

Article

# Evaluating Basic Income, Basic Service, and Basic Voucher for Social and Ecological Sustainability

Sophia Seung-Yoon Lee, Ji-eun Lee and Kyo-seong Kim \*

Department of Social Welfare, Chung-Ang University, 84 Heukseok-ro, Dongjak-gu, Seoul 06974, Korea; leesophiasy@cau.ac.kr (S.S.-Y.L.); rosmari7@cau.ac.kr (J.-e.L.)

\* Correspondence: kyoseong@cau.ac.kr

Received: 3 September 2020; Accepted: 3 October 2020; Published: 10 October 2020



**Abstract:** This paper discusses the restructuring of the social protection system in the changing labor market by comparing and critically reviewing policy ideas of Universal Basic Income (UBI), Universal Basic Voucher (UBV), and Universal Basic Service (UBS) with a focus on how the Social and Ecological Transition (SET) can be achieved. UBS is a concept often paired with UBI, and UBV is considered a middle way between UBI (cash) and UBS (in-kind). This study first analyzes Korea's basic income, basic service, and basic voucher cases, according to Bohnenberger's nine types of social benefits through Standing's policy evaluation principles. Additionally, we evaluated how each of the benefits included in basic income, basic service, and basic voucher can contribute to social and ecological sustainability in the Korean context. Through this evaluation, to pursue SET in the future, what kind of policy efforts should be accompanied with basic income through a Korean case analysis was discussed. The paper focuses on Korea in particular, as all three policies have been initiated here.

**Keywords:** sustainability; universal basic income (UBI); universal basic voucher (UBV); universal basic service (UBS); south korean welfare state

## 1. Introduction

Can ecological sustainability be achieved without social sustainability? Or can social sustainability be secured without ecological sustainability? The recent COVID-19 pandemic has proved that the ecological crisis is not just a temporary disaster and cannot be resolved by a temporary state response. Accordingly, discussions on whether the current welfare capitalist system can guarantee ecological sustainability and how the Social and Ecological Transition (SET) can be achieved have been increasing [1–4]. The argument that environmental problems are no longer disasters/occurrences and that they should be viewed as “historical/social problems” caused by the characteristics of modern capitalism [5] is gaining more attention. This literature describes capitalism as having one body and two faces of social and ecological problems.

In response to these issues, universal basic income (UBI), which is being discussed as an alternative social policy worldwide, is being proposed as an ecological alternative. The following questions are being discussed: Can a basic income guarantee ecological sustainability? Can UBI be part of a policy toolkit that promotes social and ecological sustainability? How can a UBI program be constructed to solve environmental problems simultaneously?

Basic income began to be discussed in terms of ecology in the 1970s; it was also suggested that basic income could be an environmental means to build a Steady-State Economy defined as an economy of stable or mildly fluctuating size [6]. In addition, Andersson (2010) found that basic income has significant ecological implications in that it can break the link between growth and economic security [7]. However, there is disagreement on whether basic income will be positive in terms of the environment or whether any notable effect is possible [8]. First, the basis for the argument that the

green basic income proposal can positively contribute to ecological transformation is as follows. Basic income allows people to escape the growth-based paradigm and experiment with various forms of life with relatively minimal environmental impact [9,10]. Further, people living on basic income will have more leisure and less spending options [11,12] and will be more interested in ecological values outside of the formal economy [13]. Moreover, basic income reduces inequality and disease, as well as the need for positional goods in these societies [10,14]. However, there is also skepticism that the positivity of basic income in terms of ecological sustainability is optimistic. There have been doubts regarding whether, through the payment of basic income, people will voluntarily escape wage work and move to the autonomous sphere, such as home activities, non-profit organizations, community engagement, etc. Additionally, there is criticism in terms of the people's capability to reduce the positional goods necessary to maintain their socioeconomic status, which is also ambiguous [8].

This aspect is more evident in the relationship between basic income and consumption. It is unclear whether basic income will promote sustainable green consumption for the following reasons. First, greenhouse gas emissions increase with income. Second, in the existing social security system, poverty alleviation policies presuppose the existing welfare capitalism. In other words, it is a poverty alleviation policy that redistributes income by utilizing a paradigm centered on economic growth and employment. However, poverty alleviation policies that do not consider ecological sustainability (job policies, income redistribution, etc.) make assumptions about the existing economic system, and therefore, cannot guarantee ecological sustainability. More specifically, basic income as an income guarantee system, which is an extension of the existing welfare system, can lead to policies intensifying the ecological crisis. Third, there is an "equity-pollution dilemma". If a basic income is paid to increase expenditure by poor households, it is unclear whether this will benefit ecological sustainability. This is because, as the pollution intensity of consumption per household expenditure of poor households increases, the increase in consumption of these households due to progressive redistribution can increase the total degree of pollution [15]. Nevertheless, compensating, after considering the ambiguity of these links, could serve as a strategy for driving SET through basic income.

Moreover, there are two suggested ways to avoid the aforementioned dilemma. First, it is argued that the cause of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions can be controlled through the development of innovative technologies without necessitating changes in production and consumption as a basic income for green growth. The second is a de-growth strategy, which is skeptical about the role of the technology itself. This includes focusing on structurally changing patterns of growth and consumption and developing new concepts and measures of prosperity, particularly aimed at reducing the total consumption in wealthy countries [8].

Furthermore, it is argued that in-kind transfers (food/education vouchers, free public services) rather than basic income can serve as an important policy for ecological transformation [16–19]. The position is that vouchers or services are more important for ecological transformation as compared to basic income. Furthermore, recently, there have been suggestions that a complementary currency should be issued that can only be used within a region [20] and that an ecological income should subsequently be created using this local currency method [8]. These arguments focus on how the characteristics of the "voucher" can contribute to ecological sustainability. Nevertheless, there is increasing interest in how basic income, services, and vouchers can contribute to SET, and what policy packages, including basic income, can promote SET.

To review these contents, this study first analyzes Korea's basic income, basic service, and basic voucher cases, according to Bohnenberger's nine types of social benefits through Standing's policy evaluation principles. Additionally, we evaluated how each of the benefits included in basic income, basic service, and basic voucher can contribute to social and ecological sustainability in the Korean context. Through this evaluation, to pursue SET in the future, what kind of policy efforts should be accompanied with basic income through a Korean case analysis was discussed. Further, study also looked at the composition of an alternative welfare state in the era when the global crisis caused by

ecological destruction has become the “new normal”. This paper focuses on Korea in particular, as this is a location wherein all three policies have been implemented or already initiated.

## 2. Sustainability of the Korean Welfare State in a Digital Economy

In recent years, as the development of information and communication technology has accelerated, the emergence of economic activities that involve the use of online platforms to produce and sell goods and services has attracted much attention. Concepts such as the fourth industrial revolution as well as platform, knowledge-based, digital, social, and shared economy have become widespread, not only in academia but also in policy and the daily lives of citizens. As technological development accelerates, fundamental changes are taking place in the domain of “work”. A platform economy, in which goods and services are produced and sold using online platforms, has emerged, and a new form of employment relationship, called platform work, has expanded [21]. Furthermore, these changes include an increase in irregular workers, subcontracted labor, freelancers, and fake self-employed workers.

As the economic activities that were mainly organized in offline workplaces move to online platforms, the most critical change observed is the emergence of various platform companies and platform-mediated work. Platform labor is carried out by connecting (broking) service consumers and suppliers in the process of providing specific services or carrying out specific projects using online platforms. New types of labor, variously named “online labor”, “on-demand app labor”, and “platform labor”, are characterized by a form of work organization that is difficult to explain in reference to existing labor relations [22].

In many cases these platform workers operate as independent contractors, and therefore, the status of the workers using these platforms is not recognized. They are classified as self-employed individuals or platform users and are excluded from the coverage of the Labor Standards Act and the Labor Union Act, or the social insurance law [23]. The critical factor in the exclusion of atypical work such as platform labor from social insurance is the structure of the existing social security system, which is not designed to match such changes in the labor market environment [23].

Significant recent discussions related to the social security coverage of platform workers have included discussions on the application of industrial accident insurance, the application of employment insurance, and the application of income protection policies. Despite institutional changes that have been made to expand the scope of existing social protection, studies continue to suggest that there are limitations in industrial accident insurance systems’ ability to protect these new forms of workers [24,25]. The current employment insurance system is the representative employment safety net in Korea, and it includes unemployment benefits and vocational training. However, it is difficult for these new kinds of workers to prove their eligibility for employment insurance, as it is difficult for irregular workers such as platform workers, to specify their number of working days and working hours. In other words, as the current employment insurance system mainly covers workers in traditional employment relations, new forms of work, including platform work, are excluded from the system that only provides unemployment benefits to those who are unemployed in the traditional sense. Thus, the definition of unemployment is ambiguous in the case of these new workers. As the digital economy advances and changes ways of working, applying employment insurance traditionally, as a social safety net for “unemployment”, has become increasingly difficult.

As the existing social-insurance-based social security system was built based on the traditional SER, newly created jobs that deviate from the SER are falling outside the coverage of the Korean social insurance system. Changes in the labor market, coupled with welfare policies that do not correspond with them, eventually result in an increase in precarious workers. This lack of compatibility between the welfare state and the changing labor market facilitates the discussion on the possibility of introducing alternative social protection policies in Korea. Against this background, noting the limitations in the existing social insurance policy, this paper focuses on how alternative social policy idea can be analyzed in terms of social and ecological sustainability.

### 3. Discussions on Alternatives: UBI, Universal Basic Service (UBS), and Universal Basic Voucher (UBV)

UBI, Universal Basic Voucher (UBV), and Universal Basic Service (UBS) are policy types that are proposed as new distribution mechanisms with broad concepts. Bohnenberger (2020) further classified UBI, UBV, and UBS policy into nine types of social benefits according to the characteristics of goods and services. The advantage of Bohnenberger's (2020) benefit classification is that it allows Basic Vouchers and Basic Services to be discussed according to the characteristics of welfare goods and services. According to her research, depending on the rivalry and excludability, goods are classified as public goods (nonrival, nonexcludable), club goods (nonrival, excludable), common-pool goods (rival, nonexcludable), and private goods (rival, nonexcludable). In particular, the inclusion of the concept of club goods and common-pool goods in basic vouchers is positive in that it allows the voucher discussion to be analyzed in terms of social and ecological sustainability (see Table 1). This section begins by reviewing and discussing each of the three alternative policies in detail before undertaking their comparison. As there are subcategories, we use the terms Basic Income, Basic Voucher, and Basic Service in the following sections.

