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**Background**

**Introduction**

It is our pleasure to welcome you to this deliberative discussion inspired by Deliberative Polling. During these few days, you will join your fellow students in discussing the issues confronting the political inequality in relation to economic inequality, and in hearing experts discuss those issues in response to your questions and concerns. This deliberative discussion is inspired by Deliberative Polling, a rigorous social science method of public consultation that has been implemented in 30 countries, over 100 projects at varying jurisdiction levels, and on a variety of topics. To help prepare you to discuss the issues, we have produced this briefing material. It contains background analysis and competing arguments for and against different policy proposals: universal basic income, baby bonds, progressive tax structure, and capping executive pays. Each issue briefing brings together different points of view.

**What is Deliberative Polling?**

Pioneered by James Fishkin at Stanford University’s Center for Deliberative Democracy, Deliberative Polling® is an attempt to use public opinion research in a new and constructive way. The polling process reveals the conclusions the public would reach if people had the opportunity to become more informed and more engaged by the issues. Usually with random sampling that is representative of national demographics, Deliberative Polls is used to understand how public will formation look like if the people were given the platform to engage with people like themselves.

**Relationship between Political Inequality and Economic Inequality**

This briefing material is created to lay out proposals to reduce economic inequality. Why is economic inequality important in discussing political inequality? While there are many factors that play into political inequality, economic inequality poses danger to democracy because political elites are less responsive to the poor, policy favors the rich, hence the poor and middle class are less participative to politics (Ezrow, 2015). Empirical research shows that economic inequality generates political inequality. For instance, the data that spans for three decades in 130 countries showed

---

income inequality generated political inequality (Cole, 2018). Also, the comparison between the gini index, the indicator for economic inequality and measurements for various political engagements such as the World Values Survey, the Eurobarometer, and the European Election Survey revealed income inequality suppresses political engagements (Solt, 2008).

---
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Proposals

1. Universal Basic Income

This proposal is to implement a Universal Basic Income (UBI). If passed, the federal government would provide all working-age adults (over 18 years old) a monthly cash grant of $1,000 USD regardless of income.1

Supporters of this proposal argue that a UBI will provide an important security net against poverty, especially needed as automation and joblessness is on the rise. A monthly cash grant of $1,000 USD would essentially bring all who receive it above the poverty line, making it a reliable means of combating financial inequality. Furthermore, a UBI will allow people to make long-term investments in themselves2. These latter benefits include increased financial certainty regarding education, entrepreneurship, retirement, and medical expenses, which will help those that most need assistance while growing the economy3.

Opponents argue that the costs needed to provide these monthly cash grants could be immense as some estimate the costs to be roughly US$3.9 trillion per year. This would prompt either an increase in taxes or force the federal government into borrowing more money,3 increasing deficits which, in response to the pandemic, are likely already steepening4. A UBI could also lower incentive to work, since the proposal provides aid regardless of income, meaning everybody would receive a cash grant whether or not they are employed. Furthermore, there is no way to ensure that these stipends will necessarily go into long-term investments and could instead go to frivolous spending - in that case, a UBI would not be as beneficial to the economy as supporters claim1.

UBI has been implemented throughout the world. A UBI program was run nationally throughout Iran in 2010 (making Iran one of the few countries to implement a national program, as opposed to just a specific region). The specifics of the Iran UBI are relatively similar to this proposal, except that all working-aged adults were given twenty-nine percent of the measured median income as opposed to a flat $1,000 USD3. Supporters claim the benefits are evident, reducing inequality and
showing no signs of workers leaving the job market - the economy was, arguably, improved, as the cash grants were used by those receiving them to support and expand their smaller businesses.

Another UBI program was run within the late 1970s in rural Manitoba, Canada, which offered working-aged adults CAD$16,000 per year in response to a financial crisis. The UBI allowed more workers to commit themselves to more secure, full-time work, but doubt is expressed regarding whether or not this program could be practically carried out on a national scale. More recently, a UBI program has been implemented in the Canadian city of Hamilton, Ontario, which offered CAD$17,000 to a sample of 1,000 financially vulnerable adults. In the US, the city of Stockton in California also conducted a similar program. Both programs have reported increased financial support for recipients, while not reporting any lack of participation in the job force, which suggests that the UBI is successful in rural and urban environments alike.

