Qwen

A Comprehensive Analysis of National Revenue from Taxation

The Economic Impact and Structural Role of Different Tax Types

The structure of a nation's tax system is not merely a mechanism for revenue collection; it is a fundamental component of its economic architecture, with profound implications for growth, investment, productivity, and social equity. The choice of which taxes to levy and at what rates shapes the incentives for work, saving, and capital formation, while also determining the government's capacity to provide public goods and services. Macroeconomic models and empirical evidence consistently show that different types of taxes exert distinct pressures on the economy. The most economically detrimental are often corporate taxes, followed by indirect consumption taxes, with income taxes being comparatively less harmful in the long run.

Corporate income taxes (CIT) are widely regarded as having the most negative impact on economic performance [4] [27]. Simulations using the NIESR's NiGEM macroeconomic model demonstrate that an increase in CIT leads to a severe initial contraction in GDP, reduces the economy's potential output, and lowers overall productivity [4] [27]. This occurs because higher corporate taxes increase the cost of capital, thereby discouraging business investment in new equipment, technology, and infrastructure. By reducing after-tax profits, these taxes can dampen entrepreneurial activity and innovation, which are critical drivers of long-term economic expansion. Furthermore, they can contribute to inflationary pressures as businesses may pass on some of the tax burden to consumers through higher prices [4].

Indirect taxes, such as Value-Added Taxes (VAT) and excise duties, also impose significant costs on the economy, though generally less severe than those from corporate taxes [4] [27]. Their primary negative effect stems from price increases, which reduce consumer purchasing power and aggregate demand [4]. However, their distortionary impact can be mitigated by careful design. For instance, applying VAT to final retail sales rather than intermediate business-to-business transactions avoids "tax pyramiding," where the same value is taxed multiple times along a supply chain [17]. Many countries address the regressivity and demand-reducing effects of consumption taxes by applying reduced VAT rates to essential goods like food, medicines, and books [3] [38]. Excise taxes, when targeted effectively at goods with negative externalities like tobacco and alcohol, can serve both revenue and public health objectives, but overly broad excise systems can become inefficient distortions of consumption patterns [26].

In stark contrast, taxes on personal income are considered to have the least negative effect on GDP growth over the long term [4] [27]. While high marginal rates can theoretically reduce the incentive to work or invest, the behavioral responses are often smaller than commonly assumed. Studies indicate that labor supply elasticity—the degree to which people change their work hours in response to tax changes—is relatively low for most individuals [3]. High-income earners, or "superstars," may exhibit more mobility in response to tax changes, but their overall impact on the labor market is limited [3].

The primary advantage of income taxes lies in their ability to reduce income inequality. Across OECD countries, taxation has been found to reduce inequality by approximately one-third, equivalent to a reduction of about 0.15 points on the Gini coefficient [3]. When revenues from progressive income taxes are reinvested into productive public spending—such as education, green infrastructure, or healthcare—the net economic effect can even be positive [4] [27].

Other forms of taxation present unique trade-offs. Payroll taxes, levied on labor income, are considered less distortionary than capital taxes because labor is generally less mobile than capital across international borders [17]. Property taxes on immovable assets like land and buildings are viewed as economically efficient and stable sources of revenue, although property taxes on personal property can be more disruptive [17] [30]. Wealth taxes and estate taxes can discourage investment and lead to unproductive tax planning, though modern digital tools are improving the administration of wealth taxes [17] [25]. Finally, innovative proposals like land value taxes, which target the unimproved value of land, are argued to be non-distortionary and could significantly boost economic welfare and output by shifting the tax base away from productive activities [4] [27]. Empirical studies suggest that fully shifting taxes from capital and labor to land could increase economic output by 26% and welfare by 5.2% [4] [27].

