

The background of the entire page is a photograph of several stacks of Indian coins. The coins are in various denominations, including 100, 200, and 500 rupee notes, and are arranged in a way that creates a sense of depth and perspective. The lighting is dramatic, with strong highlights and deep shadows, giving the scene a professional and serious feel.

**SALE, RGNUL**

**Working Paper Series - III**

**Universal Basic Income in India**

**An initiative of  
School of Agriculture Law and  
Economics (SALE),  
Rajiv Gandhi National University  
of Law, Punjab**

## **About SALE**

The School of Agriculture Law and Economics (SALE), a center of excellence at RGNUL, has been established with an objective of providing a platform for multidimensional analysis pertaining to research on economics and law, with special emphasis on legal, social, political and cultural paradigms. It is a specialized center for analyzing and shaping policy making in the fields of agriculture and economic laws. It aims to study the delicate relationship between economics and law for prudent economic policies and to equip its followers with thorough knowledge of the same.

### **Eligibility and Guidelines**

Contributions are invited from Students, Scholars, or Academicians pursuing any degree or course from any recognized University. (Co-authorship is permitted up to 2 authors).

Original contributions from students, scholars, academicians and practitioners are expected and the aim of the Working Paper Series is to provide an analytical perspective on the working and feasibility of the concept of UBI in India.

The sub-themes may include but are not limited to the following facets:

1. Fiscal costs
2. Population coverage
3. Resources for financing
4. UBI as a means of Social Security
5. Legal challenges

The working papers containing the workability of UBI and/or suggestive alternatives to UBI shall be preferred.

The Concept Note attached herewith is meant for facilitation of a better understanding of the concept of UBI.

The contributions received shall be selected/shortlisted on the basis of analytical content, originality and contribution to the existing body of literature available. The compilation of the selected contributions shall later culminate into a book published with an ISBN number.

## **Submission Guidelines**

1. The contribution may expand up to 5000-8000 words (including footnotes).
2. Research methodology shall be in conformation with Harvard Bluebook, 20th Ed.
3. Contribution may include graphs, pictures, tables etc. as deemed appropriate.
4. Plagiarism would be strictly checked and would lead to disqualification of submission.

5. The content should adhere to the following format:

Font: **Times New Roman**

Font size: **12 pt size**

Line spacing: **1.5**

Foot notes: **10 pt size**

6. The papers must reach via e-mail to *sale@rgnul.ac.in* with the subject "SALE Working Paper Series Submission" **on or before 15 September 2019, 11:59 P.M.**

7. The body of the e-mail must specify the name(s) of the author(s) along with the following details:

a. Title of the paper

b. College/Institute/University

c. Programme enrolled and year of study

d. Email address and contact number

8. The paper must be attached in '.doc' or '.docx' and '.pdf' format.

# Registration

There is no separate Registration fee.  
Contributors may send their papers via email  
at [sale@rgnul.ac.in](mailto:sale@rgnul.ac.in). on or before the last date  
of submission.

## Contact Details

*For any more queries, please write to us  
at [sale@rgnul.ac.in](mailto:sale@rgnul.ac.in).*

*Or contact us at:*

**+91-78373-99643**

Ms. Bhawna Gera

**+91-98150-92215**

Mr. Uday Agnihotri

(Student Coordinator)

Concept Note

For Working Paper Series – III on

# Universal Basic Income in India

An initiative by

School of Agriculture Law and Economics (SALE),

RGNUL, Punjab

## **Table of Contents**

1. Introduction .....	3
2. History .....	4
3. Philosophy .....	6
4. Pilot Projects – International .....	8
5. Pilot Projects – India .....	9
6. Conclusion.....	11

## 1. Introduction

“Whether Mahatma Gandhi would have approved the idea of a minimum income to all the citizens of India?” this is the question that the 40-page Chapter IX of the Economic Survey 2016-17<sup>1</sup> aimed to answer. Acknowledging the time of the ‘powerful idea’ of a Universal Basic Income (“UBI”) as ripe for serious discussion, the then Chief Economic Advisor to the Government of India, Sh. Arvind Subramanian, set the debate around UBI into motion. The idea of UBI is simple: an **unconditional, periodic cash payment** that the government makes to **all citizens**, irrespective of social, economic or other considerations. The Basic Income Earth Network (BIEN) defines UBI as “a *periodic cash payment unconditionally delivered to all on an individual basis, without means-test or work requirement*”<sup>2</sup>. Thus, a payment is classified as UBI if it is *periodic* i.e. not as a one-time grant, it is in *cash* and not in kind, it is paid to an *individual* and not to a household as a unit, it is *universal* (i.e. without any means test) and is *unconditional*, i.e. without any requirement of work.

