Basic Income, Human Rights & Equality

Exploring Basic Income in Scotland

Citizen's Basic Income Network Scotland

HERIOT WATT UNIVERSITY

THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

scottish universities insight institute
mobilising knowledge for a better Scotland

Exploring Basic Income in Scotland

Exploring Basic Income in Scotland is a cross-disciplinary project, funded by Scottish Universities Insight Institute, that looked at the implications of a Basic Income for a variety of intersecting issues. The project was led by academics from the Heriot-Watt University, University of Edinburgh and Citizen's Basic Income Network Scotland (CBINS). It united policy makers, practitioners and academics to look at the intersection of a Basic Income with employment and entrepreneurship, housing, care and human rights and equality and the modelling, implementation and evaluation of the policy.

Citizen's Basic Income Network Scotland

HERIOT WATT UNIVERSITY

THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

scottish universities insight institute
mobilising knowledge for a better Scotland

All outputs from the project can be found at www.cbin.scot/resources/

INTRODUCTION

Human rights are the universal rights and freedoms that belong to every person throughout their life. They can never be taken away, although they can sometimes be restricted for example through imprisonment, and they are protected by law, in Britain this is by they Human Rights Act 1998. Human rights use a foundation of dignity, fairness, respect and independence. There are many parallels between the philosophy underpinning human rights and that of a Basic Income: they are both universal, non-withdrawable and intended to improve equality amongst citizens.

Any movement towards equality ensures that the opportunities and circumstances afforded to an individual allow them to thrive. To effectively address inequalities, one must recognise that each individual's situation is different – we cannot address inequalities by offering everyone the same. Although a Basic Income is usually proposed to be a payment of the same level offered to all Citizens, it is a cash payment, meaning people can use it to support themselves however they choose. It would not be a move towards equality through directly addressing specific issues faced by those with protected characteristics, such as age, race or sex, nor would it undo historical discrimination. However, it is a single policy that would impact everyone, guaranteeing a base level of income to each Citizen would ensure no-one is faced with extreme financial poverty a circumstance that certainly limits the opportunities available to a person.

This part of the Exploring Basic Income in Scotland project set out to question how a Basic Income interacts with human rights and equality. We wanted to investigate the impact of Basic Income on people of different ages and stages, those with physical or mental impairment and women, considering relationships between men and women in particular. The following Background Paper, written by Paul Spicker, outlines human rights and equality in the social policy context. The paper was used as the foundation of a workshop that brought together policymakers, academics and practitioners with relevant insight, the outputs of the facilitated discussion are outlined in the Workshop Report.

Basic Income Definition:

A Basic Income is a periodic cash payment unconditionally delivered to all on an individual basis, without means-test or work requirement.

That is, Basic Income has the following five characteristics:

Periodic: it is paid at regular intervals (for example every month), not as a one-off grant.

Cash payment: it is paid in an appropriate medium of exchange, allowing those who receive it to decide what they spend it on. It is not, therefore, paid either in kind (such as food or services) or in vouchers dedicated to a specific use.

Individual: it is paid on an individual basis—and not, for instance, to households.

Universal: it is paid to all, without means test.

Unconditional: it is paid without a requirement to work or to demonstrate willingness-to-work.

Source: Basic Income Earth Network

Background Paper: Basic Income, Human Rights and Equality

by Paul Spicker

1. HUMAN RIGHTS AND SOCIAL SECURITY

Rights are rules which affect the way that other people and governments may treat the person who holds the rights. Rights to social security are mainly thought of as "claim-rights", requiring someone to pay benefits to the rights holder; they are also treated as "subjective rights", requiring the person who holds the right to make a claim. (Taxation is taken from people regardless of whether they make a tax return; if benefits are genuinely universal, it is not self-evidently the case that they should need to be claimed.)

