Answers To Basic Income AC

Inherency

Basic Income is inevitable, there is no real barrier to the 1AC

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.)

So **why is it inevitable? Take a look at Japan, and** now **the eurozone: economies where consumer price deflation has become an ongoing** and entrenched **reality.** This occurrence has been married to economic stagnation and continued dips into recession. **In Japan** — which has been in the trap for over two decades — **debt levels in the economy have remained high. The debt isn't being inflated away as it would under a more "normal" rate of growth and inflation.** And even in the countries that have avoided outright deflationary spirals, like the UK and the United States, inflation has been very low. **The most major reason**, I am coming to believe**, is rising efficiency and the growing superabundance of stuff.** Cars are becoming more fuel efficient. Homes are becoming more fuel efficient. Vast quantities of solar energy and fracked oil are coming online. China's growing economy continues to pump out vast quantities of consumer goods. **And** it's not just this**: people are better educated than ever before, and equipped with incredibly powerful productivity resources like laptops, iPads and smartphones.** Information and media has fallen to an essentially free price. **If price inflation is a function of the growth of the money supply against growth in the total amount of goods and services produced, then it is very clear why deflation and lowflation have become a problem in the developed world, even with central banks struggling to push out money to reinflate the credit bubble that burst in 2008**.

Solvency

A basic income will not automatically give a voice to the already disadvantaged

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.)

Although **a BI** may empower workers by giving them an exit option, it **does not automatically imply a voice** for the precariat, an increasing proportion of the population.21 **A BI does not** seem to **prevent the fact that such aggregative forms of representation as associations to represent** the precariat's **interests,** as Standing envisions, **will lose significance**. First, the organizing of the precariat is more difficult than of the salariat due to the dispersal of labor and changes in workplaces. The representation of this group's interests needs to take place outside of the workplace. **The decentralization of its bargaining system implies an increase in operating costs for trade unions because of a huge number of temporary work contracts. It is also difficult to formulate collective interests and organize strikes or other activities for this part of the labor force.** Furthermore, the main challenge for precarious workers is the enforcement and execution of law. For example, lawyers in Spain have begun to offer union services and individual forms of representation creating provider-customer relations. However, there is a cost burden to this form of interest representation called 'adversial legalism'22 and it requires a well-functioning judiciary system.

A basic income is not enough to solve poverty

Dolack, 2016 (Dolack, Pete [journalist]. "A Basic Income is Less than Meets the Eye." *Systemic Disorder*. 1, Dec. 2016. < https://systemicdisorder.wordpress.com/2016/12/01/basic-income-is-a-mirage/>)

Simply instituting a basic income, even if it were fiscally possible, in itself **doesn't address the structural causes of poverty.** Mr. Sanger writes: "While lack of financial resources is of course a primary aspect of poverty, **simply providing more money won't eliminate poverty alone. Social exclusion, inadequate access to education, public goods, opportunities, networks, lack of political influence and many other factors contribute to a persistent of poverty. Systemic racial, gender, class, and ability-based discrimination have resulted in higher rates and a persistent of poverty among women**, racialized Canadians, Aboriginal peoples, **differentially abled and among those whose families were poor."**

A basic income will cause a decrease in quality paying jobs and thus not solve poverty

Sharkey, 2016(Sharkey, Jackie. “Guaranteed Minimum Income Could be Problematic, Warns Poverty Advocate.” *CBC News*. 16, Mar 2016 < http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/kitchener-waterloo/guaranteed-minimum-income-could-be-problematic-warns-poverty-advocate-1.3493805>.)

Though [basic income] the idea **is being trumpeted as a way to eliminate poverty,** Trudy Beaulne, **executive director of Social Development Centre Waterloo Region, said unless governments are careful, it might not be as effective as proponents think. "If we have a program that assures everyone a basic income level, that might create a disconnect between the incentive to create decent jobs for people,"** Beaulne told CBC Kitchener-Waterloo. **"Employers may decide, 'Well, we don't need good business practices, we don't need to create well-paid positions, we don't need to create secure jobs because people will be taken care of.'"** Beaulne said **she also has concerns about the program's potential cost. "It's a very, very cost-heavy program to run. All of the calculations that have been prepared, that we've seen, are very large numbers.** And we wouldn't want it to be discarded for that reason." She said to be successful, government would have to raise taxes, in particular corporate taxes, to pay for it.

A basic income would ultimately harm those that are of the greatest need

Beattie, 2016 (Beattie, Alan. “A Simple Basic Income Delivers Little Benefit to Complex Lives.” *Financial Times.* 3, June 2016. < https://www.ft.com/content/6d328764-28d2-11e6-8ba3-cdd781d02d89>.)

Eliminating a multiplicity of welfare programmes may reduce bureaucracy. But it **will** also **require either politically improbable rises in taxation or a severe cut in the amount of help given to the badly off. In both cases, a pure basic income will remove support from groups in society in particular need of help. Modelling shows that, if low-income households are not to lose out relative to the current arrangements, overall taxation will have to rise sharply.** In the UK, if tax-free allowances are kept, this would probably mean pushing the combined tax and national insurance rate to 50 per cent across the range of incomes, compared with a basic combined rate of 32 per cent now. Of course, some would welcome lower payments instead, even at the cost of making the poor much poorer. The libertarian-leftist alliance in favour of a basic income would soon fall apart when it became clear that the Milton Friedmanites wanted to use it to turn the economy into a small-state paradise and the social democrats to create a Scandinavian welfare wonderland. Even if rises in taxes or cuts in benefits were politically manageable**, a BI might well result in a reduction in labour supply if households decide to cut back on hours of work in response to higher non-wage income. This would depress the amount of tax revenue available for redistribution, requiring yet higher tax rates. Reintroducing work requirements to prevent this would mean resurrecting the apparatus of coercion that the BI is supposed to eliminate**. Moreover, **the payments that most societies make to particular groups — the long-term disabled, parents, the elderly — would either have to be ditched or separately added at extra expense.** Some associated bureaucracy such as fitness-to-work requirements on the disabled would also have to be retained.

Economy Arguments

Universal basic income is an economic destabilizer and should therefore be avoided

Winningham, 2017 (Winningham, Ellis. "Universal Basic Income: An Economic." *Ellis Winningham*. 26 July 2016. Web. 04 Feb. 2017.)