However, universal basic income has not always produced the desired effects. A UBI was also implemented in Finland in the years 2017 and 2018, granting a fraction of unemployed people regular payments of 560 Euros. While reported to benefit wellbeing and mental health, the program here was considered subpar, showing no changes in employment, questionable impact on subjective happiness, and recipients showed preferences towards previously existing welfare programs. Supporters of the UBI claim, however, that these issues are more about execution and implementation than the proposal itself, and the failures of this specific program have not stopped other countries - such as India - from considering similar programs. Similar observations have occurred in several national experiments held in Mongolia within the last decade. While inequality and poverty has been diminished, the deficit too has been inflated - again, supporters cite the cause primarily as poor planning.

If implemented, a UBI has the potential to automatically bring all citizens above the poverty line, making it one of the surest ways of addressing financial inequality. By potentially allowing for longer-term investments such as education, this program could naturally lead to political equality and representation. It is worth noting, however, that supporters debate amongst themselves over whether a UBI ought to act as a supplement to currently existing welfare systems, or a replacement. If the UBI does replace existing welfare programs, some otherwise immense costs are very likely to decrease, but this could result in federal assistance being reduced for the very neediest who currently receive more than $1,000 monthly.

Questions to consider: For this proposal, what are the parameters of a governments’ “protections” of its constituents, while weighing the potential effects of a UBI program? Some say that such a program may be interpreted as a demand for freedom, while others say it is a step towards fiscal stagnation. What are your thoughts on this proposal? What are the reasons to support this proposal? What are the reasons to oppose this proposal?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments For</th>
<th>Arguments Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UBI has the potential to automatically bring all citizens above the poverty line, making it one of the surest ways of addressing financial inequality.</td>
<td>The UBI could replace existing welfare programs, some otherwise immense costs are very likely to decrease, but this could result in federal assistance being reduced for the very neediest who currently receive more than $1,000 monthly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs around the world show benefits are evident, reducing inequality and showing no signs of workers leaving the job market - the economy was, arguably, improved, as the cash grants were used by those receiving them to support and expand their smaller businesses.</td>
<td>This proposal would prompt either an increase in taxes or force the federal government into borrowing more money, increasing deficits which, in response to the pandemic, are likely already steepening.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2: [https://www.ubi.org/40/ubi-video-barack-obama](https://www.ubi.org/40/ubi-video-barack-obama)
3: [https://www.penguin.co.uk/articles/2018/universal-basic-income-pros-cons.html](https://www.penguin.co.uk/articles/2018/universal-basic-income-pros-cons.html)
5: [https://futurism.com/what-we-can-learn-from-finlands-basic-income-experiment](https://futurism.com/what-we-can-learn-from-finlands-basic-income-experiment)
7: [https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/05/iran-introduced-a-basic-income-scheme-and-something-strange-happened](https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/05/iran-introduced-a-basic-income-scheme-and-something-strange-happened)

2. Baby Bonds

Another proposal is for the federal government to implement a government bond of $1,000 to each child born, this proposal is otherwise known as Baby Bonds. With time, these bonds will accumulate in value as the government adds an additional $1,000 USD every year, which would increase along with compounding of interest rates until the child is 18 years of age. Furthermore, the government will manage these bonds into accounts or trusts on behalf of the families (or child), allowing these bonds to further accumulate in value. According to Senator Cory Booker, who advocated for Baby Bonds during his 2020 presidential campaign, he estimates that a child could receive approximately $46,000 under this program. Other scholars have estimated, depending on
interest rates and how the market performs, the Baby Bonds could yield between $25,000 to $60,000 per child. For point of reference, an annual interest rate of 3% for 18 years would yield approximately $23,000 per child\(^1\).

