*University of Michigan Law School*
Program in Law and Economics

*Year* 2013 *Paper* 61

# A Proposed Replacement of the Tax Expenditure Concept and a Different Perspective on Accelerated Depreciation

Douglas A. Kahn*

*University of Michigan Law School, dougkahn@umich.edu

This working paper is hosted by The Berkeley Electronic Press (bepress) and may not be commercially reproduced without the permission of the copyright holder.

http://law.bepress.com/umichlwps-empirical/61

Copyright ©2013 by the author.

# A Proposed Replacement of the Tax Expenditure Concept and a Different Perspective on Accelerated Depreciation

Douglas A. Kahn

**Abstract**

The thesis of this article is that the tax expenditure concept is grounded on an erroneous vision of the structure of an income tax system. The tax expenditure concept adopts a binary view of income taxation. It posits that there is an ideal or pure income tax system whose provisions are elements of the normal structure of that system without any influence from non-tax policy considerations. Tax provisions are described either as falling within those core provisions or outside of them. There are no other categories. To the contrary, this article contends that tax provisions lie on a continuum in which some are in the core and some are at different distances from the core. The author contends that virtually all tax provisions, including those within the core, reflect policy considerations. The decision whether to adopt or retain a provision takes into account both its proximity to the core and also the economic and societal consequences (both positive and negative) that the provision will cause. There is no universal tax system for all times. Tax laws are (and should be) constructed to coordinate with the needs and values of society as they change over time. The article also contends that there is not just one proper method of depreciation, and that accelerated depreciation is as consistent with neutral tax principles as is straight line depreciation.

# A PROPOSED REPLACEMENT OF THE TAX EXPENDITURE CONCEPT AND A DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE ON ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION

by

Douglas A. Kahn

## I. Introduction

The concept of tax expenditures has been widely accepted[1] and has even been adopted into federal law, which requires the annual promulgation of tax expenditure budgets.[2] Pursuant to that mandate, several federal governmental offices publish lists of what they deem to be tax expenditures. One such budget is published by the Department of Treasury, and a different budget is published by the Staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation.[3] While there is considerable overlap in those two budgets, they are not identical, and they utilize different norms and baselines for determining what constitutes a tax expenditure.[4] In addition, 45 states publish their own versions of a tax expenditure budget.[5]

---

[1]Professor Zelinsky observed in a recent article that the advocates of the tax expenditure concept have prevailed and that the federal government and the governments of 45 states publish tax expenditure budgets. Edward A. Zelinsky, *The Counterproductive Nature of Tax Expenditure Budgets*, 137 Tax Notes 1317 (Dec. 17, 2012).

[2]2 USC.§ 622(3) defines the terms 'tax expenditure" and "tax expenditure budget." 2 USC § 632(e)(1) and (2)(E) require the committees on budget of both houses of Congress to publish a report each fiscal year, and the report must contain a tax expenditure budget. 31 USC 1105(a)(16) requires the president to submit a budget each year, which must include a tax expenditure budget.

[3] Joint Committee on Taxation, Estimates of Federal Tax Expenditures for Fiscal Years 2011-2015 (JCS 1-12), January 17, 2012 (hereinafter cited as JCS 1-12).

[4]Id.

[5] Zelinsky *supra* n. 1 at 1318, citing Frank Shaforth, *Tax Expenditures: A Most Taxing Challenge*, State Tax Notes (April 30, 2012).

bepress Legal Repository



Hosted by The Berkeley Electronic Press

Electronic copy available at: http://ssrn.com/abstract=2205288

The theme of the tax expenditure concept is that some tax provisions are not elements of a normal or ideal measurement of income and that such provisions are designed to finance indirectly a program that Congress has chosen to support.[6] The listed tax provisions are designated as disguised expenditures of the government that should be subjected to the same scrutiny as are direct expenditures.[7] The budgets also provide an estimate of the amount of revenue that the government loses because of the inclusion in tax law of each such designated provision.[8]

