How it was introduced to the political agenda in Austria

The Austrian party “Liberales Forum” which has 9 (of 183) seats in the Austrian Parliament, unanimously decided in October 1997 to adopt a general tax reform including an unconditional basic income, as a main political goal of the party.

• how we introduced the idea;
• the reactions within the party and publicly;
• how we convinced the delegates and members;
• how and why we adapted the first model;
• the main arguments and alternatives of opponents;
• our most successful arguments;
• our approach to our political competitors and which p.r. measures to take;
• finally a description of the model and the financing aspects.

1. The introduction of the idea

As the speaker of a party’s permanent task force dealing with labour- and employment matters I introduced the idea in May 1996 on a “Bundesforum”, which is the convention of the party and it’s top decision making body. I had not prepared the delegates in advance, except for a brief statement about the fact, that employment wouldn't grow anymore in the foreseeable future and that our society therefore has a need to separate the basic income of the individuals from the actual or previous ownership of an employment. Together with the party’s parliament-speaker for social topics, Dr. Volker Kier, who should attend this B.I.E.N. Congress, we introduced the idea of an unconditional basic income to some twohundred delegates as a surprise package. For a majority of the delegates at that time tended to be more concerned in the economic implications of measures, we gave the economic arguments in favour of a B.I. a lot of room within the presentation and stressed mainly the following arguments:

• With the current and upcoming globalization, the economy has a vital need for restructuring and increased investments in automation. More or less unlimited flexibility in the area of working contracts is also an unavoidable demand.
• Especially in Austria, with its high level of wages and high additional cost of employment, it will otherwise not be possible to stay competitive with countries, whose average wage is 1 to 10 % of the Austrian average.
• The Austrian economy already does and will increasingly outsource workintensive productions to the eastern neighbourcountries and to the far east. This process will continue and accelerate with the ongoing development of information and communication technologies.
• The services industries have no less need for improvements of labour productivity and no less technological support in this respect than the manufacturing industry and will not any longer be able to absorb unemployed of other industries. New communication technologies will indeed create new jobs but will at the same time replace even more.

Conclusion: If the unemployment rate, resulting from the above mentioned developments leads into a devided society of job owners and unemployed to a high extent, the mass spending potential will decline rapidly and thus create a depression of our economy, then suffering from a lack of demand.
Of course we also stressed all the other valid arguments against a devided society, ethical considerations as well as security concerns and the aim of selfdecided living conceptions, which are most common in a liberal party, which is built on the principles of *liberté – égalité – fraternité / sœrité*. 
We also presented a model and figures, supporting the feasibility of a B.I. in our wealthy society.

The model was a radical one, in order to illustrate very clearly what we wanted to suggest: A monthly payment of ATS 10,000 (US$ 900) for every grown up inhabitant and ATS 5,000 for every child, irrespectively of their actual or previous employment status. Replace all other public social transfers, including common pensions, by this B.I. except transfers for disabled. Reduce the cost of public administration by at least 20%.

As for the feasibility figures we compared the cost of our model with the current amount of mass income including social transfers and public pensions and showed, that our model would only need about one third of the current mass income sum, thus leaving still two thirds for wages and other employment related incomes.

What we left open was only the method of how we would collect the money needed for B.I. purposes by taxation measurements, stating only that it would not be possible to collect it from employment related income taxes. We indicated, that a mixture of taxes on energy consumption, workless capital income and reduction of administration costs should be taken into consideration to cover B.I. costs.

We accepted the assumption that wages should eventually decline by the impact of a then existing B.I.

Finally we underlined that any B.I. would depend on the wealthy of our economy – which should grow supported by the long term advantages of the B.I.. Therefore we called our B.I. model "dividend of the gross domestic product", indicating that if too many people would prefer to cease their employment, B.I. would automatically deteriorate, thus bringing them back to work.