Returning now to the **UBI**, we can understand with a little more thought about the concept, that it **is not an automatic stabilizer. While it does increase aggregate demand, it is not a stabilizer, because it provides a guaranteed payment to everyone regardless of their income level. For a UBI to act as an automatic stabilizer, the amount provided would have to be progressive with the poorest receiving more than the richest. Because of the guarantee of equal payments regardless of the person's income level and the inflationary potential of a standalone UBI, it is**, in fact, the antithesis of an automatic stabilizer; it is **an economic destabilizer.** For these reasons and those mentioned in my article yesterday, I cannot support a standalone UBI as a solution for any economy. A federal Job Guarantee, on the other hand, is an automatic stabilizer and is superior to the stabilization effects provided by welfare, food stamps and unemployment insurance. This is not to say that I would eliminate such programs, but rather, only that a Job Guarantee is superior, because the federal deficit automatically increases and decreases at just the right amount to guarantee a situation of full employment. Furthermore, a Job Guarantee is an inflation disciplinary mechanism, superior to the current specious NAIRU concept of disciplining inflation by casting workers into a state of involuntary unemployment which nations employ today.

A basic income would put strain on state funds

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.)

In this section, I will present the transformations of the structure of the state and market which may result from the introduction of basic income because of its potential impact on citizenship norms. **Redistribution imposed by a basic income may lead to the further limitation of state provisions due to lower financial resources.** This outflow of financial resources from the state apparatus has three main causes: **first, a basic income will need to be financed from resources currently allocated to state functioning and public services provision; second, the costs of labor will increase because workers' bargaining power will give them opportunities to require higher wages than in the current system; third, the pool of employment and consumption-related taxes will shrink because of the lower number of workforce in employment.** It is one of the arguments in favor of a BI that it would lower the incentives to be employed, which would limit the extent of production and change the way production is organized. Instead of formal production, which tends to be more natural-resources-intensive, the realm of informal production will thrive. This development is particularly attractive to those concerned with environmental protection.44

Japan's declining birth rate makes economic growth impossible, the affirmative does not solve the root cause of the problem

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, of course, economic growth would be good for poverty reduction. However, **the Japanese have chosen to have fewer children and I think this would mean giving up economic growth. Today in Japan, we have been seeing a decrease in the number of births and this has resulted in labor shortages and also stagnant consumption growth among the young and middle aged. Such stagnation due to aging and the decline in the birth rate will mean that the nation has chosen no growth.** So I believe it would be difficult to achieve 2% economic growth.

Population ageing is the cause of income inequality, plan can't solve

Jones, 2007 (Jones, Randall S. (2007), "Income Inequality, Poverty and Social Spending in Japan", OECD Economics Department Working Papers, No. 556, OECD Publishing, Paris. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/177754708811)

Population ageing has contributed to higher inequality in market income through three channels. First, the elderly have less income than the working-age population**. The increase in the share of elderly from 10% of the Japanese population in the mid-1980s to 17% in 2000 raised the level of inequality because of larger between-group income differences.** Second**, the level of inequality of market income among those over age 65 is higher than for the 18 to 65 age group, reflecting the fact that a smaller portion of the over 65 age group is in the labour force.** Indeed, the Gini coefficient for the over 65 age group in Japan in the mid-1980s was 47.3 compared to 30.9 for the working-age population (Table 1). The rising share of elderly in the population thus boosted the level of inequality of market income for the total population. **Third, the degree of market income inequality among the elderly in Japan has risen sharply, as shown by the 15.6 percentage-point increase** in the Gini coefficient **for the over 65 age group since the mid-1980s**, moving it toward the OECD average. **The rising trend is partly explained by changes in living arrangements: the proportion of the elderly living alone or with a spouse rose from 32% in 1985 to 47% in 2000, increasing the number of households with older persons reporting low incomes.**

Feminism Neg

In the long term Basic Income will harm women more than help them gain economic autonomy

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.)

However, there are other authors who do not agree with these positives consequences of basic income for women. These authors think that **the only thing that basic income would obtain would be to perpetuate women in housekeeping and care work**, without managing to acquire an authentic and true citizenship (I. Robeyns, 2001). **As basic income makes possible choosing between a paid and an unpaid job, the male bias of our societies would force a lot of women to choose the second one. In consequence, basic income would contribute to make bigger the problem** we want to solve. And if **as consequence of basic income more flexible jobs are created and with worse salaries, probably all these works would be chosen by women, so basic income might reinforce the sexual division of labour and labour market segregation** (T. Fitzpatrick, 1999, pp. 167-168). I. Robeyns has pointed out that it is impossible to say which type of effects basic income could have over women in general. The consequences depend on different circumstances (I. Robeyns, 2000). Women with low earnings capacities and weak labour market attachment would gain from basic income; they usually are housewives and single mothers. Obviously, basic income would not be the solution to all their problems. **Women with high earnings capacities and a strong labour market attachment**, that is, women with career, autonomous, without children, with high salaries in short term they wouldn't obtain anything from a basic income, but Robeyns thinks that **in long term** they **might suffer an increase in discrimination when they try to obtain a job because "when these women are young, it will be difficult for an employer to distinguish whether one of these women belongs to this category, or to the category of the women with high earning capacities but lower labour market attachment"** (Robeyns, 2000, p. 132). There would be a third group composed by women with high earnings capacities but a weak labour market attachment; these women would gain from a basic income because they are students, young mothers taking parental leave or women taking care of dependant elderly or ill persons. With a basic income they would be independent economically or at least they could choose more freely a part time job. However, "**it is possible that a basic income can be used as a tool to exercise social or individual pressure on these women to withdraw from the labour market**" (Robeyns, 2000, p. 132). In last place, there is the group of women with a strong labour market attachment and low earning generating capacities. These women are obliged to work to keep the welfare of themselves and their families. In short term, they would gain from basic income, but in long term they could be cut off the labour market losing the low earning capacities they have.

