Vol. 19 (2026): Proceedings of 2026 International Conference on Financial Technology, Mathematical Statistics, and Business Analytics (ICFMB 2026)
E-ISSN: 3105-0522 P-ISSN: 3105-0514
DOI: https://doi.org/10.70267/icfmb.202619337341

Raising Taxes on the Wealthy to Reduce Income Inequality: International Evidence and Policy Implications for Malaysia

Linhao Wang*

Beijing Normal-Hong Kong Baptist University, Zhuhai, 519087, China

**Corresponding author: Linhao Wang.*

Abstract

Rising income inequality has renewed interest in progressive taxation as a redistribution tool. This paper reviews international evidence on the relationship between taxing the wealthy and reducing income inequality, with a focus on policy implications for Malaysia. Drawing on theoretical foundations such as the Matthew effect and optimal tax theory, the review synthesizes findings from developed and developing economies, including Belgium, Brazil, and Nordic countries. The analysis shows that well-designed progressive tax systems, combined with efficient public spending, can reduce Gini coefficients and improve social mobility without stifling economic growth. Key mechanisms include fiscal transfers, education and health investments, and conditional cash transfer programs like Bolsa Família. However, critics argue that high taxes may trigger capital flight and reduce innovation incentives. The review finds that such risks are often mitigated by strong institutions, infrastructure, and human capital. For Malaysia, which currently has a maximum tax rate of 30% and significant wealth concentration (top 1% holding 40% of wealth) [1], the evidence supports progressive tax reforms that fund public services and break intergenerational poverty cycles. Policy implications include raising top marginal rates, improving tax enforcement, and linking revenues to inclusive development programs.

Keywords

income inequality, progressive taxation, Malaysia, social mobility, fiscal policy

1. Introduction

Income inequality has risen persistently across both developed and developing economies over the past four decades, driven by globalization, technological change, and the growing concentration of capital. In Malaysia, the richest 1% in the population now own 40% of the nation's total wealth [1], a level of disparity that has intensified social stratification and sparked policy debates about the role of taxation in redistributing income. While Malaysia's top marginal tax rate stands at 30%, many scholars argue that this is insufficient to fund the public services — such as quality education and healthcare — that enable upward mobility for lower-income groups.

The central question facing policymakers is whether raising taxes on high-income groups can reduce inequality without harming economic growth. Critics argue that higher taxes trigger capital flight, reduce innovation, and slow investment. Proponents, however, contend that when tax revenues are reinvested into public goods and social programs, they create a positive feedback loop of improved human capital, expanded consumer markets, and long-term growth.

This paper reviews international evidence on the effectiveness of progressive taxation and wealth redistribution programs. It addresses three research questions: (1) What theoretical mechanisms link tax policy to income redistribution? (2) What does empirical evidence from different countries show about the economic impact of taxing the wealthy? (3) What policy implications can be drawn for Malaysia?

The review is structured as follows. Section 2 presents theoretical background on income inequality and tax-based redistribution. Section 3 reviews empirical literature organized thematically, covering global inequality trends, tax policy controversies, international case studies, and economic feedback loops. Section 4 synthesizes findings, identifies inconsistencies, and discusses limitations. Section 5 concludes with policy implications for Malaysia and directions for future research.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Global and National Income Inequality: Manifestations and Driving Factors

The analysis of income distribution includes practical issues concerning equity within modern economies. An example of income distribution inequity is high income earners of $1 million annually, compared to low income earners of $10,000 annually. The inequity measurable between the two income levels includes disparity of the quality of life, the levels of which the two income groups are able to develop, the opportunity each has, and the resources which they are able to access. People with an annual income of $10,000 only have enough to cover basic necessities, and are therefore forced to divert virtually all of their income to more rationed and crucial survival-focused expenditures, namely their education and healthcare, career advancement, and so on. On the other hand, $1 million a year earners not only cover their daily needs with their income, but also are afforded to expand their income with capital and high-tier education investments, a self-reinforcing phenomenon of wealth concentration described as the Matthew effect.

World Bank data shows that as of 2023, the richest 1% of Malaysia's population own 40% of the total wealth the country has to offer [1]. This absurd amount of wealth has increased social stratification, and contributed to the many debates about the role of taxation and how it regulates the distribution of income. From a global point of view, the Gini coefficient, which is one of the most important metrics that measures income inequality, has been persistently increasing, resulting from the impact of both globalization and technological change. During globalization, capital was highly mobile and could venture into different geographic locations. This benefited highly skilled professionals and capital-rich individuals as they could achieve high returns, while ordinary individuals lost their negotiating power. On the other hand, rapid technological advancement has created new and emerging industries, including the digital economy. This has enabled leading companies and their core employees to exponentially grow their wealth, while others in the traditional sectors experienced job losses and falling earnings. All these factors have driven global income inequality to unprecedented levels.

