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Twenty-five of the nation’s leading tax academics, practitioners, journalists, and public intellectuals gathered in Malibu, California on the Friday before President Obama’s second inauguration 1 to plead for tax reform. 2 The papers published in this issue of the Pepperdine Law Review provide very different prescriptions for America’s tax ills. But there is a unanimous diagnosis that the country’s tax system is sick indeed. A re-elected president’s inauguration offers a particularly propitious moment to put politics aside and embark on a treatment plan. If our lawmakers are interested in heating our tax wounds, the ideas presented in these pages offer a good place to begin. They run the gamut from relatively minor procedures to total transplantation. But all would improve the health of our current tax system.

* Charles Hartsock Professor of Law, University of Cincinnati College of Law; D & L Straus Distinguished Visiting Professor of Law, Pepperdine University School of Law. E-mail: paul.caron@pepperdine.edu. I join the many speakers who began their remarks by praising the Pepperdine Law Review students for pulling off the best-run symposium that any of us have ever attended. Many students provided tireless and cheerful service, but I want to give particular thanks to Editor-in-Chief Margot Parmenter and Symposium Editor Michael Wood. Due in large part to the students’ efforts, the symposium broke Pepperdine symposia attendance records, as the law school had to open two overflow rooms to handle the crowds. As of March 26, 2013, the video of the event (available at http://new.livestream.com/pepperdinesol/lawreviewsymposium) has been viewed 778 times, and the conference drafts of the nine symposium papers available on SSRN have been downloaded 727 times.


After Deanell Tacha and Christopher Bergin opened the symposium with brief remarks on behalf of our co-sponsors—Pepperdine University School of Law and Tax Analysts—Michael J. Graetz delivered the keynote address. He reminds us that since 2013 marks the 100th anniversary of the modern income tax, we should remember that 1913 was the culmination of a two-decade effort to achieve greater tax justice. Indeed, 1913’s public debate over “justice” and “virtue” mirrors our debates a century later over using the tax system to redistribute or create wealth. Unlike many, Graetz does not advocate 1986-style tax reform to solve today’s problems. Instead, he views the 1986 reform as merely a “temporary marriage between the forces of ‘justice’ and ‘virtue.’” In light of 2013’s political and economic realities, distributional neutrality and revenue neutrality can no longer be our tax lodestar. Moreover, today’s economic circumstances demand that we forswear the use of business taxes or debt as “pots of gold” to finance individual tax reform. Graetz contends that the 1986 Act was a promise failed: “I do not believe that the best path for tax reform is simply to improve the income tax. Changes in the past 25 years make this a dead end.”

Graetz frames the “daunting” tax challenge facing President Obama and Congress: “to reduce deficits and debt in the long-run, and simultaneously to
achieve a fair distribution of the tax burden and promote our nation’s economic growth.”\textsuperscript{16} He argues that “[w]e need to reunite ‘virtue’ and ‘justice’ by moving back toward the mix of consumption and income taxes adopted in 1913.”\textsuperscript{17} Attempts to lower income tax rates by eliminating “loopholes” are doomed to fail since the vast majority of the $1 trillion of yearly tax expenditures consists of politically untouchable tax breaks for health insurance, retirement savings, home mortgage interest, state and local taxes, charitable deductions, and capital gains.\textsuperscript{18} As he has written elsewhere,\textsuperscript{19} Graetz instead advocates refocusing the income tax on higher-income people supplemented by a broad-based sales tax on goods and services:

\begin{quote}
A dramatic reform that uses a goods and services tax to reduce our nation’s reliance on income taxation is the only path forward that will, once again, embrace both virtue and justice and enhance economic growth without abandoning tax equity. We now need a major overhaul of our nation’s tax system, not just another oil change and lubrication.\textsuperscript{20}
\end{quote}