2. the reactions within the party and publicly

The spontaneous reactions of the audit were impressive. Nobody remained lukewarm. Some 50% were extremely positive, with concerns however, the other half reacted angrily to furiousley. However, the decision made by the convention was to install a workforce with the goal to elaborate a more detailed model and the missing taxation method which would be needed to cover the B.I. costs, with the additional injunction that the average incometax ratio must not increase.

The arguments and concerns in the discussion were all those which are well known to all people, dealing with the B.I. idea, so I renounce listing them at this point but will come back on some of them later.

Since the convention was publicly and watched by journalists, there were also instant reactions in the papers. Among neutral ones we fond again extraordinary positive and negative reactions. One of the most popular weeklys spent three whole pages on the topic, “awarding” the party with the “first place in creative contributions to the labour day”. The neutral comments acknowledged the idea in principle as a good but not feasible one.

The negative comments climaxed in openly naming the idea a communist one, aiming at making everything equal and reminding us that such a system has already collapsed ruefully 1989 in all our eastern neighbourhood.

Those misunderstood our proposal, voluntarily or not, by mixing up B.I. with a minimum wage or even a common equal wage for everybody, qualified to nip any competition in the bud.

3. how we managed the process of convincing the delegates and members

I am still convinced that our approach, confronting delegates without trying to convince many of them in advance was good. Otherwise I’d fear that a widespread internal discussion process would have led finally – if ever - to a public proposal which would have reflected only a minimum of a reduced common denominator. But now, since the proposal was publicly known from the very beginning, it wasn’t so easy for
the opponents to have the substance of the proposal eroded to virtually nothing. I admit that there are different opinions too, concerning the advantages or disadvantages of this sort of approach.

However, we learned that it was extremely urgent now to make the idea understood correctly and to give all groups and members of the party a chance to express their concerns and to have their questions answered. That was in a first run more important than working on a detailed model, for some of our supporters and members left us or let us know that they at least considered to withdraw.

First of all we published a lot of paper to explain the idea in general, for only a small group has had the opportunity to attend the first presentation, and to prevent wrong rumors. We answered all of the personal letters carefully and held presentations and discussions all over the country wherever we were invited to do so.

The experience of that work was that it is possible to convince nearly every group within two or three hours time, regardless of it’s structure. I’ve met groups of elderly people, of students, of intellectuals and economists and of course completely mixed groups. Though it is of course harder to convince elderly people, it’s although possible.

What was puzzling me in the very beginning was the experience that one cannot rely on the assumption that an individual, which would clearly profit from the introduction of B.I., will automatically support the idea. In order to gain testimonials from the sciences we organized a symposium of economists, philosophers, authors of respective books and other publicly known persons. To organize such a symposium is a lot of work and consumes a lot of time since you cannot expect to gather such a group as early as within one or two months. Finally we had the symposium together a few months later. It produced good content but nearly no public attention. We published the speeches and discussions in a small book.

From all those events and discussions we derived the main concerns of the people and a lot of questions that couldn’t be answered sufficiently prior to having a detailed operable model. It was clear from the very beginning that the initial illustrative model would have to be adapted in many respects.