Some rights to social security are "general" rights founded in citizenship - membership of a political and legal community. Others are based in the "particular" (or personal) rights that people gain as part of contractual exchange or undertakings made to them personally. Most pensions schemes in Europe are based in particular, not general rights; people have contributed to a specific pension scheme and have a strong property right to their pension. One of the leading human rights cases, Five Pensioners v Peru, was actually based not on a human right to receive benefit, but to the right of the pensioners not to be deprived of property they were entitled to.[1])

It follows that most social security schemes are not primarily attributable to human rights legislation, and they would not become human rights under any UBI scheme. Nevertheless, there are a number of human rights agreements and international conventions which have a bearing on social security provision. The UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that

"Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international cooperation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality."

Article 25 continues:

"1. Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

2. Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection."

Article 9 of the International Covenant on Economic, Cultural and Social Rights provides "The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to social security, including social insurance." and article 11 recognises "the right

of everyone to an adequate standard of living for himself and his family, including adequate food, clothing and housing, and to the continuous improvement of living conditions."

The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities provides, in article 28:

1. States Parties recognize the right of persons with disabilities to an adequate standard of living for themselves and their families, including adequate food, clothing and housing, and to the continuous improvement of living conditions, and shall take appropriate steps to safeguard and promote the realization of this right without discrimination on the basis of disability.

2. States Parties recognize the right of persons with disabilities to social protection and to the enjoyment of that right without discrimination on the basis of disability, and shall take appropriate steps to safeguard and promote the realization of this right, including measures:

a) To ensure equal access by persons with disabilities to clean water services, and to ensure access to appropriate and affordable services, devices and other assistance for disability-related needs;

b) To ensure access by persons with disabilities, in particular women and girls with disabilities and older persons with disabilities, to social protection programmes and poverty reduction programmes;

c) To ensure access by persons with disabilities and their families living in situations of poverty to assistance from the State with disability-related expenses, including adequate training, counselling, financial assistance and respite care;

d) To ensure access by persons with disabilities to public housing programmes;

e) To ensure equal access by persons with disabilities to retirement benefits and programmes.

The Convention on the Rights of the Child provides, in Article 26:

1. States Parties shall recognize for every child the right to benefit from social security, including social insurance, and shall take the necessary measures to achieve the full realization of this right in accordance with their national law.

2. The benefits should, where appropriate, be granted, taking into account the resources and the circumstances of the child and persons having responsibility for the maintenance of the child, as well as any other consideration relevant to an application for benefits made by or on behalf of the child.

Article 27 continues:

1. States Parties recognize the right of every child to a standard of living adequate for the child's physical, mental, spiritual, moral and social development.

2. The parent(s) or others responsible for the child have the primary responsibility to secure, within their abilities and financial capacities, the conditions of living necessary for the child's development.

3. States Parties, in accordance with national conditions and within their means, shall take appropriate measures to assist parents and others responsible for the child

to implement this right and shall in case of need provide material assistance and support programmes, particularly with regard to nutrition, clothing and housing.

4. States Parties shall take all appropriate measures to secure the recovery of maintenance for the child from the parents or other persons having financial responsibility for the child, both within the State Party and from abroad. ...

There is no obvious conflict with UBI, but nor is there direct support for the principle. Little in these provisions commits governments to a particular type of benefit or method of distribution; the only methods of delivery that are mentioned are the provision of social insurance and parental liability for maintenance. The UN has recently been arguing, however, that the obligations of international law go beyond the obvious minimum. In the Guiding Principles on extreme poverty and human rights,[2] they call for comprehensive social security programmes, universal access, adequate benefits, and priority to those who are the most marginalised and disadvantaged. But they also argue for processes that protect people in poverty: to protect people in poverty from stigmatisation, to "prohibit public authorities, whether national or local, from stigmatizing or discriminating against persons living in poverty"[3]; to enhance the involvement of women in decision-making[4]; to ensure transparency and access to information[5]; to provide legal aid for criminal and civil cases6 and to give poor people rights of redress.[7]

> ✿ *Key insights - Human rights and social security*
>
> The UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that
>
> "Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international cooperation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality."