Tax Type	Primary Economic Impact	Key Considerations
Corporate Income Tax	Negative (reduces investment, productivity, potential GDP) [4] [27]	Discourages capital formation; can be passed to consumers; effective tax design is crucial.
Value-Added Tax (VAT)	Negative (reduces consumption demand via price increases) [4] [27]	Can be designed to be less distortionary; reduced rates for essentials can mitigate regressivity [3] [38].
Personal Income Tax	Least negative; can have neutral or positive effects if used for public investment [4] [27]	Progressivity helps reduce inequality; behavioral responses are often small [3].
Payroll Taxes	Less harmful than capital taxes due to lower labor mobility [17]	Applied to labor income, balancing incentives for employment versus revenue generation.
Property Taxes	Generally stable and efficient, especially on land [17] [30]	Land value taxes are considered non-distortionary and highly beneficial [4] [27].

Comparative Analysis of National Tax Systems: U.S., UK, and OECD

National tax systems vary significantly in their composition, structure, and reliance on different revenue sources, reflecting diverse economic conditions, political philosophies, and administrative capacities. A comparative analysis of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the broader Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) provides valuable insights into

these differences. These variations have direct consequences for fiscal stability, economic growth, and the state's ability to respond to crises.

In the United States, federal tax policy is characterized by a heavy reliance on individual income taxes, which constituted 54% of total federal revenue in 2022 [6]. This was complemented by Social Security and Medicare payroll taxes, which together accounted for 30% of revenue [6]. In contrast, corporate income taxes have become a much smaller component, contributing just 9% in 2022, a figure that had averaged only 1.5% of GDP over the preceding decade [6]. This trend reflects a structural shift away from corporate taxation as a primary revenue source. At the state and local level, the picture is more varied. Property taxes are the largest single source of revenue for local governments, providing 72.2% of their tax collections, while sales taxes are the dominant source for states, contributing 32.2% of their tax revenue [2]. This creates a patchwork of reliance, with some states like Oregon depending heavily on individual income taxes (39.1% of collections), while others like Washington, Tennessee, and New Mexico derive their highest shares from sales taxes [2]. This diversity can create resilience but also highlights the vulnerability of jurisdictions with narrow tax bases.

The United Kingdom presents a different fiscal profile. As of 2023-24, public spending reached nearly 45% of GDP, the highest sustained level since the mid-1970s, while debt stood at 98.1% of GDP [12]. Projections indicate this trajectory is unsustainable, with debt expected to reach 274% of GDP by 2073-74 under current policies [12]. The UK's tax system relies on a mix of income tax (~11% of GDP), National Insurance contributions (~5.8% of GDP), VAT (~7.4% of GDP), and corporation tax (~3.5% of GDP) [12]. However, these mainstays face significant headwinds. Revenues from fuel duty are projected to fall to zero by 2057-58 due to the transition to electric vehicles, and tobacco duty revenues are expected to approach zero by 2059-60 due to smoking bans [12]. This makes the system increasingly dependent on taxes that are politically sensitive or subject to long-term structural decline, posing a major challenge to future fiscal sustainability.

The OECD average provides a useful benchmark. In 2022, the average tax-to-GDP ratio across the 36 countries for which data is available was 34.0%, down slightly from 34.2% in 2021 [23]. This is substantially higher than the U.S. figure of 25.5% in 2020 [9], indicating that developed nations generally raise a larger share of national output in taxes [3]. The composition of this revenue differs from the U.S. The OECD average is dominated by social security contributions (25.6%), personal income tax (23.7%), VAT (20.7%), and other consumption taxes (11.2%) [23]. Corporate income tax represents a larger portion of total tax revenue in the OECD (10.2%) compared to the U.S. federal system [6, 23]. This suggests that OECD countries, as a group, place more emphasis on a diversified tax base that includes social contributions and broad-based consumption taxes alongside income and corporate taxes.

Developing countries exhibit yet another model, typically with lower overall tax-to-GDP ratios, averaging around 18% compared to 38% in advanced economies [26]. Their revenue structures are often tilted towards trade and consumption taxes, with income taxes playing a minimal role [26]. This is partly due to weaker administrative capacity and challenges in taxing large informal sectors. The table below summarizes key aspects of these three systems.

