THE ECONOMICS OF UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME

https://doi.org/10.47743/jopafl-2024-33-10

CSŐSZ Csongor
Babeș-Bolyai University
Cluj-Napoca, Romania
csongor.csosz@econ.ubbcluj.ro

Abstract: This paper delves into the economic implications and feasibility of Universal Basic Income (UBI), concentrating on the considerable tax burden necessary to fund a UBI system on a national scale. With UBI increasingly seen as a potential solution to modern economic challenges, such as income inequality, poverty, and automation-driven job displacement, this analysis underscores the significant fiscal demands of implementing UBI. Through a comprehensive literature review of global UBI trials and an analysis of economic models and simulations, the paper explores UBI's impact on labor markets, poverty alleviation, and income redistribution. Notable UBI experiments in Finland, Kenya, and Stockton have demonstrated UBI's capacity to enhance well-being and provide financial security. However, these trials also reveal critical concerns about labor market participation and, more pressingly, the heavy fiscal burden a UBI system would impose. The fiscal models reviewed in this study indicate that UBI, while promising in enhancing social welfare, would require substantial tax increases to support it. The results emphasize that funding UBI would place a considerable strain on public resources, demanding either heightened income or consumption taxes or innovative but untested funding sources, such as taxes on carbon emissions or automation. Each of these potential funding mechanisms has profound implications for economic equity, efficiency, and social acceptance, and their viability is highly dependent on a nation's specific economic context and fiscal policy landscape. Furthermore, the study assesses UBI's potential long-term effects on labor markets, finding that while UBI might support labor market flexibility by reducing economic insecurity, the level of the payment and tax structure could significantly affect employment incentives. This complex interplay of UBI payments and tax policies, which often disproportionately impact certain socioeconomic groups, underlines the need for careful fiscal planning. If structured effectively, UBI could serve as a buffer against the economic disruptions caused by automation, providing displaced workers with the resources to retrain or pursue new career paths in a shifting job market. However, the increased tax burden raises questions about long-term viability, as higher taxes could reduce disposable incomes, deter workforce participation, and, paradoxically, counter the economic dynamism UBI aims to foster. In conclusion, while Universal Basic Income holds transformative potential for reducing poverty and supporting individuals in the face of technological change, its implementation would require an unprecedented commitment of public funds. This paper argues that UBI's long-term sustainability depends on the development of funding mechanisms that can balance equity with economic efficiency, without placing undue strain on public resources or individual taxpayers. The substantial tax burden associated with UBI implementation must be carefully managed to ensure that the societal benefits outweigh the financial costs, calling for further research into tax structures that align with economic and social goals.
Keywords: Universal Basic Income (UBI), economic modeling, labor market impacts, income inequality, poverty reduction, automation, UBI trials, fiscal sustainability, economic simulations, social welfare

Introduction

Universal Basic Income (UBI) has been gaining traction as a policy intervention to address income inequality, automation-driven job displacement, and economic insecurity. The idea behind UBI is simple: all citizens receive a regular, unconditional cash payment, regardless of their employment status or wealth. Advocates argue that UBI could reduce poverty, promote individual freedom, and prepare societies for technological disruptions in labor markets. Critics, however, raise concerns about the cost, labor disincentives, and

inefficiencies of such a policy. This paper explores the economics of UBI by examining literature on UBI trials, economic modeling and simulations, long-term labor market impacts, and effects on poverty and inequality.

1. Literature Review of UBI Trials

Several trials of UBI, or UBI-like programs, have been conducted worldwide, providing valuable data on its economic and social impacts. These experiments vary in scale, design, and context, but all provide insights into UBI's potential effects.

1.1. Finland (2017-2018)

Finland conducted one of the most notable UBI experiments, providing 2,000 unemployed individuals with €560 per month for two years. The trial aimed to evaluate UBI's effects on employment, well-being, and administrative simplicity. Contrary to critics' expectations, the results showed no significant increase in employment rates, though participants reported improved mental health and life satisfaction (Kangas et al., 2019). These finding highlights that while UBI may not drastically alter work incentives in the short term, it does have positive psychological effects.

