

THE EARTH AS A COMMON TRUST

Implications for a Minimum Income Guarantee

Robert F. Clark

Wisdom of the Ancients

Human societies have always recognized a special responsibility to those in need. The reasons for this sense of responsibility vary but mainly spring from a few core values. Through a brief historical “tour d’horizon” of selected societies, we seek out those values as a way to frame the debate on extreme global poverty.

Hammurabi, the Amorite who became king of Babylon in 1792 BCE, unified the city-states of Mesopotamia and made his capital one of the great cities of the ancient world. As king he had a divinely imposed duty to ensure justice and provide for the general welfare. In 1750 BCE, he had 282 laws (most only a sentence in length) engraved onto an eight-foot stele, using the Akkadian language and cuneiform script.

The Code of Hammurabi makes provision for the upkeep of women and children. In the case of divorce (law 137), for example, the man was required to assign his former wife the usufruct of field or garden, as well as goods, to maintain herself and their children until they grew up. At his death she received a portion of the estate equal to that of one son and was free to marry again.¹

In Plato’s *Republic*, the ideal society is governed by an intellectual elite that has tapped into ultimate truth and reality. For Aristotle (384-322), “the state is a creation of nature and prior to the individual [who], when isolated, is not self-sufficing; and therefore he is like a part in relation to the whole.”² Modern notions of self-sufficient individualism would have sounded strange to both philosophers’ ears. For them, the root of social policy is the dependence of the individual on the state and vice versa.

To their discredit, ancient Greek and Roman societies countenanced slavery, an inferior status for women, abortion and infanticide. But more humane impulses also surfaced. For example, in Rome, uncertain harvests, irregular transportation schedules and price gouging periodically triggered famines.

During two terms as tribune (123-122 BCE), Gaius Gracchus won popular support for his law enabling Roman citizens to buy grain at a subsidized price. This measure helped maintain regular grain supplies and kept a lid on prices in periods of shortage. Eventually the grain subsidy turned into a free dole.³ Greek and Roman societies also made provision for poor widows, gave pensions or allowances to people with disabilities and established institutions to care for orphans whose fathers died in battle.⁴

Religion and Poverty

In the world’s great religious traditions, voluntary poverty through self-denial can produce a spiritual payoff. Involuntary poverty is another matter. Religious leaders have decried the material disparities between rich and poor and called on the former to share their bounty.

In Hinduism, there is no dichotomy between material and spiritual well-being. Material goods can sustain and enrich the spirit and the spirit can assure the proper enjoyment of material goods. Greed and selfishness prevent people from experiencing the ultimate reality of Brahman but instead condemn them to a cycle of suffering and rebirth.

Commitment to duty (or dharma), material success and love are integral to Hindu teaching, all with the goal of achieving *moksa* or spiritual freedom. Hinduism stresses both the rights of the individual and the collective welfare of humanity, both material and spiritual. All have a right to share earth's bounty, which comes through Brahman.

The individual and society are interdependent. The individual is entitled to a secure place in society so that he can both contribute to it and derive support from it. In this context, for example, aid should be given to the poor with no thought of reward. India's caste system was evolved as a societal expression of Hindu values but that expression could take other societal forms as well.⁵

Buddhism, which grew out of Hinduism, also recognizes the interplay between physical and spiritual well-being but stresses the priority of the latter over the former. By extinguishing desire, one achieves victory over suffering, the lot of humankind. The Buddha placed little value on material riches. A life of few wants and desires paves the way to the final beatitude of nirvana.

The goal is detachment, not poverty per se. When ordinary people are deprived of basic needs and instead are exploited or marginalized, they tend to resort to violence. A just social order provides for full and productive employment so that all people can live together in harmony, free of social tensions, conflict and war. The quality of life in society is measured not by material abundance but by conditions that foster caring and compassion.

Some Buddhist thinkers oppose Western-style antipoverty programs that in their view promote not only the acquisition of material goods but also greed, selfishness and overly competitive behavior. Such external influences undermine traditional beliefs and values. The eradication of poverty is desirable, provided that "poverty" is properly understood in all its dimensions.⁶

The ancient Hebrew scriptures known collectively as the Old Testament included commandments to give to the poor.⁷ These duties are elaborated on in the authoritative Talmud and in other Jewish commentaries.

Christianity not only retained this notion but also extended it through the commandment to love one's enemies and through universalization of the concept of "neighbor". Poverty was seen as a permanent feature of human society. Charity towards all but especially toward the poor was the guiding principle.