4. how and why we adapted the first model

What we are aiming at is more flexibility in working and lifeplanning conceptions, supported by the unconditional B.I. Therefore the B.I. in our conception should cover the basic financial needs of an individual sufficiently but without being comfortable. For most of the individuals it shall remain desirable to work constantly parttime or fulltime or at least from time to time. In this context one of the main problems of B.I. is, that in terms of equality it is in many constellations obvious that taking the group situation of individuals (family or other partnerships) into consideration, produces better results in measuring the most appropriate B.I. amount. Singles simply need more money than groups, to achieve the same living standard. On the other hand independence and selfdetermination of each single individual is an untouchable treasure of liberal attitude. So we decided to leave the unconditional B.I.-amount equal for each grown up inhabitant of Austria in our model. But we adopted a different conception for children: For children usually have two parents who should bear their childrens living, the party designed a conception of subsidiarity. A certain amount, depending on the respective age of children, is fixed as the minimum need of a child. Each of it’s parents has to contribute a certain sustainable percentage of his or her own income in order to produce this minimum amount. It makes no difference in this respect if the parents are living together or not. If one of the parents cannot produce his/her share, the missing amount shall be covered by the society, thus replacing the current public children supporting system which contributes to the living costs of all children notwithstanding the actual income situation of parents. The party called the proposal “the liberal family transfer model” and promoted it independently from the complete B.I. proposal, because it has always criticized the missing subsidiarity in the current system. Another important change of the previous B.I. model was made in the question of who should be entitled to receive it unconditionally. In my first, more illustrative model I had decided that everybody should be entitled, notwithstanding his/her income situation, for I assumed, that wealthy people would have to pay it back through the progressive tax rate in the end. This was, however, one of those items, that remained
widely misunderstood and were hardly accepted by the people. Additionally it was correctly argued by many, that this conception would rise the average incometax-rate unnecessarily. So the second major change of the initial conception was that our final proposal adopted a conception of B.I. as a negative income tax. Briefly described this conception provides a tax credit for every grown up individual which is genuinely obliged to pay taxes in Austria. Every such individual has to submit an incometax return. If his/her income is too low to consume the whole tax credit, he/she will get the difference in cash. In order to avoid a barrier, hindering people to accept a low wage employment when the difference between the earned money and the thus reduced B.I. was too small, we introduced, additionally to the tax credit a tax free amount, which can be earned without having to consume the tax credit. (figures -> chapter 8)

Another important adaptation of the initial model concerned also the question of who should be entitled to receive the B.I. in terms of being Austrian subject or not. You have to take into account that Austria has borders with nothing less than eight other countries, two of them EU members, four of them remaining in a low average income level. So it was from the beginning of the discussion a major concern of many how we would prevent a “B.I. tourism” into our borders. It was crucial to provide a sufficient solution for this concern, for otherwise the whole discussion would have turned into a “only EU-wide” direction, and everybody knows that this would have equaled with a “priority funeral” of the idea. We suggested two solutions: firstly, and if possible within the legal environment of the EU, we proposed a system based on reciprocity: every inhabitant of Austria should be entitled to receive B.I. If he/she is no citizen, his/her title should be restricted to the extent in which an Austrian subject would be entitled to receive B.I. in the respective other country. This approach would be problematic in the very beginning, because it would restrain most of those people, who are living in Austria since many years without being Austrian citizens yet, from their B.I. demand, although B.I. replaces all other social transfers and will have a significant impact on the labourmarket. Furthermore this solution could turn out as incompatible with EU legislation, as far as EU citizens are concerned. So we had to produce another solution which could be adopted instead of the reciprocity model or in combination with it: every inhabitant of Austria, who is in principle taxable, and has lived in Austria for at least five years, should be entitled to receive B.I.

The amount of a B.I. in our new model would be 6000 to 8000 ATS (500 to 670 US$) tax credit combined with an option to earn additional ATS 2000 to 4000 (US$ 170 to 330) taxfree.

Finally we had to concede a longterm introduction phase, up to 30 years, but starting now. The latter mainly due to the current Austrian pension system, which consists to a very high extent of public pensions, derived from the sum of the employed earnings of the individuals in their last few working decades, but funded by the payments of the actually working people. Since those pensions are in many cases much higher than the envisaged B.I. they cannot be replaced flatly by it. We however don’t think to wait 30 years with the implementation of a B.I. and a lot of pensions is actually not higher than the proposed B.I. We suggest to start immediately to rebuild the pension system on three columns, namely, duty to to pay a certain amount into one among different competing pension systems, additional company pension funds and thirdly private provision for the future. The current pensions should be replaced by the B.I. but under certain circumstances enhanced by the former pension system. We are convinced that the right to receive very high pensions cannot remain absolutely untouchable while at the same time poverty spreads among younger unemployed people and families, because the current social systems aren’t sufficient due to the completely changed overall conditions. The latter consideration is not very popular in Austria.