The Finland UBI experiment has several implications worth exploring:

1. Psychological and Social Well-being: Despite not significantly affecting employment, the improvement in mental health and life satisfaction among participants is a critical finding. This indicates that UBI can enhance well-being by reducing the financial stress associated with unemployment. Such psychological benefits may have indirect long-term economic effects, such as improved health outcomes, reduced healthcare costs, and possibly increased productivity when individuals do reenter the workforce.
2. Employment Dynamics: The unchanged employment rates challenge a common critique that UBI inherently reduces motivation to work. In Finland's case, UBI neither incentivized nor disincentivized work in the short term. This suggests that a moderate UBI amount may not impact the labor supply as strongly as critics claim, particularly if people still need additional income to meet lifestyle needs beyond basic expenses. It also implies that the effect of UBI on employment may vary based on local economic conditions and the level of benefits provided.
3. Administrative Efficiency: The Finnish experiment highlights the potential for UBI to simplify welfare systems by reducing bureaucratic costs and complexities associated with means-testing and conditional welfare programs. UBI's unconditional nature could streamline welfare administration, potentially lowering public administration expenses over time.
4. Human Capital Development: With financial support secure, participants might feel less immediate pressure to accept any available job, allowing them to consider opportunities that better align with their skills and long-term career interests. This freedom could foster a more resilient and adaptable workforce, as individuals might pursue further education, vocational training, or entrepreneurial ventures. In the long term, this flexibility could help individuals transition to roles less vulnerable to automation.
5. Policy Scalability and Transferability: Finland's findings also highlight the difficulty of generalizing UBI results across countries. Finland has a strong social safety net and labor market structure that may not mirror those of countries with

different welfare or employment landscapes. Policymakers need to consider the specific economic, social, and cultural contexts before implementing a UBI system, as outcomes may vary widely based on existing social supports and labor dynamics.

6. Labor Market Flexibility and Innovation: The Finnish UBI experiment shows potential for UBI to promote labor market flexibility. By providing a financial cushion, UBI could enable workers to transition to more fulfilling or innovative roles without immediate financial insecurity. This shift might not only support labor market dynamism but also foster creativity and entrepreneurship by reducing the financial risks associated with leaving steady but unfulfilling jobs.

Overall, Finland's UBI trial underscores that while direct economic impacts on employment may be limited in the short term, indirect benefits on well-being, human capital, and administrative efficiency present compelling arguments for further exploration. However, these results also highlight the need for careful design and context-sensitive applications to realize UBI's full potential.

1.2. Kenya (2016-present)

GiveDirectly's ongoing UBI experiment in Kenya provides cash transfers to over 21,000 people in rural areas, with some receiving payments for 12 years. Early findings suggest UBI reduces food insecurity and improves mental health (Haushofer & Shapiro, 2018). This trial offers insights into UBI's impact in developing economies, where extreme poverty is prevalent. It shows that cash transfers can directly alleviate immediate economic hardships, with recipients investing in housing, education, and health, although longer-term effects on labor participation are still under study.

1.3. Stockton, California (2019-2021)

The Stockton Economic Empowerment Demonstration (SEED) in California offered 125 residents $500 per month for two years. The program aimed to alleviate poverty and assess its impact on employment and well-being. Results from SEED showed that recipients experienced greater financial stability, were more likely to find full-time employment, and reported better mental health (West et al., 2021). The Stockton trial highlights how UBI can serve as a cushion against economic shocks and create a safety net that encourages economic mobility.

1.4. Ontario, Canada (2017-2019)

Ontario's Basic Income Pilot provided 4,000 low-income residents with a UBI of up to CAD $17,000 annually. Although the program was discontinued prematurely, initial results indicated positive outcomes, including improvements in food security, housing stability, and health (Pasma, C. & Regehr, S., 2019). However, concerns were raised about long-term funding sustainability and the political will to implement such programs nationwide.