Yet, a number of implementation and ideological challenges make UBI a complex idea, requiring deep study and experimentation before making any final conclusions. It is precisely for this reason that though the idea of a minimum income has been present since the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> Century (which was later adapted in the form of an ‘unconditional basic income’ around the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century), no State has been able to implement UBI as a long-term policy measure. Only pilot projects have been conducted across US, Europe, Asia and Africa to study its efficiency and effectiveness as a welfare measure.

The political class of India, too, has used this UBI debate for their electoral propaganda, as the acting Finance Minister, Sh. Piyush Goyal unveiled the “Pradhan Mantri Kisan Samman Nidhi” scheme (PM-KISAN) providing income to disadvantaged farmers in the interim budget 2019-2020<sup>3</sup> and Sh. Rahul Gandhi, President, Indian National Congress, promising ‘minimum income guarantee’ to the poor. Strictly speaking, these do not fall within the ambit of UBI as not being ‘universal’, but are nonetheless important for the debate around UBI – as ‘partial’ or ‘quasi-UBI’

---

<sup>1</sup> Universal Basic Income: A Conversation With and Within the Mahatma, Chapter IX, Economic Survey of India 2016-17.

<sup>2</sup> About Basic Income, Basic Income Earth Network, <https://basicincome.org/basic-income/>.

<sup>3</sup> Interim Budget 2019-2020, Speech of Piyush Goyal, Minister of Finance, para 25, <https://www.indiabudget.gov.in/ub2019-20/bs/bs.pdf>.

provide scope for slowly increasing the beneficiaries keeping in mind the financial limitations of the Indian Economy.

## 2. History

One of the earliest references to UBI can be seen in Thomas More's *Utopia* published in 1516. In it, the Portuguese traveler Raphael Nonsenso narrates a conversation he had with John Morton, the Archbishop of Canterbury pitching UBI as a solution to petty thievery: "*Instead of inflicting these horrible punishments, it would be much better to provide everyone with some means of livelihood, so that nobody's under the frightful necessity of becoming, first a thief, and then a corpse.*"<sup>4</sup> Thus, suggesting that since a 'thief' has no choice but to steal for his livelihood, it is disproportionate for the State to subject him to the gallows. Rather it is the duty of the State to provide for means of livelihood so that no person has to resort to such means.

Johannes Ludovicus Vives, in a memoir in 1526 titled '*De Subventionem Pauperum*' (On the Assistance to the Poor) insisted that the municipal government be urged by law to secure a subsistence minimum to all its residents, especially the 'deserving' poor (by proving his willingness to work as opposed to the undeserved poor) as morally required charity. Vives, however, imagined such charity as a conditional charity in return for work: "*Whatever the source of poverty, the poor are expected to work. Even to the old and the stupid, it should be possible to give a job they can learn in a few days, such as digging holes, getting water or carrying something on their shoulders. The point of requiring such toil from the beneficiaries of the scheme is in part to make them contribute to the funding of the latter.*"<sup>5</sup> However, he refrained from going as far as suggesting a basic income without any need for it, which is precisely what the 'modern day' notion of UBI is. Nonetheless, his means test idea of basic income influenced the scheme put in place by the Flemish municipality of Ypres, the School of Salamanca of Francisco de Vitoria and Domingo de Soto (from 1536 onwards), England's Poor Laws (from 1576 onwards), et al.

---

<sup>4</sup> Thomas More, *Utopia* (1st Latin edition, Louvain, 1516), English translation by Paul Turner, Harmondsworth: Penguin Classics, 1963, p. 43-44.

<sup>5</sup> Juan Luis Vives, *De Subventionem Pauperum, Sive de humanis necessitatibus*, 1526; English translation of part II only by Alice Tobriner: *On the Assistance to the Poor*. Toronto & London: University of Toronto Press ("Renaissance Society of America Reprints"), 1998, 62p.

