Basic Income Comparative Advantages AC

Observation 1- Inherency

A) Japan's current standard to receive assistance is too strict

Yamamori, 2014 (Yamamori, Toru [Professor at Doshisha University, Kyoto, Japan]. "The 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake and Basic Income1." *The 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake and Basic Income*. Ed. Yannick Vanderborght and Toru Yamamori., 2014. P. 69-81. Web. <http://www.basicincome.org/bien/pdf/munich2012/Yamamori.pdf>.)

The standards above consider the flow of income. However, there is the problem that **during the** actual **review of applications, household assets are considered**. This in itself is a natural outcome in view of the system's intent. However **it's been pointed out that this standard is extreme in Japan. The limit for bank deposits and savings is set at a month and a half's worth of social assistance.**7 Even within the committees of the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare **there have been opinions to the effect that the standard is overly austere.**8 Regarding goods, **ownership of anything that isn't found in over 70% of households in the region is**, just as, in principle ownership of a car is, **unacceptable. The result is that** until **one is unable to receive social assistance until having lost everything. It has been pointed out that the effect of these conditions is that social assistance does not help recipients rebuild lost livelihoods** (attain "independence" in Ministry terms) **and regain conditions in which they would no longer require assistance.** On the other hand, for the most part citizens with low incomes "carry on consuming patterns on par with the average citizen (Kikuchi[2010],p.105) ," taking on loans rather than coming to apply for assistance. Research on international comparisons reveals that Japan's social assistance standard regarding household assets is among the most austere (Uzuhashi[1999]).

Therefore, I offer the following Plan

The Japanese government should implement a universal basic income for Japanese citizens. Funding and Enforcement is through normal means.

**Normal Means would be the Ministry of Health, Labour, and Welfare*

Observation 2- Solvency

A) Basic Income would solve a myriad of problems

Bradbury, Ephraim, McNair, 2002 (Bradbury, Farel [Member of Council, Resource Use Institute, Royal Tunbridge Wells, United Kindgom.], Owen Ephraim [Member of Council, Resource Use Institute, Royal Tunbridge Wells, United Kindgom.], and Lord Duncan McNair [Unitax Association]. "Basic Income and the Advanced Economy." Proc. of Basic Income European Network, 9th International Congress, Geneva., 2002.)

Here is the solution to the looming retirement pensions crisis of chronic under funding in the face of the demographic time bomb. The procedure bears down on the problem of illegal immigration. **The whole concept and status of "unemployed", vanishes.** You can see the emergence of "no fault" compensation and an end to ruinous blockbuster legal payoffs. **It points the way to solving the IPR/copyright and royalty problems emerging with globalization and the Internet. The Proposition would remove all penalties on work, on adding value and on enterprise, so encouraging employment. It enables the liberation of trade with the developing world. The basic income,** and under the Proposition it is above survival threshold, **gives a measure of economic independence to employees thereby inducing attractive employment conditions.** In return it follows that **employers could benefit by the elimination of much costly and impeding "employment protection" legislation.** In a backwash of all this we ease the logjams plaguing the legal system. **All this would point to a general improvement in the quality of life, better environment, reduced costs and stability within the entire community and, possibly, a natural reduction in working hours and an increase in active leisure.**

Advantage - Women's Rights

A) Uniqueness:

The Current Welfare State is a tool to oppress women

Perez 2004 (Perez, Jose Luis Rey [professor at University P. Comillas of Madrid]. "A NEW GENDER PERSPECTIVE FOR BASIC INCOME? (BASIC INCOME AND SEXUAL MINORITIES)*." The Right to Basic Income. Egalitarian Democracy. Proc. of 10th Congress of the Basic Income Equality Network, Barcelona. 2004.)

Although basic income proposal is not addressed to solve the problems of the differences between genders, in the last years some authors have studied which role it could play in this issue. **Basic income plans a reorganization of the institutions of Welfare State and** doing that**, it is raising the gender discussion, because** in addition to the classical critics to welfare institutions as their ineffectiveness, their slowness, the poverty and unemployment traps, **the feminist authors have pointed out the male chauvinism of the Welfare State. The welfare institutions were designed in accordance with a model that does not include everybody**, a model where the only family option available was the heterosexual marriage**. In this society men had all the power and women were in a secondary place, without the recognition of a full citizenship. In the Welfare State the citizenship was linked to the development of a work valued and paid by the market**, that is, citizenship depended on having a job. The labour market was in this sense the way to obtain social inclusion. **Women were only the wives of workers. They only had access to pensions or to other social rights if their husbands were entitled to them.** As citizenship makes sense in public life, the link between woman/wife and citizenship was not direct (A. McKay and J. Vanevery, 2000, p. 273). For example, the statistics that study the labour market are wedded to male employment patterns (T. Fitzpatrick, 1999, p. 157). In this situation the tasks done by women were not valued but they contributed in the same way as men to the maintenance of that model of society. What men could do out of their houses was possible only because women worked inside. But the political institutions did not recognize that type of work considering that it owned to the private sphere. That false distinction between public and private fields was created to maintain the power of the dominant gender. The care work is heavy too and it has not the salary or recognition as incentives (D. Schoroeder, 2001).

B) Solvency:

A basic income would advance gender equality

Elgarte, 2008 (Elgarte, Julieta Magdalena [Professor of Philosophy, Political Science, and Social Science at the National University of La Plata] . "Basic Income and the Gendered Division of Labour." Basic Income Studies 3.1 (2008))

A basic income has been regarded as a policy that could advance gender justice precisely because of its ability to protect women from the distinct economic risks they face due to the gendered division of labour (Alstott 2001, Parker 1993). Full or partial specialization in unpaid care work puts women at serious financial risk in the (very likely) event of divorce, for no or weak labour market attachment leads to lower earning potential while main responsibility for childcare after divorce amounts to greater financial needs and less time available for paid work. Furthermore, **the consequences of women's more disrupted work-life extend far beyond child-rearing years into old age, for low and/or intermittent earnings lead to meager or no pension and social security entitlements.** By decoupling benefit entitlement from paid work, **a basic income is effectively able to provide life-long income security both to homemakers and part-time or intermittent workers, thus meeting women's distinctive needs regarding income security.** Additionally, as pointed out by Van Parijs (2001), **a livable basic income would substantially improve most women's fallback option from any relationship** (in giving them a modest but sufficient income they can count on no matter what). **This enhanced fallback option due to economic independence would benefit women:** I) **by increasing their ability to exit (or not to enter) undesirable relationships of any sort, thus**

significantly protecting them from domination and its damaging effects (as described by Pettit 2007) **and** II) **by consequently enhancing their voice within relationships (and hence the power to shape them so as to make them more satisfactory).**

C) Impact:

A Basic Income is key to personal autonomy

Plant 2002 (Plant, Raymond. "Can there be a right to a basic income." Proc. of Basic Income European Network, 9th International Congress, Geneva., 2002.)