1.5. Namibia

Smaller-scale UBI trials in Namibia (2008-2010) demonstrated the feasibility of UBI in reducing poverty and improving health and education outcomes. These trials found that UBI reduced malnutrition and increased school attendance, suggesting that even modest payments can significantly impact impoverished regions (Haarmann et al., 2008).

However, the scale and transferability of such results to larger or more developed economies remain uncertain.

1.6. Alaska Permanent Fund (1982-present, United States)

Alaska's Permanent Fund Dividend (PFD) is a unique form of UBI that distributes a share of state oil revenues to all residents annually. While not a traditional UBI since payments vary yearly and are tied to state oil revenues, the PFD is a valuable long-term example of unconditional cash transfers. The PFD has shown that unconditional payments do not reduce labor participation significantly. Research suggests that the PFD has helped reduce poverty and income inequality while maintaining relatively stable employment rates. However, the amount ($1,000–$2,000 annually) is relatively small, limiting its impact on broader economic behavior or security. This program demonstrates that small, consistent cash transfers can have positive social effects without significantly discouraging work, although the benefits may be limited in scale and scope.

1.7. Brazil's Bolsa Família (2003-present)

Although not a full UBI, Brazil's Bolsa Família program provides conditional cash transfers to low-income families. It is one of the world's largest cash transfer programs and shares certain UBI-like attributes, particularly in terms of poverty reduction and social inclusion. Bolsa Família has been linked to reduced poverty, improved child health and education outcomes, and increased labor market participation among beneficiaries, particularly women. The program's cash transfers have also boosted local economies through increased consumption. Bolsa Família illustrates that even partial cash transfer programs can support human capital development and boost economic stability at the household and community levels. A key takeaway is that conditional transfers can balance income support with incentives for positive behaviors in education and health, which could be an adaptation for UBI policies in specific contexts.

1.8. Madhya Pradesh, India (2011-2012)

India's Self-Employed Women's Association (SEWA), along with UNICEF, conducted a UBI pilot in Madhya Pradesh. Around 6,000 villagers received unconditional cash transfers, with findings collected over an 18-month period (Davala et al., 2015). The experiment showed that recipients spent the funds on improving housing, nutrition, healthcare, and education. Moreover, labor participation among recipients slightly increased, suggesting that a UBI may empower people to improve their living conditions and invest in their future. Improvements in sanitation, education attendance, and small business investments were also reported. The Madhya Pradesh trial highlights UBI's potential to improve economic security and foster entrepreneurship in low-income settings. Additionally, it suggests that even relatively small, unconditional transfers can stimulate investment in essential needs and reduce poverty, particularly in developing economies.

1.9. Uganda's Youth Opportunities Program (2008)

In Uganda, a large cash transfer experiment targeted at unemployed youth groups provided grants for vocational training and business startups, although it was not universally unconditional. Participants were given a one-time cash grant without restrictions on its use,

making it relevant for examining the effects of significant cash influxes without conditionality.
The program demonstrated significant improvements in earnings, business formation, and economic stability for participants, with recipients substantially increasing their income levels and business ownership rates. Long-term follow-up studies showed persistent positive effects on income and employment among recipients. This program underlines that cash grants can enable low-income individuals to achieve economic self-sufficiency and entrepreneurial growth. UBI proponents could see this as evidence that UBI could potentially support sustainable job creation and economic self-reliance.

1.10. Dauphin, Manitoba (1974-1979, Canada) – "Mincome"

Canada's "Mincome" experiment in Dauphin, Manitoba, provided a guaranteed income to residents, with the government ensuring that no family fell below a certain income threshold. Although it ended prematurely, the experiment was closely studied for its social and economic impacts. Mincome data revealed improvements in health outcomes, reduced hospitalization rates, and increased high school completion rates. Although some participants reduced their working hours slightly, the majority remained employed. Participants also reported less economic stress, allowing them to pursue education and caregiving activities. The Mincome experiment is often cited as a precedent for UBI's potential to reduce healthcare costs and improve educational outcomes. Its findings indicate that with basic financial security, people are more likely to invest in their well-being and personal development, potentially reducing long-term social costs.

