

# Osborne's Living Wage Folly

By **Alexander Baron** - Oct 28, 2015



**31**  
SHARES

After the historic defeat of the Government's latest austerity measures by the Upper House, Chancellor George Osborne reiterated his claim that Britain cannot continue to live beyond its means, and said in effect that when these measures are eventually effected in some form, and the national living wage instituted, all will be sweet and wonderful; we will be living in a low welfare, high income economy. The reality is that he is living in cloud cuckooland, ignorant of not only economic theory but of human nature.

A living wage, minimum wage or whatever you want to call it can only destroy jobs in the long and probably the medium run, as economic theory predicts. By adopting this approach to tackling the deficit, Osborne is penalising the poor and making employers pay for it. The enormous deficit is the result of the power of credit creation being in the hands

of private banks; this power belongs rightly to the Government, but there is no chance we will see **Bilderberger Osborne** facing up to that.

With regard to the living wage, the reality is that there are some people who are not worth the living wage. Look at **this photograph**; this was taken in the US, but it could have been taken in the UK, France or indeed in any other highly advanced economy. These men are unemployable; no employer in his right mind would pay any of them a living wage. Such men (and women) can at times be fit for certain types of extremely menial work, odd jobs here and there, but that is all, and it is futile to pretend otherwise. So what is the alternative? Universal basic income! This was discussed by **Michael D. Tanner** of the American Libertarian think tank the Cato Institute in Tuesday's *City A.M.* He was extremely skeptical about what he alluded to as guaranteed minimum income, claiming it would have to be means-tested. No, it would not, the clue is in the first word: unconditional, or in his version, guaranteed. It would be paid **to both paupers and billionaires**, although people could be given the choice of opting out on a quarterly or annual basis, and undoubtedly many would.

Universal Basic Income (Social Credit) would destroy the poverty trap, stimulate the economy, and would cost nothing like the £615 billion Tanner claims. To institute it, we would have to secure our borders and kick out all those who came here solely to claim it, but if it were made universal, as the **Basic Income Earth Network** wants, illegal immigration would no longer be a problem – wars in the Middle East aside.