The first is that **a basic income will increase autonomy in terms of enhancing an individuals' capacity for choice and for living [their]** his or her **life in [their]** his or her **own way** and as we saw in relation to liberty income as the possession of money can increase the choices open to you because the lack of money will mean that you will be legally proscribed from being able to undertake an action. Also as I argued, contrary to the defender of pure negative liberty, the range and quality of choice does have a central bearing on the meaning of liberty. The second point is that **a basic income increases autonomy relative to provision in kind in that in spending the income the purchases will reveal the preferences of the agent rather than that of government and its agencies and**, as I have already argued it does diminish the possible role of discretion in the provision of resources. So if autonomy and agency are central to freedom in that both negative and positive freedom acquire their value and as I argued earlier their intelligibility in relation to the idea of a person as a centre of choice and agency then the generic conditions of agency will determine the content of both negative and positive freedom. Negative freedom defining the forms of unjustified coercion and interference, which would limit autonomy; positive freedom defining those sorts of goods, which are necessary conditions for the achievement of the capacity for agency and autonomy. I have argued that a basic income could be seen as one of these conditions of agency.

Advantage - Protecting the Vulnerable

A) Uniqueness:

Japan's income security program is insufficient

Yamamori, 2014 (Yamamori, Toru [Professor at Doshisha University, Kyoto, Japan]. "The 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake and Basic Income1." *The 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake and Basic Income*. Ed. Yannick Vanderborght and Toru Yamamori., 2014. P. 69-81. Web. <http://www.basicincome.org/bien/pdf/munich2012/Yamamori.pdf>.)

Unfortunately, **Japan's system of income security has been in a state of dysfunction since long before the [2011] earthquake.** Let's take a look at several points in support of this view. To start with, how is security provided for those who, becoming unemployed, are unable to maintain their livelihoods? In Japan benefit payments from unemployment insurance is supposed to function to provide security for the unemployed. However, **in 2009, the ILO reported that among the unemployed a mere 23% receive unemployment benefits**. This figure is higher than China's 16% but significantly lower than Germany's 94%, Frances 80% and even the United States' figure of 41% (ILO [2009]). Three **reasons for this low figures are the short time period for benefits, the fact that only 60% of workers have unemployment insurance and those that are not covered are the most insecure.**

B) Solvency and Impact:

A Basic Income will protect the most vulnerable

Hirano, 2012 (Hirano, Hiroya [faculty of Human Sciences, Saitama Prefectural University]. "The Potential of introducing Basic Income for the "New Public Commons" in Japan: A Road to Associational Welfare State?" *Basic Income Earth Network*. September, 14, 2012. Web. <http://www.basicincome.org/bien/pdf/munich2012/hirano.pdf>.)

Now let me examine some effects of introducing basic income in favour of "New Public Commons". First, needless to say, **basic income can deliver the unconditional social security at the basic level, with protecting the "vulnerable" as a full and equal citizen. The unconditionality and universality of basic income not only prevent people suffering from false bureaucratic discretion, but also guarantee a certain level of stability of people's lives even under unstable economic situation**. It substantially depends on the level of income provided, but it could fully guarantee a right to live2. Because guaranteeing security of people's lives is suitable for their needs which have already indicated above, introducing basic income can be an effective device for fulfilling their needs.

Advantage - The Economy

A) Uniqueness

Japan's the 2nd poorest OECD country

Haraoka, 2016 (Haraoka, Naoyuki [Bachelor of Economics, held multiple positions within varying Economic organizations]. "Increasing Income Inequality - Today Is Different from Past Debates." *Japan Economic Foundation* 35.6 (2016))

Yes**. In talking about income inequality, I believe we need three perspectives. The first is**, like Piketty, **to look at how wealthy people are getting more wealth.** In this perspective, we look at only those people earning high incomes and with large assets. **The second perspective is to look at poor people and analyze how many are suffering from serious poverty and how that poverty is becoming more serious.** The third one is to look at the difference between the rich and the poor by paying attention to Gini coefficients. I think Piketty's analysis is consistent with the first perspective and saying that wealthy people are increasing in capitalist countries and bringing about an unprecedented income inequality at this moment. **What I have been highlighting on Japanese income inequality is the increase in poor people**, which is different from what Piketty is saying. My motivation is based upon a statistical finding mentioned by the OECD that **Japan has the second-highest relative poverty ratio following the US. It is defined as the percentage of the nation whose income is <50% of the median income of the nation. According to "Society at a Glance 2014 Highlights:** JAPAN OECD Social Indicator 2014", **relative poverty in Japan is 16.0%** - the second-highest among major OECD nations. **Though we have remarkably wealthy people in Japan as well, the percentage of those wealthy people is not as high as in the US.**

B) Solvency

A Basic Income will save Japan's economy

Basic Income Earth Network, 2016 (Anonymous. "Basic income as the monetary policy tool for the 21st century." *Basic income will be at the core of monetary policy in the 21st century*. Basic Income Earth Network, 10 May 2016.)