In prior articles, the author has expressed his view that the tax expenditure concept is flawed and misleading.[9] In this paper, the author will set forth a view of the structure of the federal income tax system that is different from, and in contravention of, the view underlying the tax expenditure concept. The author proposes an entirely different standard for measuring the appropriateness of a tax provision. The tax expenditure concept is based on a binary approach in categorizing tax provisions. Under that system, an item either is consistent with normal tax provisions or is inconsistent. There are no shades of consistency. Instead, the author proposes a

---

[6]JCS 1-12 *supra* n. 3 which states in Part I of that report, "Special income tax provisions are referred to as tax expenditures because they may be considered to be analogous to direct outlay programs, and the two can be considered as alternative means of accomplishing similar budget policy objectives."

[7]There are reasons to question just how much scrutiny is given to direct expenditures. Many governmental programs, such as social security, medicare, and medicaid, dispense large amounts of money without any congressional oversight of the programs. See Aaron Wildavsky, *The Politics of the Budgetary Process* (1964).

[8] The two budgets utilize different methodologies in determining the amount of revenue that is lost. JCS 1-12, *supra* n. 3.

[9]Ex., Douglas Kahn and Jeffrey Lehman, *Tax Expenditure Budgets: A Critical View*, 54 Tax Notes 487 (Oct. 24, 1994). See also, Boris Bitttker, *Accounting for Federal "Tax Subsidies" in the National Budget,* 22 Nat'l Tax J. 244 (1969).

bepress Legal Repository



http://law.bepress.com/umichlwps-empirical/61
Electronic copy available at: http://ssrn.com/abstract=2205288

multivariate standard for evaluating tax provisions.

Over 32 years ago, I published an article on accelerated depreciation in which I concluded that some amount of acceleration was consistent with normal tax principles and should not be classified as a tax expenditure.[10] Over the intervening years, from time to time, I have exchanged comments with authors who have questioned that conclusion.[11] It is time to revisit that topic and renew the consideration of how tax depreciation may properly operate.

This article's analysis of depreciation provides one example of how the tax expenditure budgets are flawed. The treatment of some accelerated depreciation as a tax expenditure is based on a view that any acceleration conflicts with normal tax principles.[12] The author will show in this paper that when the structure of depreciation is examined, it becomes clear that there is more than one way to determine what allowance for depreciation should be made, and that allowing acceleration does not contravene any established tax principles.

It is not the thesis of this paper that acceleration is the only proper method of tax depreciation. To the contrary, it is the view of the author that many forms of depreciation are proper and comply with normal tax principles, and that accelerated depreciation is merely one of

---

[10]Douglas Kahn, *Accelerated Depreciation – Tax Expenditure or Proper Allowance for Measuring Net Income?*, 78 Mich. L. Rev. 1 (1979).

[11]E.g., Walter Blum, *Accelerated Depreciation: A Proper Allowance for Measuring Net Income?!!!*, 78 Mich. L. Rev. 1172 (1980); Douglas Kahn, *Accelerated Depreciation Revisited – A Reply to Professor Blum,* 78 Mich. L. Rev. 1185 (1980).

[12] The commentary in the budget promulgated by the Staff of the Joint Committee states that any depreciation in excess of straight line with the recovery periods set forth in the alternative depreciation system established in § 165(g) will be treated as a tax expenditure. JCS 1-12, *supra* n. 3 .The commentary indicates that economic depreciation is deemed to be the model. Economic depreciation is explained in Part IIIA of this article.

bepress Legal Repository



Hosted by The Berkeley Electronic Press
Electronic copy available at: http://ssrn.com/abstract=2205288

the appropriate methods that can be authorized.

