

Tax Justice in Practice: Access-to-Rights Evidence from GST/VAT, tax-transfer policy, discrimination, tax justice, consumption taxes

Kazi Rukaiya Sultana

Jul 27, 2025

Abstract

This article examines tax justice through GST, VAT, consumption taxes, tax-transfer policy and discrimination. Broad consumption taxes can raise revenue efficiently, but lower-income households may spend a larger share of current income, creating distributional concerns. Reduced rates for essentials can provide relief but also benefit higher-spending households and create additional classification complexity. Targeted transfers may compensate more precisely when administrative systems can reliably identify and reach eligible households. The article emphasizes that fairness therefore depends on the whole tax-transfer system rather than the consumption-tax rate alone. It also considers discrimination in practical access: digital-only filing, identity requirements, language, disability, housing insecurity and banking access can make formally neutral procedures harder for some groups. Gender budgeting, public-finance incidence, small-business burden, retirement concessions and corporate governance further broaden the analysis. Tax clinics and tax literacy can help taxpayers use their rights, while enforcement should distinguish inability, mistake, avoidance and fraud. The article's standard for justice is equal practical capability to participate, supported by understandable rules, affordable assistance, transparent decisions, effective review and distributional assessment before reforms are implemented.



While tax justice is usually talked about on the basis of rates and redistribution, the right to have a right starts with procedure. A taxpayer should be familiar with the requirement, have records, be able to communicate with an authority, challenge an assessment, and have it reviewed at an affordable cost. When formal equality becomes de facto inequality because services and advice are required to participate, then complex law can make this possible. Access-to-rights analysis thus asks the question: can the ordinary person and the small entity take advantage of the protections provided by the text of tax law?

GST and VAT are efficient revenue tools if the base is wide, and administrative means are sound, but distribution issues may also be present as the poor tend to have a higher marginal propensity to spend. The lower rates may apply to essentials, but relief also extends to higher income households buying the same products and complexity of classification is added. Specific transfers can provide more specific compensation if administrative systems are able to reliably reach eligible households. Thus, the tax-transfer system, and not the consumption-tax rate alone, is the basis for tax justice.

Gender budgeting widens the tax justice lens as formal neutrality of rules can have different impacts on labour market and household patterns. Incidence can be influenced by a variety of paid work, unpaid care, saving for retirement, property ownership, and consumption differences. It is thus possible to have a budget that is distributionally unequal without having a gender explicit statement. Gender-aware analysis includes an examination of who benefits from concessions, who pays consumption taxes, who is eligible for credits, and the implications of policy for caregiving and lifetime earnings.

The fairness equation includes spending side public finance. Who pays taxes is an important part of tax justice, but not the only part; because revenue supports health,

education, infrastructure, income support, security and administration. A fiscal-incidence analysis is used to connect taxes and benefits and to show how they work together to impact household resources. It also prevents simplistic statements of what is 'just' and what is 'unjust' with only a single tax being taken into account rather than services and transfers as part of the overall system.

The interplay of company law and securities regulation with tax justice is in the realm of disclosure and governance. The information that is available for boards, investors, auditors, regulators and tax authorities to see is determined by corporate reporting. Issues such as related party transactions, provisions, risk of tax, uncertain tax positions, executive incentives, etc. may be relevant to risk assessment. Responsibilities must be made plain and credible oversight of a government will not allow aggressive tax planning to be continued.

The challenge with access is unique to small businesses, as the obligations are similar to larger businesses but not as in-depth. Cumulative burden can be caused by GST registration, payroll and deduction processes, record keeping and entity options. Clinics and simple, easily available information about tax can prevent small issues from becoming deep debts. Though the long run solution is the simpler one, simplicity should not be made support services or "compensation" for unnecessary complications.

Another area of access and distribution is revealed in retirement policy. Superannuation or retirement saving tax concessions can help people to secure their income for the long-term, but the fiscal value of these savings may vary significantly depending on contributions, tax rates and account balances. If you choose to take some deductions that you need to make regular payments on, lower-income earners may only experience some benefit from those deductions. Refundable offsets, contribution caps, preservation rules, age, housing costs and interaction with public pensions are thus taken into account in fair design.