1.11. South Korea's Basic Income for Youths Program

South Korea introduced a basic income program specifically targeting young adults in the Gyeonggi Province, where eligible individuals receive approximately $250 per quarter. This program was designed partly in response to high youth unemployment and the need to prepare the younger workforce for future employment shifts. South Korea's youth UBI program provides a small, regular income that recipients often use for education, certifications, and skills development. As the country faces rapid industrial and technological change, the program illustrates how UBI could provide young people with a buffer against unemployment and equip them for careers in sectors less prone to automation.

1.12. Norway

According to Stepan Hoenig (2024), the system that currently exists in Norway is the closest to a UBI system. In order to receive the benefits, those who qualify must look for employment, follow the law, participate in elections and pay taxes. Not everyone receives the benefit either. It's given to those who are in need of an income and don't have a current employment status. One of the main reasons that Norway has implemented this benefit is because they're a welfare state. Even though the benefits aren't available to everyone, they ensure all of their citizens are able to access healthcare, education and income, giving them the best opportunities for success.

1.13. Implications from Trials

UBI trials show consistent improvements in well-being, health, and economic security, though they present mixed results regarding employment incentives. The challenge lies in the variability of contexts -results from small, short-term trials in developing countries may not translate directly to larger, industrialized economies. Additionally, while UBI can mitigate short-term economic shocks and improve quality of life, its long-term sustainability and scalability are still areas of active research.

2. Fiscal Sustainability Models

Fiscal sustainability is a significant concern when modeling UBI, especially in high-income countries. Studies by economists like Hoynes and Rothstein (2019) suggest that a full-fledged UBI replacing existing welfare programs could be prohibitively expensive without significant tax increases. They model various funding mechanisms, including value-added tax (VAT) and progressive income taxes, to cover UBI costs. Results indicate that while UBI is financially feasible at modest levels, higher UBI payments would require substantial cuts to other welfare programs or large increases in taxes.

To examine the tax burden associated with Universal Basic Income (UBI) and the concerns regarding its financial sustainability, it is essential to unpack the primary fiscal challenges. Implementing UBI on a national scale would require substantial public funds, making the choice of funding mechanisms and their economic implications a critical area for analysis. Here, I will explore the complexities and consequences of financing UBI through various tax mechanisms, focusing on the significant economic pressures that arise and how these pressures make fiscal sustainability a central consideration in the viability of UBI.

First, the magnitude of the funding required for UBI cannot be overstated. A universally applied UBI would demand immense resources due to the unconditional, widespread nature of payments. For instance, a UBI scheme providing each adult with $1,000 per month in a country with 100 million adults would cost approximately $1.2 trillion per year. This is a significant portion of most national GDPs and often exceeds current government welfare budgets, requiring an overhaul of existing fiscal policies to accommodate such a shift. When comparing UBI to traditional welfare programs, the scale of UBI funding requirements becomes evident. While targeted welfare programs assist specific populations, UBI's universal nature demands a broader tax base and larger revenue inflows, which places significant strain on fiscal resources.

Various tax mechanisms could be deployed to fund UBI, each with unique implications for economic equity, efficiency, and public acceptance. One approach is through progressive income tax increases, where higher income earners bear a larger share of the UBI cost. While such a tax increase could redistribute wealth effectively, there are diminishing returns as tax rates climb too high. Overly high tax rates can discourage high-income earners from working or investing domestically, shrinking the overall tax base and potentially leading to capital flight. While progressive income taxes are often viewed positively for funding social programs, excessively high rates could create substantial opposition and raise debates over income redistribution.