And the obvious outcome, at the very least, is global Japan. This, of course, is not a complete disaster. Japan remains a relatively rich and stable country, even after twenty years of deflation. But **Japan's high level of debt — and particularly government debt — does pose a major concern.** Yes, as a sovereign currency issuer borrowing in its own currency the Japanese government runs no risk of actual default. But slow growth and deflation are stagnationary. And **without growth and inflation, the government will have to raise taxes to cover the deficit,** spiking the punchbowl and **continuing the cycle of debt deflation.** And of course, all of the Bank of Japan's attempts at reigniting inflation and inflating away that debt through complicated monetary operations in financial markets have up until now proven pretty ineffectual. This is where some form of universal basic income comes in: **ultimately, the most direct stimulus for lifting inflation and triggering productive economic activity is putting cash in the people's hands.** What I am suggesting is nothing less than printing money and giving it away to people — as opposed to trying to push it out through the complicated and convoluted transmission mechanism of financial sector lending. **This will** ultimately **become governments' major backstop against debt deflation, as well as the temporary joblessness and economic inequality created by technological acceleration.** Everything else, thus far, has been pushing on a string. And the deflationary pressure is only going to become stronger as efficiency rises and rises.

C) Impact

A Basic Income is key to many freedoms and civil society

Christensen, 2008 (Christensen, Erik [Associate Professor, Aalborg, University, Department of Economics, Politics, and Public Administration]. "A Global Ecological Argument for a Basic Income." The Heretical Political Discourse - a Discourse Analysis of the Danish Debate on Basic Income. Aalborg University Press, 2008. 119-38. Print.)

Why is an Unconditional Basic Income (UBI) desirable? Basic Income can be argued from very different normative perspectives. One type of normative argument, which comes in various forms, is that **basic income may be regarded as a factor in creating real freedom in society. It is a freedom which may, at the same time, be conceived positively (a freedom to) and negatively (a freedom from) because it means that every citizen is guaranteed a certain amount of economic resources.** Another type of normative argument is that **basic income may be regarded as a further development or consolidation of democracy. Basic income may be viewed both as the fulfilment of the social citizenship and as the beginning of an economic citizenship**, and it is not just any right, but **a basic right which is a precondition for the exercise of other rights.** Finally, there is a third type of normative argument for basic income making it an element in a fair redistribution of resources. This view may be interpreted as an extension of a Rawlsian perspective in which the goal is to secure the possibility for equal freedom for all citizens in a national state, but it may also be seen in the global perspective of sustainable development.

Basic Income Stock Issues AC

Observation 1- Inherency

B) Japan's current standard to receive assistance is too strict

Yamamori, 2014 (Yamamori, Toru [Professor at Doshisha University, Kyoto, Japan]. "The 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake and Basic Income1." *The 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake and Basic Income*. Ed. Yannick Vanderborght and Toru Yamamori., 2014. P. 69-81. Web. <http://www.basicincome.org/bien/pdf/munich2012/Yamamori.pdf>.)

The standards above consider the flow of income. However, there is the problem that **during the** actual **review of applications, household assets are considered**. This in itself is a natural outcome in view of the system's intent. However **it's been pointed out that this standard is extreme in Japan. The limit for bank deposits and savings is set at a month and a half's worth of social assistance.**7 Even within the committees of the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare **there have been opinions to the effect that the standard is overly austere.**8 Regarding goods, **ownership of anything that isn't found in over 70% of households in the region is**, just as, in principle ownership of a car is, **unacceptable. The result is that** until **one is unable to receive social assistance until having lost everything. It has been pointed out that the effect of these conditions is that social assistance does not help recipients rebuild lost livelihoods** (attain "independence" in Ministry terms) **and regain conditions in which they would no longer require assistance.** On the other hand, for the most part citizens with low incomes "carry on consuming patterns on par with the average citizen (Kikuchi[2010],p.105) ," taking on loans rather than coming to apply for assistance. Research on international comparisons reveals that Japan's social assistance standard regarding household assets is among the most austere (Uzuhashi[1999]).

Observation 2- Harms

A) Japan's current social assistance system reduces freedoms for recipients

Yamamori, 2014 (Yamamori, Toru [Professor at Doshisha University, Kyoto, Japan]. "The 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake and Basic Income1." *The 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake and Basic Income*. Ed. Yannick Vanderborght and Toru Yamamori., 2014. P. 69-81. Web. <http://www.basicincome.org/bien/pdf/munich2012/Yamamori.pdf>.)

In addition, **social assistance entails such restraint upon freedoms that some observers are of the opinion that citizenship has been taken away from recipients** (Endo[2002]). It has been observed that **these conditions stigmatize social assistance with the creation of boundaries between recipients and low income non-recipients** though they may share similar hardships living at or below the poverty level. **In 2004 the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare changed the method for determining the standard for social assistance eligibility. Rather than using typical household consumption as a standard comparisons were to be made using low income household levels of consumption** (Committee of Experts on the Public Assistance System of the Welfare Bureau in the Social Security Council of the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare[2004]) . The proposals to abolish supplementary payments and lower eligibility standards arise from this new method, the thinking that continues to back these austere proposals continues to this day. In this proposal the comparison is made between consumptions levels of the 10% with the lowest income and the consumption level of recipients of social assistance. However this 10% basically overlaps with the population living below the poverty level set by social assistance standards (Tachibanaki and Urakawa [2006], p.123). **Comparing the people living below poverty level and not receiving social assistance with people that are receiving assistance will, obviously enough, show higher consumption levels among recipients. This tactic is similar to comparing the salaries of minimum wage workers with those working for less than the minimum and then using this comparison to argue for a reduction in the minimum wage, which everyone is easy to see its nonsense.** The fact that the MHLW considers this comparison as the basis for setting the standard suggests that not only is the system not functioning to protect people from poverty, but that the very idea of a system that functions against poverty has died. **We can see that Japan's system for providing social security,** examined for the ability to assist the poverty stricken rebuild their lives, **has been dysfunctional for some time** before the current disaster. Japan's tax and social security system decrease the relative poverty rate among the working population a mere 2.2%, an extremely low figure compared to the OECD average of 11.5%. In France the rate is 19.4%, in England it is 12.5% and even America's rate of 5.2% shows up Japan's social transfer system as ineffectual in this regard (OECD 2007).