#### 3.1. Basic Income

Basic income is a periodic cash payment unconditionally delivered to all citizens on an individual basis, without means-test or work requirements. It is defined as having five main characteristics: unconditionality, universality, individuality, cash payment, and regularity [26]. The characteristic of unconditionality refers to the unconditional provisioning of basic income regardless of the demand for work or work experience. Universality refers to the provisioning of basic income to everyone without the need for means-testing or measuring income level. Individuality refers to the provisioning of basic income characterized not by benefits to household units but individual units. Furthermore, basic income is to be provided not in the form of services or vouchers but regularly in cash [26].

The academic debate surrounding basic income has rapidly developed in Korea and is related to the increase of new forms of work in the platform economy created by technological developments. These changes in the field of work are associated with increased instability due to this diversification of employment forms. Additionally, this debate was sparked by the implementation of the Seongnam City Youth Dividend in 2016 [27] and the "Gyeonggi-do Youth Basic Income" that has been in effect since 2019 [28].

The unconditional payment of benefits to populations who can work is receiving political attention, and it is also unique in terms of local currency experiments. In this regard, social income-type basic income projects have been conducted by various local governments. The idea of unconditional farmers' allowance is another example of such projects. Moreover, policy discussions regarding youth allowances and farmers' allowances have some of the attributes of basic income. In the Korea local elections in June 2018, numerous candidates made commitments that had similarities to the "Farmers Basic Income". These candidates emphasized the necessity of such a basic income based on the inequality of the direct payment system, the need to overcome the low income of farmers, the public value of agriculture, the improvement of farmers' working environments, and the need to ensure the sustainability of agriculture and rural living [29].

In the 2017 presidential election, candidate Lee Jae-Myeong pledged life cycle allowance to the youth group with the idea of land dividends. As the current Gyeonggi governor, Lee Jae-Myeong is trying to raise the land ownership tax to provide a new source of income for Gyeonggi-do youth. Basic income has also been proposed as a fair pre-distribution mechanism [30] and as a means of securing ecological sustainability. Although it is a minor political party, the Korean Green Party pledged to provide an escape from work poisoning and create green jobs by paying basic income and reducing working hours as one of their 2016 general election agendas. These kinds of categorical forms of basic income have been applied in Korea.

Basic income is a kind of commons, and thus, a source of tangible and intangible resources that all members of a population share. This discussion's interest in basic income in an agricultural environment stems from the question of who owns the big data accumulated on the new digital work platforms and whether the platform company wholly owns the profits of the "big data enclosure". This new economic concept is different from public land and includes not only subtractive resources but also non-subtractive resources such as knowledge [31]. Therefore, there are difficulties that would arise in applying basic income in a digital economy that might not be faced when applying the same in more traditional contexts.

Furthermore, Bohnenberger (2020) classified UBI into two subcategories: Unconditional Basic Income, which is given to all people according to benefits, and Transitional Basic Income, which is given to certain groups. The latter includes categorical and participation basic income. Categorical basic income refers to basic income paid to "groups belonging to a specific category" such as youth and farmers [32]. Participation income is a form of pay given with the condition that the receiver conduct "socially useful work (but not necessarily paid work)" [33,34]. In this study, we consider Unconditional Basic Income to be UBI, following the definition suggested by BIEN (Basic Income Earth Network), which is recognized for its authority in defining basic income. However, the cases of "Transitional Basic Income", "Categorical Basic Income", and "Participation Income", which have recently been discussed as similar basic income systems, are included.

### 3.2. Basic Service

UCL's Institute for Global Prosperity published a report suggesting UBS in 2017 [19]. This was a concept that was paired with UBI, and a proposal for an ambitious form of public social services created with a philosophical background similar to that behind UBI. Some already existing unconditional social services include the areas of education and health care. The concept of UBS is "the provision of sufficient freely accessible public services, as can be afforded from a reasonable tax on incomes, to enable every citizen's safety, opportunity, and participation" [35]. Specifically, UBS is a type of public service primarily divided into two general aspects of universal public social service. First, the idea behind UBS is that it provides a service that is free for everyone at the point of use. That is, there is no co-payment meaning that users also pay a portion of the service fee. Public social services, such as the National Healthcare Service in the United Kingdom, currently have this policy, whereby the service can be used free of charge at the time of use. However, most healthcare systems require co-payment.

Second, the scope of UBS is vast. In traditional public social services, the characteristics of public goods are non-compatibility, non-exclusion, dimensions' rivalry, and excludability, which also include the concept of UBS. UBS shares the UBI agenda in both its objectives and results. In both policies, every citizen of a country or community is entitled to at least a minimum share of the outcome of a group's prosperity, which allows citizens to pursue their aspirations [35]. Meanwhile, the branches of UBI and UBS are as follows. First, the most significant differences between the two are their payment methods and delivery systems. BIEN states that one of the five essential features of basic income is cash payment and that payment-in-kind, such as food or services, and the specific-use issued voucher method, cannot be classified as basic income. Furthermore, while claiming UBI emphasizes the choice of the individual, the core of claiming UBS is "social commons" [36]. Within this concept, group values, rather than individual values, are emphasized.

Next, there are differences pertaining to the point at which universality and unconditionality occur within UBI and UBS. UBI is universal and unconditionally pays cash to all individuals, while UBS is a service used "only when there is a specific need". In other words, the universal approach of UBS is only activated in response to need, while UBI preempts need. Finally, there are differences in how payment levels are determined between UBS and UBI. Disposable income increases with the use of UBI, which provides cash in advance. However, UBS reduces the level of expenditure in a specific area and does not cause an increase in disposable income but rather increases adjusted disposable income.

Finally, advocates of UBS specifically emphasize UBS' ecological benefits. Opponents of UBI have argued for the free use of vouchers and public services, claiming that UBI is not definite in terms of its positive ecological effects [16–19]. However, Gough (2019) supported UBS by arguing that public consumption emits less carbon than private consumption and that public financial welfare states emit less carbon than private financial alternatives [37]. In summary, the logic of UBS is based on two principles: shared needs and collective responsibilities [38].

Bohnenberger (2020) classified UBS into three categories according to the characteristics of its goods and services. First, State Service refers to a system that allows individuals or a society to use its services free of charge when the citizen or society considers it necessary. This is the most prominent type of UBS benefits and can be seen as a part of the expansion and increasing accessibility of the benefits of public social services in Northern European welfare states. State Services differ from other UBS types (such as Free Consumer Goods or Public Infrastructure) in that their main benefits consist of services provided by other members of society, and their results may vary depending on the availability of skilled labor in an area. Examples of this include health services, education services, child and senior care services, public transportation services, repair services, and so on. Free Consumer Goods is a type of UBS that includes free internet, free tap water, and free meals. People can receive an unlimited amount of goods for certain goods. Finally, Public Infrastructure, the last type of UBS, is the state providing free construction of public infrastructure, guaranteeing classic public goods such as parks, forests, and information centers. When it comes to sustainable welfare, the production of new forms of public infrastructure is a crucial task, and domains such as transportation, housing, and green infrastructure may be included as a part of it.

### 3.3. Basic Voucher

UBV can be considered a middle way between UBI (cash) and UBS (in-kind). However, only a few related studies compare UBI and UBS [39]. Moreover, UBI and UBV differ in their payment methods: UBI is paid in cash, while UBV offers either paper or electronic vouchers. Furthermore, UBV has the advantage of increasing the effectiveness of policy in that it can induce destination-oriented consumption/expenditure by limiting usage. However, a negative aspect of UBV is that it restricts "individual freedom" [40].

During the current COVID-19 crisis, the discussion surrounding UBI has rapidly increased. Some countries have paid or are reviewing the possibility of implementing national unconditional payments. Recently, the UK Treasury Department has reviewed a radical plan to provide vouchers for all UK citizens—£500 for adults and £250 for children—in all sectors of the economy worst hit by the COVID-19 crisis [41]. In the case of Korea's response to this pandemic, each household benefited from emergency cash transfers in the form of vouchers in May 2020, regardless of the household's income and property [42].

In the past, vouchers were considered a means of retrenchment and a form of privatization within the welfare state [43,44]. However, vouchers have recently been dealt with mainly in ecological sustainability studies and have been suggested as a new form of monetary policy, coming to be viewed as a complementary currency [20]. It is necessary to evaluate UBV in terms of sustainability because the effect of the policy may vary depending on the purpose of the voucher.

Bohnenberger (2020) classified UBV into four types of benefits according to the characteristics of goods, services, and target groups. The first type is Shift Vouchers—vouchers issued in the form of the national currency with an emphasis on behavior change. These vouchers are not limited to poor households in the form of subsidies for specific private property. They are largely divided into monetary forms such as food vouchers and non-cash benefits (e.g., ecological vacation). Ultimately, Shift Vouchers aim to "nudge" citizens to adopt a sustainable lifestyle and are widely accepted in the literature on sustainable welfare [39].

Quasi-Currency Vouchers are vouchers that grant recipients the right to restrict and regulate the use of scarce resources. Unlike Shift Vouchers, these vouchers mainly use new currency and are

introduced to manage common-pool resources. Examples of such vouchers include personal carbon dividends and housing space vouchers. Personal carbon allowance is a system that sets absolute caps for energy, resources, and emissions, dividing the allowance among citizens and thus contributing to the realization of carbon justice and “consumption corridors” [45]. Housing vouchers are vouchers that can be distributed among all citizens, enabling part of their rent to be paid as a voucher [39].

Needs Vouchers are issued to meet the needs of specific groups with the aim of compensating for several causes of poverty. They are issued mainly to provide private goods; for example, vouchers for energy, fruit and vegetables, or sustainable food. Finally, Commons-Innovation Vouchers are issued to encourage the emergence of new social and ecological institutions and mainly applied to club goods. The goal of these vouchers is to support the emergence of environmental-social innovation before the institution (commons) is fully developed. Therefore, a comprehensive example of such Commons-Innovation Vouchers is “complementary local currency”. Complementary local currency is a currency that can be exclusively used to purchase locally produced goods and for multiple purposes within a region. In other words, Commons-Innovation Vouchers support the emergence of community-based institutions, cooperatives, and shared ownership or grassroots initiatives. Specifically, complementary currencies can redeploy economic activity and contribute to building communities [39].

In summary, the discussion on the concept and usefulness of the basic voucher has recently been facilitated, and it is being re-examined in terms of its ecological advantages along with discussions on local currency. To date, previous debates on policy ideas have occurred based on basic income and basic services. However, according to the analysis, the two policy ideas can be combined to contribute to the social and ecological transformation (SET). This is because the basic income and basic services share much of the content in terms of goals and performance. In other words, both policies are based on the idea that all citizens have the right to have a minimum stake in the prosperity of the group at least [35].