Feature	United States	United Kingdom	OECD Average (36 Countries)
Tax-to-GDP Ratio	25.5% (2020) [9]	~41.2% (2028-29 projection) [12]	34.0% (2022) [23]
Primary Federal Revenue Source	Individual Income Tax (54% of federal revenue, 2022) [6]	Not Available in Provided Sources	Social Security Contributions (25.6% of total tax revenue, 2021) [23]
Secondary Federal Revenue Source	Payroll Taxes (30% of federal revenue, 2022) [6]	VAT (7.4% of GDP) [12]	Personal Income Tax (23.7% of total tax revenue, 2021) [23]
Key Fiscal Challenge	Rising public debt, aging population [7] [29]	Unsustainable long-term debt, falling revenues from fossil fuels/duties [12]	Aging populations driving up health/social spending [7]
System Characteristic	Dual federal/state/local system with varied reliance on different taxes [2]	Centralized system with strong reliance on social contributions and VAT [23]	Diversified system with high reliance on social contributions and personal income tax [23]

These comparisons underscore that there is no one-size-fits-all model for national taxation. Each system is a product of its specific history, demographics, and economic structure, and each faces unique challenges in balancing revenue needs with economic growth and social objectives.

Long-Term Fiscal Sustainability and the Burden of Demographic Change

The long-term fiscal sustainability of any nation is fundamentally linked to its ability to balance its expenditures with its revenue streams over decades. An over-reliance on a narrow set of tax sources, particularly those susceptible to economic or demographic shifts, can create profound vulnerabilities. The most significant threat to fiscal sustainability in developed nations is the demographic transition towards an aging population, which places immense pressure on public finances, primarily through rising health care and pension costs [1] [7].

The concept of a "fiscal gap" provides a powerful tool for assessing long-term fiscal health. Introduced by economist Alan J. Auerbach, the fiscal gap represents the annual percentage-point increase in the primary budget surplus (government revenue minus all spending except interest on the debt) that a government would need to commit to immediately and permanently to stabilize its debt-to-GDP ratio at a sustainable level, such as 60% of GDP, in the long run [7]. This measure is far more predictive of future fiscal distress than simple snapshots of the debt-to-GDP ratio. For example, Japan's high fiscal gap is driven by its already massive existing debt, whereas the United States' exceptionally high fiscal gap of around 10% of GDP is driven by projections that its primary

deficit will continue to grow due to spending on health care and pensions [7]. Projections show U.S. health spending alone is set to rise from 8.7% of GDP in 2015 to 20.3% by 2050, a staggering increase that dwarfs other budget items [7]. This demonstrates how long-term fiscal challenges stem more from the projected growth in primary deficits than from the current level of debt.

This demographic pressure is not unique to the U.S. In the UK, public sector net debt is projected to surge from 94% of GDP in 2028-29 to 274% by 2073-74, largely because total government spending is forecast to climb from 45% to over 60% of GDP, while revenues remain stagnant around 40% of GDP [12]. Health spending in the UK is projected to grow from 7.9% to 14.5% of GDP by 2073-74, fueled by aging demographics, income effects, and the "Baumol's cost disease" effect, where sectors with slow productivity growth (like health) see their relative costs rise over time [12]. Even countries with seemingly favorable fiscal positions, like Ireland and Italy, show signs of stress, with Italy exhibiting a negative fiscal gap that indicates a surprising room for fiscal stimulus, while Greece's gap becomes extremely large under more realistic economic assumptions, highlighting its vulnerability to market confidence [7].

Beyond demographics, persistent budget deficits pose another grave threat. Deficits occur when government spending exceeds revenue and must be financed by borrowing, leading to an accumulation of public debt [29]. The U.S. federal budget deficit reached $3.1 trillion in fiscal year 2020, equivalent to 14.9% of GDP, driven by pandemic relief measures [29]. Such large deficits increase the debt-to-GDP ratio, raising concerns about financial stability and crowding out private investment by driving up interest rates [29]. The IMF recommended a four-pronged strategy post-2009 crisis that included avoiding permanent deficit increases and committing to long-term fiscal correction to manage such risks [1].

To conclude, ensuring long-term fiscal sustainability requires proactive and comprehensive fiscal governance. Relying solely on traditional tax bases without anticipating and planning for structural changes is a recipe for future crisis. Independent fiscal councils, such as the UK's Office of Budget Responsibility, have been proposed to improve fiscal governance and enhance transparency [7]. Ultimately, achieving sustainability involves a combination of prudent short-term fiscal management and bold, long-term reforms to address the root causes of spending pressures, particularly those stemming from demographic aging. Without such action, nations risk passing on an untenable debt burden to future generations.