Turns

A Black Market exists around welfare recipients in Japan

Brasor, 2011 (Brasor, Philip. "Welfare System Not Faring Well." *The Japan Times.* 25, Sept 2011. <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2011/09/25/national/media-national/welfare-system-not-faring-well/#.WJqWqn_3hds>)

An underground economy has built up around these men. **Yakuza organize illegal gambling dens with free food and drink to attract welfare recipients. And since these men also receive free medical care, doctors ply them with drugs they don't necessarily need and then charge it all to the public health insurance scheme. The recipients turn around and sell the drugs on the black market.**

Once on welfare, the will to find work vanishes and the individual does not contribute to society

Brasor, 2011 (Brasor, Philip. "Welfare System Not Faring Well." *The Japan Times.* 25, Sept 2011. <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2011/09/25/national/media-national/welfare-system-not-faring-well/#.WJqWqn_3hds>)

The local government with the heaviest burden is Osaka, where 17 percent of the city budget goes to welfare payments. **NHK found that a substantial portion of the recipients are able-bodied males between the ages of 20 and 60**. In the past, long-term welfare recipients belonged to one of three categories: elderly people, single mothers and the chronically ill or handicapped. The remaining recipients were people who were temporarily out of work, meaning their ranks were constantly changing. The number of unemployed in Japan hovers just under the 5 million mark, and as one case worker explained, **most of the new additions to the welfare rolls are men who were employed** as haken (contract workers), non-regular employees who could be laid off easily. After thousands of these workers lost their jobs in the financial meltdown of 2008, the Ministry of Health Labor and Welfare issued a directive to local governments to ease up on the requirements for receiving welfare**. In principle, people who can work don't qualify, but in order to provide relief to this large group of newly unemployed workers, the government said that they now did. Many are still on welfare**, a situation that has as much to do with a change in social psychology as it does with continuing economic stagnation. At one point in the documentary, NHK visits the apartment of a man in his early 50s who used to work for a real-estate company. He receives ¥126,700 a month, at the end of which he has ¥40,000 left over. Though it's much less than what he received when he was working, he says he's "comfortable," which is why he has no desire to look for a job. With each additional example NHK presented, **it became clear that these men were not merely lazy. They have no desire "to be in society."** One reason is the unstable haken lifestyle. As one welfare recipient in his 20s pointed out, he doesn't go to employment offices because he's afraid of "being asked to move away" from his wife and newborn daughter. As long as he can survive on welfare, he'll stay with it. But the problem goes deeper. **One Osaka caseworker says that most of the 60 men assigned to him have "lost the will to work," and that has led to self-isolation.** In this regard, the strategy of keeping people off welfare by threatening them with social ostracism backfires: These men prefer to be ostracized.

Poverty DA

A) Uniqueness: The Japanese economy is set to improve in 2017

Nagata, 2017 (Nagata, Kazuaki. "Economists see growth on horizon for 2017." *The Japan Times*. N.p., 4 Jan. 2017. Web. <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2017/01/04/business/economy-business/japans-economy-tipped-grow-2017/#.WJo3GH_3hds>.)

Despite a number of unclear factors surrounding the global economic situation, including U.S. President-elect Donald Trump's fiscal and trade policies, **Japan will likely see its economy grow this year** on the back of the weak yen and government steps to stimulate sluggish consumption, **economists have said. They predict that 2017 will be a rather positive year for the nation's economy,** as the government looks to craft more measures to help boost consumption. These moves are likely to include lowering social insurance premiums, creating scholarships and raising wages for nursery school teachers. The yen's weaker trend against the dollar will also help boost Japanese exporters' revenues, the economists noted. On the subject of trade, however, they say Japan will need a rethink of its strategy. With the apparent death of the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement — once heralded as the new global standard — Japan must now take the leadership reins to coordinate a new multinational free trade deal. In order to bolster its export numbers, such as deal could come in the form of the China-backed Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP), they added. **Last month, the government revised upward its assessment of the country's economy for the first time since March 2015.** Currently, the economy is seeing a moderate recovery, and the outlook for household spending and exports is positive, it said. Economic research bodies also say that the prospects for this year are relatively bright. **The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development projects 1 percent growth in real terms while Bank of America Merrill Lynch estimates growth at a 1.4 percent clip and the Japan Research Institute predicts 0.9 percent.** Experts say these predictions, however, are quite high given Japan's potential growth rate stands at some 0.2 to 0.3 percent.

B) Link- A basic income would put strain on state funds and ruin the economy

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.)

In this section, I will present the transformations of the structure of the state and market which may result from the introduction of basic income because of its potential impact on citizenship norms. **Redistribution imposed by a basic income may lead to the further limitation of state provisions due to lower financial resources.** This outflow of financial resources from the state apparatus has three main causes: **first, a basic income will need to be financed from resources currently allocated to state functioning and public services provision; second, the costs of labor will increase because workers' bargaining power will give them opportunities to require higher wages than in the current system; third, the pool of employment and consumption-related taxes will shrink because of the lower number of workforce in employment.** It is one of the arguments in favor of a BI that it would lower the incentives to be employed, which would limit the extent of production and change the way production is organized. Instead of formal production, which tends to be more natural-resources-intensive, the realm of informal production will thrive. This development is particularly attractive to those concerned with environmental protection.44

C) Impact- An economic downturn in Japan will impact children the most and raise poverty levels

McCurry, 2017 (McCurry, Justin. "Japan's rising child poverty exposes true cost of two decades of economic decline." *The Guardian*. Guardian News and Media, 16 Jan. 2017.

Web. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/jan/17/japans-rising-child-poverty-exposes-truth-behind-two-decades-of-economic-decline>.)

Their **[The children's] plight is a rarely seen consequence of Japan's struggle to steer its economy out of the doldrums after more than two decades of stagnation and deflation.** Four years after Shinzo Abe became prime minister for a second time, campaigners say the rise in poverty is evidence that his grand plan for growth – known as Abenomics – has failed to deliver for many families. **Japan now has some of the worst wealth inequality and highest rates of child poverty in the developed world**, according to a Unicef report released in April that ranked Japan 34th out of 41 industrialised countries. **Of the 3.5 million children who are eligible for state support, only 200,000 actually receive any** – a low take-up rate that campaigners blame on the stigma attached to living on social security. **"The poverty rate that we see today demonstrates just how difficult life has become for children in Japan over the last 25 years,"** said Yasushi Aoto, chairman of the Japan Association of Child Poverty and Education Support Organisations. **"The poverty issue in Japan is completely neglected. We are a long way behind countries in the west in the way we tackle it."**

Poverty DA Extensions

Uniqueness Extensions

Japan's economy is projected to slightly grow in 2017

Obe, 2016 (Obe, Mitsuru. "Japan projects 1.5% economic growth in fiscal 2017." *MarketWatch*. 19 Dec. 2016. Web. <http://www.marketwatch.com/story/japan-projects-15-economic-growth-in-fiscal-2017-2016-12-19>.)

