
Abstract

This study examines the contents of the negative income tax/safe income system, the basic asset system, and basic services, which are currently in opposition to basic income in the political world, and evaluated them from the perspective of basic income. A brief summary of these is as follows.

The negative income tax reviewed in Chapter 3 was proposed by Friedman et al. of the United States, and instead of abolishing all existing social welfare, a certain percentage of the difference between tax-free income and household income (negative income tax rate) is applied to households below a certain income level (tax-free income). Negative income tax, that is, subsidy is paid, and positive (+) income tax is levied on the difference between household income and tax-free income for households with more than tax-free income to raise funds for negative income tax. In Korea, a slightly modified version of the relief income system has been proposed. The payment structure of safe income is the same as negative income tax, but unlike negative income tax, some of the existing welfare systems, namely, livelihood benefits, housing benefits, self-support benefits, work incentives, Only incentives, etc. were abolished, and in particular, the existing income tax system was maintained, so that no separate income tax was levied on households with more than the standard income.

Chapter 4 introduces the origin, main logic, and foreign cases of the basic asset system, which have been raised as a counter to the basic income idea, and analyzes the meaning and limitations of the basic asset system from the perspective of the basic income theory. The basic asset is a system that pays a certain amount of assets to young people who are taking their first steps into society. However, there is a difference between the basic income and the basic asset system in terms of

regularity, universality, and unconditionality. In the end, although the policy objective of expanding macro freedom and alleviating asset inequality through one-time payment of large sums of money for the underlying asset is meaningful in itself, the original purpose is because the underlying asset has a large limit under conditions where the stability of life is not guaranteed. In order to achieve this, it is necessary to accompany institutional devices that can secure life stability, such as basic income.

Chapter 5 looked at basic services that have been proposed as an alternative to basic income for some time in the UK, which are “free public services that enable all citizens to live bigger lives by ensuring access to safety, opportunity and participation” It is defined as “the aggregate of It embodies the principle of “free, universal access when needed”, with specific areas including housing, food, transport and information in addition to the existing free National Health Service (NHS), public education, democracy and legal services. In the future, it aims to expand to the area of child and adult care.

Proponents of basic services criticize basic income, arguing that basic services are superior to basic income. On the other hand, basic income supporters also oppose the criticism of basic income by basic service proponents. Although there is controversy over the relationship between basic services and basic income, the two are not substitutes, but complementary, in terms of principled validity, complementarity by domain, and historical experience. In other words, there exists a Granger causality between cash transfer expenditure and service expenditure in the welfare state, where one increase increases the other. Therefore, the two should not reject each other, but seek ways to develop in parallel. In particular, since basic services are based on the principle of necessity and basic income is based on the right to the commons, the grounds are different. Parallel development will be possible without conflict.

Keywords Basic Income, Negative Income Tax, Safe Income System, Basic Asset