Marie Jean Antoine Nicolas de Caritat, Marquis of Condorcet, a French philosopher and mathematician, mentioned the idea of “giving to those children who become old enough to work by themselves and found a new family the advantage of a capital required by the development of their activity.”<sup>6</sup> Two years after his death, Thomas Paine further developed Nicolas de Caritat’s idea and proposed from the ‘ground rent’ a payment “to every person, when arrived at the age of twenty-one years, the sum of fifteen pounds sterling, as a compensation in part, for the loss of his or her natural inheritance, by the introduction of the system of landed property. And also, the sum of ten pounds per annum, during life, to every person now living, of the age of fifty years, and to all others as they shall arrive at that age”<sup>7</sup> Such a payment was to be made to every person, regardless of his economic condition as ‘natural heritage’ belonged to every person as a matter of right over and above any property a person may have created.

What in Paine’s view was an unconditional endowment for all; it was a guaranteed income to thinkers such as William Cobbet and Charles Fourier. Charles Fourier relived the guaranteed income from works-test, but retained the means-test: an unconditional entitlement for the poor only. Joseph Charlier, in 1848, suggested an unconditional quarterly (and later, monthly) payment to every citizen which subsequently he refers to as ‘*dividende teritorial*’<sup>8</sup>. The famous philosopher and political economist, J.S. Mill, in his *Principles of Political Economy* (1848) argued for a certain minimum to be first assigned for the subsistence of every member of the community, whether capable or not of labour, before sharing the remainder proportion of the produce.

Towards the end of World War I, many thinkers gave their versions of UBI to alleviate poverty in a post-war Britain: Bertrand Russell argued for ‘*a certain small income, sufficient for necessities, should be secured to all, whether they work or not*’<sup>9</sup>, Dennis Milner pitched for a ‘*state bonus*’ - an income paid unconditionally on a weekly basis to all citizens, Clifford H Douglas proposed the idea of ‘*social credit*’ by paying all households a monthly ‘*national dividend*’, George D.H. Cole called it ‘social dividend’. This idea of social dividend was

---

<sup>6</sup> Condorcet, *Esquisse d’un tableau historique des progres de l’esprithumain* (1st edition, 1795), Paris: GF-Flammarion, 1988, p. 273-274.

<sup>7</sup> Thomas Paine 1796, p. 611; 612-613.

<sup>8</sup> *La Question socialerésolue, précédée du testament philosophique d’un penseur*, Bruxelles, Weissenbruch, 1894, 252p.

<sup>9</sup> Bertrand Russell, *Roads to Freedom. Socialism, Anarchism and Syndicalism*, London: Unwin Books (1918), pp. 80-81 and 127.

furthered by thinkers like James Meade, Oskar Lange, Abba Lerner etc. During the later stages of Civil Rights Movement in America, various thinkers like Robert Theobald, Milton Friedman (*'negative income tax'*), James Tobin, John Kenneth Galbraith and other economists supported UBI in one form or the other. In Europe too, the debate around UBI rekindled in and after the 1970s in countries like Denmark (*'citizen's wage'*), the Netherlands (*'guaranteed income'*), Germany, France (*'existence income'*) etc. In 1976, Alaska saw the creation of a Permanent Fund providing uniform dividend each year to all residents (after the 1982 revamp) irrespective of any considerations, thus making Alaska the only state with a genuine basic income system.

### **3. Philosophy**

What makes the idea of UBI unique is that it has found resonance in both: conservatives, like Milton Friedman as well as liberals, like Martin Luther King Jr. To the conservatives, UBI would help reducing the costs incurred by the State in providing expensive social security and welfare services like healthcare, education, unemployment allowances etc. as citizens, and not the State, will decide where to spend money on. Per contra, the liberals see UBI as way of reducing income-inequality and redistribution of resources to the marginalized that are currently excluded from the targeted social security measures. In his *Constitution for Liberty* (1960), Friedrich Hayek (proponent of classical liberalism) wrote that the state should provide "*a certain minimum income for everyone ... a sort of floor below which nobody need fall even when he is unable to provide for himself.*"

Ironically, small factions of both the conservatives and liberals denounce the idea of UBI. For the conservatives against UBI, disincentive to work is the biggest threat of UBI, especially the idea that those who work will pay for those who do not. Whereas, liberals against UBI argue that the political class will use UBI as an excuse to stop existing welfare schemes and disband institutions aimed at helping the marginalized. Further, they are apprehensive that the employers will use it as an excuse to cut down wages.

