

CAPITAL MOBILITY AND CAPITAL TAX COMPETITION

George R. Zodrow

Professor of Economics and

Rice Scholar, Tax and Expenditure Policy Program

Baker Institute for Public Policy

Rice University

International Research Fellow

Centre for Business Taxation

Oxford University

zodrow@rice.edu

Revised: September 22, 2008

This paper was prepared for presentation at a conference on "Mobility and Tax Policy: Do Yesterday's Taxes Fit Tomorrow's Economy?" sponsored by the Smith Richardson Foundation and the Center for Business and Economic Research, University of Tennessee, and held in Knoxville, TN on October 2-3, 2008. I would like to thank Leslie Countryman for research assistance.

I. INTRODUCTION

The topic of this conference – the implications for tax policy of increasing mobility of factors of production and goods in the modern global economy – is certainly a critical one, underlying many ongoing debates on tax reform at the international, national and subnational levels. Two key elements of these debates are the extent to which the mobility of capital has increased and, if it has, the extent to which the increased mobility of capital has resulted in aggressive interjurisdictional tax competition designed to attract such mobile capital. This paper examines several strands of the literature that shed light on these questions. The paper follows most of the existing literature in focusing on international capital mobility and international capital tax competition, but considers some subnational issues as well. In any case, to the extent that capital is mobile across countries and tax competition is prevalent at the international level, one would expect these phenomena to be even more evident within countries, and the empirical evidence is generally consistent with such an interpretation.¹ In particular, as will be discussed at length below, the argument against significant capital mobility at the international level focuses on econometric evidence of relatively high savings-investment correlations, a result that many studies have shown does not obtain at the subnational level (Frankel, 1993; Obstfeld, 1995; Coakley, Kulasi and Smith, 1998).

The paper is organized as suggested by the discussion above – the following section discusses various attempts to measure capital mobility while Section III considers various studies that attempt to discern the extent of tax competition. The final section summarizes the results and suggests directions for future research.

¹ One potential exception is housing capital. For example, Glaeser and Gyourko (2005) stress the durability of housing in their analysis of urban decline, and Lutz (2007) shows that empirical estimates of the incidence of the property tax in Boston vary considerably across the central city and its suburbs, primarily due to the durability of urban housing.

II. CAPITAL MOBILITY

This section examines the extent to which capital is mobile, focusing on the mobility of physical rather than financial capital, primarily within an international context. The analysis examines three different ways that economists have attempted to discern the extent of capital mobility: (1) estimating the effects of taxation on foreign direct investment, (2) estimating the incidence of taxes on capital, especially corporate income taxes, to see if the results are consistent with a high degree of capital mobility, and (3) examining saving and investment correlations and identifying their implications for capital mobility. Before proceeding, it may be useful to note, with only minimal further discussion, that there is general agreement about three important points related to the extent of international capital mobility. First, the volume of capital flows, including both portfolio capital and foreign direct investment, has grown dramatically in recent decades, suggesting that capital has become more mobile over time (Hines, 2007). Second, barriers to international capital flows have declined significantly over time and have been accompanied by widespread deregulation of financial markets and dramatic advances in information and communication technology; all of these factors have operated to increase international capital mobility (Feldstein and Bacchetta, 1991; Coakley, Kulasi and Smith, 1998). Finally, the empirical evidence is generally consistent with perfect capital mobility in the sense that interest rates on deposits of the same maturity and risk characteristics and expressed in the same national currency tend to be equalized (Obstfeld, 1995). For example, Frankel (1993) concludes that by 1988 short term covered interest differentials were in general small enough to be consistent with perfect capital mobility. However, Obstfeld (1995) also notes that little has been learned about international capital mobility from cross-country comparisons of rates of return on assets in different currencies, as such returns incorporate expected changes in exchange rates as well as an exchange-rate risk premium, and that the empirical evidence in

general does not support rate equalization (or uncovered interest rate parity) under these circumstances. For example, Frankel (1993) finds persistent deviations from uncovered interest parity, a result that has been replicated in more recent work by Smallwood and Norrbin (2008) – who do find, however, that such differentials seem to be narrowing more quickly in recent years. The implications of these empirical results on interest rate equalization are discussed in more detail below.

A. Tax Sensitivity of Investment

A natural way to measure the mobility of capital is to estimate the sensitivity of capital flows to changes in after-tax rate of return, including those caused by changes in tax variables. Unfortunately, obtaining accurate estimates is fraught with difficulty, including both measurement problems and a wide range of troublesome econometric issues.

For example, as in all econometric studies, it is difficult to disentangle the relationships of interest – between various types of investment decisions and tax policy – from the many other factors that simultaneously affect these investment decisions; these factors include proximity to markets, the costs of various primary and intermediate inputs, the skill levels available in local labor markets, the existence of other firms that may generate economies of agglomeration, the local competitive, legal and regulatory environment, and the degree of political stability including the credibility of commitments to enforce property rights. Furthermore, it is similarly difficult to disentangle the effects of host and home country taxes for investments by multinationals based in countries, like the U.S., that operate tax systems with foreign tax credits coupled with deferral of home country tax until dividends are repatriated by a foreign subsidiary to its parent.

Measurement problems also plague econometric analyses of tax effects on multinational investment decisions. A major issue is the determination of the appropriate tax rate variable to

use in analyzing these effects. Given the complexity of modern corporate tax systems simply using the statutory tax rate is likely to yield misleading results. The simplest alternative approach is to use an average tax rate, calculated as the ratio of taxes paid to some measure of before-tax profits. An important advantage of this approach is that it captures the effects of explicit tax preferences and firm-specific “negotiated” tax reductions, as well as the effects of tax planning activities. In addition, as stressed by Devereux and Hubbard (2003), average tax rates will be the critical variable in determining tax incentives for investments by multinationals that are characterized by discrete strategic choices, imperfectly competitive markets and significant economic rents. However, average tax rates typically also capture the effects of previous tax structures on old investments, which are largely irrelevant to current investment decisions (although, as will be discussed below, some researchers have calculated prospective average effective tax rates under various assumptions about the extent of above-normal returns). Moreover, if average tax rates are lower than statutory tax rates – as is typically the case due to factors such as accelerated depreciation and investment tax credits – then average tax rates will be endogenous to the investment decision (Mintz, 2001). That is, during high growth periods, investment will tend to be high which will lower average tax rates; if effective controls for this endogeneity are not utilized, the responsiveness of FDI to taxes will be overstated.

The most popular alternative to the average tax rate is the marginal effective tax rate, which looks at the effects of the existing tax system on a prospective investment, taking into account not only statutory rates but also the detailed provisions of the tax code that determine the tax treatment of investment (depreciation deductions, inventory accounting, investment tax credits or allowances, etc.), the characteristics of the investment (asset mix, method of finance, assumed inflation rate, etc.) as well as the interactions between the host and home country tax systems (King and Fullerton, 1984). The major drawback of the marginal effective tax rate

approach is that it is in fact marginal – that is, it reflects only the taxation of investments, such as incremental investments in competitive markets that typically do not yield economic rents. However, as suggested above, multinational investments are typically characterized by firm-specific or location-specific economic rents. For this reason, some analysts argue that average effective tax rates should be used to analyze tax effects on foreign direct investment – in particular, average effective tax rates can also be used to analyze the effects of the existing tax code on prospective investments, but under the assumption that the future investment will earn positive economic rents (Devereux and Griffith, 1998; Devereux and Hubbard, 2003).²

Finally, as noted by Gordon and Hines (2002), tax effects on FDI are also difficult to identify because (1) the appropriate measure of tax effects on FDI is the net burden imposed on multinationals, accounting for the benefits of public services they enjoy, which is very difficult to measure in most cases and, as will be discussed further below, (2) firms may be able to offset the apparent effect of taxes through accounting manipulations.