The Emerging Landscape of Green and Digital Taxation

Governments are increasingly turning to specialized taxes to address pressing global challenges, creating a new and dynamic landscape for national revenue. Environmental taxes and digital service taxes represent two of the most prominent examples, aiming to generate income while simultaneously steering economic behavior toward more sustainable and equitable outcomes. These novel tax categories are reshaping national budgets and sparking intense international debate.

Environmental taxation has gained significant traction as a policy instrument to combat climate change and promote environmental sustainability [13]. These taxes, which include carbon taxes, energy taxes, pollution taxes, and resource taxes, function by increasing the cost of polluting activities, thereby incentivizing cleaner production methods and consumption choices [13] [19]. The EU has been a leader in this area, with environmental tax revenue amounting to €341.5 billion in 2023, or 2.0% of

its GDP [20] [33]. This revenue is composed mainly of energy taxes (76.4%), transport taxes (18.7%), and pollution/resource taxes (4.8%) [33]. The effectiveness of these taxes is supported by econometric analysis showing that a 1% increase in environmental taxes can lead to a 2.304% long-term reduction in consumption-based carbon emissions [15]. The 'double dividend' hypothesis suggests that the revenues from these taxes can be recycled to reduce other, more distortionary taxes like income or payroll taxes, potentially yielding a net positive effect on the economy [13]. To support this transition, the OECD launched the Paris Collaborative on Green Budgeting in 2017 to help countries integrate environmental considerations into their fiscal frameworks [22].

Another rapidly evolving area is digital taxation. As multinational technology companies generate vast revenues from digital services, many countries are seeking ways to capture a portion of this income through specific taxes. Digital Service Taxes (DSTs) have been implemented in several countries, including France (3%), the UK (2%), Italy, Spain, and Canada (planned for 2024) [35] [37]. These taxes are levied on the revenue of large tech firms from activities like online advertising, digital marketplaces, and user data sales [37]. While DST revenues currently represent a small fraction of total tax revenue (e.g., around 0.1% in most countries), they are growing rapidly [35] [36]. For example, Turkey saw a 134% increase in DST revenue, and India saw a 100% increase [36]. However, DSTs are controversial. They are considered regressive as they are often passed on to consumers, risk double taxation, and have led to trade disputes, notably between the U.S. and its allies [35] [37].

Recognizing the limitations of unilateral actions, the OECD/G20 Inclusive Framework has been developing a two-pillar solution to reform international tax rules for the digital age. Pillar One aims to reallocate taxing rights to market jurisdictions, allowing them to tax a portion of the profit of large multinational enterprises, regardless of whether the company has a physical presence. Pillar Two establishes a 15% minimum global corporate tax rate, known as the Global Anti-Base Erosion (GloBE) Rules, to prevent profit-shifting and erosion of the tax base [35] [41]. As of early 2025, over 140 countries have joined this framework, signaling a major shift in the global tax landscape [41]. The success of this deal will determine the future of bilateral DSTs, with the EU considering relaunching its own proposal if progress on Pillar One stalls [36].

Tax Category	Objective	Key Examples / Mechanisms	Current Status & Challenges
Environmental Taxes	Promote environmental sustainability, fund green initiatives, correct negative externalities [13]	Carbon pricing, energy taxes, pollution taxes, eco-labeling fees [14] [19]	Growth in revenue (e.g., EU €341.5B in 2023 [20]); revenue share is declining as % of GDP [33]; complex to design and implement fairly.
Digital Service Taxes (DSTs)	Capture tax revenue from the digital economy, particularly from large tech companies [37]	Gross-based taxes on revenue from digital interfaces, advertising, etc. (e.g., France's 3% tax) [37]	Implemented by 18 countries; revenue is rising but small (<0.1-0.3% of total tax revenue) [36]; faces significant trade disputes and uncertainty following the OECD deal [35].