Japan's economy is projected to grow 1.5% in inflation-adjusted terms in the fiscal year starting in April, thanks to a gradual uptick in the global economy and a recent weakening of the yen against the dollar, the government said Tuesday. **The projection shows the economy growing at above 1% for the third straight year in fiscal 2017 and picking up speed from fiscal 2016.** The government estimates 2016 growth at 1.3%. **While the forecast expansion is unspectacular** and shows little improvement in domestic consumption, **it still points to increasing stability in the economy** as Prime Minister Shinzo Abe tries to strengthen growth.

The Bank of Japan has an optimistic outlook for economic growth

Harding, 2017 (Harding, Robin. "Bank of Japan raises growth outlook." *Financial Times*. 20 Dec. 2016. Web. <https://www.ft.com/content/718994aa-c662-11e6-8f29-9445cac8966f>.)

The Bank of Japan kept monetary policy on hold and **turned optimistic on the growth outlook** as a slide in the yen sharply improves the outlook for Japan in 2017**. Japan's economy is "likely to turn to a moderate expansion" with rising domestic demand, large-scale fiscal stimulus and growing exports,** the central bank said. Its comments highlight the dramatic turnround from September, when despairing analysts said the BoJ was out of options to stimulate the economy, to widespread optimism after the election in November of Donald Trump as president of the US.

Link Extensions

Universal basic income is an economic destabilizer and should therefore be avoided

Winningham, 2017 (Winningham, Ellis. "Universal Basic Income: An Economic." *Ellis Winningham*. 26 July 2016. Web. 04 Feb. 2017.)

Returning now to the **UBI**, we can understand with a little more thought about the concept, that it **is not an automatic stabilizer. While it does increase aggregate demand, it is not a stabilizer, because it provides a guaranteed payment to everyone regardless of their income level. For a UBI to act as an automatic stabilizer, the amount provided would have to be progressive with the poorest receiving more than the richest. Because of the guarantee of equal payments regardless of the person's income level and the inflationary potential of a standalone UBI, it is**, in fact, the antithesis of an automatic stabilizer; it is **an economic destabilizer.** For these reasons and those mentioned in my article yesterday, I cannot support a standalone UBI as a solution for any economy. A federal Job Guarantee, on the other hand, is an automatic stabilizer and is superior to the stabilization effects provided by welfare, food stamps and unemployment insurance. This is not to say that I would eliminate such programs, but rather, only that a Job Guarantee is superior, because the federal deficit automatically increases and decreases at just the right amount to guarantee a situation of full employment. Furthermore, a Job Guarantee is an inflation disciplinary mechanism, superior to the current specious NAIRU concept of disciplining inflation by casting workers into a state of involuntary unemployment which nations employ today.

Impact Extensions

Child poverty in Japan is very high for working families

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.)

Widespread poverty among single parents results in a high incidence of poverty among children in Japan. Indeed, **the rate of child poverty was 14.3% in 2000**, compared with an OECD average of 12.2%. **Given the high cost of schooling and private tutoring institutes, children in poor families are at risk of receiving an inadequate education,** thus **tending to reduce the growth potential and perpetuating poverty across generations.** The most recent PISA tests of student performance show increased stratification of the results **for Japan**. In contrast to other OECD countries, **child poverty is concentrated in working families; 49% of child poverty is in households with at least two earners and another 49% in households with one earner.** Only 2% of child poverty is in households with no earners, in contrast to an OECD average of 32%. This suggests relatively little scope to reduce child poverty by boosting employment, which would be highly effective in other OECD countries. Instead, in-work benefits for working parents, together with a reduction in the dualism in employment conditions, appear to be the key.

Once in poverty children are stuck in a cycle of poverty, one that lasts generations

Aoki, 2017 (Aoki, Mizuho [MD, PhD]. "Children in Japan struggle to break out of poverty cycle." *The Japan Times*. N.p., 4 Jan. 2017. Web. <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2017/01/04/national/social-issues/children-japan-struggle-break-poverty-cycle/#.WJpB8H_3hds>.)

The cycle of poverty over generations is a growing issue in Japan. Children in financially strapped families tend to have low academic achievement and schooling, and hence a low lifetime income, analysts say. According to the Health, Labor and Welfare Ministry, the **relative poverty rate** — the percentage of children living under the poverty line — **has increased** from 10.9 percent in **1985 to 16.3 percent in 2012. The figure translates into roughly 1 in 6 children.** The poverty line is taken as half the median household income of the total population. In 2012, Japan's poverty line stood at ¥1.22 million annual income per person. For a household with a single parent with two children, the line was roughly at ¥2.07 million, or about ¥170,000 a month.

Poverty is linked to health, educational, and economic problems

Galea, 2016 (Galea, Sandro. "Income and Health, Part 2-the Problem of Poverty | | Boston University." *School of Public Health*. N.p., 11 Dec. 2016. Web. <https://www.bu.edu/sph/2016/12/11/income-and-health-part-2-the-problem-of-poverty/>.)