The empirical research on taxes and investment, especially the most recent work, has attempted to deal with these issues. There is a general consensus that this empirical evidence demonstrates that FDI is in fact sensitive to tax factors, and suggests that this sensitivity may be increasing over time. For example, Gordon and Hines (2002, 49) conclude that the “econometric work of the last fifteen years provides ample evidence of the sensitivity of the level and location of FDI to its tax treatment.” A similar conclusion is reached by de Mooij and Ederveen (2003, 2005), who perform “meta analyses” of the literature, in which they correlate the results of a wide range of empirical studies of the effects of taxes on FDI (measured as elasticities of FDI

² Similar issues arise with respect to the measurement of FDI. The standard definition of FDI includes not only real investment in property, plant and equipment (PPE) but also capital acquired through mergers and acquisitions. However, the PPE concept (which also includes investment financed with local debt that is excluded from FDI) is

with respect to various host country tax and rate of return variables) to the characteristics of the underlying studies. Several econometric approaches have been utilized in this literature. The early studies were primarily time series analyses that estimated the effects of variations in host country tax rates on aggregate FDI.³ Gordon and Hines (2002) conclude that these studies suggest an elasticity of FDI with respect to effective tax rates of roughly -0.6 , for both FDI by U.S. multinationals and for FDI in the U.S. by multinationals based in other countries. Cross-section studies of the effects of variations of host country tax rates across countries on multinational investments in property, plant and equipment (PPE) suggest somewhat greater sensitivity of investment to tax rates, with elasticities around -1.0 (Hines and Rice, 1994; Grubert and Mutti, 2000). Perhaps more importantly, the most recent and most careful studies – especially Altshuler, Grubert and Newlon (2001) and Grubert and Mutti (2001), as well as de Mooij and Ederveen (2003) – tend to obtain the largest estimates. For example, Altshuler, Grubert and Newlon estimate that the elasticity of investment with respect to after-tax host country rates of return for U.S. multinationals increased from 1.5 in 1984 to 2.8 in 1992. Grubert and Mutti (2001) estimate an investment elasticity of roughly 3 for countries with relatively open trade regimes. Finally, for the sample of studies they analyze, de Mooij and Ederveen calculate a median estimate of the investment elasticity of 3.3; they also note that the more recent studies tend to obtain the largest elasticities.

These studies are limited to data from the early 1990s. An interesting complication is that increasing tax avoidance activity on the part of U.S. multinationals suggests that foreign direct investment may become less sensitive to taxes, since the burden of high host country rates can be more easily avoided. Nevertheless, more recent research suggests that, at least through

closer in spirit to the capital stock notions used in the theoretical analyses described above. Accordingly, although FDI is used in most studies, PPE has been utilized as the measure of foreign investment in several recent studies.

2000, the tax sensitivity of FDI is not declining and may even still be increasing. For example, Altshuler and Grubert (2006) examine data for 1992, 1998 and 2000, and find that their estimated investment tax elasticities are increasing over the period (with some estimates in the range of -4), although this result is quite tentative as the differences in the elasticities over time are not statistically significant.⁴

To sum up, the empirical literature as a whole suggests that international capital is quite mobile and in particular is significantly affected by tax factors – even if the degree of responsiveness is not as large as would be implied by a perfectly elastic supply of internationally mobile capital. Moreover, the possibility that the tax sensitivity of FDI will decline as tax avoidance activity continues to grow has not yet been verified by the data.

B. The Incidence of Capital Taxes

Another interesting approach infers the mobility of capital from results on the incidence of taxes on capital income, most often the corporate income tax. The theoretical models that have appeared in the literature have strong implications for the incidence of a source-based tax on capital if such capital is mobile. Indeed, in the simplest models in which the taxing jurisdiction is a small open economy, capital bears none of the burden of the tax which, with the assumption of perfectly mobile capital, is borne by local factors, land and relatively immobile labor, and consumers of nontradable goods. By comparison, if the taxing jurisdiction is large but capital is mobile among all jurisdictions, the share of the burden of the tax borne by capital is roughly equal to its share of the world capital stock. Indeed, in more complicated general equilibrium models, a tax on capital income may be shifted more than 100% to labor with perfectly mobile capital. For example, Harberger (1995, 2008) constructs a general equilibrium

³ For example, see Hartman (1984), Boskin and Gale (1987); Young (1988) and Slemrod (1990).

model in which labor must bear all the burden of the corporate income tax since capital is perfectly mobile and the price of the output of the corporate sector is fixed on world markets. But since labor is mobile across production sectors, the price of labor in other sectors declines as well. As a result, labor bears more than 100% of the burden of the tax – 130% in the central case analyzed by Harberger (2008). These models suggest that a test of capital mobility is whether taxes on capital income are in fact shifted to labor, especially in small open economies.

This reasoning has been called into question in a recent paper by Gravelle and Smetters (2006), who argue that, even if capital is perfectly mobile internationally, capital in the US will bear more of the burden of the corporate income tax than the US share of world output if domestic goods and imports are not perfect substitutes. In a model similar to that constructed by Harberger, they show that the capital share of the tax burden increases dramatically as the substitutability between domestic goods and imports falls. For example, if the elasticity of substitution in consumption between traded corporate domestic goods and imports is reduced from infinity to 3.0 (a value that Gravelle and Smetters argue is consistent with the empirical literature), the share of the tax burden on domestic capital increases from roughly 30% to 62%.

However, the Gravelle and Smetters result has been challenged on two grounds. First, McDaniel and Balistreri (2002) note that many trade economists are skeptical of the relatively low estimates of import substitution elasticities found in the literature, and believe that imports and domestic goods are much more substitutable than these estimates imply. Similarly, Harberger (2008) argues that such relatively low elasticities of substitution between domestic and imported products imply an implausibly large degree of market power for domestic producers, who in many cases appear in fact to have relatively little market power. Moreover,

⁴ Similar results are reported by de Mooij and Ederveen (2005) in an update of their 2003 study.

several recent studies have argued that the earlier studies were flawed, and obtained significantly higher estimates of the import substitution elasticity. For example, Erkel-Rousse and Mirza (2002) estimate an overall import substitution elasticity of 3.8, with many industries characterized by elasticities between 6.5-7.0 and some as high as 13.0, and Hertel, et al. (2004) obtain an average estimated import substitution elasticity for 40 different products of 7.0, with estimates that exceed 10 in some cases.

Second, Randolph (2006) argues that a plausible extension of the model constructed by Gravelle and Smetters dramatically alters its results. Specifically, he extends the Gravelle-Smetters model to allow a domestic corporate sector that produces two types of traded goods – some that are perfect substitutes for imports and others that are imperfectly substitutable. In this case, if the capital intensities in the two corporate tradable goods sectors are identical, the incidence of the corporate income tax is independent of the degree of import substitutability in the second sector and, if capital is perfectly mobile, capital bears slightly less than 30% of the corporate tax burden in the U.S., as predicted in the simplest tax incidence models noted above. (If the tradable goods corporate sector with perfect import substitutability is more capital-intensive than the other tradable goods corporate sector, the share of tax burden borne by domestic labor increases moderately (and vice versa), as it does if capital is perfectly mobile.)

Taken together, these results suggest that empirical estimates of the incidence of a tax on capital income would provide some useful information on the extent of capital mobility. Estimating the incidence of corporate income taxes is notoriously difficult, especially in country cross section analyses that face the daunting task of controlling for a multitude of factors other than the corporate income tax that might affect wages and the process of wage determination within each country. Nevertheless, three recent studies have attempted to do so and thus indirectly shed light on the question of the mobility of capital.

Each of these studies examines various samples of OECD countries and estimates that differences in corporate income taxes across countries are to a large extent reflected in differences in wages.⁵ Arulampalam, Devereux and Maffini (2008) analyze micro data on wages from France, Italy, Spain and the UK over the period 1993-2003 in the context of a wage bargaining model that determines how firm owners and labor divide economic rents, including how the corporate income tax affects this division of rents. (They thus do not consider explicitly the tax-induced capital emigration stressed above.) The corporate tax burden is measured using actual revenues. Their central estimates suggest that 62% of the corporate income tax is borne by labor in the short run, and labor fully bears the burden of the tax in the long run.