Another common proposal is to use Value-Added Tax (VAT) or other consumption taxes to fund UBI. VAT is applied broadly to goods and services, making it a reliable source of revenue. However, VAT is inherently regressive, impacting lower-income individuals more heavily since they spend a higher proportion of their income on taxed goods. This regressive nature poses a paradox for UBI's goals unless the UBI payments are high

enough to offset the increased consumer costs, especially for low-income earners. Countries with high VAT rates, such as those in Europe, show that VAT can be a consistent revenue generator. However, if rates rise too sharply, it may reduce consumer spending, negating some of the revenue gains from the tax.

Corporate taxes present another possible funding method, targeting large, profitable firms that may be capitalizing on automation and technological advancements. While corporate taxes can potentially fund UBI, higher corporate tax rates may deter business investment, especially in sectors driven by automation. Companies may relocate or seek cost reductions through automation, which could reduce job opportunities domestically and lower income tax revenues, offsetting the intended benefits. Politically, corporate taxes are appealing since they target wealthier entities, but they also risk impacting international competitiveness, posing challenges for countries in a globalized economy.

Wealth taxes are another option, applied to the net worth of individuals or on certain asset types. By taxing wealth more than income, policymakers could potentially generate large sums for UBI funding. However, wealth taxes are administratively complex and often met with resistance. They can deter savings and investments, and they face high rates of tax avoidance. The implementation and enforcement challenges make wealth taxes a difficult choice for sustained UBI funding, despite their appeal in redistributing wealth from the affluent to the broader public.

Fiscal sustainability is a major concern when discussing UBI funding mechanisms. Maintaining UBI long-term requires a steady, reliable revenue stream that does not overburden the economy. If UBI is primarily funded through increased labor or income taxes, this could discourage workforce participation, especially among higher earners, which would shrink the tax base over time. High levels of taxation may also lead to reduced incentives for working and consumption, especially if UBI payments themselves are not substantial enough to support all individuals.

The high tax burden necessary to sustain UBI raises serious questions about long-term viability, as any tax-dependent UBI program could become highly sensitive to economic cycles. For instance, a UBI funded by consumption taxes would be particularly vulnerable during economic downturns when consumer spending declines, leading to revenue shortfalls and potential instability in UBI financing. Without a sustainable fiscal model, a tax-dependent UBI system risks becoming unsustainable in times of economic strain.

Implementing UBI would have significant macroeconomic effects, as a high tax burden could impact growth by lowering disposable incomes, reducing consumption, and deterring investment. This is a particular risk for economies where growth is driven by consumer spending. Inflationary pressures are another concern, as increased government spending on UBI could elevate aggregate demand, especially if funded through debt, which might contribute to rising prices. Inflation could erode the real value of UBI payments, reducing their effectiveness in providing financial security.

An additional concern is that UBI funding may crowd out other social programs, redirecting funds that currently support targeted welfare initiatives. Replacing targeted welfare benefits with a UBI payment could leave some individuals and groups worse off, particularly those who rely on specialized assistance like healthcare or housing support. Reallocation of social budgets to fund UBI may thus compromise the social safety net, which raises ethical and economic questions about the trade-offs involved.

Alternative funding mechanisms have been proposed to alleviate the tax burden associated with UBI. Carbon taxes are one potential option, aligning environmental goals with social equity by taxing carbon-heavy activities. Additionally, taxes on automation and robotics could target industries that benefit from job displacement, generating revenue while addressing technological unemployment. However, these taxes are difficult to implement consistently and may inhibit technological growth. Debt financing is another potential short-term solution, particularly if UBI is used to stimulate the economy. However, debt-financed UBI would be unsustainable long-term due to potential inflation and fiscal instability.