**II. Replacement of the Tax Expenditure Concept.**

Even those that admire the tax expenditure concept acknowledge that there is a problem in identifying many of the items that constitute expenditures because there is not universal agreement as to what constitutes a pure income tax system, which is the base against which tax provisions are measured to determine whether they constitute a normal tax provision or an expenditure.[13] Nevertheless, they note that there are many clear examples of what are and are not tax expenditures, and so they approve of the concept and regard any questionable inclusions in the budgets as minor discrepencies.[14] It is noteworthy that some of the items that are regarded by the concept's admirers as clearly constituting expenditures are not so regarded by some other commentators. For example, Professors Chirelstein and Zelenak state that all personal deductions, such as charitable contributions and medical expenses, clearly are tax expenditures.[15] To the contrary, a number of commentators have concluded that some personal deductions are consistent with a normal tax system.[16] That conflict of views illustrates that even if the premise of the expenditure concept were correct, the classification of many such tax items as expenditures will

---

[13]E.g., Marvin Chirelstein and Lawrence Zelenak, *Federal Income Taxation* (12th ed. 2012) at p. 206.

[14]Id.

[15]Id. See also, Gregg D. Polsky, *Rationally Cutting Tax Expenditures*, 50 U. Louisville L. Rev. 643 (2012).

[16]E.g., William Andrews, *Personal Deductions in an Ideal Income Tax*, 86 Harv. L. Rev. 309 (1972); Jeffrey Kahn, "*Personal Deductions - A Tax "Ideal" or Just Another "Deal"?*, 2002 L.Rev. MSU-DCL 1 (2002); William Turnier, *The High Road and the Low Road, Personal Deductions and Tax Reform,"* 31 Vill. L. Rev. 1703 (1986); Joel Newman, *Of Taxes and Other Casualties*, 34 Hastings L.J. 941 (1983).

bepress Legal Repository



http://law.bepress.com/umichlwps-empirical/61

be controversial.

To quarrel with the inclusion of some of the items in the budgets may not be sufficient to justify abandoning the expenditure concept. While such commentary casts doubt on the reliability of parts of the budgets, it leaves open the question of whether the concept itself is viable. The more items that are questioned, the greater the skepticism over the reliability of the budgets; but the flaw in the concept is more fundamental than the difficulty encountered in identifying those items that are expenditures.

It is the thesis of this paper that the controversial aspect of some of the items listed in the budgets is a symptom of the fact that the underlying premise of the expenditure concept is unsound. The failure of the expenditure concept is not merely that many of the inclusions in the budget are questionable. Rather, its failure lies in the fact that the entire concept is based on an erroneous view of the income tax system. It is not sufficient to correct individual items of the budget; the entire tax expenditure concept should be discarded. I discuss below the view of the tax system on which the expenditure concept is based and describe a different view of the tax system that more accurately comports with how tax law actually operates and should operate.

The Tax Expenditure concept rests on the view that an ideal or normal tax system exists. Tax provisions are then compared to that ideal or normal system to see if they conform or not. The two governmental budgets apply different standards for determining the baseline against which tax items are measured.[17] The drafters of one budget create what they considers to be an ideal system for their baseline, and the drafters of the other budget determine what principles they consider to be normal in the current tax system and then characterize some of the current tax

[17] JCS 1-12, *supra* n. 3.

bepress Legal Repository



Hosted by The Berkeley Electronic Press

provisions as out of place with those principles and therefore tax expenditures. Both budgets recognize that some basic tax principles are appropriate and therefore do not create an expenditure. The doctrine of realization is treated as a normal and appropriate part of a tax system, and so adherence to that doctrine does not create a tax expenditure for either budget.[18] For accounting purposes, the Joint Committee's budget treats the accrual method as normal except where it is not feasible to use it.[19] The budgets acknowledge that administrative convenience is a proper goal of a tax system, and that is why they accept the realization doctrine. In recognition of the importance of administrative convenience to the operation of a tax system, the budgets accept a number of other tax principles including the measuring of gain without regard to the effect of inflation.[20] The Joint Committee's budget does not treat the imputed income from home ownership as a tax expenditure because the Committee considers it to be excluded from income out of administrative necessity.[21]

The tax expenditure system is based on a binary view of tax provisions. They either conform to normal principles or they do not. Every tax provision is either black or white. That is an inaccurate picture of how a tax system is actually structured and how it should be structured.