The point of debate is concentrated around the question of what should be distributed in preference to basic goods. It is a discussion of whether it is income or essential services such as food, education, and health, given the budget constraints. In this context, Percy (2019) pointed out the advantages of basic services over basic income as follows. First, basic income is paid regardless of need, while basic services are efficient because they can directly satisfy people’s needs. Further, cash cannot be directly controlled, but in the case of services, it is efficient because it is possible to control the quality and protect the right to access. By establishing an infrastructure for service provision, regional capabilities can be strengthened. In addition, financially, basic income is expected to be relatively expensive, but as services can be built gradually, it is more politically acceptable [35].

However, these debates are neutralized when considered in terms of the goal of implementing SET. Moreover, amid global ecological constraints, the system of overproduction and overconsumption must be corrected, which requires a more radical distribution of goods. This redistribution includes the universal provision of high-quality public goods for all people to live, with sufficient income guarantees [2]. Only when these conditions are provided, the level of economic/social inequality can be lowered, and actors seeking voluntary simplicity and consumption restrictions can be formed along with the shortening of working hours [46]. In the following analysis, we evaluate the social/ecological sustainability of each policy benefit and highlight the contribution of the combination of the two types of benefits—voucher-based basic income and basic service—to SET.

**Table 1.** Typology of sustainable welfare benefits (revised [39]).

	Basic Income		Basic Vouchers				Basic Service		
	Universal Basic Income (UBI)	Transitional Income	Shift Vouchers	Quasi-Currency Vouchers	Needs Vouchers	Commons-Innovation Vouchers	State Service	Free Consumption Goods	Public Infrastructure
Description	A periodic cash payment unconditionally delivered to all citizens on an individual basis, without means-test or work requirements	As variants of UBI, conditionality is given or paid to specific groups	Vouchers issued to allow for specific behavior shifts by supplying better allowances and price change	Vouchers that are allocated to recipients to restrict and organize usage of a scarce good	Vouchers given to people with the goal of ensuring that their needs are met	Vouchers issued to enable the emergence of allowances and innovations	Services a person can enjoy free of charge when they or society considers it necessary	Goods provided that can be used by citizens without limitations	Institutions and public goods that are established or maintained and can be accessed by everyone
Recipient (ex-ante)	known	known	known	known	known	known	unknown	unknown	unknown
Target recipient	everyone	selected groups	groups who perform specific actions	everyone	low-income and selected groups	everyone or selected group	–	–	–
Good or service (ex-ante)	unknown	unknown	known	unknown	unknown	known	known	known	known
Target goods or service	–	–	Private goods	Common-pool resources	Private goods	Club goods	Club goods	Private goods	Public goods
Examples	UBI, Social dividends	Categorical basic income, Participation Income	Regional food, Sport Vouchers, Ecological leave for sustainable behavior	Personal carbon allowance, Housing space vouchers	Public transport vouchers, Electricity vouchers, Vouchers for green and healthy food	Regional currencies, Time banks	Healthcare, Education, Childcare and elderly care, free local transport, repair services	Free internet, Free tap water, Free school meals	Parks, Forests, Bike lanes, Community space, Repair Cafés, Transition houses



#### 4. Analysis Framework

Standing (2009) argues that labor in the era of globalization is different from that of industrial capitalism. Neoliberal globalization, global labor flexibility, and global privatization have led to the rise of a “precariat” class that is different from the working class that formed around the “proletariat” during industrial capitalism. If the existing labor system has formed social entitlements for the core working class in a manner centered on trade unions (“national industrial citizenship”), following globalization, the concept of labor must be expanded and made more comprehensive to define social, economic, and cultural rights applicable to all occupations. At this time, work and labor must be distinguished, and occupation must be proposed as a new concept for work distinguished from skill or jobs (“people do jobs, people are occupations”) [47]. With the advent of industrial capitalism, labor became linked to citizenship in an unusual and problematic way, while the right to social benefits has become linked to labor. Therefore, social policy principles following changes to the nature of labor in the era of digital economy should include “reviving occupation in full freedom”, which includes guaranteeing a basic income for all [40,47]. Standing (2009) suggests five principles that should be considered in building a sustainable welfare state in the future. Alternative social policies such as UBI, UBS, and UBV can be evaluated based on these principles. There are different aspects to be considered between these principles, and policies that contradict these principles must be implemented with caution. However, there is also a debate surrounding these principles’ effectiveness, as some policies are neutral with respect to ecological implications. Further, Standing (2009) suggests that social policies should be evaluated according to whether they satisfy the following five policy principles [40,47,48].

##### 4.1. The Security Difference Principle

The security difference principle states that a policy or institutional change is socially just only if it improves the security and work prospects of the least secure groups in a society [47]. If a policy boosts the job opportunities of middle-income groups while worsening the prospects of more disadvantaged groups, this is unjustifiable, unless the disadvantaged groups are then acceptably compensated. The Security Difference Principle stems from Rawls, who argued from a liberal philosophical perspective, claiming that social and economic inequalities are only just if they allow for the betterment of the most unfortunate groups in a society [49]. Thus, a policy should be judged by whether it helps those who have the least social security [47]. If it fails to do so, one should be uneasy (primarily if this policy benefits others who are not so insecure), unless some other principle is recognized that is demonstrably superior. If so, it would be up to the evaluator to state the principle and support the policy. The critical point to be considered here is that everyone should have the right to access a minimal amount of resources to enhance their capacity to develop and exercise “effective freedom” [48].

##### 4.2. The Paternalism Test Principle

The second principle is the Paternalism Test Principle, which posits that a policy or institutional change is socially just only if it does not impose on some groups controls that are not imposed on the most free groups in a society [47,48]. According to this principle, it is against the concept of social justice to force people to conduct certain forms of labor or “jobs” when others in society are not forced to do these forms of labor, even if government authorities genuinely believe that such a policy would result in the material betterment of those required to conduct such labor. The notion that there is a prima facie case against paternalism underlies this principle, and this principle aims to protect the disadvantaged from policies that constrain their freedoms. This principle requires that all groups who could be subject to paternalistic direction have a Voice (collective and individual) that represents their interests. Only people with a Voice have some semblance of control over their work and lives, and it is only by having control that an individual can attain dignified work [48].

Another point that is relevant to the paternalism principle is the popularity of the subject of happiness in recent research. Researchers have reiterated that people who have control over their work and life are happier than those who do not and have even considered the influence the access to benefits has on happiness [50]. In this context, control means having the capacity and opportunity to make decisions for oneself, without such decisions being determined by the state, patriarchal figures, religious institutions, or other institutions [47]. This principle is concerned with “effective” or “full” freedom, for which underlying economic security is essential [48].

#### *4.3. The Rights-Not-Charity Principle*

The third principle is the Rights-not-Charity Principle, which states that a policy or institutional change is just socially if it enhances the rights the recipient has to benefits or services and limits the discretionary power of the providers [47,48]. A right is something a person possesses as a mark of their humanity or citizenship and cannot be made dependent on some behavioral conditionality. For instance, people should not be expected to have to plead for assistance in times of need or have to rely on the selective benevolence of civil servants or politicians. Social entitlements should be rights, not matters placed at the discretion of bureaucrats, philanthropists, or aid-donors [47].

The principle that everybody should have an equal opportunity to pursue and develop their work capacities and competencies is defensible. Thus, equality of opportunity requires policies and institutions to enable every person in society an equal chance to develop their productive capacities, should they wish to do so [48].

#### *4.4. The Ecological Constraint Principle*

The fourth principle is the Ecological Constraint Principle, which posits that a policy or institutional change is socially just only if it does not involve an ecological cost borne by the community or by those directly affected by the policy [47,48]. This is a quintessentially 21st-century principle. In other words, potential ecological consequences must be incorporated into the policy rather than considered as an afterthought. For instance, there may be a trade-off between jobs and ecological sustainability and revival. Commercial drive, which pursues growth and profits without taking social externalities into account, is a recipe for global ecological disaster [47,48]. For evaluation purposes, this ecological principle dictates that all policies should be subject to the constraint that they should not deliberately, willfully, or carelessly jeopardize the environment. In this context, one could argue that subsidies intended to boost skills, employment, or job-creating investment should be modified to promote only ecologically beneficial work and skills. However, the ecological constraint principle raises some issues when applied in low-income countries, as its application can slow their economic growth and hinder development [47,48].

#### *4.5. The Dignified Work Principle*

The fifth principle is the Dignified Work Principle, which states that a policy or institutional change is just only if it does not impede the dignified pursuit of work and does not disadvantage the most insecure groups in this respect [40,48]. To some degree, this principle is incorporated into the Rights-not-Charity Principle. However, the Dignified Work Principle involves two implicit value judgments. First, it implies that work that is dignifying is worth promoting (whereas any deterioration in working conditions or opportunities is not). Second, it implies that a policy should enhance the range and quality of work options for the most insecure groups, relative to other groups, or more than for other groups. While this may seem complicated, the primary focus of this principle is to determine whether a scheme favors the development of more freely chosen work opportunities and capabilities [48].

In the review of these five policy principles, it is notable that the Security Difference Principle, the Paternalism Principle, the Rights-not-Charity Principle, and the Dignified Work Principle are fundamentally intended to secure social sustainability. Meanwhile, the Ecological Constraint Principle

is focused on the importance of considering ecological sustainability when designing policy. In this case, the implication is that efforts to ensure social sustainability are not automatically linked to principles behind ecological sustainability [1]. For example, several policy benefits paid as rights do not necessarily have a positive ecological effect. Therefore, it is necessary to carefully consider the relationship between social and ecological sustainability when designing policies for welfare states functioning in a digital economy.

## 5. Comparison

In this section, nine Korean cases of welfare benefits are evaluated according to Standing's five policy principles introduced above. For comparison, Korean policy cases corresponding to the characteristics of nine policy benefits were selected based on the key features of Bohnenberger's benefit types. To capture the process of developing alternative ideas into specific policy proposals, policies that are being actively reviewed, policies already in place at the local government level, and policies that are about to be implemented are included. This is to derive implications for the development of policies toward SET in the future and the process of policy formation. However, in the case of UBI, which is an ideological type, the case of the Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend was used as an exception because there was no Korean alternative.

