

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

TO: Scottish Government

Opinion text was added to the following web page:

<https://www.ideas.gov.scot/minimum-income-guarantee-share-your-views/>

(NOTE: Annex 1 holds information about copyright, licence and disclaimers.)

1. The Finnish context

Previous Government of Finland (prime minister Juha Sipilä) organised the basic income experiment. The Finnish basic income experiment could be evaluated in Scotland. The web page of the basic income experiment is following:

<https://www.kela.fi/web/en/basic-income-experiment>

2. Too few experiment groups for the Finnish basic income experiment

Problem with the Finnish basic income experiment is/was just one experiment group. There should have been several experiment groups (e.g. 5 experiment groups).

3. Several experiment groups in Scotland

I propose that Minimum Income Guarantee (MIG) models in Scotland should be tested with several experiment groups (e.g. 5 experiment groups). Testing just one group is not enough. There can be different models for Minimum Income Guarantee (MIG).

4. Viewpoint of human beings / Simple machines or complex entities?

One of the main issues is the viewpoint of human beings. Are humans just simple machines which can be guided with simple basic laws? Are humans complex entities which can not be guided with simple basic laws? I note that humans are not simple machines and therefore Minimum Income Guarantee (MIG) models should be assessed based on several viewpoints.

5. Rational humans or irrational humans?

When assessing different policy proposals (e.g. Minimum Income Guarantee (MIG)) we should note that humans don't behave rationally on all possible situations. There can be some irrationalities with human behaviour. I have called this "rationality assumption". From external viewpoint we can assume some behaviour which is rational. Unfortunately there can be different internal irrationalities which should be assessed carefully. Therefore it is very important to organise tests for several experiment groups. When testing several groups it should be easier to assess different irrationalities of different models.

6. Viewpoint of laziness or activeness / Viewpoint of humans (more about that)

46 Some commentators may say that people are lazy and different governmental subsidies means more
47 inactivity and laziness. I propose viewpoint that people are not lazy and different governmental
48 subsidies can mean support for human activeness. Generally speaking people don't like being
49 hindered by different governmental subsidies which can mean organising different governmental
50 subsidies in new and creative ways like Minimum Income Guarantee (MIG) or Universal Basic
51 Income (UBI).

52

53 **7. An example: governmental subsidies based on unemployment**

54

55 Here we can not that unemployment benefit is sometimes quite rigid system since in some
56 situations working can mean problems unemployment benefits. Minimum Income Guarantee (MIG)
57 could mean that in many cases it could be beneficial to work without problems with unemployment
58 benefits.

59

60 **8. Reducing bureaucracy**

61

62 One main issue is bureaucracy with different governmental subsidies since there can be several
63 different, conflicting and complex regulations. At least in Finland there can be very bureaucratic
64 situations with different governmental subsidies. There has been political discussion for several
65 years about reducing bureaucracy with different governmental subsidies without actual success.

66

67 **9. Entrepreneurs and small-scale business?**

68

69 One issue for assessing Minimum Income Guarantee (MIG) is small-scale business and
70 entrepreneurship. As we all know there is the situation of death valley curve when establishing new
71 business. This means that in death valley situation there is not enough actual revenue and actual
72 earnings for a new business. Minimum Income Guarantee (MIG) can mean that death valley
73 situation is not the main issue when establishing new business. It can be also noted that many
74 people actually dream often about their own business even though they are working somewhere as
75 an employee. Minimum Income Guarantee (MIG) can mean that it could be possible to start small-
76 scale business with less problems. One example is naturally subcontracting for a larger companies
77 which can mean doing some additional work when a larger company has need for some additional
78 work for a very short time-period. This means that a larger company may not need to employ
79 temporary employees for a very short time-period which can mean some additional work for
80 subcontractors. Minimum Income Guarantee (MIG) could mean some assurances that doing some
81 additional work for a company doesn't mean several bureaucratic problems with basic income.
82 Naturally there can be some regulations for having fair cooperation between main contractors and
83 subcontractors. E.g. in Finland there has been some problems with payments for subcontractors and
84 this may mean some new law proposals to Finnish legislation for payments between companies.

85

86 **10. Summary**

87

88 Minimum Income Guarantee (MIG) models should be tested carefully in Scotland. Without tests it
89 is harder to assess need for new legislation. After careful testing of different Minimum Income
90 Guarantee (MIG) models there could be good proposals to Scottish legislation.

ANNEX 1

DISCLAIMERS

Legal disclaimer:

All opinions in this opinion paper are personal opinions and they do not represent opinions of any legal entity I am member either by law or voluntarily. This opinion paper is only intended to trigger thinking and it is not legal advice. This opinion paper does not apply to any past, current or future legal entity. This opinion paper will not cover any of the future changes in this fast-developing area. Any actions made based on this opinion is solely responsibility of respective actor making those actions.

Political disclaimer:

These opinions do not represent opinions of any political party. These opinions are not advices to certain policy and they are only intended to trigger thinking. Any law proposal based on these opinions are sole responsibility of that legal entity making law proposals.

These opinions are not meant to be extreme-right, moderate-right, extreme-centre, moderate-centre, extreme-left or moderate-left. They are only opinions of an individual whose overall thinking might or might not contain elements of different sources. These opinions do not reflect past, current or future political situation in the Finnish, European or worldwide politics.

These opinions are not meant to rally for a candidacy in any public election at any level.

Content of web pages:

This text may or may not refer to web pages. The content of those web pages is not responsibility of author of this document. They are referenced on the date of this document. If referenced web pages are not found after the date when this document is dated, that situation is not responsibility of the author. All changes done in the web pages this document refers are sole responsibility of those organisations and individuals maintaining those web pages. All illegal content found on the referred web pages is not on the responsibility of the author of this document, and producing that kind content is not endorsed by the author of this document.

Use of broken English

This text is in English, but from a person, whose is not a native English-speaking person. Therefore the text may or may not contain bad, odd and broken English, and can contain awkward linguistic solutions.

COPYRIGHT

This opinion paper is distributed under Creative Commons licence, to be specific the licence is "Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)". The text of the licence can be obtained from the following web page:

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

The English explanation is on the following web page:

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode>



Tämän lausunnon lisenssi on Creative Commons -lisenssi, tarkemmin ottaen Nimeä-EiKaupallinen-EiMuutoksia 4.0 Kansainvälinen (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). Lisenssin tekstit saa luettua seuraavilla www-sivuilla:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.fi>

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode.fi>

Copyright, licence and disclaimers: check Annex 1.