. These beliefs around the potential of BI to promote economic security, social justice and freedom correspond to its philosophical basis. (Standing, 2017)

Standing (Ibid. p. 25) defines social justice as one of the prime arguments to support a BI. He suggests that a BI should be an economic right, as it would consequently become a guarantee of economic security. By relating with the concept of social justice, the logic of BI as a right is based in the assertion that the collective character of wealth, would set people free from the restraints of the labour market (Orton, 2008). In theory, this could cause a disruption in the waged labour system, reshaping the current understanding of work and letting individuals select activities of more relevance to them.

Social justice therefore, as part of the philosophical side of the BI must be understood as the way to assure a secure livelihood, detaching individuals from the dependency and obligation to participate in the labour market to sustain themselves. Key areas of the social life that require plenty of time and are vital in order to maintain good living standards such as care for the young and old, or care for the environment, are sometimes disregarded due to the demands of the labour market (Bauman, 1999). This suggests that a BI could bring the confidence for individuals to choose between the exchange and use-

value of their time, for them to address such areas that are of great concern for the social life. (Gorz, 1999)

This implied outcome of BI involves the notion of freedom, which can be described from different angles. It constitutes a highly important element in the debates, as it defines the meanings and positions on BI. Real freedom according to van Parijs (2004), must involve the pursuit of the realisation of one's version of a good life e.g. performing enjoyable activities, getting a job, consuming or whatever it might be. This libertarian approach to freedom is to some extent needed in the debates. However, one of the main critiques to this perspective is that it might encourage an irresponsible use of it because, some more than others, might find more complicated to translate a BI into libertarian freedom. (Anderson, 2001)

In other words, such version of freedom could eventually leave certain groups in society behind. It would force them to compete in the pursuit of rewards and consequently, limit their own freedom, since it cannot be earned individually against the rest of society. In contrast, republican freedom involves the collective actions of individuals and could serve by complementing the domestic sphere of the libertarian version. Such freedom of association requires individuals to make rational decisions as a collective entity (Standing, 2017, p. 59). For this aspect of freedom to be real, individuals should be provided with adequate resources. In this sense, individual choices towards the pursuit of one's aspirations are in fact, linked to the extent to which these resources are supplied by the state. (Orton, 2008)

From a normative perspective, individual freedom should be an outcome of the unified actions towards the benefit of all society. Standing (2017) indicates that republican freedom and social justice comprise the most legitimate arguments to advocate for a BI. The logic behind this is that a republican notion of freedom would help empowering vulnerable sectors of society and incorporate them in the collective decisions. This would result in turning BI into an emancipatory force. These assertions nevertheless, are still considered secondary in the public debates.

More pragmatic proponents declare that the approach should be one of outcome evaluation, rather than the transformation of the social order; in case it is implemented

(Offe, 1992). In fact, more pragmatic justifications dominate the nature of current experiments in Europe, as it will be explained later in this chapter. According to Loek Groot and Robert van der Veen (2000), philosophical justifications involve a significant level of abstraction, as these have to face disagreements about social unfairness – e.g. handing money to able-bodied people who are unwilling to work for a living. Their pragmatic focus is based in the argument that it would move the proposal to the institutional agenda by accommodating two of welfare state's main targets – full employment and poverty alleviation. (Beveridge, 1942; Morel, et al., 2012)

It is important to devote efforts to address these issues indeed. However, introducing BI as a social policy mean to solve the 'problem of the poor' (Bauman, 1999, p. 183), frustrates its political recognition and broader social support. In fact, the findings from the qualitative interviews show a strong class debate among young people. For example, Participant 1 describes his preoccupation around the possibility that a BI could turn income inequality around. He explains that implementing a BI in densely populated poor communities would break the 'economic traditions' since families from these populations tend to be very large. "*There would be more affluence in the mountains and external localities than in the city. It would be a terrible destabilisation because a lot of people depend on this workforce*"¹.

He elucidates the reality of his own family of three members, with that of his grandmother's cleaning lady of eleven members. "*If we are earning – considering my partner and I – 3,000 USD, those people would be earning 30,000 dollars*" (Appendix 2). Although this is a reality in some developing countries, reconciling the 'problem-resolution' approach of BI with the class divide is the idea's main obstacle towards a broader social support. Similarly, Participant 3 states that poor people would regard the BI as something they are entitled to just because they are poor: "*if you do not have a working culture education, you would think that the state simply has to provide everything to you*"². (Appendix 4)

On the contrary, participants living in developed countries side with the idea that a BI should not be provided to higher social classes, arguing that these do not need it.

¹ Translated from Spanish

² Translated from Spanish

However, there are a couple of contrasting cases with more affluent backgrounds. On the one hand, respondent 4 admits that a BI would not make much of a difference in his life, but he would use the BI as a safety net: "*I would not have thoughts necessarily on my existence once I'm laid off, or once I quit my job, so I also take that money and just breach the gap between two jobs*" (Appendix 5). On the other hand, Participant 6 (Appendix 7) – comes from a family of prominent lawyers and studied law as well – argues that a BI would let her follow her passion. By mentioning this, it could be implied there was some family pressure in the decision that took Participant 6 to become a lawyer.

It is interesting to notice that coming from an affluent background does not mean that a BI would not be useful. In this sense, more attention should be paid to the emancipatory effects it could have – even with people in more privileged positions. Therefore, directing the discourse towards the 'consequential' aspects of BI (Bauman, 1999; Standing, 2017), narrows the discussion as another mean of poverty alleviation. For instance, some perceptions about the possible effects of BI in people's lives are correlated to those of welfare benefits as Participant 5 infers: "*It feels like it would be compared to people that live of benefits now in Holland. Some of these people... they just sit around*". (Appendix 6)

The dominant presence of pragmatic justifications in the overall discussions, might help to clarify the fact that on-going projects with governmental support in Europe, are presented as policies to address poverty and unemployment. There are two initiatives within the European Union that illustrate the debate: the Finnish experiment and the Utrecht social assistance programme in the Netherlands.

The 2015 Participation Act implementation in the Netherlands caused that several municipalities coalesced in reaction to it – as it hardened welfare support conditions (McFarland, 2017a). Initially, the municipalities advocated for some form of BI (Blommesteijn & van Waveren, 2015) but as Dr. Sanders explains – researcher appointed to conduct the investigations (Utrecht University, 2017) –, these are not BI experiments *per se*. However, in socio-political and philosophical terms they share some aspects in common with it (Annex 1). The design of these initiatives is framed within the present basic welfare system in the Netherlands – 'bijstand' –, as some form of last resort for individuals with an insufficient income from other sources. (Hoeijmakers, 2016)

Similarly, the Utrecht experiment intends to test the effects of minimising the conditions attached to welfare support and removing the poverty trap (Standing, 2017, p. 263). The follow-up studies will evaluate the impacts on outflow to work, well-being, health and happiness of people that are currently on benefits (Annex 1). It proposes to let people be freer and offer to help on a voluntary basis, to balance the strict nature of the Dutch Participation Act (Utrecht University, 2017). Results will follow in two years since, according to Dr. Sanders, the evaluators are in the stage of completing the selection of the participants. The outcomes will be evaluated by the collaborative efforts of the Utrecht University and the City of Utrecht. (Utrecht University, 2017)

While the follow-up research considers more qualitative outcomes, it hardly relates to what the BI stands for. Governmental pressures and the Participation Act have had an impact on the final policy. For instance, one of its features involve subjects having their benefits reduced if during the experiment they acquire a waged job (McFarland, 2017a; Utrecht University, 2017). The benefit will depend on the household and income conditions and is definitely not intended to be unconditional. (McFarland, 2017b)

Contrary to the Utrecht experiment, the Finnish initiative targets individuals and is unconditionally provided, hence no means-tested. It was designed by the Finland's National Insurance Agency – Kela –, further implemented in 2017 and it is programmed for a period of two years (Kela, 2017). The sample considers 2,000 unemployed beneficiaries of the agency, selected at random and each one receives a tax-free income of €560 per month (Kela, 2016). Contrary to its Dutch counterpart, the Finnish social experiment is in fact envisioned as a BI. (Kangas & Simanainen, 2017)

It contemplates two main purposes. First, to estimate the variations of employment rates between test subjects and the rest of the Kela beneficiaries. Second, to evaluate the effects that a simplification in the social security system and cash incentives will have on the employment rate of the selected beneficiaries (*Ibid*). To measure the results, the studies will consider as main outcomes work volume, employment and income; leaving health, social relations, economic stress and general well-being as 'secondary' outcomes (Kangas, 2018). The pragmatic approach towards the experiment's results, relegates it as another 'crisis management' initiative. Bauman (1999, p. 183) states that a BI framed as a one-issue policy, would barely turn it into a vision-guided strategy for the polity.

In fact, the extent to which any social innovation is accepted within the political realm of any government, largely depends on the political alignment and the BI is no exception. Hence, another crucial element in the debates concern in fact to the political approach to it. The political influence could have an enormous impact on the initiative, both in its final design and the possible outcomes. Both the political right and left approaches to BI, consider arguments in favour and against the idea. In combination with the political alignments, the discussions surrounding BI are turned into the perfect arena to witness theory meeting practice.

For instance, the Utrecht experiment found in the central government one of its main challenges as it is controlled by the right-wing VVD (Standing, 2017, p. 263). In the Finnish case, it was Juha Sipilä's right-wing government that decided to approve the experiment. Considering the pragmatic design of the Finnish initiative, it aligns with Sipilä's government concerns of diminishing working disincentives and income traps since it argues these weaken the social transfer system in Finland (Kangas & Kalliomaa-Puha, 2016). Both the Dutch and Finnish cases, contradict the common assumption about right-wing administrations as antagonistic to the concept of BI, since these believe it could be a possible creator of layabouts that receive free cash with no requirement to work for it. (Dolan, 2014)

Even though in recent years the idea of BI has been mostly debated from the left (van Parijs, 2018), right-wing advocates are as numerous and have been long-established in the discussions. In the past, Milton Friedman (1962, p. 158) as one of the main thinkers behind neoliberalism, proposed a negative income tax – not a BI *per se* (Standing, 2017, pp. 7-8) – as a way to set a ‘floor’ to prevent individuals from falling into poverty. Contemporary right-wing proponents in line with the liberal tradition, believe in keeping a small state. According to Charles Murray (2006), a BI should be a mean to abolish welfare programmes – even social security – and must stay aside from any political faction.

Alternative right-wing proposals advocate for a BI from a diverse range of angles. From minimising bureaucracy to aiding the labour market to adapt to the potential loss of low-skilled jobs (Gordon, 2014). In fact, arguments supported by Silicon Valley tech companies (Talks at Google, 2017) and business leaders such as Elon Musk or Mark Zuckerberg imply

that artificial intelligence will cause job displacement in the near future (Carmody, 2017). These arguments precisely, drive the non-libertarian left to refuse the BI as they perceive it as a strategy from the right and corporations to break apart the welfare system. (Standing, 2017, p. 54)

Similar arguments from the left imply that a BI could be a response to the decreasing labour demand due to automation and the decline of labour supply due to the shortening of the workweek (2015). In the same line, Rutger Bregman (2017, p. 199) suggests that in light of automation, job displacement and the reduction of the workweek, the remedy would be a massive redistribution of capital in the form of BI. Along with globalisation and neoliberal policies, one of the outcomes has been a growing ‘precariat’. As defined by Guy Standing (2011), it comprises millions of people around the globe facing economic insecurity (UNDP, 1994), hence referring to the BI as necessary for the twenty-first century.

For van Parijs (2004), the implementation of a BI should follow the continuation of a welfare system over a workfare, as the latter would arguably constitute a costlier mean for poverty alleviation and the acquisition of social security. The empirical evidence of this study suggests that fears of losing social security constitute a source of uncertainty among young adults towards the idea of BI, as Participant 1 explains: “*I would be worried what would be the cost. I mean, would I have to give up my social security?*”³.

Substantially, the main divide within the debates concerns to the permanence of the welfare state. International organisms such as the International Labor Organisation – ILO – (2017) indicate that a neoliberal design of a BI could potentially increase inequalities and could follow the marketization of social services (Srnicek & Williams, 2015, p. 119). In a context in which welfare services are weak or non-existent, direct money transactions to the people could hinder the collective bargaining power of the individuals. Likewise, the factions of the left in favour of the initiative advocate for a BI that works in combination with the welfare system.

In a normative sense and just as the welfare state was formulated in its time, a BI policy must be supported by true political commitment, beyond any partisan or political

³ Translated from Spanish

allegiance (Bauman, 1999). Coupled with the political challenges, the pragmatic nature of the current BI initiatives could explain a reason why the BI still lacks a more amplified support from young adults – as the empirical evidence of this research suggest. A limited ‘problem-solution’ approach makes it seem as another ‘band-aid’ policy, as some participants infer. In fact, the experiments described previously are reduced to productivity and efficiency (Bregman, 2017). This approach could thwart the estimations of the so-called ‘secondary’ outcomes (Kangas, 2018) – e.g. health, general well-being and care.

Although said experiments could be an initial step that leads to a fully implemented BI, their permanence is tied to the likes of the political factions in turn. Strategically therefore, presenting a BI to address unemployment and welfare traps – as important as it might be –, hinders its political acceptance and broader social support. The pragmatism attached to such initiatives could alter the expected outcomes and, if the results are not positive in the eyes of the society, media or the polity – or all in the worst-case scenario –, it could jeopardise the idea itself. Regardless if the experiments are officially defined as a BI or not, if the idea behind these is to attain more equality and social justice, then the vision-guided strategy behind the policy must be revisited. Or created, if that is the case.

Chapter II

The Postmodern Paradox: The Individual, the State and the Universal

*"We are not what we are, but what we have become;
we are not natural beings".*

- G.I. Gurdjieff (1866-1949)

As explained in the last chapter, the main challenges that current BI-like pilots in Europe face, is their pragmatism and the political acceptance. A problem of design and a political one. Beginning with the problem of design, the pragmatic nature of such experiments could alter their outcomes. An important downside from both Finland and Utrecht initiatives can be found in their limited timespan. It should be remarked that one of the principal characteristics of a BI is its transformative long-term capacity, both in society and the polity (Bauman, 2000; Srnicek & Williams, 2015; Standing, 2017). Therefore, two-year results cannot fully define whether a BI works or not – specially, regarding the Finnish experiment as it is presented as a BI. (Kangas, 2018)

To better illustrate the point, suppose that 'Subject X' was selected among a group of unemployed people to receive an unconditional payment every month. The objective is to evaluate the employability rates of the participants. Subject X is aware of the conditions that could affect receiving such benefit in the future i.e. the two-year duration of the programme and the government in turn. The limited extent of the benefit and the political unreliability, could pose a degree of uncertainty in Subject X's decisions. The motivations behind the use of this money would be influenced by uncertainty, rather than a desire to do something meaningful with it. This situation presents risks towards the very aim of the experiment, as time pressure could push Subject X to take any paid job – regardless of its quality –, since the monthly benefit might end one day.

Time therefore, ceases to be a measure of value and it is replaced by money. A rather pragmatic abstraction (Watts, 2007) that could be defined as an economic value consisting in the reciprocal exchange of sacrifices, where these sacrifices exist in the space between desire and immediate enjoyment (Simmel cited in Appadurai, 1988). Consequently, the money provided by the initiative might turn into an instrument that perpetuates precarious labour, since participants could be moved in fear of the

eventuality of losing the benefit. Money in this case, is a misguided motivator to evaluate employability. In fact, the qualitative interviews show that young adults present an interesting link between money as a motivator, and work.

Participant 5 is passionate about her part-time job at her university's Green Office. However, when asked if this would instead be an unpaid position, she admits she would not stay. Later, she continues with the example of another sustainability organisation run by students: "*they are not getting paid and you can clearly see the differences. Like you feel less responsibility if you are not getting paid for it*" (Appendix 6). Work is not a social convention anymore but rather, it is regarded as a mean to "earn a living". (Weeks, 2011)

In this fluid consumer-friendly postmodern society (Bauman, 2000), earning a living takes a different turn as it is not necessarily related to the satisfaction of needs, but to the consummation of desires. Money becomes the instrument through which consumers find their freedom and the meaning of their self-expression in the marketplace (Bauman, 2000; Mason, 2015; Raworth, 2017). Consumerism as the present life-policy, raises concerns among young adults' perception of BI effects on people's behaviour, driving the debate to one where the individuals' use of their money and freedom is questioned.

Understandably, there is a certain degree of uncertainty about how other people might act when receiving unconditional monthly cash payments: "*I believe that people would be less stressed... but also, they might go crazy investing, and something would crack*"⁴ (Appendix 3) or "*they probably wouldn't be encouraged to work if they were getting that amount of money*" (Appendix 8). While views such as these constitute presuppositions and cannot be fully confirmed by any of the respondents, there is distrust towards what to expect from other people.

Zygmunt Bauman's (1996) definition of the postmodern society is one of a liquified state, where existence is turned into a gamble comprised of short-lived rounds and constrained by small bets that fuses with a fluid public agenda, devoid of any long-term compromises. Such combination prolongs the development of a scarcity mindset (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013) in people, making them afraid of an unstructured existence (Bauman, 2001;

⁴ Translated from Spanish

Orton, 2008). In an era of apolitical technocracy (Bregman, 2017, p. 19), social innovation projects absent of a vision-oriented strategy in combination with consumerism in society, could be a dangerous blend for any BI initiative.

This constitutes a paradox if considering the feasibility of a BI. On one hand, the band-aid approach to the policy. On the other, the consumer individual in society. Is it the individual's fault for his behaviour, or governments for their imprudence? Is the idea of a BI too much to bear to be compatible with the human nature? Are current politics the reflection of society? Or is it the other way around? To address these issues, it is necessary to analyse the ideological foundations rooted to the very core of BI as a concept. Or, as framed in the introductory paragraph of this chapter, the political challenges for BI initiatives.