The European Convention on Human Rights makes no relevant provisions. The most specific international conventions on social security are the conventions of the International Labour Organisation, but they do not create rights; they only mean that the states that sign up to them have agreed to the principles the Conventions lay out, and not many states have done that. The conventions on minimum standards (1952), equality of treatment (1962), maintenance of rights (1982) or social protection floors (2012)[8] set standards, offer guidance and establish a framework for supervision, for those states that ratify (or partially ratify) the agreements. However, ratification has been limited - as few as 38 countries ratified the equal treatment convention (one has since resiled), and only 4 have ratified the convention on the maintenance of social security rights. The principle of ratification is important. International law works, for the most part, by asking countries to agree to conventions. The rights which are secured are enforced in the first place by the country in question, and international courts mainly have the effect of drawing governments' attentions to deficiencies in their conduct. They do not in most cases give individuals any direct basis for legal action.

2 EQUALITIES

Inequality is not difference, but disadvantage; equality is not uniformity or sameness, but the removal of disadvantage. There are many competing concepts of equality.[9]

- The equality of persons demands that people are not treated differently on the basis of birth, race, gender and so forth.
- Equality of rights implies that the same rights, and same rules, should apply to everyone.
- Equal citizenship is about people's status. "All those who possess the status are equal with respect to the rights and duties with which the status is endowed."[10]
- Basic security is a call for a common foundation. Tawney argued for an equality that would 'make accessible to all, irrespective of their income, occupation or social position, the conditions of civilisation which, in the absence of such measures, can only be enjoyed by the rich.'[11]
- Equality of welfare goes further, arguing for more equal outcomes.

It is possible to argue that UBI supports equality in all of these senses.

The duty of public services in the UK to reduce inequality is based not in human rights legislation but in the Equality Act 2010. This prohibits discrimination, harassment or victimisation for people with a range of "protected characteristics", requires public services to make reasonable adjustments for people with disabilities, and requires a public service "when making decisions of a strategic nature about how to exercise its functions, have due regard to the desirability of exercising them in a way that is designed to reduce the inequalities of outcome which result from socio-economic disadvantage."

The protected characteristics are

- age;
- disability;
- gender reassignment;
- marriage and civil partnership;
- pregnancy and maternity;
- race;
- religion or belief;
- sex;
- sexual orientation.

This is not comprehensive. In Belgium, equalities legislation refers to inequalities of birth, and inequalities of "fortune"; being unlucky is not a good reason for people to be homeless or destitute, or a reason to differentiate between people.

Although UBI could be considered to be egalitarian in general terms, most UBI schemes do not act specifically to remedy inequalities in the protected characteristics. The main exception concerns couples. Benefits within the existing system generally pay less for couples than they do for two adults claiming in their own right (for example, a brother and a sister). The effect of that rule is a potential inequity - the implication is that unmarried couples may be treated more advantageously than married ones. This leads to the "cohabitation" rule, that people "living together as man and wife" (or even "living together as if they were in a civil partnership") should be treated as if they were a couple. The difference between a couple and a brother and sister comes down to sex, rather than membership of the same household, and consequently the cohabitation rule has been associated with prurient and intrusive investigations of people's personal circumstances. Paying people UBI individually is a way of avoiding those problems.

It can be argued too that UBI will have a positive impact on the relative position of women. This is not straightforward. The cumulative effects of lower income tend to imply that women are more likely to be poor, but this is not reflected in every benefit. The following table is drawn from ONS figures.[12]

Men and women claiming key benefits, 000s, Nov 2016

	Men	% men	Women	% women	Total (000s)
Jobseekers	279	61	181	39	460
ESA	1275	52	1171	48	2446
Lone parents	10	2	391	92	401
Carers	214	31	471	69	685
Other	53	73	20	27	73
Disabled	160	51	152	49	312
Bereaved	15	21	56	79	71
State Pension (May 2017)	5687	44	7197	56	12884
Pension Credit (May 2017)	673	37	1149	63	1822

The existing pattern of benefit receipt means that women disproportionately receive some benefits relative to men: particularly low income benefits for pensioners, lone parents and carers. However, women are less likely to receive benefits as jobseekers or for long term sickness - most probably, because they drop out of the labour

market and depend on family support instead. The imbalance of genders relating to Pension Credit is significant: low income pensioners are much more likely to be women, and this group is particularly likely to gain from UBI or a Citizens Pension.