David Brunori\textsuperscript{21} moderated the first panel on \textit{The Buffett Rule, the 1%, and the Fairness/Growth Divide}. The three papers focus on different groups of taxpayers. In \textit{The 535 Report: A Pathway to Fundamental Tax Reform}, Dorothy A. Brown\textsuperscript{22} argues that the current tax code disadvantages taxpayers of color while favoring the select few—especially members of Congress.\textsuperscript{23} She presents data showing how taxpayers of color receive disproportionately fewer benefits from popular tax breaks such as those for pensions, capital gains, and home mortgage interest.\textsuperscript{24} Like Graetz, Brown is skeptical of the political will to eliminate such popular tax expenditures.\textsuperscript{25} But she argues
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\item \textsuperscript{19} MICHAEL J. GRAETZ, 100 MILLION UNNECESSARY RETURNS: A SIMPLE, FAIR, AND COMPETITIVE TAX PLAN FOR THE UNITED STATES (2008).
\item \textsuperscript{20} Graetz, supra note 6, at 635.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Executive Vice President of Editorial Operations, Tax Analysts.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Professor of Law, Emory University School of Law.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Dorothy A. Brown, The 535 Report: A Pathway to Fundamental Tax Reform, 40 PEPP. L. REV. 1155 (2013).
\item \textsuperscript{24} Id. at 1161–62.
\item \textsuperscript{25} See id. at 1170.
\end{itemize}
that such reform could be triggered through a “focusing event” that galvanizes the American public to demand change.\footnote{Id. at 1170.} She proposes \textit{The 535 Report} as such a focusing event: an annual IRS “study of the 100 senators and 435 members of the House of Representatives” that would report “the percent[age] of members of Congress who take advantage of the largest tax expenditures” and how that compares to the average taxpayer.\footnote{Id. at 1171.} Her “hunch is that \textit{The 535 Report} would show the harm to the average American in the form of higher tax rates that was inflicted by Congress for tax breaks that most members of Congress receive but that most Americans do not.”\footnote{Id. at 1172.}

In \textit{Access to Tax InJustice} Francine J. Lipman\footnote{William S. Boyd Professor of Law, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, William S. Boyd School of Law.} contends that the 46 million Americans living in poverty belie the nation’s promise of liberty and justice for all.\footnote{Id. at 1181–85.} She argues that alleviation of poverty is a fundamental precondition for social justice, and that the earned income tax credit (EITC) is our most successful antipoverty program for working lower-income Americans.\footnote{Id. at 1185–98.} Yet running such an ambitious anti-poverty program through the tax code creates serious access issues for low-income workers.\footnote{Id. at 1200-1203.} Because the IRS is fundamentally a collection agency, its orientation and expertise are in collecting revenue rather than in distributing resources.\footnote{Id. at 1208.} As a result, Lipman endorses the National Taxpayer Advocate’s recommendation that the IRS appoint a deputy commissioner with primary responsibility over all tax-system based social benefit initiatives like the EITC.\footnote{Id. at 1208.} Such a Social Benefits Deputy Commissioner would join “an impressive team of social justice advocates across America, inside and outside of the government, to better provide access to tax justice for all Americans, including through the income tax system, to the most vulnerable and voiceless among us.”\footnote{Id. at 1208.}

Kirk J. Stark\footnote{Vice Dean and Professor of Law, UCLA School of Law.} and Eric M. Zolt\footnote{Michael H. Schill Distinguished Professor of Law, UCLA School of Law.} shift the focus to \textit{Tax Reform and the American Middle Class}.\footnote{Kirk J. Stark & Eric M. Zolt, \textit{Tax Reform and the American Middle Class}, 40 PEPP. L. REV. 1209 (2013).} They present data showing two distinct trends over the past quarter century: (1) the middle class is in real and significant
economic decline, with reduced median income and wealth, while (2) politicians from both parties have showered ever more tax relief on the middle class. “[T]he middle class is indeed struggling, but neither the root causes of America’s ‘middle class decline’ nor the policy solutions to address it are likely to be found within the confines of the Internal Revenue Code.”39 Although the tax zeitgeist currently requires Democrats and Republicans to pledge fealty to “middle class tax relief,” Stark and Zolt ask whether this approach “has outlived its usefulness.”40 They instead propose “fortification of key expenditure programs designed to alleviate economic insecurity, even if it means a less progressive tax system.”41 Such apostasy may better serve average Americans than mindless adherence to middle class tax dogma.42