Universality constitutes a fundamental aspect of a BI. From a social policy perspective, this means that it will apply to anyone that holds a residence in a given community or country (Standing, 2017, p. 5), in accordance with the principles for social equality (Titmuss, 2008). Universality is a concept that should be understood as a perpetual process of renegotiation and contestation of its own official content (Zizek, 2000), and it is permeated by particularities (Gramsci cited in Butler, 2000). In the case of the BI both conceptions of universality apply, the first one from a practical side and the other from an ideological angle⁵.

The current universal beliefs emerged from the late seventeenth century Enlightenment ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity (Sternfeld, 2007; Crow & Jones, 2018). They have been reproduced and institutionalised in the twenty-first century through the United Nations in the form of universal values (UN, 2003) e.g. equal rights, human dignity, social progress, freedom. Such values are shared throughout the UN organs and initiatives, from the International Court of Justice to the Sustainable Development Goals. It makes sense therefore, why in the discussions about BI, its proponents' assumptions towards the behavioural changes tend to have an idealised positive outlook.

⁵ For the aim of this research only the ideological part is analysed. Universality from a public policy perspective, is understood as a policy model that addresses the entire population (Esping-Andersen, 1990) and constitutes an essential element of BI as a policy proposal. (van Parijs & Vanderborght, 2017; Standing, 2017)

As a comparative example, BI shares important parts of its foundational values with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Both ideas appear to be based in a Kantian humanism (UN, 2012). Along with its universalistic character, both concepts' fundamental objective is to ensure an existence free of fear and necessity, as all human beings are entitled to their freedom (Allison, 1971; UN, 2015). Various forms of universal humanisms (Svetelj, 2014) have repeated themselves in history, linked to value judgements to legitimate conceptions of man adopted from politics, science or religion. (Ouspensky, 1957; Foucault, 1984)

In such sense, the institutionalised version of universalism follows the outdated human-centred ideas from modernity, that have failed in their promise of individual freedom (Bauman & Bordoni, 2014), turning instead into ideological forms of control over human relations (Vite, 2002). Universalism in this sense, must be regarded as a product of politics (Srnicek & Williams, 2015, p. 78). Today's liquid universality, moves from the 'macro' to the 'micro' levels (Bauman, 2000). This means, an institutionalised universality founded on antiquated ideas that dictates the lives of present day individuals, as it is disconnected from the issues that affect the socio-political life in the twenty-first century e.g. environmental change and technological disruption.

By understanding this predominant notion of universality as historically determined conception (Zizek, 2000), the idea about the 'good nature' of man becomes rather questionable. Both concepts – human rights and BI – fail to grasp the extent to which a person is decentred from his actions in society, the very moment the human subject is put at the heart of reality. (Foucault cited in Dreyfus, 2003)

This explains to an extent the suspicions towards BI in the public debate. Although evidence from pilots outside Europe – e.g. India and Namibia – identify favourable outcomes on social equity and the emancipatory impacts of the initiatives (Standing, 2017, pp. 230-237), distrust towards human nature constitutes a latent concern. Young adults' perceptions reveal an element of scepticism towards the idea of BI given to people from their own communities – or even themselves: "*maybe, if we would have a different mentality, if aspirations were higher and stronger. But that is not the reality we live in. It*

*is not a mentality that we possess*⁶ (Appendix 2) or “*we have these human qualities that will always be in humans. Or in some, depending on your personality I think. Like not working as hard*”. (Appendix 6)

Human nature seems to contest all that humanism stands for. However, human nature cannot be defined as a fixed reality, but as the human subject’s acts upon himself through the interaction with others (Foucault, 1988). Therefore, it could be implied that an individual’s subjectivity is tied to externalities, where identity is defined by discourse, thus missing motivation or purpose for himself. In other words, individual identity is a consequence of the exercise of power, as this constitutes a way in which certain actions modify others (Foucault, 2009). However, this exercise of power is only possible if the subjects are free. According to Foucault (1982, pp. 788-790), such freedom involves a subject or a collective set of subjects faced with a field of possibilities, where a number of behaviours may be realised.

To some extent, this explains the way consumerism works. An individual receiving a BI could use his freedom in the pursuit of short-lived gratifications. The consumer’s wants are produced and reproduced through the liberation of wishful fantasies, where the wish replaces desire as the force of consumption (Ferguson cited in Bauman, 2000). Consumerism in the postmodern era is translated in shopping as a compulsory activity, where choosing becomes the liberation of the pleasure principle (*Ibid*, p.76), expressed in the addiction to buy. In fact, some young adults not only show concern towards the link BI-consumerism but also define the act of consuming as part of their lives, in the form of rational decisions.

For example, Participant 4 admits he would spend the BI on luxurious goods when asked how he would use the money: “*could be a choice, because I’m really addicted to nice watches, I’m really addicted to cars*” (Appendix 5). Similarly, Participant 1 states that buying produces some sort of good feeling: “*I believe that spending produces some endorphins in all of us, right? (...) in reality, that is the highest of pleasures: spending for the sake of spending*”⁷. (Appendix 2)

⁶ Translated from Spanish

⁷ Translated from Spanish

The examples above should not be seen as judgements against the participants. Rather, as evidence of how the economic life is regarded nowadays. Subjects are alienated, stripped from their expression within the cultural, social, political and economic realms degraded from citizens into mere consumers (Bauman, 2000; Raworth, 2017). Subjects seem to be bound to all sorts of influences without realising it. The motivations behind most people's choices are based on mere reactions to external circumstances. (Gurdjieff cited in Ouspensky, 1957)

Foucault (1982) defines the subject as either someone under some sort of dependence or control, or instead someone tied to his own identity by self-knowledge or conscience. For Gurdjieff, in order for somebody to attain Foucault's second definition of subject, he has to become aware of his condition and his surroundings (Ouspensky, 1957, p. 5). This self-awareness though, is contested by the reigning conception of the '*Homo economicus*'. A rational economic individual with pre-set preferences that has proven effective in modelling today's economic reality. However, such individual's tastes are moulded from childhood by the politico-economic apparatus, drawing their consumption habits of tomorrow. (Raworth, 2017, p. 61)

Coupled with the libertarian understanding of individual freedom (Van Parijs, 1992), it could be said that the human subject is in fact compliant, prone to fall for his innermost urgent desires, lacking any purpose. Following this logic, the individual pursuit of freedom becomes an effective source of massive control when coupled with consumerism. Thus, advocating for a BI in the public debates through the more individualistic aspect of freedom constitutes a significant ideological drawback. Not only because the parochial image of the human nature (Srnicek & Williams, 2015, p. 83) is seen with disbelief, but because strategically is not convenient for the policy as it could be subject of manipulation.

Behind the individuals' motivations for consumption, lies an entire machinery with the capacity to fabricate wishful fantasies and reproduce compulsiveness. A non-repressive form of power that exercises a soft-control through seduction and agitation of volatile desires, to spark consumerism (Deleuze, 1988; Bauman, 2000). Power thus constitutes a set of microphysical relations orbiting around a molar agency (Foucault cited in Deleuze, 1988). In other words, an array of local and partial amalgamations, each directed towards

particular relations, organised to manage what is intended to be governed. Foucault (2009, pp. 118-119) therefore, defines the state as a totalising institution responsible for the local and general application of disciplinary mechanisms, where other technologies of power are encompassed.

However, power nowadays has set itself free in politically uncontrolled spaces (Deleuze, 1988). The postmodern state is barely capable of organising or modifying power relations, as it has outsourced some of its former faculties to the administration of non-state entities (Bauman & Bordoni, 2014, pp. 34-35). Contrary to Foucault's understanding therefore, power relations and the social interweaving (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) have turned fluid rather than fixed to the administration of a molar agency. Global instead of local and vice versa.

The liquidising powers have turned from the 'macro' to the 'micro' in the form of the privatisation and deregulation of what once constituted the collective property of society, now individualised (Bauman, 2000). Social organisations have been restructured through the dictates of the globalised free-market (Revise Sociology, 2016), as individuals have been convinced that consuming is the same as the expression of personal interests to attain prosperity. (Mason, 2015, p. xi)

Individualisation as a process of alteration of the identity, puts on the shoulders of the individual the complete responsibility of his situation and everything it entails (Bauman, 2000, p. 31). In the case of BI, libertarian advocates – even less the pragmatic ones – regard the political significance of republican values as secondary or consequential – if at all. This is of vital importance in the debates, as such values consider the restoration of private/public places (Bauman, 1999, p. 182). However, in the present context where the free-market ideology regards associations as antagonistic to its aims (Standing, 2017, p. 59), poses a challenge to such values – including the collective aspect of freedom.

The marketization and dismantling of the state's function as a provider of economic security (Bauman & Bordoni, 2014), makes it incapable to deliver the elements to enable the collective features of freedom. Liberty has thus been relegated to its individualistic side, limiting an individual's notion of freedom to what he is able to afford in the never-ending halls of the consumerist market. Consequently, the political narrative has been

moved from the republican ‘just society’ to the ‘human rights’ imperative as the individuals’ right to be different (Bauman, 2000, p. 29) in their pursuit of his own version of a good life.

The belief of the individual as the master of his own destiny is strengthened around the myth of the self-made. Someone that, in the quest to attain his dreams, manages to have his value recognised by turn it into currency (Bauman, 2007). Stories about visionary self-made individuals that, through raw virtuosity have managed to revolutionise societies by means of the market e.g. Steve Jobs. However, the reality behind these successful characters is one of a rather virtuous blend of large amounts of public investment and tax avoidance (Mazzucato, 2015). These enterprises have generated vast amounts of profit, that neither the taxpayers nor the state are part of.

Rewards are therefore privatised and later reinvested in the process of replication of wishful fantasies, by which consumers are created. In this scenario, the state is no longer the totalising institution as it downgraded itself to just another technology of power (Foucault, 2009). The postmodern state relegates the protection of its citizens, devoting its efforts and resources to serve the concerns of corporations (Vite, 2002; Orton, 2008). What follows is the socialisation of state-funded risks and therefore, the widening of the inequality gap (Mazzucato, 2015, p. 200) and a growing precariat. (Standing 2011; 2017)

A process where the socialisation of risks derived from deregulation shapeshifts globally into what Bauman (2000, p. 37) calls the private invasion of the public. State-funded companies in Silicon Valley that profit from the taxpayer’s money, while dodging taxes with Olympic dexterity. Labour insecurity in Europe, as job markets absorb market uncertainties through the allocation of workers in temporary jobs (Gebel & Giesecke, 2011). Alternative ways of survival in Latin America that oscillate between informal employment to criminal activities (Vite, 2002) where cheap labour must be kept to attract private investment. (Carbajal-Suárez & Morales-Fajardo, 2016)

The advancement of BI seems stagnated in the face of postmodern states reluctant to improve the unsustainable economic conditions of their populations. Such facts disarm the arguments of libertarian and pragmatic proponents in the debates. In the same way, they ridicule the obsolete universal humanism in which the BI, along with a set of

institutions – local and international – and even constitutions are founded. Young adults are aware of these realities since they are currently experiencing them, as their perspectives towards BI show.

Chapter III

Findings: The Sustainability Imperative and Human Nature 2.0

*“Earth provides enough to satisfy every man’s need
but not for every man’s greed”.*

- Mahatma Gandhi (1869-1948)

One of the key elements of the empirical evidence of this work is its multicultural aspect. While cultural particularities from the participants are considered in the interviews and the research overall, the priority is to explore the common outlooks towards the idea of BI beyond the national differences e.g. welfare systems. It is important to remark that the research regards the data collected from a generational standpoint. To understand the participants’ perspectives about BI, it is necessary to first elaborate on the impacts of macro influences in the lives of young adults. This translates in matters of economic insecurity, which constitutes a constant factor along in the empirical evidence.

Economic security is defined by the 1994 Human Development Report (UNDP, 1994) – HDR – as a guaranteed basic income generated either from remunerated work, or from a publicly financed safety net. According to the report, any the following elements would constitute a threat to an individual’s sense of security: unemployment, underemployment, insecure working conditions, temporary contracts, income insecurity, poverty or homelessness (*Ibid.*, pp. 24-26). While none of the participants face conditions of absolute poverty or homelessness, all of them relate to other elements comprising economic insecurity.

While Participant 1 considers that his family is not deprived from basic goods – food and even some recreation – he explains that for him, income insecurity is a reality: *“it is necessary to distribute the income for the family’s basic needs”* (Appendix 2). Although Participant 5 seems satisfied with her part-time position, she points at two elements that keep her there: the competitive labour market and the fact that it is paid. (Appendix 6)

According to Davis and Cartwright (forthcoming, 2018), such uncertainties are the result of neoliberal profit-driven replacements of social and public service provisions where austerity driven policymaking is taking a toll in the future of the youth. The New Social

Risks school of social policy explains that welfare states have been reoriented due to globalisation and rapid changes, thus bringing new uncertainties to people's lives (Crouch & Keune, 2012). In this sense, a report from the Resolution Foundation shows there is a widespread pessimism among the so-called Millennials regarding their economic security prospects for the future, in comparison to those of prior generations. (Shrimpton, et al., 2017)

Realities vary, but the sense of economic insecurity is a constant. Careers have been frustrated as Participant 3 exemplifies. She explains her desire to work in cooperation and development within an international organisation. However, most job offers in that field for recent graduates rely on volunteering, while demanding functions of a proper job. In the same way she clarifies, internships are not remunerated (Appendix 4). Some international organisations contradict themselves between their values – as described in Chapter II – and their practices. In some cases, these have turned into promoters of precarious employment, as the case of a 22-year-old UN intern in Geneva that was forced to live in a tent since the placement was unpaid. (Cosslett, 2015)

The sum of these experiences depicts a situation that has become the new normal after the global financial crisis of 2008 (Krugman, 2012; Alberti, et al., 2018). Young people have been forced to accept underpaid jobs due to an existential fear of unemployment (Stiglitz, 2013), as one in eight around the world cannot find work (ILO, 2017; Raworth, 2017) in a labour market with increasingly more insecure forms of employment. Automation and digital technologies appear as a source of job displacement and inequality that might explain the global decline of living standards. (Mason, 2015, p. 28)

Mazzucato explains that while some jobs might become automated in certain areas, as long as profits from the investment in those machineries are reinvested in the economy, new jobs will arise (Intelligence Squared, 2018). However, job displacement did happen and the gap it created was filled with a plethora of low-quality positions (Graeber, 2018). Technological advancements plus the neoliberal austerity-driven labour policies (Davis & Cartwright, forthcoming, 2018) from the late 70's, laid the conditions for the surge of unregulated forms of digitally mediated service work (van Doorn, 2017). This climate of manufactured uncertainties has derived in new forms of precarisation. (Alberti, et al., 2018)

Better known as the ‘on-demand’ business model, this form of platform economy took advantage of economic globalisation and the aftermaths from the last economic recession (van Doorn, 2017, p. 900). It has rapidly transformed and – in some cases – disrupted traditional forms of economic activities all around the world taking policymakers, traditional regulations and its own ‘workforce’, unprepared to adapt such business model. Some of these businesses offer people the possibility to become masters of their own time (Uber, 2018), presenting the platform as a door to entrepreneurship. In short, the liquification of the myth of the self-made individual into the digital life.

Young people however, are not necessarily in search of this partial version of (libertarian) freedom. Just as stated by one of the participants: *I do not want to be my own boss, I want social security. I want a contract. I want pensions*⁸ (Appendix 3). People want to feel secure and precisely, these labour platforms fail to offer any sort of social security, reinforcing the conditions of precarity, characteristic of today’s society as it is the case of Uber, Glovo or Deliveroo. (Slee, 2014; van Doorn, 2017)

A recent survey from the ILO (2017a) shows that people aged 15-29 are more likely to work in the platform economy than older populations. For 52% of young respondents, this constitute their main source of income, while more than 40% in lower-income countries report to earn more from these jobs than other opportunities. There is also a significant gender gap within the platform economy, as young women earn 22% less since they combine platform labour with childcare and other household activities. (Ibid, p. 69)

Young people constitute vulnerable groups as new deficiencies in job quality continue to affect them in both developing and developed regions (ILO, 2017b), making the labour platform another case of corporations not being accountable for their actions. According to Stiglitz (2013), these practices shape the rules of the economy to their favour, using inequality to erode the rule of law. As a result, it helps to reinforce and expand (Standing, 2011; 2014) the precarious conditions of a contingent workforce in a low-income service economy. (van Doorn, 2017)

In this sense, participants showed a positive outlook on the broader effects of BI in a precarious society as their views were more optimistic on the impacts it could have:

⁸ Translated from Spanish.

“everybody would feel on a more equal footing” (Annex 6) or *“I think it’d make people a lot happier. They’ll have decent money (...) there’d be less poverty as well”* (Annex 7). However, there are a series of concerns about the feasibility of a BI. The findings point at three main sources of concern for the participants: the origin of the initiative’s resources, what others might do with the income and its effects on equality.

Funding constitutes the most common objection in the debates as detractors of BI can also be found on the bureaucratic behalf of politics (Curzon, 2018). Just as it happened with both the Finnish and Utrecht initiatives – despite the latter not being BI *per se* – this concern is shared by participants. The social acceptance of the idea is questioned due to the affordability matter: *“selling the people tax raises will always be tough in combination with the UBI”* (Appendix 5). Participants seem to associate the cost of BI as part of the welfare budget.

The affordability debate in fact, stems not only in concerns regarding the continuity of the welfare state – as illustrated in Chapter I –, but also in fears of the implications that a change in government could have towards BI. This is closely related with the problem of design and pragmatism described in Chapter II. Participant 1 explains that he would be worried that the government suddenly decided not to continue with the policy, thus creating disruption in his life, since he believes he would settle in a ‘comfort zone’ if receiving a BI. (Appendix 2)

Similar doubts were expressed by other participants as they seem to reflect on their own behaviour: *“If I have to be really honest, I just also said when you asked if I wouldn’t be paid in my job I would stay, and I said no. Then I think, maybe I’m even like that”* (Appendix 6). This view is expressed as well but towards other people, as some respondents believe that a BI could turn people lazy or even drive them to waste their lives away: *“You never know (...) It could help someone out and then at the same time, it could just make society worse”*. (Appendix 8)

The findings in fact, show interesting perspectives towards BI as a potential generator of inequality. Some arguments are tied to the class debate as presented in Chapter I – i.e. not to give it to rich people, as it would make them richer; or giving poor people a BI in certain societies could even turn the current state of disparities around. Additionally,

alternative sources of inequality are considered by the participants, as it is the case of cosmopolitan cities and extensive migrant populations.