The public and political feasibility of a tax-funded UBI is another significant concern. The public's willingness to accept higher taxes to fund UBI is uncertain, especially if the costs impact the middle class or adversely affect employment and economic growth. Higher taxes could create significant political resistance, both from high-income individuals and corporations, as well as ideological opposition to broad redistribution policies. Policymakers may face challenges in maintaining public support if UBI does not demonstrate clear benefits that outweigh the financial burden on taxpayers.

Ultimately, the balancing act between meaningful UBI payments and an acceptable tax burden will define UBI's feasibility. Smaller UBI payments may not achieve substantial poverty reduction, while larger payments could increase the tax burden to unsustainable levels. While UBI has the potential to reshape social welfare, the heavy tax burden required for its implementation presents significant obstacles. Excessive taxation may deter work, reduce investment, and ultimately hinder economic growth, challenging UBI's fiscal sustainability.

Thus, the debate over UBI is intrinsically linked to society's capacity to bear higher taxes. To be viable, UBI would require a carefully designed funding model that can handle the economic pressures of large-scale tax increases while ensuring that social and economic gains justify the costs. Addressing these fiscal challenges will be essential for realizing UBI as a sustainable policy in modern economies.

3. Long-Term Economic Impacts of UBI on Labor Markets

The long-term effects of UBI on labor markets remain a topic of intense debate, with advocates and critics presenting contrasting views on its potential to transform or destabilize the workforce.

3.1 Labor Force Participation

One of the primary concerns regarding UBI is its potential to reduce labor force participation by providing individuals with enough financial security to opt out of work. Traditional economic theory suggests that providing a guaranteed income could reduce the incentive to seek employment, especially for lower-income individuals who may perceive UBI as sufficient to cover their basic needs. However, UBI trials in Finland, Stockton, and Kenya indicate that UBI does not significantly reduce labor participation. **In some cases**, recipients use the financial security UBI provides to pursue better job opportunities, education, or entrepreneurial endeavors (Kangas et al., 2019; West et al., 2021).

3.2. Labor Market Dynamism

Proponents of UBI also argue that it could lead to a more dynamic labor market by allowing workers the freedom to transition between jobs without the fear of financial insecurity. Workers might pursue higher education or entrepreneurial ventures, reducing "job lock" and encouraging innovation. On the other hand, critics argue that such a transition could lead to a reduction in overall labor supply, raising wages but decreasing the competitiveness of low-skilled industries (Hoynes & Rothstein, 2019).

3.3. Automation and Job Displacement

Exploring the impact of UBI on automation and job displacement brings to light some of the most pressing concerns facing modern labor markets. As automation accelerates, with machines and algorithms taking over tasks previously done by humans, the risk of significant job displacement is growing. The role of UBI in this context is often framed as a potential safety net that could provide financial stability to individuals affected by technological unemployment, giving them the resources and time to retrain or transition to new roles. Below, we delve into the implications of automation, UBI's potential as a buffer against job displacement.

The Scope of Automation-Driven Job Displacement

Automation threatens a broad range of industries, from manufacturing to services, and even white-collar sectors like finance and law. A study by Frey and Osborne (2017) estimates that approximately 47% of jobs in the United States could be automated within the next two decades, with similarly high projections in other developed economies. Occupations involving repetitive tasks, such as assembly line work, data entry, and customer service, are especially vulnerable. As artificial intelligence (AI) and robotics evolve, even roles requiring cognitive skills, such as medical diagnostics or legal research, are at risk.

These trends highlight the need for policy interventions to manage the social and economic fallout of job displacement. Without intervention, widespread job losses could lead to increased economic inequality, social unrest, and a diminished consumer base, creating a feedback loop that stifles economic growth. UBI could theoretically mitigate these risks by providing a guaranteed income, offering displaced workers a level of security while they adapt to a changing job market.

UBI as a Transitional Buffer for Displaced Workers

A major argument in favor of UBI is its potential to act as a buffer during times of significant labor market shifts. **By providing individuals with an income floor**, UBI allows displaced workers to consider retraining, educational programs, or entrepreneurial ventures without the immediate pressure of securing a new job. This could help economies to transition more smoothly as technological advancements reshape the employment landscape.