Supporters of Baby Bonds argue that these bonds can be used to fund higher education, or to otherwise support the child’s upward mobility as they enter the job force. Note that families will not be able to access these bonds before a child turns 18. Furthermore, supporters of this proposal argue that these Baby Bonds would directly address the root cause of accelerated inequality - that not everybody is born with equal opportunity. These bonds would provide needed assistance for young people who lack the funds to pay for education, find the right job, start a family, or save for retirement\(^2\). As things currently stand, only the top 10% of young people can rely on adequate family support. Supporters of this proposal also argue that Baby Bonds would be increasingly needed to address increasing financial debt. Currently, roughly ninety percent of all jobs require college degrees and as the cost of attending college grows rapidly, there is an increase of young people accumulating debt from attending post-secondary institutions\(^5\). This disparity in wealth also runs along racialized lines as, on average, white families tend to have ten times the net worth of black families\(^3\). Baby Bonds would theoretically lessen this wealth gap by ensuring that all Americans receive a fair start in their adult lives, and that our newest working-aged adults are given the tools to become secure and contributing members of the community.

Opponents argue that there is uncertainty regarding the process that is not being addressed in the proposal. Since Baby Bonds could rely on the ebbs and flows of fluctuating markets, the effectiveness of such accounts might vary depending on the current state of the economy or the industry in which these bonds are invested in. This results in the risk that such investments could be lost with improper planning or simple bad luck\(^4\). This means that in the event of losses, the federal government could be responsible for paying out these Baby Bonds. This is an additional burden to the federal government and yet again, increasing our ever growing debt. The implementation of Baby Bonds, too, can be potentially very costly: one estimate regarding a proposal drafted by Senator Cory Booker puts the governmental cost of baby bonds at about USD$60 billion, which would have to be supported through increased taxes or government loans\(^1\). Alternatively, such a proposal could be paid for by cutting existing child welfare programs (as suggested by Senator Mitt Romney in his proposal) which in some cases might cause further financial instability, or might be preferred by recipients\(^6\). Furthermore, opponents argue that there is no way to ensure that these funds will actually be used for long-term investments on behalf of the child, which would ultimately defeat the purpose of investing in such resources in the first place.

As things currently stand, not all young people can rely on family support as they enter adulthood, and this disparity in luck contributes to immense inequality. Without financial stability, young people are focused on their economic upward mobility and perhaps less on being engaged
civically and involved in their communities. If implemented, Baby Bonds could provide the funds necessary to give all young adults a suitable start, allowing them to become contributing members of society more quickly and more securely. On the other hand, there are numerous risks and potential pitfalls associated with the proposal that could ultimately render Baby Bonds useless, at best, or very costly for the country, at worst. Under light of the idea that not all are born within leveled platforms, you may ponder whether closing the gap presents a reflection of a government’s duty towards the citizenry, or if these are matters best left to be dealt by citizens themselves.

**Questions to consider:** What duty does the government have towards its citizenry when it comes to closing the wealth gap? Would providing Baby Bonds, as described here, finally lift up more people in society so there indeed a more level playing field? What are your thoughts on this proposal? What are the arguments in support of this proposal? What are the arguments in opposition to this proposal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments For</th>
<th>Arguments Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baby Bonds would directly address growing inequality - and an increasingly competitive job market - by providing new, working adults with starting money.</td>
<td>This proposal, when compared to other measures addressing inequality, is less secure or reliable, potentially relying on the ebbs and flows of the economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This would make the pursuit of higher education, or the investment of small businesses, more accessible, stimulating the economy by allowing for more contributing young adults.</td>
<td>Additionally, these Baby Bonds can prove quite costly to distribute in their own right. This can lead either to an increase in taxes or federal debt, or to the cutting of existing child welfare programs, which might otherwise be preferred by more financially vulnerable recipients.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3: [https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2020/02/27/examining-the-black-white-wealth-gap/](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2020/02/27/examining-the-black-white-wealth-gap/)
4: [https://www.morningstar.com/articles/1006994/how-should-baby-bonds-be-invested](https://www.morningstar.com/articles/1006994/how-should-baby-bonds-be-invested)
6: [https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2021-02-05/romney-s-child-allowance-would-upend-welfare](https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2021-02-05/romney-s-child-allowance-would-upend-welfare)

