SBCM Case Study: Comparative Analysis of Fiscal Stagnation and Structural Wealth Extraction in Tokyo, Osaka, and Aichi

(SBCMケーススタディ：東京・大阪・愛知における財政停滞と構造的富の搾取の比較分析)

Author: Hokuto Koyama (小山 北斗)
Date: January 5, 2026
Version: 3.1
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18147498
Keywords: Meso-Economics, Fiscal Velocity, Fund Rotation Ratio (R_{fund}), Aichi Barrier, Structural Asymmetry

Abstract

[Objective] This study applies the **Standard Block Comparison Method (SBCM)** to quantify the fiscal disparities among Japan's three primary economic hubs: **Tokyo** (Capital), **Osaka** (Commerce), and **Aichi** (Industry).
[Method] Using FY2024 settlement data, we conducted a comparative analysis of **Revenue Structure** and **Fund Liquidity**. We introduce **Aichi Prefecture** as a control group representing a "High-Productivity / Non-Capital" economy to isolate the impact of structural centralization.
[Results]

1. **The Extraction Proof:** Despite Aichi possessing Japan's leading industrial base, its Tax Dependency Ratio is **51.8%**. In

contrast, Tokyo exhibits an abnormal **74.8%**, suggesting that Tokyo's excess revenue is derived not from industrial productivity but from **Structural Wealth Transfer (I_{ext})** via headquarters taxation.

2. **The Stagnation Proof:** Tokyo retains **4.21 trillion JPY** in funds with a Fund Rotation Ratio (R_{fund}) of **0.47**. This is approximately **4 times higher** than Osaka (0.12) or Aichi (0.15), indicating a critical state of **Fiscal Stagnation** unique to the capital.
   [Conclusion] The comparison with Aichi definitively disproves the "Productivity Defense." The capital functions as a **"Liquidity Trap,"** absorbing national wealth and immobilizing it. We propose an algorithmic redistribution mechanism to bypass this gravitational sink.

1. Introduction

The concentration of capital in Tokyo is often justified by the "Agglomeration Hypothesis" (productivity) and the "Resilience Hypothesis" (disaster reserves).
However, **SBCM (Standard Block Comparison Method)** challenges these narratives by analyzing the thermodynamic flow of wealth.

This study introduces **Aichi Prefecture**—Japan's industrial heartland—as a control variable. By comparing Tokyo with Aichi (which creates value) and Osaka (which manages debt), we prove that Tokyo's fiscal superiority is a product of **Systemic Extraction** and **Metabolic Stagnation**, not organic growth.

2. Methodology

2.1 The Fund Rotation Ratio (R_{fund})

To measure fiscal metabolic rate:

$$R_{fund} = \frac{\text{Total Fund Balance}}{\text{Total Annual Revenue}}$$

A high R_{fund} indicates **Stagnation** (low velocity of money).

2.2 Structural Extraction Index (I_{ext})

We define the "Normal Tax Yield" based on the industrial structure of Aichi. Any revenue deviation significantly exceeding Aichi's productivity-to-tax ratio constitutes **Structural Extraction (I_{ext})**.

3. Results (Comparative Analysis)

3.1 Input Anomaly: The "Aichi Barrier"

Table 1 compares the revenue structures. Aichi represents the "Physical Limit" of industrial productivity. Tokyo's deviation from this limit represents "Unearned Revenue."

Table 1: Fiscal Revenue Structure (FY2024)

Metric	Tokyo (The Sink)	Osaka (The Debtor)	Aichi (The Maker)
Regional GDP	~110 Trillion	~41 Trillion	~41 Trillion
Total Revenue	**8.96 Trillion**	3.14 Trillion	2.80 Trillion
Local Tax Revenue	**6.69 Trillion**	1.50 Trillion	1.45 Trillion
Tax Dependency (R_{tax})	**74.8%** (Abnormal)	47.7% (Standard)	51.8% (Standard)

- **Finding:** Aichi and Osaka share similar GDP and Tax Dependency (~50%). Tokyo, despite having a GDP only ~2.7x that of Aichi, collects **4.6x** the tax revenue.
- **Implication:** This "Super-Linear Scaling" proves that Tokyo's revenue is decoupled from physical production. The excess (~20% of dependency) is **Structural Transfer**.

3.2 Stock Anomaly: The Liquidity Trap

Table 2 compares the accumulation of funds.

Table 2: Fund Dynamics and Rotation Ratio

Metric	Tokyo	Osaka	Aichi
Total Fund Balance (S_{fund})	**4.21 Trillion**	0.36 Trillion*	0.42 Trillion
Fund Rotation Ratio (R_{fund})	**0.47** (Stagnant)	**0.12** (Active)	**0.15** (Active)
Fiscal Adj. Fund (Free)	**967 Billion**	41 Billion	150 Billion

(Note: Osaka's "Total Fund" excludes Sinking Funds for strict comparison of discretionary reserves.)

- **Finding:** Tokyo retains nearly **half a year's revenue** (0.47) as static stock. Aichi and Osaka circulate their funds rapidly ($0.12 - 0.15$).
- **Implication:** Tokyo is not an "Engine" but a **"Capacitor."** It absorbs liquidity and fails to discharge it back into the economy.

4. Discussion: Refuting the Defenses

4.1 The "Productivity" Defense

> *Argument: "Tokyo is rich because it is productive."*

Refutation: Look at Aichi. Aichi is the global center of the automotive industry (High Productivity). Yet, its tax structure is standard ($R_{tax} \approx 52\%$). Tokyo's anomaly (75%) cannot be explained by "Work"; it is explained by "Headquarters Location."

4.2 The "Resilience" Defense

> *Argument: "The 4.2 trillion JPY is for disaster preparedness."*

Refutation: This is a thermodynamic contradiction.

1. **Concentration Risk:** Storing 4.2 trillion JPY of financial energy in the exact spot predicted to be hit by a mega-earthquake (Tokyo) increases system fragility.
2. **Sabotage:** If the goal were resilience, these funds would be spent on **dispersion** (relocating functions to Osaka/Aichi) today. Hoarding them in the danger zone is **Administrative Sabotage**.

5. Conclusion

The comparative data is irrefutable. Tokyo operates under a different set of physics than Osaka or Aichi.

- **Input:** It sucks in wealth it didn't produce (Extraction).
- **Output:** It freezes wealth it doesn't spend (Stagnation).

To cure this national metabolic failure, we must implement **Algorithmic Forced Circulation**—bypassing the Tokyo administration to return the extracted wealth (I_{ext}) directly to the regional blocks that generated it.

References

1. **Tokyo Metropolitan Government.** (2025). *FY2024 Settlement*.
2. **Osaka Prefecture.** (2025). *FY2024 Settlement*.
3. **Aichi Prefecture.** (2025). *FY2024 Settlement*.

4. **Koyama, H.** (2025). *SBCM Field Theory*. Zenodo.