Under Church law, the wealthy had an obligation in both justice and charity to share their resources with the less fortunate. In the medieval period, assistance to the poor was also provided through the vast network of monasteries, dioceses and parishes. "Hospitals" were multipurpose institutions that cared for the sick, lepers, pilgrims, orphans, elderly persons and the destitute.⁸

Among the five pillars of Islam is the duty to give alms.⁹ According to the Koran, "To be charitable in public is good, but to give alms to the poor in private is better and will atone for some of your sins."¹⁰ The Prophet Muhammad (570-632), who had been orphaned as a child and raised by an uncle, always emphasized that widows, orphans and people in poverty deserve help and respect.¹¹

More broadly, the Prophet's message stressed social solidarity and compassion. The Koran highlights the virtue of *infaq*, or voluntary spending to benefit the poor. Islamic countries mandate almsgiving by law; in non-Muslim countries, local communities collect alms as voluntary gifts. In both cases alms aid the needy and help with the spread of Islam.

In recent centuries, leaders in some religious traditions have worked to improve conditions for the poor as less as a matter of compassion or even moral obligation than as a matter of social justice.

In Western societies, especially since the Renaissance, traditional Judeo-Christian values of love and charity as the response to poverty have ceded ground to more legalistic notions of equity and social justice.

*Influence of Humanism*¹²

With the rise of humanism during the sixteenth century, European thinkers began to tout the duty of government rather than the Church to alleviate poverty.

In *Utopia*, humanist (and Catholic saint) Thomas More (1478-1535) has the fictional Portuguese traveler Rafael Nonsense recount a conversation involving Rafael, the Most Reverend John Morton, Cardinal Archbishop of Canterbury and Lord Chancellor of England, and a certain lawyer. The lawyer wondered why England continued to be plagued with thieves and robbers, since so many were caught and hung.

Rafael responds that, instead of meting out punishment, it would make more sense “to provide everyone with some means of livelihood, so that nobody’s under the frightful necessity of becoming first a thief and then a corpse.”¹³ When the lawyer rejoins that many trades are open to those who have instead opted for thievery, Rafael launches into a lengthy indictment of English society.

Idle nobles extort exorbitant rents from their tenants. Retainers who lose their positions will not accept more menial jobs and instead turn to violence for their livelihoods. Nobles, gentlemen and abbots enclose ever more land as sheep pasture, evict small farmers, and drive up the price of wool. Incongruously, wretched poverty is linked with expensive tastes, as all classes of society “are recklessly extravagant about clothes and food.” They waste money in brothels and at gaming tables.

Rafael’s solution? “Stop the rich from cornering markets and establishing virtual monopolies. Reduce the number of people who are kept doing nothing. Revive agriculture and the wool industry, so that there’s plenty of honest, useful work for the great army of unemployed...”¹⁴

This falls short of guaranteeing everyone an income. But it does dictate a responsibility for society to change conditions that induce people to resort to violence and thievery as their means of survival.

Thomas More’s friend Johannes Ludovicus Vives (1492-1540) was the first to develop an argument and a detailed plan for a minimum subsistence. Born in Valencia into a family of converted Jews, Vives left Spain in 1509 to escape the Inquisition, studied at the Sorbonne, but spent most of his adult life in Bruges.

During a stay in England in the 1520s, he mingled with people prominent in letters and politics, including Thomas More, and was often a guest at the court of Henry VIII. He was exposed to new theories about the duty of the state to provide for the poor and efforts to outlaw begging as a means of support. The various English poor laws for the administration of relief at the parish level influenced his thinking.

In a 1526 memo to the mayor of Bruges, titled *De Subventionem Pauperum* (“On Assistance to the Poor”), Vives proposed that the municipal government assure a subsistence minimum for all its residents. No one, he contended, not even the most dissolute, should die of hunger.

Why is this a social responsibility? Theologically, God’s creation is meant for all His children. Those who appropriate nature’s gifts for themselves are “thieves” unless they help those in need. Subsistence aid should be extended only to those truly in need but before they are compelled to request it.

However, the poor must deserve the help they get by being willing to work. Those who have lived lives of dissipation should be given “smaller rations and more irksome tasks” in order to serve as an example to others.¹⁵

Christ had said that the poor would always be with us. Some actually worried that, if poverty were eliminated, these words would be proven false. In strikingly modern terms, Vives replied that “not only those without money...are poor, but those who lack bodily vitality, physical well-being and mental health and sanity...”¹⁶ These latter poor would remain in abundance.