There is little doubt that poverty is inextricably linked to health. Over the past 15 years, life expectancy in the United States has increased for middle- and upper-income Americans. However, top earners have gained relatively little ground against the median. This suggests that **wealth**, for all its benefits, **makes little difference in improving health past a certain basic threshold of well-being. In sharp contrast, less-advantaged** Americans **have seen little or no life expectancy increase, lagging ever-further behind the rest of the population. This difference in life expectancy is explained by a broad range of differences in the lives of those living in poverty compared to those who are not.** I have written before about how **the**

assets that less-advantaged populations often lack—education, health insurance, an advantageous living environment—shape health. Education, for example, **is an enormously consequential determinant of well-being.** Abundant work has shown that **education is closely tied to life expectancy and quality of life**, with college graduates living at least five years longer than those who do not graduate high school. **Lack of educational attainment also drives the risk of disease—both chronic and communicable—and injury**. Further, the obesity epidemic disproportionately affects America's less-advantaged populations. Other examples abound. **Driven largely by a lack of affordable, nutritious food, and a wealth of cheap, calorie-rich, nutrient-poor food,** this crisis has fueled rates of diabetes, heart disease, and other obesity-related conditions in impoverished communities. **Those living in poverty are also more likely to smoke, less likely to breathe clean air, and are subject to all the daily stressors—and attendant mental health problems—of economic insecurity. Another reason to focus on those living in poverty is that** (in addition to the causal link between poverty and health) **they are the most likely to face health expenditures that reduce their ability to meet life's other needs, whether school fees, food, rent, or heat.** The epidemic of medical bankruptcy in the US is a salient indicator of this impact. And our inability to create a health system that protects people from health-related financial ruin leads to losses of well-being in other domains, and a vicious cycle of poverty and poor health.

Welfare State DA

A) Uniqueness:

Japan's citizens have an obligation to work according to the constitution

Brasor, 2011 (Brasor, Philip. "Welfare System Not Faring Well." *The Japan Times.* 25, Sept 2011. <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2011/09/25/national/media-national/welfare-system-not-faring-well/#.WJqWqn_3hds>

In spirit, **Japan**'s public welfare system is closer to America's than it is to Europe's. **Citizens do not have a right to be supported by the government.** Some claim they do and as proof point to Article 25 of the Constitution, which states that all people have the right to "maintain the minimum standards of wholesome and cultured living." But **Article 27 states that people have** the right "and **the obligation" to work. What this means in practice is that a person who applies for welfare must pass a rigorous screening process** that can include personal disclosures, such as whether or not the applicant has access to support from a relative or even a lover. The applicant has to conform to certain notions of impoverishment. I've heard that in the 1960s and 70s, potential welfare recipients would hide "inessential" possessions like color TVs when a case worker visited.

B) Link

A basic income would make everyone reliant on the state and result in an increased governmental control over our daily lives

Bailey, 2016 (Bailey, Tom. "The Basic Income is a Dangerous Idea that Gives the State Power to Control Every Penny that Citizens Spend." *Independent.* 15, May 2016. http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/the-basic-income-is-a-dangerous-idea-that-gives-the-state-power-to-control-every-penny-their-a7030391.html.)

With UBI, every citizen will rely, at least in part, on his or her income being handed out by the state. Rather than there existing pockets of state dependency, **all of us will become** (albeit to differing degrees) **dependent.** The state will now have a role in topping up everyone's pay packet. **Instead of the state playing a role within society and the economy**, where private action is inadequate (for schooling and healthcare, for example), **and as a safety net of last resort** (as the welfare state was originally conceived,) **it becomes an manager and provider for all. It will become a constant fixture of the financial lives of us all, a sort of lifetime employer.** The implications are huge. At a time where the way we live our lives and our consumption habits have become the constant, nagging concern of the state – from minimum prices for alcohol to the 'sugar tax' – **there's the worrying potential for a basic income to be used to enforce a change in people's spending habits and lifestyle.**

C) Impact

Welfare states cause a lot of problems

Rogan, 2013 (Rogan, Tom. "Welfare States are Unfair States." *The Week*. 7, Jan, 2013. <http://theweek.com/articles/469009/welfare-states-are-unfair-states>)

Ultimately, **welfare states actually don't help people in need.** Instead, they perpetuate empty, short-term remedies for social problems that require far deeper attention. **In establishing a governing premise that removes consequential risk from calculations of conduct, welfare states weaken the incentives for initiative and sacrifice the social benefits that are born of personal responsibility.** And welfare states represent the epitome of crony capitalism — they exchange redistributive patronage for political power. In contrast to some of my fellow conservatives, when it comes to welfare states, I actually know what I'm talking about. I spent 24 of my 26 years living in a welfare state: The U.K. By studying the U.K.'s example, we can see at least three good reasons why an American welfare state would be bad for all of us. The first: **Welfare states encourage economic inactivity. By offering citizens a cradle-to-grave system of unconditional government support, welfare states disincentivize personal responsibility.** When the benefits of not working are conceived to outweigh the benefits of working, major problems arise. Consider this 2012 BBC story on a standard, long term U.K. benefits recipient. The report (probably inadvertently) illustrates how, **far from encouraging a return to the workplace, welfare states actually encourage unemployment.** In the U.K., unemployment benefits cover housing, cable TV, an effective bar allowance, and cell phone contracts. Not a bad day's reward for a non-existent day's work! The impact of the absence of means testing access for benefits can further be seen in the explosion of U.S. disability claims over the past 10 years. **The tragedy of this absurdity is not just its drain on taxpayers, but also the welfare system's willful destruction of social mobility**. As Professor Casey Mulligan points out, incentivizing unemployment serves to sustain unemployment. This isn't complex. Clearly, where a condition of relative but perpetual comfort is offered in return for social disengagement, then the attraction of social engagement is obviously and seriously degraded. Reason number two: **Welfare states punish success. Big government expenditures require heavy taxation, and where taxes are higher, disposable income is reduced.** Although many American liberals peddle the notion that the "rich" alone can pay for an American welfare state, this argument is fundamentally disingenuous. Consider taxation levels in the U.K. In the next British tax year, earnings over $52,000 will be taxed at 40 percent. Earnings over $241,000 will be taxed at 45 percent. Combined with the U.K.'s payroll tax, this will mean that a 2013-14 U.K. income of $250,000 would owe a $100,300 tax bill, while an $100,000 income would incur $30,500 in taxes. Staggering as they are though, these figures don't even take into account the U.K.'s high fuel tax, 20 percent sales tax, or local taxes! Oh, and forget deductions; the U.K. has far less tolerance for those than the U.S. tax system. So why such wealth extraction? Simple. U.K. government expenditures have had to grow dramatically to cope with welfare demands. The British government is now trying to restrain public finances, but until massive reform of the welfare state is undertaken, these efforts are likely to be in vain. Until then, the middle class will have to pay an ever more exorbitant price. This is an important example for America. Third reason: **Welfare states cause social fractures. In redistributing earned income to those who choose not to work, welfare states are** not only **unfair**, they are intractably unfair. In the millions of government workers who require the welfare state for their continued employment, a powerful political class emerges. Thus, **when economically disengaged beneficiaries of the welfare state are combined with these government workers, the result is politicians who have a major interest in the ballooning welfare state. Social interest is rendered irrelevant in this client-patron relationship**. Then, in the space of understandable public anger over "freeloading" and its intractable political guardians, extremists find openings. Consider the rise of the far right BNP, a political party which, ludicrously, blames U.K. immigrants for the growth of the state. Furthermore**, by blurring the lines between the job-seeking unemployed, those who cannot work, and the professional unemployed, welfare states fuel a stratification of class biases.** This feeds a dissection of social groups shaped by perceptions of social identity rather than by common affinity. Not good at all. Certainly, opposition to an American welfare state needs to be vested in facts rather than fear. Yes, conservatives need to offer more solutions to advance economic and social mobility in our poorest communities. And yes, we must accept that denying medical care to those who cannot help themselves is devoid of moral justice. However, an American welfare state won't provide a solution to these challenges. The European example is clear. If Americans want a system in which the apparatus of government and its arms of taxation grow