This proposal is that the absolute highest earners - those who earn more than $2 million per year - pay a higher rate on additional income. In addition, capital gains — income earned when an investment that has increased in value is sold — should be taxed the same as ordinary wage income. This would establish a tax structure that would not disproportionately benefit the very rich and attempts to place an economic ceiling to help combat economic inequality.

Supporters of this proposal argue that these measures would provide much needed funding to support government programs regarding health insurance, education funding, and various welfare programs. The income taxes would only affect the most wealthy who, they believe, could easily bear the burden; notably, the top 1% of which own 44% of the wealth worldwide. On average, the incomes of the very wealthy have been rising significantly faster than the incomes of those belonging to the middle and lower classes. In the U.S., ten years from now, a 1% increase on income tax for the two highest brackets would lead to about USD$125 million. Raising income taxes would make use of the wealthiest tax-payers to fund programs. This would combat inequality by redistributing some of the resources of the very wealthy.

Raising capital gains taxes would prevent wealthy people who make millions from stock from paying lower tax rates as a percent of income than middle- and upper-middle-class wage earners. Currently, low tax rates on investments benefit mostly wealthy people because they have the resources needed to hold most investments. As of 2018, the capital gains tax rate in the U.S. was 18%, but studies show that a rate of 40% would maximize government revenue while not altering the behavior of investors substantially. To the U.S., where the standard income tax rate is 39.5%, this would mean raising taxes on capital gains to meet taxes in income earned through work. Other countries have capital gains taxes at or above the U.S. income tax rate. Just like the money generated by raising taxes on wealthy tax-payers’ income, this money could fund programs that benefit tax-payers who are economically disadvantaged.

Opponents argue that this tax would not be as effective as supporters claim. In the US in particular, currently, the top 1% already pay 37% of total individual income taxes, and this proposal would hike these contributions up to 65% or more in high tax states. This would lower incentives to work and generate less revenue than expected. Instead, opponents argue that encouraging top earners to privately invest these earnings would better simulate the economy, while providing more opportunities to those in need. Similarly, raising taxes on investments makes investing and starting a business less attractive, possibly drying up sources of income for businesses that would otherwise create jobs. This could hurt more people (workers) than just those who directly own investments. There are also concerns that the decreased number of investments could lead to a decrease in revenue for the government. Others argue that income inequality itself may not be the core issue that must be addressed, as sometimes shifts that benefit the wealthy can have positive effects for the poor. For
example, they argue that taking wealth out of the hands of the very rich limits opportunities for them to fund productivity\(^5\). In general, most opponents warn against these tax reforms because their unpredictable outcomes outweigh the moral foundation on which they are built.

At present, during this pandemic, it is also worth noting that lower economic inequality is correlated to better responses to the COVID-19 pandemic, as shown in the graph below\(^6\). The European Center for Disease Prevention and Control and Our World in Data collected data in the summer 2020 comparing countries’ ability to control the pandemic with the current wealth gap in those countries. During this time period, countries like South Korea and Norway had far less deaths than countries like Mexico and Brazil. Of course, there may have been other factors that contribute to these results. But, this chart offers insight into how economic inequality plays into a country’s ability to handle a pandemic.

