

Aff Case Defense

ADV 1: Right to subsistence

The present social security programs never work. For example, the LDP's neoliberal reforms have disabled public assistance.

Hayato Kobayashi, Associate professor at Social Welfare Department, Nihon Fukushi University, 2014

Although recipients and citizen groups opposed the adjustment policy and sought improvements in the administration of public assistance, the neoliberal structural reforms advanced by the Koizumi administration mainly targeted social security as an area for cost-cutting. As a result of Koizumi's reforms agenda, the pressure for the financial retrenchment of public assistance became stronger (Yoshinaga 2006: 160–8). The Special Committee on Public Assistance Institutions concluded that public assistance reform should introduce “self-reliance support” and a market-based logic. (location 2136)

(The future of the public assistance reform in Japan: Workfare versus basic income?

Basic income in Japan: Prospects for a radical idea in a transforming welfare state. Eds. Yannick Vanderborght & Toru Yamamori. NY: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2014. Kindle Ed.)

BI saves victims of natural disasters such as earthquakes.

Professor Toru Yamamori of Doshisha University, 2014

Various reasons make income guarantees as a form of BI desirable in the light of the conditions in the disaster zone. First and foremost, it is crucial to get cash into the hands of victims as quickly as possible. Unconditionality is a great asset for efficiency in implementation. Making distinctions on the basis of different levels of damage in disaster zones requires victims to go through time- and effort-consuming processes. Second, further burdening the damaged municipalities in the disaster-stricken area must be avoided. Another great advantage of unconditionality is that it minimizes the amount of work demanded of these municipalities. Third, though the majority of disaster victims may agree that the amount and eligibility of cash benefits should be determined by the extent of damages suffered, as the actual review process divides people into recipients and nonrecipients, there is great potential for community disruption. Another advantage of unconditionality is that it avoids community strife caused by envy. Fourth, there are several reasons for the individual basis of income guarantees. A National Governors' Association statement proposes that benefits go to the heads of households (National Governors' Association 2011). However, if the head of the household is missing, the family must go to family court for a death certificate and this process takes over a year (Inoue 2008). Emotionally, I imagine that there may be many families that will want to wait for over a year to seek an official court

ruling on the death of a loved one. Regardless, the application process under existing law would not seem to provide immediate relief for bereaved families.¹³ Another problem is that opinions differ within households with regard to evacuating away from radiation risks to ensure the health and safety of children. Income guarantees should not have the effect of increasing dependency and unduly effect family decision making by increasing dependence on the head of the household. In contrast, evacuees who have decided to take their children away from the risks of radiation in spite of the opinions of the family head should not be denied benefits. Social policy research from a feminist perspective has repeatedly shown that benefits are not necessarily distributed equally among family members, and benefits provided on a household basis tend to strengthen subordination to family heads. The conditions of the current disaster will not suddenly make these policies immune from such criticism. (location 1888)

(The 2011 great east Japan earthquake and basic income. *Basic income in Japan: Prospects for a radical idea in a transforming welfare state*. Eds. Yannick Vanderborght & Toru Yamamori. NY: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2014. Kindle Ed.)

ADV 2: New lifestyle

BI enables a more democratic and participatory society. It encourages more young people and domestic caregivers to participate in social activities.

Hiroya Hirano, Lecturer of social policy and sociology at Meiji University, 2014

With a substantial basic income, caregivers can be liberated from their domestic duties such as housework and childcare, so that they can really choose what they want to do, as they can pay other people to do the housekeeping work and childcare by using their basic income. The unemployed are liberated from endless and compulsory job search and can use their free time for activities that they might consider as being more valuable. Making free time more widely available creates opportunities to expand the range of possible activities as much as possible. Therefore a basic income makes it easier for people to take part in social activities, as it helps individuals to meet their needs in terms of income and time. (location 5068)

(The potential of introducing basic income for the “new public” in Japan: A road to associational welfare state? *Basic income in Japan: Prospects for a radical idea in a transforming welfare state*. Eds. Yannick Vanderborght & Toru Yamamori. NY: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2014. Kindle Ed.)

BI will change the public perception regarding social security and government responsibility.

Hayato Kobayashi, Associate professor at Social Welfare Department, Nihon Fukushi University, 2014

As the number of public assistance recipients and the costs for public assistance have grown in Japan, public assistance reform discourses based on workfare have been focused on changing the balance between the rights and duties of recipients. However, if the government seeks to change that balance, it must first increase the take-up rate to twice or three times its present level at least, in order to guarantee the right to subsistence, because public assistance has never been fully developed. The idea of an unconditional BI emphasizes the right to subsistence not only for people who are eligible for public assistance, but for all. This radical idea has the potential to transform welfare discourses in Japan, from ones that emphasize self-responsibility for falling into poverty, into ones that respect the obligation of the central government to guarantee a minimal level of economic security. (location 2347)

(The future of the public assistance reform in Japan: Workfare versus basic income?)

Basic income in Japan: Prospects for a radical idea in a transforming welfare state. Eds. Yannick Vanderborght & Toru Yamamori. NY: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2014. Kindle Ed.)