UBI can thus promote a more dynamic labor market by enabling workers to pursue alternative career paths that align better with future labor demands. For example, as automation reduces the need for manual or low-skilled work, displaced workers could use UBI support to retrain for roles in growth areas such as healthcare, green energy, or technology. With an income cushion, individuals may also be more willing to relocate or take on short-term or project-based work, further enhancing labor market flexibility and resilience.

3.4. Potential Criticisms and Limitations of UBI in the Context of Automation

While UBI has the potential to address some of the challenges posed by automation, it is not without limitations. One concern is that UBI might inadvertently lower the incentive for individuals to upskill, particularly if the UBI payment is generous enough to cover basic needs comfortably. This could lead to a scenario where individuals become reliant on UBI rather than actively pursuing personal development. Additionally, the costs of funding UBI could place a heavy burden on government resources, potentially detracting from other public investments in education, healthcare, or infrastructure that also play essential roles in supporting displaced workers.

Another criticism is that UBI, while providing financial stability, may not be enough to offset the social and psychological effects of losing one's job. Jobs often provide individuals with a sense of purpose, social interaction, and identity. Therefore, UBI alone might not fully address the broader impacts of automation-related unemployment, suggesting that UBI should be combined with other policies, such as workforce retraining programs, mental health support, and community initiatives that provide meaning and purpose beyond financial security.

In sum, the rapid progression of automation highlights the need for policies that can buffer individuals and communities from disruptive changes. UBI's potential as a transitional support mechanism, illustrated by these global examples, makes it a compelling policy option. By allowing workers to retrain, pursue new careers, and support themselves amidst economic shifts, UBI could serve as both a social safety net and a stimulus for a more resilient and adaptable workforce. However, its limitations mean that UBI should likely be part of a broader suite of policies aimed at addressing the multifaceted impacts of automation on the labor market.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Universal Basic Income stands as one of the boldest and most transformative social policy proposals of our time, seeking to address multifaceted economic challenges such as poverty, income inequality, and job displacement due to automation. The evidence from UBI trials and economic models reveals a nuanced picture: while UBI has consistently demonstrated its potential to enhance financial stability, improve well-being, and offer a safety net against economic shocks, its effects on labor market participation, productivity, and long-term economic growth remain mixed and highly context-dependent. The path toward implementing UBI on a national or global scale is fraught with financial and political challenges, particularly concerning the tax burden required for fiscal sustainability. Large-scale funding of UBI would demand careful, adaptive tax policies that balance fairness with economic efficiency, while also preserving incentives for productivity and investment. Policymakers would need to contend with potential trade-offs, as financing UBI might necessitate tax increases or reallocation of funds from other essential services. This raises complex questions about the balance between direct financial security provided by UBI and the continued need for targeted welfare programs and public goods that directly address issues such as healthcare, housing, and education.

Looking forward, UBI's role as a buffer against technological disruption could make it a critical element in future social policy frameworks. As automation and AI technologies continue to reshape industries and labor markets, UBI could provide displaced workers with the time and resources necessary to adapt, retrain, and re-enter the workforce with

skills suited to new, less automatable roles. This adaptability may become a defining trait of resilient economies in the 21st century, suggesting that UBI, though currently experimental, could evolve from a theoretical proposition to an essential social mechanism in the face of rapid technological advancement.

However, significant further research is required to fully understand UBI's potential impacts on different economic environments, particularly in developing countries and diverse socioeconomic settings where UBI trials are still limited. Long-term, cross-national studies are necessary to explore UBI's broader economic and social ramifications, such as its effects on productivity, innovation, and individual agency. Ultimately, UBI's feasibility and effectiveness will depend on its integration within comprehensive, carefully designed policy structures that account for economic context, fiscal capacity, and social needs. In envisioning the future of UBI, we are, in essence, imagining a shift in the social contract - a redefinition of how society provides security and opportunities for its members. Whether UBI becomes a foundational pillar of social policy or remains an experimental vision, its ongoing exploration reflects a profound commitment to innovating in the face of economic uncertainty, inequality, and transformation. In this light, UBI represents not just a policy proposal, but a vision of a society where financial security, flexibility, and resilience are accessible to all, empowering individuals to thrive in a rapidly changing world.