Mild as they may appear to us in the 21st century, Vives' proposals ran into opposition from Church leaders. In Bruges, private religious and parish associations rather than municipal authorities handled poor relief. This situation was changing elsewhere, for example, Brussels and Louvain. Vives' plan was adopted in Lille (1527), Ypres (1527), Mons, Oudenarde and Valenciennes (1531) and eventually Bruges itself (1556).

Small wonder that Church leaders viewed Vives' approach as a threat to the status quo. Faculties at the Sorbonne condemned the Ypres plan for transferring the administration of poor relief from ecclesiastical to civil authorities. The Bishop of Sarepta declared it heretical and subversive, a product of the Lutheran sect.¹⁷

However, the genie was out of the bottle. Vives' ideas about the role of the state in providing for the poor espoused principles that were embodied in the great Elizabethan Poor Law of 1601. That law consolidated an unwieldy tangle of poor relief legislation developed in Britain over the prior century. Poverty was not a condition to be punished; instead relief was to be provided by the state at public expense.

These notions found their way into the country's new colonies on the eastern seaboard of North America. As pioneered in Connecticut, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, the American system of poor relief included almshouses for the deserving poor, workhouses for the able-bodied, prisons for debtors and public hospitals for sick paupers.¹⁸

Vives had helped set in motion an antipoverty approach that replaced donor beneficence and isolated local efforts with more coordinated national plans. However the goal of public assistance continued to be alleviation of individual need rather than elimination of poverty as a social evil.

According to the English political philosopher John Locke (1632-1704), "God gave the world to men in common...[and]...the fruits it naturally produces, and beasts it feeds, belong to mankind in common..." The improvements to the earth made by an individual's labor give rise to the right of private property. "As much land as a man tills, plants, improves, cultivates, and can use the product of, so much is his property." Still, as I read Locke, the right to private property is not absolute, since it should not operate to the "prejudice" of the rest of mankind.¹⁹

For Thomas Paine, the issue was one of social justice.

A Stake in Society

Thomas Paine (1737-1809) is justly celebrated for his authorship of *Common Sense*, a pamphlet issued on January 10, 1776 that powerfully influenced the American movement toward independence.

The Rights of Man, written in defense of the French Revolution and published November 1790, contended that the young, aged and indigent deserved public assistance not as charity but as a right. In Part II of this great work, published in February 1792, Paine attacked the British monarchy, advocated world revolution on behalf of democracy and presented ideas for making wars unnecessary.

In other writings, Paine advocated governmental reform, popular education, poor relief, pensions, and a progressive income tax.²⁰ For our purposes, his argument and plan for wealth transfer deserve particular note.

There are echoes of Vives in his rationale. Land is the natural inheritance of all people. The privatization of property can result in improvements in the land through cultivation; at the same time, it leaves many of a nation's inhabitants dispossessed of their inheritance, thereby plunging them into poverty. As a matter of right, not charity, they should be indemnified against this loss.

"[The plan I propose is] to create a national fund, out of which there shall be paid to every person, when arrived at the age of twenty-one, the sum of fifteen pounds sterling, as a compensation in part, for the loss of his or her natural inheritance, by the introduction of the system of landed

property...And also, the sum of ten pounds per annum, during life, to every person now living, of the age of fifty years, and to all others as they shall arrive at that age.”²¹

Thus, Paine’s conception of social justice was grounded (no pun intended) in land as the common inheritance of humanity. This complements Aristotle’s emphasis on the individual as a component of the social whole, thereby setting up reciprocal obligations between people and the state.

Five Frenchmen

While in prison for his role in the French Revolution, Paine’s contemporary, the Marquis de Condorcet (1743-1794), journalist, mathematician, and member of the Convention, wrote a treatise in which he espoused a system of social insurance.

Employing actuarial and investment analysis methods, his system would be used to benefit older persons, widows, and fatherless children. The basic idea was to distribute the savings of those who died before they could enjoy them. The principles of insurance would be applied not just to individuals or groups but to society at large.²²

Utopian socialist Charles Fourier argued that civilization owes the means of subsistence to people unable to meet their basic needs because they are deprived of access to natural resources. Such access included the right to hunt, fish, pick fruit and graze cattle on common lands. Subsistence would take the form of lodging in a sixth class hotel and three meals a day.