Tax Category	Objective	Key Examples / Mechanisms	Current Status & Challenges
Global Minimum Tax	Prevent base erosion and profit shifting (BEPS), ensure MNEs pay a fair share of tax, level the playing field [41]	Pillar Two sets a 15% minimum effective tax rate for MNEs with >€750M revenue [35] [41]	Negotiated within the OECD/G20 Inclusive Framework; implemented by over 100 countries; the US is not compliant, and President Trump rejected the deal [35] [41].

Fiscal Policy as an Economic Stabilizer and Its Implementation Challenges

Governments utilize fiscal policy—their use of taxation and spending—to actively influence economic activity and achieve macroeconomic objectives such as stable growth, full employment, and price stability [1]. The effectiveness of fiscal policy depends critically on its design, timing, and implementation. The government expenditure and tax components directly feed into the GDP equation, where GDP = C (consumption) + I (investment) + G (government spending) + NX (net exports) [1]. While government spending (G) is directly controlled, taxes indirectly affect the other components by altering disposable income and business costs.

One of the most important roles of fiscal policy is acting as an automatic stabilizer during economic cycles. During periods of economic downturn, tax revenues automatically decline as corporate profits and household incomes fall, especially under progressive tax systems [1]. This reduction in tax receipts provides a natural counter-cyclical stimulus, leaving households and businesses with more money to spend and invest, thereby softening the blow of the recession. Similarly, government spending on programs like unemployment benefits tends to rise automatically during recessions, further supporting aggregate demand. Advanced economies generally have stronger automatic stabilizers due to wider tax bases and more robust social safety nets, which allows them to absorb shocks more effectively without requiring additional discretionary policy action [1]. Conversely, countries with narrow tax bases or weak institutions have weaker stabilizers, limiting their capacity to respond to crises [1].

When automatic stabilizers prove insufficient, governments may deploy discretionary fiscal stimulus. The effectiveness of such stimulus is measured by fiscal multipliers, which quantify the change in GDP resulting from a change in government spending or taxes. Multipliers are generally higher for government spending than for tax cuts, and higher for spending on investments like infrastructure, which can have a multiplier of 1.59, compared to just 0.23 for labor income tax cuts [29]. The size of the multiplier also depends on factors like the openness of the economy (multipliers are lower in small, open economies due to higher leakages) and the credibility of the government's commitment to fiscal consolidation [1]. For stimulus to be effective, it must be timely, targeted, and temporary, ideally deployed with pre-planned "shovel-ready" projects to minimize implementation lags [1].

However, implementing fiscal policy is fraught with challenges. One major hurdle is the phenomenon of "implementation lag"—the delay between recognizing the need for a policy change and seeing its effects on the economy. This can be exacerbated by political gridlock and bureaucratic inertia. Another challenge is determining the optimal composition of the stimulus. While spending multipliers are higher, tax cuts can be more flexible and faster to implement. Furthermore, the scale of the intervention matters. Withdrawing stimulus too abruptly can be contractionary; cutting government consumption by just 1% of GDP can reduce real GDP by 1.55% in the first year [29].

Effective fiscal policy also requires access to fiscal space—the ability to increase spending or cut taxes without jeopardizing financial stability or triggering a loss of investor confidence [1]. This space is determined by a country's financing access and the confidence of its creditors. Persistent deficits can erode this space, making it harder to respond to future shocks. The U.S. structural deficit, which rose to nearly 5.0% of GDP by 2019 despite strong economic conditions, illustrates this vulnerability [29]. Therefore, successful fiscal management involves a delicate balance between using fiscal policy to smooth economic cycles and maintaining long-term fiscal discipline to preserve the capacity for future action. This requires robust institutional frameworks, independent fiscal oversight, and credible long-term budget plans to guide policymakers through turbulent economic waters.

Strategic Imperatives for Modernizing National Revenue Systems

As nations navigate the complexities of the 21st-century economy, their tax systems are facing unprecedented challenges and opportunities. The convergence of globalization, technological disruption, demographic shifts, and climate change necessitates a strategic rethinking of how national revenue is generated. To build resilient and sustainable economies, governments must move beyond incremental adjustments and embrace bold, forward-looking reforms. These imperatives center on diversification, adaptation to the green and digital economies, and leveraging innovative fiscal instruments to meet long-term goals.

