SUPPORTING UBI FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF DIFFERENT FRAMEWORKS OF JUSTICE, BY THEME

	LIBERAL EGALITARIANISM[1]	LEFT/REAL LIBERTARIANISM[2]	RIGHT LIBERTARIANISM[3]	REPUBLICANISM[4]	MARXISM/SOCIALISM[5]	FEMINISM[6]
Empowerment within the household	**As a benefit paid to the individual and not to the household, UBI could go a long way in empowering economic dependents and providing them with exit options (for example, in cases of domestic abuse). (Van Parijs 1995; Robeyns 2001; Pateman 2004; McKay 2007; Zelleke 2014)**	**As a benefit paid to the individual and not to the household, UBI could go a long way in providing people with real freedom, which in case of economic dependents would mean financial and psychological empowerment. (Van Parijs 1991, 1995)**	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to empowerment in the household and UBI.	**As a benefit paid to the individual and not to the household, UBI could go a long way in protecting economic dependents from the potential dominating control of other members of their household. (Pettit 2007)**	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to empowerment in the household and UBI.	**As a benefit paid to the individual and not to the household, UBI could go a long way in empowering economic dependents and providing them with exit options (for example, in cases of domestic abuse). (Van Parijs 1995; Robeyns 2001; Pateman 2004; McKay 2007; Zelleke 2014)**
Neutrality of preferences	**UBI grants individuals more freedom in determining life choices by providing a lifetime of financial security regardless of one's career preferences. It would thus support individuals in developing and pursuing their own conception of happiness. (Van Parijs 1995; Zelleke 2014)**	**UBI respects the autonomy and agency of individuals by providing them with financial means to satisfy their own needs without being coerced into a particular labor-intensive lifestyle. (Van Parijs 1991; Moseley 2011; Munger 2012; Henderson 2017)**	**UBI respects the autonomy and agency of individuals by providing them with financial means to satisfy their own needs without being coerced into a particular labor-intensive lifestyle. (Van Parijs 1991; Moseley 2011; Munger 2012; Henderson 2017)**	**UBI would promote freedom from domination by reducing the power of employers and over individuals' economic lives. This is because UBI could boost bargaining power, exit options, and power to say no to exploitative contracts. (Pettit 2007, Widerquist 2013)**	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to neutrality of preferences and UBI.	**UBI grants individuals more freedom in determining life choices by providing a lifetime of financial security regardless of one's career preferences. It could potentially free women from the traditional roles they have assumed, allowing them to develop and pursue their own conception of happiness. (McKay 2007; Zelleke 2008)**
Non-demeaning welfare	**Because it is unconditional and universal, UBI avoids the paternalizing, demeaning, and stigmatizing process of means-testing. It thus treats all citizens on a par and recognizes their individual right to basic resources. (Zelleke 2014)**	**UBI's unconditionality and universality avoids the paternalizing, demeaning, and stigmatizing process of means-testing, which is central to most of the current welfare schemes. (Van Parijs 1991, 1995; Munger 2012; Zwolinski 2015)**	**UBI's unconditionality and universality avoids the paternalizing, demeaning, and stigmatizing process of means-testing, which is central to most of the current welfare schemes. (Van Parijs 1991, 1995; Munger 2012; Zwolinski 2015)**	**A non-stigmatizing basic income grant people with more independence than means-tested benefits, thus promoting their freedom from domination of the bureaucratic apparatus of the state. (Pettit 2007)**	**By avoiding the paternalizing, demeaning, and stigmatizing process of means-testing, UBI moves toward more equal power relations within classes. (Wright 2006)**	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to non-demeaning welfare and UBI.
Poverty elimination	**UBI has the potential to eliminate absolute poverty – poverty which is incompatible in the most basic sense with individual freedom. (Van Parijs 1995; Zelleke 2014)**	**UBI has the potential to eliminate absolute poverty and to guarantee basic subsistence for every individual, thus providing them with real freedom. (Van Parijs 1991, 1995; Zwolinski 2015)**	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to poverty elimination and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to poverty elimination and UBI.	**UBI has the potential to eliminate absolute poverty and to guarantee basic subsistence for every individual. (Rogers 2017)**	**UBI has the potential to eliminate absolute poverty, which affects women disproportionately, and thus to satisfy most of our basic needs. (Zelleke 2008)**
Community participation	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to community participation and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to community participation and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to community participation and UBI.	**UBI could allow people to spend more time on unpaid activities within their communities and thus help promote a model of individuals as public citizens who participate in the public sphere and are involved in various democratic practices. (Dagger 2006; White 2007)**	**UBI could allow people to spend more time on unpaid activities within their communities and thus help strengthen social bonds between citizens. (Wright 2006)**	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to community participation and UBI.