B) Currently, there is a high stigma against social assistance in rural areas versus urban areas, this is especially bad for areas affected by the 2011 earthquake.

Yamamori, 2014 (Yamamori, Toru [Professor at Doshisha University, Kyoto, Japan]. "The 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake and Basic Income1." *The 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake and Basic Income*. Ed. Yannick Vanderborght and Toru Yamamori., 2014. P. 69-81. Web. <http://www.basicincome.org/bien/pdf/munich2012/Yamamori.pdf>.)

It has also been pointed out that, while **the percentage of households actually living below the standard for public assistance eligibility in small cities and rural district of less than 50,000 people is higher, the actual number of recipients is higher in the larger cities** (Tachibanaki and Urakawa [2006],p.135). The researchers' hypothesis is that **the feelings of stigma attached social assistance are stronger in rural than in urban areas. The areas most effected by the tsunami and the area within 30 kilometers of the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear plants include**, with the exceptions of a few big cities like Sendai and Ishinomaki**, there many municipalities of less than 100,000 people. Many of these municipalities are the result of recent mergers and dissolutions so that there are**, actually, **combinations of smaller localities of less than 50,000 people.**

C) The traditional gendered division of labour deprives women of many things

Elgarte, 2008 (Elgarte, Julieta Magdalena [Professor of Philosophy, Political Science, and Social Science at the National University of La Plata] . "Basic Income and the Gendered Division of Labour." Basic Income Studies 3.1 (2008))

The so-called "traditional" gendered division of labour - prescribing a specialization in paid "productive" work for men and unpaid "reproductive" work for women- **has been regarded by a number of feminist scholars as the primary cause of women's social and economic inequality** (Okin 1989, Bubeck 1995, Fraser 1996). **Urged by much publicized ideals of femininity and masculinity, and enforced by many social and legal norms, the gendered division of labour gets to mold actual people's lives.** And this is so even today, when so many women have entered the labour market, for the prescription still holds that these women may choose to have a job, but familial responsibilities are still all theirs, a "second shift" for them to perform (Hochschild 1989). So be it as full time homemakers or double shifters, household and care work is still overwhelmingly women's work, which in turn is not without consequence as to the modalities of women's labour market participation, **women being more likely to work part-time and to withdraw temporarily from the work force to accommodate family responsibilities, leading to a less stable and profitable working life. The fact that women effectively bear exclusive** (or main) **responsibility for socially useful yet unpaid and undervalued household and caring work has several adverse consequences for women. The most immediate and apparent is deprivation of a (sufficient and reliable) independent income, which leads to domination while living with a (male) partner, and grave risk of poverty after a breakup or death of partner, especially when children are involved.**

Therefore, I propose the following Plan

The Japanese government should implement a universal basic income for Japanese citizens. Funding and Enforcement is through normal means.

**Normal Means would be the Ministry of Health, Labour, and Welfare*

Observation 3- Solvency

B) Basic Income would solve a myriad of problems

Bradbury, Ephraim, McNair, 2002 (Bradbury, Farel [Member of Council, Resource Use Institute, Royal Tunbridge Wells, United Kindgom.], Owen Ephraim [Member of Council, Resource Use Institute, Royal Tunbridge Wells, United Kindgom.], and Lord Duncan McNair [Unitax Association]. "Basic Income and the Advanced Economy." Proc. of Basic Income European Network, 9th International Congress, Geneva., 2002.)

Here is the solution to the looming retirement pensions crisis of chronic under funding in the face of the demographic time bomb. The procedure bears down on the problem of illegal immigration. **The whole concept and status of "unemployed", vanishes.** You can see the emergence of "no fault" compensation and an end to ruinous blockbuster legal payoffs. **It points the way to solving the IPR/copyright and royalty problems emerging with globalization and the Internet. The Proposition would remove all penalties on work, on adding value and on enterprise, so encouraging employment. It enables the liberation of trade with the developing world. The basic income,** and under the Proposition it is above survival threshold, **gives a measure of economic independence to employees thereby inducing attractive employment conditions.** In return it follows that **employers could benefit by the elimination of much costly and impeding "employment protection" legislation.** In a backwash of all this we ease the logjams plaguing the legal system. **All this would point to a general improvement in the quality of life, better environment, reduced costs and stability within the entire community and, possibly, a natural reduction in working hours and an increase in active leisure.**

C) A basic income would allow for increased democratic participation

Gajewska, 2014 (Gajewska, Katarzyna [PhD, independent scholar, author]. "How Basic Income Will Transform Active Citizenship? A Scenario of Political Participation beyond Delegation." Proc. of 15th International Congress of the Basic Income Earth Network, Montreal, Quebec. 2014. 1-22.)

Standing makes a valuable point by linking the character of democracy to the structure of production and the use of labor. In his articles and book, he analyzes the impact of the growing precariazation of work in developed countries on political participation and choices. Standing observes that **political participation and well-functioning democracy are impeded by two factors** imposed by the precarization of labor: **1) the lack of representation of the interests of this marginalized group and 2) the lack of control over their own time and insufficient time to build a political community.** Standing describes the 'precariatized mind' as being prone to engage in undemanding activities rather than concentrate on one subject. He points to the shrinking of time available for reflection and the discussion of politics within this group, which would be a condition for meaningful participation in the democratic process. He assumes that **the time 'gained' thanks to the increased security conveyed by the provision of a basic income would be used for reflection and debate, which would rebuild the old model of delegation democracy.**6 His vision of a 'politics of paradise' – **an optimistic scenario of democracy in the postindustrial age – combines three elements: the development of associations representing the interests of the precariat, a basic income, and the increased involvement of the precariat in political deliberations, and consequently its participation in associations, parties, and voting.** He envisions that **the introduction of a basic income will enable citizens to build associations** for the precariat **and give them time to engage actively in deliberation, voting, and other political activities.**7 However, he mainly writes about forms of participation associated with a model of democracy based on delegation and the aggregation of interests.