Bruce Bartlett43 and David S. Miller44 provided commentary on the papers. Bartlett agrees with The 535 Report proposal, but would go even further by requiring every member of Congress to publicly release his or her tax return.45 He notes the disingenuousness of Republicans who now bemoan the fact that only 47% of Americans pay federal income taxes when it was Gerald Ford who created the EITC, Ronald Reagan who expanded it, and Newt Gingrich who made it refundable.46 Bartlett congratulates Stark and Zolt “for treading where very few are willing to go, of stating that the middle class is under-taxed. I agree with this completely. But I also agree that we need to soak the rich a lot more.”47

Miller notes that all three papers “share a very common thread. Stated broadly, the wealthy are jumping ahead; the poor and middle class are falling behind; and tax policy has rolled away.”48 He shares the desire to
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44. Tax Partner, Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP, New York, NY.
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make the tax system more progressive, but thinks too much attention is given to income inequality and not enough to wealth inequality. Miller continues to support a progressive mark-to-market tax system, at least with respect to publicly-traded stock.

I moderated the second panel on Estate and Gift Taxation. In Distracted from Distraction by Distraction: Reimagining Estate Tax Reform, Edward J. McCaffery offers very simple advice about what to do about the estate tax: “forget about it.” He argues that the “estate tax has long since ceased” to serve a significant policy objective such as “raising revenue, instilling progressivity into the tax system, ‘backing up’ the income tax, or breaking up large concentrations of wealth.” McCaffery contends that through devices such as the dynasty trust, the estate tax can be so easily avoided with a modicum of planning that we should no longer be distracted by it. Indeed, the failure of the tax system to tax unrealized appreciation enables the wealthy to engage in Tax Planning 101 (buy, borrow, die) to escape taxes altogether. Instead, we should focus reform efforts elsewhere to serve the estate tax’s goals by adopting a progressive consumption tax, taxing unrealized appreciation, or replacing stepped-up basis at death with either carryover basis or capital gains/realization at death.

In contrast, James R. Repetti and I are not ready to give up on the estate tax. In Occupy the Tax Code: Using the Estate Tax to Reduce Inequality and Spur Economic Growth, we present data showing that income and wealth inequality has increased dramatically over the past thirty years. This increased inequality causes a variety of adverse social consequences and slows economic growth. We argue that federal tax policy can play an important role in reducing inequality and that the estate tax is a particularly apt reform vehicle. Although we concede that dynasty trusts and other loopholes permit significant leakage in the estate tax, we present tax return

49. Id.
51. Robert C. Packard Trustee Chair in Law, Economics and Political Science, USC Gould School of Law; Visiting Professor of Law and Economics, California Institute of Technology.
53. Id.
54. Id. at 1241–44.
55. Id. at 1250–51.
56. Id. at 1251–54.
57. William J. Kenealy, S.J. Professor of Law, Boston College Law School.
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data showing that the estate tax plays an important role in moderating the
amount of wealth that is passed from generation to generation. We
propose a modest reform: that Congress restore the estate tax exemption
level ($3.5 million) and top rate (45%), as in effect in 2009 and as proposed
by President Obama in his 2014 federal budget:

Our take on the political environment in Washington, D.C.—now
and for the foreseeable future—is that attempts to “go big” and
pursue dramatic reform have little chance for success. . . . Instead,
we believe a “go small” approach has the greatest chance for
political success and would win a small but significant battle in the
long war against inequality in America. . . . Tax policy perfection
must not be the enemy of the tax reform good that is politically
achievable.