Empowerment within the workplace	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to empowerment within the workplace and UBI.	**A workplace should be free from external constraints to pursuing a satisfying career path, such as poor working conditions, an abusive employment contract, or lack of sufficient leisure time. UBI could empower workers by removing such external constraints. (Van Parijs 1991, 1995)**	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to empowerment within the workplace and UBI.	**Workers should be free from the domination of their bosses, which can manifest itself through a precarious employment contract or unregulated working hours. UBI could provide workers with more freedom from non-domination. (Pettit 2007)**	**A workplace should have decent working conditions, provide opportunities for leisure time and exit options, and develop the capacities and talents of these employees. UBI could empower workers in these ways. (Van der Veen & Van Parijs 1986; Wright 2006; Gourevitch 2016)**	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to empowerment within the workplace and UBI.
The right not to work	**Wealthy countries have a humanitarian duty, or a duty of justice, to satisfy the basic needs of their citizens even when they choose to engage in non-waged kinds of work. UBI could be a good way for countries enjoying productive economies to discharge this duty. (Baker 1992)**	**Differences among people's occupational needs and preferences should be respected through a system of free choice of occupation, including the right not to work at all. UBI could help sustain those who choose to exercise this right. (Van Parijs 1991, 1995)**	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to the right not to work and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to the right not to work and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to the right not to work and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to the right not to work and UBI.
Equal world-ownership	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to equal world-ownership and UBI.	**UBI could help promote the right to equal world-ownership and to an equal use of land resources. (Moseley 2011; Vallentyne 2012; Munger 2012; Zwolinski 2015)**	**UBI could help promote the right to equal world-ownership and to an equal use of land resources. (Moseley 2011; Vallentyne 2012; Munger 2012; Zwolinski 2015)**	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to equal world-ownership and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to equal world-ownership and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to equal world-ownership and UBI.
Efficiency of welfare	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to efficiency of welfare and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to efficiency of welfare and UBI.	**Welfare distribution is often inefficient and ineffective as it relies on a large bureaucracy of control. A universal cash transfer would remove the need for a large bureaucracy and promote a more efficient distribution of benefits. (Zwolinski 2010; Munger 2012)**	(There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to efficiency of welfare and UBI.)	(There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to efficiency of welfare and UBI.)	(There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to efficiency of welfare and UBI.)
Education / Acquisition of skills	**UBI would allow individuals to access opportunities for additional education and re-training. Such opportunities could give people material and intellectual resources to pursue the kind of projects they want to. (Zelleke 2014)**	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to education and acquisition of skills and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to education and acquisition of skills and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to education and acquisition of skills and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to education and acquisition of skills and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to education and acquisition of skills and UBI.
Recognition of care work	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to recognition of care work and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to recognition of care work and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to recognition of care work and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to recognition of care work and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to recognition of care work and UBI.	**Gender equity requires a more adequate recognition and compensation of care work and housework. UBI could help further this goal by increasing the economic security of unwaged caregivers and detaching income from employment. (Robeyns 2001)**

Family time	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to family time and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to family time and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to family time and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to family time and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to family time and UBI.	**Everyone should be able to spend as much quality time with their loved ones and dependents as they want to, but these prospects are often incompatible with our breadwinner economic model. UBI could support all individuals (regardless of gender) in reducing work hours to care for dependents. (Pateman 2004; McKay 2007)**
Offsetting automation effects	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to offsetting automation effects and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to offsetting automation effects and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to offsetting automation effects and UBI.	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to offsetting automation effects and UBI.	**UBI could help protect workers from the growing unemployment and labor displacement, which continuous technological advancements and automatization are likely to cause. (Rogers 2017)**	There is no supporting evidence from this framework of justice that speaks to offsetting automation effects and UBI.

[1] **Liberal egalitarianism**

Liberal egalitarianism, most commonly associated with the work of John Rawls, is concerned with reconciling the value of equality with the value of liberty, which jointly embed the idea of justice as impartiality. The liberal egalitarian emphasis on liberty can be understood as striving to ensure that everybody has the freedom to develop and pursue their own conception of the good life. The value of equality is also essential and corresponds to the liberal commitment to supporting individual choices regardless of their preferences. Such respect is considered to be incompatible with very large socio-economic inequalities. Rawls has famously unified these values in his two fundamental Principles of Justice. The First Principle gives everyone equal right to a scheme of basic liberties compatible with the same liberties for others. The Second Principle specifies that socio-economic inequalities must be arranged to everyone's advantage and that everyone must compete for jobs and other positions on equal terms.

[2] **Left/real libertarianism**

Libertarians endorse a theory of natural (pre-political) rights, including the right against coercion, the right to self-ownership, and the right to private property. Left libertarians in particular are additionally primarily concerned with providing everybody, including the least well-off, with a large degree of freedom from external constraints (such as scarcity of basic resources or an abusive work contract). They believe that this requires a certain measure of redistribution to ensure all individuals can adequately own themselves. Left libertarians also generally believe in the right to an equal share of natural resources: the "Lockean proviso" according to which all individuals have an equal right to the natural resources necessary for subsistence. Mixing one's labor, over which one has full self-ownership, with natural resources usually yields in one's right to private property.