For Fourierists, eligibility for subsistence, while not entailing a work test, was nonetheless not unconditional. Rather it was intended as compensation to the poor for being deprived of certain basic rights.²³

In John Stuart Mill’s description of Fourierism, this was changed. Industrial associations would make distribution of a certain minimum of production “for the subsistence of every member of the community, whether capable or not of labour.”²⁴ Thus Mill clearly but mistakenly ascribes to Fourier an unconditioned right to subsistence.

In a book published in 1848, Joseph Charlier (1816-1896), a Brussels lawyer, proposed a scheme under which every citizen would receive quarterly – later changed to monthly – a minimum income payment. Following in the tradition of utopian socialist Charles Fourier (1772-1837), Charlier saw the right to a regular guaranteed income as flowing from an equal right of all to ownership of land. The amount of the payment would be based on the rental value of all real estate. The payments would constitute a monetary equivalent of sharing out equally the common patrimony.

Charlier viewed his scheme, labeled variously as “minimum”, “revenue garanti”, and eventually “dividende territoriale”, as a means of ending the domination of capital vis a vis labor. Since the income would truly be minimal, it would not encourage excessive idleness. Anything above the minimum would have to come from paid work.²⁵

His contemporary, French professor of philosophy and social theorist François Huet (1814-1869), sought to reconcile the extremes of individualism and communism while integrating Christian concepts with the ideals of the French Revolution: liberty, equality, fraternity.

Instead of a basic income, he endorsed sharing the common patrimony (or divine patrimonium) with individuals through an unconditioned capital endowment.²⁶ This patrimony includes produced assets as well as the means of production. It would be funded through a one hundred percent inheritance tax.

While the value of uncultivated land might in principle be shared out equally, what about the value of improvements? Or, more broadly, what is the appropriate distribution of net new assets produced from the earth’s resources through the investment of capital and labor by individuals and groups? What are the appropriate shares for these producing entities relative to all others? The answers vary from one society to another.

Charlier and Huet appear to have been unaware of each other's work. Both together have largely been ignored, despite their standing as progenitors of current debates over the comparative merits of basic income versus stakeholder grant schemes.

The first formal consideration of a negative income tax appears in the writings of the brilliant French economist Augustin Cournot (1801-1877).²⁷ It foreshadows the twentieth century's policy debates over this approach, which included several negative income tax experiments in the United States and Canada during the 1970s and 1980s. Offshoots of these policy debates have included schemes for a basic income, stakeholder grants, and refundable tax credits, among others. For the most part, they have been advocated at the national level in some countries, although increasingly there are calls for more global interventions.

Rawlsian Justice

Philosopher and social theorist John Rawls (1921-2002) conceived justice as fairness, a condition in which there is "social cooperation among equals for mutual advantage."²⁸ The implicit notion of reciprocity has been used as an argument for and against a guaranteed basic income.

Rawls postulated a hypothetical "original position" in which members of society, who start out as rough equals, agree on the principles of fairness without knowing how they as individuals will be affected as a result.

Thus, for a case like income distribution, they will not know where on the socio-economic pecking order they will end up. Society is predicated not in the equality of results but in the equality of basic rights and duties.

For Rawls, social and economic inequalities are tolerable in a just society so long as "they result in compensating benefits for everyone, and in particular for the least advantaged members of society."²⁹

This difference principle, as it is known, has attracted critics from the right, who resist redistribution, and the left, who cannot countenance inequality. The former refuse to acknowledge a shared human patrimony and the latter minimize the connection between inequality and incentives for self-improvement.

Given the Rawlsian emphasis on rights and duties, which suggests reciprocity among the members of society, some use the difference principle to advocate societal assistance only for those who are incapable of supporting themselves. They reject the notion of subsidizing people able but unwilling to work or, to put it differently, the voluntarily disadvantaged.

Others, however, expand the notion of reciprocity beyond the metric of paid work. It is taken as embracing all aspects of life – work, leisure, parenting, hobbies, volunteerism, self-improvement, etc. – and the whole of society, not just its members individually.

Seen through this lens, the principle of reciprocity can justify providing a minimum measure of security for all as a way of releasing latent human capabilities. Some free riders (the legendary "Malibu surfer") may abuse the privilege but in the long run and on whole society will gain more than it loses.

Thus, in the context of a guaranteed basic income for all, the Rawlsian concept of justice cuts both ways. Rawls tended to view society in terms of the nuclear family and the autonomous nation-state. Others will determine how well his core ideas can be applied to the emerging global village.³⁰ For instance, it remains to be seen whether and if so the extent to which the difference principle should govern relations among nation-states.