If implemented, these tax reforms would directly address financial inequality, targeting only the very wealthy in order to provide improved public resources, specifically for lower earners. However, debate lies in how effective these measures actually would be - especially when compared to the present situation, in which higher earners already make up a disproportionately high amount of tax contributions.
**Questions to consider:** In contemplating the contentions for and against more progressive tax structures, it is possible to consider the role of taxes within a state. Does there exist a moral obligation to uphold the collective? What are your thoughts on this proposal? What are the arguments in support of this proposal? What are the arguments against this proposal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments For</th>
<th>Arguments Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher income taxes on the very wealthy would allow the government to fund programs to benefit those in need.</td>
<td>Higher income taxes on the wealthy are unnecessary; they already pay enough, and taxing them more would lower incentives to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxing the wealthy more would establish an economic ceiling, managing inequality between the very rich and the very poor.</td>
<td>Raising taxes on capital gains would make running a business in the country less attractive, stifling the economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising taxes on capital gains would change the system so that money earned through work is valued the same as money invested, benefiting those without the means to invest.</td>
<td>Taking more money from the wealthy would limit their ability to fund productivity, negatively impacting economic growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2: [https://www.brookings.edu/policy2020/votervital/who-are-the-rich-and-how-might-we-tax-them-more/](https://www.brookings.edu/policy2020/votervital/who-are-the-rich-and-how-might-we-tax-them-more/)
3: [https://www.cbo.gov/budget-options/54787](https://www.cbo.gov/budget-options/54787)
5: [https://www.hoover.org/research/income-inequality-isnt-problem](https://www.hoover.org/research/income-inequality-isnt-problem)

### 4. Capping Executive Pay in 20x Proportions to the Median Salary of the Company

This proposal is to cap executive salary, making the CEO pay to median employee pay ratio be 20-to-1. Peter Drucker, who is credited as the father of modern management, has continuously advocated keeping CEO pay to employee pay ratio to 20-to-1. Research shows that CEO wage has increased 1,007.5% for forty years since 1978 while worker’s wage has increased only 12% during the same time in the US. Comparatively, American CEOs now make on average 278 times the average worker’s salary, using the options-exercised formula. Table 1 illustrates the discrepancies between the executive and median employee pay. This large discrepancy is not limited to the United States.
According to a BBC report, the pay ratio between CEOs and their average workers in India is 229:1; in South Africa 180:1; China 127:1; Mexico 62:1; and Singapore 56:15 (Table 2). Furthermore, pay ratios differed from industry to industry. In an analysis on the UK’s Financial Times Stock Exchange 350, the highest average CEO income ratio was 140:1 in retails and the lowest average CEO income ratio was 35:1 in finances6.

While some view that inequality naturally occurs due to an individual’s exceptional talents, supporters of this proposal argue that executive compensation that is disproportionately larger than median employee payment does not derive from leadership ability. Researchers who studied the trend of the pay gap between C-suites and employees argue that CEOs’ ability to negotiate how they will be paid contributes heavily to the increasing pay ratio, not their productivity or skills7. Also, even when companies reveal their rationale behind the high salaries of their executive members, the standards reported to the shareholders have room for skepticism. In the reports, the rationale behind cash bonuses and stock grants are not explained fully, failing to justify how much C-suites have contributed to the firm’s performance to deserve a high salary8. Mere transparency of pay structure does little to address income inequality. In the case of the United States where 2015 legislation made domestic companies report their pay ratio to the public, unintentional consequences of growing pay ratio followed suit. Rival firms began to compare each other’s pay ratio and raised CEO pays9. This incident illustrates the need to have a cap on the salaries to meet the true goal of reinforcing the transparency of pay ratio, to lower unnecessary executive pays.

Having no ceiling to executives poses dangers to the company too. Peter Drucker, the original thinker behind this proposal, believed that inequality within a company is bad for workers’ morale and thus detrimental to the company’s productivity1. Also, consumers prefer a fairer company9. The researcher compared consumer’s willingness to shop and pay more in two scenarios, one company with a pay ratio of 1,000:1 and the other with more equal pay, to find out consumers preferred the second scenario.