[3] **Right libertarianism**

Libertarians endorse a theory of natural (pre-political) rights, including the right against coercion, the right to self-ownership, and the right to private property. In addition, philosophers commitment to right libertarianism (most prominently Nozick) emphasize the normative priority of individual freedom and advocate for a small state with minimal intervention in private and market-based interactions. The sole function of such a state would be the specification, interpretation, and enforcement of negative individual rights through the military, police, and court system. Right libertarians generally reject the non-consensual taxation of labor and the products of labor. They share ties with neoliberalism as an economic doctrine.

[4] Republicanism

Republicans (notably Pettit) are concerned with the idea of freedom from domination – the absence of dominating control or the condition of not being subject to the arbitrary or uncontrolled power of others. Republicans understand the idea of dominating control as a hierarchical mechanism whereby one individual or institution can exercise arbitrary power and control over another individual. Another value central for the republican political thought is civic virtue: the formation of a virtuous character that demonstrates a dedication to the wellbeing of one's community and active political participation. Civic virtue is supposed to be influenced and shaped by public institutions and by public policies designed to deliberately cultivate it.

[5] Marxism/socialism

One of Karl Marx's original criticisms of capitalism is the exploitation of wage laborers: the logic of capitalist production dictates that the only potential source of profit is found in the gap between the value produced by the workers and the wage they received for their labor. Capitalism thus necessitates the exploitation of workers and their subjection to the arbitrary power of wealth over which they have no ownership. As a result, workers experience exploitation and a growing sense of alienation from their labor, from the product of their labor, and from having meaningful connections with other people. Contemporary Marxist and socialist political thought emphasizes the importance of collective bargaining and organized labor; the need to reduce the asymmetry between employers and employees; the need for a workplace with decent working conditions and opportunities for growth; the importance of recognizing the value of informal work and community engagement; and the workers' right to be protected from the political or technological changes in the labor market.

[6] Feminism

Feminist political thought has been centered on the need for gender equity understood as equal political, educational, and career opportunities for men and women and, relatedly, the importance of empowering women across economic, political, and social spheres. One key concern has been the recognition of the value of care work and housework, including the need to distribute the burdens of such work more equitably within the household. According to the ethics of care – an ethical theory founded on feminist thought – moral action further centers around intimate caring relationships between individuals. Contemporary feminist political thinkers advocate for the empowerment of economically dependent spouses, the need for affordable daycare and longer parental leaves, and an adequate recognition and compensation of informal labor. They also emphasize the distinctiveness of the experiences and struggles of women and other gender minorities who are multiply burdened because they find themselves at the intersection of numerous axes of oppression.

References:

Baker, J. (1992). "An Egalitarian Case for Basic Income". In: Van Parijs, P. (ed.). *Arguing for Basic Income: Ethical Foundations for a Radical Reform.* Verso: 101-127.

Dagger, R. (2006). "Neo-Republicanism and the Civic Economy." *Politics, Philosophy, and Economics* 5(2): 151-173.

Gourevitch, A. (2016). "The Limits of a Basic Income: Means and Ends of Workplace Democracy." *Basic Income Studies* 11(1): 17-28.

McKay, A. (2007). "Why a Citizens' Basic Income? A Question of Gender Equality or Gender Bias. *Work, Employment and Society* 21(2): 337-348.

Moseley, D. (2011). "A Lockean Argument for Basic Income." *Basic Income Studies* 6(2): 1-6.

Munger, M. C. (2012). "Basic Income Is Not an Obligation, But It Might Be a Legitimate Choice." *Basic Income Studies* 6(2): 1-13.

Pateman, C. (2004). "Democratizing Citizenship: Some Advantages of a Basic Income." *Politics & Society* 32(1): 89-105.

Pettit, P. (2002). "A Republican Right to Basic Income?" *Basic Income Studies* 2(2): 1-8.

Robeyns, I. (2001). "Will a Basic Income Do Justice to Women?" *Analyse & Kritik* 23(1): 88-105.

Rogers, B. (2017). "Basic Income in a Just Society". *Boston Review* [online].

Van Parijs, P. (1991). "Why Surfers Should Be Fed: The Liberal Case for an Unconditional Basic Income." *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 20(2): 101-131.

Van Parijs, P. (1995). *Real Freedom for All: What (If Anything) Can Justify Capitalism?* Oxford University Press.

White, S. (2007). "The Republican Case for Basic Income: A Plea for Difficulty." *Basic Income Studies* 2(2): 1-7.

Widerquist, K. (2013). *Independence, Propertylessness, and Basic Income: A Theory of Freedom as the Power to Say No.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Wright, E. O. (2006). "Two Redistributive Proposals: Universal Basic Income and Stakeholder Grants. *Focus* 24(2): 5-7.

Zelleke, A. (2008). "Institutionalizing the Universal Caretaker Through a Basic Income?" *Basic Income Studies* 3(3): 1-9.

Zwolinski, M. (2015). "Property Rights, Coercion, and the Welfare State: The Libertarian Case for a Basic Income for All." *The Independent Review* 19(4): 515-529.