Grayson M.P. McCouch discusses the evolution of dynasty trusts in
Who Killed the Rule Against Perpetuities? Although the conventional
view is that the $1 million (now $5.25 million) generation-skipping transfer
(GST) tax exemption led to the explosion of dynasty trusts, McCouch takes
a more nuanced view of the relationship between the federal wealth transfer
taxes and the rule against perpetuities. He notes that marketing material
for perpetual trusts stresses not only their transfer tax avoidance potential but
also “their ability to conserve and manage accumulated wealth for future
generations and protect beneficiaries against improvidence . . . .” But in the end, the drive for perpetual trust legislation
owes more to the efforts of bankers and lawyers to drum up business than to
lobbying by wealthy clients motivated by tax and non-tax concerns.

Joseph J. Thorndike provided commentary on the Estate and Gift Tax
panel papers. He agrees that McCaffery makes a compelling case for the
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for the Second Obama Administration (Jan. 18, 2013) (transcript on file with the Pepperdine Law
irrelevance of the estate tax in revenue, progressivity, and fairness terms, but
not in political terms. Thorndike wonders whether we are experiencing a
rebirth of progressive tax ideas and, if so, how Caron and Repetti’s pro-
growth estate tax revival might fit into that rebirth. As a historian,
Thorndike likes McCouch’s tale of who killed the rule against perpetuities—
there is a great story to be told about the marketing of tax policy.

Thomas G. Bost moderated the third panel on Business and
International Taxation (I). The first two papers discuss missing elements in
business tax reform. In The Globalization of Corporate Tax Reform, Steven
A. Bank notes that the international tax reforms proposed by President
Obama and Congress neglect to take into account the global corporate tax
reform movement. Although the United States has tools to unilaterally
target abusive transactions like the Double Irish/Dutch Sandwich, the
OECD, European Commission, and others have called for collaborative
global tax reform to address multinational tax evasion. Bank does not take
a position in favor of either international tax reform cooperation or unilateral
corporate tax reform. But he concludes that “to be successful, any attempt
at domestic corporate tax reform must be informed by and in some respects
reflect international standards and developments in the global corporate tax
reform movement.”

Karen C. Burke explains in Passthrough Entities: The Missing Element in Business Tax Reform that passthroughs have “become the vehicle of choice for nonpublicly-traded businesses.” As a result, business tax reform plans that decrease corporate tax rates while increasing individual tax rates must prevent the use of corporations as tax shelters that would erode the personal income tax base. Burke supports an entity-level tax on large
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publicly-traded partnerships and securities partnerships to stem the long-term decline in corporate tax revenues.\footnote{82}{Id. at 1340–43.}

In \textit{A Proposal for the Tax Treatment of Interest in a Territorial System}, Martin A. Sullivan\footnote{83}{Chief Economist, Tax Analysts.} responds to House Ways and Means Committee Chair Dave Camp’s call for the “adoption of a territorial tax system in which most active foreign profits of multinational corporations would be exempt from U.S. tax,” along with a reduction in the corporate tax rate from 35\% to 25\%.\footnote{84}{Martin A. Sullivan, \textit{A Proposal for the Tax Treatment of Interest in a Territorial System}, 40 \textit{PEPP. L. REV.} 1345, 1345, 1350 (2013).} Sullivan argues that in such a case, the United States should adopt interest allocations rules, either with other countries (with assets as the allocation factor) or unilaterally (with gross profits as the allocation factor).\footnote{85}{Id. at 1350–61.}

Michael L. Schler\footnote{86}{Tax Partner, Cravath Swaine & Moore LLP, New York, NY.} provided commentary on the \textit{Business and International Tax (I)} panel papers.\footnote{87}{Michael L. Schler, Commentary at the Pepperdine Law Review Symposium: Tax Advice for the Second Obama Administration (Jan. 18, 2013) (transcript on file with the Pepperdine Law Review; video recording available at http://new.livestream.com/pepperdinesol/lawreviewsymposium).} He is skeptical about the effectiveness of global cooperation to prevent the shifting of income to tax havens.\footnote{88}{Id.} Schler agrees that the passthrough tax system is a complete mess, and that lower corporate tax rates will turn closely-held corporations into the new tax shelter.\footnote{89}{Id.} Although he likes the idea of using gross profits as the interest allocation rule, he fears the revenue gains may prove illusory.\footnote{90}{Id.}