The opposers argue that capping salaries to executives will not contribute to wealth inequality. Firstly, some opponents believe when salaries are capped, talented people will stop working as executives but move on to become lawyers or hedge fund operators instead10. Under good management and leadership, a company’s productivity rises as demonstrated in the Microsoft and Bill Gates’s case11. Secondly, historically, policies to restrict executive salary had backfired12. To report a reduced pay ratio, CEOs could fire low-paid workers, dismantle low-paid workers’ employment stability by replacing their work with part-time workers, or increasing paid salary but counteracting the increase with lowering non-financial compensation12. In Switzerland, where its pay ratio is 152:1, citizens voted not to implement a 12:1 cap on executive compensation. The citizens worried that capping executive compensation will be detrimental to their economy if the companies decided to move to other countries with no regulations on executive pay13.
Critics of this proposal suggest that too much focus on the pay ratio may shadow larger problems behind income inequality. Growing outsourcing by tech companies is behind the growing inequality. A New York Times article that investigated the lives of two janitors, one who was employed directly by Kodak in the 1980s and the other who was working as a contractor for Apple, revealed that direct employment created more opportunities for the worker to have upward mobility while the same cannot be said for the current Apple’s janitor. Issue of contractors is very critical because they are not factored in the conversation of CEO to median employee pay discussion. This proposal, when capping CEO salary uses ratio within a company instead of an exact value, excludes those who face the harshest forms of employment instability from the conversation. Furthermore, data on contract workers are difficult to pin down because companies often hire private contracting companies for the lowest paying jobs. Also, the wealth gap between firms, even in the same industry, should be considered. Research shows that only one-third of the income inequality of the United States can be explained by the income gap within a firm, while the inequality between the companies accounts for two-thirds of total inequality.

**Questions to consider:** Is the potential dismantling effect of the widening pay gap on society the responsibility of government intervention? Or, would these issues be better handled between the shareholders of a company? To what extent is government’s intervention justified and to what extent should citizens believe in the free market? What are your thoughts on this proposal? What are some reasons to support this proposal? What are some reasons against this proposal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments For</th>
<th>Arguments Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Pay gap is increasing.</td>
<td>● When salaries are capped, talented people will stop working as executives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Executive compensation that is disproportionately larger than median employee payment does not derive from leadership ability.</td>
<td>● Policies to restrict executive salary had backfired, harming economic minorities greatly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Fairer pay is beneficial to the company because employees’ morale is boosted and consumers prefer fairer companies.</td>
<td>● Too much focus on the pay ratio may shadow larger problems behind income inequality such as frequent outsourcing and income inequality between firms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Companies and their pay ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alphabet</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$246,804.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>$22,554,543</td>
<td>$228,651.00</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>$1.4</td>
<td>$213,155.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$25,843,263</td>
<td>$167,689.00</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>$36,572,367</td>
<td>$104,791.00</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfizer</td>
<td>Industrials</td>
<td>$17,928,963</td>
<td>$98,972.00</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPMorgan Chase</td>
<td>Financials</td>
<td>$31,619,266</td>
<td>$80,431.00</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson &amp; Johnson</td>
<td>Industrials</td>
<td>$25,380,258</td>
<td>$76,000.00</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In a CNBC report, Walmart explained that its median employee salary does not include other monetary supports provided to its employees. Also, in the same report, the Gap explained that its low median employee salary is reflective of seasonal jobs.

Table 2. Countries and their pay ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>CEO to average worker pay ratio</th>
<th>Annual CEO wage (in $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>265:1</td>
<td>14.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>229:1</td>
<td>1.16m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>201:1</td>
<td>7.95m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>180:1</td>
<td>2.21m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>171:1</td>
<td>8.24m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Pay Ratio</td>
<td>Annual Earnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>152:1</td>
<td>8.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>149:1</td>
<td>6.49m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>143:1</td>
<td>4.89m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>136:1</td>
<td>6.17m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>127:1</td>
<td>1.87m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>66:1</td>
<td>2.32m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>62:1</td>
<td>1.29m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>60:1</td>
<td>2.79m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>56:1</td>
<td>4.62m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4: [https://www.bloomberg.com/graphics/ceo-pay-ratio/#PEGA](https://www.bloomberg.com/graphics/ceo-pay-ratio/#PEGA)
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