Hassett and Mathur (2006) examine a large sample of 72 countries using data from 1981-2002, looking at the relationship between five-year averages of hourly wages in manufacturing and corporate income taxes, measured using either statutory tax rates, effective marginal tax rates, or average effective tax rates. They estimate extremely large elasticities of the labor tax burden with respect to the various measures of the corporate tax rate that range between 0.5 and 1.0.⁶ Indeed, Gravelle and Hungerford (2007) argue that the results are highly implausible, as a wage elasticity of 1.0 would imply that a one percent increase in corporate revenues would be accompanied by a fall in wages that would be roughly 26 times as large. Gravelle and Hungerford replicate the Hassett-Mathur analysis but use annual data (rather than five-year averages) for wages and tax rates on the grounds that such an approach better measures the long term effects of corporate tax rates on wages, and use several alternative methods for converting

⁵ For an excellent analysis of these studies, including more details on the methods used, see Gentry (2007).

⁶ In addition, Hassett and Mathur find that higher tax rates in neighboring countries are associated with higher wages in the taxing country, and that labor tends to bear a larger fraction of the corporate income tax in smaller countries, results that are both consistent with the tax competition arguments described above.

nominal values in other currencies to U.S. dollars. They obtain much smaller, and often statistically insignificant, effects of the corporate tax on wages.

Finally, Felix (2007) examines a sample of 19 OECD countries over the period 1979-2002. She uses the statutory tax rate as a measure of the corporate tax burden and analyzes labor compensation for workers at three skill levels as measured by education level. In her central case, which controls for the extent to which the economy is open, she obtains estimates that imply that a one percentage point increase in the average corporate tax rate would reduce labor compensation by roughly four times the amount of revenue collected, with little variation across the skill groups. These results also imply a significant amount of overshifting of the burden of the corporate income tax to labor, although the degree of overshifting is considerably less than that reported by Hassett and Mathur.

Because these studies are relatively new and in light of the inherent difficulties of measuring the incidence of corporate tax burdens across countries, the results of these studies must be viewed as quite tentative. Nevertheless, they are generally suggestive of considerable international mobility of capital, and further research examining the robustness of their conclusions is no doubt in the offing.

C. Saving and Investment Correlations

Although most of the literature discussed thus far suggests substantial international mobility of capital, an important line of research provides a significant cautionary note. Specifically, this alternative approach to examining the extent of capital mobility, pioneered by Feldstein and Horioka (1980) with subsequent papers by Feldstein (1983), Feldstein and Bacchetta (1991) and Feldstein (1994), focuses on measuring the correlation between domestic

saving and domestic investment as an indicator of international capital mobility.⁷ Feldstein and Horioka (1980) note that the fraction of an increase in domestic saving reflected in an increase in domestic investment (termed the “saving retention coefficient” in subsequent work) should be approximately one if economies are largely closed. By comparison, if capital is highly mobile internationally, domestic saving and domestic investment should be nearly uncorrelated, as any increase in domestic saving is distributed across the world economy to maximize after-tax returns and increases in domestic investment are financed from the world supply of capital rather than solely from increases in domestic saving.

Feldstein and Horioka (1980), hereafter FH, examined averages over five years or more of annual domestic saving and investment rates relative to GDP over the period 1960-1974 for a cross-section of 16 OECD countries. They argued that with perfect capital mobility the saving retention coefficient for a given country should roughly equal its share of the world capital stock and, in the aggregate, should be less than 0.10 for their sample of OECD countries. In marked contrast, however, FH estimated that in the basic version of their model the fraction of domestic saving invested domestically was 0.89 for gross saving and investment, an estimate not statistically significantly different from the closed economy value of one. Furthermore, they showed that their empirical results were robust to various extensions of their base model and alternative estimation techniques.⁸ Feldstein and Horioka (1980, p. 321) concluded that “the evidence strongly contradicts the hypothesis of perfect world capital mobility and indicates that most of any incremental saving tends to remain in the country in which the saving is done.”

⁷ Note that testing for equalization of rates of return is not a promising strategy for testing for capital mobility in the case of foreign direct investment, as rates of return to such typically long-lived investments are exceedingly difficult to measure.

⁸ In addition, anticipating subsequent critiques, FH noted that high savings retention coefficients might reflect common factors that increase saving and investment simultaneously, but explicitly left it to others to identify such common causal factors.

Feldstein (1983) extended the analysis to include the mid-1970s, and obtained a somewhat smaller saving retention coefficient of 0.80, a result that he interpreted as implying that “capital does tend to flow to countries with low savings rates although certainly much less than perfect capital mobility would imply” (Feldstein, 1983, p. 134). He also stressed that his analyses, which estimated savings retention coefficients using observations that were averages over 5-10 years or more, reflected the long run response of international capital movements to differences in domestic savings and investment, and thus were much less likely to suffer from simultaneous equation bias than the alternative methodology (discussed in more detail below) of constructing time series estimates of annual observations for a single country. These results were supplemented by Murphy (1984), who examined two subsets of a group of 17 OECD countries to determine whether relatively small countries, which should approximate small open economies, have lower savings retention coefficients. Indeed, Murphy found this to be the case, as the savings retention coefficient was 0.98 for the seven largest countries in his sample, but 0.59 for the ten smallest countries.

Feldstein and Bacchetta (1991) updated the FH study to include data through 1986, observing that during the 1980s international capital flows increased markedly and capital market barriers around the world were lowered or eliminated, suggesting that lower saving retention coefficients might be expected. This conjecture was confirmed in their empirical analysis, extended to include 23 OECD countries over the period 1960-1986, as the estimated saving coefficients declined steadily over the period to a value of roughly 0.61 in 1980-86, considerably lower than the original estimate of 0.89 but still significantly different from zero. They also showed that savings retention coefficients were lower for a subset of their sample consisting of EU countries, falling to a value of 0.356 in 1980-86, and declined more rapidly for this group than for all of the OECD countries in their sample. Feldstein and Bacchetta attributed

this result to greater integration of European capital markets, and suggested that this result strengthens the case for the interpretation that relatively higher savings retention coefficients in other less integrated capital markets are attributable to relatively lower levels of informational and institutional links.

A more recent update is provided by Obstfeld and Rogoff (2000), who replicated the FH analysis for a sample of 24 OECD countries over the period 1990-1997, and obtained a savings retention coefficient of 0.60, virtually identical to the value obtained by Feldstein and Bacchetta (1991) for the 1980-86 period. In addition, they observed that the savings retention coefficient drops to 0.41 when the sample is expanded to 56 countries by adding various smaller and developing countries that are more likely than the OECD countries in the original sample to be appropriately characterized as small open economies. (They caution, however, that this expansion includes many developing countries for which the data used are suspect.)

The current state of affairs is thus that estimates using the FH methodology indicate that while savings retention coefficients have declined over time and are relatively small for the highly integrated EU and for the smaller and developing countries that are more likely to be appropriately characterized as small open economies, the estimated coefficients are still considerably higher than the value of approximately zero that FH argue would be consistent with perfect international capital mobility. Given the other evidence, discussed above, which implies significant international capital mobility – as well as the common perception that capital is highly mobile internationally coupled with widespread use of the assumption of perfectly mobile capital in macroeconomic models (Coakley, Kulasi and Smith, 1998) – this contradictory result has been highly provocative and indeed is commonly termed the “Feldstein-Horioka Puzzle.” For example, Dornbusch (1991, p. 220) notes that, “Feldstein’s discovery of the tight link between national saving and investment rates continues to baffle the profession ... The finding

runs counter to the spirit of the open economy literature in which ... changes in national saving rates are primarily reflected in the current account, *not* in investment.” Accordingly, the FH result – as well as their interpretation of its implications – has spawned a vast literature, and the issue of interpretation is in particular still quite controversial.