First and foremost is the imperative of revenue diversification. Over-reliance on a single source of income, whether it is a volatile commodity like oil or a specific tax type like corporate income tax, exposes a nation to significant macroeconomic risks [8] [28]. The experience of U.S. municipalities provides a compelling case study: cities with more diversified revenue structures were better able to withstand fiscal stress during the 2001 and 2008 recessions, avoiding sharp cuts in operational spending [11]. Research shows that a 13-percentage-point increase in revenue diversification correlates with a 7.2% rise in per-capita general revenue [30]. This principle applies at the national level as well. The decline of traditional revenue sources, such as the planned phase-out of fuel duty in the UK, underscores the urgent need to cultivate new streams of income before old ones disappear completely [12].

Second is the strategic adaptation to the green economy. Environmental taxes are no longer just a niche policy but a central pillar of efforts to combat climate change and promote sustainable development [13] [31]. The data clearly shows a positive correlation between environmental taxation and progress toward Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) [16]. These taxes can generate substantial revenue that can be recycled to reduce other distortionary taxes, potentially creating a "double dividend" [13]. The EU's record of collecting €341.5 billion in environmental taxes in 2023 demonstrates the scale of this potential [20]. The introduction of mechanisms like the EU's Carbon

Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) and the global minimum tax (Pillar Two) further reinforces the link between trade, finance, and environmental goals, forcing a systemic integration of climate considerations into national fiscal policy [4] [41].

Third is the need to adapt to the digital economy. The rapid growth of the digital sector has created a significant mismatch between where economic value is created and where it is taxed. The proliferation of Digital Service Taxes (DSTs) by numerous countries, including France, the UK, and India, signals a clear intent to capture a share of this new wealth [35] [36]. While these unilateral actions have sparked trade tensions, they have also catalyzed the landmark OECD/G20 global tax deal [35] [41]. This deal offers a blueprint for a more stable and equitable international tax system, moving away from ad-hoc measures toward a coordinated, rules-based framework. Adopting this framework is a strategic imperative for avoiding costly trade wars and ensuring that the benefits of the digital economy are shared more broadly.

Finally, there is an opportunity to explore and implement more innovative and efficient tax instruments. Concepts like land value taxes, which are considered non-distortionary and could boost economic output by as much as 26%, represent a paradigm shift in tax thinking [4] [27]. Similarly, a global financial transaction tax (FTT) could raise significant revenue with minimal impact on long-term investment, while a global wealth tax could tap into a previously untaxed reservoir of capital [25]. The adoption of modern digitalization tools, such as e-invoicing and electronic fiscal devices, can dramatically improve tax administration, helping to close tax gaps and increase revenue without necessarily raising rates [25]. In conclusion, modernizing national revenue systems requires a multi-pronged strategy. It demands a departure from outdated models and a commitment to building flexible, diversified, and forward-looking tax systems that can generate the necessary resources to fund public goods, adapt to structural change, and secure a prosperous and sustainable future.

Reference

1. Fiscal Policy: Taking and Giving Away https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/fandd/issues/Series/Back-to-Basics/Fiscal-Policy
2. Sources of State and Local Tax Collections (FY 2020) https://taxfoundation.org/data/all/state/state-local-tax-collections/
3. Taxation - Our World in Data https://ourworldindata.org/taxation
4. Which taxes are best and worst for growth? - Economics Observatory https://economicsobservatory.com/which-taxes-are-best-and-worst-for-growth
5. Government Revenue | U.S. Treasury Fiscal Data https://fiscaldata.treasury.gov/americas-finance-guide/government-revenue/
6. What are the sources of revenue for the federal government? https://taxpolicycenter.org/briefing-book/what-are-sources-revenue-federal-government
7. Long - Term Fiscal Sustainability in Advanced Economies - Auerbach https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/app5.131

