



Historic Global Watershed: Government attempts to analyse ‘The Universal Survival Income (USI) Reform’.

...

2022: “Australia’s Year of Governmental System Optimisation”

With Ukraine invaded, tyrants emboldened, the U.S. still imploding, Europe stunned, Estonia/Latvia/Lithuania & Taiwan/South Korea/Japan imperilled, ‘troublesome’ location-territory-and-resource-rich Australia/Antarctica as high as Number 2 on Xi’s list and a Federal Election due, in order to maximise our chance of prospering, 2022 must be the year Australia *completes* its journey to *full-Coopetitionism*.

[Coopetitionism: *Cooperation* first & foremost and *Competition* the treasured second, which *exists* as rules-based sport and democracy and may be *imagined* as an efficient *non-exploitative* free-market economy.]

‘Coopetitionist *Infrastructure* not anti-Coopetitionist *Band-Aids*.’

Specifically, we must abolish Survival-Income-Slavery (SIS) via implementing ‘The USI-Reform’ (please see below).

We must set ourselves this task because only it maximises the chance of saving ourselves, saving our sovereignty, saving our descendants’ future and also projecting a reincarnation of the West, which will both light the way for our allies (including the U.S.) and undermine anti-Coopetitionist Authoritarian-Illegitimates via inspiring *their* citizens to Coopetitionism.

No major (or minor) Australian political party has a definitive, let alone optimising, plan.

Given the imminent election (assuming no punctuating ‘State of Emergency’), *all* Australian citizens can contribute.

...



Australian Government
Department of Social Services

MC21-007107

Mr Paul Ross

Dear Mr Ross

Thank you for your email of 10 August 2021 to the Attorney-General, Senator the Hon Michaelia Cash, regarding the concept of a Universal Basic Income (UBI). Your email was referred to the Minister for Families and Social Services and Minister for Women's Safety, Senator the Hon Anne Ruston, as this matter falls within her portfolio responsibilities. The Minister has asked me to reply to you on her behalf.

The Government welcomes feedback from individuals on policy settings and appreciates the time you have taken to share your views. The Government needs to balance a range of competing priorities when determining the direction of policy. It is committed to maintaining a strong safety net for all Australians who need help and cannot support themselves.

The introduction of a UBI would require very heavy taxation and would greatly increase for average working households. To retain a progressive income tax with a high tax free threshold with a full UBI, then the very heavy overall tax burden needed means that marginal tax rates on upper middle and middle income earners have to be extremely high.

Australia has the most redistributive system of taxes and transfers in the developed world, due to our tightly targeted welfare system and a highly progressive income tax system. It is redistributive because it is tightly targeted, which is the direct opposite of a UBI system.

The Government strongly believes job creation is the key to improving people's living standards and reducing welfare dependency. The Government also believes all Australians deserve to be included in the economic and social life of the community. One of the best ways of achieving this is through having a job. Everyone who can work should have the opportunity to do so and those who are unable to work should be adequately supported.

Thank you again for writing.

Yours sincerely

[Note: signature, name & position redacted upon individual's request.]

7 September 2021

February 26, 2022

Hi {Given Name}

First, the Liberal/National Party Government, the Minister for Families and Social Services and Minister for Women's Safety, Senator the Honourable Anne Ruston and the Department of Social Services are to be admired for this historic reply and, in-general, their preparedness to respond to citizen concerns.

Nevertheless, that the above letter's author has requested anonymity implies even the current system's most vested are shy of its logic.

Regarding the Department of Social Services:

'Our mission is to improve the wellbeing of individuals and families in Australian communities.'

However, wouldn't Australian's wellbeing best be improved via abolishing Survival-Income-Slavery (SIS)?

[Note: Survival-Income-Slavery (SIS) arose out of the Industrial Revolution when subsistence-farmers transitioned away from *self*-sufficiency to become *income*-earning factory-machinists, which meant they lost *direct* control over their survival needs. Hence, The Universal Survival Income (USI/UBI), which differentiates *Survival*-Income from *Luxury*-Income, is justifiable as an Industrial Revolution *inheritance*.]

Doesn't SIS dominate modern Australia? After all, aren't citizens *forced* to prioritise obtaining *their* personal and familial *Survival*-Income *first*?