Khrista McCarden\footnote{91}{Associate Professor of Law, Pepperdine University School of Law.} moderated the fourth panel on \textit{Business and International Taxation (2)}. In \textit{Corporate and International Tax Reform: Proposals for the Second Obama Administration (and Beyond)}, Reuven S. Avi-Yonah\footnote{92}{Irwin I. Cohn Professor of Law and Director, International Tax LLM, University of Michigan Law School.} offers a series of corporate and international reform proposals, grouped in long-term, medium-term, and short-term time horizons.\footnote{93}{Reuven S. Avi-Yonah, \textit{Corporate and International Tax Reform: Proposals for the Second Obama Administration (and Beyond)}, 40 \textit{PEPP. L. REV.} 1365 (2013).} On the long-term front, he joins in Michael Graetz’s call for a value-added tax,\footnote{94}{GRAETZ, supra note 19, at 61–83.} but
would not eliminate the corporate tax.\textsuperscript{95} In the medium-term, Avi-Yonah advocates shifting to a territorial corporate tax system with transfer pricing reform.\textsuperscript{96} In the short-term, he embraces the Obama Administration’s proposal for a minimum tax on foreign source income of U.S.-based multinational corporations.\textsuperscript{97}

Allison Christians\textsuperscript{98} discusses two pieces of legislation passed in the first Obama administration in \textit{Putting the Reign Back in Sovereign: Advice for the Second Obama Administration}: (1) the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act (FATCA); and (2) the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) addendum to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Dodd-Frank).\textsuperscript{99} She applauds the reinvigoration of the role of the nation-state in regulating people and resources, but argues that both statutes fall short for two reasons.\textsuperscript{100} First, neither adequately deals with the thorny issues of global disclosure and compliance.\textsuperscript{101} Second, each is too narrow: FATCA should be fully reciprocal, and EITI should expand beyond extractive industries.\textsuperscript{102} Christians outlines how the second Obama administration could cure these defects.\textsuperscript{103}

In \textit{The Transfer Pricing Regs Need a Good Edit}, Susan C. Morse\textsuperscript{104} seeks to constrain the ability of U.S. corporations “to allocate taxable income away from U.S. affiliates and income tax deductions toward U.S. affiliates.”\textsuperscript{105} She argues that the IRS already possesses the regulatory authority to incrementally add formulaic elements tethered to high-friction non-tax reference points “without adopting any formulary global transfer pricing standard.”\textsuperscript{106} Because the transfer pricing regulations are “more like standards and less like rules,” the IRS should have a wide berth in implementing Morse’s suggestions.\textsuperscript{107} Particular incremental formulary changes to the U.S. transfer pricing regulations also might be accepted by U.S. tax treaty partners.\textsuperscript{108}
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Robert Goulder provided commentary on the *Business and International Tax* (2) panel papers. He notes that international tax is where the action is—it is where the money is, and where the worst abuses are. Goulder agrees with Avi-Yonah’s specific reforms and his observation that the plans proposed by President Obama and House Ways and Means Committee Chair Camp are not far apart. Goulder considers Christians’ EITI discussion “the revelation of the conference. Few tax professionals are even aware of the regime’s existence. Bravo to Professor Christians for highlighting the issue and framing the issue in such an insightful manner.” He concurs with Morse that “transfer pricing is really the big problem. What did they say about World War II fighter pilots that were getting shot at? If you’re getting flack, you know you’re over the target. You know you’re getting flack because transfer pricing is right over the target.” Like the late Walter Brooke’s advice to a young Dustin Hoffman in *The Graduate* (“plastics”), Goulder closed with advice for the audience: “[T]ransfer pricing and FATCA, that’s your future.”

David Cay Johnston delivered the luncheon address and closed the symposium in a *Morning Joe*-inspired segment on *What Have We Learned Today?* He compared the current tax system to a *New Yorker* cartoon: “[O]ne brontosaur[s] is talking to the other and saying, ‘You know, warm weather, lots of food, we can go on like this forever.’”
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