undaunted, then establishing a welfare state is the way to go. But don't be misled by false prophets. A welfare state will also bring a society in which personal responsibility and economic freedom rot at the altar of big government.

Welfare State DA Extensions

Link Extensions

A basic income would decrease pay and increase governmental control

Bailey, 2016 (Bailey, Tom. "The Basic Income is a Dangerous Idea that Gives the State Power to Control Every Penny that Citizens Spend." *Independent.* 15, May 2016. http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/the-basic-income-is-a-dangerous-idea-that-gives-the-state-power-to-control-every-penny-their-a7030391.html.)

UBI would not eliminate this problem but **extend** it: **the primary role of the state** will be **to top up its citizens' pay packets and pensions.** Many economists observe that when it comes to wages, the floor price is often determined by the cost of the workers' ability to survive from day-to-day. That is, that they must pay at least the bare minimum in order for the workers to eek out some sort of shelter, and acquire at least some sustenance in order for them to return to work the next day. Not anymore: **with a basic income, the state will guarantee everyone's basic ability to survive from one day to the next. And so work, however skilled, will potentially pay less.**

Impact Extensions

Increased social benefits spending increases the negative consequences of the welfare state

Geiger, 2012 (Geiger, Ben B. "The Positive and Negative Consequences of the Welfare State." *Inequalities.* 25, Oct 2012. < https://inequalitiesblog.wordpress.com/2012/10/25/the-positive-and-negative-consequences-of-the-welfare-state/>)

What's really interesting here is **that countries that spend more money on social benefits perceive MORE negative consequences of the welfare state** – but substantially more positive consequences too (Table 4 in the paper). As the authors say, **"a higher spending welfare state promotes its social legitimacy by stimulating in people the idea that it is doing a good job, more than that it arouses their worries about its effect on the economy and morals."** For me, this suggests that trying to combat negative perceptions of benefits is not the best way of trying to get support for higher spending; rather, the aim is to focus on what social benefits can achieve when they're done well.

The welfare state results in a decline in democratic involvement

Swartz, et al, 2009 (Swartz, Teresa T; Blackstone, Amy; Uggen, Christopher; McLaughlin, Heather. "Welfare and Citizenship: The Effects of Government Assistance on Young Adults' Civic Participation." *HHS.* 1, Oct 2009. Doi: 10.1111/j.1533-8525.2009.01154.x < https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2771575/>)

The development and recent transformation of the welfare state may play an important if unexplored and potentially paradoxical role in these developments and dynamics. On the one hand, liberal democratic nations, including the United States, have developed welfare state measures to ensure the provision of minimal living standards needed for the populace to function as citizens and workers. By reducing the extremes of inequality, the welfare state is intended to protect its citizens and promote the possibilities for active engagement. On the other hand, **some critics** from very divergent perspectives **explain the current decline in democratic involvement by contending that the welfare state curtails active citizenship and promotes passive dependency** (Mead 1986, 1997; Murray 1984; Habermas 1991). Indeed, some **empirical evidence suggests that welfare recipients are a particularly politically quiescent group compared to others, despite their large stake in government policies** (Verba, Scholzman and Brady 1995). Others argue that it is not the receipt of government assistance itself that cultivates "passivity" but that state policies can either promote or discourage civic participation depending on the program design and implementation. From this perspective, stigmatizing programs such as welfare are thought to have deleterious effects, while programs that valorize citizenship, such as veteran's benefits or Social Security, are thought to have mobilizing effects (Mettler and Soss 2004; Soss 1999, 2000; Pierson 1993; Mettler 2005; Campbell 2003).

The welfare state incentives people not to work and allow governments to adopt policies that fail

Caplan, 2016 (Caplan, Bryan. "12 Reasons to Oppose the Welfare State." *Foundation for Economic Education.* 7, March 2016. < https://fee.org/articles/12-reasons-to-oppose-the-welfare-state/>.)

Social programs - universal or means-tested - **give people perverse incentives, discouraging work, planning, and self-insurance. The programs give recipients very bad incentives; the taxes required to fund the programs give everyone moderately bad incentives. The more "generous" the programs, the worse the collateral damage.** As a result, even programs carefully targeted to help the truly poor often fail a cost-benefit test. And while libertarians need not favor every government act that passes the cost-benefit test, they should at least oppose every government act that fails it. "Helping people" sounds good; complaining about

"perverse incentives" sounds bad. Since humans focus on how policies sound, rather than what they actually achieve, **governments have a built-in tendency to adopt and preserve social programs that fail a cost-benefit test.** Upshot: We should view even seemingly promising social programs with a skeptical eye.

Women's Rights DA

A) Uniqueness: Women in Japan are beginning to stand up and become involved in politics

Hu, 2017 (Hu, Elise. "Women Are Making Their Voices Heard In Male-Dominated Japanese Politics." *NPR*. 13 Jan. 2017. < http://www.npr.org/sections/parallels/2017/01/13/509611952/women-are-making-their-voices-heard-in-male-dominated-japanese-politics>.)