In Europe, cities like London, Amsterdam and Barcelona are known to host highly diverse migrant populations (Kochan, 2014; Gebhardt, 2016). In Barcelona for example, about 17% of its population holds an additional nationality to the Spanish (Gebhardt, 2016, p. 854). Based in her own experience living in Barcelona, Participant 3 states that for a BI to be implemented, the local government will necessarily have to consider giving it on a residence-basis. Otherwise, a BI could potentially turn into a generator of disparities by not giving equal resources to an important part of its inhabitants. (Appendix 4)

Such concerns however, point instead to an affinity towards the need for more sustainable ways of living and even, organising the society. Regardless whether participants were sceptic, indecisive or supported the idea of the BI, most of them favour the need for more sustainable practices. Their reasons were ample, ranging from diseases acquired due to pollution, to a desire of just "*moving society forward*" (Appendix 6). The findings in this sense, are aligned with a growing tendency among the younger generations towards more sustainable behaviours.

A report issued by Morgan Stanley (2017) shows that Millennials are more likely to invest in companies that target social or environmental matters, in comparison to the older populations. The same study indicates that younger investors believe that their investment decisions can have an impact on climate change and poverty alleviation. Consuming trends are taking a different turn among young adults as well. A survey made by Nissan (2016) shows that 77% of people aged 18-34 in Europe, would consider switching to eco-friendly vehicles in the next 10 years. Also, young people are 2.4 times as likely to spend on resale clothing due to the environmental impact of the fashion industry. (edie.net, 2017)

Equally, the arguments presented by some respondents towards the importance of sustainable-oriented behaviours, match their perspectives about BI in two levels: environmental and social. Parting from the environmental side, Participant 2 implied she would spend more in organic products in the event of receiving a BI – since according to her, these are way more expensive (Appendix 3). Her motivations for this mainly revolve

around health concerns due to the chemicals used on certain foods, the pollution these create and the need for more sustainable ways of food production. Similarly, Participant 5 regards mass production as inefficient towards the environment. She implies that a de-intensification of these processes of production could not only be more profitable for the environment, but even put more people to work. (Appendix 6)

Rifkin (2011) suggests that shifting infrastructures – from mass production to more sustainable systems – would in fact generate new jobs, as such a transformation will require every sector to be involved. So far, the global economy relies on the base of an industrial era, characterised by the imperative of fossil fuels that has led to a growing social inequality and ecological degradation (Rifkin, 2011; Raworth, 2017). According to Standing (2017, pp. 38-41), a BI could be possible by taxing polluting activities or removing fossil fuel subsidies. The resources could be redirected to finance the initiative, thus deterring the use of fossil fuels and all the implications this may have, justifiable on social justice principles.

In fact, when participants are asked about the possible long-term effects of a BI, most of them agreed there would be a change in social relations. Parallel to the answers that present a degree of uncertainty about the idea – regarding what others might do with the income –, respondents imply outcomes that could link certain effects of a BI to more sustainable societies i.e. less criminality, better working conditions and the improvement of familiar relations.

Participants coincide in viewing BI as a mean the end of poverty and consequently, attenuate criminality rates since people would not face the necessity of doing so. “*There’d probably be less crime. There’d be less people trying to rob people for money*” (Appendix 8). In close relation to the context of economic insecurity and precarity explained at the beginning of this chapter, Participant 1 regards uncertainty as a major source of precarity and crime: “*I believe that having a guaranteed BI would remove uncertainty (...) it would remove a lot of problems that affect society*”⁹. (Annex 1)

Mullainathan & Shafir (2013) explain that a perception of scarcity – of money in this case – in people’s lives has great impact on their behaviour. A scarcity mentality hinders long-

⁹ Translated from Spanish

term thinking, thus narrowing one's focus to provide for immediate lacks. It pushes people to make unwise decisions (Bregman, 2017, p. 57) e.g. robbing or even joining a criminal organisation. In Mexico for example, poverty and unemployment contribute greatly to the underlying social conditions that lead young people to join gangs and drug cartels (Jones, 2013; Encinas, 2016). This example however, illustrates an extreme case of the impact that uncertainty and scarcity could have in a society at large.

Envisioned towards a scarcity of time, Participant 4 explains that a BI could let people use it as a safety net that would help them to feel less pressured within their jobs and improve family relations. He argues that, while the stigma around paternal leave has weakened, a BI could have a further positive impact: "*That could be a benefit for future societies*" (Annex 4). In most societies, family is considered the principal unit through which socialisation occurs (Barkan, 2012). An imbalance in the family's processes or structures could pose a threat to its stability and consequently weaken the society. (*Ibid*, p. 497)

Coupled with the latter, some families are faced with one or both partners in temporary, part-time positions or flexible arrangements. For example, Participant 1 defines his temporary job as exhaustive and reveals how his income is only enough to provide the basic necessities for his family. He admits that inflation grows faster than his salary and now he cannot afford certain products (Appendix 2). The situation is worse for families from lower socio-economic groups. Low-income families must deal with several issues that affect children's development. These later affect them through early adulthood and beyond – e.g. poor health, unemployment, criminality, inadequate education, etc. (Barkan, 2012, p. 500) –, condemning individuals to repeat the same patterns over generations.

The correlation between inadequate working conditions and unhealthy family relations constitute a vicious cycle that hinders the chances of building more sustainable societies. However, the sum of economic insecurity plus technological advancements, in combination with the sustainable imperative of the younger generations is already transforming social relations. This could provide an insight towards the relation between a BI and the possibility of a future postcapitalist society – an idea equally explored throughout the interviews. Nevertheless, most of the respondents presented with this thought are incredulous to it.

Participants regard it as either too advanced for its time (Appendix 4) or incoherent, since a BI implies monetary exchanges (Appendix 2). Interviewees share the same perception that money still constitutes a very important part of life, and it will continue to do so: “*the idea of capitalism is very ingrained in us*” (Appendix 4). While it is not possible to imply any form of postcapitalist social interactions from BI as results from ongoing experiments are yet to be seen, radical social changes are already happening.

Negri and Revel (2008) suggest that the creation of value in the postmodern society relies in positioning subjectivities within networks they create, appropriating the common. In the current global context – as developed throughout this chapter – young people have resorted to produce new forms of non-profit community-based economies. Accordingly, Participant 3 describes the cooperative network of expatriates that she is part of, that helps her compensate for the difficulties of the immigrant life:

“whenever some immigration procedure related with economic issues or even economic support is required, one uses the social support network to do it. Of course, these are not big loans, they are small”.¹⁰

Rifkin (2011; 2014) suggests there is a whole transformation occurring behind these collaborative networks. According to him, a third industrial revolution is taking place. It constitutes an economic shift characterised by the convergence of three elements: the internet of things, renewable energies and new forms of transportation – shared mobility and driverless vehicles (*Ibid*, 2011). Consequently, this is shifting business relationships from competitive vertical enterprises to collaborative businesses.

Contrary to its corporatized version – i.e. on-demand economy –, grassroots forms of sharing economy are sprouting under the sustainable imperative. Online platforms in Berlin for example, have opened the spaces to materialise a collaborative economy against the dictates of the consumerist machine, by reducing the need of consumption, thus contributing to a more sustainable environment (Hambrett, 2014). The combined efforts of citizens, civil-society groups along with the city government, have

¹⁰ Translated from Spanish

demonstrated a high degree of cooperation to create a community-based collaborative economy. (Zvolska, et al., 2018)

However, most of the support behind the development of non-commercial collaborative activities in Berlin is mainly driven by civil society organisations (Arnold, 2017). What studies show is that Berlin municipality is in fact more supportive of for-profit initiatives instead (Zvolska, et al., 2018, p. 11). In this sense, work as production from its political composition, fails in organising these commons since institutions, their internal mechanisms and juridical categories turn out to be obsolete. (Negri & Revel, 2008)

Therefore, how does BI, younger generations, economic uncertainty, technological advancements, the commons and sustainability intersect? According to the findings, this intersection is part of a complex socio-ecological system (Raworth, 2017, p. 32) and can be explained in two levels. On the macro level, the current disruptions brought by the third industrial revolution is transforming economic and political regimes. Humanity has relied on a fossil fuel economy that peaked forty years ago (Rifkin, 2011, pp. 11-13), and nowadays is harming the environment. Entire infrastructures have been built around fossil fuels, defining the rules of commerce, the way political power is exercised and thus conducting social life.

In light of this, some entities are already taking steps to make the transition. For instance, projects to digitalise the communication infrastructure of the single European market are already taking place. (DIGITALEUROPE, 2018). The Horizon 2020 programme constitutes a €77 billion effort to drive the European Union's economic transition – from the fossil fuel infrastructure to a more sustainable one – by innovating the areas of transport and energy. (European Commission, 2018)

The micro level on the other hand, draws its relevance from the qualitative interviews and the secondary quantitative data supporting them. As explained in Chapter II, an individual's identity and conduct constitute mechanical reactions largely dependent on external circumstances (Ouspensky, 1957). Collectively, individuals define a society's behaviour. The way external circumstances are presented in their lives will determine the characteristics of a society. However, contrary to the competitive imperative of the *homo economicus* pushed forward by Spencer's (1864) conception of the survival of the fittest,

studies have shown that humans constitute the most cooperative species in the world. (Raworth, 2017, p. 58)

The calibration of welfare of others, empathy and social norms to align individuals in the group, have allowed humans to engage in large-scale cooperation, thus enhancing their chances of survival (Jensen, et al., 2014). From a generational standpoint, the current state of ecological degradation, climate change and social inequality has in some way ‘upgraded’ young people’s conducts. As the findings show, this has manifested in an increasing sense of awareness, materialised in more conscious consumption and a sense of empathy towards less fortunate fellow humans.

The participants’ perceptions towards BI make evident not only their views towards the idea, but also reveals a problem present in other areas of the political spectrum. This is, a need to bring politics and policymaking to the reality of the twenty-first century. Changes are happening everywhere – climate, behaviours, technology and entire infrastructures – but not political ideology. Although BI is portrayed as a radical proposal by its advocates (van Parijs & Vanderborght, 2017), young people think otherwise. Just as technology is advancing and younger generations have to some extent updated their awareness, political narratives need an update as well.

Conclusion

The problem with BI is evidently not the intention behind it, nor its affordability. In fact, the problem with BI stems in two interconnected levels: one of narrative and one ideological. Narrative plays a central role to the policy process. Crow & Jones (2018) identify the existence of an empathy fallacy in communicating a policy. It is defined as the narrator's assumption of projecting an emotive human story – usually referring to a specific group e.g. precariat –, expecting to persuade the audience by generating universal human empathy. In the BI debates, the efforts of advocates like Standing or van Parijs are contested when contrasted with this study's empirical evidence.

BI is regarded with suspicion as another reactive measure, very often compared to welfare benefits. These benefits in turn, are perceived in a negative way as they are regarded as generators of layabouts – hence the aversion to the idea of 'free money'. The efficiency attached to the European initiatives is sought after the wrong reasons, as these are tied to a problem-resolution approach rather than an organic outlook. BI advocates differentiate the proposal from the existing welfare system based on its unconditional non-means tested character. However, it is built over the same universalistic premise as the welfare state.

Irrespective of their particular life experience, young people participating in this research seem to identify BI as yet more of the same, regardless of whether they might or might not be aware of the philosophical orientation behind both the welfare system and BI. Thus, driving the problem to the ideological level. According to Herman & Vervaeck (2013), ideologies as a frame of values that inform the narrative, are partially constructed or completely disregarded by the subjects. This decision depends on the interaction of three elements: the individual, the context and the idea.

Today's political struggles lie within the space of modernity's ideals (Srnicek & Williams, 2015). Welfare benefits constitute a reflection of how social problems are addressed by the polity. The polity exercises its responsibilities through policymaking. This act in turn, reflects the welfare tradition of a state. Whether this welfare tradition is based in a liberal, corporatist or social-democratic regime (Esping-Andersen, 1990) – or a combination of

all –, these share the same ideological base: universal humanism. In this sense, BI ceases to be a problem by itself and turns into part of a bigger issue.

The antiquated human-centred universalism is reluctant to accept itself as a particularity (Gramsci cited in Butler, 2000) of what the universal means in the twenty-first century. The old conception continues to permeate the macro and micro levels, as a set of obsolete mechanisms and juridical categories fail to understand the nature of the socio-ecological interweaving (Negri & Revel, 2008; Raworth, 2017). From institutions down to policymaking, infiltrating the social life and down to the individual. Yet, the process takes a cyclic turn as individuals' behaviours make societies, and societies determine how the institutions will address governmentality (Foucault, 2009). The absence of a coherent universalism, hampers the ability of political imagination leading to the short-termism and misguided efficiency that characterises current politics. (Bauman, 2000)

The humanist paradox has on one side the libertarian conception that teaches people to praise and nurture their individual self-exploration. On the socialist side, the prioritisation of the greater (social) good, over individual desires (Harari, 2015). This is, a conflict within the very ideological foundations of our institutions, laws, politics and of course policies i.e. BI, struggling to give meaning to the world by revering the human-subject. A BI – or any other so-called social policy innovation – ideologically founded in a human-centred universalism, will hardly address the interconnectedness that the broader socio-ecological system demands. Reality is downright submitted to the fiction of control.

The categorical otherification of nature under an imperative of subjecting other – environment – to self – human –, continues today despite the undeniable environmental change and its consequences in the social life. In trying to control or interfere over the course of nature, changes it in unpredictable ways (Watts, 1966) as control in turn takes the form of separation (Bauman, 1978). From the macro categories, abstract constructions attempt control by drawing the boundaries between the ‘civilised’ world and the untamed nature. (*Ibid.*, 196)

Nature as humanity’s common was first taken over by the state. Through the exercise of political power, the state as the totalising institution labelled nature as economic management and political representation (Foucault, 2009). In a liquid turn of events,

nature followed private appropriation, to be exploited for the sake of profit, thus completing the private invasion of the public (Bauman, 2000; Negri & Revel, 2008). This resulted in a limitless, steady material growth on resource consumption as the dominant model followed by decisionmakers today (Castro cited in Klein, 2014). This led to an unsustainable global regime that has replicated in many other areas, from the macro to the micro and reproduced vice versa.

The sustainable imperative posed by younger generations, aligned with their behavioural changes are a contestation to the unsustainable practices followed by modernity's humanist regimes. Just as technology is driving the transitions in communications, renewable energy and even business relationships, there must be a transformation in policymaking. Not to persuade society to accept a certain policy or align the market to their new consumption preferences. The human subject cannot be the centre of the political reality anymore, but a particularity within an ecological pre-eminence. Universality therefore should not be considered a fixed reality, as hegemonic universalisms are always open to be challenged by other universalisms. (Butler, et al., 2000; Srnicek & Williams, 2015)

True universal causes in the form of policymaking, should regard the environment as a matter beyond the concerns of the left and the right, public or private, global or local, rich or poor. Vision-guided strategies, instead of short-term crisis management solutions. Proactive instead of reactive. Energy regimes have defined the nature of political power and how social relations are conducted (Rifkin, 2011). Thus, ideologies based on the human subject as the centre of reality and applied to economics, politics and society are unsustainable, as these cause the reversed effect of separating and alienating humanity – from itself and its surroundings. As policies, these constitute mere reactions to the human condition of the moment, instead of acting proactively by considering the collective individual self in cooperative partnership with his/her environment. (Einstein cited in Raworth, 2017)

A BI policy grounded on an environmental imperative rather than human concerns – e.g. poverty or unemployment –, could be part of a broader preventative tactic against climate change. It must be a long-term strategy that incorporates an environmental agenda as its *de facto* mainspring. Outcomes should avoid subjective notions such as

happiness, or short-term pragmatic partisan-pleasing results like employment and income. Instead, indicators of environmental footprint or green entrepreneurship (Farinelli, et al., 2011) shall be prioritised – terms that resonate with younger generations. Focusing on these outputs could force a breaking point to the environmentally toxic aspects of the consumerist society, leading to environmental consciousness raising. Equally, policymaking would keep up with current technological and infrastructural changes.

This by no means is a call to dismiss other categories within the human-subject framework that deserve as much attention within policymaking and the social sciences. Instead, it constitutes a proposal to upgrade our ideologies through a coherent policymaking for the twenty-first century. While we have the capacity to transform nature, the human-self is in essence, a product of it. It is imperative to understand that our wellbeing – and survival as it seems nowadays – largely depends on the wellbeing of the environment.

A blessing and a curse, climate change is the signature issue of this century. A curse for obvious reasons. A blessing because the urgency needed to create more synergic common spaces, enables the possibility to push forward the application of a sustainability agenda in policymaking, grounded in an environmental universalism. This automatically implies the necessity of a vision-oriented strategy. Therefore, shifting the terms of efficiency from ‘band-aid’/‘problem-resolution’ to long-term sustainable development is essential.