On the other side of the coin, most UBI schemes do not discriminate to the detriment of any of the protected categories: however, there are commonly differences proposed in the provision made for people of working age and older people. This is defensible, because it can legitimately be argued that the difference between pensions and people of working age is not a disadvantage to either, but it reflects an acceptance of the principle that different economic positions require different adjustments. (It is rather more difficult to defend some of the other age-related anomalies in the existing benefits system, such as the denial of mobility support to people on the basis of the age at which their disability starts.)

Key Insights - Equalities

Inequality is not difference, but disadvantage; equality is not uniformity or sameness, but the removal of disadvantage.

REFERENCES

1. Inter-American Court of Human Rights, 2003, Case of the "Five Pensioners" v Peru, http://www.corteidh.or.cr/docs/casos/articulos/seriec_98_ing.pdf

2. UN, 2012, Guiding principles on extreme poverty and human rights, http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/OHCHR_ExtremePovertyandHumanRights_EN.pdf

3. UN 2012, p 5-6

4. UN 2012 p.6

5. UN 2012, p.10

6. UN 2012, p.19

7. UN 2012, p.11

8. e.g. International Labour Organization, Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102); Equality of Treatment (Social Security) Convention, 1962 (No 118) Maintenance of Social Security Rights Convention, 1982 (No. 157); Social Protection Floors Recommendation, 2012 (No. 202)

9. See P Spicker, 2006, Liberty, equality, fraternity, Bristol: Policy Press.

10. T H Marshall, 1963, Sociology at the crossroads, London: Heinemann, p.87.

11. R Tawney, 1930, Equality, London: Allen and Unwin, 1961, p 122.

12. Nomis, at http://nomisweb.co.uk; StatExplore, at https://stat-xplore.dwp.gov.uk/webapi/.

Workshop Report: Human Rights and Equality

by Cleo Goodman

This workshop looked at the theoretical impact of a Basic Income on Human Rights and Equality. The group considered people of different ages and stages, those with physical or mental impairment, women's rights and household dynamics between women and men.

This sessions speakers were Tanya Wilson, lecturer specialising in Family Economics and Labour Economics, who spoke on equality within households and James Elder-Woodward, one of the pioneers of the disabled people's Independent Living Movement in Scotland, spoke about emancipatory welfare.

Those attending the session, and the organisations they represent, all had relevant insight into Basic Income, human rights and equality.

Who?	Why?
North Ayrshire Council Local government of the unitary authority of North Ayrshire, one of 32 unitary authorities in Scotland	North Ayrshire Council is one of 4 councils involved in the work looking at the feasibility of a Basic Income experiment in Scotland. Local authorities in Scotland provide a range of public services, including, social care and economic development, therefore local government is a key partner in any work looking at a Basic Income in the Scottish context.
Paul Spicker Writer and commentator on social policy, Emeritus Professor of Public Policy Robert Gordon University	Paul has an in depth understanding of social policy that can be applied to the discussions about Basic Income. A critical sceptic of Basic Income and author of several of this project's background papers.
Scottish Government The Scottish Government is the devolved government for Scotland responsible for the economy, education, health, justice, rural affairs, housing, environment, equal opportunities, consumer advocacy and advice, transport and taxation.	Scottish Government are involved in the feasibility work looking at a Basic Income experiment in Scotland. Their remit of responsibilities makes them a key partner in any work looking at a Basic Income in the Scottish context.
Annie Miller Economist and co-founder of Citizen's Income Trust and Citizen's Basic Income Network Scotland	Annie provides insight into the economic aspects of Basic Income and the global Basic Income movement and debate drawing from her experience looking at the topics over the last 30 years.