The positive opinion regarding UBI is shared between the Developed, Developing and Underdeveloped Nations, too. The developed economies support this idea due to the increasing concerns of rising income inequalities, stagnant trade flows, slow productivity gains and most importantly, rising unemployment due to automation and technological innovations. Whereas,

widespread corruption, poor allocation, exclusions and leakages, and the failure to tackle poverty and unemployment etc. are good enough reasons for the developing and underdeveloped countries to experiment with UBI. Mr. Abhijit Banerjee, Mr. Paul Niehaus and Ms. Tavneet Suri, in a recent paper, differentiated the impact of UBI from that of the existing cash transfer schemes in at least three ways: the importance of being universal, allocation between the households as well as the duration and longer-term planning.<sup>10</sup>

Further, simply put, the Left of the political spectrum hails UBI for its egalitarianism and the Right for its efficiency. Entrepreneurs like Elon Musk, Mark Zuckerberg and Richard Branson and staunch socialists like Bernie Sanders have supported the idea of UBI.

The reason for such support from thinkers cutting across different philosophies and ideologies has been well explained by Dr. Elise Klein. A lecturer of Development Studies at the University of Melbourne, Dr. Klein, in an essay for the discussion paper on ‘*Universal Basic Income and shorter working week*’ of the Green Institute, highlights three main ideas forming the cornerstone of UBI:

***Freedom:*** UBI is a way to free people from the threat of starvation, undignified labour and excessive state surveillance under conditional social welfare models. UBI is also a way for people to have freedom to live the lives they value and to have the capability to engage fully in their citizenship.

***Justice:*** UBI is an idea to transfer democratic power back to the citizenry, where UBI is paid as a social dividend for their citizenship rather than as welfare. Related to this, UBI is also a way to give negotiating power back to labour—to have the choice not to work in undignified employment. Moreover, UBI can remunerate productive labour which is currently unpaid: for example, care work and household domestic work—a burden mostly held by women.

***Economic transformation:*** UBI is not just about tying people over in times of crises, increased casualization and precariousness. UBI has also been seen as a way to transition into the slow

---

<sup>10</sup>Abhijit Banerjee et al., “Universal basic income in the developing world”, p. 5, <https://economics.mit.edu/files/16000>.

*growth economy through providing people the freedom to undertake forms of labour outside the growth and consumption economy.*<sup>11</sup>

Since these fundamental ideas, in some shape or form, find their place in various philosophies, the proponents are inclined to experiment with UBI, making it such a unique idea.

#### **4. Pilot Projects – International**

Although various countries across the US, Europe, Africa and Asia have experimented with UBI, such as Canada, Brazil, the Netherlands, Spain, southern Africa etc., the projects undertaken in Kenya and Finland are most significant, giving detailed insights into the challenges and effects of having a UBI in place.

The pilot project in Kenya is a 12-year long experiment started in October 2016 supported by “GiveDirectly” a US Non-Profit Organization, and is being monitored by Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab under the directorship of Mr. Abhijit Banerjee of MIT *to evaluate both the short- and long-term effects of a long-term UBI on recipients’ economic status, time use, risk-taking, gender relations, and broader outlook on life.*<sup>12</sup> The experiment includes providing about US\$0.75 per adult per day for 12 years to cover basic needs in 44 villages (Long-term UBI), for 2 years in 80 villages (Short-term UBI), one-time payments about US\$500 per adult in 71 villages (Lump sum UBI) whereas 100 villages will not receive payments. The first follow-up survey is scheduled to take place later in 2019, however, preliminary surveys reported that only 5% of the beneficiaries reduced or stopped working as being “*too sick or old to work*”. Further, most of them spend the extra income on buying necessities and increasing savings.<sup>13</sup> A similar experiment took place earlier in 2011 in Rarieda in Kenya. The results showed that the program had significant welfare-improving impacts, both economically and psychologically.<sup>14</sup> It allayed the fears of skeptics as there was no increase in expenditures on ‘temptation goods’, such as alcohol and tobacco, rather, households significantly increased consumption by US\$36.18 per

---

<sup>11</sup> Towards an historical account of Universal Basic Income, Dr. Elise Klein, ‘CAN LESS WORK BE MORE FAIR? A discussion paper on Universal Basic Income and shorter working week’, the Green Institute, p. 23.

<sup>12</sup> Abhijit Banerjee et al., The Effects of a Universal Basic Income in Kenya, Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab, <https://www.povertyactionlab.org/evaluation/effects-universal-basic-income-kenya>.