D) A basic income would advance gender equality

Elgarte, 2008 (Elgarte, Julieta Magdalena [Professor of Philosophy, Political Science, and Social Science at the National University of La Plata] . "Basic Income and the Gendered Division of Labour." Basic Income Studies 3.1 (2008))

A basic income has been regarded as a policy that could advance gender justice precisely because of its ability to protect women from the distinct economic risks they face due to the gendered division of labour (Alstott 2001, Parker 1993). Full or partial specialization in unpaid care work puts women at serious financial risk in the (very likely) event of divorce, for no or weak labour market attachment leads to lower earning potential while main responsibility for childcare after divorce amounts to greater financial needs and less time available for paid work. Furthermore, **the consequences of women's more disrupted work-life extend far beyond child-rearing years into old age, for low and/or intermittent earnings lead to meager or no pension and social security entitlements.** By decoupling benefit entitlement from paid work, **a basic income is effectively able to provide life-long income security both to homemakers and part-time or intermittent workers, thus meeting women's distinctive needs regarding income security.** Additionally, as pointed out by Van Parijs (2001), **a livable basic income would substantially improve most women's fallback option from any relationship** (in giving them a modest but sufficient income they can count on no matter what). **This enhanced fallback option due to economic independence would benefit women:** I) **by increasing their ability to exit (or not to enter) undesirable relationships of any sort, thus significantly protecting them from domination and its damaging effects** (as described by Pettit 2007) **and** II) **by consequently enhancing their voice within relationships (and hence the power to shape them so as to make them more satisfactory).**

Extensions

Inherency Extensions

Japan's social safety net is performing very poorly

Yamamori, 2014 (Yamamori, Toru [Professor at Doshisha University, Kyoto, Japan]. "The 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake and Basic Income1." *The 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake and Basic Income*. Ed. Yannick Vanderborght and Toru Yamamori., 2014. P. 69-81. Web. <http://www.basicincome.org/bien/pdf/munich2012/Yamamori.pdf>.)

The first question is answered by looking at the take up rate for which researchers in each country have made estimates. For a long time **the Japanese government** did not make estimates of the take up rate but **made an estimate** available in 2010. According to this estimate, **[that] the take up rate was 15.3% in 2007** (Ministry of Health Labor and Welfare, Social Welfare and War Victims' Relief Bureau [2010]). The government's estimate is consistent with researchers' previous estimates. For example, economist Toshiaki Tachibanaki et al showed a downward trend in take up rates estimating 19.7% with the data from 1995 and 16.3% for 2001 (Tachibanaki, Toshiaki and Kunio Urakawa [2006]) . **A take up rate below 20% means that among all the households that have fallen below the standard, for every ten households not even two of them are receiving social assistance.** Receiving social assistance depends on successfully completing official application forms and even given the true intentions of the system not achieving a take up rate of 100% does not have to be an immediate problem. However, **considering the system as the "last and final safety net" for ensuring "minimum standards of wholesome and cultured living** (the article 25 of the constitution of Japan)" **the fact that the take up rate is less than 20% forces us to say that the social assistance system is not functioning as a safety net**. In international comparisons Japan stands out for it's extremely low take up rate. For example, the system that is the equivalent of Japan's public assistance in the UK has a take up rate of 78-90%.5 Most industrialized countries have rates of over 50% (Hernanz, Malherbet and Pellizzari[2004]).

Harms

Japan's income security program is insufficient

Yamamori, 2014 (Yamamori, Toru [Professor at Doshisha University, Kyoto, Japan]. "The 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake and Basic Income1." *The 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake and Basic Income*. Ed. Yannick Vanderborght and Toru Yamamori., 2014. P. 69-81. Web. <http://www.basicincome.org/bien/pdf/munich2012/Yamamori.pdf>.)

Unfortunately, **Japan's system of income security has been in a state of dysfunction since long before the [2011] earthquake.** Let's take a look at several points in support of this view. To start with, how is security provided for those who, becoming unemployed, are unable to maintain their livelihoods? In Japan benefit payments from unemployment insurance is supposed to function to provide security for the unemployed. However, **in 2009, the ILO reported that among the unemployed a mere 23% receive unemployment benefits**. This figure is higher than China's 16% but significantly lower than Germany's 94%, Frances 80% and even the United States' figure of 41% (ILO [2009]). Three **reasons for this low figures are the short time period for benefits, the fact that only 60% of workers have unemployment insurance and those that are not covered are the most insecure.**

Household income is on a global decline

Haraoka, 2016 (Haraoka, Naoyuki [Bachelor of Economics, held multiple positions within varying Economic organizations]. "Increasing Income Inequality - Today Is Different from Past Debates." *Japan Economic Foundation* 35.6 (2016))

According to McKinsey Global Institute's report issued in July 2016 titled "Poorer than Their Parents? A New Perspective on Income Inequality", **between 2005 and 2014 some 65-70% of all households among the 25 highest-income countries saw either stagnancy or a decline in their income, whereas only 2% of those households suffered from such between 1993 and 2005.** Even when looking at their disposable income after tax and provision of social welfare, between 2005 and 2014 some 20-25% of the households in these countries suffered from stagnant or declining income. **MGI's research** on the personal nature of the standard of living also discovered that people would be happier to feel that they were wealthier than their parents had been rather than having a standard of living closer to that of their contemporary wealthy friends. **This** again **indicates how a lack of growth could provoke serious social discontent.**

Japan's the 2nd poorest OECD country

Haraoka, 2016 (Haraoka, Naoyuki [Bachelor of Economics, held multiple positions within varying Economic organizations]. "Increasing Income Inequality - Today Is Different from Past Debates." *Japan Economic Foundation* 35.6 (2016))

Yes**. In talking about income inequality, I believe we need three perspectives. The first is**, like Piketty, **to look at how wealthy people are getting more wealth.** In this perspective, we look at only those people earning high incomes and with large assets. **The second perspective is to look at poor people and analyze how many are suffering from serious poverty and how that poverty is becoming more serious.** The third one is to look at the difference between the rich and the poor by paying attention to Gini coefficients. I think Piketty's analysis is consistent with the first perspective and saying that wealthy people are increasing in capitalist countries and bringing about an unprecedented income inequality at this moment. **What I have been highlighting on Japanese income inequality is the increase in poor people**, which is different from what Piketty is saying. My motivation is based upon a statistical finding mentioned by the OECD that **Japan has the second-highest relative poverty ratio following the US. It is defined as the percentage of the nation whose income is <50% of the median income of the nation. According to "Society at a Glance 2014 Highlights:** JAPAN OECD Social Indicator 2014", **relative poverty in Japan is 16.0%** - the second-highest among major OECD nations. **Though we have remarkably wealthy people in Japan as well, the percentage of those wealthy people is not as high as in the US.**

