

Taxes on wealth: what kind of reform?

By [Guillaume Allègre](#), [Mathieu Plane](#) and [Xavier Timbeau](#)

Why and how should wealth be taxed? Are France's wealth taxes fair and efficient? In an article entitled, "[Reforming the taxation of wealth?](#)", published in the [special Tax Reform issue](#) of the *Revue de l'OFCE* [in French], we examine these issues and propose some possible ways to reform the taxation of wealth.

We show that in recent years real economic income from capital has been very substantial. The visible income from capital (interest, dividend, rents received, etc.) exists alongside less visible income (capital gains net of the consumption of fixed capital and inflationary tax). As only a portion of potential capital gains are realized, this less visible income forms a significant part of average personal income. Between 1998 and 2010, despite two financial crises, capital gains increased real per capita income by an annual average of 12% (33% on average from 2004 to 2007). This growth was due in large part to the sharp rise in property prices.

We also show that the actual tax rate on income from wealth is low, even though the nominal interest rates on capital income are high, and the tax rate *on income that is actually taxed* is even higher due to not taking into account inflationary tax in the calculation of taxes [\[1\]](#). After taking into account all taxation based on household wealth, including wealth which is held ("ISF" wealth tax, property tax) or which is passed on (property transaction taxes *i.e.* "stamp duty") and income from wealth (income tax, "CSG" wealth tax, etc.), the actual rate of taxation on economic income from capital [\[2\]](#) comes to an average of 11.1%. This low rate for the actual taxation of capital income is due to the fact that a large portion of this

income fully or partially escapes taxation: real property gains on principal residences are totally exempt, and secondary residences are partly exempt; the housing enjoyed by owner-occupiers ("imputed rent") is not taxable, even though, net of interest, it constitutes income; gifts serve to "purge" any capital gains, even when these are not taxed (there is a tax allowance of 159,000 euros per child for gifts to direct heirs, which is renewable every ten years); and some financial income avoids income tax (life insurance, tax-exempt bank accounts, etc.).

Next we discuss possibilities for reform that would lead to taxing all income from wealth. We believe that income from wealth (net increased income from wealth) should be taxed in the same way as labour income. This principle is fair (in the sense that households are then taxed on their contributory capacity, regardless of the source of their income), and it would also help to combat tax avoidance. In an increasingly financialized economy, the interface between labour income and capital income has become porous. Taxing capital income differently opens the door to tax schemes. Any reform of wealth taxation should make it a priority to tax all real capital gains, in particular real property gains, which currently are subject to specific rules. In addition, since property is a fixed asset, the existing rules cannot be justified as due to tax competition in Europe. They are occasionally defended based on the need to take account of inflation or due to the unique character of the principal residence. But taking inflation into account cannot justify the total exemption of real property gains on secondary residences after they have been held for a certain time (currently 30 years, previously 22 years): not only does the exemption on capital gains seem unfair, but it can also prompt some households to keep their property, in particular during speculative bubbles. Furthermore, the specific character of property cannot be invoked once there has been a definitive withdrawal from the market. The taxation of realized capital

gains, net of inflation, of the consumption of fixed capital and of renovation costs, would thus be preferable to a system of allowances based on the period of ownership. This could take place when the sale is not followed by another purchase – so as not to penalize mobility – and during inheritance (taxation of unrealized gains, before calculating inheritance tax). The taxation of real property gains upon a definitive withdrawal from the market could gradually replace the system of property transaction taxes or “stamp duty”, which would promote mobility and greater horizontal fairness.

In light of these arguments, what do we make of the proposals by the new French President François Hollande with regard to the taxation of wealth? He proposes (1) to tax capital income at the same rate as labour income is taxed; (2) to roll back the tax breaks on the ISF wealth tax and to raise the rate of taxation on the top income brackets; and (3) to reduce the inheritance tax allowance from 159,000 euros per child to 100,000 euros (it was raised from 50,000 euros to 150,000 euros in 2007).