<sup>13</sup> Testing a Universal Basic Income in Kenya, Michael Cooke ,GiveDirectly, <http://www.lse.ac.uk/LSEE-Research-on-South-Eastern-Europe/Assets/Documents/Events/Conferences-Symposia-Programmes-and-Agendas/2018/COOKE-MICHAEL-Testing-UBI-in-Kenya-v3.pdf>.

<sup>14</sup> The Impact of Unconditional Cash Transfers in Kenya, Innovations for Poverty Action, <https://www.poverty-action.org/study/impact-unconditional-cash-transfers-kenya>.

month (23 percent), on food, medical and educational expenses, and social events. Psychologically, people were happier and satisfied.

Finland became the first European country to experiment with the idea of UBI from January 2017, when a Finnish government agency Social Insurance Institution (Kela) provided monthly payment of €560 to 2,000 people on unemployment benefits selected at random. The aim of the experiment was to see whether a guaranteed income would help people find jobs. The government stopped the experiment on 31 December 2018. On 8 February 2019, the preliminary results were released, raising questions about the effectiveness of UBI. According to researcher Olli Kangas, *“the basic income recipients of the test group reported better wellbeing in every way than the comparison group”*. According to another researcher, Minna Ylikanno, the beneficiaries said they felt *“less stress symptoms as well as less difficulties to concentrate and less health problems than the control group and they were also more confident in their future and in their ability to influence societal issues.”* However, the experiment’s effect on unemployment or self-employment was negligible<sup>15</sup>, raising doubts regarding the success and future of the scheme.

## 5. Pilot Projects – India

India was a host to two significant studies testing the feasibility of UBI. The first study was carried out in 2011, in a West Delhi slum following complaints of a defective PDS system. The experiment (“Delhi Cash Transfer”) organized by the NGO Self Employed Women’s Association (SEWA) provided for a transfer of Rs. 1000 per month to the beneficiaries *in exchange of PDS*.<sup>16</sup> It was a conducted particularly to measure the impact of UBI on food security, nutrition, and wasteful expenses. The results of the experiment were positive as it was observed that there was no reduction in per-capita calorie consumption in beneficiary households. Along with that, expenditure incurred on food items like pulses, fish, eggs, and meat increased. More importantly, there was negligible increased spending on alcohol or nonfood

---

<sup>15</sup>Preliminary results of the basic income experiment: self-perceived wellbeing improved, during the first year no effects on employment, Kela, [https://www.kela.fi/web/en/news-archive/-/asset\\_publisher/IN08GY2nrZo/content/preliminary-results-of-the-basic-income-experiment-self-perceived-wellbeing-improved-during-the-first-year-no-effects-on-employment](https://www.kela.fi/web/en/news-archive/-/asset_publisher/IN08GY2nrZo/content/preliminary-results-of-the-basic-income-experiment-self-perceived-wellbeing-improved-during-the-first-year-no-effects-on-employment).

<sup>16</sup>ShubhashisGangopadhyay, Robert Lensink, and Bhupesh Yadav, “Cash or In-Kind Transfers? Evidence From a Randomised Controlled Trial in Delhi, India,” *Journal of Development Studies* 51, no. 6 (2015).

expenses. Thus, UBI as an alternative to PDS neither affected food security nor encouraged wasteful and unproductive expenditure.

A more elaborate project was undertaken by SEWA and the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) from June 2011 to November 2012 in nine villages in Madhya Pradesh. The project was bifurcated into two sub-projects: In the first sub-project, every adult received Rs. 200 (later Rs. 300) and every child received Rs. 100 (later Rs.150) per month in eight villages, compared with those of twelve control villages receiving no transfers. In the second sub-project, a tribal village was selected and every adult received Rs. 300 and child received Rs. 150 per month for an entire year. It was compared with another tribal village which acted as a control. This project was different from the Delhi Cash Transfer project as the beneficiaries received income *over and above the existing welfare schemes*. According to Professor Guy Standing, a researcher on the project stated that “*basic income was transformative for the participants*”.<sup>17</sup> As per the survey, there was a *shift from wage labour to own cultivation... the study also shows that if the right amount is given as a basic income, the positive effect is disproportionately higher than what the monetary value is. In other words, the emancipatory value of basic income is several times greater than its monetary value*. It was further found that the income significantly improved living conditions: households receiving basic income could access better public and private sources of drinking water, while those in tribal villages purchased significantly more household assets. Households in both the general and tribal pilots reported that the basic income increased their food sufficiency, and this had a concomitant, statistically significant impact on children’s nutrition. Neither pilot indicated a rise in alcohol consumption. The uptake of education and health services grew—the use of private healthcare and health insurance rose significantly for basic income villages compared to control villages, as did spending on schooling, especially for female students. The basic incomes also stimulated economic activity: the probability that individuals would diversify their economic activities was far greater in basic income villages than in control villages, and the number of hours participants worked similarly increased.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup>Guy Standing, “Basic Income Paid to the Poor Can Transform Lives,” Guardian, December 18, 2014, <https://www.theguardian.com/business/economics-blog/2014/dec/18/incomesscheme-transforms-lives-poor>.