Bibliography

- Alberti, G. et al., 2018. In, Against and Beyond Precarity: Work in Insecure Times. *Work, Employment and Society*, 32(3), pp. 447-457.
- Anderson, E., 2001. Optional freedoms. In: P. V. Parijs, ed. *What's Wrong With a Free Lunch?*. Boston: Beacon Press, pp. 9-75.
- Arnold, A., 2017. *7 Reasons Why Berlin is a Successful Sharing City*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.shareable.net/blog/7-reasons-why-berlin-successful-sharing-city> [Accessed 21 August 2018].
- Barkan, S. E., 2012. *A Primer on Social Problems*. First ed. s.l.:Creative Commons.
- Bauman, Z., 1978. *Hermeneutics and Social Science: Approaches to Understanding*. First ed. London: Hutchinson of London.
- Bauman, Z., 1996. De peregrino a turista, o una breve historia de la identidad. In: S. Hall & P. d. Gay, eds. *Cuestiones de identidad cultural*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu editores, pp. 40-68.
- Bauman, Z., 1999. *In Search of Politics*. First ed. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z., 2000. *Liquid Modernity*. First ed. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z., 2007. *Liquid Times*. First ed. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. & Bordoni, C., 2014. *State of Crisis*. First ed. Cambridge: Polity Press Ltd..
- Beveridge, W., 1942. *Social Insurance and Allied Services*, London: H. M. Stationery Office.
- Blaikie, N., 2000. *Designing Social Research*. First ed. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Blommesteijn, M. & van Waveren, B., 2015. *Dutch municipalities announce experiments with "basic income"*, Brussels: European Commission.
- Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. J., 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. s.l.:University of Chicago Press.
- Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. J. D., 1992. *Toward a social praxeology: the structure and logic of Bourdieu's sociology*. First ed. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bregman, R., 2017. *Utopia for Realists. And how we can get there*. First ed. London: Bloomsbury.
- Bregman, R., 2017. *Utopia for Realists: And How We Can Get There*. First éd. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Carbajal-Suárez, Y. & Morales-Fajardo, M. E., 2016. El sector automotriz en México y Brasil: Un análisis desde la perspectiva comercial. *Revista Eletrônica de Negócios Internacionais*, 11(3), pp. 4-21.

Carmody, K., 2017. The Resurgence of Universal Basic Income. *Econ Focus*, 22(3), pp. 16-19.

Cosslett, R. L., 2015. *I understand why an intern would live in a tent*. [Online]
Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/aug/13/intern-tent-david-hyde-un-internship-geneva>
[Accessed 18 August 2018].

Crouch, C. & Keune, M., 2012. *The governance of economic uncertainty: beyond the 'new social risks' analysis*, Brussels: ETUI.

Crow, D. & Jones, M., 2018. Narratives as tools for influencing policy change. *Policy & Politics*, 46(2), pp. 217-234.

Curzon, H., 2018. *Finland: Olli Kangas reveals the resistance to UBI*. [Online]
Available at: <https://basicincome.org/news/2018/06/finland-olli-kangas-reveals-the-resistance-to-ubi/>
[Accessed 17 August 2018].

Davis, M. & Cartwright, L., forthcoming, 2018. 'Deferred Lives': Money, Debt, and the Financialized Futures of Young Temporary Workers. In: M. Featherstone, ed. *The Sociology of Debt*. s.l.:Chicago University Press / Policy Press [access to final draft provided by the authors].

Deleuze, G., 1988. Foucault. In: G. Deleuze, ed. *Strategies or the Non-stratified: the Thought of the Outside (Power)*. London: Continuum, pp. 59-77.

DIGITALEUROPE, 2018. *DIGITALEUROPE*. [Online]
Available at: <http://www.digitaleurope.org/Our-Work/Projects>
[Accessed 21 August 2018].

Dolan, E., 2014. *A Universal Basic Income: Conservative, Progressive, and Libertarian Perspectives*. [Online]
Available at: <http://archive.economonitor.com/dolanecon/2014/01/27/a-universal-basic-income-conservative-progressive-and-libertarian-perspectives-part-3-of-a-series/>
[Accessed 30 May 2018].

edie.net, 2017. *Carbon footprint of UK clothing on the rise, despite uptake in resales*. [Online]
Available at: <https://www.edie.net/news/5/Carbon-footprint-of-UK-clothing-on-the-rise-->

[despite-uptake-in-resales/](#)

[Accessed 20 August 2018].

Emmel, N., 2013. *Sampling and Choosing Cases in Qualitative Research. A Realist Approach.* First ed. London: Sage.

Esping-Andersen, G., 1990. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism.* First ed. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

European Commission, 2018. *Horizon 2020.* [Online]

Available at: <https://ec.europa.eu/inea/en/horizon-2020>

[Accessed 21 August 2018].

Farinelli, F., Bottini, M., Akkoyunlu, S. & Aerni, P., 2011. Green entrepreneurship: the missing link towards a greener economy. *ATDF Journal*, 8(3), pp. 42-48.

Flick, U., 2014. Mapping the Field. In: U. Flick, ed. *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis.* London: SAGE, pp. 3-18.

Foucault, M., 1982. The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), pp. 777-795.

Foucault, M., 1988. Technologies of the Self. Lectures at University of Vermont Oct. 1982. In: *Technologies of the Self.* s.l.:University of Massachusetts Press, pp. 16-49.

Foucault, M., 2009. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-78.* Third ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Friedman, M., 1962. *Capitalism and Freedom.* Second ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Gebel, M. & Giesecke, J., 2011. Labor Market Flexibility and Inequality: The Changing Skill-Based Temporary Employment and Unemployment Risks in Europe. *Social Forces*, 90(1), pp. 17-39.

Gebhardt, D., 2016. Re-thinking urban citizenship for immigrants from a policy perspective: the case of Barcelona. *Citizenship Studies*, 20(6-7), pp. 846-866.

Gordon, N. J., 2014. *The Conservative Case for a Guaranteed Basic Income.* [Online]

Available at: <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2014/08/why-arent-reformicons-pushing-a-guaranteed-basic-income/375600/>

[Accessed 30 May 2018].

- Gorz, A., 1999. *Reclaiming Work: Beyond the Wage-Based Society*. First ed. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Graeber, D., 2018. *Bullshit Jobs: A Theory*. First ed. London: Simon & Schuster.
- Hambrett, L., 2014. *Culture of Sharing in Germany*. [Online]
Available at: <http://www.young-germany.de/topic/live/life-style/culture-of-sharing-in-germany>
[Accessed 21 August 2018].
- Harari, Y. N., 2015. *Homo Deus: A Brief History of Tomorrow*. First ed. London: Penguin Random House.
- Herman, L. & Vervaet, B., 2013. Ideology and Narrative Fiction. *the living handbook of narratology*.
- Hoeijmakers, S., 2016. *Municipal Basic Income-related Experiments in the Netherlands*. [Online]
Available at:
https://www.socialjustice.ie/sites/default/files/file/Social%20Policy%20Conference/2016/chapter_5.pdf
[Accessed 27 May 2018].
- ILO, 2017a. *Global Employment Trends for Youth 2017: Paths to a better working future*, Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- ILO, 2017b. *Guide to International Labour Standards and Rights at Work concerning Young People*, Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- Intelligence Squared, 2018. *Ten Years On: The Financial Crisis and the State of Modern Capitalism*. s.l.:s.n.
- International Labour Organization , 2017. *World Social Protection Report 2017–19: Universal social protection to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals*, Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Jensen, K., Vaish, A. & Schmidt, M. F. H., 2014. The emergence of human prosociality: aligning with others through feelings, concerns, and norms. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5(822).
- Kangas, O., 2018. *Basic Income (BI) Experiment in Finland*. London, Kela.
- Kangas, O. & Kalliomaa-Puha, L., 2016. *Basic income experiment in Finland*, s.l.: European Social Policy Network.

- Kangas, O. & Simanainen, M., 2017. *Basic income experiment at halfway point*. [Online] Available at: <http://blogi.kansanelakelaitos.fi/arkisto/4352> [Accessed 09 08 2018].
- Kela, 2016. *Research team recommends expansion of basic income experiment in 2018*. [Online] Available at: http://www.kela.fi/web/en/news-archive/_asset_publisher/LN08GY2nIrZo/content/research-team-recommends-expansion-of-basic-income-experiment-in-2018?_101_INSTANCE_LN08GY2nIrZo_redirect=%2Fweb%2Fen%2Fnews-archive [Accessed 27 May 2018].
- Kela, 2017. *Objectives and implementation of the Basic Income Experiment*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.kela.fi/web/en/basic-income-objectives-and-implementation> [Accessed 27 MAy 2018].
- Krugman, P., 2012. *End This Depression Now!*. First ed. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Manzano, A., 2016. The craft of interviewing in realist evaluation. *Evaluation*, 22(3), pp. 342-360.
- Mason, P., 2015. *PostCapitalism*. First éd. Milton Keynes: Allen Lane.
- Mazzucato, M., 2015. *The Entrepreneurial State: Debunking Public vs. Private Sector Myths*. First ed. s.l.:Anthem Press.
- McFarland, K., 2017a. *THE NETHERLANDS: Social Assistance Experiments Under Review*. [Online] Available at: <https://basicincome.org/news/2017/05/netherlands-social-assistance-experiments-review/> [Accessed 26 May 2018].
- McFarland, K., 2017b. *Current Basic Income Experiments (and those so called): An Overview*. [Online] Available at: <https://basicincome.org/news/2017/05/basic-income-experiments-and-those-so-called-early-2017-updates/#netherlands> [Accessed 28 July 2018].
- Morel, N., Palier, B. & Palme, J., 2012. *Towards a Social Investment Welfare State? Ideas, Policies and Challenges*. First ed. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Morgan Stanley, 2017. *Sustainable Signals: New Data from the Individual Investor*, s.l.: Morgan Stanley Institute for Sustainable Investing.

Mullainathan, S. & Shafir, E., 2013. *Scarcity: Why Having Too Little Means So Much*. First ed. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Murray, C. A., 2006. *In Our Hands: A Plan to Replace the Welfare State*. First ed. Washington D.C: AEI Press.

Negri, A. & Revel, J., 2008. *Inventing the Common*. [Online]
Available at: http://www.generation-online.org/p/fp_revel5.htm
[Accessed 30 May 2018].

Nissan Europe, 2016. *Millennials at the Forefront of the Green Revolution*. [Online]
Available at: <https://newsroom.nissan-europe.com/eu/en-gb/media/pressreleases/426149837/76-percent-of-millennials-see-switching-to-an-eco-friendly-car-as-the-single-best-action-to-drive-a>
[Accessed 20 August 2018].

Offe, C., 1992. A Non-Productivist Design for Social Policies. In: P. Van Parijs, ed. *Arguing for Basic Income: Ethical Foundations for a Radical Reform*. London: Verso, pp. 61-80.

Orton, I. G., 2008. *Why we Ought to Listen to Zygmunt Bauman?*. [Online]
Available at: <https://basicincome.org/bien/pdf/dublin08/2eiortonyzmuntbaumanbi.pdf>
[Accessed 26 May 2018].

Ouspensky, P., 1957. *The Fourth Way*. First ed. New York: Vintage Books.

Raworth, K., 2017. *Doughnut Economics: Seven Ways to Think Like a 21st-Century Economist*. First ed. London: Random House Business Books.

Revise Sociology, 2016. *Neoliberalism and The New Right - An Introduction*. [En ligne]
Available at: <https://revisesociology.com/2016/04/14/neoliberalism-new-right-introduction/>
[Accès le 1 January 2018].

Rifkin, J., 2011. *The Third Industrial Revolution*. First ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sampieri, R. H., Collado, C. F. & Lucio, P. B., 2010. *Metodología de la investigación*. Fifth ed. Ciudad de México: McGraw-Hill.

Shrimpton, H., Skinner, G. & Hall, S., 2017. *The Millennial Bug: Public attitudes on the living standards of different generations*, s.l.: Resolution Foundation.

Spencer, H., 1864. *The Principles of Biology*. First ed. London: Williams and Norgate.

Srnicek, N. & Williams, A., 2015. *Inventing the Future: Postcapitalism and a World Without Work*. First ed. London: Verso.

Standing, G., 2011. *The Precariat*. First ed. London: Bloomsbury.

Standing, G., 2017. *Basic Income: And How Can We Make It Happen*. First ed. Milton Keynes: Penguin Books.

Sternfeld, N., 2007. *Whose Universalism Is It?*. [Online]

Available at: <http://eipcp.net/transversal/0607/sternfeld/en>

[Accessed 06 August 2018].

Stiglitz, J. E., 2013. *The Price of Inequality. How Today's Society Endangers our Future*. First ed. London: W. W. Norton & Company.

Svetelj, T., 2014. Universal Humanism – A Globalization Context is the Classroom of Unheard Options how to Become More Human. *The Person and the Challenges*, 4(1), pp. 23-36.

Talks at Google, 2017. *Robert Reich: "Preparing Our Economy for the Impact of Automation & AI"* | *Talks at Google*. [Online]

Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5xfIVUa4M_8&t=219s

[Accessed 05 January 2018].

Titmuss, R. M., 2008. What is Social Policy?. In: S. Leibfried & S. Mau, eds. *Welfare States: Construction, Deconstruction, Reconstruction I*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 138-147.

Uber, 2018. *Uber*. [Online]

Available at: <https://get.uber.com/p/legacy-cl-base/>

[Accessed 18 August 2018].

UN, 2003. *Universal Values - Peace, freedom, social progress, equal rights, human dignity - acutely needed, Secretary-General says at Tübingen University, Germany*. [En ligne]

Available at: <https://www.un.org/press/en/2003/sgsm9076.doc.htm>

[Accès le 08 August 2018].

UN, 2012. *The United Nations General Assembly and the Business of Universality*. [Online]

Available at: <http://www.un.org/en/ga/president/66/statements/nyu130212.shtml>

[Accessed 28 May 2018].

UNDP, 1994. *Human Development Report*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Utrecht University, 2017. *Utrecht University and City of Utrecht start experiment to study alternative forms of social assistance*. [Online]

Available at: <https://www.uu.nl/en/news/utrecht-university-and-city-of-utrecht-start-experiment-to-study-alternative-forms-of-social>

[Accessed 28 July 2018].

van der Veen, R. & Groot, L., 2000. *How Attractive is a Basic Income for European Countries?*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

van Doorn, N., 2017. Platform labor: on the gendered and racialized exploitation of low-income service work in the 'on-demand' economy. *Information, Communication & Society*, 20(6), pp. 898-914.

van Parijs, P., 1992. Competing Justifications of Basic Income. In: P. van Parijs, ed. *Arguing for Basic Income: Ethical Foundations for a Radical Reform*. London: Verso, pp. 3-43.

Van Parijs, P., 1992. Competing Justifications of Basic Income. In: P. Van Parijs, ed. *Arguing for Basic Income: Ethical Foundations for a Radical Reform*. London: Verso, pp. 3-43.

van Parijs, P., 2004. Basic Income: A Simple and Powerful Idea for the Twenty-First Century. *Politics & Society*, 32(1), pp. 7-39.

van Parijs, P., 2018. *Basic Income And The Left: A European Debate*. [Online]

Available at: <https://www.socialeurope.eu/book/basic-income-and-the-left-a-european-debate>
[Accessed 11 August 2018].

van Parijs, P. & Vanderborght, Y., 2017. *Basic Income: A Radical Proposal for a Free Society and a Sane Economy*. First ed. London: Harvard University Press.

Vite, M. A., 2002. Globalización y modernidad: una reflexión. *Polis: Investigación y Análisis Sociopolítico y Psicosocial*, 2(2), pp. 41-63.

Watts, A., 1966. *The Book: On the Taboo Against Knowing Who You Are*. Fifth ed. London: ABACUS.

Watts, A., 2007. *Does it Matter? Essays on Man's Relation to Materiality*. Fourth ed. Novato: New World Library.

Weeks, K., 2011. *The Problem with Work: Feminism, Marxism, Antiwork Politics, and Postwork Imaginaries*. First ed. London: Duke University Press.

Zizek, S., 2000. Class Struggle or Postmodernism? Yes, please!. In: J. Butler, E. Laclau & S. Zizek, eds. *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality. Contemporary Dialogues on the Left*. London: Verso, pp. 90-135.

Zvolska, L. et al., 2018. *Urban sharing in smart cities: the cases of Berlin and London*. s.l.:s.n.

Appendices

Appendix 1

Interview Questions

1. What is your current occupation?
2. What do you think about it?
3. What motivates you to do it? / If unemployed: Why are you there?
4. If you were given the chance to do whatever you'd like to do, what would it be? Could be a passion, a dream-job, a hobby, you name it.
5. If you were assured 1,500 (specify currency GBP/EUR/USD/other) every month aside from your salary/scholarship/earnings, no attachments, for the rest of your life, how would your life change?
6. What do you think if everyone – regardless of their condition, would receive the same amount of money?
7. Do you think a BI would be a feasible option in your community/country?
8. How do you think a UBI could benefit society at large?

Appendix 2

Participant 1

- Mexican
- Male
- 25 years old
- Lives with his partner and 3-year-old son
- Recently finished his undergraduate studies. His degree is on hold.

1. ¿A qué te dedicas actualmente?

- Analista en la Secretaría de Seguridad Pública y Tránsito Municipal de Puebla. Es un trabajo temporal.
- Lleva ahí 6 meses

2. ¿Qué piensas de este trabajo?

“Es un trabajo exhaustivo, pero bastante interesante.” En general menciona que está bastante a gusto con su trabajo.

3. ¿Qué te motiva a hacer lo que haces?

Uno de sus principales motivos es su familia. “Aquí en México, para poder llevar una vida aceptable... medianamente aceptable, es necesario tener un buen trabajo con un buen sueldo”.

3.1. ¿Qué te permite hacer tu sueldo actual?

No está privado de cosas básicas: “alimentación, sustento e incluso un poco de recreación”. Cree que no es la aspiración que debería tener una persona de su edad y nivel académico. Compara su situación con otras personas de su generación y ve los gastos de esta gente son propios, no compartidos. “Si yo quisiera tener un ingreso como el que tendría una persona soltera, necesariamente debería ganar tres veces lo que estoy ganando hoy en día”. “Hay que racionar el ingreso económico en las necesidades básicas de la familia”.

4. Si tuvieras la oportunidad de dedicarte a cualquier cosa, ¿a qué sería?

Indeciso. Le gustaría una vida de campo... “tener una pequeña ranchería, animales, cultivos. Alejado un poco de todo el barullo de la ciudad y vivir tranquilo. Vivir mi vida apartado”.