This literature has numerous strands. One approach has focused on econometric issues raised by the estimation methods used in the FH paper and its progeny, including their assumption (discussed explicitly in the original FH paper) that a country’s saving rate is determined exogenously by structural factors such as demographics, population growth, income, tastes and the nature of social security retirement programs.⁹ Coakley, Kulasi and Smith (1998, p. 170) summarize the results of this literature as the late 1990s as indicating that the “result of a high saving-investment association has remained remarkably robust in OECD cross-sections.” More recently, however, Coakley, Fuertes and Spagnolo (2004) argue that estimated savings-investment correlations are reduced significantly when the appropriate econometric methodologies are applied. Specifically, they analyze panel data for a sample of 12 OECD countries over the period 1980-2000, modifying the FH approach to correct for country heterogeneity and cross-section dependence in saving and investment rates. They show that in the absence of such corrections, their estimate of the savings retention coefficient (0.676) is typical of those obtained in the latest estimates using the FH methodology. However, once they correct for country heterogeneity, the estimate drops by more than half, to 0.328, and for their preferred correction for cross section dependence, the saving retention coefficient is virtually zero (0.062). They conclude that, “On the basis of these findings, we tentatively conjecture that that the FH puzzle may well be history” (Coakley, Fuertes and Spagnolo, 2004, p. 587).

Nevertheless, the issue is still quite controversial. In particular, in a recent contribution Evans, Kim and Oh (2008, p. 808) discuss a wide range of potential econometric problems with the FH methodology and conclude that, “Although many such problems were identified, correcting for them did not resolve the puzzle. Specifically, the finding of large saving-retention coefficients is robust to measurement error, endogeneity, autocorrelation of errors, and many other possible misspecifications.”¹⁰

A second approach, characteristic of the macroeconomics literature on this issue, has focused on analyzing time series regressions of saving and investment correlations in particular countries, rather than the cross-sectional analyses of countries conducted by Feldstein and his co-authors. These time series estimates of the savings retention coefficient vary greatly – e.g., from 0.063-0.929 in Tesar (1993), and from 0.025-1.182 in Coakley, Kulasi and Smith (1994). However, the latter set of authors show that the averages of these long run time series estimates are very close to the estimates of the savings retention coefficients obtained in FH-type cross-section studies. More recently, Evans, Kim and Oh (2008) also find a large range of savings retention coefficients (e.g., they find that capital mobility is very high for Canada but quite low for the U.S.) as well as considerable variation in savings retention coefficients over time.¹¹

Thus, there is a general consensus that relatively high saving retention coefficients – especially among OECD countries and to a lesser extent among smaller countries, including developing and emerging economies, are an empirical regularity that must be explained. Numerous competing explanations have been proffered.

⁹ Feldstein and Horioka (1980) obtained similar results for savings retention coefficients in a life-cycle model in which saving rate was endogenous.

¹⁰ They do not discuss the study by Coakley, Fuertes and Spagnolo (2004).

These competing explanations have been highly controversial, partly because, as stressed by Feldstein and his co-authors, the implications of imperfect international capital mobility are so dramatic. For example, Feldstein and Horioka (1980, p. 328) argue that their results imply that “it is appropriate, at least as an approximation, to study income distribution in general and tax incidence in particular with models that ignore international capital mobility.” In particular, Feldstein (1994) notes that the FH results call into serious question the relevance of the most important results of open economy models, including the results that with internationally mobile capital, (1) source-based taxes on capital income are borne entirely by domestic labor and land as capital is driven out of the taxing country until after-tax rates of return to capital are equalized, (2) saving incentives and other programs that affect saving such as social security have little or no effects on domestic capital accumulation, which is financed from the pool of world capital rather than from domestic savings, and (3) shortfalls in national saving, including government budget deficits, have little effect on interest rates since additional investment funds can be obtained by borrowing abroad, with no crowding out of private investment (except to the extent that the country is large enough to affect the equilibrium interest rate in the international capital market).

At the same time, Feldstein has stressed that his results should not be “overinterpreted” and agrees that there is considerable evidence of some capital mobility. Instead, he argues that, “The conflict between the evidence that there is global capital mobility and the evidence that there is a global capital market segmentation is more apparent than real. ... Evidence that capital *can* move and that *some* capital does move is not the same as evidence the capital is allocated globally without regard to national boundaries” (Feldstein, 1994, p. 11). Thus, he maintains his

¹¹ Indeed, in contrast to most of the other literature, they find that savings retention coefficients have tended to increase over time despite significant reductions in institutional constraints on capital movements, a result that they

earlier position that “It is reasonable to interpret the FH findings as evidence that there are substantial imperfections in the international capital market and that a very large share of domestic savings tends to remain in the home country” (Feldstein, 1983, p. 131).

In particular, Feldstein and Bacchetta (1991) and Feldstein (1994) stress that high savings coefficients are not necessarily inconsistent with the capital mobility implied by certain forms of interest rate equalization. Following Frankel (1986),¹² Feldstein and Bacchetta note that perfect capital mobility implies the existence of covered interest parity, that is, equalization of interest rates adjusted for both expected changes in exchange rates and an exchange rate risk premium. They note that the empirical evidence, summarized in Frankel (1992), is generally consistent with covered interest parity. However, Frankel (as well as Feldstein and Bacchetta) stress that the existence of covered interest parity does not imply equalization of real interest rates. Indeed, Frankel shows that many groups of countries that are characterized by rough covered interest parity nevertheless also simultaneously exhibit substantial real interest differentials, driven primarily by a currency premium that reflects both expected changes in exchange rates and an exchange rate risk premium.¹³

This distinction is critical, as domestic savings and investment respond to real interest rates and the empirical evidence indicates that real interest rate differentials are not arbitrated away; that is, new increments of saving are not necessarily dispersed across the global economy in search of the highest real rates of return. Indeed, Frankel (1992, p. 200-01) concludes that “there is no reason to expect saving-investment correlations to be zero ... [as] even with the

suggest may indicate that savings-retention coefficients are not a good indicator of capital mobility.

¹² See Frankel (1992) for further exposition.

¹³ See also Lemmen and Eijffinger (1995). Note, however, that recent research by Caselli and Feyrer (2007) and Batista and Potin (2007) suggests that although estimated marginal products of capital still differ significantly across countries, these differences largely disappear once other factors such as differences in production functions, production mix, natural resources and especially capital costs are considered explicitly.

equalization of covered interest rates, large differentials in *real* interest rates remain.” For example, increases in domestic savings could depress the domestic real interest rate, lowering the cost of capital and inducing additional domestic investment, thus generating simultaneous increases in domestic saving and investment and creating real interest differentials without necessarily violating covered interest parity. Feldstein and Bacchetta agree with this interpretation, arguing that real interest rate differentials are likely to persist, both because purchasing power parity does not appear to obtain even in the long run and certainly not for extended periods of time, and due to a premium for exchange rate risk, which may also be augmented by a premium for the risk of policy changes, including the tax treatment of capital income and, at least in some cases, the possibility of expropriation. As a result, an equiproportionate increase in domestic saving and investment in a country that causes a decline in the domestic real interest rate need not violate the covered interest parity that is consistent with perfect capital mobility. That is, “there is no presumption that real long-term yields would be equalized even if all investors were completely free to invest wherever in the world they want” (Feldstein and Bacchetta, 1991, p. 203).