Discrimination can be in the design and access even if it is not overtly expressed in legislation. The practical complexity of complying can be altered due to digital-only filing, identification requirements, language requirements, handicap access, housing insecurity, and lack of banking. There are also different tax rates for consumption taxes for informal and formal businesses depending on the registration thresholds and the systems of invoice. Access-to-rights analysis is not just a question of what mechanisms are available in the law, it is an examination of whether or not they are accessible to those who require them.

There is also a rule-of-law question raised by the advanced tax issues: certainty should not be afforded only to those who can afford to hire a tax specialist to interpret the tax laws. Private rulings, public guidance, safe harbours, and published administrative positions can be helpful to minimize uncertainty, if they are available and the reasoning is consistent. Too much discretion leads to risk, since there are many different facts that may result in different outcomes. The transparent interpretation is thus a justice mechanism and an administrative efficiency instrument.

Enforcement should continue to be proportional. While robust measures to fight intentional non-compliance benefit honest taxpayers and the base of tax revenue, measures which are coercive can have serious consequences when they are used for those who are hardship or may have a genuine misunderstanding. There is a need for protection, review and well-defined escalation procedures in regards to debt collection, penalties, garnishment and litigation. A rights-based system does not lump all issues into the moral category, however, but distinguishes between inability, mistake, avoidance and fraud.

Reform becomes believable when access measures are included with revenue measures. Administration can monitor the resolution of complaints, outcomes, processing time, debt continuation, digital exclusion, clinic referrals and error types. This type of data can provide insight into whether legal modifications are aiding to minimize friction or merely redirect it. Thus, tax justice is quantifiable in terms of the performance of institutions, not just in terms of abstract arguments about the rates of tax.

Tax clinics are the answer to that need. The National Tax Clinic (NTC) program is a government-funded initiative providing support to individuals and small business with tax matters. Clinics also provide learning experiences for students supervised by them and provide data regarding common administrative issues. This is important because some of these individual issues may uncover systemic issues that are related to debt, record keeping, registration, family situation, digital access, and/or misunderstanding of legal notices.

Tax knowledge is an additional layer of justice. To avoid unnecessary debt and penalties, it is important to understand the filing dates, deductible expenses, business registration, instalments, and review rights. Don't use literature as a replacement for the basic law, as even informed taxpayers have trouble with polygamous rules and definitions. Good systems involve clear instructions that have manageable requirements and available professional/community assistance.

Voluntary compliance is influenced by procedural fairness as well. If reasons are clear,

evidence is taken into account, there are review pathways that are trusted, and communication is respectful, people are more likely to go along with an adverse outcome. Behavioral tax research has thus come out of the narrow fear-of-audit bandwagon. Trust cannot be a substitute for enforcement, but enforcement can be more legitimate through consistent process and can decrease the perception that outcomes are based on resources or connections.

The practical rule is that equal ability to engage in the tax system. That standard calls for the establishment of clear rules, accessible support, accountability that is clear to all, review of impact and distributional analysis prior to implementation of reforms. Although collection is necessary for the delivery of public services, its legitimacy goes up as rights are put into use. A tax system is more trusted when it is not so complicated, it is not so powerful in its enforcement and its fiscal decisions are subject to scrutiny across income and organisational lines.

The better way to evaluate statutory design, however, is by measuring actual incentives, administrative capacity, and distributional impacts, and not by labeling. The view also helps to bring uncertainty into sight, thus enabling better decisions when there are no precise estimates of behavioural responses or implementation costs. Another precaution is that assumptions, definitions and evaluation criteria should be published prior to a policy becoming politically unpopular that can be changed. The most informative evidence will be one that touches on fiscal cost, fairness, behaviour, and administration, not in isolation, but all at once, in the same narrative of a policy.

If review mechanisms can provide flexibility on thresholds, eligibility, or reporting rules with the passage of time as economic conditions and technology evolve, then the review is long run. The real issue is how much real public benefit is being provided for the compliance costs, distribution and opportunity costs. Transparent governance transforms that into a repeatable process, rather than a one-time justification when introducing it. This holistic perspective mitigates the likelihood that a technically sound rule will result in suboptimal outcomes once household, firm, and administrator responses to real incentives come into play.

The more useful analytical method is to examine the incentives in the design of the statutes, the administration of the statutes, and the distribution of the benefits of the statutes without taking on labels.