4.1. ¿Qué crees que es lo que te detiene para vivir esta vida?

La realidad. Considera que para poder llevar ese estilo de vida:

- Se requiere conocimiento.
- Se requiere paciencia y aceptación para adaptarse a un nuevo estilo de vida, que es completamente ajeno a vivir en una ciudad.

“Es totalmente irreal. Sería dejar de lado responsabilidades, el crecimiento personal y profesional. Prácticamente lo que la sociedad exige para poder estar dentro”. No tiene miedo al rechazo social. De hecho, es precisamente lo que busca. Quiere estar apartado en el campo. Pero el primer obstáculo es su realidad: “la realidad en la que yo vivo, la realidad en la que vive mi familia. La realidad de mi entorno... empezar a renunciar a lo que se entiende por ‘correcto’ a ojos de la sociedad”.

5. Si tuvieras asegurados 1,500 USD-MXN mensualmente, aparte de tus ingresos, sin condiciones, para el resto de tu vida. ¿Cómo cambiaría tu vida? ¿En qué usarías ese dinero?

“Me ubicaría en un estado de confort”: habla de los pilares que definen el desarrollo personal y profesional. Habla en tercera persona. Dice que cuando se obtienen algo a partir de la nada y sin ningún esfuerzo, se cae en este estado de confort y en el conformismo. Argumenta que deja de haber una búsqueda por mejorar. “Si a mí me lo ofrecieran, claro, bienvenido. Pero a mí me queda completamente claro que me convertiría en un completo zángano. Dejaría de esforzarme por mejorar... por crecer. Y obviamente vendría esto en detrimento mío”.

Académicamente dice que suena muy bonita la idea, pero argumenta que en la economía habría inflación y encarecería el estilo de vida. “Quizá si la mentalidad fuera otra; quizás si las aspiraciones fueran mayores y más fuertes que (se corta y no se entiende) ... pereza y el estado. Pero la realidad es así. No es una mentalidad que tengamos, hablando de

México, por ejemplo. No es una realidad en la que vivamos, ni una mentalidad que poseemos. Entonces creo que no estaría preparado para ello, en definitiva.”

5.1 ¿Estás hablando de ti o de México?

“Estoy hablando de la mayor parte de la gente que conozco”. Pone el ejemplo del caso de un tercero al que le ha tocado recibir dinero y argumenta que en lugar de aprovecharlo e invertirlo, guardararlo o esforzarse por volver a ingresar algo de esa manera, se reservan y se limitan a esa entrada. Dice que habla de mucha gente y al final generaliza diciendo que habla por los mexicanos.

5.2 Me gustaría saber cómo llegaste a la conclusión sobre el aumento de precios

Cuenta su historia familiar. Durante años, su padre siendo militar llegó a cierto nivel donde ya no podía seguir ascendiendo. Cuenta cómo es que él ve como con el transcurrir de los años los precios aumentaban, pero el sueldo de su padre no aumentaba. Luego describe su situación laboral. Menciona que su sueldo se ha mantenido igual, pero los precios han subido y ya no puede permitirse comprar ciertos productos, precisamente porque han encarecido. Define el funcionamiento de la inflación.

Después de desarrollar mejor el término para Alberto, él reafirma su posición en decir que el IBU fomentaría el estancamiento y el desarrollo personal de la gente.

6. ¿Qué piensas si todos (sin importar su condición...) recibieran la misma cantidad de dinero?

“Sería bueno, pero no me preocuparía el ahora; me preocuparía el después... ¿a qué costo? Hay que pensar también cual es el origen del recurso. Entiendo que, por el hecho de ser mexicano, tendría derecho a este ingreso. Pero si me preocuparía a que costo. ¿Es decir, tendría que renunciar a mi seguridad social? ¿Tendría que renunciar a mis servicios más básicos e indispensables? ¿Tendría que renunciar a golpes más indirectos, como subvenciones estatales? Desconozco cual sería el origen para que nosotros pudiéramos obtenerlo”.

6.2 Independientemente de los costos que implique la implementación, ¿por qué dices que sería bueno?

“Desaparecería la incertidumbre”. Menciona como la incertidumbre es uno de los mayores problemas que aquejan a la población mexicana – ¿qué se va a comer hoy/como le vamos a hacer hoy? La incertidumbre en México genera ansiedad y es un foco de generación de criminales, por la precariedad y lleva a la gente a cometer acciones “socialmente incorrectas”. “Creo que el hecho de tener garantizado el acceso a un ingreso económico fijo, eliminaría esa incertidumbre. Eliminaría de raíz el problema. Eliminaría muchísimos problemas que aquejan a la sociedad”.

6.3 Se abre tema sobre narcotráfico en México en relación con su respuesta respecto a la incertidumbre como foco de criminalidad. Si se hiciera una encuesta entre los integrantes del narco y preguntaras ¿Por qué te dedicaste a esto?, ¿Qué crees que te dirían?

Coincide en que mayormente responderían cosas como la necesidad de alimentarse o de dinero u oportunidades, para ellos y los suyos. “Siempre hay una excepción a la regla... desgraciadamente no siempre el motor es – como tu mencionas – la pobreza, sino que también si hay esas excepciones a las reglas y sí hay gente que lo hace por pasión a matar. Pero fuera de eso describe como bastante “humana” la propuesta del IBU, ya que “disminuiría enormemente esta desigualdad y en la necesidad impetuosa de obtener un ingreso a cualquier costo”. Menciona que la creación de brechas financieras dentro de la población obliga a la gente a cometer actos desesperados, forzando a la gente a delinquir... obliga a que la gente vaya dispuesta a todo, incluso a dar la vida (valdría la pena recordar que estamos hablando del caso mexicano. Narco y migración masiva).

6.4 ¿Crees que, si se te diera un ingreso mensual de este tipo, tendrías más tiempo o los recursos para buscar otras oportunidades o para realizar tu ideal de vivir en el campo y lo de la ranchería?

Dice que efectivamente sería posible y constituiría la oportunidad perfecta para hacerlo. Sin embargo, relaciona esto de manera tal que explica que realizar este ideal implicaría abandonar el desarrollo personal y profesional. “Yo creo que hay aspiraciones que nos motivan, que impulsan a seguir adelante, y hay otras que se deben de quedar nada más en eso: en el puro placer de imaginarlo”. “Yo creo que si tuviera la oportunidad de vivir en un mundo donde este ingreso fuera real, lo mejor que se me ocurriría hacer sería

guardarlo y asegurar el futuro de mi familia. Porque dinero que fácil llega, dinero que fácil se va... dicen aquí en México”.

Habla de la preocupación de que, en dado momento a alguien en las cúpulas de poder se le ocurriera pensar que el IBU ya no conviene y que constituiría un peligro dado el estado de confort al que él estaría acostumbrado, dejándolo en bancarrota.

“Si me iría de vacaciones por un tiempo. Me daría un break en mi vida, pero no lo tomaría como forma de vida, eso en definitiva”.

6.5 Entonces, ¿Qué es lo que tomarías como una forma de vida?

“Yo creo que seguir adelante, tal cual lo estoy haciendo ahora. Buscar crecimiento profesional, crecimiento personal. Escalar, mejorar mis ingresos económicos... considero que, si este IBU tomara cuerpo, sería lo mejor de verdad. No me caería nada mal, pero lo más conveniente sería continuar como si no existiera. No confiarme y no estancarme”.

7. ¿Crees que una política (Ingreso Básico) de este tipo sería una opción realizable en tu estado (Puebla)?

Explica que, si podría ser posible, sin embargo, cuenta como este estado tiene una captación de extranjeros muy grande, así como inversión por parte de grandes empresas extranjeras – VW. Explica que la ciudad, por ejemplo, ha venido desarrollándose, pero más que nada a costa de esta inversión extranjera. “Otorgárselo (el IBU) a la gente frenaría muchísimo el desarrollo de la ciudad. Yo creo que ahorita la ciudad se encuentra en un apogeo de crecimiento... de expansión misma y siento que lo frenaría de cierta forma”. En contraste, habla como esto podría disminuir el aumento de la inseguridad (física). Dice que en general sería algo muy bueno para la población, pero reafirma su argumento sobre los peligros de que la gente caiga en un estado de confort.

Define el estado como grande, con numerosos municipios y poblaciones muy alejadas. Cuenta que su trabajo le ha permitido conocer a estas poblaciones y sus características. Explica que una política como el IBU rompería con tradiciones económicas locales, ya que la lógica en estas poblaciones es que mientras más hijos se tengan, más manos hay para trabajar. “Hace tiempo platicaba con una persona que me contaba que en los pueblos la gente tiene hijos, porque entre más hijos, hay más manos para poner a trabajar y esto

implica mayor ingreso... los pueblos serían los más beneficiados porque serían familias con hasta 15-16 integrantes y que estarían ingresando esos volúmenes de dinero... las brechas económicas se empezarían a invertir. Ahora existiría mayor afluencia en las localidades aledañas a sierras, que en la misma ciudad... sería una desestabilización terrible, porque mucha gente depende de esas poblaciones, de esa mano de obra. No estoy haciendo un comentario clasista... pero como te digo, yo lo nombraría una costumbre, una tradición económica... como se vienen desarrollando, el papel que desempeña cada quien en este sistema”.

7.1 ¿Crees que se invertirían los polos de la riqueza en Puebla?

Compara a su propia familia con la familia de la señora que les hace el aseo en casa de su abuela. Cuenta que esta señora tiene una familia de 11 personas. “Si nosotros aquí estaríamos ingresando por mi mujer y por mi 3000 USD, esas personas estarían ingresando 30,000 dólares”.

7.2 ¿Qué piensas de esta situación, pero con la gente que vive en La Vista (fraccionamiento más rico de Puebla)?

“La diferencia... es que estas personas que te comento están en la base de un esquema productivo, que solo generan producción. Son los trabajadores, la mano de obra. Por el contrario, estas personas de La Vista si bien van a recibir esa misma cantidad de dinero, son familias que no tienen ese volumen o ese índice de miembros de familia... además, contribuyen a la generación de empleos, son fuentes de empleo. Gente que tiene empresas, gente que tiene un poco más allá para aportar... hay una diferencia”.

8. ¿Crees que el IBU podría ayudar a la sociedad?

“Yo creo que se disminuiría por algún tiempo la brecha... a lo que yo me refería con que sería bueno es lo que te mencionaba. Habría cero-pobreza, ya no habría necesidad de delinquir por parte de esas personas pobres y los pobres dejarían de ser pobres, porque lo ricos se harían más ricos (¿?)”.

8.1. ¿Crees que incrementaría la brecha de desigualdad?

El cree que habría un desequilibrio. “En México, la gente de familias de escasos recursos o que viven en pobreza extrema, son las personas que mayor número de personas tienen

viviendo dentro de su familia. Y personas de una clase media – que no es pobre, por así decirlo – no tienen tantos. Nosotros somos 3 en mi familia... Nosotros nos veríamos un poquito beneficiados, pero una familia en pobreza extrema con muchos integrantes, saldrían de la pobreza y entrarían a la opulencia. Ellos mismos estarían ganando más de lo que yo genero con mi trabajo y con ese doble ingreso (IBU). Sería un cambio violento y muy abrupto”.

8.2 En este sentido, ¿En México crees que funcionaría un Ingreso Básico, pero por familia?

“Exactamente. Que fuera proporcional”.

8.3. Si algo así se implementara, ¿crees que al largo plazo cambiarían las relaciones sociales hacia modelos no monetarios o post-capitalistas?

Lo ve difícil, ya que el ingreso básico significa precisamente incentivar la circulación de capital. Si se llegara a dar esa suplantación, provendría más bien de una raíz ideológica más que de la política pública per se. “Algo tan sencillo como es el valor. No el valor monetario, pero el valor que le tenemos a las cosas... para ti no va a valer lo mismo que para mí. Hoy día, lo que nos da un intermedio es el valor monetario... sería muy difícil que empezaras a generar una transición de esa magnitud cuando reciente acabas de darle a la gente – más allá de un estado de confort – la idea y el gusto del poder adquisitivo”.

8.4. ¿Podrías explicar esto un poco más?

“Si tú le empiezas a dar dinero a una persona – de la nada – que no estaba acostumbrada a comprar bienes o a recibir servicios innecesarios/lujos innecesarios. Cosas que fueran más allá, no de lo básico, sino de lo que puede y le cambias ese universo en el que se ha desenvuelto; esta persona va a aceptar el cambio... esa persona lo va a ver con muy buenos ojos. Lo va a recibir muy bien y va a aceptar la costumbre también de adquirir, de comprar, de gastar. Creo que gastar nos produce a todos un poco de endorfinas ¿no? Entonces, le vas a generar el gusto y si un día, a esa misma persona le cortas el suministro de tajo o progresivamente y le dices ‘bueno, no te voy a dar dinero para que lo compres, ahora te lo voy a dar directamente (el bien material). No lo va a recibir igual que recibió el dinero, porque le estás cortando el gusto. Le estás cortando algo a lo que se había acoplado de una manera rápida y que así de rápido se lo quitaste”.

“Eso pasaría – considero yo – si se tratara de hacer ese tipo de transición. Le estás abriendo a la gente un panorama que jamás habían conocido. Un panorama de estar holgados económicamente, de poder gastar; porque en realidad ese es el mayor de los gustos: gastar por gastar. Y de repente le dices a la gente ‘sabes que, pues ya no vas a gastar’. Ya no vas a invertir dinero en cosas innecesarias, sino que ahora vas a recibir pues lo que necesitas. Generaría descontento y tal vez desequilibrio”.

Appendix 3

Participant 2

- Spanish
- Female
- 27 years old
- Lives with her parents and brother.

1. ¿A qué te dedicas actualmente?

- Estudiante del máster de Formación de Profesorado para Secundaria y Bachillerato.
- Profesora de extraescolares en un colegio. 2 horas a la semana.
- Practicante: de oyente para profesora de teatro en una escuela de teatro de Madrid.
- Tiene formación en bellas artes. Usa sus prácticas para presentar sus obras y así concursar para obtener becas
- Proyecto artístico: da talleres de teatro

1.1. Lo de profe, ¿lo haces porque te gusta y también porque es de donde piensas vivir?

“De todas las opciones laborales que puedo tener, es la que más me apetece realizar, porque he sido profe de extraescolares muchos años con niños pequeños, pero nunca he tenido una formación de eso. Creo que profe de secundaria puede darme un trabajo con buenas condiciones laborales y aparte también me gusta. Pero creo que es una forma fácil de trabajar... fácil entre comillas”.

1.2. ¿Por qué fácil entre comillas?

Dice que a pesar de la estabilidad que un trabajo de estos brinda – “horario fijo, vacaciones y sueldo digno” –, es complicado obtenerlo por la experiencia y las cualificaciones que se requieren para obtenerlo. También recalca que políticamente es un sector muy castigado: “veo que los profes – y ahora más con el máster – tienen mucha carga de trabajo y se les valora muy poco”.

1.3. ¿Por qué esta políticamente machacado?

“En concreto a mi caso... han quitado muchas horas de las asignaturas que yo tendría que impartir. Por ejemplo, dibujo artístico en bachillerato sólo se da 2 horas a la semana cuando antes eran 4... eso también hace que la calidad de un profe de arte en la pública pues no tenga casi trabajo. Entonces hay mucha competencia también... las políticas están siempre orientadas a la educación de otras asignaturas, más que de las artísticas. En general, yo creo que no están protegiendo la educación pública”.

2. ¿Qué piensas de tu situación como estudiante de enseñanza? Económicamente y en cuestiones de tiempo, ¿a ti como te afecta?

Mientras ella estará estudiando para las ‘oposiciones’ el año que viene, debido a la alta cantidad de requisitos que se les piden para ser profesores, ella no tendrá el tiempo de estar trabajando y, por lo tanto, tampoco el dinero. Precisamente, por esa falta de tiempo y por la necesidad de cubrir esas necesidades, ella se vea en la necesidad de presentar sus oposiciones en otra comunidad autónoma y establecerse ahí, pero eso es algo que ella no quiere.

3. ¿Qué te motiva a hacer lo que haces... que por un lado quieras mantener esta vida profesional de artista, y por el otro estés mezclando esta parte de profesor de enseñanza?

“A mí me interesa tener un trabajo estable para poder tener una vida estable. Yo no quiero andar de un lado para otro con residencias, porque en el arte puedes coger y decir ‘bueno, pues me presento a esta residencia artística, me voy a vivir 6 meses a Finlandia – por ejemplo – y luego vuelvo’. Eso es dinero que tú también gastas, a pesar de que te vayan a dar beca. Entonces a mí me interesa tener un poco de estabilidad... yo creo que el trabajo de profe me puede dar estabilidad y aparte, creo que sí que puedo combinarlo.

Ella pone el ejemplo de sus profesores, ya que muchos de ellos aparte de su rol en la docencia, tienen sus talleres para crear su arte. Muestra motivación en el sentido de decir, ‘si veo que ellos pueden, ¿por qué yo no?’.” Creo que del arte es muy complicado vivir, a no ser que estés ya en la cima... y yo no pretendo estar en la cima. Yo solo quiero poder hacer lo que me gusta”.

"Los jóvenes en España y en Madrid... o en el mundo, que son artistas y que no tenemos alguien que nos dé dinero, habitualmente para poder hacer nuestra propia obra, se pierde dinero más que ganarlo. Además, la forma que se tiene de trabajar es que tu encuentras una convocatoria y entonces haces una obra para acomodarse a la convocatoria que, a lo mejor, no es de lo que tú quieras hablar o no es tu estilo, pero porque esa convocatoria te va a dar dinero, una beca o una residencia o lo que sea pues acomodas tu obra a eso. Entonces por un lado te está quitando esa libertad. Esa inclinación tuya que tienes para desarrollar tu trabajo y además a lo mejor eso, no te lo pagan. Y tú has estado mazo de horas trabajando para presentarte a eso y luego no ves un duro."