<sup>18</sup>SarathDavala, Guy Standing, RenanaJhabvala, and Soumya Kapoor Mehta, Basic Income: A Transformative Policy for India (New Delhi, India: Bloomsbury Publishing India, 2014), SEWA Bharat, “A Little More, How Much It Is”.

Apart from these two projects, Sikkim is set to become the first state to roll out a UBI scheme in India. The Sikkim Democratic Front (SDF) has promised to implement the scheme by 2022 for which it has already started the process.

## 6. Conclusion

The Chapter of the Economic Survey concludes that *the Mahatma as the embodiment of universal moral conscience would have seen the possibility of UBI in achieving the outcomes he so deeply cared about and fought for all his life. But the Mahatma as moralist would have had doubts because of seeing uncompensated rewards as harming responsibility and effort. As a fiscal conservative he would permit UBI only if convinced that macro-economic stability would not be jeopardized. Recognizing the difficulty of exit, the Mahatma as astute political observer would have anxieties about UBI as being just another add-on government programme. But on balance he may have given the go-ahead to the UBI.*<sup>19</sup> Albeit, in principle, UBI may be a revolutionary idea, it is bound to face a number of practical challenges: the implementation and financial aspects being the basal requirement, as Dr. Luke Martinelli, a researcher at the University of Bath Institute for Policy Research, points out, “*an affordable UBI is inadequate, and an adequate UBI is unaffordable*”<sup>20</sup>. The problem becomes more acute in light of absence of any experimental studies for a long-lasting UBI.

To tackle fiscal issues, various models of UBI have been proposed, such as the Economic Survey targeting the bottom 75% of the population or alternatively women or other vulnerable groups like widows, pregnant mothers and the old and infirm, Quasi-universal basic rural income (QUBRI) by the former CEA, Sh. Arvind Subramanian<sup>21</sup> targeting 75% of the rural population, or Sht. Reetika Khera’s push for a phased manner implementation of UBI, providing income as pensions and maternity entitlement to a targeted group like all elderly, widows, disabled persons, and pregnant women, whilst some like Mr. Banerjee and Dr. Guy Standing pushing for a universal scheme. Mr. Banerjee explains that a country that grows at 7% a year could afford 3-4% increase in government spending.

---

<sup>19</sup> Universal Basic Income: A Conversation With and Within the Mahatma, Chapter IX, Economic Survey of India 2016-17, p 195, para 9.79.

<sup>20</sup> Luke Martinelli, Assessing the Case for a Universal Basic Income in the UK, University of Bath, [https://www.bath.ac.uk/publications/assessing-the-case-for-a-universal-basic-income-in-the-uk/attachments/basic\\_income\\_policy\\_brief.pdf](https://www.bath.ac.uk/publications/assessing-the-case-for-a-universal-basic-income-in-the-uk/attachments/basic_income_policy_brief.pdf).

<sup>21</sup> Arvind Subramanian et al., “Quasi-Universal Basic Rural Income (QUBRI): The Way Forward”.

Another point of variation is regarding the existing welfare schemes. While most economists argue scrapping of the schemes that have run their course whilst continuing MGNREGS, PDS, old age pensions, maternity benefits etc., some like Mr. Banerjee propose complete scrapping of the welfare schemes like MGNREGS and PDS in the medium run, whereas some like Prof. Jayati Ghosh argue against UBI and propose Universal Basic Services with UBI as an addition and not a substitution to UBS.

Although the debate around UBI, fiscally speaking, will revolve around the questions of who gets the money, how much, who bears the financial burden and what to take away; it is certain that the idea of UBI is here to stay: as UBI to the twenty-first century is what civil and political rights were to the twentieth. To carry forward this debate, original contributions from students, scholars, academics and practitioners, making analytical comparisons between different models of UBI on factors such as fiscal costs, population coverage, means for financing etc. and/or suggesting alternatives to UBI for India are expected.