Frankel argues that this effect is important enough to resolve the FH puzzle, an interpretation with which Feldstein and Bacchetta are sympathetic. However, neither provides evidence linking high saving investment correlations with real interest rate differentials of the appropriate sign. Moreover, Obstfeld (1995) argues that this resolution of the FH puzzle is incomplete, since persistence in savings-investment correlations implies persistent changes in exchange rates. In addition, one would expect differentials in real interest rates attributable to currency risks to decline over time, given the availability and increasing use of financial derivatives to hedge such risks. Thus, although this argument provides a potentially important explanation for the FH result as the real interest rate effects induced by macroeconomic shocks

can persist for lengthy periods of time generating associations between domestic saving and investment of the type captured in FH-type estimates, its relevance seems likely to diminish over time. Indeed, in his most recent paper on these issues, Feldstein (1994, p. 4) notes that “the growth of the derivatives market has made it possible for cross-border investors to hedge long-term as well as short term currency and interest rate risks,” but also observes that because such hedging reduces the returns earned by risky cross-border investment, currency risks still function as an important impediment to international capital flows.

More generally, Feldstein (1994, p. 11) attributes relatively high savings-investment correlations to a reluctance by investors and corporate managers to invest abroad, concluding that, “Capital is mobile but its owners generally prefer to keep it at home. ... The evidence on investment-saving correlations and portfolio composition reflects the fact that ignorance, risk aversion and prudence keep capital close to home.” In particular, he argues that investors appear to perceive that the additional return and benefits of diversification that might be obtained from additional foreign investment are more than offset by the additional risks of such investment, in the form of the currency risks discussed above, the uncertainties associated with investing in unfamiliar economies where information is difficult and costly to obtain (Gordon and Bovenberg, 1996; Ahearne, Grier and Warnock, 2004), as well as the political risks of policy changes ranging from higher capital income taxation and market regulation to capital controls or convertibility restrictions to outright expropriation in the case of developing or emerging economies. In addition, as noted previously, Feldstein (1994) argues that currency risk discussed above is still an important factor, despite the existence of well-developed derivatives markets, as the costs of hedging currency risks significantly diminishes the higher rates of return that might be obtained with a diversified portfolio.

In support of this position, he cites the extensive empirical evidence on the existence of significant “home country bias” in investment portfolios (Gordon and Hines, 2002). Early evidence of home country bias was provided by French and Poterba (1991), who found that in 1989 approximately 94% of US portfolios were invested in US securities, with similarly large domestic shares for many other countries. Tesar and Werner (1992) estimated that the diversification costs of such home country bias was on the order of 200 basis points. More recently, the ongoing process of globalization has been accompanied by a decline in the extent of home country bias. Nevertheless, recent studies suggest that home country bias is far from eliminated. For example, Sercu and Vanpée (2007) report that in the U.S. the fraction of total equities invested in domestic securities was 82.2 percent in 2005, and that this share has declined considerably over the past twenty-five years. Nevertheless, the 82.2 percent figure is still more than twice the benchmark figure of 40.5 percent that would reflect a diversified portfolio in which the share of domestic securities equaled the U.S. share of total world market capitalization. Although home country bias is declining around the world, Sercu and Vanpée report still significant home bias for every country in their sample of 42 countries; the degree of home country bias, however, varies considerably, with relatively smaller values reported for more developed economies, especially those in the E.U.¹⁴

Thus, although risk-averse investors are increasingly willing to take advantage of investment opportunities abroad, the evidence suggests that they are still reluctant to invest in countries with which they are less familiar than their home country, and strongly averse to both currency risks and political risks, including changes in tax and regulatory policies and, in some

¹⁴ Sercu and Vanpée examine five potential explanations for home country bias: (1) the need to hedge risks in the home country, (2) differentially high costs of foreign investments, (3) information asymmetries, (4) differences in corporate governance and transparency, and (5) behavioral biases. They conclude that all of these explanations, including irrational behavior, play a role in explaining the existing level of home country bias.

cases, the prospect of expropriation.¹⁵ Finally, although barriers to capital flows have been reduced, they have not been eliminated, and Feldstein notes that even in the U.S. some institutional restrictions on pension funds and insurance companies hamper the free flow of capital to international investments. Thus, he concludes that foreign stocks and bonds are very imperfect substitutes for domestic securities so that his empirical evidence supporting segmentation of international capital markets is not surprising.

Numerous other observers, however, have argued that alternative explanations, consistent with perfect mobility of capital, provide more plausible rationales for the high savings-investment correlations found in the FH literature. The following discusses four of the most prominent explanations; for more detailed discussions, as well as a discussion of additional alternatives to the FH interpretation, see Obstfeld (1995) and Coakley, Kulasi and Smith (1998).

First, as mentioned previously, numerous observers have noted that, contrary to the explicit assumption of FH, the saving rate in their estimating equation may not be exogenous, as various factors (e.g., productivity or technology shocks, labor force growth, cyclical factors, etc.) may simultaneously affect both national saving and investment and thus generate the FH result. The most prominent example is Obstfeld (1986) who constructs a model of a world with perfectly mobile capital and a small open economy with immobile labor that experiences an increase in labor productivity.¹⁶ The increase in the size of the effective labor force stimulates additional investment, while at the same time higher incomes, supplemented by an increase in the fraction of the effective labor force that is relatively young and in its high-saving years,

¹⁵ Feldstein (1994) also notes that imperfections in the international capital markets are offset to some extent when the foreign subsidiaries of U.S. parents borrow abroad to finance foreign direct investment, effectively availing themselves of foreign funds that, given the segmentation of global capital markets, would not have been invested in the U.S.

¹⁶ Similar results could be obtained with relatively high rates of GDP or population growth.

generate increases in savings. Obstfeld simulates savings and investment rates in his model of perfectly mobile capital and obtains values that would imply regression estimates of the saving retention coefficient that approximate one. Moreover, if the country experiencing the productivity shock is large, or many or all countries experience the same shock, then the resulting increase in saving will reduce the world interest rate and thus increase investment in the countries affected by the shock, as well as in other countries (Baxter and Crucini, 1993).¹⁷ However, both Summers (1988) and Feldstein and Bacchetta (1991) argue that this explanation, while interesting from a theoretical perspective, is of limited relevance because adding controls for population growth, productivity growth and income distribution to the FH estimating equations has little effect on the savings retention coefficient. Similarly, Kim (2001) finds that business cycle shocks can explain only a very small portion of observed saving-investment correlations.

A second approach to resolving the FH puzzle draws on the persistent heterogeneity across countries in capital-labor ratios that has been observed in many studies. If capital is mobile, it should be allocated to equalize rates of return, taking into account tax treatment in host and home countries. Because such rates of return on long-lived investments are difficult to measure, numerous researchers have focused instead on the question of whether there has been a tendency toward convergence of economy-wide capital-output ratios, as might be expected if production functions were identical and taxes did not distort the world-wide allocation of capital. However, the empirical evidence suggests that capital-output ratios have not even approximately been converging over time (Maddison, 1991; Obstfeld, 1995; Caselli and Feyrer, 2007).

¹⁷ Baxter and Crucini (1993) examine the effects of country-specific and global shocks in a model in which the size of the countries can vary, and generate large saving-investment correlations for the larger countries in their model in the presence of perfectly mobile capital. Barro, Mankiw and Sala-i-Martin (1995) obtain high savings-investment correlations in a model that incorporates immobile human capital into the production function.

Feldstein (1994) argues that this provides additional evidence of the imperfect mobility of capital. However, an alternative explanation is that such persistent differentials in capital-output ratios arise for other reason, such as differences in capital costs, or because production functions and natural resources differ across countries as do the mixes of production activities, so that countries differ significantly in their capital requirements (Caselli and Feyrer, 2007; Batista and Potin, 2007). In the latter case, savings-investment correlations will be relatively high even with perfect capital mobility if capital-intensive countries also tend to have high savings rates, providing a potential explanation for the FH puzzle. One problem with this interpretation, however, is that countries with high savings and investment rates do not seem to have the high capital shares in income that would typically be associated with high capital intensities (Mankiw, Romer and Weil, 1992). In any case, it is not obvious how to choose between the two competing – and diametrically opposed – explanations for the observed persistent differentials in capital-output ratios.