For the first time in Japanese history three women of different political persuasions **are in positions that could be stepping stones to the prime minister's office. It's especially notable in Japan, where women's labor force participation remains among the lowest among developed nations, and gender roles are traditionally-defined.** "Women have not really been coached or mentored or encouraged to take on leadership roles," Kyoto University diplomacy professor Nancy Snow explains. "Also, women aren't allowed [culturally] to often show ambition, to sort of telegraph that." Lack of childcare options in Japan — and the cultural pressure for women to take on household duties — means it's the moms here who drop out of work. In official registries, married women to this day are listed, along with children, as part of a man's household. If they're single, part of their parents' household. "I think it really goes back to the social hierarchy, the way that [Japan has] been for decades," Snow says. **Women make up 43 percent of the labor force in Japan — with more than half of them in part-time jobs.** That's far below the 57 percent of working women in the U.S. **Their roles in leadership are scant. But in the political realm, signs point to change. Tokyo is now led by its first-ever female governor — Yuriko Koike. Japan's new defense minister, Tomomi Inada, is only the second woman to ever hold the role. And the opposition Democratic Party in Tokyo is for the first time led by a woman.** She's a former journalist named Renho Murata.

B) Link: A basic income would harm women's continuing fight for independence by increasing discrimination

Elgarte, 2006 (Elgarte, Julieta Magdalena. "Good for women? Advantages and risks of a basic income from a gender perspective." Proc. of 11th BIEN Congress, Cape Town, South Africa. N.p.: n.p., 2006. < http://www.basicincome.org/bien/pdf/JulietaElgartefullpaper.pdf>.)

As I have argued so far, a UBI has the power to meet women's most pressing needs. By doing it unconditionally, it would also enhance women's bargaining power relative to partners, employers and public officers, protecting them from being forced into abusive and demeaning relationships out of fear of material deprivation and thereby providing them some power to shape their relationships into fairer ones. However, **some fear that a UBI could in more subtle ways be detrimental to women's interests. A key conjecture behind these fears is that more women than men would take advantage of their UBI to reduce or interrupt labour market participation in order to care for dependent children or adults** (Fitzpatrick 1999: 167). **A UBI would thus lead to a reinforcement of the gendered division of labour.** 9 The conjecture that more women than men would reduce their attachment to the labour market is plausible in the light of evidence from some opinion surveys, negative income tax experiments (henceforth, NIT) and gender-blind career interruption schemes, such as the Belgian career interruption premia. These premia are paid by the government to male or female employees choosing to temporarily interrupt their labour market participation or to temporarily reduce their working hours. As noted by Robeyns (2000) drawing on Szabo's (1997) findings, "85 percent of the employees making use of this system are women. The motivation for taking a career interruption equally differs: women leave their job to raise small children, whereas men try to start an independent business, or use it as a transitional stage to early retirement" (p. 123). Evidence from NIT experiments is also useful to speculate on the likely effects of a UBI scheme, given the similarity between both types of policy. The analysis of the four NIT experiments carried out in the United States and Canada from 1968 to 1980 shows that while

under a NIT scheme married men would work for pay tenuously less or about as much as they do now (their decline in labour supply ranging from 0 to 9 depending on the st udy and data), the labour market participation of single mothers would decrease slightly more, and married women would reduce the hours spent on paid work by around 20 or 30 percent (Widerquist, 2005). However, some may be reluctant to see any harm in women's more often choosing to be homemakers or to "lighten the 'double shift' at certain periods of their lives" by going part-time (Van Parijs 2001a: 20), especially with a UBI protecting them from poverty and securing a workable exit option and the enhanced bargaining power that goes with it. "Good for them, one may conclude: this shows that a basic income would be more valuable for women than for men." (Van Parijs 2001b: 127). If anything -the argument goes- a UBI would enlarge women's options, should we not be glad that they thereby have options they obvi ously value and want to choose? Why would this be a bad consequence of the introduction of a UBI rather than a good one? Robeyns (2001a) points at one possible answer to this question**: if under a UBI scheme more women than men reduced their labour market participation in order to take up an even** 10 **larger share of domestic responsibilities, negative spill over effects on other women can be expected. Effectively, this would bring about an increase in statistical discrimination that would work to the detriment of those women who remain committed to their careers**, **in making it even more difficult for them to get hired or promoted, as they would be seen by potential employers** – more than they already are**- as statistically less reliable than equally qualified men.** Not knowing how committed an individual woman may be, it is rational for employers to fear she will display the traits that are typical of the classes to which she belongs (interalia , of the class of female workers). If a UBI scheme makes women more likely than they presently are to reduce their labour market participation to raise small children (while leaving men's tendency not to do it virtually unchanged), this will in turn boost employers propensity to regard women as less committed workers than men, as workers, that is, less worth investing in. 7 Why bother to hire, train or promote a woman (who may subsequently take a parental l eave or go part-time to raise a family) when we could equally hire a man (whose wife will probably raise his children for him)? Intuitively, statistical discrimination of this kind looks patently unfair to career oriented women who are uninterested in (or prepared to renounce to) having a family, for these women will be discriminated against even though they are exhypothesi equally suitable for the job than similarly qualified men 8 .

D) Impact: Women are needed in politics to ensure that a multitude of concerns are addressed

Mollmann, 2015 (Mollmann, Marianne. "Why women in politics matter." *Human Rights Watch*. N.p., 17 Apr. 2015. Web. <https://www.hrw.org/news/2011/06/24/why-women-politics-matter>.)

First, **the more closely government represents the composition of society as a whole, the more stable its policies are likely to be. This means that it is not just important to include women, but also to ensure broad representation**. For example, Rwanda tops the charts for the percentage of women in parliament, with 56 percent, but most are from the same ethnic group, which some commentators warn could lead to instability.

Second, **a mixed-gender cabinet or parliament should, all other things being equal, tend to address more of the concerns that apply exclusively or disproportionately to women.** Of course, female politicians don't always bring up issues that are important to women, and male politicians don't always exclude these concerns. But research has shown that non-feminist women are more likely than non-feminist male colleagues to work on policies that affect women.