"Por ejemplo, los talleres que estoy haciendo yo de teatro, he invertido muchísimas horas y no he ganado ni cien pavos. Pero mazo mazo de horas... ¡que llevo dos años con el proyecto! Es como una cosa cumulativa que no te da resultados en seguida... o quizás no te los dé nunca."

3.1.O sea, ¿haces arte por amor al arte?

"Me gustaría dedicarme a eso 100 por cien, pero para dedicarme a ese 100 por cien tendría que venderlo. Y como a mí tampoco me interesa vender eso, pues vendo mi fuerza de trabajo como profesora y hago mi producción artística".

3.2.¿Por qué no te interesa venderlo?

"Las relaciones son muy complicadas... van todos por intereses económicos o de influencias, y ni siquiera económicas porque casi no ganas dinero. Hay tanta competitividad de compañeros que no te avisan del concurso: 'tronco, si vas a competir con mogollón de gente, que más te da competir conmigo'. Entonces, como que las relaciones que hay en ese mundo a mí no me interesan demasiado como para meterme a competir así... Me parece mucho más costoso estar pidiendo becas y concursos y conociendo gente sólo por interés, que prefiero trabajar de otra cosa".

4. Si tuvieras la oportunidad de dedicarte a cualquier cosa, ¿a qué sería?

“A mí sí que me gustaría trabajar en arte... y no me importaría combinarlo pues con eso, un profe de teatro o un profe de arte”. “Me encantaría trabajar en el teatro, producir mis propias obras de teatro y arte plástico... artista.”

“A lo mejor no querría tener ningún trabajo. Porque si yo no necesitara dinero, no querría trabajar. O sea, no que sea una vaga ahí que no quiera trabajar de nada, sino que la actividad que yo haga pues tampoco la haría por dinero. Si diera clases, a lo mejor pues no sería considerado mi trabajo, sino otra cosa. Como que cambiaría el concepto de trabajo, yo creo. Yo el arte lo hago por amor al arte, no para que me dé de comer. Para empezar, ahora mismo es un gasto más que un trabajo.”

5. Si tuvieras asegurados 1,500 EUR mensualmente, aparte de tus ingresos, sin condiciones, para el resto de tu vida. ¿Cómo cambiaría tu vida? ¿En qué usarías ese dinero?

“Lo primero: compraría comida ecológica (orgánica). No compraría en un supermercado nunca más y me alimentaría bien. Del tiempo libre... iría más veces al cine, por ejemplo, o viajaría más. Estaría más tranquila yo creo, en general. Y lo primero la comida. Eso es lo que más me preocupa”.

5.1.¿Por qué la comida?

“No es que coma mal. Yo, por ejemplo, me voy a un supermercado ecológico y me gasto 10 pavos en 2 cosas y es carísimo. Me molaría poder comer pues las verduras, la pasta, el pan, todo que sea ecológico. Yo compro cosas ecológicas pero muy puntuales... yo vivo con mis padres y mi hermano y la fruta no es de temporada siquiera... me molaría vivir fuera de Madrid también. En plan pues, que no haya ruido ni contaminación.”

5.2.¿Por qué estás interesada en consumir comida ecológica?

“Sobre todo por los químicos que les echan a las verduras, la forma de producir toda la comida o los conservantes, o mogollón de químicos que le echan. Pero no sólo a la comida, a las cremas, a todo lo que te echas”. También su preocupación viene del hecho de que en 2016 le diagnosticaron endometriosis – enfermedad que le da a las mujeres en el aparato reproductor. El tejido que se produce para recubrir el útero se produce fuera del útero – el intestino en su caso. No se ha investigado mucho acerca de la

enfermedad, pero se cree que es causada en parte por la polución y los químicos en los alimentos.

Cuenta que no hay tratamiento, pero una forma de ayudar a que su cuerpo funcione mejor es no someterlo a químicos. Afirma que se siente mejor cuando come sin químicos: “he hecho ese experimento en estos dos años y me encuentro bastante mejor... con esta enfermedad que me ha rayado mucho, intento cuidarme más”.

5.3.Entonces, ¿usarías ese dinero para comer de manera más orgánicamente y para actividades de ocio?

“Como viviría más desahogada... no estaría tan agobiada con el tiempo. No perdería tanto tiempo en buscar trabajo”. “Cada vez tienes que hacer un currículum para cada cosa. No te vale uno. Tienes que hacerte 20 y ponerlo bonito”.

6. ¿Qué piensas si todos (sin importar su condición...) recibieran la misma cantidad de dinero? ¿Qué crees que pasaría?

“Me sorprende mucho siempre cómo funciona la gente en general. No sabría calcular que pasaría, a lo mejor se reactivaría la economía, porque la gente está comprando... se regularía algo a nivel económico. Yo lo que creo que si pasaría es que la gente estaría más tranquila. Creo que, sobre todo, el estrés principal de la gente es por el dinero... pero igual se volverían locos y se pondrían a invertir y petaría algo”.

6.1.¿Ves diferentes escenarios dependiendo de las personas?

“Supongo que algunas personas se quedarían igual, en plan, no me lo voy a flipar comprándome mazo cosas. Igual otros se arruinarían. Bueno si tienes 1500EUR igual no te arruinas, pero te endeudas mazo. Hay gente muy loca. O igual irían mejor las cosas y todo sería muy fluido”.

7. ¿Crees que una política (Ingreso Básico) de este tipo sería una opción realizable en Madrid?

Cree que es posible y explica que lo sería porque la alcaldesa de Madrid es de izquierdas. Sin embargo, la Comunidad no lo es. No es la primera vez que alguien se muestra más positivo respecto a la implementación de una política de este tipo cuando hay un

gobierno de izquierda. “Yo creo que si se podría porque hay dinero para eso. Lo que pasa es que lo utilizan mal y se ha demostrado que, si lo gestionan bien, las cosas salen... Hay propuestas ciudadanas por ejemplo que abren un portal en internet y tu propones algo que quieras que el ayuntamiento pague para hacerlo, y la gente lo vota. Luego se hace el que más votos tiene. Entonces, si se pueden hacer esas cosas que, a lo mejor, cuestan millones de euros de hacer una reforma en la Plaza de España, no sé cómo no se puede hacer eso. Y también es una obligación de los políticos garantizar eso... creo que si sería posible hacerlo en Madrid”.

7.1.¿Crees que es una obligación del Estado proveer las condiciones de seguridad económica para la gente?

“Si. No puede ser que vayas por la calle y veas a la gente durmiendo en la calle en Madrid. Me parece que la ciudad es una ciudad con dinero como para que eso pase... Hay gente que dice que ellos no quieren estar en albergues, pero es que ¡si hay pisos vacíos en Madrid! Hay edificios a medio construir... no puede ser que no haya dinero para la renta básica, pero si lo haya para dejar obras. No sé si sea privado... no lo sé. Yo creo que no puede haber gente en Madrid viviendo en la calle”.

“¿Cómo me puedo enterar yo de cómo destinan o a qué proyectos destina dinero el gobierno de mi ciudad o de mi país? Yo no lo sé”.

8. En el caso hipotético de que se haya implementado esta política, ¿crees que en general y a la larga este IBU podría ayudar a la sociedad?

“Yo creo que si... si la mayor parte de la gente está muy jodida, con trabajos precarios, yo creo que les ayudaría ya sólo por no tener que aceptar trabajos de mierda porque hay mucha gente que por 600 EUR al mes estar trabajando en unas condiciones de mierda. Entonces, yo creo que, si ayudaría a la sociedad, aunque sea para que desaparezcan esos trabajos precarios.”

8.1.¿Cómo qué tipo de trabajos precarios?

“Por ejemplo, lo de esto de repartidores de Glovo. No sé cómo será en otros países, pero estos que van con la mochila y la bici repartiendo cosas... no sé cómo son sus condiciones, no sé si tienen contrato o como va, pero es muy precario. O lo de Uber o todo eso. No

solo ellos están esclavizados en un trabajo precario, sino el funcionamiento de esas empresas, yo creo que repercute negativamente. Por ejemplo, en los taxistas de Madrid y el Uber han tenido muchos problemas, porque les están quitando clientes. Creo que son empresas que compiten negativamente... la forma de funcionar de esas empresas no es demasiado buena”.

“Yo creo que la forma de funcionar de la empresa Uber, o de Glovo o de todas estas que son ‘tú eres tu propio jefe’ me parece que es, no solamente perjudicial para la persona o el individuo que trabaja en ese momento ahí, sino que es una dinámica que no se debe extender... no quiero ser mi propio jefe, yo quiero seguridad social. Quiero un contrato, quiero pensiones”.

8.2.¿Tienes algún otro comentario?

“Yo no le daría 1500 EUR a todo el mundo. A lo mejor una persona que ya gana 1500 euros en un trabajo digno, igual no necesita 1500 más... No le puedes dar 1500 pavos a un tío que vive en un barrio rico y que tiene dos casas y que igual no lo necesita. Debería contribuir él para que sea todo un poco más igualitario; con los impuestos y eso, que no les gusta pagar nunca a los ricos”.

Appendix 4

Participant 3

- Venezuelan migrant in Spain
- Female
- 29 years old

1. ¿A qué te dedicas actualmente?

- Estudiante de máster en Estudios Internacionales en la Universidad de Barcelona.
- Abogada de profesión en Venezuela. Gestorías. No ha litigado, ha hecho documentación en Venezuela. En España ha realizado asesorías en el ámbito migratorio.

2. ¿Qué piensas de tu situación como estudiante extranjera en España?

Ella describe que, como estudiante extranjera y venezolana, los trámites para estudiar en cualquier país europeo, pero particularmente en España, son relativamente fáciles. Pero describe un filtro económico, que no permite a ciertas personas la estancia si no pueden costear sus programas. También, para los estudiantes que deseen prorrogar su estancia, la oficina de extranjería pone muchas trabas administrativas.

2.1. Ahora que estás allá, ¿Cómo le haces para mantenerte? ¿Tienes una beca, tienes un trabajo o que es lo que haces?

No existen becas para venezolanos, a menos que sean internacionales. Generalmente la gente se maneja por su propio dinero. “En Barcelona, yo tengo una red de apoyo que son venezolanos expatriados que, cuando se requiere algún trámite en extranjería relacionado con cuestiones económicas o incluso, apoyo económico – independientemente de la situación –, uno utiliza su red de apoyo social para hacerlo. Por supuesto, no son préstamos grandes, son préstamos pequeños. Pero uno se apoya de su red de connacionales. Es uno de los tantos mecanismos que uno utiliza”.

“Otro mecanismo que yo utilizo es a través de las asesorías. Si es cierto que no cobro como abogado – porque no soy abogado en España –, dependiendo de la persona y del

tipo de asesoría cobraré o no cobraré un precio. Otras veces salen trabajos de manera informal y se mueven también por tu red de apoyo... aparte, ahorros familiares o nexos que uno tenga con nacionales de otros países también funciona. Por ejemplo, asesorías a través de internet a otros amigos que están en otros países o compra y venta de bienes en tu país”.

2.2. Son varios ingresos, pero más que nada ¿vienen de esta comunidad / red de apoyo de connacionales?

Resume el apoyo económico en el extranjero en base a tres ingresos principales:

- I. Red de apoyo de nacionales.
 - II. Ahorros familiares
 - III. El trabajo que puedas autogenerarte
3. ¿Qué te motiva a hacer lo que haces? En cuanto a tus estudios y a hacer las cuestiones de extranjería.

“En el ámbito de extranjería, lo que me impulsa a seguir es que yo tengo aproximadamente 2 años y medio en España – casi 3 –, y he estado siempre en condiciones legales...” básicamente, hacer el salto de estudiante a profesionista en España implica ciertos requisitos legales y esa es una de sus principales motivaciones.

“Para mi familia representa una inversión. ‘Ve, regresa y luego ayúdanos’... digamos que yo soy una salida para mi familia desde un punto de vista indirecto. Esa es una motivación... Digamos que mi motivación es: tratar de estar legal y tratar de terminar mi proceso migratorio. Tener una residencia temporal, no en condición de estudiante, sino en condición de trabajador”.

“A nivel de estudios... hice un máster de inmigración cuando llegué y para continuar estando en España de manera legal y también para profundizar mis estudios, realicé el de estudios internacionales y que estoy culminando ahora. La motivación principal es que en el ámbito de estudios internacionales veo cooperación al desarrollo y algunos matices en el ámbito de ciencias sociales que creo que pueden ayudar, no solamente a mí como persona, sino a otros... creo que es una buena oportunidad para luego poder volver y aplicar lo que pude hacer acá”.

4. Si tuvieras la oportunidad de dedicarte a cualquier cosa, ¿a qué sería?

“Me gustaría tener un trabajo que implique viajar y suena súper idílico, pero creo que el tema de cooperación al desarrollo y en el ámbito de estudios internacionales se podría dar. Lo único es que veo que es todo muy elitista en el sentido de que por ejemplo, para trabajar en las naciones unidas o en organizaciones regionales, tienes que tener un currículum bastante amplio. Si pudiese vivir de algo, sería de cooperación al desarrollo o ayuda humanitaria o diplomacia... creo que las nuevas generaciones – empresas/yo –, pueden hacer algún tipo de cambio en las estructuras sociales o regionales actualmente. Lo que pasa es que una persona no puede hacer el cambio, necesitas muchas otras pero creo que es un trabajo que me permitiría viajar, conocer otras culturas y profundizar y también crear crecimiento personal y emocional. También los cambios se hacen desde el crecimiento individual y por ahí es que se empieza”.

4.1. ¿Te apasiona lo que estudias ahorita?

“Si, me apasiona... pero las prácticas son prácticas no remuneradas, los organismos te piden realmente un currículum de alta categoría para la que tengo. Normalmente ves a las personas en las grandes instituciones de los 35 para arriba... ahorita mi aspiración es meterme en el ámbito de cooperación internacional o sus derivados para empezar a hacer carrera”.

4.2. ¿Dirías que el recién egresado está económicamente abandonado?

“Totalmente. En el campo de las ciencias sociales, actualmente – al menos en España – hay mucha precariedad. También diría un poco en Venezuela. Casi nadie ejerce lo que estudió, cosa que es una lástima, porque uno hace una inversión de dinero bastante importante para tener este conocimiento o profundizar o crecer. Y lo otro es que la oferta laboral en este ámbito, son muchos voluntariados y te exigen hacer cosas, muchas veces que le exigen a un trabajador. Entonces a veces las organizaciones se aprovechan del voluntariado. No todas...”

“Lo otro es que las prácticas, como son asociadas al desarrollo académico, son prácticas no remuneradas. Entonces tienes cosas absurdas”. Explica esto último con el caso de unos estudiantes haciendo prácticas en Ginebra acampando fuera de Naciones Unidas porque no tenían como costearse una habitación. Destaca la ironía de jóvenes queriendo

trabajar para organismos que se supone ayudan a otras personas, cuando estos no pueden ayudar a estos jóvenes. “Al final terminas haciendo cualquier cosa y lo que estudiaste se convierte en tu hobby... y creo que como extranjero hay una dificultad extra porque sin papeles, no vas a poder conseguir un trabajo de ese calibre o al menos no mientras logres llegar a tener algún tipo de residencia”.

5. Si tuvieras asegurados 1,500 EUR mensualmente, aparte de tus ingresos, sin condiciones, para el resto de tu vida. ¿Cómo cambiaría tu vida? ¿En qué usarías ese dinero?

“Creo que me daría estabilidad económica porque tomando en consideración el salario mínimo en España, en comparación con el costo de la vida en la ciudad, creo que hay una desproporción. Entonces, yo creo que estos 1500 me darían más estabilidad y podría invertirlos en algo que pueda ser productivo para mí y, en consecuencia, también para la sociedad”. Después muestra desconfianza de lo que otra gente pueda hacer con el UBI y piensa que sólo vivirían de eso. “La idea es que sea un incentivo y no que sea una parálisis”. Lo compara con el beneficio social del paro en España. Explica que mucha gente decide vivir del paro, ya que éste paga más que conseguir un trabajo y por eso la gente opta por quedarse con beneficios.

“Yo usaría los 1500 para generar mi estabilidad económica. Para garantizarme por lo menos, el techo. Y el resto, podría seguir generándolo yo o podría hacer algún proyecto de emprendimiento”.

6. ¿Qué piensas si todos (sin importar su condición...) recibieran la misma cantidad de dinero?

“En el supuesto de que esto sea así, lo que creo que habría que hacer es educar a la población. Y digo educar, porque los ricos pensarán que los 1500 provendrán de los impuestos; los pobres pensarán que se lo merecen solo porque son pobres... es un concepto un poco radical, pero si no tienes una educación de una cultura de trabajo pensarás que el Estado simplemente tiene que ser un Estado paternalista que te suministre todo. Y en el momento que el Estado no pueda darte los 1500, entonces tendrás una revuelta social en tu ciudad/país”.

“En el tema de la clase media, no sé cómo reaccionaría. Creo que primero es un tema de educación. Decirle a la gente, de donde vienen esos 1500 y cómo hacer de esos 1500 algo productivo, para que eso también se materialice en calidad de vida. Creo que eso varía de acuerdo al país. No es lo mismo que lo implementes en un país desarrollado a un país en vías de desarrollo. Esta propuesta puesta en el marco europeo, es diferente proponerlo a Latinoamérica. O sea, en contexto social y cultural. Por eso creo que la educación en relación a donde proviene este dinero, como puede invertirse y con qué fin se está haciendo, es importante para que todos los estratos sociales sepan qué hacer con ese dinero y no sea sólo el Estado paternalista que te lo da sólo porque sí, y para que la gente también sepa que eso se trabaja y es una inversión que uno debe hacer”.

7. ¿Crees que sería (el IBU) algo realizable en Barcelona? Contrastado con Venezuela

Barcelona

Explica las dificultades político-sociales que la ciudad, como parte de Cataluña, ha tenido respecto a cuestiones de independencia. No está segura de que pueda funcionar dadas las tensiones políticas con el gobierno central. Pero dice que, si las condiciones fueran más ideales, el IBU sería posible si: “incluyes a los nacionales – españoles y catalanes – en conjunto con los inmigrantes. Si se da a todos por igual y en iguales condiciones de legalidad porque si no, creo que enfrentaría mayores diferencias sociales”.