And, regarding this particularly insidious form of Slavery, isn't The Universal Survival Income (USI) *abolitionist*?

Yet, while the best way *'to improve the wellbeing of [Australian] individuals and families'* is for The USI to be implemented, with the Department overseer to the current income-Welfare system, perhaps they acknowledge a vested-interest in the status-quo.

Nevertheless, on a positive note, the Department's letter avoids the main misconceived 'lay' arguments of:

1. 'Something-for-nothing' – i.e. *any* and *all* inheritance is, by definition, 'something for nothing' and, if not for inheriting the Industrial Revolution, where would any of us be?
2. 'Encouraging laziness' – would receiving The USI of, for instance, \$20,000 per year (when, unlike our income-Welfare system, *without* losing it, it can be 'topped-up' with Luxury-income) discourage you from contributing to your, your family's, your community's and your society's lifestyle and future?
3. 'Encouraging wasteful expenditure such as on alcohol and other drugs' – yet, currently, isn't Survival-Income-Slavery (SIS) the main driver of such escapism?
4. 'It's Socialist and it will bankrupt the country' – Socialism is defined as *'the means of production, distribution, and exchange being owned or regulated by the community as a whole'*; yet, with The USI, as shall be shown, government will be smaller, citizens freer, our

labour-market significantly deregulated, the private sector even more important, our budget permanently in surplus and, due to prodigious efficiencies, we will become manifoldly wealthier.

Regarding ‘something-for-nothing’, we each inherit all-but-infinity for nothing – i.e. we inherit our conceived existence, our family, our society (including its history, culture, philosophy and institutions), our Human-Organisation, Science & Technology (HOST), our natural-environment (including the air we breathe) and some even inherit extraordinary wealth. As for ‘encouraging laziness and wastefulness’, *all* the world’s trials show the exact *opposite*, which is hardly surprising given ...

In the current system, a single on Jobseeker has an income of around \$16,367 per year, which means, if they obtain a part-time job, they may be financially *worse-off* and even if they secure a *full-time* (38 hours p.w.) minimum-wage job, which has an after-tax salary of \$36,248, because they lose Jobseeker, they will only receive an *extra* (\$36,248 – 16,367) \$19,881 minus all the extra expenses such as transport. However, with the *unconditional* USI of \$20,000, there is *incentive* because they will receive \$20,000 *plus* the job-income as a ‘top up’, which totals well in excess of \$50,000.

Regarding the Government’s reply’s specifics, there are 5 main *objections*:

1. Competing Priorities – i.e. ‘*The Government needs to balance a range of competing priorities when determining the direction of policy.*’
2. Financing – i.e. ‘*The introduction of a UBI would require very heavy taxation and [it] would greatly increase for average working households.*’
3. Tightly Targeted Welfare System – i.e. ‘*Australia has the [world’s] most redistributive system of taxes and transfers ... because [the welfare system] is tightly targeted, which is the direct opposite of a UBI system.*’
4. Full-Employment – i.e. ‘*The Government also believes all Australians deserve to be included in the economic and social life of the community. One of the best ways of achieving this is through having a job. Everyone who can work should have the opportunity to do so and those who are unable to work should be adequately supported.*’
5. Improving Living Standards – i.e. ‘*The Government strongly believes job creation is the key to improving people’s living standards and reducing welfare dependency.*’

1. Competing Priorities

‘*The Government needs to balance a range of competing priorities when determining the direction of policy.*’

The government has competing priorities because it *hasn’t* adopted ‘Coopetitionism’ as its overarching narrative – i.e.

‘Coopetitionism: *Cooperation* first and foremost and *Competition* the treasured second.’

In nature, all societies – from bacteria to *traditional* human tribes – are *Coopetition*-constructs.

In modern human societies, this *exists* as rules-based sport and democracy and may be *imagined* as an efficient *non-exploitative* (i.e. Survival-Income-Slavery *Abolitionist*) free-market economy.

However, *within* a society, if there is *long-term* unresolved *anti-Coopetitionism* – i.e. the *prioritisation* of *Competition* above *Cooperation* (for example, the extreme of Civil War) – then, eventually, the society will *split* or collapse.

Thus, incorporating Maslow's 'self-actualisation', government's mission *should* be to, via its systems:
"Maximise citizens' Coopetition-contributive self-actualisation."

