

who work are not generally concerned with the unemployed, because our culture has provided many of our citizens with a kind of "self-evident" notion that those who do not work should not eat, and because most U.S. citizens are simply not aware that there are millions of people through no fault of theirs who are hungry and impoverished in the United States.

It is evident that material need is widespread in our country and that we still lack an effective, impartial, and humane system to meet the need. A guaranteed annual income has been proposed as a generic approach to overcoming this deficiency. As study and debate of the guaranteed annual income increase, certain issues and problems emerge. These must be faced openly and incisively. Many perplexing questions must be answered and many doubts settled. The following are some of the issues.

1. *An issue of major proportions is the very basic one of entitlement*

We submit that every human being has an inalienable right to a decent minimum of subsistence and that this right emanates from his nature and worth as a living person. The following quote is relevant:

Every human being is a person. By virtue of this he has rights and duties flowing directly from his very nature which are, therefore, universal, inviolable and inalienable * * * Every man has the right to life and to the means which are necessary for the proper development of life; these are primarily food, clothing, shelter, rest, medical care and finally the necessary social services. A human being also has the right to security in cases of sickness, inability to work, widowhood, old age, unemployment or in any other case in which he is deprived of the means of subsistence.

This was written by one of the giants of history, Pope John XXIII, in the encyclical "Pacem in Terris." He specifies these rights as universal and inalienable; and it doesn't seem disputable.

Accepting that premise—if many "qua man" as inalienable rights to these basics of life, we then ask upon whom falls the grave duty to make that theoretical entitlement become a fluid reality? In other words, who is obliged to deliver the goods when title claims them? His colleagues and neighbors? Yes. By their good will and benevolence? No. The "good will—condescension" attitude has too long pervaded our American scene. It has been wrapped up in the word-concept, "dole," distasteful but still rampant. Many European countries erased the dole idea years ago.

Recently a prominent American in public life said:

Welfare should not be considered as an inalienable right of the poor but something of a gift granted by people who earn their own way to those who cannot or will not work.

A statement like that sets back 30 years the poor of our Nation. Such a fallacy in positioning the origin of subsistence rights—though still somewhat popular—should be followed by a quote like this one:

"You are not making a gift of your possessions to the poor person. You are handing over to him what is his."

This was spoken by Pope Paul VI in the encyclical, "Development of Peoples." The basics of life to the needy are never a gift nor a dole but "what is his;" they belong to him; the poor person has title to them. Another statement pertinent to his question is from the Vatican Council: