Korean Basic Income

I B Middleton

AI research document. Responses by Google AI.
AI can make or include mistakes, so double-check responses.
For financial advice, consult a professional.

28 August 2026

Contents:

Questions and responses:

1. Is Korea is planning to introduce a Basic Income? What will be the value of this Basic Income as a percentage of GDP per capita, and how will it be funded?

The South Korean government, under the administration of President Lee Jae-myung, has officially integrated the introduction of a universal basic income (UBI) into its long-term national agenda via the **"Third Basic Social Security Plan (2026–2030)"**. [1, 2]

However, because the full nationwide policy is designed to be implemented progressively by 2030, the government **has not yet legally finalised a single fixed percentage of GDP per capita or a permanent funding mechanism** for the final national rollout. Instead, the value and funding structure are defined by two tracks: President Lee's phased policy proposals and the active 2026 pilot programs. [1, 3, 4]

Projected Value as a Percentage of GDP per capita

South Korea's nominal GDP per capita for 2026 is projected to be approximately **USD $37,520 to $40,050** (roughly **50 million to 53 million Korean Won [KRW]**). Based on official proposals and active trials, the value shapes up as follows: [5, 6, 7]

- **The Proposed National Target:** President Lee's phased national UBI framework outlines an initial rollout of **KRW 250,000 per person per year**, gradually increasing to a target of **KRW 1,000,000 per person per year**. At KRW 1 million annually, this represents approximately **2% of South Korea's GDP per capita**. [4, 8]
- **The Ultimate Long-Term Goal:** Proponents within the administration have cited an ultimate baseline target of KRW 500,000 per month (KRW 6 million annually), which would equal roughly **11% to 12% of GDP per capita**. [9]
- **Active 2026 Pilot Programs:** As a localised stepping stone, the government expanded the **"Rural and Fishing Village Basic Income"** pilot program across multiple population-declining counties. This program provides **KRW 150,000 per month** (KRW 1.8 million annually) in local currency vouchers, which amounts to roughly **3.5% of the current GDP per capita**. [10, 11, 12]

How the Basic Income Will Be Funded

Because a full national system is expected to cost tens to hundreds of trillions of won annually, funding remains a highly debated topic. The Lee administration and economic ministries are utilising and proposing three primary funding mechanisms: [1]

1. AI & Semiconductor "Boom" Dividends

The administration has aggressively advocated for treating UBI as a "social dividend" stemming from shared public and technological wealth. A core funding pillar relies on capturing and redistributing corporate tax revenues generated by South Korea's massive **artificial intelligence (AI) and semiconductor boom** (such as profits from tech giants Samsung and SK Hynix). [8, 13, 14, 15]

2. Earmarked "Ecology & Resource" Taxes

To create a sustainable, recurring revenue stream without ballooning the general national deficit, the legislative roadmap focuses on two new controversial tax formats: [16]

- **Land Value / Holding Taxes:** Levying higher taxes on real estate ownership to curb speculation and fund the citizen dividend.
- **Carbon Fees & Green Energy Dividends:** Taxing carbon emissions and redirecting the excess revenues generated by publicly owned solar and wind projects into local payouts (referred to by President Lee as "sunlight and wind pensions"). [8, 16, 17]

3. Budget Restructuring and Cost Sharing (The 2026 Trial Model)

For the ongoing regional rollouts, the government is leaning heavily on aggressive **spending restructuring**. The Ministry of Planning and Budget has adjusted formulas for local education subsidies and tapered eligibility thresholds for standard senior basic pensions to free up fiscal room. For the current rural basic income pilots, the funding is split: the **central government finances 40% to 50%**, while provincial and county budgets absorb the remaining **50% to 60%**. [11, 12, 18, 19, 20]

If you would like to explore further, let me know if you want to look into **how local businesses are responding** to the regional trials or examine the **macroeconomic arguments** Korean lawmakers are using for and against the land tax.

[1] https://www.chosun.com
[2] https://www.chosun.com
[3] https://ap.fftc.org.tw
[4] https://www.ubiworks.ca
[5] https://en.wikipedia.org
[6] https://www.macrotrends.net
[7] https://www.macrotrends.net
[8] https://www.ubiworks.ca
[9] https://mondediplo.com
[10] https://www.commonwealth.ca
[11] https://www.koreajoongangdaily.com
[12] https://ap.fftc.org.tw
[13] https://www.facebook.com
[14] https://medium.com
[15] https://finance.biggo.com
[16] https://basicincome.org
[17] https://www.ubiworks.ca
[18] https://www.koreajoongangdaily.com
[19] https://www.koreajoongangdaily.com
[20] https://www.chosun.com

2. Will the payments be made as gross taxable payments or as net tax-free payments?

Under the proposed national framework, South Korea's Basic Income payments will be made as **net, tax-free payments**.

Rather than treating the basic income as "gross taxable income" that individuals must report on their annual tax returns, the administration is structuring the policy as a **direct public dividend**. This ensures the distribution mechanism remains administratively simple and highly progressive.

Why the Payments are Structured as Net Tax-Free

The Lee administration's decision to bypass the standard individual income tax structure relies on specific economic and logistical choices:

- **Legal Classification as a Dividend/Grant:** Under the proposed "Basic Society" legislative framework, the payouts are legally classified as "social wealth dividends" or universal state grants rather than earned, business, or standard global income. Under current Korean National Tax Service (NTS) guidelines, universal state welfare handbooks classify citizen-wide cash transfers as **non-taxable income**. [1, 2]
- **Preventing "Clawbacks" on Lower-Income Households:** If the payments were treated as gross taxable income, the funds would artificially inflate the gross income profiles of low-income citizens. This could accidentally push them into higher progressive tax brackets or disqualify them from local low-income energy, housing, and medical subsidies.
- **The Funding Loop is Managed at the Source:** Because the basic income is largely funded by dedicated mechanisms—such as the newly proposed land-holding taxes, carbon fees, and corporate windfall dividends from the AI/tech boom—the government claws back wealth from higher earners at the *tax collection* stage rather than taxing the basic income payout itself. [3, 4]

The Local Currency Clause (The True "Net" Safeguard)

To guarantee that the basic income acts as a direct economic stimulus, the pilot programs currently active in population-declining counties are distributed via **regional local currency vouchers (Local Love Gift Certificates)**.

Because these vouchers are strictly distributed for immediate local spending and cannot be converted into standard bank deposits or financial capital, they are completely insulated from the national income tax framework. Recipients receive the exact face value of the voucher (e.g., KRW 150,000 per month) to spend entirely tax-free at local small-and-medium-sized businesses.

If you'd like to dive deeper, we can look into **how local businesses handle these vouchers** or look at a breakdown of **how the proposed land-holding tax impacts property owners**.

[1] https://basicincome.org
[2] https://taxsummaries.pwc.com
[3] https://www.ubiworks.ca
[4] https://www.sciencedirect.com

3. Will the Korean Basic Income replace other welfare payments of equal or less value as part of the funding mechanism, and will there be top-ups to ensure that no one is worse off?

No, the proposed national Basic Income framework is designed to **supplement, not completely absorb or eliminate**, existing welfare systems, and a **"no one worse off" guarantee** is integrated into the legislative strategy. [1, 2]

Because the initial payouts—proposed at KRW 250,000 per year and scaling toward KRW 1,000,000 per year—are considerably less than the standard of living provided by existing safety nets, the administration is treating the basic income as an additional "economic stimulus dividend" rather than a total welfare overhaul. [1, 3, 4]

Interaction with Existing Cash Welfare Payments

- **National Basic Livelihood Security (NBLS):** Korea's primary safety net for low-income citizens (the NBLS) will **not be replaced**. Under current Ministry of Health and Welfare rules, any new cash transfer could technically count as "earned or regular income," which would accidentally disqualify vulnerable families from NBLS benefits. To prevent this, the administration is drafting legal exemptions so that UBI payouts do not count toward the NBLS income threshold. [5, 6]
- **The Child Allowance:** This program will remain completely untouched. It operates on a distinct demographic mandate to combat South Korea's severe birth rate crisis.
- **The Basic Pension (Elderly Overhaul):** This is the only major area experiencing structural integration. Rather than replacing the pension, the government is introducing a **"thicker below, thinner above"** reform. The eligibility threshold is being tightened from the bottom 90% to 80% of the median income by 2030 to free up national funds. However, the actual monthly pension amounts for low-income seniors will increase to ensure they are financially better off. [1, 7, 8]

Top-Ups and the "No One Worse Off" Safeguard

To address public anxiety and secure legislative backing, President Lee's **"Basic Society"** legislative framework integrates two precise safeguards: [2]

- **The Universal Basic Rights Clause:** The governing policy states that UBI cannot lower a citizen's baseline net financial state. If any overlapping municipal or national restructuring inadvertently reduces an individual's existing cash transfers, an automatic **local top-up** mechanism will match and exceed their previous baseline. [2, 9]
- **Tiered Cash Enhancements:** In the legislative blueprints for broader universal grants, the administration has explicitly built in tiered "top-ups" for the vulnerable. For example, during universal distributions, those categorised below the poverty line receive separate, higher baseline cash injections (e.g., KRW 400,000) alongside the basic citizen dividend to widen the safety net. [4]

Would you like to examine **how the opposition party is challenging this policy** over inflation concerns, or review a breakdown of **how the income tax brackets might change** to accommodate these top-ups?

[1] https://www.chosun.com
[2] https://www.koreatimes.co.kr
[3] https://www.koreajoongangdaily.com
[4] https://www.straitstimes.com
[5] https://bristoluniversitypressdigital.com
[6] https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com
[7] https://www.chosun.com
[8] https://www.chosun.com
[9] https://biz.chosun.com

4. What is the reason for spreading the introduction of Basic Income over four years?

Spreading the phase-in of the Basic Income funding—specifically regarding the revenues captured from the **AI and semiconductor boom dividends**—over a four-year horizon (running through the *Third Basic Social Security Plan* timeline toward 2030) is driven by critical macroeconomic, fiscal, and technical factors: [1, 2]

1. Absorbing the Shocks of AI-Driven Unemployment

A primary driver is the accelerating pace of AI automation replacing human work. Economic studies in South Korea project that over the next four years, labour's share of national GDP will drop significantly as automated systems and high-bandwidth memory infrastructures displace entry-level corporate and tech roles. A four-year roadmap gives the Ministry of Health and Welfare time to roll out transitional "Participation Incomes" for vulnerable demographics (like youth) while the full universal dividend scales up. [3, 4, 5, 6, 7]

2. Matching the Cyclical Reality of Tech Profits

Corporate tax windfalls from tech leaders like Samsung and SK Hynix are highly volatile and cyclical. The Korean government cannot fund a permanent social safety net on a single year of record-breaking semiconductor revenue. Spreading the policy over four years allows the Ministry of Planning and Budget to smooth out revenue spikes, build fiscal reserves, and create a predictable "social dividend" allocation model that doesn't collapse during a tech-market downturn. [3, 8]

3. Synchronising with Welfare Restructuring

Because the Basic Income is designed to supplement the existing system, other areas of the national budget must be slowly recalibrated to avoid severe political and public backlash. For example, the government's plan to contract the baseline eligibility for the standard Basic Pension (dropping coverage thresholds from the top 90% to 80% of median income) is being distributed over a multi-year window ending in 2030. This gradual tapering frees up public funds incrementally without stripping vulnerable seniors of their security overnight. [2, 9]

4. Giving the "Money Multiplier" Time to Scale

The initial rollout relies on local currency vouchers designed to stimulate small- and medium-sized neighbourhood businesses. Staging the rollout over four years prevents an immediate, overwhelming cash injection into the retail market, which could spark inflation. Instead, it allows local businesses and regional infrastructure time to adapt to increased regional consumer demand. [10, 11]

If you'd like to look more closely into this economic transition, I can provide a breakdown of **how the "Participation Income" bridges the gap** for displaced workers, or look at **how the corporate tax code is adjusting** to capture AI-driven corporate profits. [6, 7]

[1] https://omdia.tech.informa.com
[2] https://www.chosun.com
[3] https://www.generatewealth.co.nz
[4] https://en.sedaily.com
[5] https://www.bok.or.kr
[6] https://en.sedaily.com
[7] https://en.sedaily.com
[8] https://www.koreaherald.com
[9] https://www.asiae.co.kr
[10] https://thediplomat.com
[11] https://www.facebook.com

5. How is the corporate tax code adjusting to capture AI-driven corporate profit?

The South Korean corporate tax code is undergoing structured updates to isolate, capture, and manage the massive cash windfalls generated by the global artificial intelligence (AI) and semiconductor boom. [1, 2]

Rather than passing a volatile, penalising "windfall profit tax" that could spook capital markets, the Lee Jae-myung administration and the National Assembly are rewriting the tax structure to aggressively capture tech profits at the collection stage, while simultaneously offering targeted incentives to keep physical production within Korea. [3, 4, 5, 6, 7]

---

1. The 1% Universal Corporate Tax Hike

In the late 2025 legislative session, South Korea passed a **1 percentage point increase to the top corporate tax bracket**. [3]

- **The Target:** This directly hits tech monopolies like Samsung Electronics and SK Hynix, whose supply of High-Bandwidth Memory (HBM) chips has led to record-breaking corporate revenue. [5, 8]
- **The Yield:** This bracket adjustment has ballooned 2026–2027 national corporate tax collection expectations to a historic high of over **100 trillion won (~$65 billion USD)**, effectively doubling previous baseline expectations. [9, 10]

2. Legal Creation of the "Future Response Fund"

To prevent this massive influx of AI-driven corporate cash from being absorbed into general government administrative waste, the Ministry of Planning and Budget is enacting legislation to introduce a legal partitioning tool called the **Future Response Fund (or Future Fund)**. [11, 12, 13]

- **The "Excess Revenue" Formula:** The code establishes a statistical baseline calculated from the 10-year rolling average growth of domestic tax receipts. [11]
- **The Separation Rule:** Any corporate tax revenue collected from the tech sector that spikes *above* this long-term trend line is legally classified as a **"social tech dividend"**. It is automatically redirected into the fund to finance the progressive scale-up of public dividends, youth participation incomes, and rural basic income pilots. [2, 8, 11, 13, 14]

3. Output-Based Internal Offsets (Carrot-and-Stick)

To ensure that tech conglomerates do not move their AI operations offshore to escape the higher tax collections, the tax code has integrated aggressive **domestic production credits**. [6]

- **The Condition:** Companies can only deduct R&D expenses and receive up to **50% extra tax credits** if the core AI components, advanced semiconductors, or robotics are physically produced and sold *inside* South Korea.
- **The Result:** This forces tech giants to anchor their data centres and manufacturing clusters locally, creating a stable, physical corporate asset base that the state can reliably tax over the long term to maintain the basic income safety net. [6, 7, 13, 15, 16]

4. Moving Toward a "Technology Monopoly" Framework

Government economic advisers have explicitly reshaped the tax code to treat the AI economy not as a traditional export market, but as a **technology monopoly economy**. Because the global AI race creates an intense scarcity of high-tier chips, the government views excess corporate profit as shared national wealth rather than purely private gain. Re-routing these corporate taxes into a state stabilisation fund allows the government to absorb massive corporate gains during tech upcycles and guarantees a steady revenue stream for social security. [5, 8, 13, 17]

If you are interested, we can look into **how these corporate tax adjustments affect foreign investors** on the Kospi index, or review the timeline for **when the National Assembly will vote on the final fund legislation**. [1, 4, 9, 14]

[1] https://www.mlex.com
[2] https://koreabizwire.com
[3] https://www.kedglobal.com
[4] https://finance.yahoo.com
[5] https://www.reuters.com
[6] https://www.koreajoongangdaily.com
[7] https://biz.chosun.com
[8] https://www.taipeitimes.com
[9] https://finance.yahoo.com
[10] https://www.bloomberg.com
[11] https://www.reuters.com
[12] https://www.koreajoongangdaily.com
[13] https://technode.global
[14] https://www.bloomberg.com
[15] https://www.euronews.com
[16] https://en.sedaily.com
[17] https://www.enca.com

6. As the Basic Income is phased in and its value increases, are other payments likely to be reduced in value to provide partial funding of the Basic Income?

No, existing core welfare benefits will **not be reduced or inflated away** to absorb the cost of the basic income. However, the government is executing structural **means-testing adjustments and categorical tapering** to free up partial funding as the payouts scale. [1]

The administration's guiding philosophy for this phase-in—formally termed ***"Ha-hu-sang-bak" (하후상박)***, meaning **"higher support for lower incomes, frozen growth for higher incomes"**—ensures that the scaling of the Basic Income is partially offset by restructuring existing systems without reducing absolute payouts for those who need them most. [1]

🔎 Where the Budget is Being Restructured (Tapering)

Rather than reducing the dollar value of social security, the Ministry of Planning and Budget is tightening eligibility criteria across specific frameworks to generate partial funding:

- **The Basic Pension Overhaul:** The **Basic Pension for seniors** is undergoing its most significant structural shift in over a decade. Previously, the pension covered the lowest 70% of income earners aged 65 and older. The government is transitioning this to a benchmark based directly on the **national median income**, effectively freezing or tapering off future automatic increases for wealthier seniors at the top of the bracket to free up cash for the universal pool. [1]
- **Consolidation of Redundant Local Grants:** Dozens of overlapping, minor municipal cash transfers (such as localised youth incentives and regional farming subsidies) are being gradually consolidated into the broader Basic Income fund to eliminate administrative bloat and duplication.

⚠ How the Value Protection Safeguards Work

To prevent vulnerable populations from experiencing a net loss in support as the basic income grows, two explicit legislative guardrails are being integrated:

1. The Legal Non-Count Clause

The primary threat to low-income earners under a growing basic income is that the new cash would legally count as "regular income," pushing them above poverty lines and automatically disqualifying them from the **National Basic Livelihood Security (NBLS)** framework. [2]

- **The Fix:** Amendments to the Social Security Act explicitly classify Basic Income payouts as **non-countable social dividends**.
- **The Result:** A household's existing NBLS medical, housing, and living subsidies remain fully intact, regardless of how high the universal Basic Income scales.

2. The Inflation Indexing Shield

Critics of basic income frequently argue that injecting universal cash into the economy will trigger localised inflation, effectively reducing the purchasing power of other fixed welfare payments. To counter this, Korea's scaling framework mandates that traditional welfare cash tiers must be **annually indexed against a specialised localised consumer price index (CPI)** that factors in the velocity of the local currency vouchers. This ensures that traditional payments preserve their real-world value alongside the basic income. [2, 3, 4]

If you want to explore the mechanics further, let me know if you would like a closer look at **how the new median income benchmarks** shift the senior pension brackets, or an analysis of **how local inflation is monitored** during the voucher rollouts.

[1] https://evrimagaci.org
[2] https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com
[3] https://www.auckland.ac.nz
[4] https://link.springer.com

7. With the proposed introduction of a Korean Basic Income, how will corporate tax adjustments affect foreign investors in the Kospi index?

The introduction of a Universal Basic Income (UBI) framework in South Korea—such as the one proposed in *UBI from Idea to Reality*—requires a fundamental restructuring of the nation's tax system. To fund a nationwide UBI, proposed tax overhauls typically involve a combination of broadened tax bases, carbon taxes, land-value taxes, and significant **corporate tax adjustments**. [1, 2]

For foreign investors holding equities in the **Kospi index**, these corporate tax adjustments create a complex interplay of systemic risks and market structural shifts.

📉 1. Compression of Corporate Profit Margins

Funding a nationwide basic income requires expanding tax revenues. Broad tax reforms—such as Korea's actual tax overhauls and proposed UBI blueprints—consistently target an **increase in corporate income tax rates across the board**. [3, 4]

- **The Impact on Foreign Investors:** Foreign institutional investors evaluate Kospi corporations based on net after-tax earnings and forward-looking earnings per share (EPS). Corporate tax hikes directly compress net profit margins, lowering corporate valuations. Historically, sudden announcements of tax code changes targeting corporate earnings have triggered swift foreign equity sell-offs on the Kospi. [3, 5]

📊 2. Reversal of the "Korea Value-Up" Initiatives

South Korea has long suffered from the **"Korea Discount"**—a phenomenon where South Korean companies face lower market valuations than global peers due to low dividend payouts and governance structures. To combat this, the government has pushed "Korea Value-Up" programs. [3]

- **The Disruption:** Global investment banks (such as *Citigroup* and *Goldman Sachs*) note that shifting toward heavy corporate and capital gains tax hikes represents a **180-degree turn** from investor-friendly market reforms. High corporate taxation reduces the cash reserves companies can use for treasury share cancellations or increased dividend payouts, severely dampening foreign appetite for long-term Kospi holding. [3, 6]

💸 3. Transaction Costs and Market Liquidity

In macroeconomic funding models for universal welfare, transaction or securities levies are often adjusted upward to target speculative trading. For instance, recent adjustments have seen Kospi transaction rates increase to generate trillions in revenue. [7, 8]

- **The Impact on Foreign Investors:** Higher securities transaction taxes directly elevate the cost of capital for foreign portfolio managers. Institutional investors who engage in high-volume, algorithmic, or rebalancing strategies are penalised by these friction costs, leading to **depressed market liquidity and trading volumes** across the Kospi. [7, 8]

☑ 4. The Macroeconomic Trade-off: Domestic Consumption

Conversely, UBI proponents argue that corporate tax adjustments are balanced by the macro-benefits of cash transfers.

- **The Silver Lining:** Injecting a regular basic income into the population significantly stimulates domestic demand and consumer spending, particularly benefiting consumer defensive, retail, and domestic services sectors. [9, 10]
- **The Structural Headwind:** The Kospi index is heavily weighted toward **large, export-oriented conglomerates (Chaebols)** like Samsung Electronics and SK Hynix. These companies derive the vast majority of their revenue from global tech demand, meaning a boost in *local* Korean consumer spending does not offset the hit they take from a higher domestic corporate tax burden.

🔍 Summary of Market Pressures

Tax Adjustment Triggered by UBI Funding	Direct Effect on Kospi Listed Companies	Strategic Response of Foreign Investors
Higher Corporate Income Tax Rates	Directly lowers net income and depresses EPS growth.	Capital flight toward markets with more competitive corporate tax rates.
Increased Capital & Transaction Levies	Increases friction costs on equity trading volume.	Reduced portfolio rebalancing and lower overall market liquidity.
Shift from "Value-Up" to Public Redistribution	Limits capital available for share buybacks and dividends.	De-risking out of Kospi value stocks due to policy inconsistency.

⇥ Next Steps

Would you like to explore **how specific sectors on the Kospi** (such as technology vs. domestic retail) would be unevenly impacted by these tax adjustments, or look at the **currency risk (Won volatility)** that typically accompanies welfare-driven tax shocks?

[1] https://www.democracylab.uwo.ca
[2] https://www.researchgate.net
[3] https://www.koreaherald.com
[4] https://globaladvisoryexperts.com
[5] https://www.reuters.com
[6] https://www.asiae.co.kr
[7] https://www.lexology.com
[8] https://www.shinkim.com
[9] https://basicincome.org
[10] https://ssir.org

8. How will the proposed land-holding tax impact property owners?

The introduction of a **National Land-Holding Tax (국토보유세)**—a foundational pillar proposed by basic income advocates like those behind *UBI from Idea to Reality* and championed by progressive factions like President Lee Jae-myung—fundamentally rewrites how property wealth is taxed in South Korea. [1]

Unlike standard real estate taxes that focus on structures, a land-holding tax targets the **unearned increment of land value** itself. Its impact varies starkly based on the volume and type of property an individual owns: [2]

🏡 1. Impact on Single-Home Owner-Occupiers

For the vast majority of citizens who own a single home that they live in, the policy is designed to be **financially positive** or, at worst, neutral.

- **The "Tax-Benefit" Balance:** While property owners will see a new line-item land tax, the revenue generated is immediately redistributed as an equal per-capita **Universal Basic Income (UBI)** payout to every member of the household.
- **Net Beneficiaries:** Because land ownership in South Korea is highly concentrated, government and academic models show that roughly **80% to 90% of ordinary single-home households will receive more in UBI payouts than they pay out in the new land-holding tax**, making them net economic gainers.

🏢 2. Impact on Multiple-Home Owners and Speculators

For real estate investors, landlords, and multiple-property owners, the impact is **sharply punitive**. [3]

- **Aggregated Value Taxation:** The tax calculates the total value of all land held by an individual on a nationwide basis, applying heavily progressive tax rates. [2]
- **No Shielding via Non-Residency:** Under recent legislative trends moving toward residency-based tracking, individuals holding high-value properties that they do not occupy will face minimised deductions. The massive tax burden quickly outpaces any individual UBI payout, forcing multi-home owners to either absorb steep holding costs or sell off their secondary properties. [4, 5, 6]

🏭 3. Impact on Commercial Real Estate and Corporate Landholders

The heaviest structural hit lands on corporate entities and conglomerates (Chaebols) holding vast commercial tracts, factories, and unbuilt corporate real estate.

- **The Cost of Idle Land:** Because land value taxes do not penalise building improvements, corporations are heavily disincentivised from sitting on idle "speculative" land. It forces companies to either rapidly develop their land holdings to generate income or liquidate them onto the open market, shifting corporate asset sheets from fixed property toward liquid capital.

📊 Direct Comparison: Proposed Land Tax vs. Traditional Property Taxes

Feature	Traditional Property Tax (Comprehensive Real Estate Tax / *Jongbusae*)	Proposed Universal Land-Holding Tax (*Gukto-boyuse*)
Tax Base	Combines the value of the **building structure + the underlying land**.	Focuses **strictly on the unimproved value of the land**.
Primary Goal	General local government revenue and ad-hoc housing market cooling.	Funding a **Universal Basic Income** and eradicating land speculation.
Exemptions	High basic deductions (e.g., up to 1.4 billion won for single-home residents).	**Zero or minimal exemptions**; all land is taxed progressively to capture social wealth.
Net Outcome for Middle Class	A pure financial outflow with no direct individual return.	A **net cash injection** because the resulting UBI payout exceeds the land tax bill.

⚠ Long-Term Housing Market Shifts

- **Downward Pressure on Prices:** By drastically increasing the ongoing cost of holding real estate, the tax effectively bursts speculative bubbles, particularly in red-hot zones like Seoul's Gangnam district.
- **Transition of the Rental Market:** Landlords will naturally attempt to pass the tax onto renters. However, because a land-value tax applies universally and land supply is fixed, economic consensus suggests landlords must absorb most of the holding tax burden, giving tenants greater leverage in *Jeonse* (lump-sum deposit) and monthly lease negotiations. [1, 7, 8]

Would you like to analyse **how the land valuation formulas** distinguish between agricultural land and premium urban residential land, or explore the **political hurdles** this tax faces in the National Assembly?

[1] https://www.asiae.co.kr
[2] https://www.lincolninst.edu
[3] https://www.koreajoongangdaily.com
[4] https://www.koreatimes.co.kr
[5] https://www.donga.com
[6] https://www.koreaherald.com
[7] https://m.arirang.com
[8] https://biz.chosun.com

9. Please review the timeline for when the National Assembly will vote on the final fund legislation.

The final vote on major financial frameworks, national fund allocations, and related tax overhauls by the **National Assembly** follows a strict legislative timeline tied to the autumn parliamentary session, with a legal deadline of **December 2nd**. [1, 2]

The structural milestones for the upcoming legislative review proceed through the following phases:

📅 **Phase 1: Formal Bill Submission (Early September)**

- **Date: September 2nd – 3rd 2026**
- **Action:** The Ministry of Economy and Finance (MOEF) formally submits the finalised budget proposal and special fund legislation (such as the *Future Response Fund* law designed to capture tech/corporate tax windfalls) to the National Assembly. This kicks off the **100-day regular parliamentary session**. [1, 3, 4, 5]

⚖️ **Phase 2: Committee Deliberation & Fast-Track Windows (September – November)**

- **Action:** The legislation undergoes intensive policy questioning and review by the **Special Committee on Budget and Accounts** alongside the relevant standing committees. [1]
- **Accelerated Timeline:** Under a newly passed revision to the National Assembly Act, the deliberation period for fast-tracked legislative bills has been shortened from 330 days to a maximum of **90 days** (60 days in standing committees and 30 days in the Legislation and Judiciary Committee). This ensures contentious welfare and tax bills can be brought to the floor within the autumn cycle. [4, 6]

🗳️ **Phase 3: Final Plenary Floor Vote**

- **Target Deadline: December 2nd 2026**
- **Action:** Following floor leader negotiations and adjustments to resolve partisan disagreements over the scale of spending, the final package is put to a full floor vote at a **plenary session of the National Assembly**. The majority floor leadership aims to pass the final budget and revenue acts fully on time to meet this constitutional legal deadline. [1, 2, 5, 7, 8]

[1] https://www.youtube.com
[2] https://www.youtube.com
[3] https://english.mofe.go.kr
[4] https://www.facebook.com
[5] https://www.asiae.co.kr
[6] https://www.koreajoongangdaily.com
[7] https://www.korea.net
[8] https://www.koreaherald.com

10. Please tell me about the book: UBI from Idea to Reality – A Blueprint for Basic Income in Korea. Who are the authors, and what does the book cover?

UBI from Idea to Reality: A Blueprint for Basic Income in Korea is an academic book published by Palgrave Macmillan. It explores how South Korea can integrate its tax and social safety systems to build a comprehensive, fiscally sound basic income model. [1, 2, 3, 4]

The Authors

The book is co-authored by three South Korean academic experts in economics and social welfare: [2]

- **Jong-sung You:** Director of the Korea Inequality Research Lab at Yonsei University with a Ph.D. from Harvard.
- **Nam Hoon Kang:** Professor Emeritus of Economics at Hanshin University and Vice-Chair of South Korea's Presidential Commission on Basic Society.
- **Seungju Lee:** Professor of Social Welfare at Daegu University specialising in poverty and inequality. [2]

[Also, Soomi Lee, Almaz Zeileke, Philippe van Parijs, Guy Standing, and Karl Widerquist.]

What the Book Covers

The book proposes a pragmatic **"Three-Pillar Integrated Model"** combining tax and welfare mechanisms to implement basic income in South Korea: [1, 2, 4]

1. **Prototype UBI:** An unconditional universal dividend for all citizens funded through common wealth.
2. **Negative Income Tax (NIT):** A model providing targeted supplements for citizens earning below a specific income floor.
3. **Universal EITC:** A universal earned income tax credit protecting labour incentives and productivity. [1, 2, 4]

Using national survey data and tax records, the authors evaluate the **feasibility** of this package and offer a methodology applicable to other developed nations. [1, 2, 4]

We can further explore how the book calculates the net cost or adjusts income tax brackets if you are interested.

[1] https://link.springer.com
[2] https://link.springer.com
[3] https://www.amazon.sg
[4] https://link.springer.com

Note: The authors presented their findings at the BIEN (Basic Income Earthy Network) congress in Toronto on 22 August 2026.

11. Please explain what EITC is in the Korean context.

In South Korea, the **Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC)** is locally known as **Geun-ro Jang-ryeo-geum (근로장려금)**, which translates directly to the **"Work Incentive Bonus."** [1, 2]

Administered by the National Tax Service (NTS), it is a refundable tax credit designed as a "workfare" program. Rather than operating as traditional welfare, it provides cash payouts to low-income earners to incentivise employment and alleviate economic polarisation. [3, 4, 5, 6]

📊 How the System Works

Like EITC programs in other countries, South Korea's system operates on a "trapezoid" phase model: [6]

1. **Phase-in:** As your earned income increases, your credit amount grows.
2. **Plateau:** The credit reaches a maximum cap and stays flat across a specific income bracket.
3. **Phase-out:** As income increases further, the credit gradually tapers off until it hits an upper limit. [6, 7]

Payments are usually applied for in May and disbursed later in the year. Notably, the NTS frequently distributes these funds early to help households manage living costs. [8, 9]

🔎 Eligibility & Payout Thresholds (2026/2027 Updates)

The South Korean government recently expanded the EITC parameters under its latest tax code revisions to account for inflation and living costs. Eligibility is strict and evaluated at the **household level**, not by individual salary alone. [4, 10, 11]

1. Household Income Limits & Maximum Payouts

The system divides applicants into three distinct household structures: [9]

Household Type	Eligibility Criteria	New Annual Income Limit	Max Annual Payout
Single-Person (단독가구)	No spouse, dependents, or elderly parents living together.	**26 million won** *(Up from 22M)*	**1.8 million won** *(Up from 1.65M)*
Single-Income (홑벌이가구)	Spouse has an annual income below 3 million won, OR there is a qualified dependent child/parent.	**37 million won** *(Up from 32M)*	**3.1 million won** *(Up from 2.85M)*
Dual-Income (맞벌이가구)	Both applicant and spouse earn more than 3 million won annually.	**52 million won** *(Up from 44M)*	**3.6 million won** *(Up from 3.3M)*

2. Asset Test Criteria

Even if you meet the income requirements, your household's **total property value must be under 240 million won**. This aggregate value includes real estate, motor vehicles, bank deposits, and unlisted stocks. Crucially, any existing household debt is **not subtracted** from your total asset calculation when testing eligibility. [4, 12]

⚠ Rules for Foreign Residents

If you are an expat working in South Korea, claiming the EITC is generally restricted, but there are vital exceptions: [4]

- **General Rule:** Individuals who do not hold Korean nationality cannot claim the EITC. [4]
- **Exceptions:** You *can* apply and receive the credit if you meet all standard income/asset checks **AND** fit one of these two criteria:
    1. You are a foreign resident married to a South Korean national.
    2. You are a foreign resident with a dependent child who holds South Korean nationality. [4, 13]

💡 Child Tax Credit (CTC) Integration

The EITC is frequently paired alongside the **Child Tax Credit (자녀장려금)**. If you have dependent children under 18 and make less than the specified single/dual-income thresholds, you can receive an additional payout of up to **1 million won per child** on top of your EITC work bonus. [2, 12, 14]

Are you looking to see if you **personally qualify** for the Korean EITC, or are you researching its **macroeconomic impact** on the Korean workforce? Let me know so I can tailor the next steps for you.

[1] https://papers.ssrn.com
[2] https://www.youtube.com
[3] https://en.sedaily.com
[4] https://taxguidekorea.com
[5] https://www.koreajoongangdaily.com
[6] https://www.oecd.org
[7] https://www.kdi.re.kr
[8] https://biz.chosun.com
[9] https://mbiz.heraldcorp.com
[10] https://biz.chosun.com
[11] https://en.sedaily.com
[12] https://www.youtube.com
[13] https://www.youtube.com
[14] https://www.koreajoongangdaily.com

12. Please explore how the book calculates the net cost and adjusts income tax brackets.

In *UBI from Idea to Reality: A Blueprint for Basic Income in Korea*, authors Jong-sung You, Nam Hoon Kang, and Seungju Lee calculate the net fiscal cost by subtracting tax clawbacks and administrative savings from gross distributions, placing the true net expense between 2.5% and 3% of South Korea's GDP. To achieve fiscal neutrality, the book outlines personal income tax code restructuring, including the elimination of deductions, transitioning to an individual-based tracking system, and blending flat-rate dividends with progressive scales to optimise effective marginal tax rates. For more details, visit Springer Nature Link. [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]

[1] https://www.degruyterbrill.com
[2] https://www.researchgate.net
[3] https://ideas.repec.org
[4] https://www.ubicenter.org
[5] https://keithrankin.co.nz
[6] https://philpapers.org

13. Do the authors also include Soomi Lee, Almaz Zeileke, Philippe van Parijs, Guy Standing, and Karl Widerquist?

No, the authors **do not include** Soomi Lee, Almaz Zelleke, Philippe van Parijs, Guy Standing, or Karl Widerquist. [1]

The book *UBI from Idea to Reality: A Blueprint for Basic Income in Korea* is strictly written by the three South Korean scholars mentioned earlier: **Jong-sung You**, **Nam Hoon Kang**, and **Seungju Lee**. [1, 2]

The other individuals you mentioned are distinct, prominent figures and philosophers within the global Universal Basic Income movement:

Philippe van Parijs and **Karl Widerquist** are co-founders/prominent leaders of the Basic Income Earth Network (BIEN).

Guy Standing is a well-known British economist who wrote extensively on UBI and the "precariat" class.

Almaz Zelleke and **Soomi Lee** are noted political scientists and economists who frequently publish academic papers on the feminist and macroeconomic arguments for UBI in the United States and globally. [3, 4, 5]

While their foundational theories and global frameworks are heavily cited in the book to frame the Korean context, they are not co-authors of this specific volume. [3, 5, 6]

Would you like to explore **how the authors adapt the theories** of Philippe van Parijs or Guy Standing specifically to South Korea's economic situation? [3, 6]

[1] https://www.springer.com
[2] https://philpapers.org
[3] https://link.springer.com
[4] https://digitalcommons.du.edu
[5] https://www.researchgate.net
[6] https://www.researchgate.net

14. How do the authors adapt the theories of Philippe van Parijs or Guy Standing specifically to South Korea's economic situation?

In *UBI from Idea to Reality: A Blueprint for Basic Income in Korea*, authors Jong-sung You, Nam Hoon Kang, and Seungju Lee meticulously bridge Western philosophical foundations with East Asian macroeconomic realities. Both Philippe van Parijs and Guy Standing—who served as peer reviewers and provided high praise for the volume—argue for UBI on the grounds of freedom, security, and class justice. [1, 2, 3]

The authors adapt their respective theories to South Korea's unique hyper-capitalist and technologically advanced economic landscape through several targeted strategies:

1. Adapting Guy Standing's "Precariat" to the AI Era

Guy Standing's core work focuses on the "precariat"—a rapidly growing class of people facing insecure employment, lack of occupational identity, and volatile incomes. The authors localise this theory directly to South Korea's severe vulnerability to automation. [3, 4]

- **The Korean Context:** South Korea has the world's highest density of industrial robots and a hyper-efficient tech infrastructure.
- **The Adaptation:** The book argues that South Korea's "precariat" is expanding exponentially not just due to gig-work, but because artificial intelligence and high-bandwidth tech are rapidly swallowing traditional entry-level corporate and manufacturing jobs. The authors adapt Standing's call for "cash as a right to stability" by modelling a UBI funded directly by tech monopolies, creating a structural buffer that stabilises the purchasing power of this newly displaced tech-precariat. [4]

2. Tailoring Philippe van Parijs's "Real Freedom for All"

Philippe van Parijs famously advocates for UBI as a tool for "real freedom," arguing that a basic income should maximise the freedom of the least advantaged by being completely unconditional and universal.

- **The Korean Context:** South Korea suffers from an intensely stratified dual-labour market (vast wage gaps between elite conglomerates like Samsung and small subcontractors) alongside severe demographic decline and elder poverty.
- **The Adaptation:** The authors argue that a pure, high-value universal rollout à la Van Parijs is politically and fiscally blocked in Korea by intense taxpayer anxiety and polarisation. To achieve Van Parijs's goal of "real freedom" while respecting local fiscal conservatism, they adapt his philosophy into a pragmatically tiered **"Three-Pillar Integrated Model"**. They blend a smaller, pure universal dividend with a Negative Income Tax (NIT) and a Universal EITC. This satisfies Van Parijs's moral demand that the poorest gain immediate, life-altering financial freedom, but packages it via tax clawbacks that make it palatable to the Korean electorate. [1, 4]

3. Transitioning from "Rentier Capitalism" to Common Wealth

Both Van Parijs and Standing advocate for funding UBI by capturing economic "rents" (unearned income from land, natural resources, or intellectual monopolies). The authors directly operationalise this theory into concrete Korean policy solutions.

- **The Adaptation:** They map Standing's and Van Parijs's broad concept of "common wealth dividends" onto South Korea's highly specific real estate crisis and carbon emissions tracking. The book demonstrates mathematically how aggressive land-holding taxes and green carbon fees can shift South Korea away from volatile speculative real estate and channel those unearned corporate rents directly into the hands of ordinary citizens. [4]

4. Overcoming the Median Voter Barrier

While Van Parijs and Standing write heavily from a progressive moral and sociological standpoint, the authors adapt these concepts using cold mathematical political science via the **Median Voter Theorem**. They model South Korean tax data to prove that under their integrated system, **70% of the Korean population would emerge as net beneficiaries**. By doing so, they convert the global philosophers' utopian arguments into a calculated electoral blueprint designed to defeat the status quo bias and tax aversion unique to Korean politics. [4]

If you'd like to look deeper into this framework, we can review **the exact mathematical formulas** the authors use to calculate the 70% net-beneficiary threshold, or look at **how the book suggests restructuring** the Universal EITC. [1, 4]

[1] https://politics-prose.com
[2] https://www.amazon.com.au
[3] https://fivebooks.com
[4] https://link.springer.com

15. Please review the exact mathematical formulas that the authors of *UBI from Idea to Reality – A Blueprint for Basic Income in Korea* use to calculate the 70% net-beneficiary threshold.

In their book *UBI from Idea to Reality: A Blueprint for Basic Income in Korea*, authors Jong-sung You, Nam Hoon Kang, and Seungju Lee estimate that roughly 70% of the South Korean population would become net beneficiaries under their tax-benefit framework. This threshold is derived through a microsimulation model analysing the break-even point where total integrated benefits equal new tax burdens across income distribution deciles. For further analysis, visit Springer Nature Link. [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]

[1] https://link.springer.com
[2] https://www.researchgate.net
[3] https://link.springer.com
[4] https://link.springer.com
[5] https://www.researchgate.net

16. How does the book suggest restructuring the Universal EITC?

In *UBI from Idea to Reality: A Blueprint for Basic Income in Korea*, the authors propose transforming the household-based Earned Income Tax Credit into a Universal EITC based entirely on individual earnings. Furthermore, the model eliminates the traditional phase-out range to lower marginal tax rates and remove work disincentives for low-income workers. For more details, visit EconPapers. [1]

[1] https://econpapers.repec.org

* * *