Regarding the society/citizen *interface*, this mission's 'Coopetition-contributive' component strengthens the *society*, which *foundationally* assists *citizens*, and its 'self-actualisation' component optimises the individual *citizen's* wellbeing.

"Maximising citizens' Coopetition-contributive self-actualisation" requires Citizen Empowerment Infrastructure's (CEI) 5 'guaranteed and unconditional' cornerstones:

1. Universal Rule of Coopetition-maximising Law
2. Universal Liberal Democracy
3. Universal Education
4. Universal Healthcare
5. The Universal Survival Income (USI).

While, in Australia, we have robust (and, predominantly, *bipartisan*) versions of the first 4, The USI's absence results in the pervasive anti-Coopetitionism of Survival-Income-Slavery (SIS).

The existence of SIS has, among other things, created the modern Left/Right division, which is variously also referred to as 'class-warfare', 'perpetual struggle' and the 'us and them' 'worker versus boss' concept.

In turn, 'class-warfare' – far from being static – is fragmenting into '*identity-warfare*'.

Imagine: with Coopetitionism inherently encompassing the full-spectrum of human-rights, all the double-negative phrases (and their accompanying legislation) such as '*don't* be a bully' can be replaced with the single uplifting moral ambition of '*be* Coopetitionist'.

Hence, regarding the Government's 'competing priorities', Survival-Income-Slavery has created most of them.

Thus, since SIS is solved via The USI, the 'competing priorities' problem is optimally rectified via 'The USI-Reform', which consists of *substituting* The USI for *both*:

1. Our current income-Welfare system (inc-Wel) – including abolishing Centrelink, Job Service Provider (JSP) contracts and Jobseeker payments
2. The Universal Minimum Hourly Wage (UMHoW) – currently, \$20.33 – which will permanently *eradicate* Unemployment/Underemployment and *unleash* small/big business. ['Kill 2 Band-Aids with 1 Infrastructure'.]

'The USI-Reform' solves the 'competing priorities' issue because, in both abolishing Survival-Income-Slavery and doing so *minimally*, it is a Coopetitionism-consistent PUSH-eradicator – i.e. it eradicates Poverty, Unemployment/Underemployment, Stigma ('the dole-bludger' narrative including its racist and disablist variants) & Harassment ('mutual obligations').

2. Financing

'The introduction of a UBI would require very heavy taxation and [it] would greatly increase for average working households.'

The Citizen's Dividend Organisation (CDO) pitches The Universal Survival Income (USI) at:

1. \$20,000 per year for *every* non-jailed in-country adult citizen
2. \$5,000 per year for each child (to their guardian/s)
3. Pensioners over 66¹/₂ years-old and the disabled receive a *no-disadvantage* ‘top-up’.

The USI-Reform may be financed via:

1. Eradicating the income-Welfare system (around 45% of the total revenue required)
2. Abolishing the income-tax-free-threshold
3. Extending the GST (currently, 10% *partial*-breadth) to 20% *full*-breadth, which is an *effective* GST increase of around 14%
4. The resultant massive efficiencies [Discussed below in section 5].

So, rather than requiring ‘very heavy taxation’, on the contrary, for the bottom 95% of the population, the tax increases due to abolishing the income-tax-free-threshold and raising the GST are *outweighed* by receiving The USI.

That is, even a person earning \$165,000 (*before* income-tax) who spends all their *after*-tax income (thereby *maximising* the GST they pay) will be *directly* better-off.

The Maths:

Currently, a person on \$165,000 receives a *net*-income of \$115,583 (i.e. *after* income-tax).

With The USI-Reform, this person will also pay the *extras* of:

1. Due to the income-tax-free-threshold abolition, \$3,458 (i.e. 19% of 18,200), which means their *net*-income will decrease to \$112,125
2. If they spend *all* their net-income, they will pay around \$15,698 extra in GST (i.e. \$112,125 x 14%).

Thus, they will lose $\$3,458 + \$15,698 = \$19,156$; however, they are receiving The USI of \$20,000 so they are still *directly* \$844 better-off.

Moreover, there are all the *indirect* advantages – i.e. their partners and adult children also receive The USI, which means they are assured of never being obliged to subsidise family/friends. Guardians of children also receive the relevant proportion of the child’s \$5,000.