8. Tax Revenue Volatility Is Increasing in Most States https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/articles/2024/05/07/tax-revenue-volatility-is-increasing-in-most-states
9. Taxation in the United States - Wikipedia https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Taxation_in_the_United_States
10. Government Revenue Structure and Fiscal Performance in the G7 https://www.mdpi.com/2673-4060/6/3/97
11. [PDF] Revenue Diversification and Changes in Municipal Spending After ... https://gfrc.uic.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/188/2019/05/Hendrick-GFRC-Shadow-paper-May-2019.pdf
12. Fiscal risks and sustainability – September 2024 - OBR https://obr.uk/frs/fiscal-risks-and-sustainability-september-2024/
13. The role of taxation in environmental sustainability in G-20 economies https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0301479724039835
14. Environmental Taxes and Sustainable Development in the EU - MDPI https://www.mdpi.com/2079-8954/13/7/503
15. Do environmental taxes, environmental innovation, and energy ... https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10681941/
16. Impact of taxes on the 2030 agenda for sustainable development ... https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666660X23000373
17. Not All Taxes Are Created Equal | TaxEDU - Tax Foundation https://taxfoundation.org/taxedu/primers/primer-not-all-taxes-are-created-equal/
18. Explaining Central Government's Tax Revenue Categories through ... https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/2330443X.2024.2356507
19. Environmental tax - OECD https://www.oecd.org/en/data/indicators/environmental-tax.html
20. Environmental tax revenue shows slight increase in 2023 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-eurostat-news/w/ddn-20250722-1
21. Environmental Taxes - World Bank https://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/the-global-tax-program/environmental-taxes
22. Green budgeting - OECD https://www.oecd.org/en/topics/sub-issues/green-budgeting.html
23. Revenue Statistics 2023 - OECD https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/2023/12/revenue-statistics-2023_6ee814f4.html
24. G20 provides record financial support for fossil fuels https://www.energypolicytracker.org/g20-fossil-fuel-support/
25. [PDF] G-20 Note on Alternative Options for Revenue Mobilization, June 2024 https://www.imf.org/external/np/g20/pdf/2024/062424.pdf
26. Economic Issues No. 27 -- Tax Policy for Developing Countries https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/issues/issues27/

27. Which taxes are best and worst for growth? - Economics Observatory https://www.economicsobservatory.com/which-taxes-are-best-and-worst-for-growth
28. The Risks Of Relying On A Single Source Of Income - FasterCapital https://fastercapital.com/topics/the-risks-of-relying-on-a-single-source-of-income.html/1
29. Fiscal Policy: Economic Effects | Congress.gov https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R45723
30. [PDF] Revenue Diversification in Large U.S. Cities - IMFG https://imfg.org/uploads/176/chernick_imfg_%235_online.pdf
31. ENVIRONMENTAL TAXATION AND CARBON EMISSION IN G20 ... https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/5242414.pdf?abstractid=5242414&mirid=1&type=2
32. Tax revenue | OECD https://www.oecd.org/en/data/indicators/tax-revenue.html
33. Environmental tax statistics - Statistics Explained - Eurostat https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Environmental_tax_statistics
34. UK: annual environmental taxes revenue - Statista https://www.statista.com/statistics/491800/tax-revenue-from-environmental-taxes-united-kingdom-uk/
35. [PDF] A PRIMER ON DIGITAL SERVICE TAXES AND THE OECD'S TWO ... https://taxpolicycenter.org/sites/default/files/2025-05/A-Primer-on-Digital-Service-Taxes-and-the-OECD%27s-Two-Pillars.pdf
36. [PDF] Digital Service Taxes - EU Tax Observatory https://www.taxobservatory.eu/www-site/uploads/2023/06/EUTO_Digital-Service-Taxes_June2023.pdf
37. Digital Taxation around the World - Tax Foundation https://taxfoundation.org/research/all/global/digital-taxation/
38. Consumption Tax Trends 2024 - OECD https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/2024/11/consumption-tax-trends-2024_57c7322a.html
39. Tax Policy Reforms 2023 - OECD https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/tax-policy-reforms-2023_d8bc45d9-en.html
40. Towards a European digital services tax: renewing the momentum ... https://www.ceps.eu/ceps-publications/towards-a-european-digital-services-tax-renewing-the-momentum-for-a-fair-contribution/
41. The OECD and Digital Services Taxes - Bloomberg Tax https://pro.bloombergtax.com/insights/international-tax/understanding-digital-services-taxes-the-oecd/