### 5.1. Comparing the Three Policies

From the above discussion, it is clear that UBI, UBV, and UBS have similar purposes. All three policies are designed to provide citizens with a minimum share in the state and community, in the form of cash, services, or vouchers, respectively, as a kind of right. The differences between UBI, UBV, and UBS are as follows [39].

First, while all three are payment methods, each takes a different position on the continuum of in-cash and in-kind benefits, with vouchers holding a middle position between the other two [39] (p. 6). UBI proponents argue that cash benefits give people "real freedom", and they point out that UBV and UBS limit individual freedom in terms of options. However, the "services" and "vouchers" that UBV and UBS offer emphasize equality, efficiency, social solidarity, and sustainability. UBV tends to focus on ecological perspectives and social sustainability, and through the use of vouchers, not only changes the mechanism of action but also provides information on goods and services.

Second, all three are delivery systems. In principle, UBI is the simplest, while UBV is the most complex. In the case of UBV and UBS, the division of the roles of the federal and local governments as service providers and fiscal policymakers and regulators is essential; the role of the private sector is also crucial for UBV (Commons-Innovations Vouchers). In terms of the three policies' delivery systems, UBV and UBS are more efficient than UBI cash payments in satisfying people's needs, and social solidarity can be strengthened through the use of services and vouchers. In particular, the use of new vouchers called complementary currency has helped to revitalize the local economy.

Third, there are differences in the universality of targets for supply and demand between these three policies. While UBI pays everyone, UBS pays everyone when a need arises. Additionally, UBV differs in the scope of benefits it provides for each specific type of benefit. In the case of Shift Vouchers, specific actions are paid to a person, while Quasi-Currency vouchers are paid unconditionally to everyone in the same way as UBI is paid. In the case of Needs Vouchers, they are mainly paid to low-income people or to a person who has performed a specific action. Commons-Innovation Vouchers are paid to everyone or a specific group depending on the characteristics of the policy.

Next, differences arise depending on whether beneficiaries and goods and services are known in advance. In the case of UBI and UBV, the beneficiary can be known in advance. Conversely, UBS is unable to accurately identify the beneficiary in advance because the eligibility to receive a service occurs from the point of desire. However, in the case of UBI, goods and services cannot be known in advance because individuals receiving UBI are free to choose from all goods and services that can be

traded for cash on the market. However, in UBV and UBS, what goods and services a beneficiary will use can be known in advance.

Finally, benefit types differ according to the characteristics of goods and services. In general, cash gives the recipient access to all the goods and services available for trading on the market. Nonetheless, vouchers and services differ in how they are supplied depending on the characteristics of the goods. In the case of existing public social services, the state has traditionally provided services in response to the people's rights to public goods such as medicine and education. However, UBS is an extension of universal free basic services, expanding to include private goods and club goods as well as public goods. Nevertheless, in the case of vouchers, the existing discussions have mainly centered on guaranteeing public access to private goods; Bohnenberger's UBV typology covered the concepts of club goods and common-pool goods.

## 5.2. Analysis of UBI, UBS, and UBV Using Social Policy principles

### 5.2.1. Universal Basic Income

An example of an ideological type of UBI is the Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend. The Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend has been paying an average annual dividend of \$1110 or more to all citizens since 1982 and has since gained political support.

According to Standing (2017), UBI is positively evaluated in terms of the "Security Difference Principle", "Paternalism Test Principle", "Rights-not-Charity Principle", and "Dignified Work Principle" [40]. However, in the case of the "Ecological Constraint Principle", UBI displays positive and negative aspects [8].

First, UBI complies with the Security Difference Principle, Paternalism Test Principle, and Rights-not-Charity Principle because UBI pays all individuals unconditionally and regularly. Specifically, it satisfies the Security Difference Principle because it promotes the security of the most vulnerable groups in society as a right and avoids weakening the welfare of the poor by replacing existing social insurance and social services. In addition, due to UBI's characteristic of unconditionality, it is possible to remove the possibility of various pitfalls (poverty, unemployment, and insecurity traps) as well as screening and stigma [40]. UBI promotes real freedom for all individuals [51] and may enhance individual worker's bargaining power [52,53]. Second, the principle of Rights-not-Charity—that is, the principle of being paid on the basis of one's citizenship rather than benevolence—stems from the universal wealth sharing arrangements that applies to all citizens [54] (p. 180). This principle includes the principle of universality as it supports the creation of social cohesion and collective experiences as well as individual interests [55] and can promote solidarity [56].

Third, basic income conforms to the principle of Paternalism Test in that it contributes to the formation of a social foundation through which a socially disadvantaged group can be given a Voice [54]. Thus, through basic income, power can be transferred from the hands of conservative paternal welfare states to those of community politics [57,58]. Fourth, in the case of the Dignified Work Principle, UBI is positively evaluated in that it can increase both the quantitative aspect of work and productivity and improve the quality of leisure time [40]. In the case of the Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend, while its payments were low, they enabled increased consumption for low-income families, thus boosting Alaska's macro-economy and expanding labor demand and employment. Furthermore, it had little effect on the labor market participation of most people, and the working hours of part-time workers increased slightly [59]. In a situation where the boundaries between labor and work are blurred, and the measurement and compensation of labor can become complicated, basic income provides compensation for all jobs that have a fundamentally social character [40]. Additionally, basic income can provide an individual with the ability to decline "bullshit jobs" [60], which might otherwise be necessary for survival and can provide more options for work [61].

However, UBI is ambivalent as concerns the Ecological Constraints Principle. Although there is no singular vision of green UBI, there are optimistic views surrounding the ecology of UBI and its

effect on sustainable life [8]. The vision of green basic income is divided mainly into green growth advocates and slow growth/degrowth advocates, with the role of basic income varying accordingly [8]. In the former case, there is a tendency to primarily claim carbon tax and carbon dividends, while for degrowth green thinkers, raising carbon prices in tandem with economic growth is not a solution. Degrowth advocates emphasize that the goal of full employment must be abandoned in favor of reducing total consumption [17]. Therefore, for degrowth green thinkers, post-growth orientation should be accompanied by not only basic income but also various supplementary policies (education on a more frugal way of life, reduction of working hours, etc.) that promote changes in consumption behaviors. Thus, consumption behaviors should adapt, challenging “consumer culture” and ensuring ecological sustainability [8,17].

### 5.2.2. Transitional Basic Income

Transitional Basic Income includes participation and category basic income. The Seoul Youth Allowance in Korea is an example of a system with similarities to participation income. However, the Seoul Youth Allowance cannot be entirely categorized as participatory income due to its means-tests and work requirements. Nonetheless, efforts to expand the concept of labor can be seen in this policy’s design.

The Seoul Youth Allowance has been implemented as part of the comprehensive youth policy implemented in Korea since 2016, and it is intended to benefit young people aged between 19 and 34 who have been unemployed for two or more years after graduation and who meet the income and work requirements. The requirement for a young person’s income level is less than 150% of median income, and each recipient must meet the work requirement of fewer than 30 h per week. The allowance is paid in cash, and the young person claiming this allowance can receive KRW 500,000 (USD 420) per month for 2–6 months [62]. Conceptually, it can be viewed as participation income as it is characterized by its quasi-universality, individuality, and cash payment method. It has contributed to easing the strictness of employment and job-seeking activities on eligibility for receiving support.

This Seoul model qualifies as participation income, and as such, satisfies both the Rights-not-Charity Principle and Dignified Work Principle. The Seoul Youth Policy began in 2012, and by December 2014, the Seoul City Council had adopted the nation’s first “Basic Ordinance for Youth” [63]. Following this, they announced the “2020 Youth Guarantee Seoul”, which stipulates a public duty to guarantee the rights of youth and protects the youth allowance that is aimed at enhancing the social participation capacity of Korean youth. The youth allowance attempted to expand from the sector of labor to work to activity. For example, in the past, cash was used only in places linked to job-seeking activities. However, in the case of this youth allowance, the scope has been expanded, enabling cash to be used to meet various needs of youth (e.g., food, communication, transportation expenses, monthly rent, etc.).

Moreover, the results of an analysis of changes in participants before and after receiving the youth allowance found that the autonomy of participants’ time use was secured by reducing their need to take on unstable part-time jobs [64]. In this respect, the Dignified Work Principle is met to some extent by the Seoul model. However, the Seoul model does not meet the criteria of the Security Difference Principle and Paternalism Test Principle because conditionality is imposed in the form of income requirements and some job-seeking requirements. In addition, the patriarchal factor is reflected in the Seoul model’s monitoring condition, wherein recipients are required to submit an activity record. If income, assets, and working conditions are not required to be declared and only a requirement for socially productive work is applied, then the Security Difference Principle can be satisfied.

Additionally, the Seoul model does not satisfy the Ecological Constraint Principle because ecological factors are not considered in the first place. However, if Ecological Transition Income [65] is provided, an incentive for actions toward ecological sustainability is created, and this may have a positive effect in terms of the Ecological Constraint Principle, enabling changes toward more sustainable lifestyles.

### 5.2.3. Shift Voucher

A Shift Voucher is a voucher-type benefit provided to a population to change behavior and consumption patterns. It can be seen as a voucher form of participation income that incentivizes specific behaviors. Ultimately designed for the purpose of “nudging” people toward a more socially and ecologically sustainable lifestyle, Shift Vouchers support socially essential but undervalued activities [39]. Voucher forms regarding Agrarian basic income, basic income for artists, and Green Party policy proposals are examples of such systems.

In the case of Korea, Gyeonggi Province has been promoting basic income for farmers since 2019, and this form of basic income is expected to be introduced in the second half of 2020. The new basic income will differ from the existing Farm Household Allowance in that it will be paid to individual farmers rather than to household units, and it will consist of a provisional KRW 600,000 (USD 504) per year to be paid in the local currency [66]. The controversial factor within this is determining who the “farmer” is. As Korean law does not provide a clear definition of a “farmer”, determining whether people who are doing agricultural work are viewed as farmers or whether people living in rural areas are viewed as farmers is a current issue. The Basic Income Committee for farmers in each city and county in Korea has organized for the promotion of this project, enabling residents to participate and make decisions concerning this matter.

Farmers’ basic income is being introduced to ease income inequality by easing the income gap between households in urban and rural areas. It secures the livelihoods of small farmers and considers farmers who do not reside in rural areas. Agricultural work is socially valuable and necessary but is often undervalued. Thus, this basic income is being introduced to improve the lives of small farmers and female farmers. In this respect, it satisfies the principles of Security Difference, Rights-not-Charity, and Dignified Work.