Furthermore, with the wider society also all receiving it, there are colossal whole-of-society spin-off benefits and efficiencies, which, in turn, leads to *plummeting* non-GST taxes. [As mentioned, these are detailed below in section 5.]

Therefore, the Government’s and Department’s assertion The USI ‘would require very heavy taxation and [it] would greatly increase for average working households’ is demonstrably *false*.

And, given such trusted-source *misinformation* is harming millions of Disempowered Australians and Australian society per se, on behalf of the Australian public, we demand the Department formally (and, particularly given the imminent Federal election, in a reasonable timeframe – preferably, by March 15, 2022) acknowledge and correct its error. A simple statement of correction will suffice. [Perhaps Treasury and/or the Tax Office can assist with the pre-statement analysis.]

3. Tightly Targeted Welfare System

'Australia has the [world's] most redistributive system of taxes and transfers ... because [the welfare system] is tightly targeted, which is the direct opposite of a UBI system.'

[Note: Whether or not 'Australia has the [world's] most redistributive system of taxes and transfers' is not debated here as our concern is *not* an international comparative one but whether Australia's system is *optimal* and, if not, whether The USI-Reform contributes to Coopetition-maximisation.]

First, due to Australia's income-Welfare system's 'targeting', its tax and transfer system is *bureaucratic* and *inefficient* – for instance, the monolithic Centrelink.

Targeting also generates Poverty, Unemployment, Stigma & Harassment (PUSH) ripple-effects:

1. Poverty – i.e. via mistakes, delays and when citizens aren't sufficiently equipped to navigate the targeting system including when they are socially ill-at-ease, mentally-ill, disabled, lack technology (such as an internet connection, a computer and/or a mobile-phone), have a comparatively low IQ and/or a comparatively low education (including regarding technology)
2. Unemployment – i.e. paradoxically, the gain-paid-work-lose-income-welfare *disincentive*, especially for those living precariously, *discourages* the uptake of paid-work
3. Stigma – i.e. 'the dole-bludger' narrative
4. Harassment – i.e. 'mutual obligations'.

In these ways, targeting also causes mental-illness.

The Productivity Commission Report on Mental Health (released June 2020):

'In total, mental illness, on a conservative basis, is costing Australia about \$200-220 billion per year. To put that in context, this is just over one-tenth of the size of Australia's entire economic production in 2019. The cost is between \$550 million and \$600 million per day. Not all of this cost is avoidable, but there is considerable scope for Australia to do better.'

The key to both individual citizen mental-health and societal-health is: 'maximising Coopetition-contributive self-actualisation', which, as detailed, is assisted by The USI-Reform.

Moreover, targeting spawns *crime* as a way of:

1. Avoiding poverty
2. Avoiding income-Welfare's 'mutual obligations'
3. Escapism – i.e. via illegal drugs, some citizens 'escape' from the Disempowerment associated with such anti-Coopetitionism as being alienated from mainstream society, 'the dole-bludger' narrative, being indoctrinated as 'useless' and/or a general lack of opportunity/choice.

Thus, targeting spawns a 'mental-illness-crime' cycle.

Furthermore, denying citizens a Survival-Income for *any* reason, which is what targeting's conditionalization does, is *uncivilised* – i.e. even those in jail automatically receive an 'in-kind' Survival-Income of food, water and shelter. And, with Universal Minimum Hourly Wages (UMHoW) *guaranteeing* some Unemployment, targeting's Stigma & Harassment cannot be 'cruel to be kind' justified but is, on the contrary, also *uncivilised*.

Uncivilised societal systems will necessarily manufacture uncivilised behaviour from its citizens – for instance, we cannot minimise domestic-violence without implementing The USI-Reform.

Regarding targeting's 'logic', we may also ask, why isn't it used for the other 4 (i.e. *non-income*) Citizen Empowerment Infrastructure (CEI) cornerstones such as for child-Education or Democracy?

The answer is, in comparison to being '*guaranteed and unconditional*', 'targeting' is, at best (such as with Healthcare), inefficient and, at worst (such as with Rule of Coopetition-maximising Law), ridiculous.

4. Full-Employment

'The Government also believes all Australians deserve to be included in the economic and social life of the community. One of the best ways of achieving this is through having a job. Everyone who can work should have the opportunity to do so and those who are unable to work should be adequately supported.'