The advocates of the tax expenditure concept are correct in asserting that there is a core of provisions that clearly are part of the structure of an income tax system. The deduction of the expenses of producing income is a necessary part of a tax system if one seeks to tax net income as

---

[18] Id.

[19] Id.

[20] Id.

[21] Id

bepress Legal Repository



http://law.bepress.com/umichlwps-empirical/61

contrasted to gross receipts.[22] The number of provisions that fit within that core may be fewer than some imagine, but there is no doubt that there is a core of such provisions. But it is an error to treat tax provisions as either within that core or outside of it. Rather, most provisions lie on a continuum of varying distances from that core. For example, the expenses of day care for an infant may be necessary for the parent to work and earn income, but the personal elements of having a child cause that expense to lie further from the core than are the expenses of paying an employee to sell the taxpayer's products. Medical expenses may be an appropriate deduction,[23] but they are further from the core than are ordinary business expenses.

Tax law does not operate in a vacuum. Tax laws affect behavior and can have societal and economic consequences that may be desirable or may be undesirable. For example, the failure to tax imputed income may influence one spouse to stay home to care for a child rather than to earn taxable wages and pay someone else to care for the child. The tax law will have an influence on the parent's decision. The likelihood of the tax system's skewing that decision is enhanced by the fact that the secondary spouse may be taxed at a higher rate on her wages because of the income earned by the other spouse. If no deduction is allowed for child care, the tax law will create an incentive for one spouse to not be employed. The decision for one spouse to stay home and care for the child may be regarded as desirable or undesirable depending upon one's views on both societal and economic issues. If it were concluded that that decision should be made by the

---

[22] There are good reasons not to base a tax system on gross receipts. Such a tax would impose greater taxes on businesses with high costs than on those with low costs. That would violate the doctrine of horizontal and vertical equity.

[23] To the contrary, as previously noted, there are those who conclude that medical expenses should not be deductible. The issue is controversial. See the text to ns. 15 and 16, *supra*.

bepress Legal Repository



Hosted by The Berkeley Electronic Press

parents, insulated from any outside influence from the government, the tax law's influence could be neutralized by providing a tax deduction for the expense of child care. The parent's decision could then be made independently of tax considerations. Instead of providing a deduction, current tax law gives a tax credit for such expenses.[24] That works less efficiently then would a deduction, but it serves the same function.

The child care example is one where a tax provision could be adopted to prevent another tax provision (the failure to tax imputed income) from influencing behavior when it was determined that such influence is undesirable. It seems to the author that a provision designed to negate a negative influence of the tax law should not be regarded as a tax expenditure even if the provision is deemed to differ from an ideal tax. Provisions of that nature should be classified differently.

In contrast to neutralizing tax influences, a tax provision could be adopted in order to induce certain behavior or to deter it. Some provisions clearly were designed to further a non-tax objective. For example, providing tax benefits for the purchase of anti-pollution devices has programmatic goals. The tax expenditure adherents would claim that a tax provision that is designed to induce behavior is a subsidy and should be characterized as an expenditure. But that view is too simplistic.

As noted above, relatively few tax provision fit within the core of measuring net income. Instead, most lie on a continuum in which some are close to the core and some are far away from it. Legislators take into account the effect that a proposed tax provision will have on behavior and consider whether that behavior will have societal or economic consequences that are desirable or

[24] § 21.

bepress Legal Repository



http://law.bepress.com/umichlwps-empirical/61

undesirable. It would be foolish to ignore the influence of taxation on the economy and on societal decisions and just allow good and bad consequences to occur in any way they happen to arise. That is not what occurs.