Third, Summers (1988) argues that another way in which the FH assumption that national savings and investment rates are exogenously determined may be violated is that high savings-investment correlations may simply reflect policy responses to large current account deficits. Specifically, he argues that countries have a strong interest in pursuing policies designed to avoid large trade imbalances.¹⁸ For example, countries may attempt to limit capital inflows to avoid large changes in exchange rates and in the trade balance that will negatively impact the domestic traded goods sector, or limit capital outflows because social returns to domestic investment may exceed private returns (e.g., due to domestic taxes or risks of capital

¹⁸ See also Artis and Bayoumi (1992).

expropriation).¹⁹ However, because the balance of payments on current account equals the difference between domestic savings and investment, such policies by definition will tend to bring domestic saving and domestic investment into balance, creating the correlations captured in the FH analysis. Summers constructs a simple model in which capital is perfectly mobile and countries set their budget deficits to offset imbalances in net saving and thus the trade balance. He shows that the endogenous budget deficit policy response in his model explains roughly three quarters of the observed correlation between savings and investment; in addition, he argues that the remaining correlation could be explained by other policies designed to bring savings and investment into balance. Summers concludes that high investment savings correlations should not be treated as evidence that capital is immobile internationally, and instead reflect the efforts of governments to maintain external trade balance.

Feldstein and Bacchetta (1991) agree that governments are likely to want to restrict the size of trade deficits in response to political pressure from exporters and the producers of domestic substitutes for imported goods. In addition, they note that policies other than budget deficits, including monetary policies and targeted tax incentives might be utilized to change the level of saving or investment. However, they also note that the empirical results presented by Summers relating budget deficits and net saving imbalances can just as easily be explained as reflecting the traditional crowding out of private investment by government budget deficits, and they argue that empirical evidence which shows that domestic investment responds similarly to either increases in saving or decreases in the government budget deficit support the traditional crowding out hypothesis. Nevertheless, Obstfeld (1995) concludes that the current account

¹⁹ Summers also notes that the assumptions that governments will set policies to maintain trade balance explains the otherwise puzzling support of investment tax incentives by firms in the tradable goods sector; that is, although such firms are aware that they capital inflows induced by the investment incentives will tend to reduce net exports, they anticipate that this effect will be offset by other policies.

targeting hypothesis provides a compelling explanation for the high savings-investment correlations found by FH.

Finally, a huge literature in empirical macroeconomics is highly critical of the conclusion that high savings-investment correlations imply imperfect capital mobility. The central argument, which dates back to Sinn (1992), is that large savings and investment correlations are not indicative of capital immobility but instead reflect a long-run intertemporal budget constraint that precludes countries from running current account deficits or surpluses indefinitely; this intertemporal solvency constraint implies that in the long run domestic saving and investment must be highly correlated. That is, under this view, the high savings retention coefficients obtained in the FH literature, which is designed to capture the long-run relationship between savings and investment, simply reflect the fact that countries must eventually bring their current accounts into balance. However, in the short run capital mobility allows deviations of saving and investment that would not exist if capital were immobile, and it is longer (temporary) deviations from equality of domestic saving and investment that are the best indicator of greater capital mobility – an interpretation that obviously turns the interpretation of the FH results on its head. Numerous studies have adopted this approach to measuring capital mobility (Coakley, Kulasi and Smith, 1996; Coakley and Kulasi, 1997; Hoffman, 2004, among many others). Most recently, Pelgrin and Schich (2008) analyze a sample of 20 OECD countries over the period 1960-1999 within the context of a dynamic model that takes into account the speed of an economy's adjustment to shocks. In contrast to most earlier studies, which note that the long run budget constraint applies only in the limit and stress that many countries – most prominently, the U.S. – run persistent current account deficits or surpluses (Nason and Rogers, 2003; Coakley, Fuertes and Spagnolo, 2004), Pelgrin and Schich (2008) conclude that the relationship across countries between savings and investment is roughly consistent with a binding solvency

constraint in a sufficiently long run, especially in recent years. (That is, their empirical results are consistent with the high long run savings-investment coefficients found in the FH literature, although their interpretation is completely different.) At the same time, they find that short run deviations from the long run equilibrium – that is, savings-investment correlations significantly less than one – have become more persistent over time, a result that they interpret as being consistent with increasing capital mobility over time.²⁰

Not surprisingly, interpreting all of these conflicting results is exceedingly difficult. For example, in discussing the Feldstein-Horioka puzzle, which they describe as “one of the most robust and intractable puzzles in international finance,” Obstfeld and Rogoff (2000) note that, “International macroeconomics is a field replete with truly perplexing puzzles, and we generally have five to ten (or more) alternative answers to each of them. These answers are typically very clever but far from thoroughly convincing, and so the puzzles remain.” In particular, Feldstein's arguments that high savings and investment correlations imply that international capital is relatively immobile certainly suggest that caution is appropriate in simply assuming capital mobility, and that it is inappropriate to model large economies as facing a perfectly elastic supply of capital. Nevertheless, even researchers who have followed in the FH tradition have found savings investment correlations that have declined considerably over time, and that are smaller in more highly integrated economies and in smaller and developing economies, and in one case alternative estimation techniques have resulted in a savings retention coefficient that is virtually zero. In addition, the various alternative explanations of the FH result have some plausibility, and the results and interpretations of the empirical macroeconomics literature raise

²⁰ In a related article, Obstfeld and Rogoff (2000) construct a model in which they argue that the Feldstein-Horioka puzzle can be explained by taking into account the costs of trade in goods markets in the presence of large current account deficits. They show that such costs result in dramatic increases in effective real interest rates faced

some troublesome issues with the traditional interpretation of high savings-investment correlations, although the practical relevance of the long run solvency constraint is unclear. On balance, a reasonable interpretation may be the now somewhat dated but still highly relevant view of Harberger (1980), who argues that while international capital may not be perfectly mobile, the mobility of capital is relatively high, especially among smaller economies and the developing emerging countries and in the long run, and that with the inexorable march of globalization the level of capital mobility is likely to continue increasing over time – a development that deserves serious consideration in the formulation of tax and other economic policies.²¹

III. EVIDENCE ON TAX COMPETITION

Assuming that capital is either partially or fully mobile across taxing jurisdictions, a large literature has examined whether countries and indeed subnational governments engage in tax competition designed to attract that capital. This section first examines the predictions of theoretical tax competition models, and then turns to various empirical approaches that have been utilized in an attempt to discern the extent of tax competition.

A. Theoretical Models of Tax Competition

The early models of tax competition were relatively simple, with an economy consisting of many small identical jurisdictions engaged in Cournot-Nash competition in capital income tax rates to attract perfectly mobile capital. In this context, if a tax on immobile local factors is available, then a source-based tax on mobile capital is undesirable – the now-standard “zero tax

by borrowers when current account deficits become large. The prospect of facing these high interest rates limits current account deficits and thus limits deviations of domestic saving from domestic investment.

²¹ Harberger also argues that the FH result arises primarily because their sample consists primarily of large countries that can easily finance their investment needs from their own saving and can also affect the international return to capital. He provides data that show that relative capital flows are more variable for small countries.

result” indicative of a “race to the bottom” in capital income tax rates (Zodrow-Mieszkowski, 1983; Gordon, 1986; Razin-Sadka, 1991). The logic underlying this result is that, even purely from the perspective of local residents, a source-based tax on capital income is counterproductive; specifically, such a tax would drive out perfectly mobile capital until the nationally or internationally determined after-tax rate of return to capital was achieved, with the burden of the tax borne entirely by local residents in the form of lower wages and land rents or higher prices for non-tradable goods.²² As a result, it is preferable simply to tax local residents directly and at least avoid the efficiency costs of the tax, including the effects of capital emigration, lower capital intensities in production, and a tax bias against consumption of capital-intensive goods.²³ If instead the government is for political or other reasons constrained to utilize a source-based tax on capital income, it is likely to under-provide public services due to concern about driving mobile capital out of the jurisdiction (Zodrow and Mieszkowski, 1986; Wilson, 1986; Bucovetsky and Wilson, 1991; Brueckner, 2000).²⁴ In addition, independent of tax competition considerations, these arguments for low levels of capital income taxation may be bolstered by the traditional rationales for consumption-based rather than income-based taxation.²⁵ Moreover, several models suggest not only that capital income should not be taxed, but that it should be subsidized. For example, subsidies to capital income may be desirable to

Additional support for this view is provided by Murphy (1984) and Mamingi (1994), who find that the saving retention coefficient is much smaller for developing countries than for OECD countries.

²² Indeed, Harberger (2008) argues that for the corporate income tax, local labor bears more than a 100% of the tax once general equilibrium adjustments are taken into account.

²³ Note that these arguments do not apply for benefit taxes for services provided to mobile capital or taxes designed to compensate for external costs imposed by mobile capital.

²⁴ On the other hand, tax competition may restrain “Leviathan” tendencies for overconsumption of public services and encourage governments to use desirable user charges and benefit taxes (McLure, 1986; Edwards and Keen, 1996; Huber and Runkel, 2004). See Wilson (1999), Fuest, Huber and Mintz (2003), Wildasin and Wilson (2004) and Zodrow (2003) for discussions of the negative and positive aspects of tax competition.

²⁵ See Zodrow (2007) for a recent review of these arguments.

attract foreign investment by companies who have relatively poor information on the host countries investment prospects, market conditions, accounting rules, likelihood of expropriation, etc. (Gordon and Bovenberg, 1996), or to offset the effects of imperfect competition in the markets for capital goods (Judd, 1997, 2001).

However, these rather stark predictions have been tempered by numerous models that elaborate in various ways upon the structure of the basic tax competition models. For example, although the basic model assumed perfectly competitive markets, recent extensions have examined the role played by imperfect competition and economic rents, especially rents earned by multinational enterprises (MNEs) in an international context. Although the basic tax competition results obtain if firm-specific economic rents are added (Gordon and Hines, 2002), this is not the case if the economic rents are location-specific, in which case taxation of capital income as a means of capturing some of these rents becomes highly desirable, especially if they accrue to foreign residents. Moreover, the distinction between statutory/average effective tax rates and effective marginal tax rates, which is not an issue in the basic model, becomes very important in this context, as the level of taxation of economic rents is largely determined by the statutory tax rate. Thus, one would also expect tax competition in statutory tax rates as countries attempt to attract highly mobile capital that generates firm-specific economic rents,²⁶ tempered by the desire to tax location-specific rents, especially if a significant fraction of such rents accrue to foreigners (Devereux and Hubbard, 2003; Huizinga and Neilsen, 1997; Sorensen, 2006). Note that this reasoning suggests that tax competition will be more severe for small economies with little potential for location-specific economic rents. For example, Bucovetsky and Wilson (1991) construct models of asymmetric tax competition where only large countries with some

market power in capital markets have positive taxes on capital income, and the “new economic geography” models implies that larger “core” countries with significant agglomeration economies have relatively high tax rates on capital income, which are avoided by relatively smaller and less developed “peripheral” economies (Baldwin and Krugman, 2004).

The difference between statutory and marginal tax rates is also critical when the basic tax competition model is extended to include the potential for income shifting across jurisdictions. Much empirical evidence suggests that multistate corporations and multinational enterprises have considerable latitude in reallocating profits across jurisdictions in response to tax differentials through the use of various financial accounting manipulations, including the use of transfer prices, loans and other intercompany transactions, and judicious allocation of general expenses (Hines, 1999; Altshuler and Grubert, 2002, 2004; Grubert, 1998, 2003; Bartlesman and Beetsma, 2003; Buettner and Wamser, 2007; Desai, Foley and Hines, 2004, 2006) and that such income shifting is increasing over time (Altshuler and Grubert, 2006). The benefits of income shifting are determined primarily by the statutory tax rate, as firms face obvious incentives to shift revenues to jurisdictions with relatively low statutory tax rates and deductions to jurisdictions with relatively high statutory tax rates. The implication again is that tax competition extends to statutory tax rates.

Indeed, several recent studies suggest that if income shifting is sufficiently important, competition in statutory tax rates may be more important than competition in effective marginal tax rates in attracting mobile capital. For example, Haufler and Schjelderup (2000) construct a tax competition model with income shifting in the form of transfer pricing and show that lowering the statutory tax rate while increasing effective marginal tax rates can be desirable,

²⁶ Note in particular that although in the basic model extended to include location-specific rents, a cash flow tax with a relatively high rate is desirable, that is not the case if the model is extended to include firm-specific rents.

especially if a local firm is partially owned by foreigners. Similar results were obtained by Devereux, Lockwood and Redoano (2008), and in models in which firms can easily reallocate debt (Fuest and Hemmelgarn, 2005), and models in which firms are differentially mobile with the more mobile firm generating higher profits (Becker and Fuest, 2005). Thus, because reductions in statutory tax rates simultaneously attract corporations that generate firm-specific rents, reduce the incentives for revenue-decreasing income shifting, and lower the tax burden on marginal investments (as long as this effect is not offset by other measures), tax competition in statutory tax rates may be even more intense than competition in effective marginal tax rates. In addition, consistent with the standard argument that tax competition may lead to under-provision of public services, Gomes and Pouget (2008) provide evidence that such tax competition has led to a significant decline in spending on public infrastructure; they estimate that the decline of roughly 15 percentage points in the statutory corporate income tax rate that has occurred in their sample of 21 OECD countries has led to a reduction in public investment of between 0.6-1.1 percent of GDP.

On the other hand, several factors act to temper tax competition. For example, low taxes on capital income create incentives for income shifting from the personal income tax base, that is, for disguising labor income as relatively lowly tax capital income (Gordon and Slemrod, 2000). In an international context, host countries that import capital from countries such as the US and the UK that allow foreign tax credits have an incentive to keep their taxes high to the extent that they will be offset currently by such tax credits. Also, if public goods generate significant positive spillover benefits across jurisdictions, the incentive for a government to lower its capital income taxes to attract mobile capital declines to the extent that such a capital reallocation results in lower public services being produced in other jurisdictions and thus lower spillover benefits. Indeed, if local goods are pure public goods and all jurisdictions use capital

income taxes, there is no incentive for underprovision of public services (Bjorvatn and Schjelderup, 2002).

Finally, the implications for tax competition of corporate tax avoidance are complex. As noted above, the potential for income shifting creates another dimension of tax competition, especially in statutory tax rates. However, the existence of the potential to avoid the negative effects of higher tax rates suggests that their deleterious effects on investment may be significantly smaller than suggested by the standard tax competition literature (Hong and Smart, 2007). For example, Altshuler and Grubert (2006) argue that tax competition is increasingly taking the form of allowing tax avoidance by multinational enterprises, especially in the form of income shifting to tax havens. In particular, they stress that the “check the box” rules in the US greatly facilitated tax avoidance by US multinationals by allowing the creation of hybrid entities that allow the shifting of interest and other forms of income to tax havens without triggering current taxation under the US controlled foreign corporation rules.

To sum up, the basic tax competition model as well as several its extensions suggest that if capital is mobile tax rates on capital income should be relatively low and indeed in some cases should be zero. Moreover, tax competition extends to statutory rates, especially to the extent such rents are firm specific and firms have the potential to shift income through various financial manipulations. However, the rather stark results obtained with these models are tempered by a variety of additional considerations, including the desire to tax location specific economic rents, especially if such rents are earned by foreigners. Thus, the extent of tax competition is ultimately an empirical issue. Various strands of the empirical evidence on this question are examined in the following sections.