5. the main arguments and alternatives of opponents

I assume that the participants of a B.I.E.N convention, for who I write this paper, are most familiar with the arguments against B.I. So I will give only a brief list of them without commenting them in depth:

According to the opponents B.I. is
- not affordable for the political economy
- preventing people from working
- killing competition
- taking away the satisfaction that people derive from their work
- not feasible for one single country
- qualified to prevent people from paying taxes any more
Some alternative concepts:

- Concept No 1 is, as always, to leave everything unchanged. It’s supporters argue that there is enough work for those who want to work. They’d prefer a renaissance of personal services, affordable through low wages. They do, however, not picture themselves as low wage social servers. They also don’t take into account that the general decline of the average income, resulting from such a beginning working poor environment, would affect the demand on our home market in a long turn scope and could thus lead into a depression of our economy.

- Another popular alternative concept is to manage a set of non commercial working opportunities (communitarism) for those who would otherwise remain unemployed, and reward this sort of work with an amount equaling with the proposed B.I. Our main reservations against this concept are firstly that it would be up to the government to decide which sort of work is social valuable and which is not. Secondly we fear an unfair competition between this sort of organisations and private entrepreneurs who are dealing in related services segments.

- Not a complete concept but a related suggestion we often heared is to give mothers and housewifes a salary for their duty. We completely refuse this idea for it is qualified to prevent women from the labourmarket and thus from a selfdecided life conception. We set a high value on the principle that the B.I must be unconditional, of course and first of all even unconditional in terms of gender.

6. our most successful arguments

Recalling lots of discussions I think that there are only few important arguments which usually convince people. The rest of the discussions is only to answer detailed questions or give people the impression, that there are at least several possible solutions for each detailed concern.

The most convincing statements were the following:

- Globalization is inevitable. Thus we are to stay competitive with economies, which have only a small fraction of our labour costs. To compete with them successfully means to employ machines instead of workforces. Machines do produce a GDP but do not need food and do not produce demand for goods and personal services.

- The need for workers is structurally and progressively declining through
  - globalization which forces companies to control costs and improve efficiency
  - the necessary extention of flexibility in terms of working contracts and working hours is aimed at having workers present only when they are actually needed
  - new technologies, including telecommunications technologies are replacing more jobs than they are creating:
    - once payments and the following delivery of customs can be made completely selfserviced in shops and supermarkets, another large group of jobs will vanish
    - lots of databases need no longer to be kept and maintained on multiple places once it is possible to access them from anywhere in the world with virtually no timelag
    - new materials allow for miniaturizing customs thus replacing jobs in transport and storekeeping
    - and so on and so on

All the above mentioned impacts replace jobs but increase the wealth of companies and the economies. Economists and related scientists tend to underestimate the impact of new technologies in their forecasts.
The incomes of jobowners are increasing due to their declining number. This is one reason why labor unions have ambiguous attitudes in respect of this development since it is also a success for their members.

A such divided society has to be avoided for many reasons, as there are:

• The wealthy part of a divided society will not consume additionally the full amount of goods and services which cannot be afforded anymore by the starving part. The thus missing demand could lead into a depression. Therefore it is necessary to keep the household spending potential spread - to a certain extent - throughout the whole society.
• The famous depression of the thirties of this century, came from a very comparable economic situation: New technologies produced a lot of unemployed. Their missing household spending power led to a deep economic depression which caused – among other reasons – the second world war.
• Apart from all the very valid ethical considerations, a deeply divided society is also a threat to political stability and security. If many people have only a choice between steeling and starving, they will have to decide to steel.

Conclusion 1: The proverb “who doesn’t work shall not eat” doesn’t suite any more in the economic situation of the developed countries in the northern hemisphere. In the contrary: We are having a strong need to replace human work by all means of automation, restructuring, improving efficiency, flexibilization and outsourcing. Only this will keep our economies sound and wealthy, provided that a reasonable part of the household spending power is well spread all over the whole society.