While the Ecological Constraint Principle is not met by Korean farmer’s basic income as it was not designed to limit specific consumption behaviors, it is met in the sense that this policy is designed to protect a country’s relatively weakening agricultural economy in the global supply chain. Simultaneously, this form of basic income aims to protect the agricultural economy in the region through the use of local currency. It is positive in the sense that it seeks activation and protection. However, guaranteeing basic income for people engaged in agriculture can cause a feeling of relative deprivation, as introducing this form of basic income excludes people in other industries.

Further, the question of the definition of a farmer may differ from region to region. If the decision-making process behind forming this definition is not democratic, it may become “patriarchal”. In the case of the current basic income for farmers in Gyeonggi-do, an organizing committee comprising local residents is responsible for the project at a regional level. This organization can be seen as a reflection of efforts to block the patriarchal tendency in decision-making and include the community. In addition, discussions surrounding the promotion of basic income for artists, who currently operate in a blind spot within the existing social security and labor market protection system, are steadily progressing in the Gyeonggi-do region.

The beginnings of a policy that seeks to “change consumption and behavior” more directly in terms of ecological sustainability can be found in the Korean Green Party’s policy commitment. In the Korean National Assembly election of April 2020, the Green Party pledged to increase social awareness of the necessity to minimize meat consumption and the need to prepare a system for doing so. While, as of yet, no specific policy proposal has been presented, the “vegetarian option” can be guaranteed through “fruit or vegetable vouchers” that are paid to reduce unsustainable meat consumption. In addition, in the case of granting “holidays” rather than subsidies for goods, the Green Party proposed a system similar to “ecological leave” [39]. For example, during the summer heatwave and winter cold, two weeks of paid leave are given. Further, a policy proposal that grants one year of sabbatical after working five years with employment insurance has been proposed.

Such policies enact more direct change on consumption and behavior patterns, thus satisfying the Security Difference Principle, Rights-not-Charity Principle, and Ecological Constraint Principle in that

they enable the most vulnerable in society to participate in sustainable consumption. In the case of expanding “vacation”, such a policy can have a positive effect in terms of the Dignified Work Principle, encouraging activities that could not otherwise be performed due to time constraints.

This discussion demonstrates the ways in which Shift Vouchers can contribute to a more resource-light economy and have positive ecological effects [8,39]. However, even if the purpose is justified, Shift Vouchers fail to satisfy the Paternalism Test Principle because within this system, incentives are given for specific actions and value judgments are included.

#### 5.2.4. Quasi-Currency Vouchers

Quasi-Currency Vouchers aim to distribute common-pool resources. In this system, a new currency (voucher) is issued for the purpose of restricting/regulating the use of scarce goods. The reason for using such vouchers instead of cash is to achieve more effective “distribution of resource use”. A typical example of a Quasi-Currency Voucher is the “carbon dividend”, a system that sets an upper limit on carbon use and distributes allowances. Quasi-Currency Vouchers pay out the resource tax and resource dividend model in the form of vouchers (with limited usage or limited exchangeability for other currencies) rather than cash [39]. This is consistent with the idea of basic income as a social dividend for the commons, excluding payment methods.

Dividends for common resources currently being discussed in Korea are primarily divided into “land dividends” and “carbon dividends”, which are natural commons, and “citizen dividends” and “data dividends”, which are artificial share dividends. These categories were presented as part of a general election pledge by the Basic Income Party in Korea in 2020. Specifically, basic incomes of 600,000 won per month have been suggested to be paid to all citizens through “citizen dividend”, “land dividend”, and “carbon dividend”. Additionally, “democratic dividend” and “data dividend” have also been suggested. Sources of these benefits include citizen tax, land ownership tax, carbon tax, nuclear power risk tax, democracy fund, and data economy fund, and the level of benefits is composed of the sum of dividends to the commons.

In the case of “land dividend”, the suggested policy idea was that a land ownership tax of 1.5% is levied on all private sector land assets. In the case of the “carbon dividend”, financial resources have been raised through the establishment of a carbon tax and taxation of nuclear power risk. The “data dividend” forms a “big data sharing fund” by charging 1% to the total market capitalization of all stock-listed companies every year based on their shared interest in big data. The “democratic dividend” is a plan that provides the public with a tax credit for political funds of up to 100,000 won, which was previously given only to people with a certain income or higher [67].

Unfortunately, there is no discussion of the “new currency” of common dividends within the Korean Basic Income Party. Therefore, it is not known whether the party’s main task can be fully realized through the proposal regarding the optimistic ecological effects of basic income, as post-growthists argue. The main tasks for the Basic Income Party are to respond to the intensification of the climate crisis, lay the foundation for participatory democracy, and address intensifying inequality centered on wage labor and social issues following the reorganization of the industrial structure, now coming to center on big data. Regarding the provision of financial resources, specific proposals were made for each area; however, a concrete conception of a “cash-based basic income” composed of the sum of dividends has not been achieved. The Korean Basic Income Party’s common dividend proposal meets the requirements of the Security Difference Principle, Rights-not-Charity Principle, and Dignified Work Principle.

Moreover, data dividend is a new, noteworthy social dividend plan, wherein data commons are discovered and linked with dividends. The most important challenge in platform capitalism is that, as various activities that have not been commercialized are subsumed through the platform and under the platform capital, its whole existence becomes the source of profit accordingly. Therefore, data have come to be seen as “social labor”, and common ownership can be asserted over big data [30]. Data dividends can be said to satisfy the Dignified Work principle to some extent in terms of securing

the rights to resources through data distribution and preventing the exploitation of labor, which is included in platform capital.

Meanwhile, this proposal is neutral with regard to the Ecological Constraint Principle. When the carbon tax and carbon dividend models discussed above are paid in cash, it can contribute to reducing carbon use. However, the mechanism is not clear regarding how contributions are to be made in terms of the distribution of resource use. Thus, the relationship between issuing new currency and common resource distribution will be further studied in considering sustainable consumption. Primarily, this is to clarify whether the purpose of benefit payments is to support the use of specific goods and services or distribute the use of resources. If the aim is the distribution of resource use, the key would be to determine how the benefits are distributed and whether they can be traded. As the current consumption structure claimed by post-growthists is market-oriented, and the current general-purpose money, or cash, is very unevenly distributed today, vouchers could be a useful tool [39].

Therefore, if various dividends of the Korean Basic Income Party are paid to Quasi-Currency Vouchers, it will help to realize environmental justice, prevent overconsumption, and optimize the amount of harmful consumption. In other words, they can be a powerful tool for increasing ecological sustainability. However, payment by voucher rather than cash does not satisfy a certain degree of the Paternalism Test Principle. For example, in the case of a group with high consumption, these payments will place some restrictions for reducing consumption. Nevertheless, this would allow for equality in market freedom (freedom to consume).

#### 5.2.5. Commons-Innovation Vouchers

Commons-Innovation Vouchers also set a demand for certain goods. However, the main goal of their implementation is to create new institutions or commons that provide goods and services to communities and societies. Commons-Innovation Vouchers highlight the formation of new institutions through vouchers (local currency) in a way that Quasi-Currency Vouchers do not.

One representative example of this type of voucher is Korea's "Gyeonggi-do Youth Basic Income", which was implemented in April 2019. "Gyeonggi-do Youth Basic Income" is a system that was inherited from and expanded upon the 2016 Youth Dividends project of Seongnam City. It can be classified as "categorical basic income in the form of vouchers". For revitalizing the social citizenship and local economy of youth, up to 1 million won per year (KRW 250,000 per quarter) is paid in local currency to 24-year-old individuals residing in Gyeonggi-do province.

This form of vouchers has several main characteristics. First, there is an age limit, but if the residency requirement is satisfied, it is paid regardless of income, property, or job. Second, there were approximately 175,000 young adults who reached the age of 24 in 2019, and the required budget is KRW 175.3 billion (USD 147 million). Thus, this policy has the largest known payment size after the Alaska case [68]. Third, with the introduction of youth basic income, a local currency (issuance of complementary currency) was fully implemented. Each city and district issues paper, card, and mobile types of local currency, with uses limited to each city and district. In addition, by limiting vouchers for use in affiliated stores with annual sales of less than 1 billion won, this policy attempted to increase sales of local small businesses. The finances are divided between the city and the wider country of Gyeonggi Province at a ratio of 7:3, respectively. Fourth, this form of vouchers may be difficult to duplicate within the central government's support programs (public assistance, employment support system).

The "Gyeonggi-do Youth Basic Income" is a system that satisfies all of the criteria of the Paternalism Test Principle, Rights-not-Charity Principle, and the Dignified Work Principle. However, as it is challenging to double-supply the benefits of the metropolitan local governments and that of the central government, the exclusion of the poor from these benefits may be a potential problem. Accordingly, it may violate the Security Difference Principle. Further, in the case of the Ecological Constraint Principle, this voucher can be considered neutral because ecological elements do not exist for within its purpose.



The question at the core of the Commons-Innovation Vouchers is whether there any new innovations caused by the local currency method. This is also related to the verification principle of avoiding patriarchy, as supporting the emergence of community-environmental innovation can ultimately lead to the reinforcement of the Voice and collective action of community members. Furthermore, it can contribute to economic and political democracy within the community [39]. In the case of the local currency of the “Gyeonggi-do Youth Basic Income”, rigorous evaluation is difficult as the system is still in its early stages of implementation. However, there is significant evidence indicating positive results. First, in the satisfaction survey on the local currency conducted among its recipients in 2019, more than 80% of respondents answered that they are using local currency conveniently, and expressed overall satisfaction with the purpose of the local currency. Additionally, they indicated that their interest in revitalizing the local economy and fostering local communities had increased upon receiving local currency. Second, most local currencies in Gyeonggi-do take the form of electronic money (debit cards) and are generally evaluated as equivalent to cash payments. This policy is receiving a positive evaluation, as locals claim that payment through local currency rather than cash has nurtured a virtuous, cyclical structure within the welfare state and local economy [69].

As of August 2020, the local currency of Gyeonggi Province was 15,846 billion won (94.1%), and the amount used was 1361.6 billion won (85.6%) [70]. Gyeonggi-do’s local currency was used to pay not only the “Gyeonggi-do youth basic income” but also the Emergency basic income, which was implemented as a countermeasure against COVID-19 in April 2020. In this context, it is notable that local currency is issued for two main purposes: one is as local currency to conduct policy purposes, and the other is for general issuance to general citizens. In the case of general issuance, there is a discount of up to 6% and an income deduction of 30%, which can improve the real income of consumers. The expected effect of local currency on the local economy and welfare is linked to the characteristics of Gyeonggi-do’s local currency. First, the use of local currency is limited to the place of residence and cannot be used in other areas. These characteristics are expected to increase consumption in local communities and alleviate regional economic imbalances. Second, in the case of general issuance, consumers’ real income can be increased through an additional 6% discount and income deduction. Third, as the consumer is limited to SMEs, local SMEs are expected to increase their sales rather than large companies. An analysis of the local economic effect based on the amount of local currency used in 31 cities and counties in Gyeonggi Province indicated the following: As of the end of September 2019, the production inducement effect totaled 490.1 billion won, the value-added inducement effect totaled 204.4 billion won, and the employment inducement effect had impacted 2591 people [69].