Some Basic Propositions

The arguments for minimum levels of support for the poorest boil down to a few propositions. We share a common humanity. We naturally organize ourselves into human

societies. This creates rights and responsibilities for the individual on one side and for the social units to which he or she belongs on the other.

The relative weight assigned to these four factors – individual rights, individual responsibilities, societal rights, societal responsibilities – varies from one social unit to another. The state is the overriding social unit and can make the largest claims on the individual. It is responsible for assuring the welfare of society collectively as well as its individual members.

The earth's resources are a common trust. Whoever exploits these resources has an obligation to share at least some of the benefits with the larger society. For the world's great religious traditions, that implies a special responsibility for those in the greatest need. (At the same time, they stress, overcoming material poverty should not in turn foster conditions for impoverishing the spirit.)

With a view of the earth as a common trust and from the perspectives of the world's major religious traditions, it is clear that redistribution of some wealth to alleviate the needs of the world's poorest has philosophical and theological underpinnings. Furthermore, following the United Nations Commissioner for Human Rights, under a rights-based approach, the elimination of global poverty is “more than charity, more than a moral obligation – it becomes a legal obligation.”³¹

The state is the ultimate guarantor that the earth's resources are used for the benefit of all. Absent some form of redistribution, those in extreme poverty are denied a share of the common patrimony. Redistribution can take many forms (and has) but the most direct is the transfer of current income from the non-poor to the poor. A minimum income guarantee (via whatever administrative mechanism) does not assure individual happiness and social harmony.

It does, however, eliminate obstacles to that goal posed by pervasive poverty and makes human beings freer to unleash their unrealized capacities. That appears consistent with humankind's deepest ethical and religious impulses.

#

Note: This article is adapted from a chapter in a new book I am writing, provisionally titled *Giving Credit Where Due: A Path to Global Poverty Reduction*. In it I make a case for a reimbursable tax credit administered by developing countries with financial and technical assistance from the United Nations. A draft of the full manuscript is available for comment. Go to members.cox.net/rclark41/BobClark.htm, scroll down to “Book in Progress” and click on the link. Comments welcome at rclark41@cox.net.

NOTES

¹Hammurabi's code may be found at several websites. One of the best is at the Yale University website, www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/medieval/hamframe.htm.

²Aristotle. 1885. *Politics*. Translation of Benjamin Jowett. Web edition at www.mdx.ac.uk/www/study/xari.htm. Page references follow the numbering system of Immanuel Bekker (1785-1871).

³The *lex frumentaria* permitted citizens to buy grain from the government at 6 2/3 sesterces per modius (or “bushel”). Citizens would buy on the private market so long as prices remained below that level but had an alternative, if they could endure long lines, if prices rose above it. See www.barca.fsnet.co.uk/gracchus-gaius.htm.

⁴Trattner, Walter I. 1999. *From Poor Law to Welfare State: A History of Social Welfare in America*. New York: The Free Press, pp. 1-2.

⁵www.btinternet.com/~aurelia/povertyandhinduism.htm. India's hierarchical caste system, which has shaped its history for several thousand years, evolved from earlier Vedic society that was divided into four classes, Brahmans, Nobles or Warriors, Commoners and Serfs. For more, see inter alia Radhakrishnan, S. 1989. *Eastern Religions and Western Thought*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, p 371. Note: First published in 1939.

⁶Premasiri, P.D. 1999. *Religious Values and the Measurement of Poverty: A Buddhist Perspective*. Paper prepared for the “Consultation on WDR 2000/1 [World Development Report]: Poverty and Development”, Johannesburg, South Africa (January 12-14). www.worldbank.org/poverty/wdrpoverty/joburg.

⁷Consider, for example: “When reaping the harvest in your field, if you have overlooked a sheaf in that field, do not go back for it. Leave it for the stranger, the orphan and the widow, so that Yahweh your God may bless you in all your undertakings.” (Deuteronomy, 24:19). *The Jerusalem Bible: Reader’s Edition*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1968.

⁸⁸Trattner, Walter I. 1999. *From Poor Law to Welfare State: A History of Social Welfare in America*. New York: The FreePress, pp. 3-6.

⁹The other four are to: (1) confess faith in God and Muhammad as his prophet, (2) perform ritual prayers, (3) perform the fast at Ramadan, and (4) make a pilgrimage to Mecca.