B.I is affordable, for it needs only a part of the amount, people are currently make their livings of. It leaves enough money to pay work competitively on results.

It is extremely unlikely that a percentage, higher than the current rate of unemployed, would decide to cease their employment, relying only upon a sufficient but very very modest B.I. On the other hand it is very likely that the introduction of a B.I. would support and create new flexible living conceptions and patterns, thus spreading the provided amount of work among all those who want to work.

Conclusion 2: B.I. is affordable, without killing competition and without making a big share of the society living from their B.I. only.

7. our approach to our political competitors and which p.r. measures to take

Now, that we have an operable model (see chapter 8) suiting the specific austrian situation, we are trying to make it more poular and to find supporters. At least we would like to achieve a reasonable public discussion about the idea rather than getting only – if any - superficial instant statements of governmental representatives. Furthermore we’d like to stimulate the government and all the official entities, who have access to important databases, to use those databases in order to produce long term scenarios, showing themselves and us how different B.I. solutions would work, in comparison with the maintained status quo or other conceptions.
We would like to kick off such a process also within the EU administration.
What we already did in this respect was, to get expert advice in the same way, as bills (of new law) have to 
be submitted in advance to many different entities, as parties, ministries, departments, churches 
representatives, chambers of labour an commerce, trade (labor) unions and other lobbies. We’ve got some 
response but not really a breakthrough.

Many of ours are still attending different panel discussions and we don’t stop penetrating the idea in press 
releases and whenever we get access to the public media. We’ve also put in ads, promoting the B.I. idea.

In order to multiply the ambassadors of the idea, we started a series of workshops with our representatives 
in the different countries of Austria. Whenever there are local election campaigns, we try to promote the 
B.I., among other topics of course.

We’ve not achieved a reasonable widespread public discussion yet, but what we’ve achieved is that B.I. has 
become a steady part of our party’s image.

The idea is currently supported by the CARITAS, (a popular and important welfare organization within the 
catholic Church in Austria), and in initial stages from human rights organizations.
One of our competing parties, Die Grünen (the green), have adoptet the idea at least partly, as one 
possibility to reform the public pensions system.
Sometimes there emerges a flair of sympathy in favor of B.I. considerations from the side of industry 
association’s representatives.

The hard core of opposition and ignorance is the governing Social Demokratic Party and the labor (trade) 
unions. I think, the reason for this fact is a subconscious deeply routed fear, that the whole worker’s class 
could vanish as a class, once a B.I. would be introduced. Furthermore, the fear of loosing the compulsion of 
the need for a job, as a means of disciplining the society, seems to influence the attitude of governments 
towards B.I in general.

We keep working step by step.

8. The model and the financing aspects
An unconditional basic income that covers fundamental needs is the central point of orientation here.

As an integral part of the tax system, this income would guarantee financial security for all citizens. It would 
also give impetus to the labor market and open the way to dynamic economic development. However, an 
unconditional basic income would not eliminate the need for everyone to provide for their own future 
financial security, especially those in a position to do so.

An unconditional basic income is a tax credit deducted from taxes or directly paid out on the basis of 
income. For all citizens of working age, i.e. between 19 and 65 years of age, it would be geared towards the 
minimum amount required for subsistence and translate into a monthly income of between ATS 6,000 and 
ATS 8,000, or an annual income of ATS 72,000 to ATS 96,000.

All previous social transfers such as unemployment benefits, emergency relief, child leave benefits, social 
relief or assistance to students would be replaced by the unconditional basic income. The only transfer 
payments to be retained would be those needed to create equality of opportunity, e.g. the allowance for 
nursing attendance.

All minors entitled to maintenance would also have the right to an unconditional basic income. It would 
have to be provided by their parents and correspond to a subsistence level ranging according to age from 
ATS 4,500 to ATS 6,500 per month! Parents able to provide this basis of subsistence would receive no 
government assistance. For families unable to provide it, the shortfall would be covered from tax resources.