Women's Enterprise Scotland Support women in starting and growing their businesses.	Women's Enterprise Scotland were able to represent the perspective of entrepreneurs, particularly female entrepreneurs.
Oxfam Charity working to improve the lives of the world's poorest people	Oxfam is a global voice on poverty & inequality, women's rights, humanitarian issues and climate change.
James Elder-Woodward Senior Social Work Officer in Physical Disability until 1999, assisted in the development of the Glasgow Centre for Inclusive Living and is now Chair of the Scottish Independent Living Coalition, Convenor of the Glasgow Centre for Inclusive Living, a Board Member of both Inclusion Scotland and Capability Scotland	James Elder-Woodward has had life-long experience of disability, not only as a health and social service user, but also as a service provider, planner and researcher.
See Me Scotland Scotland's Programme to tackle mental health stigma and discrimination.	See Me work with people to end mental health stigma and discrimination and to change negative behaviours towards those with mental health problems, ensuring their human rights are upheld.
Tanya Wilson Lecturer in the Division of Economics at the University of Glasgow.	Tanya's research areas are predominantly within Family Economics and Labour Economics both relevant areas to the topic of discussion.
Engender Feminist member organisation with a vision for a Scotland in which women and men have equal opportunities in life, equal access to resources and are equally safe from harm.	Engender is a policy organisation and through research and analysis aim to make women's inequality visible and persuade those with power to make positive changes to services, policy, regulation, practices, and laws that negatively affect women.
Zero Tolerance Zero Tolerance are a charity working to end violence against women through tackling gender inequality.	Zero Tolerance were able to provide insight into the causes of violence against women, rooted in gender inequality. Their work focuses on women's experiences and research considering the social, economic and political equality of women.

DEFINITIONS, NEED AND ASSESSMENT

Basic Income, some prefer to refer to it as a Universal Basic Income others a Citizen's Basic Income. In practice, an implementable Basic Income must include some detail on the definition of Citizen, who is entitled to receive the payment? This was noted during the workshop as were a number of other definitions and distinctions relevant to the design of a Basic Income scheme.

There are a variety of factors that impact the basic costs of living for a person, the key ones highlighted during the session were disability, age and cohabitation. The report "The Disability Price Tag" published by Scope in February 2019 showed that: On average disabled people face extra costs of £583 a month, for one in five disabled people extra costs amount to over £1,000 per month. This means the money required by a disabled person to cover their basic needs is not equivalent to that for non-disabled people: £100 for a non-disabled person is comparable to just £68 for a disabled person[1]. This would need to be taken into account when designing a Basic Income. It is often suggested that a disability benefit could be provided in addition to a Basic Income.

Key Insights - Definition, Need and Assessment

Disabled people's money doesn't tend to go as far. On average, £100 for a non-disabled person is equivalent to just £68 for a disabled person.

The method of assessment of the additional financial needs of disabled people is central to ensuring a Basic Income functions for people with disabilities. If the additional costs incurred by people with disabilities aren't addressed effectively, some disabled people could be worse off than they currently are. Assessment for this additional payment could be focused on ensuring people fulfil their potential rather than ensuring they are receiving just the amount required to meet their needs. It was also suggested that if the intention of a Basic Income is to remove the invasive assessment processes used to allocate means-tested benefits it is discriminatory to not remove this from the disability element too. To ensure a system that truly promotes equality the assessment process must be carefully considered.

Some proposed Basic Income schemes suggest a different level of Basic Income for children, people of working age and people after retirement[2]. The financial need of people of different ages needs to be assessed and the level of Basic Income afforded to them defined. When considering children's Basic Income, the age at which a child gains control of their payments needs to be defined.

Economies of scale refer to the reduced costs of co-habitation; preparing a meal for two people at once uses less resources (e.g. gas) than two people doing the same separately, heating one room for two people costs less than heating two rooms. This is considered by many means-tested benefits which is why they are allocated to the household. A Basic Income however is paid to the individual, which has implications for the dynamics within a household.

EQUALITY WITHIN HOUSEHOLDS

Tanya Wilson is a lecturer at the University of Glasgow and her work focuses on Family Economics and Labour Economics. Tanya, alongside Dan Anderberg, Helmut Rainer and Jonathan Wadsworth, produced the paper "Unemployment and Domestic Violence: Theory and Evidence" which showed that female unemployment increases the risk of domestic abuse while male unemployment reduces the risk[3]. Tanya said that, "Relative economic position in the household is important. Improvements in an abused partner's (future) economic position decreases the propensity for being abused" [her presentation], if a Basic Income reduced inequality within a household it may also decrease the incidence of abuse.