(1) The first point would also involve eliminating the flat-rate withholding tax and the various tax loopholes that permit tax avoidance. It is similar to our proposals, so long as the income subject to tax takes into account inflationary tax and the consumption of fixed capital. This kind of proposal would involve taxing imputed rent, which constitutes an imputed income from capital. Nevertheless, given the difficulty of estimating the tax base, imputed rent has not been taxed since 1965 (see the article by [Briant and Jacquot](#)). One solution to this difficulty is to permit renters and first-time buyers to deduct their rent or loan interest payments from their taxable income, while increasing the average income tax rate to offset this.

(2) The second point departs from our proposals, but the ISF tax offers one solution for taxing large estates bit by bit, *even when they do not procure any taxable income* (when there

are unrealized capital gains but an absence of dividends or earned rent, for example). In a situation like this, the ISF tax makes sense *only if it is not capped based on the taxable income (or a similar notion)*. The ISF tax on wealth makes even more sense when the actual yields, including the unrealized gains on the assets, are not very heterogeneous (but it is then equivalent to a tax on the income from the assets) or when the supervision of the asset owners can improve their yields (taxation based on holding the wealth, and not on income, then serves as an additional incentive “to owners to ‘activate’ their estate,” in the words of Maurice Allais). In contrast, if the asset yields are heterogeneous and strong incentives to optimize the wealth already exist, then a tax on the income from the wealth is preferable from the viewpoint of fairness and not undermining economic efficiency.

(3) Higher inheritance taxes seem legitimate from the perspective of equal opportunity. We feel, however, that this should go further, at least by eliminating the purge of capital gains, in particular when the goods have been exempted from inheritance tax.

* *This text is taken from the article [Reforming the taxation of wealth?](#) published in the special Tax Reform issue of the *Revue de l’OFCE*, available on the [OFCE website](#).*

[1] As [Henri Sterdyniak](#) points out: “It is thus erroneous to claim that capital income is taxed at a lower rate. When it is *actually* taxed, this is at higher rates.”

[2] Defined as the ratio between the sum of taxes based on wealth and the net increased income from the wealth after having subtracted the consumption of fixed capital and inflationary tax.

Competitiveness and industrial demand: The difficulties facing the French-German couple

[Jean-Luc Gaffard](#)

The obsession with competitiveness has returned to centre stage with the election campaign. This reflects the reality that French companies are indeed suffering a loss of competitiveness, which is behind the deterioration in foreign trade for almost a decade. This loss is clear vis-à-vis the emerging markets and explains the trend towards relocating abroad. It is also clear vis-à-vis firms from other developed countries, mainly in the euro zone and in particular German companies. This latter situation is especially serious, as it challenges the coherence of European construction ([cf. OFCE, note 19: Competitiveness and industrial development: a European challenge in French](#)).

The gap in competitiveness that has emerged with Germany is clearly based on non-price competition. One of the reasons for this is Germany's superior business model, which is characterized by the maintenance of a network of local businesses of all sizes that focus on their core business and on the international fragmentation of production. This model is especially suitable for business development that is targeted at global markets, and it largely protects the countries hosting these companies from the risk of deindustrialization.

It would, nevertheless, be a mistake to ignore that this

development is also the product of an adverse change in price competitiveness. This reflects labour market reforms in Germany, which lowered the relative cost of labour, as well as strategies that are based on the segmentation of production and the outsourcing of intermediate segments, which have also contributed to lowering production costs.

Germany has thus managed to virtually stabilize its market share of global exports by increasing their level in the European Union (+1.7% in the 2000s) and even more so in the euro zone (+2.3%), while France has lost market share in these same areas (3.1% and 3.4%, respectively).

Two developments have particularly hurt France's industry. Its network of industrial SMEs has fallen apart. They were hit less by barriers to entry than by barriers to growth. All too often SME managers have been inclined or encouraged to sell the enterprises to large corporations rather than to ensure their growth. This is due both to the lack of genuine partnerships with these corporations and to the difficulties experienced in obtaining permanent financing from the banks and markets. For their part, the large industrial firms, both those operating on a multitude of local markets and those in the international markets, have chosen to focus on acquisitions and on the geographical decentralization of both their operations and their equipment and services suppliers. This strategy has been designed to meet geographical shifts in demand and to deal with the demand for immediate profitability set by volatile shareholders, but this has come in part at the expense of the development of local production networks. This process involved a vast movement of mergers and acquisitions that primarily drew on financial skills. The financial institutions were, in turn, converted to the universal banking model, abandoning some of their traditional role of being lending banks and investment banks. These concomitant developments have proved disastrous for overall competitiveness, particularly as hourly labour costs in industry were rising simultaneously.