Everyone 65 and older would be entitled to an unconditional basic income. In this case, it would be akin to 
a unconditional basic pension that would replace all other public retirement pensions. The basic pension
would be supplemented by additional company and private pensions. This model is already being successfully applied in Holland.

Economic and social policy will be closely linked with each other as a result of this **liberal tax reform**. It provides the required control effects without the need for complicated regulations while greatly simplifying administrative procedures for all citizens.

Fixing a flat tax rate considerably lower than the current maximum rate would stimulate the economy. According to the assumptions in the model, this tax rate could be set at between 40% and 47%. Together with the general tax exemption and the unconditional basic income as a tax credit, this rate would bring about a definite reduction in taxes for the majority of the population.

The personal exemption is an incentive to enter into the job force and to "earn extra money" in lower income brackets. It amounts to ATS 2,000 to ATS 4,000 a month. In other words, an annual income of from ATS 24,000 to ATS 48,000 would be tax exempt. This is an important control measure against illicit work. (Annexes 1 and 2 explain the mechanics of this tax reform and show the effects it would have in relation to the existing tax system.)

With a flat tax rate, a personal tax exemption and an unconditional basic income, people would be able to calculate and plan for the taxes they owed and the groundwork would be laid for annual self-assessment.

Incorporating more ecological criteria in the tax system would have a self-regulating effect. As indirect taxation affecting energy consumption, it would replace the current complicated legal regulations and promote energy conservation. It would also reduce the tax burden on human labor and help to create and safeguard jobs. Sustained development and "healthy" economic growth would be encouraged.

Creating equality of opportunity is a further goal of the tax reform. Tax privileges for set groups must be eliminated. The elimination of the special tax status of the 13th and 14th salary (there are 14 "monthly" salaries paid out to employees in Austria) would put all tax payers on an equal footing. Parallel to eliminating this privilege, the system would be switched to annual incomes based on 12 monthly payments.

Fairness in the tax system means that income from gainful employment should not be at a disadvantage over income from capital and that companies should not be taxed on the basis of their corporate structure. Our plan therefore calls for a slight increase in the capital gains tax and an adjustment of corporate income tax. Corporations should be taxed on the same basis as partnerships.
A look at financing.

Despite the recent pension reform, we will not be able to finance the current social security system in the medium to long term.

Our only option is to rebuild the entire social security system on the basis of a new solidarity – e.g. guaranteeing every citizen an unconditional basic income as a basis of subsistence, supplemented by his or her own provisions for financial security.

Applying current law, we can neither implement a dynamic model for financing this unconditional basic income and the requisite tax reform nor forecast budget developments of the next 30 years.

However, we can conduct a plausibility check to determine whether the granting of an unconditional basic income would be possible.

Based on the number of people living in Austria (approx. 8,050,000 in 1995, of which approx. 1.78 million are children under the age of 19 and 1.22 million are persons over 65), the working age population totals approx. 5.05 million.

Children and young people: The revenue-neutral family transfer model (see Annex 3) developed by the Liberal Forum is a type of unconditional basic income for children and young people based on the principle of subsidiarity. The total calculated cost of this measure for 1.78 children would be ATS 45 billion.

Retirees: Based on well-founded estimates, experts\(^1\) have determined that an additional amount of some ATS 30 billion would be required to provide all retirees over the age of 65 with an unconditional basic income of ATS 8,000 a month.

Working population: Of the 5.05 million people of working age, about 1 million currently earn no income, 1.3 million have an income below the subsistence level and another 1.3 million have an income so low that they would receive net payments under the unconditional basic income plan. For the remaining 1.45 million in the work force, the unconditional basic income would reduce taxes.