Despite these advantages, it seems that the “Gyeonggi-do Youth Basic Income” local currency has not yet fully achieved its task. This is because the long-term indicator of the success or failure of the Commons-Innovation Vouchers lies in whether it enables the formation of new institutions, including profit and non-profit oriented actors. This, in turn, is because, to secure sustainability as a complementary currency within Gyeonggi Province’s current top-down, government-led system, the currency must establish a strong cooperative relationship with actors such as companies and cooperatives [39]. Therefore, the formation of a democratic decision-making structure involving both public and private sectors will be a major task in the issuance and operation of future local currencies [69].

#### 5.2.6. Needs Vouchers

Needs Vouchers are issued to meet the needs of some members or all members of a population with the aim of compensating for various causes of poverty. They mainly cover private goods. In this context, the central government of Korea is currently issuing a “National Voucher Integrated Card”, which mainly issues goods and services to vulnerable groups or groups in need. Among these vouchers is an “energy voucher” in the form of support for the elderly, infants, disabled people, pregnant women, people with severe/rare/incurable diseases, single-parent families, and boys and girls. This voucher supplies a differential amount to each household. In addition, the “diaper and prepared milk support”

project is provided to low-income parents with infants (0 to 24 months); to be eligible, parents must have a median income of 40% or less for up to 24 months. Additionally, these vouchers include a project to provide “sanitary pads” to female adolescents who are recipients of public assistance, members of the second-class, or children from single-parent families [71].

However, voucher-type private property support aimed to help the poor has the following limitations in terms of social justice. First, even though it is paid in the form of Rights-not-Charity, it is patriarchal. Needs Vouchers support only certain items that are permitted to the poor and presupposes that the authorities know the needs of the poor better than the individuals themselves. Moreover, payment with vouchers rather than cash presupposes that recipients will waste benefits if they are provided otherwise. Second, it violates the Security Difference Principle because it mainly involves an asset investigation. Selecting and paying directly to the most vulnerable class seems to satisfy their needs most effectively, but it inevitably creates a blind spot. In addition, vouchers are less valuable to the recipient than their equivalent in cash, and the means-testing used in this process can cause the recipient to experience stigma and a sense of contempt [40]. Finally, this type of voucher gives no consideration to the Ecological Constraints and Dignified Work Principles.

Notably, however, there are cases where vouchers have been issued to satisfy the needs “for everyone”. In these cases, the issuance of Needs Vouchers does not violate the Paternalism Test Principle because it can serve as an indicator for the principles of Rights-not-Charity and Security Difference.

#### 5.2.7. State Services

In general, increasing access to social services, employment, and education, social housing, and healthcare strengthens the capacity and control of those who are socially disadvantaged. In this respect, UBI and UBS share commonalities. In addition, UBS advocates specifically emphasize its ecological benefits.

State Service refers to a policy that allows individuals or society to use services universally. It enables free access to club goods such as education, health, care, and public transportation when it is needed. State Service can meet expensive and hidden needs well, and its advantages include its equality and lack of stigma.

In the case of Korea, public service systems are generally well-established in the fields of education and health, whereas in the field of care, such state services are relatively inferior. The recent Korean Basic Income Party pledge includes not only UBI but also UBS. Its main contents are free public transportation, free childcare and care services, free education, and free medical care. First, the party proposed policies to make buses and subways across the country completely free while optimizing public transport systems by utilizing public data. Second, free childcare and caring service systems have been established entirely. This guarantees universal access to such services without paying for existing service users and simultaneously includes reinforcing publicity and improving the working conditions for service workers. Third, they pledged the establishment of a comprehensive free education system. This is in response to a national situation, wherein the proportion of private education is increasing asymmetrically as students move toward higher education. Thus, the Basic Income Party aims to provide free education up to the university level while increasing the number of national and public universities. Fourth, it is entirely free of charge [67].

These policies satisfy the criteria of the Security Difference Principle, the Paternalism Test Principle, and the Rights-not-Charity Principle. Further, the ecological effect can be higher for services than for cash benefits in that services enable collective consumption when needs arise rather than catering to individual consumers. However, if abuse of services leads to the excessive consumption of resources and energy, ecological problems will arise [39,72].

Finally, regarding the Dignified Work Principle, whether a policy meets this principle’s criteria depends upon the services’ system design, which must seek to improve the working conditions and treatment of service workers. In general, the establishment of service systems such as free medical care, child care and elderly care, education, and transportation is linked to job creation in various

public service areas. The improvement of working conditions and the treatment of service workers should be dealt with separately. In addition, as the quality of service may, in part, vary depending on the competence of public service workers, establishing high-quality working requirements should be a core task. Thus, whether a policy meets the Dignified Work Principle will depend on the scheme design. Finally, government-led public services can be positive in that they can alleviate inequality in each sector. However, provisioning can become excessive due to excessive abuse of power, which can lead to high social costs [39].

#### 5.2.8. Free Consumption Goods

Free Consumption Goods are goods that people can receive for free. They include certain “private goods” such as free school meals, free internet, and free drinking water. Free Consumption Goods have the advantage of being able to equalize consumption patterns and limit the number of areas where income inequality is a problem [39].

Recently, Gyeonggi-do has begun to promote a “basic housing policy plan” that considers housing as a Free Consumption Good. It is an innovative plan that promotes housing stability by providing houses as public services such as tap water. Housing is currently supervised by the state but has always been considered private property. Gyeonggi-do’s basic housing proposes a long-term public service that would prevent homelessness, allowing anyone to live in a well-located house for more than 30 years with an appropriate rent, avoiding the problems of the existing rental housing supply method (e.g., income/asset/age limit/high rent). Although a small amount of rent must be paid, the basic housing policy plan is advanced in that it strengthens the peoples’ right to housing and allows homeless people to apply unconditionally and universally.

Free Consumption Goods satisfy the Security Difference Principle, the Paternalism Test Principle, and the Rights-not-Charity Principle. The possible danger of such a policy is that the goods may not match the needs of the recipient and could be overconsumed. Nevertheless, they can be more cost-effective than individual purchases due to their reduced production costs. In terms of the ecological aspect, it would be useful to establish environmentally friendly provisions (e.g., directing low energy use). In addition, institutions should be designed to reduce the beneficiary’s market dependence and increase sustainable well-being. This includes consideration of long-term financing and operating costs [39]. However, Free Consumption Goods are not directly related to the Dignified Work Principle and thus, cannot be evaluated accordingly.

#### 5.2.9. Public Infrastructure

The last form of policy to be discussed is the construction of public infrastructure for public goods. This includes green infrastructure, transportation, and housing. As a policy pledge in the 2020 general election, the Korean Green Party proposed the establishment of a circular economy platform at the national and regional levels to build infrastructure aimed at facilitating the reuse of resources [73].

The construction of public infrastructure has many positives when evaluated in terms of the Security Difference Principle, Paternalism Test Principle, Rights-not-Charity Principle, and the Ecological Constraint Principle. Specifically, when public infrastructure is accessible to all people regardless of commercial interests, this contributes to social integration without facilitating discrimination against specific classes. Ecologically, public infrastructure can help in forming sustainable lifestyles, in the development of low-carbon strategies, and in building non-commercial spaces. Furthermore, once a form of public infrastructure has been constructed, its low operating costs are another ecological benefit [39]. Additionally, the building of public infrastructure is positively evaluated in accordance with the Dignified Work Principle, as it can be linked with “creating socially sustainable jobs”, as infrastructure expansion, like the expansion of state services, can create public jobs. However, if the working conditions and employment policies for public jobs are discriminatory, this can result in violations of the principle of Dignified Work. Table 2 below presents the result of the our analysis.

**Table 2.** Comparing Alternative Universal Basic Income (UBI), Universal Basic Service (UBS), and Universal Basic Voucher (UBV) Policies with Policy Evaluation Principles.

Types	Example	Security Difference Principle	Paternalism Test Principle	Rights-Not-Charity Principle	Ecological Constraint Principle	Dignified Work Principle
UBI	Ideal type (the Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend)	○	○	○	△	○
Transitional Basic Income	Categorical Basic Income and Participation Basic Income, (Seoul Youth Allowance)	○	X	○	△	○
Shift Vouchers	Participation Income in the form of vouchers, (Basic income for farmers and election promises of the Korean Green Party)	○	X	○	△	○
Quasi-Currency Vouchers	Vouchers to organize usage of a scarce good (Gyeonggi province's plan to be implemented)	○	△	○	△	○
Commons-Innovation Vouchers	Local Currency, Basic Income for (Youth in Gyeonggi province)	○	○	○	△	○
Needs Vouchers	Voucher to meet the needs of the poor members or all members of a population (National Voucher Integrated Card)	△	△	△	-	-
State Services	Education, Health Care, Care Services (Election promises of the Korean Basic Income Party)	○	○	○	△	△
Free Consumption Goods	Free Internet, Free tap water, Free school meals (Gyeonggi province's plan to be implemented)	○	○	○	△	-
Public Infrastructure	Parks, Bike lanes, Community Centers (Election promises of the Korean Green Party)	○	○	○	○	△

○: Satisfied, △: Satisfied or not satisfied depending on the policy design, -: Not relevant.

## 6. Discussion and Conclusions

This study classified Korean cases according to the types of UBI, UBV, and UBS benefits discussed as alternative social policies and evaluated these policies in terms of ecological/social sustainability. In the case of Korea, discussions on these policies have been actively conducted over the past five years, and the policies analyzed in this study consider the latest policy discussions. Although specific

empirical data are insufficient, a comprehensive view of these payrolls in terms of future SET pursuits is expected to present an implication for future discussion and analysis.