The Current Welfare State is a tool to oppress women

Perez 2004 (Perez, Jose Luis Rey [professor at University P. Comillas of Madrid]. "A NEW GENDER PERSPECTIVE FOR BASIC INCOME? (BASIC INCOME AND SEXUAL MINORITIES)*." The Right to Basic Income. Egalitarian Democracy. Proc. of 10th Congress of the Basic Income Equality Network, Barcelona. 2004.)

Although basic income proposal is not addressed to solve the problems of the differences between genders, in the last years some authors have studied which role it could play in this issue. **Basic income plans a reorganization of the institutions of Welfare State and** doing that**, it is raising the gender discussion, because** in addition to the classical critics to welfare institutions as their ineffectiveness, their slowness, the poverty and unemployment traps, **the feminist authors have pointed out the male chauvinism of the Welfare State. The welfare institutions were designed in accordance with a model that does not include everybody**, a model where the only family option available was the heterosexual marriage**. In this society men had all the power and women were in a secondary place, without the recognition of a full citizenship. In the Welfare State the citizenship was linked to the development of a work valued and paid by the market**, that is, citizenship depended on having a job. The labour market was in this sense the way to obtain social inclusion. **Women were only the wives of workers. They only had access to pensions or to other social rights if their husbands were entitled to them.** As citizenship makes sense in public life, the link between woman/wife and citizenship was not direct (A. McKay and J. Vanevery, 2000, p. 273). For example, the statistics that study the labour market are wedded to male employment patterns (T. Fitzpatrick, 1999, p. 157). In this situation the tasks done by women were not valued but they contributed in the same way as men to the maintenance of that model of society. What men could do out of their houses was possible only because women worked inside. But the political institutions did not recognize that type of work considering that it owned to the private sphere. That false distinction between public and private fields was created to maintain the power of the dominant gender. The care work is heavy too and it has not the salary or recognition as incentives (D. Schoroeder, 2001).

Solvency Extensions

A Basic Income will save Japan's economy

Basic Income Earth Network, 2016 (Anonymous. "Basic income as the monetary policy tool for the 21st century." *Basic income will be at the core of monetary policy in the 21st century*. Basic Income Earth Network, 10 May 2016.)

And the obvious outcome, at the very least, is global Japan. This, of course, is not a complete disaster. Japan remains a relatively rich and stable country, even after twenty years of deflation. But **Japan's high level of debt — and particularly government debt — does pose a major concern.** Yes, as a sovereign currency issuer borrowing in its own currency the Japanese government runs no risk of actual default. But slow growth and deflation are stagnationary. And **without growth and inflation, the government will have to raise taxes to cover the deficit,** spiking the punchbowl and **continuing the cycle of debt deflation.** And of course, all of the Bank of Japan's attempts at reigniting inflation and inflating away that debt through complicated monetary operations in financial markets have up until now proven pretty ineffectual. This is where some form of universal basic income comes in: **ultimately, the most direct stimulus for lifting inflation and triggering productive economic activity is putting cash in the people's hands.** What I am suggesting is nothing less than printing money and giving it away to people — as opposed to trying to push it out through the complicated and convoluted transmission mechanism of financial sector lending. **This will** ultimately **become governments' major backstop against debt deflation, as well as the temporary joblessness and economic inequality created by technological acceleration.** Everything else, thus far, has been pushing on a string. And the deflationary pressure is only going to become stronger as efficiency rises and rises.

A Basic Income is key to many freedoms and civil society

Christensen, 2008 (Christensen, Erik [Associate Professor, Aalborg, University, Department of Economics, Politics, and Public Administration]. "A Global Ecological Argument for a Basic Income." The Heretical Political Discourse - a Discourse Analysis of the Danish Debate on Basic Income. Aalborg University Press, 2008. 119-38. Print.)

Why is an Unconditional Basic Income (UBI) desirable? Basic Income can be argued from very different normative perspectives. One type of normative argument, which comes in various forms, is that **basic income may be regarded as a factor in creating real freedom in society. It is a freedom which may, at the same time, be conceived positively (a freedom to) and negatively (a freedom from) because it means that every citizen is guaranteed a certain amount of economic resources.** Another type of normative argument is that **basic income may be regarded as a further development or consolidation of democracy. Basic income may be viewed both as the fulfilment of the social citizenship and as the beginning of an economic citizenship**, and it is not just any right, but **a basic right which is a precondition for the exercise of other rights.** Finally, there is a third type of normative argument for basic income making it an element in a fair redistribution of resources. This view may be interpreted as an extension of a Rawlsian perspective in which the goal is to secure the possibility for equal freedom for all citizens in a national state, but it may also be seen in the global perspective of sustainable development.

BI promotes women's voices and increases gender equality

Katada, 2010 (Katada Kaori [Assistant Professor, Saitama Prefectural University] (2010) Basic income and feminist citizenship (s): In terms of de-commodification and defamilialization. In: 13th international congress of the basic income earth network , Sao Paulo, Brazil, June 30–July 2 2010, pp. 1–10. Available at: http://www.sinteseeventos.com.br/bien/pt/ papers/BIEN2010KATADA.pdf.)

Pettit, for example, argues that **BI presents women with the freedom to escape from, or choose not to participate in, non-ideal relationships by promoting their economic independence**. In this way, **BI expands a woman's "voice" and power in such relationships and offers protection from the damage of violence and authority.** This means that a woman's negotiating power/bargaining power rise in, for example, relationships with a husband in the household, or with an employer in the workplace (Pettit 2007). Relatedly, Guy Standing argued that **BI promotes gender equality in the labor market, and enables males to assume more household duties, thus weakening the gender division of roles and labor by enhancing female negotiating power and encouraging more male part-time work** (Standing 1992). However, as discussed later, many feminists doubt this "happy relationship" between BI and the gender division.