There are two requirements for restoring the competitiveness of French companies and thereby encouraging the country's re-industrialization. The first is to allow immediate control of labour costs and the restoration of profit margins; this could be helped in particular by tax measures that would adjust the financing of a portion of social protection. The second requirement is to promote the reorganization of industry through the creation of a network of stable relationships between all those involved in the industrial process, especially by the use of aid that is conditioned on cooperation between large and small firms in "competitiveness clusters".

This medium-term effort will nevertheless largely remain ineffective if cooperative policies are not implemented across Europe. These policies need both to stimulate supply through the implementation of technology development programmes and to boost internal demand wherever it is clearly insufficient to satisfy production capacity.

Towards a major tax reform?

By [Guillaume Allègre](#) and [Mathieu Plane](#) (eds.)

Taxation is more at the heart of the current election campaign and public debate than ever before. The economic and financial crisis, coupled with the goal of rapidly reducing the deficit, is inevitably shaking up the electoral discourse and forcing us to confront the complexity of our tax system. How do taxes interact with each other? What are the effects? How are they measured? What kind of consensual basis and constraints does taxation require? How should the tax burden be distributed among the economic actors? How should social welfare be

financed? Should we advocate a “tax revolution” or incremental reform? The contributions to [a special “Tax Reform” issue of the Revue de l’OFCE – Débats et Politiques](#) aim to clarify and enrich this discussion.

The first section of the special issue deals with the requirements and principles of a tax system. In an introductory article, [Jacques Le Cacheux](#) considers the main principles that should underpin any necessary tax reform from the viewpoint of economic theory. In a historical analysis, [Nicolas Delalande](#) emphasizes the role of political resources, institutional constraints and social compromises in drawing up tax policy. [Mathieu Plane](#) considers past trends in taxation from a budgetary framework and analyzes the constraints on public finances today. In response to the problem of imported carbon emissions, [Eloi Laurent and Jacques Le Cacheux](#) propose the implementation of a carbon-added tax.

The second section deals with the issue of how the tax burden is distributed among households. [Camille Landais, Thomas Piketty and Emmanuel Saez](#) respond to the important article by [Henri Sterdyniak](#) in which he recommends a “tax revolution”. [Clément Schaff and Mahdi Ben Jelloul](#) propose a complete overhaul of family policy. [Guillaume Allègre](#) attempts to shed light on the debate over France’s “family quotient” policy. Finally, [Guillaume Allègre, Mathieu Plane and Xavier Timbeau](#) propose a reform of taxation on wealth.

The third section concerns the financing of social protection. In a sweeping review of the literature, [Mireille Elbaum](#) examines changes in the financing of social protection since the early 1980s, and considers the alternatives that have been proposed and their limits. [Eric Heyer, Mathieu Plane and Xavier Timbeau](#) analyze the impact of the implementation of the “quasi-social VAT” approved by the French Parliament. [Frédéric Gannon and Vincent Touzé](#) present an estimate of the marginal tax rate implicit in the country’s pension system.

AAA, AA+: much Ado About nothing?

by [Jérôme Creel](#)

The loss of France's AAA rating on Friday the 13th of January 2012 was a historic event. It poses three questions: should the austerity measures announced in autumn 2011 be strengthened? Why has Germany been singled out? And what is to be done now?

The loss of the AAA rating on French government bonds is not surprising – far from it. The sovereign debt crisis that has shaken the euro zone for over two years, starting in the autumn of 2009, was not managed properly because it occurred during a recession, at a time when all the EU Member States had their eyes glued to their own economic difficulties. In the absence of a concerted response that included immediate solidarity and mutual guarantees by the euro zone Member States of the zone's entire public debt, with the support of the European Central Bank (cf. Catherine Mathieu and Henri Sterdyniak, [here](#)), the foreseeable contagion occurred. The objective public finance mistakes committed by successive Greek governments followed by the vagaries of the Irish banks have now led to a systemic crisis in Europe.