The considerations that go into the adoption of tax provisions are multifaceted. The proximity of the provision to the core of a tax system is one factor, but only one factor. The further a provision is from the core, the greater the policy considerations must be to justify its retention. The closer that the provision is to the core, the less relative weight that is accorded to policy considerations. But policy considerations are never entirely absent from the equation. Even a core provision may be removed from the tax law because of the prominence of adverse policy considerations. For example, a deduction for an expense that directly produces income is a core provision. But, there are circumstances where no deduction is allowed for such expenses because they contravene non-tax policies. One such exception is for illegal expenses, which are denied deductibility by § 162(c). While, for several reasons, I think that § 162(c) is a bad provision, its legislative purpose obviously rests on non-tax considerations. A fine that arises out of an activity conducted in operating a business is nondeductible because of § 162(f). Another example is unreimbursed employee business expenses which are treated as a miscellaneous itemized deduction and so are subjected to limitations on their deductibility[25] or even disallowed entirely if the AMT applies.[26] There is no aspect of a tax system that would justify that treatment of business expenses, which are clearly within the core of proper tax provisions.

---

[25] §§ 67 and 68.

[26] § 56(b)(1)(A) disallows a deduction for miscellaneous itemized deductions in determining the alternative minimum taxable income of an individual. See § 67(b).

bepress Legal Repository



Hosted by The Berkeley Electronic Press

This picture of taxation explains one reason why tax provisions need to be altered from time to time. The consequences of a provision can change as societal and economic conditions change. The values that society holds can change so that consequences that once were thought desirable are now viewed as undesirable or vice versa.

There is another fundamental flaw in the tax expenditure concept. Not only does it posit that there is a pure income tax system, it is based on the assumption that the current tax law is designed generally to conform to that system so that variances from it can be seen as departures that often represent disguised expenditures. The model for the pure system is some version of the Haig-Simons definition of income as the sum of the changes in the taxpayer's wealth plus the market value of the taxpayer's personal consumption over a taxable year. To the contrary, the current system is not designed to be purely a taxation of net income nor did its drafters aspire to that exclusive goal. The current system is far more pragmatic. It is designed to be a combination of a taxation of income and consumption.[27] In their excellent casebook, Professors Bankman, Shaviro, and Stark state, "it is often said that our system is as much a consumption tax as an income tax, or more precisely some sort of impure hybrid of the two."[28]

Given the hybrid and pragmatic nature of the country's income tax system, it is folly to speak of provisions departing from some fixed ideal view of income. Such so-called departures can be as much a proper part of the system and those that are seen as core provisions. There are

---

[27] For example, the tax law does not apply to some significant accessions to wealth such as imputed income and unrealized appreciation of the value of assets, and the tax law's view of consumption appears to be different from the one contemplated in the Haig-Simons definition..

[28] Joseph Bankman, Daniel N. Shaviro, Kirk J. Stark, *Federal Income Taxation*, (16th ed., 2012), at p. 14.

bepress Legal Repository



http://law.bepress.com/umichlwps-empirical/61

numerous factors to be considered in determining whether any tax provision should be retained, but its relationship to some ideal tax system is not one of them.

The admirers of the tax expenditure concept do not contend that the items listed in the budgets necessarily should be repealed or changed. They contend that since the items do not conform to established tax principles, each should be repealed unless a convincing case can be made for its retention on the basis of serving some valuable societal or economic purpose whose benefit justifies the amount of revenue that is lost because of that provision. In other words, because of their equivalence to a direct expenditure, they should meet the same process of review that is applied to determine whether to continue making a direct expenditure.[29]

By singling out some tax provisions because they serve non-tax policy functions, the concept obscures the fact that non-tax policy considerations have a role in the question of the adoption or retention of virtually all tax provisions.[30] By placing all so-called tax expenditures in a single category of non-neutral, the concept ignores the different status of provisions that lie on different points of the continuum. Since the adoption or retention of virtually all tax provisions is influenced by non-tax considerations, the selection of some such provisions to be designated as having a programatic function is misleading because it suggests that those provisions are significantly different from the many other provisions that also serve a programatic function.

The expenditure concept has more of a political purpose than of providing any useful

---

[29] As previously noted, some authors have questioned the extent to which direct expenditures are scrutinized. See e.g., Zelinsky, *supra* n. 1 at p. 1320.