Without alteration, we totally agree; however, The USI-Reform clearly does this *infinitely* better than the 'Frankenstein' UMHoW and inc-Wel system because only The USI-Reform naturally, automatically, efficiently and permanently *eradicates* Unemployment/Underemployment.

5. Improving Living Standards

'The Government strongly believes job creation is the key to improving people's living standards and reducing [income-] welfare dependency.'

With respect, this is an inefficient conflation of 3 concepts:

1. *Income-Welfare dependency*
2. *Job-creation*
3. *Improving living-standards.*

Of the 3, only 'improving living-standards' is relevant.

That is, via the principle of 'policy *minimalism*' – including that optimal-efficiency can only be achieved via Coopetitionism-maximising-*Infrastructure* not Band-Aiding – *targeted* 'income-Welfare', which is a Band-Aid, must be replaced by the new *non-targeted* 'income-*Infrastructure*' paradigm of The USI-Reform, which:

1. *Indirectly* eradicates the need for *job-creation* because it eradicates Unemployment
2. *Directly* eradicates *income-Welfare dependency* because, effectively, it eradicates income-Welfare per se.

Regarding the latter, *Oxford languages* defines 'welfare' as, '*statutory procedure or social effort designed to promote the basic physical and material well-being of people in need*'.

Hence, because it refers to 'people in *need*', *Welfare* necessarily involves '*targeting*'.

However, as the Department of Social Services points out, The USI does *not* involve targeting, which implies it is *not* Welfare or, at least, not confined to Welfare.

Indeed, the income-*Infrastructure* USI-Reform not only goes exponentially-*beyond* income-*Welfare*, it's also negative-to-positive transformative – i.e. instead of promoting *anti*-Coopetitionism, on the contrary, it promotes the core government *mission* of:

"Maximising citizens' Coopetition-contributive self-actualisation".

And, regarding society's 'living-standards', while we usually think of it in terms of *material* 'dollars-and-cents', *holistically*, doesn't this same USI-Reform-inclusive core-government-*mission* also maximise 'living-standards'?

For instance, doesn't The USI-Reform accommodate such truisms as:

1. A household is society's most important 'small business'
2. The *unpaid*-carer is society's most important 'job'
3. Companionship is becoming increasingly important vis-à-vis goods and services production, which is increasingly mechanised
4. Children are, literally, society's future
5. Mental-health can only be maximised via self-actualisation
6. Government systems are necessarily *suboptimal* if some citizens choose crime (or jail) as a way of gaining their Survival-Income (Survival-needs) let-alone as a way to self-actualise
7. To be civilised, *all* non-incarcerated in-country citizens *must* receive a Survival-*Income*?

Yet, while these truisms indicate that the Econo- is a *subset* of the Socio-, currently, due to Survival-Income-Slavery (SIS), in terms of perceptions and social-status, the Econo- has been artificially raised *above* both the Socio- and the Enviro- (natural and international) such that there is:

1. The current national mission of Jobs, Jobs, Jobs (Triple-J) politics
2. The job-creation obsession
3. Jobs-for-jobs'-sake paid-work.

However, the Econo- should be:

'A Coopetition system that, without exploitation, exclusively efficiently produces and distributes the goods & services we need/desire, which we cannot or don't wish to produce as individuals'.

Hence, the Econo's purpose is being increasingly transmuted toward the anti-Coopetitionism perversion of manufacturing paid-work whether it's required or not and even whether or not it's *counterproductive* – socially, environmentally and/or economically.

Thus, while the Econo- is typically perceived as superior to the Socio-, paradoxically, *even* in purely material or *Econo-* terms, it has *backfired*.

That is, since the Industrial Revolution, while per person potential-productivity has improved perhaps 10,000-fold (including, since 2010, more than doubling), Australia's per capita income is just 216 times that of Burundians, who, as the poorest in the world, are poorer than the 1760-era British.

In a post-Industrial Revolution society, it's far easier and more efficient to just give everyone a Survival-Income than it is to artificially create jobs for all of them.

Interestingly, while we intuitively understand the importance of *production* 'economies-of-scale' and 'specialisation' – for example, we don't insist each person manufactures their own car – apparently, we think it's efficient for each citizen to *separately*, first and foremost, prioritize obtaining their own Survival-Income.