By implementing austerity measures simultaneously, Europe's governments have magnified the economic difficulties: economic stagnation and even recession are now on the agenda for the euro zone (cf. Xavier Timbeau *et al.*, [here](#)). A downgrade of debt ratings in the euro zone was thus to be expected. It does, however, raise three questions.

1. Should the austerity measures be strengthened? In a commentary on the supplementary 7 billion euro French austerity plan announced in November 2011, Mathieu Plane (see in French [here](#)) pointed out that the race for the AAA rating had already been lost. The impact of this austerity plan on economic growth was objectively inconsistent with the fiscal consolidation target – and Standard & Poor's was surely not unaware of this argument.
2. Why did S&P single out Germany and Slovakia, the only economies in the euro zone not downgraded on Friday 13 January? While their commercial links are undeniable (cf. Sandrine Levasseur, 2010, [here](#)), which could justify their comparable treatment, the main markets for both of these economies, and particularly Germany, lie in the euro zone. Slowing growth in the euro zone outside Germany will not leave the other side of the Rhine unaffected (cf. Sabine Le Bayon, in French [here](#)). It is difficult to see how the contagion of the crisis could stop at the borders of Germany and Slovakia. The recent take-up of German government 6-month bonds at a negative interest rate could even be interpreted to reflect extreme distrust of Germany's commercial banks. In any case, its economy, situated in the euro zone, is no less fragile than that of France.
3. What should be done now in France? The loss of the AAA rating reflects a negative outlook both for the state of public finances and for economic growth. While Germany has not been downgraded, it is possible that this is because S&P takes a positive view of its non-cooperative strategy in the past. From this perspective, the principle of a social VAT measure can be considered a way to help France catch up with Germany in terms of competitiveness, as Jacques Le Cacheux points out ([here](#)): if the Germans did it, why can't we? This would help boost tax revenue by increasing the competitive advantage of businesses established in France. If such a

measure were to be adopted, Germany and France would be on equal footing. The two countries could then sensibly consider a cooperative policy for a recovery in Europe. Some possible focuses include: industrial policy (cf. Sarah Guillou and Lionel Nesta, in French [here](#)); social policy; an ambitious climate and energy policy (cf. Eloi Laurent, [here](#)); and a financial policy that includes a common tax on financial transactions, with the revenue raised being used to ensure that the taxpayer would never again need to bail out the private banks, which would free up additional maneuvering room for the first three policies. The policy outlines would of course need to be defined, but it is crucial to recognize that policy action is urgently needed.

“Social VAT”: Is it anti-social?

by [Jacques Le Cacheux](#)

The prospect of a “social” value added tax, which was raised anew by the President of France on December 31 during his New Year speech, is once again provoking controversy. While the French employers association, the MEDEF, has included this measure in a series of proposed tax changes designed to restore France’s competitiveness, the Left is mostly opposed. It views the “social VAT” as an oxymoron, an antisocial measure that is designed to cut the purchasing power of consumers and hits the poorest among them disproportionately and unfairly. But what exactly are we talking about? And from the viewpoint of taxes on consumption, what is the situation in France relative to its main European partners?

The proposal to establish a social VAT represents, in fact, a combination of two measures: raising the VAT rate and allocating the additional revenue obtained to finance social welfare, while lowering – in principle by the same amount – social contributions. The way that these two operations are conducted can differ greatly: the rise in VAT could involve the standard rate (currently 19.6%), the reduced rate (currently 5.5%, but recently increased to 7% for a range of products and services), the creation of an intermediate rate, a switch to the standard rate of certain products or services currently at the reduced rate, etc., while the reduction in social contributions could cover employer contributions or employee contributions, be uniform or targeted on low wages, etc. Many policy choices are available, with distributional impacts that are not identical.

France now has one of the lowest rates of implicit taxation on consumption in the European Union (Eurostat). Its standard VAT rate was reduced to 19.6% in 2000 after having been raised to 20.6% in 1995 to help ensure compliance with the Maastricht criteria, as the recession of 1993 had pushed the budget deficit significantly higher. This rate is now slightly lower than the rate applied by most of our partners, particularly as the deterioration of public finances has recently prompted several European countries to raise their standard rate of VAT. The reduced rate, at 5.5%, was, until the increase decided in December 2011 on certain products and services, the lowest in the EU.