¹⁰Surah 2: 267 (“The Cow”), from the translation by Dawood, N..J. 1999. London: Penguin Books.

¹¹Nasr, Seyyed Hossein. 2002. *The Heart of Islam: Enduring Values for Humanity*. New York: HarperSanFrancisco, p. 171.

¹²This section draws heavily on Van Parijs, Philippe. 2001a. *A Short History of Basic Income* (available at <http://www.bien.be/BI/HistoryBI.htm>) and Vives, Juan Luis. 1999. *On the Assistance to the Poor*. English translation of Vives’ *De Subventionem Pauperum* (1526) by Alice Tobriner, with introduction and commentary. Toronto and London: University of Toronto Press (Renaissance Society of America Reprint Texts.).

¹³More, Sir Thomas (1516), Penguin Books edition (1965) 44-49.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Vives, Juan Luis. 1526. *On the Assistance to the Poor*. English translation by Alice Tobriner (1999, with introduction and commentary) of Vives’ *De Subventionem Pauperum*. Toronto and London: University of Toronto Press (Renaissance Society of America Reprint Texts), p. 40.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 51.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 18.

¹⁸Ibid.: pp. 25-28.

¹⁹Locke, John. 1690. *The Second Treatise of Civil Government*. London. Quotes are taken from Chapter 5, “Of Property”, Sections 25-51, as found in the online version, www.constitution.org/jl/2ndtr05.htm.

²⁰Most prominently in Part II of *The Rights of Man*, published in London in February 1792. See Foner, Philip S., editor. 1999. *The Life and Major Writings of Thomas Paine*. (February) Bridgewater, New Jersey: Replica Books, pp. xxix-xxx and, for the pamphlet itself, 345-458.

²¹Foner, Philip S., editor (1999) 611-613. The plan is included in Thomas Paine’s last great pamphlet titled *Agrarian Justice*, which was published in the winter of 1795-96 and is reproduced in Foner (1999) 605-623.

²²Caritat, Antoine, Marquis de Condorcet. 1988. *Esquisse D’un Tableau Historique des Progrès de L’Esprit Humain* (1st edition, 1795), pp. 273-74.

²³Fourier, Charles. 1967. *La Fausse Industrie*. First published in 1836. Paris: Anthropos, pp. 491-492. More background is found in the history of basic income found at www.bien.be/BI/HistoryBI.htm. This website is indispensable for anyone interested in a universal basic income.

²⁴Mill, John Stuart. 1909. *Principles of Political Economy*. William James Ashley, editor. Note: This is based on the 7th edition. First edition published 1848. First publication of the 7th edition, 1870. London: Longmans, Green and Co. The complete text of the 7th edition is available at www.econlib.org/library/Mill/mlP14.html. See Book II, Chapter I.

²⁵He expounded his plan in several works, including: 1) *Solution du Problème Social ou Constitution Humanitaire: Basée sur La Loi Naturelle, et Précédée de L’exposé de Motifs*, Bruxelles: Chez Tous les Libraires du Royaume, 1848 and *La Question Sociale Résolue, Précédée du Testament Philosophique d’un Penseur*, Bruxelles: Weissenbruch, 1894. My description draws on *Basic Income* – 32, Spring 1999 (Newsletter of the Basic Income European Network), which is found at www.estes.ucl.ac.be/BIENbackup. Also see Cunliffe, John and Guido Erreygers. 2000. *Basic Income? Basic Capital! Origins and Issues of a Debate*. Paper prepared for the Eighth Congress of the Basic Income European Network, Berlin (October 6-7, 2000).

²⁶Cunliffe, John and Guido Erreygers (2000) pp.7-9.

²⁷Cournot, Augustin. 1838. *Recherches sur les Principes Mathématiques de la Théorie des Richesses*. [Researches into the Mathematical Principles of the Theory of Wealth] Paris: L. Hachette. Translated into English by Nathaniel T. Bacon, 1897. English edition: New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927. Reprinted New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1960, 1964, 1971 [Reprints of economic classics].

²⁸Rawls, John. 1999. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, p. 13. Note: originally published in 1971.

²⁹Ibid.

³⁰Nussbaum, Martha. 2001. “The Enduring Significance of John Rawls,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education: The Chronicle Review* (July 21). See chronicle.com/free/v47/i45/45b00701.htm.

³¹Office of the United Nations Commissioner for Human Rights. *Draft Guidelines: A Human rights Approach to Poverty Reduction Strategies*. Available at www.unhcr.ch/development/povertyfinal.html.