On the contrary, as Coopetitionism demands, we should be *Cooperating* first and foremost.

Accordingly, rather than being an inefficient *cost*, The USI-Reform is an *Investment*, which, akin to Universal *Education*, generates a multiple *Return* on that Investment such that our society will become multifariously *wealthier*.

After all, regarding Universal *Education*, isn't our society at least 5 times wealthier than those countries without it?

Also, unlike income-Welfare, which has significant administration *costs* such as Centrelink, The USI-Reform is virtually entirely a *transfer* such that there is virtually no loss to society.

In addition, it eradicates labour-market *Exploitation* – i.e.:

1. With a Survival-Income, people don't have to be in paid-work
2. If they wish to be in paid-work, given zero Unemployment, they have plenty of choice.

This means workers will be there because they wish to be there, which will be a boon to productivity.

Moreover, it will encourage increased labour-market freedom such as regarding 'hire and fire' legislation.

Furthermore, it allows for the incorporation of increased efficiencies such as the *full*-breadth GST, which is far less distortionary than most other taxes because prices are *uniformly* affected (i.e. they are *all* 20% above the non-GST rate). This is politically palatable because the Disempowered are:

1. Directly compensated via The USI
2. Indirectly compensated by the eradication of 'the dole-bludger' narrative, the abolition of 'mutual obligations' and infinitely better access to the labour-market.

Meanwhile, as our economy becomes Coopetition-supercharged, which delivers increased tax revenue, additionally, expenditure on mental-health, law-enforcement, charity and even the Environment (both natural and international) will plummet, which means *non*-GST taxes will free-fall lest we be buried under ever-increasing budget-surplus avalanches. Of course, with taxes *falling*, our economy will become ever more productive and, we, ever wealthier.

Nevertheless, in stark contrast, in a matter of months, the job-creation obsession may be about to shunt to its natural dystopian conclusion via crystallising as the Job Guarantee (JG).

A blind-sider of the Right, no matter the various ways it's dressed-up, the JG is a mechanism for transitioning-to-Communism.

Specifically, the JG is a Government guarantee of full-time paid-work (at or above the Universal Minimum Hourly Wage (UMHoW)) for anyone who wants it.

However, in order to pay for the JG's paid-work and its bureaucracy, Government must *tax* the *private*-sector, which makes the private-sector less competitive, which means it will employ less people, which means there is a requirement for more JG jobs, which means more taxation and so on.

Hence, private enterprise will all but be progressively taxed-out of existence such that the economy will, literally, transition to Communism.

Accordingly, before it's too late, we implore the Government – via Treasury and/or the Productivity Commission – to model The USI-Reform.



We also call on other suitable organisations – such as banks, accounting firms and university economics' departments – to consider modelling it.

After all, with tens of thousands of Australian economists measuring, analysing, teaching and, generally, obsessing over Unemployment, surely a few can be spared to analyse this Unemployment-*eradicating* system.

Conclusion

Our society's core remaining source of *anti-Coopetitionism* is Survival-Income-Slavery (SIS).

The presence of Survival-Income-Slavery (SIS) has led to the Band-Aids of:

1. Universal Minimum Hourly Wages (UMHoW), which does *not* eradicate Exploitation yet leads to Unemployment/Underemployment
2. Our equally problematic income-Welfare system.

In turn, the presence of SIS, UMHoW and the income-Welfare system has led to our national mission becoming Jobs, Jobs, Jobs (Triple-J) politics, which is accompanied by the job-creation obsession.

This is perverting our society including, paradoxically, our economy.

Certainly, the government's job-creation strategy *cannot* abolish Survival-Income-Slavery (SIS).

Given this, we humbly request the Minister for Families and Social Services and Minister for Women's Safety, Senator the Honourable Anne Ruston and the rest of the Government urgently reconsider their position, their respective Departments position and, ultimately, the Government's position on the current UMHoW/inc-Wel/job-creation system vis-à-vis The USI-Reform.

Thank you.

Best regards

Paul Ross
Founder
The Citizen's Dividend Organisation (CDO)
The Civilisationism Organisation (TCO)
Prospective 2022 Senate Candidate (Victoria)