Venezuela

Dice que una iniciativa de ese tipo ayudaría en gran medida, debido a la crisis sociopolítica que se vive en Venezuela. Pero explica que la gente debería ser educada, ya que existe una tradición de subsidios. “El gobierno ha subsidiado algunos enseres básicos... y en el momento de la crisis, ya no pueden ser subsidiados”. Menciona algunos casos objeto de subsidio: gasolina, educación, cesta básica y algunas medicinas. “No veo viable el caso de los 1500 en Venezuela por un tema de educación y porque hay casi un estallido social, pero si considero que pueden ser útiles porque hay mucha gente que está pasando necesidad y hambre, por lo cual sería un desahogo. Pero eso no significa que sea una inversión o que sea rentable para el país, porque la gente no va a saber qué hacer con esos 1500 porque hay muchos problemas macro que solucionar”.

“Yo como venezolana, viviendo en Venezuela si tengo necesidad, yo utilizaría esos 1500 para sobrevivir. No los invertiría, por ejemplo, en un proyecto de emprendimiento, a diferencia de como yo lo haría en Barcelona donde hay una política y una seguridad de Estado, y un soporte de la Unión Europea que puede un poco respaldar tu seguridad jurídica y social de alguna manera. El contraste para mí, yo lo focalizo en el sentido de que Barcelona como parte de España – hasta el momento –, tiene una política estatal que te brinda cierta seguridad. Entonces tú tienes un margen para saber qué quieras hacer con esos 1500. Digamos que no tienes las mismas necesidades sociales... En Venezuela, por el contexto actual de crisis... el Estado actualmente no te proporciona una seguridad para tu poder usar esos 1500 en otras cosas diferentes a la supervivencia. En este caso, te preocuparás por tu salud, cosa que, por ejemplo, en España está garantizada. Ese es el matiz que yo veo: la seguridad que te brinda un Estado en contraste con el otro, para poder hacer uso de esos 1500”.

7.1. Respecto a tu comentario sobre migración. En lugar de dar este ingreso en base a la ciudadanía ¿mejor darlo en base a la residencia?

“A lo mejor es utópico y no sé qué tanto podría incrementar la brecha de desigualdad. Por eso incluí el tema de la residencia y no la nacionalidad... si se lo das a uno sí, y a otro no, entonces tendrás una población con una brecha de desigualdad muy grande en el poder adquisitivo porque variará muchísimo. Toma en cuenta que Barcelona es una de las ciudades más cosmopolitas de España y la mayoría de las personas que viven en Barcelona, son inmigrantes”.

8. En el caso hipotético de que se llegara a implementar, ¿crees que al largo plazo esto cambiaría las relaciones sociales hacia modelos no monetarios o post-capitalistas?

“No. O sea, en este momento, la idea es muy buena. Creo que en la medida en que la gente tenga una seguridad y una estabilidad económica va a poder hacer uso de sus recursos personales para poder hacer otras cosas y diversificarse. Sin embargo, el ser humano por naturaleza es un ser ambicioso y esta idea del capitalismo, la tenemos muy arraigada. Creo que es una idea buena (IBU), pero muy avanzada para el tiempo en el que estamos viviendo. Ahorita todo lo mueve el mercado financiero y el dinero. De hecho,

muchas de las crisis que se dan, las crisis personales que la gente tiene, muchas de ellas son por razones económicas. Entonces creo que el dinero forma parte de nuestra vida”.

“Creo que es una idea que se podría implementar, pero para llegar al punto de no necesitarlo y desarrollar un poco más de cooperación, tenemos que tener primero otro estado de conciencia. Suena místico, pero otro estado de conciencia y de ayuda a los demás. Y lo otro, es una estabilidad económico-social muy buena a nivel local y a nivel estatal, de lo micro a lo macro para que esto se pueda dar”.

“Creo que la idea (IBU) es buena pero no creo que sea en el corto o en el mediano plazo. Ni siquiera por acuerdos internacionales, porque creo que es una idea muy avanzada para el tiempo en el que estamos viviendo... estamos anclados a veces al trabajo para tener dinero y es nuestro principal intercambio... También a nivel mundial, hay un orden mundial. Me refiero a que las grandes potencias seguirán siendo las grandes potencias y la brecha de desigualdad no solamente se da a nivel local, sino que también se da a nivel mundial. Tanto es así que las principales organizaciones se manejan por las grandes potencias. Y los temas de cooperación internacional siempre se dan desde países desarrollados a países subdesarrollados o en vías de desarrollo. Entonces tendrías que tener un plano de igualdad muy consolidado, para tu poder generar la cooperación sin ayuda del dinero. Por eso creo que es una idea utópica, pero sí creo que podría implementarse a largo plazo, por ejemplo, a nivel de Estado. Pero prescindir del dinero hablando a nivel mundial, no creo que sea posible.

“Me parece que es un tema interesante y de vanguardia, y creo que hacen falta este tipo de estudios, este tipo de propuestas. Y la verdad... cuando termines tu trabajo me gustaría leerlo e incluso ayudarte a compartirlo, porque creo que vale la pena. Yo no había escuchado algo así al respecto”.

Appendix 5

Participant 4

- German
- Male
- 28 years old
- Single
- Background: International Business, Economics and International management.

1. What is your current occupation?

Business consultant for the banking sector. Consult banks on how to implement certain things. Steering portfolios to increase the profitability out of an asset allocation of the bank.

2. Do you enjoy doing this?

“Partially. Simply due to the fact that for one: it’s really time consuming. We currently work somewhere in the range of 55 to 70-something hours a week which, of course, I chose to do so. So yeah, it’s getting annoying a bit. But the matter as such is also partially interesting. Simply because you can simulate the net interest income for a whole bank – and this is a big bank where we are doing it right now – so, you have quite some detail into this bank and you can also see from the simulation which steering impulses you would actually get from these simulations... basically how to hedge a risk in certain products.”

2.1. Would you do this for the rest of your life?

“No. Definitely not.”

3. What motivates you to do what you do?

“For one is definitely the insights that you get, and you simply have the opportunity to learn or to see a bank from different angles, which you wouldn’t have in a different job. So, you can learn quite a bit. That’s for sure one motivation, because it also grants you an

easier transition when changing jobs. If you've worked as a business consultant – at least that's what I'm telling myself – you have so many insights into so many topics and you've learnt to work in a project really efficiently. The other one is of course the money that you're earning because it's quite ok what we earn as business consultants. It's worth it. It motivates you."

4. If you were given the chance to do whatever you would like to do, what would it be?

"Testing cars, new cars. I'd be really into it. If there'd be an opportunity I'd love to take it because I'm just a car nerd and just have fun testing new cars. Irrespective of it being solely, exclusively sports cars or just simply everyday used cars. So, I'd just be open to that and I'd really love to just test the different cars that there are in the market."

5. If you were assured 1,500 EUR every month aside from your salary or current earnings, no attachments, for the rest of your life, how would your life change?

"Not sure for my situation. Simply because I am not sure who's actually gonna pay for it. The government is not simply giving away more money to the people without having raised any taxes or whatsoever. So I'd be thinking about the concept as such, if it's really 1500 that I'm earning more, or if it is 1500 I'm earning more gross. But then again, I have to pay a certain amount of taxes additionally, so I come out with maybe 200 euros more a month. Anything under a thousand euros, I don't think would make a big difference to my daily living."

5.1. You say it wouldn't make so much of a difference but let's suppose you are earning this money. How would you spend it?

Basically, he defines three specific possibilities:

- Luxurious goods: "could be a choice, because I'm really addicted to nice watches, I'm really addicted to cars. I'd like to buy a Mustang."
- Investing: "simply, buying a house is really expensive over here. Specially, when looking in Cologne, in a big city. So, some extra money for investment activities would be really nice, which would actually be the pursuit of more wealth. So I'd use the money to earn more money, in theory."

- Safety net: “in case I ever wanna quit my job and just wanna look around. So, it’d have an aspect of safety, which I would be granted so I won’t have thoughts necessarily on my existence once I’m laid off, or once I quit my job, so I also take that money and just breach the gap between two jobs. Or think about a start-up that I could come up with, because also currently I’m still thinking about a start-up opportunity – maybe pursue it next year... we are still writing the business plan. For a pilot phase, it would be nice to have some guaranteed income.”

6. What do you think if everyone – regardless of their condition, would receive the same amount of money?

“Not sure. The first thing that I’m actually thinking about it is these are costs for the government and where are these costs covered? Because I’m pretty sure it has to be within any kind of tax, because every government wants to be re-elected, which is the ultimate goal in today’s politics, I sense. So, selling the people tax raises will always be tough in combination with the UBI, it might work but I’m not just sure about it. Then again, I also think about the inequality that it would come with it, because I still think a UBI is still unfair. There’s certain social classes that simply do not need any kind of UBI. There’s some classes, some families which never have to work, because simply they have so much money. I’d love to see a concept where more income is just granted to lower classes in society like dividing classes by income. I’d like to see a reversed tax scheme where the lower classes earn more, get more UBI and the higher income classes are granted less, simply because they have the chances to earn so much more money.”

7. Do you think a policy like (Basic Income) would be a feasible option in your country?

“In Germany as of right now, I highly doubt it. For one you have an income for unemployed people, which is not enough in my opinion, but you have that safety-net in theory. And the other thing is: I don’t see how in Germany you could cover the costs without having the people become upset with their respective party or government (because of the tax increments he explained before). So that, what I sense is the biggest hurdle for Germany right now to introduce such an idea where the costs are just a big topic to discuss, and they would have to come with a good way to cover the costs.

Otherwise, I don't see how people will happily enjoy that. Specially in Germany where people are critics."

7.1. Why critics? As in people are cynical?

"Well, if you follow the German politicians nowadays, you can simply see how there has been some gaps between the people and the politicians, I sense. This is also the reason why certain right-wing parties are getting more votes nowadays than four years ago, or even eight years ago. The people don't feel that politicians are attached to the everyday needs of the people anymore and that's a big opportunity for other parties to jump in there and pretend to fight for the everyday needs of the regular people. That's why people are looking at politics and politicians really critical these days. Whenever some politician in Germany says something very wrong – from the bigger parties – then it's tough for that politician to push anything through. I'm just sensing that German people would really be upset in case any further tax adjustment would be made in order to cover the cost (of the UBI)."

7.2. Do you think that for a BI to happen, taxes would go higher? As some sort of welfare benefit?

"Right. Might be the easiest option which I'm currently seeing, but I think that it would have to be over some kind of tax."

7.3. What do you think about taxing companies and businesses, instead of the taxpayers?

"Companies always seek profit maximisation. Either they run to a different location where taxes are not as high, where they have better conditions from the government or they would in some way just pass the increase of taxes, by an increase in product prices. Mostly, the big companies within each country are also the biggest lobbyists. So, they also have their say and their word in politics and the political direction that the country is taking. I'm not sure if you just pass taxes to companies, that these costs wouldn't be transferred to the people again. That's my ultimate fear. That the cost would be turned over to the regular people."

8. How do you think a UBI could benefit society at large?

"In case it's really the perfect policy; prices and inflation are not linked to the UBI, then I think that people would have for a safety net that could simply explore their ideas and just be easy within their job – because of the pressure of performing within your job –, otherwise you could be laid off. I mean, you could even choose to take some time off. Just you are becoming a parent and you think 'hey, I wanna see how my son or my daughter is gonna develop within their first six years so, I'm just staying at home teaching that kid some valuable lessons'. That could be a benefit for future societies, of course. I mean, the more education we can get – whether it'd be by your parents or by the opportunity to pay for a certain university – the UBI would be a big chance to enrich our knowledge. I think there could be a big benefit and that would be the increase of knowledge, which will then result in new products, new companies, new political views, new whatsoever. So, knowledge is basically the big benefit I would see in the end from a UBI, combined with a 'perfect policy'."

"Germany is already learning from the Nordics. When you see parental leave, the Nordics I think, many many dads actually take the parental leave until eight – I don't know how many years. It is becoming also a thing in Germany. More or less copied the Nordics and also stay at home when the dads have a new-born child. I think ten years ago, hardly any dad would be willing to put the – in quotation marks – 'shame' upon himself to stay at home as a parental leave, just to see their kids grow up."

8.1.Do you think it was some sort of stigma?

"Yeah. Definitely."

8.2.Do you believe this stigma would be either less or could completely disappear if there would be a safety net?

"Well, it is (the stigma) already weakened in today's society so I think it could have a further impact with the UBI."

Appendix 6

Participant 5

- Dutch
- Female
- 28 years old
- Shares a flat with her boyfriend

1. What is your current occupation?

- Masters student
- Part-time bartender
- Works at the Green Office at the University of Leiden. 12 hours a week

2. What do you think about it? Working these two part-time jobs and studying at the same time.

“I like it... all three things give me experiences that are really valuable to me... and I think they give me experience for the future that is gonna be really useful. Prepare me for an actual job, I guess”.

2.1.How do you feel about it in terms of time?

“I’m currently doing a masters, so that takes a lot of time and I think sometimes that I should be spending more time on studying than on working. But I think that you, kind of automatically do it because work always gives you this feeling of satisfaction, more than studying. I mean, that’s at least what I have so, I think that’s why you automatically start doing more of that than studying. It always comes in second place with me”.

2.2.When you talk about work satisfaction, you talk about the Green Office, the bartending one or both?

“No, let’s just stick to the Green Office”.

3. What motivates you to:

3.1.Do your masters?

"I wanna gain more knowledge in the field that I'm studying, so I can actually contribute with something with that knowledge later in my working life".

3.2. Work in the Green Office?

"I think it's a couple of things. First of course, to make a little of extra money. And then I think, more importantly is some practical experience, because in university we talk about theory and some case studies, but not actually working with real people in real situations. That has been really helpful, that I have that space right now. And then, another important one is that lately, is getting a little bit more competitive. More people are getting a master's degree so, having something extra-curricular activities on your resume is good for job opportunities".

3.2.1. Let's say this position wouldn't pay, would you be there?

"I honestly don't think so".

4. If you were given the chance to do whatever you'd like to do, what would it be? Could be a passion, a dream-job, a hobby, you name it.

"I don't know. It has to be something with people and something with I could contribute something to my community, or society in whatever way and I would like it to have... like that sustainability aspect in it. In moving society forward".

4.1. You are almost there with what you do at the Green Office, right?

"Yeah, kind of. Only that I feel that in the Green Office I'm sometimes very limited because the university is such a big bureaucratic thing. Thus, very difficult to make changes in what they do".

5. If you were assured 1,500 EUR every month aside from your salary or current earnings, no attachments, for the rest of your life, how would your life change?

"I'm not really sure if people don't get really lazy... because I have noticed there's for example another sustainability organisation run by students. Basically, the same as us but they're not getting paid and you can clearly see the differences. Like you feel less responsibility if you are not getting paid for it. I think that's one. But then I think also that if you get this basic income and you set something of yourself, then that's what motivates people. Because it's then your own baby and then you're gonna work really hard for it".

"So, what would I do... probably I'd set something of myself and surround me with a group of people that is also really motivated to work towards the same goal. I don't know if it's really, really what I would do".

5.1.Basically, you would spend this money in building something for yourself?

"Oh no for myself, but like an organisation or like a company". She later explains it would be something related to sustainability or social entrepreneurship.

6. What do you think if everyone – regardless of their condition, would receive the same amount of money?

"I think it would be very mixed. I think there would be a large part of people that would indeed thrive and start doing all these great things. But I think also, a lot of people would probably not benefit from it at all and just stay at home and do nothing".

6.1.Do you think it would drive society towards a new sort of inequality?

"It feels like it would be compared to people that live off benefits now in Holland. Some of these people... they just sit around. There are some other things coming to play, because there's also people that are not able to work physically or mentally... or they are drug addicts or whatever. But probably there's a whole scheme for that in the basic income concept for what happens to those people".

"People stay in their own circle, right? So, if you have this circle of people that start doing really great things and they also get a little bit of this social pressure of feeling these things. But if you are in the other circle and you are only with people that doesn't really move forward, then there's no pressure".

Short explanation about the current social assistance experiments in the Netherlands. There are certain concerns regarding the social acceptance of the idea, and a discussion about the effectiveness of the experiments: "If the rest of the society around you isn't in that system, is very difficult. And then, they were supposed to get a job, so they will get money for that, right?"

7. Do you think a policy like (Basic Income) would be a feasible option in your community/country?

"No. I think it costs a lot of money for the government, first of all. And... well... maybe yes. You get the same amount of money, but you also get to decide how much you want to work, right? It is very difficult to imagine..."

7.1. You find it difficult to imagine working/not working?

I think there are a lot of lazy people, so I think people might just work two days a week. And then systems would just stop functioning."

7.2. Which systems for example?

"For example, supermarkets and a lot of places where you just need people every day, like hospitals, the police, firefighters... stuff like that."

We start a conversation about the automated tills at the supermarkets, moving the discussion towards the argument of job displacement due to automation.

7.3. When it comes to technology, what do you think about this?

"In the specific case of the supermarkets, I think that you still need a guy that checks if people are scanning everything".

7.4. What do you think about the jobs that would be replaced and how do you think we could address that?

"I guess the basic income would be a good solution. Then you could say that we need less working hours from people, so that people can start spending more time in another thing... In an ideal world, I guess... I would say we should try to de-intensify all the processes and start like, farming really sustainably and then you need more hands again!"

"I'm looking from a sustainability perspective. So for me, all this mass production, all these super intensive processes... if you look at farming like I said, those really efficient processes have a lot of waste, not really efficient for the environment. So, for example, a small farmer doing some permaculture somewhere – which takes a lot of his energy – would be maybe more profitable for the environment. That's maybe a way to keep more people at work."

8. Do you think that in the long-term, a UBI – if virtually implemented – would change social relations towards a non-monetary based/post-capitalist society?