This study aimed to review each type of benefits against these five principles to help future researchers and policymakers in the construction of basic income, basic voucher, and basic service policies. To this end, an analysis of newly introduced or actively discussed Korean policy proposals was undertaken. Let us summarize the analysis results. First, the Security Difference Principle is related to universality, and most policies satisfied its criteria except for the Needs Voucher. Second, the Paternalism Test Principle is largely concerned with individual autonomy and control. This principle is not satisfied when “conditionality is imposed”, even if the conditionality is tolerant, such as when incentives or regulatory mechanisms for action are reflected in policymaking, as is the case within Transitional Basic Income, Shift Vouchers, and Needs Vouchers. Third, the principle of Rights-not-Charity was generally satisfied by all types of benefit payments when the principle of Security Difference was realized. In other words, it was generally satisfied in all benefits except for the Needs Vouchers for the poor. Fourth, in the case of the Ecological Constraint Principle, it is difficult to expect any policy to have a positive ecological effect unless the purpose of improving ecological sustainability is incorporated in the policy’s institutional design. Benefits in the form of vouchers have many positives in relation to the Ecological principles, as they effect changes in consumption patterns and the structure of resource distribution. Fifth, the Dignified Work Principle can be satisfied when efforts to expand from labor to work and promote autonomous areas of activity are included in policymaking. In general, if the Rights-not-Charity Principle is satisfied, the Dignified Work Principle tends to be satisfied as well. In the case of basic services, which are generally related to the creation of public jobs, these principles are of utmost importance as developments will be linked to improving working conditions in the service sector and creating sustainable jobs. Recalling the historical experience that job creation through the expansion of public services has become an instrument of economic growth, the simultaneous introduction of basic income and basic services can double ecological/social sustainability in the context of supporting the creation of a steady-state economy.

Moreover, UBV can be viewed as an intermediate step between UBS and UBI and has an advantage in terms of sustainability. First, voucher payments in the form of a complementary currency (local currency) can contribute to the formation of new commons and institutions. This aspect has been frequently overlooked in previous discussions. In addition, while limiting the usage of such vouchers can reduce individual freedom, such measures should be thoroughly reviewed because of their ability to drive changes toward a more sustainable and ecological life (consumption). In conclusion, vouchers have many positives in terms of social/ecological sustainability.

In Korea, discussions on UBI, UBV, and UBS have been active in recent years, and increased interest in alternative distribution policies has been observed. Additionally, the COVID-19 pandemic revealed the limitation of the existing social insurance system. As precarious work such as nonstandard work and platform workers spreads, the problem of mismatch in the traditional social security system has emerged. With the political success of Provincial Governor Lee Jae-Myeong and Gyeonggi-do Youth Basic Income, the interest and feasibility of a new guarantee system for ordinary citizens is also increasing. At the center of these basic income debates are the systems that are currently referred to as basic income in Korea—the Youth Basic Income, Emergency Basic Income, and Farmers Basic Income. These systems are partially implemented as vouchers in the form of local currency. In other words, many of the policies that are called basic income in Korea actually take the form of vouchers and should be categorized as UBV rather than UBI. As the monetary systems of these local currencies develop, the boundaries between real cash and vouchers may be blurred, and a more detailed evaluation of the prospects and the practical applicability of vouchers may be necessary.

The benefits classification system used in this study was useful as it provided a framework whereby benefits payment methods (cash, vouchers, and services) could be examined according to the characteristics of the goods and services they provide (private goods, free goods, common-pool resources, public goods). This can be seen in the case of “housing”, where it is possible to pay in the

form of a housing voucher or universal housing service. The advantages and disadvantages of these housing benefits can be determined in detail by the characteristics of the goods and services.

In an era where the concepts of labor, work, production, and distribution have changed in general, the concept of fair distribution must shift from distribution by a direct exchange relationship between labor and the capital in the market to distribution as an allocation of the commonwealth. To this end, three policy ideas—UBI, UBS, UBV—have been discussed as alternatives to realize the allocation of the socially produced commonwealth to all citizens. Thus, how to restructure the welfare state with a policy package around UBI, UBS, and UBV to accomplish the sustainability of the welfare state in the digital economy should be studied further. The welfare state based on traditional social insurance is not only threatened in terms of sustainability but also not sufficient to improve workers' living conditions. Therefore, a paradigm shift in the traditional welfare state may be inevitable.

Additionally, the reconstruction of the welfare state should, as emphasized in this paper, consider ecological sustainability. This paper contributes to the existing welfare state discussion on how UBV can be an effective tool to realize ecological sustainability. This aspect has been frequently overlooked in previous discussions, while our study suggested that vouchers can have many positive effects in terms of ecological sustainability. That is, vouchers enable the construction of a new distribution system for the resources of the commons while nudging people toward more ecological behavior. Future researchers might consider better facilitating the discussion on alternative social policies by analyzing payment methods according to the specific characteristics of the goods/services they can be exchanged for in practical terms. Further, contextualizing each policy according to the region, history, and social background they have arisen from may be the next necessary step.

In conclusion, there are important implications of this study. First, separating the discussion of social and ecological transformation hinders the two organic solutions. In other words, it is necessary to recognize that the problem-consciousness that social and ecological problems are closely connected and that all ecological problems are derived from historical capitalism [5]. Second, although basic income alone cannot achieve ecological transformation, it is a prerequisite for promoting ecological transformation. Basic vouchers and basic services can be considered as social policies to supplement this. In the case of basic vouchers that issue basic income as vouchers, there are three positive contributions. First, it is possible to revitalize the local economy through issuance of complementary currencies commonly used in the region, and thereby achieve a function of controlling global capital (commons-innovation vouchers). This can be used as a way to restore the economy/society/ecology of the local community in response to the encroachment of capital without geographic boundaries. Next, the basic voucher can function as a means of promoting "sustainable consumption" (shift voucher), which is an important requirement in the economies of socio-ecological transformation. Furthermore, basic vouchers can function as a means of acquiring rights to human life/labor and natural resources that capital is exploiting without payment (Quasi-Currency Vouchers). This method of paying basic income as a voucher can increase the advantage in terms of ecological sustainability.

Recalling that the key to social-ecological transformation is the "guarantees of everyone's basic goods" in the long run, basic income and basic services must be designed together. Basic income reduces economic/social inequality in a degrowth society and guarantees everyone's access to basic goods through "collaborative consumption" (defined as "non-ownership models of utilizing goods and services") for basic services. Thus, it makes everyone's lives stable [46]. Therefore, a new social policy in the post-COVID era will require simultaneous planning of basic income (basic voucher) and basic services. UBI, UBV, and UBS can ultimately be the three policy combinations necessary for a social and ecological transformation.

This paper offers a necessary move toward specific policy analysis that is required to advance our understanding of the link between UBI and environmental and social sustainability. Based on the analysis, it is clear that social and ecological sustainability should be classified and treated in a more integrated manner rather than in parallel. Accordingly, a combination of basic income, basic vouchers, and basic services was proposed. In addition, there are relatively few discussions about

basic income in terms of ecological transformation, and effective data have not been generated. Thus, this paper emphasizes that these contents must be dealt with in the discussion of alternative social policies to pursue SET in the future. Further, in the area of social policy, not only social sustainability but also ecological sustainability was considered. The advantage of this perspective is that social policy suggests a radical change in the approach to solving various social problems that arise “without fundamentally transforming the capitalist system”. Moreover, through this study, we take a preemptive approach to the ecological crisis, and this drive of ecological transformation is impossible without a social transformation.

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualization S.S.-Y.L., J.-e.L. and K.-s.K.; methodology, S.S.-Y.L. and J.-e.L.; formal analysis, S.S.-Y.L. and J.-e.L.; data curation, J.-e.L.; writing—original draft preparation, S.S.-Y.L. and J.-e.L.; writing—review and editing, S.S.-Y.L. and J.-e.L.; project administration, K.-s.K.; funding acquisition, K.-s.K. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** This work was supported by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF-2017S1A6A3A01078538).

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

- Birnbaum, S.; Alfredsson, E.; Malmaeus, M. Basic income and social sustainability in post-growth economies. *Basic Income Stud.* **2020**, *15*, 1–27. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Mulvale, J.P. Social-ecological transformation and the necessity of universal basic income. *Soc. Altern.* **2019**, *38*, 39–46.
- MacNeill, T.; Vibert, A. Universal basic income and the natural environment: Theory and policy. *Basic Income Stud.* **2019**, *14*, 1–15. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Pinto, J. Environmentalism, ecologism, and basic income. *Basic Income Stud.* **2020**, *15*, 1–12. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Moore, J.W. *Capitalism in the Web of Life: Ecology and the Accumulation of Capital*; Verso Books: London, UK, 2015.
- Johnson, W.A. The Guaranteed Income as an Environmental Measure. In *Toward a Steady-State Economy*; Daly, H., Ed.; W.H. Freeman: San Francisco, CA, USA, 1973; pp. 175–189.
- Andersson, J.O. Basic Income from an Ecological Perspective. *Basic Income Stud.* **2010**, *4*, 1–8. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Howard, M.W.; Pinto, J.; Schachtschneider, U. Ecological effects of basic income. In *The Palgrave International Handbook of Basic Income*; Torry, M., Ed.; Palgrave Macmillan: Cham, Switzerland, 2019; pp. 111–132.
- Boulanger, P. Basic income and sustainable consumption strategies. *Basic Income Stud.* **2010**, *4*, 1–11. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Schachtschneider, U. Ecological Basic Income: An Entry is Possible. In Proceedings of the BIEN Congress, Munich, Germany, 14–16 September 2012.
- Goodin, R.E. Work and welfare: Towards a post-productivist welfare regime. *Br. J. Political Sci.* **2001**, 13–39. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Arnsperger, C.; Johnson, W.A. The guaranteed income as an equal-opportunity tool in the transition toward sustainability. In *Arguing About Justice*; Vanderborght, A.G.Y., Ed.; Presses Universitaires de Louvain: Louvain, Belgium, 2011; pp. 61–70.
- Fitzpatrick, T. Basic income, post-productivism and liberalism. *Basic Income Stud.* **2010**, *4*, 1–11. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Wilkinson, R.G.; Pickett, K. *The Spirit Level: Why More Equal Societies Almost Always Do Better*; Allen Lane: London, UK, 2009.
- Sager, L. Income inequality and carbon consumption: Evidence from environmental engel curves. *Energy Econ.* **2019**, *84*. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Bergmann, B.R. A Swedish-style welfare state or basic income: Which should have priority? *Political Soc.* **2004**, *32*, 107–118. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Gough, I. *Heat, Greed and Human Need: Climate Change, Capitalism and Sustainable Wellbeing*; Edward Elgar: Northampton, MA, USA, 2017; ISBN 978-1-78536-510-2.
- Heath, J.; Panitch, V. Why cash violates neutrality. *Basic Income Stud.* **2010**, *5*, 1–26. [[CrossRef](#)]