In terms of payments, the unconditional basic income would increase costs (based on a model assumption of ATS 8,000 per month) for the working age population by about ATS 200 billion. This amount would be covered as follows:

- Elimination of costs for previous transfer payments such as the family allowance, (monetary) unemployment benefits, social and emergency relief, child leave allowances and student grants. The elimination of current transfer payments alone would bring in ATS 175 billion;
- Massive savings in government administration due to tax reform, outsourcing and privatization;
- Creation of an ecology-based tax system;
- Reduction of agricultural subsidies;
- Increased revenues from income tax due to the broadening of the basis of calculation and thus an elimination of the unfair exemptions allowed for in the current tax system;
- Higher revenues from VAT as a result of the increased purchasing power of the general population;
- Increased revenues as the result of a higher capital gains tax.

---

\(^1\) Study: “Fundamental conditions, feasibility and ramifications of an unconditional basic income for all”, by Nikolaus Dimmel, Klaus Firlei and Gerhard Wohlfahrt, Salzburg 1997.
Assuming a range of economically induced variance and a transitional period of approx. 30 years for the phase-in of this unconditional basic income and tax reform, we can only say today that slight fluctuations in the model assumptions—whether in the personal exemptions, tax rates or tax credits—would have major impacts on the economy. For example, a change of ATS 100 in the monthly unconditional basic income would decrease or increase the total volume by ATS 6.7 billion; an increase/decrease of ATS 1000 in the monthly personal exemption would change the total volume by ATS 28 billion.

Introducing the unconditional basic income in a series of individual steps would be a reasonable approach to take. In terms of short term priorities, it can be implemented by revamping the child allowance system (LIF’s model for transfer payments to the family) and a comprehensive pension reform.

Finding a tenable and affordable approach is indeed possible. All that is needed is a broad political consensus.

income-tax: current / new
in ATS

![Graph showing income-tax comparison between current and new models]
That was how long was required to introduce Northern Ireland’s first climate bill for assembly consideration. The so-called first reading is a technical step in the legislative process. It is when the bill is introduced, its title is read out and it is ordered to be published. But while its introduction may have been dry, its journey through the law-making process will be more eventful. And having been the only part of the UK without its own climate legislation, Northern Ireland could well end up with two competing climate bills in the coming months. How much carbon to cut? There is now c Mostly without knowing it, we have consented to the entire political and legal structure that we believe has power over us. Keeping it within the context of mandatory vaccination, I would like to introduce you to Jerry Day, whose website FreedomTaker serves as a resource for those who would like to come to a better understanding of their sovereignty as individuals and learn about the practical defense of their innate liberty in our current society. In the video below, Day gives a strong indictment against the Bill Gates/WHO vaccine agenda and its inherent risks to each of us personally, and explains what we need to do if we ever find ourselves being coerced by our government and medical establishment into taking a vaccine. Introduce digital currencies to track and control all economic activity. Abolish cash and financial freedom. DEPOPULATION OBJECTIVES. Short video explaining how mandatory mask wearing can be seen as part of a psychological initiation ritual into the elite’s planned “New World Order” 12 mins. 2.3 The Control Agenda: The Political Reset. The political changes in the “Great Reset” are designed to position global corporations and global regulators as the new “trustees of the public good”. These will be completely unaccountable. The UN, through agencies such as the WHO, FAO and IPCC, are already dictating national health, education, environment, migration and food policies according to the globalists’ agenda. 6 Taming the Far Right in Austria? 7 Conclusions and Extensions. Appendix A: Coding Scheme for Die Zeit Content Analysis. In Austria, Anton Pelinka, Ruth Wodak, Heidemarie Uhl, and Walter Manoscheck taught me to navigate the Austrian political scene and provided much hospitality. Nearly two hundred people graciously agreed to be interviewed for this book, and I thank each and every one of them. Many friends and colleagues commented on this project at various stages. Second, public debates can introduce previously taboo subjects into political discourse and extend the limits of acceptable political space. Third, debates can create new code words for old ideas. In politics, a political agenda is a list of subjects or problems (issues) to which government officials as well as individuals outside the government are paying serious attention at any given time. It is most often shaped by political and policy elites, but can also be influenced by activist groups, private sector lobbyists, think tanks, courts, and world events. Media coverage has also been linked to the success of the rise of political parties and their ability to get their ideas on the agenda (see