What can we expect from a social VAT? Let's consider in turn the effects on competitiveness and then on purchasing power, while distinguishing the two aspects of the operation. A VAT hike has a positive impact on the competitiveness of French business, because it increases the price of imports without burdening exports, which are subject to the VAT of the destination country. In this respect, a VAT increase is equivalent to a devaluation. In so far as most of France's

trade is conducted with our European partners within the European single market, this could be deemed a non-cooperative policy. Fine, but if all our partners were to use this type of “internal euro zone devaluation” – recall that in 2007 Germany increased its standard VAT rate from 16% to 19% – and we didn’t, this would actually amount to a real appreciation of the “French euro”. It would undoubtedly be better to aim for improved fiscal coordination in Europe, and to work for more uniform rates. But current circumstances are hardly favourable for that, and the threat of a VAT increase may be one way to encourage our main partner to show more cooperation on this issue.

Allocating the revenue raised to reduce social contributions will, in turn, have an additional positive impact on competitiveness only if it leads to a real reduction in the cost of labour to firms located in France. This would be the case if the reduction targeted employer contributions, but not if it were on employee contributions.

Can we expect a positive effect on employment? Yes, at a minimum thanks to the impact on competitiveness, but this would be small, unless we were to imagine a massive increase in VAT rates. The effect of lowering labour charges is less clear, because the employers’ social contributions are already zero or low on low wages, which, according to the available studies, is precisely the category of employees for which demand is sensitive to cost.

Isn’t the decline in the purchasing power of French households likely to reduce domestic consumption and cancel out these potential gains? In part perhaps, but it’s far from certain. Indeed, the rise in VAT is unlikely to be fully and immediately reflected in selling prices: in the case of Germany in 2007, the price increase was relatively small and spread over time –meaning that the margins of producers and distributors absorbed part of the increase, thus reducing the positive impact on business somewhat. In France, [empirical](#)

[work on the increase in 1995](#) shows that it too was not fully and immediately reflected in prices; and, although one cannot expect symmetrical results, it's worth recalling that the cut in VAT in the restaurant business was not passed on much in prices.

Would the rise in VAT be “antisocial” because it winds up hitting the poorest households disproportionately? No! Don't forget that the minimum income, the minimum wage (SMIC) and pensions are indexed to the consumer price index. So unless these indexes were somehow frozen – which the government has just done for some benefits – the purchasing power of low-income households would not be affected, and only employees earning above the minimum wage, together with earnings on savings, would suffer a decline in purchasing power, if consumer prices were to reflect the rise in VAT. It should also be noted that, if there is a positive impact on employment, some unemployed workers would find jobs and total payroll would increase, meaning that the depressive impact on consumption often cited by opponents of this measure would only be minor, or even non-existent.

In short, “social VAT” should be neither put on a pedestal nor dragged through the dirt. As with any tax reform, we should certainly not expect a panacea against unemployment, or even a massive shift in our external accounts, even though it should help to improve our external price-competitiveness. But rebalancing our tax burden to focus more on consumption and less on the cost of labour is a worthy goal. In the context of globalization, taxing consumption is a good way to provide resources for the public purse, and VAT, a French innovation that has been adopted by almost every country, is a convenient way of doing this and of applying, without explicitly saying so, a form of protectionism through the de-taxation of exports. VAT is not, on the other hand, a good instrument for redistribution, since the use of a reduced rate on consumer products ultimately benefits the better-off as much or more

than it does the poor. Most of our European partners have understood this, as they either do not have a reduced rate (as in Denmark) or have one that is substantially higher than ours (often 10% or 12%). It would be desirable to make the French tax system fairer, but this requires the use of instruments that have the greatest and best-targeted potential for redistribution: direct taxes – income tax, CSG-type wealth taxes, property tax – or social transfers, or even certain government expenditures (education, health). What is missing in the proposed “social VAT” is making it part of a comprehensive fiscal reform that restores consistency and justice to the system of taxes and social contributions as a whole.