A Basic Income will protect the most vulnerable

Hirano, 2012 (Hirano, Hiroya [faculty of Human Sciences, Saitama Prefectural University]. "The Potential of introducing Basic Income for the "New Public Commons" in Japan: A Road to Associational Welfare State?" *Basic Income Earth Network*. September, 14, 2012. Web. <http://www.basicincome.org/bien/pdf/munich2012/hirano.pdf>.)

Now let me examine some effects of introducing basic income in favour of "New Public Commons". First, needless to say, **basic income can deliver the unconditional social security at the basic level, with protecting the "vulnerable" as a full and equal citizen. The unconditionality and universality of basic income not only prevent people suffering from false bureaucratic discretion, but also guarantee a certain level of stability of people's lives even under unstable economic situation**. It substantially depends on the level of income provided, but it could fully guarantee a right to live2. Because guaranteeing security of people's lives is suitable for their needs which have already indicated above, introducing basic income can be an effective device for fulfilling their needs.

A Basic Income is key to personal autonomy

Plant 2002 (Plant, Raymond. "Can there be a right to a basic income." Proc. of Basic Income European Network, 9th International Congress, Geneva., 2002.)

The first is that **a basic income will increase autonomy in terms of enhancing an individuals' capacity for choice and for living [their]** his or her **life in [their]** his or her **own way** and as we saw in relation to liberty income as the possession of money can increase the choices open to you because the lack of money will mean that you will be legally proscribed from being able to undertake an action. Also as I argued, contrary to the defender of pure negative liberty, the range and quality of choice does have a central bearing on the meaning of liberty. The second point is that **a basic income increases autonomy relative to provision in kind in that in spending the income the purchases will reveal the preferences of the agent rather than that of government and its agencies and**, as I have already argued it does diminish the possible role of discretion in the provision of resources. So if autonomy and agency are central to freedom in that both negative and positive freedom acquire their value and as I argued earlier their intelligibility in relation to the idea of a person as a centre of choice and agency then the generic conditions of agency will determine the content of both negative and positive freedom. Negative freedom defining the forms of unjustified coercion and interference, which would limit autonomy; positive freedom defining those sorts of goods, which are necessary conditions for the achievement of the capacity for agency and autonomy. I have argued that a basic income could be seen as one of these conditions of agency.

A Basic Income would increase financial autonomy for women

Perez 2004 (Perez, Jose Luis Rey [professor at University P. Comillas of Madrid]. "A NEW GENDER PERSPECTIVE FOR BASIC INCOME? (BASIC INCOME AND SEXUAL MINORITIES)*." The Right to Basic Income. Egalitarian Democracy. Proc. of 10th Congress of the Basic Income Equality Network, Barcelona. 2004.)

The consequences of basic income for women have been studied by a group of authors with different conclusions. Some of them argue that it would have positive consequences. They pointed out, firstly, **that basic income would increase the autonomy and the economical independence of women**. As **nowadays women have less economical autonomy than men, a basic income would increase the power of women; that quantity of money would liberate them from male domination because with a basic income the worker status loses its meaning and that would give force to** people, as **women**, that are excluded of that status (H. Parker, 1993, p. 61). In this sense, Pisarello talks about basic income as a gender power that fights against the male power (G. Pisarello, 2001-2002, p. 101). Secondly, **basic income recognizes the value of activities that are not valued by the market**; these works, as **the care work, are developed by women and they are important for our societies. Basic income is a recognition of those tasks and it could contribute to a better distribution of work among genders.** Thirdly, **the basic income is** not a familiar institution but **individual. Each man or woman perceives the basic income independently** from they live single or accompanied. With the family structure of the institutions of Welfare State, many women are obliged to leave their jobs to achieve that their husbands maintain their right to some programs. **Being individual, basic income is fixed and it does not depend on the salary the husband or the wife brings to the home.** Parker has pointed out that **basic income would make better the position of women with part time jobs, especially those ones with lowest salaries and it would help to obtain the equality of salaries between men and women** (H. Parker, 1993, pp. 47-60). In this sense, it has been pointed out that women are the main ones who suffer the stigmatization of the institutions of Welfare State; if basic income helps to reduce the stigmatization it would improve the position of women (L. Pautassi, 1995, p. 271; T. Fitzpatrick, 1999, p. 166).

BI provides economic independence for women

Katada, 2010 (Katada Kaori [Assistant Professor, Saitama Prefectural University] (2010) Basic income and feminist citizenship (s): In terms of de-commodification and defamilialization. In: 13th international congress of the basic income earth network , Sao Paulo, Brazil, June 30–July 2 2010, pp. 1–10. Available at: http://www.sinteseeventos.com.br/bien/pt/papers/BIEN2010KATADA.pdf.)

This argument first originates in the fact that BI is an individual unit**. Under the current guaranteed income regime, women's entitlements often assist women's dependence on a husband, against the background of the modern family model and occupational segregation. By contrast, feminists** have traditionally **asserted that individualized entitlements are indispensable to the exercise of women's socio-political rights.** Unlike the current guaranteed income regime**, because BI is an individual unit, it can become a women's autonomous guaranteed income that does not require a husband as a route** (Lister 1990). For that reason, women with no direct economic income can experience a substantial benefit in the area of economic independence (Walter 1989). Furthermore**, BI can offer an opportunity to escape domestic violence to a woman stuck in an abusive marital relationship due to economic circumstance.** Secondly, the argument that BI promotes women's economic independence also originates in the fact that it is unconditional. **Due to the gender division of roles and labor, women are on the one hand excluded from, and marginalized within, the labor market—often becoming workers in unstable and low-income unskilled or part-time positions—while on the other hand they often perform unpaid labor in the household.** In these circumstances, finding work is often intermittent due to child-rearing duties, and the maintenance and growth of the quality of personal capital in labor becomes comparatively difficult. In contrast with the current guaranteed income regime**, BI views labor on an equal level, and does not tie entitlements to wage labor. Thus, BI can better satisfy the guaranteed income needs specific to women who are in unstable standing in the labor market while performing unpaid labor at home.** In this way BI avoids the economic risk women often face as a result of the gender division of roles and labor, and promotes women's economic independence (Alstott 2001; Parker 1993).