Tanya began by looking at the reasons for people living together. These are pecuniary, relating to improvements in financial situation, and non-pecuniary, the social reasons for wanting to co-habit. Living with another person can reduce the expenditure on rent and utilities and there are both physical and mental health benefits associated with people in multi-person households. There may be other, negative implications in certain household dynamics relating to co-habitation, specifically a loss of autonomy. In a shared household there is more negotiation required potentially through compromise or an unbalance of decision-making power, skewed towards the "Head of the Household", who is often found to be the chief breadwinner, this can lead to exploitative situations.

Tanya noted that the method of payment is relevant to the use of money in a household citing evidence collected in the late 1970s when child benefit changed from a reduction in the amount withheld for taxes from the father to a cash payment to the 'primary caregiver' (mother). "This represented a substantial redistribution of income - in 1980 child benefits were approximately £500 per year for a family with two children (8% of average male earnings)." An increase in expenditure on women and children's clothing, compared to men's, resulted from this shift4.

Key Insights - Equality within Households

Improvements in an abused partner's economic position decreases the propensity for being abused

THE RIGHT TO WORK

When considering benefit payments, an increase in paid work that leads to a decrease in total income can which can make employment financially unviable. With a Basic Income each hour of additional work represents an increase in total income as there is no conditionality, the payment is not reduced based on the amount earnt through paid employment, which could lead to an increased ability to engage with paid work when compared to means-tested benefits.

This is particularly important to consider when looking at a potential supplementary

element for people with disabilities. Disabled people must have equal opportunity to engage with paid work if desired.

THE RIGHT TO AN INCOME

During the discussion the impact of a Basic Income on the perception of benefits and what it means to earn an income were considered. It is possible that a Basic Income could reduce the stigma of people who depend on welfare benefits, which in some cases are those with protected characteristics. It is possible to consider access to an income that is enough to cover your basic needs as a right.

EMANCIPATORY WELFARE

James Elder-Woodward delivered a talk on Emancipatory Welfare, drawing from his lived experience and extensive work with health and social services. James suggests that the role of a Basic Income is as an element of an empowering support system focused on self-directed personal development. He said the challenge we face is creating a universal, emancipatory welfare system that develops individual and collective potential.

James told us that the movement for equal rights for disabled people is best described as a fight for emancipation. That is the removal of political, social and economic restrictions of their rights to allow for participation as equal Citizens. The report Citizenship and Disabled People describes three areas that need to be addressed to ensure the equality of opportunity for disabled people: Self-determination, the ability to exercise autonomy, participation, both political and within communities, and contribution, recognition of the value of their contribution to economic and social life[5]. The Independent Living Movement states that independent living "means rights to practical assistance and support to participate in society and live an ordinary life."[6] Due to the additional costs incurred by people with disabilities income must be considered in all of these contexts.

The Social Care (Self-directed Support) (Scotland) Act 2013 states: "It is THE DUTY of local authorities to provide someone, who is deemed eligible for social care, with money; and, with this money, for them to decide how to meet their needs." This commitment to self-directed support should be a move towards the emancipatory welfare system required however, only 25% of social care recipients have been offered this option in the last seven years of it being available[7]. Parallels can be drawn between self-directed support and a Basic Income as they both require unrestricted cash payments. This is to allow for autonomy and choice, something highlighted as key in both movements.

A Basic Income can be seen as a financial support to ensure people are able to thrive and fulfil their potential. The universality removes the need for assessment of need and makes the payment an investment in potential. As there are additional costs incurred by disabled people the level of payment required is different. It could be possible to include a set amount in addition to the Basic Income for people with disabilities, but this may be too much for some and, crucially, too little for others.

James said, "In any case, assessing NEED, whether as the 'PLUS' to UBI, or any other system of welfare, is discriminatory and exclusionary. It makes disabled people 'other'. If we are to implement a Basic Income policy, truly, we should adopt the principles and practice of assisting welfare recipients' citizenship potential rather than needs."

The ambiguity of the position of disabled people in a Basic Income scheme is cause for concern. It is crucial that the scheme is designed in a way that does not other or side-line disabled people. The three key areas of concern for disabled people that James highlighted are: 1) A Basic Income that is too low and leaves disabled people in poverty and therefore excluded from community, social and civic life. 2) A Basic Income that underestimates or doesn't account for the extra costs faced by disabled people, prohibiting participation as an equal citizen. 3) The methods of assessment, in particular neglecting to include collective forms of self-advocacy and self-assessment. These areas would need to be addressed to produce an appropriate Basic Income scheme.

Key Insights - Emancipatory Welfare

If we are to implement a Basic Income policy, truly, we should adopt the principles and practice of assisting welfare recipients' citizenship potential rather than needs

It is crucial that a Basic Income scheme is designed in a way that does not other or side-line disabled people

REFERENCES

https://www.scope.org.uk/campaigns/extra-costs

Universal Basic Income in the UK by Paul Spicker

http://cep.lse.ac.uk/pubs/download/dp1230.pdf

https://notendur.hi.is/helgakr/micro/R_Lundberg_Pollak_Wales_1997_JHR_Do_husbands_and_wives_pool_their_resources.pdf

http://enil.eu/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/Citizenship-and-disabled-people_A-scoping-paper-prepared-for-the-Disability-Rights-Commission_2005.pdf

http://www.ilis.co.uk/independent-living

Audit Commission, (2017) Self-Directed Support Progress Report

BASIC INCOME, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUALITY SUMMARY

POTENTIAL BENEFITS

- Payment to the individual gives more autonomy to the recipient
- Reducing economic inequality within a household decreases the incidence of domestic abuse
- Supports personal growth
- Supports a culture of mutual support between Citizens
- Improved public perception of benefits and social security recipients
- People more able to leave undesirable domestic situations
- Improved awareness of the benefits of self-directed support
- Increased trust in the choices of fellow Citizens
- No reduction in income when couples cohabit which is the case with many means tested benefits

CONCERNS

- A more universal approach could leave some disabled people with lower income
- If disability benefits are provided in addition to the Basic Income this could lead to the exclusion or vilification of disabled people
- If disability benefits are provided out with the Basic Income this could impact the ability of disabled people to engage with the work force
- The assessment of the additional financial need of disabled people may not be designed adequately
- The additional costs incurred by disabled people may be underestimated
- Basic Income experiments and significant changes to welfare and social security are disruptive to people's lives
- The definition of citizenship is complex and ill-defined
- The impact on the behaviour of each individual is not easily predicted or assessed

KEY QUESTIONS

Small Some of the key questions from this session related to the modelling of a Basic Income:

- How should a Basic Income be allocated to children?
  - How much should a child's Basic Income be?
  - At what age should a child gain control of their Basic Income?
- How do you assess the additional costs incurred by disabled people and how does this function alongside a Basic Income?
- How do you define Citizen?

Small The answers to these questions can only be provided by long term analysis of the impacts of a full Basic Income. The questions consider outcomes that operate on different time scales, for some evidence could be collected on a short term basis during a Basic Income pilot, others are medium or long term outcomes that would require a longer duration of data collection to evidence. They are roughly in order of the time scale required for assessment but this depends heavily on the specific experimental criteria.

The Basic Income Steering Group facilitating the feasibility study in Scotland use the following categories for outcome timeframes: short term: 2-3 year pilot period, medium term: 4-10 year and longer term: 10-20 years.

- Does the receipt of a Basic Income change the perception of those on benefits?
- What would the impact of a Basic Income on domestic situations be?
  - What would the impact on cohabitation be?
  - What are the drivers for changes in domestic situations?
  - Would there be a change in what is purchased by a household?

Basic Income, Human Rights & Equality

All outputs from the project can be found at www.cbin.scot/resources/

Citizen's Basic Income Network Scotland

HERIOT WATT UNIVERSITY

THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

scottish universities insight institute
mobilising knowledge for a better Scotland