"It really depends on how's implemented, and also we all are already there. So, it would be really difficult to change that back, I think. It'd definitely change things. Because you won't have that person that's the richest, but you would have for example that person who builds the most houses with this money or something... It would change the relations, but there would be something like that always. Some kind of inequality in a way."

8.1.Which kind of inequality do you imagine could come with this?

"This is maybe not even a bad thing. But then get people who are for example, smarter or have a better way of working, so they get more done with basic income than other people. They would be higher in some way than the people that get less done."

8.2.What do you think about competition taken this way?

"That would be probably good for society... it would be really productive."

"We have these human qualities that will always be in humans. Or in some, depending on your personality I think. Like not working as hard. If I have to be really honest, I just also said when you asked if I wouldn't be paid in my job, I would stay, and I said no, then I think, maybe I'm even like that. I wouldn't give as much effort if I weren't paid... I think I'm maybe that kind of person... I always think that money is a strong incentive for people, for everything."

Appendix 7

Participant 6

- Indian
- Female
- 27 years old
- Married
- Her family is composed of important lawyers and politicians in India

1. What is your current occupation?

- Not working
- Lawyer. Certified advocate, she practiced until recently, but she quitted
- In the meantime, she is starting a centre for arts and spirituality

2. What do you think about quitting what you used to do and starting with this project of your own?

“I feel liberated. Not having to work long hours. It was a very stressful job and took up a lot of my time for very less pay. I was doing environmental law and labour law, human rights related cases, so it was also very frustrating to navigate the Indian legal system. So, I feel free from the stress and now I am doing something more related with my passion.”

3. Do you think there was something that told you “I need to follow my passion; I need to quit this job and start with this project of mine”?

“It was stress. I was extremely stressed out and almost depressed for my job. It was a difficult job and I think I just kind of hit a breaking point. Stress was the main reason. Not being able to handle stress, I guess.”

3.1. Why did you take that job?

“I thought that was my passion. I studied human rights and law in England, and before that I was working for a human rights organisation in Sri-Lanka. I thought that by doing law, in some way people might make work in human rights more useful, using law as an

instrument. But turns out, It's a very frustrating process and passions change. I realised this is not the only way."

She saw law as the right instrument to use to work for human rights but discovered there are other ways. She didn't like practicing law in her country due to corruption and the frustration this brings to make things happen or either consider oneself an agent of change. "At some point, you feel that all your efforts are futile."

3.2.And you mentioned you weren't paid that well, right?

"When you are in the human rights field, the pay is not so high."

4. If you were given the chance to do whatever you'd like to do, what would it be? Could be a passion, a dream-job, a hobby, you name it.

"I'm still starting this centre for art because we all need to do something. We need some kind of income to sustain our lives. But if I didn't have to do this, I would just wake up, garden and paint... I wouldn't want to work if I don't have to."

5. If you were assured 1,500 GBP every month aside from your salary or current earnings, no attachments, for the rest of your life, how would your life change?

"That's enough money for my needs and my wants in India... because I lived in England, so I know that with the same amount of money I can get much more luxurious life here with that exact same amount, than in England. If I got that, I would be gardening and painting. I would be following my passion."

6. What do you think if everyone – regardless of their condition, would receive the same amount of money?

"I think that's perfect, because I think that would eliminate the superiority complex that people feel from money, and everybody would feel on a more equal footing. It doesn't bother me what my neighbour gets. For me this is a great amount and I think for my neighbour as well, it would be a great amount."

7. Do you think a policy like (Basic Income) would be a feasible option in your country or at least in your community?

“I believe that the government has money to give us this universal basic income but given the current state – I’m sure that you know that the Indian government is one of the most corrupt in the world. We have corruption in like every stage of governance. Every bureaucrat unit is corrupt, so I don’t think it is feasible. I don’t think it would work. I think people would be cheated out of it and it would go into the politicians’ pockets.”

7.1.If you would have to address a problem in India, that would be corruption first, in order to make something like this happen?

“Yes definitely. Because it would be the state who would have to basically navigate and implement the UBI. If they are the implementing authority, it would not work. So when it comes to the UBI and implementation, then corruption is one of the biggest challenges. Forget about convincing somebody that people should get money. That would also may be a problem, but the main thing would be corruption.”

8. Do you think that in the long-term, a UBI – if virtually implemented – would change social relations towards a non-monetary based/post-capitalist society?

“Yes. I think it may have an immediate impact because social hierarchy is very ingrained in Indian society. It is maybe caused based on the monetary hierarchy so, that would all suddenly be in chaos. Like this hierarchy that we have brought for so long, now it may slowly be diminished, or in the process of being nullified. So, I think yes, there may be a state of confusion to the old hierarchy and going into some kind of new more equal society. I don’t know if you already read, but in India the income distribution... the gap is very wide. The Indian rich versus the Indian poor is galaxies apart.”

Appendix 8

Participant 7

- English
- Male
- 24 years old
- Shares a flat with his girlfriend. Both work at the same barber shop

1. What is your current occupation?

- Barber
- Music producer and Deejays. He considers this a hobby

2. What do you think about your job?

"Is good. It can be stressful at times and busy, but all in all I do like it. The social side of it and speaking to people and having a laugh. It's good. And also, the creativity of it, I like doing stuff because I can't sit down in an office and do nothing all day. I need to be functioning properly."

3. What motivates you to do what you do?

"Money. Because I need a job... just because it gets me out of the house. Gives me some structure in my life. But yeah, I prefer to be a musician but that's just something that I can do. So, I might as well do it, instead of doing nothing."

4. If you were given the chance to do whatever you would like to do, what would it be?

"I definitely would be a touring musician. Deejaying, making music. The highlife pretty much. But nothing too mainstream. Just keeping it underground."

5. If you were assured 1,500 GBP every month aside from your salary or current earnings, no attachments, for the rest of your life, how would your life change?

"It'd be very very good, obviously. I recon it would help because I could use that money to put a way, maybe use it to buy a house or something like that... I think it's a good idea."

Using it for home or maintenance, things like that. I wouldn't use it for things like pleasure. Probably use it to actually put down to buying a house or something like that."

5.1.Do you think you would still be doing the barber job?

"Probably yeah. To be fair, if I was gonna get that money, I'd probably concentrate more on the music thing. If I was getting just money for free I'd probably think 'right, I'm just gonna concentrate more on the music' but I probably do part time as well. Do half music, half bartering. I'd still be doing something, but then at the same time I'd still be getting that as well."

6. What do you think if everyone – regardless of their condition, would receive the same amount of money?

"If obviously homeless people got it, it'd be great because then they could possibly get their lives back on track or they could probably... I don't know, if they are drug addicts or something, they probably use it to fade their addiction. I think it should be given to somebody that – if you make like a certain income over that (?). Say you make like over 50 grand a year, you shouldn't get it because you got plenty of money... Obviously gives more to the rich. Or it should be given not just given cash, it should be given in like a way. To some people anyway. To people that are unemployed. If someone doesn't have a job and you're like 'oh, I'm gonna give you 1500 pounds a month just to sitting on your ass all day', then it's not gonna work. They should be made to work for it. But, if you're in employment then it could be easy."

"It's half and half. Of course, I'd still work, but if I was getting money to do nothing, I probably quit my job and concentrate on something else."

6.1.You think other people would see it like that?

"Yeah, I think a lot of people would think the same way as me about it. 'If I'm getting money to just doing nothing all the time, then there's no point in working'. But I think you should have to be made to do something for it."

6.2.You mentioned earlier that you would keep the barber job as a part-time thing. Now you tell me that if an unemployed would receive this, this person might be sitting there without doing nothing?

"That's probably what a lot of people would do if they were getting that amount of money every month, easily. I know a lot of people that do that."

6.3.Do they just live on benefits?

"Exactly, that's it! And more than benefits, that's a good income anyway. It's decent. Not amazing but is enough."

7. Do you think a policy like Basic Income would be a feasible option in your country or at least in your community?

"Yeah, I guess so. But a lot of people where I come from don't work. So, they probably wouldn't be encouraged to work if they were getting that amount of money. If you're getting money for nothing, for just sitting around or watching tv all day. They're doing that on benefits, let alone you know one and a half thousand pounds."

7.1.Why do you think they don't work? Is it because they just don't want to or what is it?

"Maybe they're just lazy... I've been there, I was on benefits for a little bit and I got used to not working. I could do whatever I wanted. Get up at whatever time. Go out all day. You kinda get stuck in the rut pretty much. But now I like working because I have something to do every day, and I'm not just sleeping in until what time. So anyway, is good that I got a job."

"Now if I have more than two days off in a row, I'll get bored and start going crazy. I like to have some structure to my life now. I definitely prefer a work life, to the life not working."

7.2.Do you think that receiving the basic income would have the same impact on you? Do you think you would be encouraged to work?

"Probably yeah. I'd probably go and do part-time, like few days a week just to fill my time a little bit more."

8. Do you think that a UBI could benefit society at large?

"I think it'd make people a lot happier. They'll have decent money. There'd probably be less crime. There'd be less people trying to rob people for money. There'd be less poverty as well. There'd be less people on the streets. It's hard to see people on the streets you

know... they just had bad luck, but if someone would gonna give 'em some luck, some money, then they'd be able to sort themselves out. But then in other ways they could make it worse and take drugs or whatever."

"I think some people would use it and think 'right, I'm gonna get my life back on track now'. But then other people would be just like 'fuck it, I'm just gonna take lots of drugs, because I've got money to waste on drugs'... It could make it worse and it could make it better as well (the society). You never know. That is definitely the biggest argument. It could help someone out and them at the same time it could just make society worse."

"Free money. I don't think money should be free anyway. I think you have to do something to earn that money, even if it's just like doing a little job. I definitely think it shouldn't just be given to people to sit around all day and not do anything."

8.1. UBI is supposed to be unconditional. Do you think it has to be otherwise and could be that people should be encouraged to find a job or start a company or do something 'productive' with that money?

"I think if someone was like 'right, we'll give you this money if you do this'. Give people jobs and then I think people would obviously work them... I think a lot of time people don't have jobs because they can't be arsed find them, because they just get rejected anyway. People don't get back to them. That's why so many people are just giving up now (with the job search), because people just thought 'no one gets back to me'. They (employers) don't even read the emails. That's why when I was looking for a job, I was just like whatever. You just apply for like five jobs a day and then they give you income benefits. Just prove that you've applied for five jobs every day. You can do that, and you can just apply for anything. You've got to prove that you've applied to different jobs. They used to give you a book and you can just write what you've done. Sometimes, I just used to write stuff that I've not done it. I just said, 'I gave my CV out to this job... gave my CV out to that shop'. Stuff like that. Maybe one out of ten times someone might get back to you, maybe even less than that."

Annex

Re: Basic Income/IRIS Inquiry

Sanders, M.W.J.L. (Mark) <M.W.J.L.Sanders@uu.nl>

dom 22/07/2018 16:09

Para: Carlos Montaño Garcia [ss17camg] <ss17camg@leeds.ac.uk>;

No problem. Your line up for the 19th looks impressive. Unfortunately I cannot attend the event as I will be in Nice for IRIS on that day. But have an excellent meeting!

Mark

Op 19 jul. 2018 om 10:47 heeft Carlos Montaño Garcia [ss17camg] <ss17camg@leeds.ac.uk> het volgende geschreven:

Hi Professor Sanders,

I hope you are doing well and thanks again for your help! I would like to consider your approval to use our messages as part of my research, just to legitimise the information. I will be adding them as part of the appendix in that case.

In other news, a couple of colleagues and I are organising a full day of events on inclusive growth and I think it might be of your interest. It will include a workshop, two discussion panels and a keynote speech from Professor Mariana Mazzucato. I am coordinating our panel on Automation, the Future of Work and Basic Income. So far, we have representatives from the Citizen's Basic Income Trust, the Institute for Global Prosperity and from the local government. For the last two seats, we are hoping to receive a confirmation from a Labour MP and a post-work advocate.

Also, we will have a networking session after the keynote speech and I recon we have people attending that are currently working on Horizon 2020 funded projects. So if you happen to be available on Friday the 19th of October, it would be really nice if you could come... I am sure you will find it interesting!

Best wishes,

Carlos

<Conference Flyer.jpg>

De: Sanders, M.W.J.L. (Mark) <M.W.J.L.Sanders@uu.nl>

Enviado: lunes, 9 de julio de 2018 18:39:22

Para: Carlos Montaño Garcia [ss17camg]

Asunto: Re: Basic Income/IRIS Inquiry

Hi Carlos,

We look at people that are already on benefits and measure these things using validated surveys. We are thinking about how to collect the more qualitative information. We have just done the initial wave of surveys and are analysing the data.

In IRIS we are focused on inclusive growth because we will be engaging with citizens in the demonstration area. This part of the city has high rates of low income families, social housing and migrants. the problem there will be to match the rather complex and high tech solutions with people that have very different problems and issues than saving the planet. You can find a lot on that project as it unfolds over the coming years on: <http://irissmartcities.eu/>

IRIS Smart Cities | Integrated and Replicable Solutions ...
irissmartcities.eu

In IRIS Smart Cities flagship, Métropole Nice Côte d'Azur is proving essential to developing a string of near zero energy districts using the latest in smart grids, energy management and storage, data sensors and renewables – amongst other tech – generating a great deal of international interest from actors wishing to learn and ...

Best,

Mark

On 3 Jul 2018, at 21:43, Carlos Montaño Garcia [ss17camg] <ss17camg@leeds.ac.uk> wrote:

Hi Professor Sanders,

Thank you for the good wishes and your reply, it is quite helpful! I recon I am arriving somewhat early to any result, but I do believe in the importance of both experiments and I will be very eager to read about them when the information is out there. About the social security initiative, I have read that advocates (mostly from the Green Party, like Heleen de Boer) have been very careful in presenting the idea to the council. Now that you explain the welfare traps of the Dutch system and the bureaucratic burden it poses on people, it makes complete sense.

I think that for a social innovation initiative (not only in the form of basic income) to have more political acceptance and a broader social support, it is also important to consider its philosophical and conceptual approach. That's why I find it very interesting that you are tracking the impacts on health, well-being and happiness. Recently, I wrote a paper precisely on basic income and one of my arguments towards the current initiatives that share some elements with basic income (including the Dutch municipalities), is that they could easily fall under crisis management agendas due to their highly pragmatic approaches. However, now that you tell me the elements you are considering for its evaluation, makes me realise that my findings could be misguided. Or that I need to take some Dutch lessons to dig deeper into fresher information :)

In any case, I am glad about it because this means that the experiments are in fact, a more vision-oriented strategy. I do believe that taking into account health, well-being and happiness in the evaluation is quite important to achieve social justice. But, how do you plan to measure these elements? Are the participants part of specific populations, like unemployed or people already on benefits, or is it a mix? I can imagine there will be some qualitative research in the future to draw evidence on this. As for the IRIS project I have (yet) another question. Is the overall project linked in some way to a notion of inclusive economic growth?

I hope that you are doing fine professor. Looking forward to hear from you!

Best wishes,

Carlos

De: Sanders, M.W.J.L. (Mark) <M.W.J.L.Sanders@uu.nl>

Enviado: lunes, 2 de julio de 2018 14:38:14

Para: Carlos Montaño Garcia [ss17camg]

Asunto: Re: Basic Income/IRIS Inquiry

Hi Carlos,

one can never have too many questions ;-). But I am afraid I do not have all too many answers. At least on the IRIS project, we are still very much involved in getting the research set up. In this very large consortium, we work on business incubation towards a smarter city, in which energy transition is one of three important transition paths. But so far there is little to report. We found out a few things that do not work ;-). Next year we will collaborate with the municipality to set up a proper challenge and hopefully succeed in finding and incubating some energy transition innovations in the project. Then we can start collecting data on what such innovations need and how they can be promoted.

As for the experiment, it is decidedly NOT a basic income experiment, as Loek will also confirm. We are testing in the field 3 alternative social security arrangements that socio-politically and philosophically

have some things in common with the basic income debate. The trend in Dutch social security has long been to be stricter and pile up administrative burdens and requirements on the beneficiaries. Their lives are effectively taken over by bureaucrats and bureaucracy, when most of these people are not very strong in that. Our experiments simply propose to let them more free and offer help on a voluntary basis. We track impacts on outflow to work but also well being, health and happiness. But there too, we have only just finished selecting the participants and making the treatment groups. Results will only follow in two years.

All the best and good luck with your research and graduation in Leeds.

Best,

Mark

On 1 Jul 2018, at 22:13, Carlos Montaño Garcia [ss17camg] <ss17camg@leeds.ac.uk> wrote:

Dear Professor Sanders,

My name is Carlos Montaño and I am studying the masters in Social and Political Thought at the University of Leeds. I have been in contact with Rens van Tilburg, since I am very interested in the research carried out by the University of Utrecht's Institutions for Open Societies. Drs. van Tilburg told me that you are working on basic income, thus he kindly referred me to you. Currently, I am writing my masters thesis and it addresses the perspectives of young adults with regard to basic income, and the extent to which this idea could lead towards a more sustainable society. I am well aware of the research carried out by Prof. Loek Groot on basic income, as well as the University's involvement in the social assistance experiment proposed for Utrecht municipality.

I have not found much information in English about the Utrecht initiative, and I was wondering if you could be able to help me. One of the chapters of my dissertation will include a comparative study between the Finnish and the Utrecht initiatives. The analysis will focus on the socio-political and philosophical-theoretical aspects of both initiatives. Also, I took the liberty of looking at your research and I am really interested about the IRIS project. Precisely, in one of the chapters of my research I want to link social innovation and the transition towards a more environmentally sustainable energy infrastructure, basing my arguments on Jeremy Rifkin's Third Industrial Revolution. But since that is basically what the IRIS Project is all about, is there any evidence yet of the social impacts of the initiative or any theoretical foundation?

I am aware that I am asking too many questions, but I find your research and the projects carried out by the University quite thrilling and in tune with my research. I hope you could help me out with this. Thanks in advance!

Best wishes,

Carlos