[30] As previously noted, even core provisions, such as business expenses, are subject to non-tax considerations. See the text to ns. 24 and 25, *supra*. In that case, as contrasted to inducing the adoption of a provision, the presence of undesirable non-tax consequences can lead to eliminating or limiting the item.

bepress Legal Repository



Hosted by The Berkeley Electronic Press

information. By classifying some provisions as tax expenditures, it suggests that they do not belong in the tax system and makes them prominent targets for repeal whenever Congress needs to increase revenue.[31] This labeling could alter the debate on listed items by marking them with a scarlet letter. Moreover, the question of where the items belong on the continuum, which should be a factor, might be overlooked. The following discussion of accelerated depreciation provides an example of a designated expenditure provision that can be seen to be within the core itself. The characterization of accelerated depreciation as an expenditure reflects the rigidity of the expenditure concept and its failure to reflect the flexibility of the tax system, which accommodates a variety of approaches for the determination of income.

**III. Depreciation Deductions**

The cost of acquiring an asset that will be used in a trade or business or for the production of income is deductible.[32] However, if the asset is to be used by the taxpayer for more than one year, the cost cannot be deducted currently, but must be capitalized.[33] The capitalized cost can be allocated among the years of the asset's useful life, and a portion of the cost can be deducted in

---

[31] Despite the promulgation of tax expenditure budgets, the number of items that are classified as expenditures has continued to grow. Some have concluded, therefore, that the tax expenditure budgets have been ineffective. Indeed, Professor Zelinsky contends that the budgets have been counterproductive and have actually stimulated the increase in tax expenditures. Zelinsky, *supra* n.1. While that seems an unlikely consequence and other explanations are available, I make a different point in this article. My thesis is that the expenditure concept is based on a false premise and should be discarded regardless of its efficacy.

[32] §§ 162(a), 212(1).

[33] § 263.

bepress Legal Repository



http://law.bepress.com/umichlwps-empirical/61

each year. Certain types of amortization of cost are referred to as depreciation.[34] If an aliquot amount is allocated equally to each year of the recovery period, the depreciation is referred to as "straight line depreciation." Some methods of depreciation allocate a greater amount of cost to the earlier years of the recovery period than to the later years. Those types are called "accelerated depreciation." The most common accelerated method authorized by the Code is the declining balance method.[35]

While there is little dispute as to the appropriateness of allowing depreciation deductions, there are issues as to the method of depreciations that should be available and as to the choice of a recovery period. In general, the Tax Expenditure Budgets treat accelerated methods as expenditures to the extent that the amount of deduction in a year exceeds what would be allowed under straight line depreciation. The source of the view that accelerated depreciation is excessive is an approach to depreciation called "economic depreciation." or "sinking-fund depreciation."

*A. Economic Depreciation.*

Economic depreciation is based on the premise that the correct amount of depreciation allowable for a year is the amount by which the asset declined in value by the end of the year. It is not based on the actual decline in the asset's value, which would require appraisals to be made. Rather, it is based on the decline that occurs because of the passage of time without regard to changes that may have taken place in market conditions. Apart from the administrative difficulty in measuring market changes, tax law has firmly established that changes in market value do not

---

[34] See §§ 167, 168.

[35] § 168(b).

bepress Legal Repository



Hosted by The Berkeley Electronic Press

affect the amount of depreciation that is allowable.[36]

Economic depreciation concludes (quite reasonably) that the value of an asset is the sum of the present values of the income stream that it is assumed the asset will produce. The calculation of economic depreciation is illustrated in an example in the treatise on federal income taxation that is co-authored by Professors Chirelstein and Zelenak.[37] I will use their example since it provides such a clear explanation of that approach to depreciation.

In that illustration, a machine is purchased for $4,000 to be used in a business. The machine is expected to last for 5 years and to produce (after maintenance expenses) income of $1,200 each year. While it is unrealistic to assume an equal amount of income production each year, that assumption makes the calculations easier. We will also assume, unrealistically, that the entire $1,200 is received at the end of each year, rather than being earned throughout the year.