Women’s Rights DA Extensions

Uniqueness Extensions

Women are gaining political ground in Japan

Rich, 2016 (Rich, Motoko. "Opposition Figure's Rise could Pave the way for Female Leader's in Japan." *The New York Times*. 14, Sept. 2016. < https://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/15/world/asia/japan-women-renho-murata.html?_r=0>.)

Yet if, as widely predicted, **Renho Murata**, a member of the upper house of Parliament, prevails in a leadership contest on Thursday and **becomes the first woman to lead the opposition Democratic Party**, she will be the third woman to assume a high-profile political post in Japan in less than two months. **In July, Tokyo elected its first female governor, Yuriko Koike, and last month, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe appointed Japan's second female defense minister, Tomomi Inada**. (Ms. Koike was the first.) Both are members of Mr. Abe's conservative party, the Liberal Democrats. A victory by Ms. Murata, 48, a former model and television news announcer who has served in Parliament for more than a decade, would hardly usher in an era of female dominance. Women still represent less than 15 percent of all seats in Parliament, and Mr. Abe was forced to concede last year that his government would not achieve its goal of placing women in 30 percent of management roles by 2020. Still, **with three women in positions that could be steppingstones to the prime minister's office, it would be a noteworthy moment for Japan**, which is far behind nations like South Korea, Taiwan, Britain and Germany, which have elected female leaders, and the United States, which has its first female major party candidate for president.

The shift in the status of women in politics has begun in Japan

Dalton and Miura, 2016 (Dalton, Emma; Miura, Mari. "Japan's politics is opening up to women, but don't expect a feminist revolution yet." *The Huffington Post*. 11, Nov. 2016. < http://www.huffingtonpost.com/the-conversation-global/japans-politics-is-openin_b_12918866.html>)

Three women have in recent months been appointed to politically powerful positions in Japan. But even as seeing women in positions of power becomes less unusual in the country, gender parity is a long way off. Renho Murata (commonly known as **Renho) is the new leader of the opposition Democratic Party**; **Koike Yuriko beat her two male competitors to become Tokyo's first female governor; and Japan's Ministry of Defense is**, for only the second time, being led by a woman — **Inada Tomomi** (Koike Yuriko was defense minister from July to August 2007). **The appointment of the these women to leadership positions suggests a shift in the role and status of women in Japanese politics, and in society more generally. And some have wondered if the surge means that a woman prime minister could be around the corner.** But this is no revolution.

Link Extensions

A basic income would harm gender equality

Dolack, 2016 (Dolack, Pete [journalist]. "A Basic Income is Less than Meets the Eye." *Systemic Disorder*. 1, Dec. 2016. < https://systemicdisorder.wordpress.com/2016/12/01/basic-income-is-a-mirage/>)

It is also argued that a basic income could disproportionally affect women. **The feminist economist Barbara Bergmann countered advocates of basic income who argue that such payments would enable parents to stay home with young children by pointing out that women disproportionally are the stay-at-home parents, to the detriment of their long-term earning potential. Thus a basic income would make women more dependent, not less, she wrote:** "Many if not most employers have come to see women as likely to be continuous labor force participants, not inevitably destined to leave the work force, and therefore as people worth training, worth putting into jobs leading to promotion, worth considering for promotion. This kind of progress would be reversed if a higher proportion of women withdrew from the labor force when their first child was born. For this reason**, the full-blown implementation of Basic Income schemes in the near future should not appeal to those for whom gender equality is an important goal."**

Impact Extensions

Women being involved in politics benefits everyone

Jarroud, 2015 (Jarroud, Marianela. "Everyone Benefits from More Women in Power." *Inter Press Service*. Inter Press Service News, 2 Mar. 2015. Web. <http://www.ipsnews.net/2015/03/everyone-benefits-from-more-women-in-power/>.)

Women's participation in decision-making is highly beneficial and their role in designing and applying public policies has a positive impact on people's lives, women leaders and experts from around the world stressed at a high-level meeting in the capital of Chile. "It is not about men against women, but **there is evidence to show through research that when you have more women in public decision-making, you get policies that benefit women, children and families in general,"** Winnie Byanyima, executive director of Oxfam International, told IPS. **"So women tend**, when they're in parliament, for example, **to promote women's rights legislation.** When women are in sufficient numbers in parliaments they also promote children's rights and **they tend to speak up more for the interests of communities, local communities, because of their close involvement in community life,**" she added. Byanyima, from Uganda, is one of the more than 60 women leaders and government officials who met Friday Feb. 27 and Saturday Feb. 28 at the meeting "Women in power and decision-making: Building a different world", organised by U.N. Women and the Chilean government in Santiago.

Women involvement in politics is more likely to create direct change, in Japan it could raise the GDP by 12.5%

Young, 2016 (Young, Gwen K. "Why we need more women leaders." *CNN*. Cable News Network, 31 Jan. 2016. Web. <http://www.cnn.com/2016/07/29/opinions/women-rising-benefits-society-young/>.)

The evidence shows that female leaders typically have more compassion and empathy, and a more open and inclusive negotiation style. This is not, of course, necessarily true of all women -- there are many different leadership styles. That said, **modern ideas of transformative leadership are more in line with qualities women generally share: empathy, inclusiveness and an open negotiation style.** In developing nations, **having women at the table impacts how policy resources are spent** -- either through gender budgeting efforts or simply, such as in the case of climate change, showing how women in the developing world experience issues differently than men. **The involvement of women in the climate movement**, for example**, has led to better policy making and spurred solutions like clean solar cookstoves. Women's leadership also helps drive direct change in structural policies including parental leave, child care and pay.** As the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development has noted, "Women typically invest a higher proportion of their earnings in their families and communities than men." USAID, meanwhile, says that when "10% more girls go to school, a country's GDP increases on average by 3%," adding that when women have the same amount of land as men, "there is over 10% increase in crop yields." It's not just developing countries that can benefit from increasing female participation in the workforce, including in leadership positions. **A 2014 Goldman Sachs report argued that Japan could boost its absolute GDP by 12.5% if female workforce participation rose to match that as men.** And **in Canada, one study on the impact of women in public service showed that women have had a clear impact on "policy, programs and operations such as in fisheries, the automotive industry, national security, natural resources, the environment, science, human resources and international relations." This impact arises not only from the inclusion of women's perspectives, but also from leadership styles that are open, collaborative and less hierarchical.**