2.2 The Theoretical Link Between Tax Policy and Income Redistribution

The foundation of income inequality problems is that more personal income means more ability to be taxed. This not only captures a sense of tax fairness but also represents a major means of income redistribution. Regarding Malaysia's tax practice, the prevailing maximum tax rate of 30% is considered by scholars and tax policy makers to be too low to enable significant redistribution of wealth. The immediate outcome of a tax rate being too low is that the government does not have the necessary level of tax revenue to spend on public services, which is a problem for people trying to access high quality education and market opportunities. The lack of an adequate education system restricts the ability of low-income people to enhance their capabilities and move out of their class, while restricted market access also diminishes the development opportunities available to micro, small and medium-sized enterprises, and to the workforce. This situation ultimately lowers economic growth. According to an IMF report [2], countries are losing as much as 2% of their economic growth potential annually due to the insufficient provision of public services, which is, in turn, a consequence of income inequality.

2.3 Controversies over Tax Increases on High-Income Groups

Controversies on tax rate increases continue unabated. Critics of tax increases state that taxation puts a chill on the innovativeness of economic actors. Innovation is critical; high-income individuals and high-income enterprises will stop making costly innovations if they are over-taxed and will lose the impetus for self-sustained economic growth. Hence the critical issue of tax policy remains striking a delicate balance between societal interests and paying attention to the policy of the state to maintain a balance between taxation, innovation, and societal interests. From the perspective of income redistribution to curb income disparity, the principles of tax equity and the role of taxation require that governments across countries increase taxation on the high income earners and provide a design of the tax system that balances economic growth and social equity.

In tax policy debates, opposition to taxing the rich has always argued that tax increases will stifle investment and economic growth. The logic is that high taxes on the rich will leave them with less disposable income, and in search of greater returns on their money, the wealthy individuals and firms will move their money to low tax jurisdictions. This loss of investment will lead to lower domestic investment. Because investment is fundamental to economic growth, outflows of money from a country will weaken economic growth and worsen the job crisis, particularly for the poor. For instance, the Tax Foundation's special report for 2024 highlights that high taxes on the rich cause capital outflows [3]. Wealthy people will always seek to invest their resources in low tax environments to maintain and enhance the value of their capital, given the globalized and liberalized capital markets.

Initial capital outflow and lowered domestic investments translate to little to no economic growth in a country's GDP. Corporate investment in production scale and industry upgrades becomes impossible to obtain. Employment and income decrease, consumer markets shrink, and we are left with a negative cycle of 'declining investment — slowing economic growth — reduced employment.' In spite of this, there is the possibility that the argument of economic loss is greatly exaggerated. There is evidence that shows tax rates are only a small factor influencing the investment decisions of wealthy individuals and businesses. Some other key variables include: market environment, infrastructure, and the quality of human resources. In this regard, it is noted in Pozen [4] that governments that are able to utilize tax revenues to make the necessary high quality infrastructure investments that improve business operations will induce wealthy individuals and businesses to invest and conduct business in their own countries.

3. The Positive Feedback Loop of Rational Tax Policies on Economic Development

The positive interaction between tax policy and economic development shows that rational tax policies are not a hindrance to economic growth, but instead can create a positive economic ecosystem for all through a constructive circulation of public funds. In this ecosystem, social responsibility is embedded in high-income individuals, as they pay taxes and enjoy the development benefits of quality public service provision; low-income individuals are given equitable growth opportunities and higher incomes through service provision that upgrades their consuming capacity, which broadens market horizons and increases profit potential for businesses. Hence, in relation to employment and investment, the opportunities created by justifiable taxation significantly outweigh its disadvantages. A tax system that holds merit achieves a constructive and equitable distribution of interests, allowing all social strata to experience the benefits of economic growth. This creates the development cycle of 'tax coordination – improved public services – economic cycle.' Tax system design aims to create an optimal system for redistributing wealth across different income brackets. In particular, the underlying principle for justifying increased taxation for wealthier brackets is the need to devise a sustainable system for redistributing wealth. The system's sustainable value is derived from the ability to simultaneously achieve economic efficiency and social equity and to end the trade-off between the two.