19. Portes, J.; Reed, H.; Percy, A. *Social Prosperity for the Future: A Proposal for Universal Basic Services*; UCL's Institute for Global Prosperity: London, UK, 2017.
20. Hornborg, A. How to turn an ocean liner: A proposal for voluntary degrowth by redesigning money for sustainability, justice, and resilience. *J. Political Ecol.* **2017**, *24*, 623–632. [[CrossRef](#)]
21. Srnicek, N. *Platform Capitalism*; Polity: Cambridge, UK, 2017.
22. Hwang, D.S.; Park, C.N.; Park, J.S.; Howcroft, D.; Bergvall-Kåreborn, B.; Berg, J.; Huws, U.; Spencer, N.H.; Joyce, S.; Mandle, I.; et al. *A Study on Changes in Employment Relationship and the Paradigm of Social Welfare*; Korea Labor Institute: Sejong, Korea, 2016.
23. Seo, J.H.; Baek, S.H. Reform in the age of the fourth industrial revolution: Reconstruction of employment status framework in platform labor and basic income. *Korean J. Law Soc.* **2017**, *56*, 113–152. [[CrossRef](#)]
24. Park, C.N.; Hwang, D.S.; Kim, K.S. *Trends of Verification in the Working and Industrial Insurance*; Korea Labor Institute: Sejong, Korea, 2016.
25. LEE, S.G. Digitalization in work and changing of workers' status. *J. Bus. Adm. Law* **2018**, *28*, 181–215.
26. Basic Income Earth Network. Available online: <https://basicincome.org/about-basic-income/> (accessed on 12 July 2020).
27. Yamamori, T. South Korea: Seongnam City Announced to Implement 'Youth Dividend'. Available online: <https://basicincome.org/news/2015/10/seongnam-city-implements-youth-dividend/> (accessed on 5 August 2020).
28. Ahn, H. Korea to Launch Provincial 'Youth Basic Income' Program. Available online: <https://basicincome.org/news/2019/04/korea-to-launch-provincial-youth-basic-income-program/> (accessed on 3 August 2020).
29. Yong-Ryeol, K.; Seong-Hwan, S.; Chang-Ho, K.; Sung-Hwi, W.; Chung-eun, L. *Basic Income System Discussion Trend and Implications for Agricultural Sector*; Korea Rural Economic Institute: Naju, Korea, 2018.
30. Geum, M. *Distributing to All What Is Common*; East Asia: Seoul, Korea, 2020.
31. Ostrom, E.; Hess, C.; Press, M.I.T. *Understanding Knowledge as a Commons: From Theory to Practice*; The MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, USA; London, UK, 2011.
32. Parijs, P.V. *Basic Income: A Radical Proposal for a Free Society and a Sane Economy*; Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2017.
33. Atkinson, A.B. The case for a participation income. *Political Q.* **1996**, *67*. [[CrossRef](#)]
34. Atkinson, A.B. *Inequality: What Can Be Done*; Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2015.
35. Leff, B.; Percy, A.; Story, M.; Szlinder, M. Alternatives to Basic Income. In *The Palgrave International Handbook of Basic Income*; Palgrave Macmillan: Cham, Switzerland, 2019; pp. 213–231.
36. Coote, A. *Building a New Social Commons*; The New Economics Foundation: London, UK, 2017; pp. 1–24.
37. Gough, I. Universal basic services: A theoretical and moral framework. *Political Q.* **2019**, *90*, 534–542. [[CrossRef](#)]
38. Coote, A.; Kasliwal, P.; Percy, A. *Universal Basic Services: Theory and Practice—A Literature Review*; UCL Institute for Global Prosperity: London, UK, 2019.
39. Bohnenberger, K. Money, Vouchers, Public Infrastructures? A Framework for Sustainable Welfare Benefits. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 596. [[CrossRef](#)]
40. Standing, G. *Basic Income: And How We Can Make It Happen*; Penguin: London, UK, 2017.
41. Torry, M. The UK Considers Universal Vouchers. Available online: <https://basicincome.org/news/2020/07/the-uk-considers-universal-vouchers/> (accessed on 30 July 2020).
42. Jun, J.H. South Korea Begins Offering Coronavirus Relief Funds. Available online: [https://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/nation/2020/05/119\\_288952.html](https://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/nation/2020/05/119_288952.html) (accessed on 24 June 2020).
43. Thomas, K.R.; Strauser, D.R. Rehabilitating the rehabilitation delivery system: A commentary on the voucher system. *J. Rehabil.* **1995**, *61*, 18–22.
44. Valkama, P.; Bailey, S.J. Vouchers as an alternative public sector funding system. *Public Policy Adm.* **2001**, *16*, 32–58. [[CrossRef](#)]
45. Di Giulio, A.; Fuchs, D. Sustainable consumption corridors: Concept, objections, and responses. *GAIA Ecol. Perspect. Sci. Soc.* **2014**, *23*, 184–192. [[CrossRef](#)]
46. Heikkinen, T. An equilibrium framework for the analysis of a degrowth society with asymmetric agents, sharing and basic income. *Ecol. Econ.* **2018**, *148*, 43–53. [[CrossRef](#)]
47. Standing, G. *Work after Globalisation: Building Occupational Citizenship*; Edward Elger: Cheltenham, UK, 2009.
48. Standing, G. *How Cash Transfers Boost Work and Economic Security*; Department of Economics and Social Affairs: New York, NY, USA, 2007.
49. Rawls, J. *A Theory of Justice*; Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2009.



50. Haidt, J. *The Happiness Hypothesis: Finding Modern Truth in Ancient Wisdom*; Basic Books: New York, NY, USA, 2006.
51. Parijs, P.V. *Real Freedom for All: What (If Anything) Can Justify Capitalism*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 1997.
52. Wright, E.O. Two redistributive proposals—universal basic income and stakeholder grants. *Focus* **2006**, *24*, 5–7.
53. Wright, E.O. Basic income as a socialist project. *Basic Income Stud.* **2006**, *1*, 1–11. [[CrossRef](#)]
54. Birnbaum, S. *Basic Income Reconsidered: Social Justice, Liberalism, and the Demands of Equality*; Palgrave Macmillan: New York, NY, USA, 2012. [[CrossRef](#)]
55. Torry, M. *The Feasibility of Citizen's Income*; Palgrave Macmillan: New York, NY, USA, 2016. [[CrossRef](#)]
56. Standing, G. *A Precariat Charter: From Denizens to Citizens*; A&C Black: London, UK, 2014.
57. Standing, G. *Beyond the New Paternalism: Basic Security as Equality*; Verso: London, UK, 2002.
58. Parijs, P.V. Basic Income: A Simple and Powerful Idea for the 21st Century. In *Redesigning Distribution: Basic Income and Stakeholder Grants as Alternative Cornerstones for a More Egalitarian Capitalism*; Ackerman, B., Alstott, A., van Parijs, P., Eds.; Verso: London, UK, 2005; pp. 7–38.
59. Jones, D.; Marinescu, I. *The Labor Market Impacts of Universal and Permanent Cash Transfers: Evidence from the Alaska Permanent Fund*; National Bureau of Economic Research: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2018; pp. 1–73.
60. Graeber, D. *Bullshit Jobs*; Simon & Schuster: New York, NY, USA, 2018.
61. Mays, J. Social Effects of Basic Income. In *The Palgrave International Handbook of Basic Income*; Torry, M., Ed.; Palgrave Macmillan: Cham, Switzerland, 2019; pp. 73–90.
62. Seoul Provides “Youth Allowance” for 100,000 Young People for the Next Three Years at Least Once in a Lifetime. Available online: <http://english.seoul.go.kr/seoul-provides-youth-allowance-for-100000-young-people/#none> (accessed on 21 July 2020).
63. Seoul Metropolitan Government Framework Ordinance on Youths. Available online: <https://legal.seoul.go.kr/legal/english/front/page/law.html?pAct=lawComparison&pPromNo=4180> (accessed on 10 October 2020).
64. Lee, H.W.; Lee, J.H.; Seo, B.K. *2019 Seoul Youth Activity Support Project Participants Analysis Study and 2018 Participants Follow-Up Survey*; Seoul Youth Guarantee Center: Seoul, Korea, 2020.
65. Swaton, S. For an Ecological Transition Income. Available online: <https://www.greeneuropeanjournal.eu/for-an-ecological-transition-income/> (accessed on 14 July 2020).
66. Hong, Y.D.; Ahn, K.O.; Park, I.K.; Song, I.G.; Kim, I.W.; Local, S. Korean Governments to Undertake Various Basic Income Experiments in 2020. Available online: [http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english\\_edition/e\\_national/923113.html](http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_national/923113.html) (accessed on 24 June 2020).
67. Basic Income Party's Core Policy Pledges for the 2020 General Election. Available online: <https://www.basicincomeparty.kr/policy/> (accessed on 23 July 2020).
68. Bollain, J.; Groot, L.; Miller, A.; Schmidt, E.; Tahiraj, E.; Verlaet, T.; Yi, G. A variety of experiments. In *The Palgrave International Handbook of Basic Income*; Torry, M., Ed.; Palgrave Macmillan: Cham, Switzerland, 2019; pp. 407–435.
69. Lee, S.H.; Yoo, Y.S.; Kang, N.H. *Performance Analysis and Promotion Strategy for the Local Currency in Gyeonggi-Do*; Gyeonggi Research Institute: Suwon, Korea, 2019; pp. 1–89.
70. The Local Currency in Gyeonggi Province. Available online: <http://www.gmoney.or.kr/main/cop/bbs/selectBoardArticle.do> (accessed on 22 September 2020).
71. 2018 Welfare Services Guidelines. Available online: [http://www.mohw.go.kr/eng/nw/nw0103.jsp?PAR\\_MENU\\_ID=1007&MENU\\_ID=100704](http://www.mohw.go.kr/eng/nw/nw0103.jsp?PAR_MENU_ID=1007&MENU_ID=100704) (accessed on 1 July 2020).
72. Parrique, T.; Barth, J.; Briens, F.; Kuokkanen, A.; Spangenberg, J. *Decoupling Debunked: Evidence and Arguments against Green Growth as a Sole Strategy for Sustainability*; European Environmental Bureau: Brussels, Belgium, 2019.
73. 2020 Green Party Policy Pledges. Available online: <https://www.notion.so/39f9dcd5e0d34f37893ae51ba5780764> (accessed on 8 July 2020).