Answers to Economic Issues

Basic Income is key to a balanced and effective national budget

Bradbury, Ephraim, McNair, 2002 (Bradbury, Farel [Member of Council, Resource Use Instute, Royal Tunbridge Wells, United Kindgom.], Owen Ephraim [Member of Council, Resource Use Institute, Royal Tunbridge Wells, United Kindgom.], and Lord Duncan McNair [Unitax Association]. "Basic Income and the Advanced Economy." Proc. of Basic Income European Network, 9th International Congress, Geneva., 2002.)

The procedures of the Resource Economics Proposition **add a dynamism and responsiveness to economies which are inconceivable by methods prevailing at the time of this Congress. The strengthening and harmonisation of democratic forces within society are also achieved. The equity, transparency and simplicity of the proposals allow governments to take a longer view in major programmes of health, education and, security and environment from a controlled inflation base and a fully balanced budget.** This longer view is made possible by removing contentious aspects from each phase of reform. **The** Resource Economics **Proposition provides a toolbox for easier, more accurate, simpler and more effective economic operation: regardless of the not inconsiderable social benefits.** More information on the REP can be accessed through: <www.rui.co.uk>.

Automating the workforce is significantly reducing the number of available jobs

Kammerer, 2016 (Kammerer, Peter [senior writer]. "Get ready for robots that'll eat your lunch; Peter Kammerer says some societies are already going beyond training and education to test the feasibility of a basic income." *South China Morning Post*. 30 Aug. 2016.)

Bank cashiers have long known about the trend and it is gradually moving into supermarkets and shops. There's a restaurant in Mong Kok that has four robots, including a receptionist and a dress-wearing waitress, while **there is a hotel in Japan that is almost fully automated. Production lines have had robotic arms sorting and packing for years and motorised machines zip around warehouses the world over,** shaving valuable seconds off internet-placed orders to get goods off shelves and prepare them for shipping. One company in Australia is trying them out to deliver pizzas and some media companies used software during the Rio Olympic Games to write medal tallies and event reports, freeing up journalists for in-depth assignments. **There's nothing new about innovation taking jobs**; it was what drove English textile workers known as Luddites to smash weaving machines with sledgehammers 200 years ago. Society came through the industrial revolution wealthier and better developed, though, and there's no reason to suggest robots will lead to anything else. But **with artificial intelligence and machines that can do our jobs will come a seismic shift in the work environment. Some jobs will survive, others won't and a lot of people will have to adapt through training and education. There's every possibility that a world dominated by robots will mean fewer jobs.** What will those without a steady income do for money? One idea is a guaranteed basic income that a government would give all citizens, no matter what their job status or level of wealth. There are a number of terms for the concept, but one gaining traction is universal basic income.

Non-permanent employees and taxation policies are reasons for the growing poor in Japan

Haraoka, 2016 (Haraoka, Naoyuki [Bachelor of Economics, held multiple positions within varying Economic organizations]. "Increasing Income Inequality - Today Is Different from Past Debates." *Japan Economic Foundation* 35.6 (2016))

Yes, but there are other reasons as well. **The most important reason is continuing deflation. For the** so-called **two lost decades, our economic growth has been very low and thus we have not been able to expect an increase in wages.** Secondly, as you mentioned, **Japanese business firms have increased the weight of their non-permanent employees as the recession has continued and become more serious than ever. The percentage of non-permanent employees to total employees excluding executives reached 37.1% in the second quarter of 2016, compared with 20% in 1990,** according to a Labor Force Survey by the Statistics Bureau of the Japanese Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications. The third reason is that **the Japanese taxation and social welfare systems have not been so useful in correcting income disparities.** In comparison with the welfare states of the European nations, our social welfare system such as pensions, healthcare and caregiving is far behind them and has not been working well in helping poor people get out of poverty. Fourthly, **the income tax rate on high income earners is getting lowered to a little more than 40%, while it was 70-80% in the past.** The expected income redistribution function of income tax, namely taking more tax from wealthy people and distributing it among the poor, does not work well today. Fifthly, **our minimum wage is too low and lower than those in Europe.** For all these reasons, I believe, the number of poor people is now increasing in Japan.

Non-regular workers are the cause of increased income inequality

Perez 2004 (Perez, Jose Luis Rey [professor at University P. Comillas of Madrid]. "A NEW GENDER PERSPECTIVE FOR BASIC INCOME? (BASIC INCOME AND SEXUAL MINORITIES)*." The Right to Basic Income. Egalitarian Democracy. Proc. of 10th Congress of the Basic Income Equality Network, Barcelona. 2004.)

Instead, **the growing proportion of non-regular workers is a key explanation of increased inequality in market income in Japan. Non-regular workers include part-time and dispatched workers** (employed by temporary worker agencies) **and temporary and short-term contract employees.**19 **On an hourly basis, part-time workers - who account for about two-thirds of non-regular workers - were paid only 40% as much as full-time workers in 2003**.20 Consequently, **the increase in the share of non-regular workers** from 19% of employees in 1994 to 30% in 2005 (Figure 2) **has significantly raised the overall level of inequality in Japan.**21 Another study found that the wage differential between regular and non- regular workers has risen since the early 1990s (Higuchi and the Policy Research Institute, MOF, 2003). Moreover, **the level of inequality among non-regular workers is relatively high** – with a Gini coefficient of 48 in 2002 compared to 28 for regular workers - **and has been increasing. Part-time workers earn on average only 40% as much per hour as full-time workers,** a gap which appears too large to be explained by productivity differences. There appears to be a significant degree of wage discrimination, as the 60% gap between the average hourly wages of full and part-time workers is unlikely to be matched by the difference in productivity. In addition to the equity implications of greater labour market dualism, non-regular workers receive less on-the-job training, thus limiting their human capital and Japan's growth potential.