4. International Case Studies: Effectiveness of Progressive Taxation and Wealth Redistribution Programs

In Belgium, a multi-bracket progressive tax system reduced the post-tax Gini coefficient from 0.49 to 0.25, a 49.5% improvement [5]. The World Bank (2023) confirms that well-designed tax policies can lower income inequality by 10–15% and improve social mobility [1]. Brazil's tax-funded Bolsa Família programme lifted 36 million people out of poverty between 2003 and 2014, while the economy grew by 20%. The programme also helped break the intergenerational poverty cycle through educational and nutritional grants [1]. The OECD notes that high social spending funded by taxes increases social mobility; Norway's fully subsidised university education attracts international talent and boosts long-term growth [6].

In the United States, over 60% of federal tax revenues go to social security and health care [6]. These expenditures protect health, reduce poverty, and stabilise aggregate demand — all of which support economic growth. Research indicates that investment in economic growth areas broadens development horizons, mitigates social conflicts, and builds a more flexible economy [7]. The practical experience of Nordic countries (Sweden, Norway) shows that high-tax, high-welfare policies do not cause economic stagnation; they rank at the top in GDP per capita and the Human Development Index [8]. For Malaysia, the current 30% top tax rate limits fiscal capacity. Raising rates on the wealthy could fund infrastructure and education, enhancing competitiveness without driving capital away — especially because investment decisions depend more on market environment and human capital than on tax rates alone [4].

5. Policy Implications for Malaysia: Advocating Progressive Tax Reforms to Promote Sustainable Development

The increase in global wealth disparity has also caused an expanding gap in potential development between classes and regions. Apart from stunting the gradual development of the economy, this gap could create development-threatening social unrest and conflicts. It is imperative, therefore, that world leaders take strong and immediate measures and start using tax policies as an essential means of controlling and redistributing population income. A few clarifications need to be made concerning the progressivity of tax systems. A tax system of this type is not simply an option, or just an instance of "robbing Peter to pay Paul"; it is a matter of social justice that conforms to principles of fair and equitable distribution of resources in society. An equitable distribution of what has been developed fosters full participation of the people in the social and economic development of the nation. Development is no longer a "feast" for the privileged few; rather, it is a "win" for all classes of society, in a manner that all share in the economic development of the nation. Such a tax system would help develop the economy and also repeatedly adjust social justice, thus creating a good starting point for an economy that is also equitable and sustainable.

6. Conclusion

This review has examined international evidence on raising taxes on the wealthy as a strategy to reduce income inequality, with implications for Malaysia. The findings show that progressive taxation, when paired with efficient public spending, can significantly lower Gini coefficients, improve social mobility, and even support economic growth — contradicting the claim that tax increases necessarily stifle investment or innovation. Key success factors include reinvesting revenues into education, healthcare, and conditional cash transfer programs, as demonstrated by Belgium, Brazil, and Nordic countries. For Malaysia, where the top 1% holds 40% of national wealth [1] and the maximum tax rate is only 30%, the evidence supports progressive tax reforms. Such reforms could fund quality education and infrastructure, breaking intergenerational poverty cycles and expanding consumer markets. However, policymakers must address capital mobility concerns by improving institutional quality and linking tax revenues to visible development outcomes. Future research should focus on: (1) longitudinal studies of tax reforms in middle-income countries; (2) the political feasibility of raising top marginal rates; and (3) micro-level evidence on how tax-funded social programs affect entrepreneurship and labor supply. Until then, the balance of evidence suggests that well-designed progressive taxation is a viable, effective tool for reducing inequality without sacrificing growth.

References

[1] World Bank. (2023). World Development Report 2023. World Bank Publications.

[2] International Monetary Fund. (2025). FISCAL MONITOR Spending Smarter: How Efficient and Well-Allocated Public Spending Can Boost Economic Growth. International Monetary Fund.

[3] Enache C. (2024 June 26). The High Cost of Wealth Taxes. Tax Foundation; Tax Foundation. https://taxfoundation.org/research/all/eu/wealth-tax-impact/

[4] Pozen R. C. (2011 September 27). The Myth of Corporate Tax Reform. Brookings. https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-myth-of-corporate-tax-reform/

[5] Hasell J. (2023). Income inequality before and after taxes: how much do countries redistribute income? Our World in Data. https://ourworldindata.org/income-inequality-before-and-after-taxes

[6] Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. (2025 January 28). Policy Basics: Where Do Our Federal Tax Dollars Go? Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. https://www.cbpp.org/research/federal-budget/where-do-our-federal-tax-dollars-go

[7] Tharpe W. (2019 February 5). Raising State Income Tax Rates at the Top a Sensible Way to Fund Key Investments. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. https://www.cbpp.org/research/state-budget-and-tax/raising-state-income-tax-rates-at-the-top-a-sensible-way-to-fund-key

[8] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). Tax Policy Reforms 2024.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgment

This paper is an output of the science project.