References

Colombino, U., (2019). Is unconditional basic income a viable alternative to other social welfare measures? IZA World of Labor.

Csősz, Cs., (2024). The economics of innovation: Blockchain technology, Annals of the „Constantin Brâncuşi" University of Târgu Jiu, Economy series, issue 5/2024, pp. 74 – 80.

Davala, S., Jhabvala, R., Mehta, S., & Standing, G. (2015). Basic income: A transformative policy for India. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Eubanks, V., (2017). Automating Inequality. St. Martin's Press New York.

Ferdosi, M., Mcdowell, T., Lewchuk, W. & Ross, S. (2022). On how Ontario trialed basic income, Ontario Canada. https://en.unesco.org/inclusivepolicylab/analytics/how-ontario-trialed-basic-income

Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. A. (2017). The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerization? Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 114, 254-280. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.08.019

Gentilini, U., Grosh, M., Rigolini, J., Yemtsov, R., (2020). Exploring Universal Basic Income. World Bank Group.

Ghuman, U., (2022). A Policy Review of the SEED (Stockton Economic Empowerment Demonstration) Project: Is the Devil in the Details? Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2022. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42413-021-00145-3

Haarmann, C., Haarmann, D., Jauch, H., Shindondola-Mote, H., Nattrass, N., Samson, M., & Standing, G., (2008). Towards a basic income grant for all. Basic Income Grant Coalition. https://www.namibiadigitalrepository.com/items/show/454

Haushofer, J., & Shapiro, J. (2018). The long-term impact of unconditional cash transfers: Experimental evidence from Kenya. National Bureau of Economic Research, Nairobi, Kenya.

Hoenig, S., (2024). Does Canada have a Universal Basic Income (UBI)?, https://www.springfinancial.ca/blog/lifestyle/does-canada-have-a-universal-basic-income-ubi.

Hoynes, H., & Rothstein, J. (2019). Universal basic income in the United States and advanced countries. Annual Review of Economics, 11, 929-958. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-080218-030237

Kangas, O., Jauhiainen, S., Simanainen, M., & Ylikännö, M. (2019). The basic income experiment 2017–2018 in Finland. Final report, Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Finland.

Lowrey, A., (2018) Give People Money, How a Universal Basic Income Would end Poverty, Revolutionize Work, and Remake the World. Crown, New York.
Parijs, van Ph., & Vanderborght, Y., (2017). Basic Income, A Radical Proposal for a Free Society and a Sane Economy. Harvard University Press.
Pasma, C., & Regehr, S., (2019). Basic income: Some policy options for Canada. Basic Income Canada Network (BICN).
Standing, G., (2017). Basic Income: And How We Can make It Happen. Pelican an imprint of Penguin Books.
Swift, J., & Power, E., (2021). The Case for Basic Income, Freedom, Security, Justice. Between the Lines, Toronto.
Yang, A., (2018). The War on Normal People, The Truth about America's Disappearing Jobs and Why Universal Basic Income is our Future. Hachette Books, New York, Boston.
Wehner, B., (2019). Universal Basic Income and the Reshaping of Democracy, Towards a Citizens' Stipend in a New Political Order. Springer.
West, S., Castro Baker, A., Samra, S., & Coltrera, E., (2021). SEED: Stockton Economic Empowerment Demonstration. Preliminary analysis: SEED's First Year. https://www.stocktondemonstration.org.
Winderquist, K., (2024). Universal Basic Income. The Mit Press Essential Knowledge Series, Cambridge, Massachusetts.