To calculate the value of each year's income stream to a purchaser, the market will discount the $1,200 for that year by a figure that represents the rate of income that the market deems appropriate for the risk involved in purchasing the machine. The discount rate that is used to establish the price of an asset is set by the market. Since the purchaser paid $4,000 for a machine that will produce $6,000 over a 5-year period, the discount rate was about 15%.

The value of the machine will decrease by the end of each year since the remaining life of the machine will be one year less. But, simultaneously, the value of the remaining years of use will increase because they are one year nearer to occurring. The latter increase in value will offset some of the reduction in value caused by the expiration of one year's life. Chirelstein and Zelenak

---

[36] *Fribourg Navigation Co., Inc. v. Commissioner*, 383 U.S. 272 (1966)

[37] Chirelstein and Zelenak, *supra* n. 13 at 187-188.

bepress Legal Repository



http://law.bepress.com/umichlwps-empirical/61

illustrate this effect by setting forth the following schedule.

| | Present Value of Investment | Present Value of Remaining Payments | | | | | Annual Loss in Present Value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Start Year 1 | $4,000 | $1,045 | 905 | 790 | 687 | 573 | |
| End Year 1 | 3427 | | 1,045 | 905 | 790 | 687 | $ 573 |
| End Year 2 | 2740 | | | 1,045 | 905 | 790 | 687 |
| End year 3 | 1,950 | | | | 1,045 | 905 | 790 |
| End year 4 | 1,045 | | | | | 1,045 | 905 |
| End year 5 | 0 | | | | | | 1,045 |
| | | | | | | Total | 4,000 |

As you can see from that schedule,. The decline in value of the machine at the end of Year 1 was $573. in the next year, the machine declined in value by $687, The decline in value was larger each subsequent year until the fifth year when the decline was $1,045. If depreciation deductions were to follow that schedule, there would be only $573 depreciation in the first year and increasing amounts each year until the last year would have $1,045 depreciation. Instead of straight line or accelerated depreciation, there would be decelerated depreciation. In a nutshell, that is economic or sinking-fund depreciation.

Because economic or sinking-fund depreciation is based on several unrealistic assumptions, noone advocates the adoption of that system. Indeed, Chirelstein and Zelenak themselves acknowledge that the assumptions are unrealistic for the depreciation of tangible assets; and they note that if more realistic assumptions were made, "the proper depreciation method would be less decelerated than sinking-fund, or possibly even straight line or accelerated."[38] While the tax expenditure budget proposed by the Joint Committee on Taxation

[38] Id. at p. 189.

bepress Legal Repository



Hosted by The Berkeley Electronic Press

considers economic depreciation to be the model, they treat straight line depreciation as the normal baseline for their budget.[39]

*B. Proper Method of Depreciation*

Let us ignore the unrealistic assumptions that go into economic depreciation and focus on whether it is the only proper view of depreciation even accepting those assumptions.

Referring to the schedule above for the machine that was purchased for $4,000, we can see that of the $4,000 that the purchaser paid for the machine, $1,045 of it was attributable to the income he expected to earn in the first year of using the machine. If he paid $1,045 for the first year's use of the machine, why doesn't economic depreciation allow him to deduct that amount for the use of the machine in that year? Why does economic depreciation allow him to deduct only $573? The answer is that while he used up the first year of the machine's life for which he paid $1,045, the value of the remaining four years of the machine's life increased due to the fact that they are all one year closer in time to being earned. So, we can see that economic depreciation is based on offsetting the exhaustion of the $1,045 paid for the first year's use of the machine by the increase in value of the remaining life of the machine due to the passage of time.

The increase in the value of the remaining life of the machine is unrealized appreciation. The doctrine of realization is a basic element of the federal income tax system, and the Tax Expenditure Budgets do not treat the application of that doctrine as creating an expenditure.[40] If the increase in value of the remaining life were not taken into account in determining depreciation because of the realization doctrine, the machine would be depreciated on an accelerated method.

---

[39] See *supra* n. 12.

[40] *Supra* n. 18.

bepress Legal Repository



http://law.bepress.com/umichlwps-empirical/61

The first year's depreciation would be $1,040, the second year would be $905, and so on until the fifth year's depreciation would be $573.

Does that accelerated method violate normal principles of federal income taxation? It is the thesis of this article that it does not. It rests on an application of the realization doctrine which is widely used in the federal income tax system and clearly is part of the normal tax system.

As previously noted, it is not the position of the author that accelerated depreciation is the only permissible method under normal taxation rules. While the realization doctrine is generally applied in the tax system, there are a few circumstances when Congress has chosen not to apply it.[41] If Congress chose not to take the unrealized appreciation of the remaining life of an asset into account when determining depreciation deductions, that would not violate any neutral principles of taxation. Similarly, if Congress chose to calculate depreciation by offsetting the appreciation of the remaining life of an asset against the amount paid for one year's use, even though that would not comport with the realization doctrine, that treatment also would be consistent with normal tax principles. While the realization doctrine is a normal part of tax law, there is no requirement that it be used. Ignoring the realization doctrine is just as "normal" as following it. There is no "correct" method. Either one is permissible.

*C. Illustration of a Flaw in the Tax Expenditure Concept*

The Tax Expenditure Budgets' treatment of accelerated depreciation illustrates the basic flaw in that concept. The Budgets rest on the notion that there is a single correct or perfect system of federal income taxation which has no relationship to policy considerations. The error in that view is much more than the great difficulty that exists in determining just what constitutes a

[41] For example, see § 1272.

bepress Legal Repository



Hosted by The Berkeley Electronic Press

perfect system. The error is to assume that such a system exists. The budget's rigid approach to depreciation illustrates how wrong it is to hold that there is a single correct approach to measuring income. The tax law is and should be far more flexible than that. It should accommodate the needs of the time. Policy considerations are a normal part of the tax system and should not be classified as aberrations.

If accelerated depreciation is more desirable at one point in time, it should be employed. If it is not desirable at another point in time, it should be abandoned. There is no reason to skew that decision by categorizing one of the choices as being inconsistent with normal tax principles. Accelerated depreciation is consistent with normal tax principles, and the decision whether to retain or repeal it should not be influenced by a false characterization that it is not.

**IV. Conclusions**

The author maintains that the tax expenditure concept is grounded on a basic error in its view of the income tax system. There is no perfect or ideal tax system. The tax system is not divorced from every political, societal, and economic condition that exists, nor is it independent of the values that society holds at given points in time. The tax expenditure concept views the ideal tax system as one that is insulated from non-tax factors rather than being a part of and responsive to them. It is wrong to treat tax as isolated from everything else. The adoption of that view can distort the proper consideration of the passage or repeal of tax provisions.

The advocates of the tax expenditure concept recognize that non-tax policies can properly induce congress to adopt specific tax provisions. Their contention is that such provisions should be scrutinized as they would if they were direct expenditures. However, by characterizing some

bepress Legal Repository



http://law.bepress.com/umichlwps-empirical/61

provisions as inconsistent with neutral tax principles, they attempt to make it more difficult to defend the listed items. More importantly, by adopting a binary approach in characterizing provisions as either within normal tax principles or outside of them, the concept fails to take into account the greater variety that exists in a properly structured tax system. Provisions that are outside of the core of proper tax provisions are not all distanced from that core to the same extent. Some provisions lie closer to the core than others, and some are far removed from it. The expenditure concept obscures that fact and describes the tax world as containing only two categories – those within the system and those outside of it.

It has been pointed out that while the tax expenditure concept has been widely accepted, it has been notoriously ineffective in changing the tax law.[42] While there has been some speculation as to why that is so, the most obvious reason seems to have been ignored. The likely reason that the concept has not had a greater impact on tax legislation is that even though people purport to approve of the concept, they intuitively realize that it is flawed and should not have any influence.

[42] See e.g., Zelinsky *supra* n. 1.

bepress Legal Repository



Hosted by The Berkeley Electronic Press