B. Corporate Tax Rates

It is clear that statutory corporate tax rates have declined significantly in recent years. For example, Devereux, Griffith and Klemm (2002) note that average statutory corporate income tax rates in the EU and U.S. fell dramatically from 48% in 1982 to 35% in 2001. Similarly, Devereux (2007) shows that the average statutory tax rate in the OECD was roughly 40 percent over the period from 1965 to the early 1990s, but dropped from 41 percent in 1988 to 33 percent in 1993, and was roughly constant at that level through 2004 (when it was 32 percent). At the same time, however, these rate reductions have often been accompanied by base-broadening efforts, so that overall corporate tax revenues as well as average and especially marginal effective tax rates have declined considerably less (Devereux, Griffith and Klemm, 2002; Gorter and de Mooij, 2001; Becker and Fuest, 2005); indeed, corporate tax revenues as a share of total revenues have risen over the past two decades in the U.S. (Auerbach, 2006). Similarly, corporate tax revenues as a fraction of GDP have been roughly constant over the past forty years, and indeed have increased in recent years (Devereux, 2007).²⁷ This evidence is suggestive of tax competition in statutory rates, but also implies that tax competition has not yet had as significant an impact in these countries on the marginal effective tax rates that were the focus of the earlier theoretical tax competition models.

More generally, although the data are now somewhat dated, Grubert (2001) examines a sample of 60 countries and shows that average effective tax rates, defined as foreign taxes paid relative to net income as reported by US multinationals to the IRS, fell by almost ten percentage

²⁷ See Devereux (2007) for a discussion of various additional possible explanations for the relative stability of corporate revenues in light of reductions in statutory rates, including increased inward profit shifting as statutory rates decline, increased shifting of income to the corporate base from the individual base, increased relative firm profitability, and increased investment in response to tax reductions. In addition, Auerbach (2006) argues that corporate tax revenues have increased due to an increasing dispersion of corporate profitability, coupled with the fact that profits are taxed while losses are not fully deductible so that the average tax rate on positive income net of losses has increased.

points between 1984 and 1992, with statutory rates falling by a somewhat smaller amount (and rates in the EU falling by less than this average). This result is more consistent with the existence of tax competition in effective tax rates, as is Grubert's finding that average effective tax rates fell much more in the small, open and relatively poor countries that are more susceptible to the effects of tax competition. Altshuler and Grubert (2006) find that the rate of decline in average effective tax rates continued but moderated over the 1992-2000 period, and that although the declines were more pronounced in smaller countries through 1997, this result vanishes for the period 1998-2000. (As will be discussed below, they attribute this result to the increased importance of tax planning and tax avoidance activities rather than reduced competition in tax rates.) Similarly, Slemrod (2004) finds that statutory tax rates are negatively associated with measures of openness (although he does not find evidence of such a link for revenues as a fraction of GDP), Winner (2005) finds that decreasing capital tax burdens and increasing labor tax burdens over time are especially pronounced for smaller countries, and Bretschger and Hettich (2002) obtain similar results for statutory corporate income tax rates.

Garretson and Peeters (2006) examine the impact of increasing capital mobility (measured as either increases in FDI flows relative to gross capital formation or using an index of the extent of the legal restriction placed on international capital mobility) on corporate tax rates for a sample of 19 OECD countries. They base their model on the theory of tax competition with agglomeration economies noted above, which posits that tax competition should be less intense among "core countries" that are characterized by significant economies of agglomeration, relative to smaller less developed "peripheral" countries (Baldwin and Krugman, 2004). They find that increased capital mobility does lead to tax competition in the form of lower corporate tax rates, but that this effect is considerably less pronounced for countries with significant agglomeration economies (estimated using several measures of market potential);

they conclude (Garretson and Peeters, 2006, p. 1) that, “If there is a race to the bottom, it seems that it is more real for some countries than others.”

Similarly, Keen and Simone (2004) argue that tax competition has been more pronounced in developing countries, where competition has not been limited to statutory tax rates, but also to average and marginal effective tax rates as well as revenues, primarily due to generous tax holidays and tax incentives designed to attract foreign direct investment. For example, in a sample of developing countries using data from the early 1990s to the early 2000s, average statutory rates declined by six percentage points or 16%, and corporate tax revenues relative to GDP declined by 20%. This result is confirmed by Huizinga, Laeven and Nicodème (2006) who find that corporate tax revenues relative to GDP decline with size (measured as GDP). However, this result has been questioned by Hines (2007) who examines a longer time period and a different sample of non-OECD countries and finds the corporate tax revenues relative to GDP are roughly constant over the period 1972-2004; even in this case, however, corporate tax revenues relative to GDP decline if one assumes that tax competition was not an important force until the early 1980s. In addition, Hines finds that tax competition has significantly benefited U.S. multinationals, as their average effective foreign tax rates fell from 43% in 1982 to 26% in 1999.

C. Reaction Functions

Another strand of the empirical literature tests for tax competition by looking for evidence of strategic interactions among governments in setting tax rates on capital, as predicted in models of tax competition in which governments take into account the tax policies of neighboring jurisdictions (rather than assuming them to be fixed). Brueckner (2003) surveys the literature that examines this issue in the subnational context, including important contributions by Heyndels and Vuchelen (1998), Brett and Pinkse (2000), Buettner (2001), Hayashi and

Boadway (2001) and Brueckner and Saavedra (2001). He notes that the slope of a local government's tax reaction function is theoretically ambiguous in sign. For example, if neighboring jurisdictions lower their tax rates, the standard tax competition argument implies that the local government should react by lowering its own tax rate (a positively sloped reaction function); however, the capital outflow induced by the rate reduction of other jurisdictions implies a reduction in revenues and, if local tastes for public services are sufficiently strong, the local tax rate can increase. Nevertheless, Brueckner (2003) notes that in virtually all of the empirical studies he analyzes, the estimated tax reaction function confirms strategic interaction and is upward sloping, indicating that the traditional tax competition factors dominates.²⁸

Devereux, Lockwood and Redoano (2008) utilize a similar approach in an international context. Following Devereux and Griffith (1998, 2003), they construct a model in which multinationals choose their investment locations in response to differences in statutory tax rates and choose their level of investment, given location, in response to the marginal effective tax rate. In addition, firms are assumed to be able to use transfer pricing, limited by the threat of audit, to shift profits across jurisdictions in response to differences in statutory tax rates. Governments potentially compete in both marginal effective tax rates and statutory tax rates. Devereux, Lockwood and Redoano analyze multinational investment decisions in a sample of 21 OECD countries over the period 1982-1999. They find strong evidence of international tax competition over statutory corporate tax rates; specifically, they estimate that a one percentage point reduction in the weighted average statutory tax rate in other countries results in a 0.7 percentage point reduction in the home country tax rate. They also find evidence of competition in marginal effective tax rates, but the magnitudes of the effects are much smaller, suggesting

²⁸ The results of these studies, however, cannot identify whether the observed reaction functions reflect tax

that competition over statutory tax rates is the dominant form of international tax competition.²⁹ Finally, they note that their estimated government tax reaction functions suggest that equilibrium statutory tax rates should have fallen substantially over the time period considered, consistent with the observed behavior described above.

Heinemann, Overesch and Rincke (2008) also provide a recent test for the existence of tax competition. They examine a series of discrete tax reform events involving reductions in statutory tax rates in a sample of 32 European countries to test for interactions among neighboring countries. They estimate that a country reduces its own statutory tax rate by 1.5-3.2 percentage points in response to a reduction in statutory tax rates of one percentage point in neighboring countries. Similarly, Altshuler and Goodspeed (2002) estimate that the EU has a positive tax reaction function to tax changes in the US (which they model as a Stackelberg leader) and the tax competition between the EU and US has become increasingly intense, and Besley, Griffith and Klemm (2001) show the corporate income tax rates are positively related to tax rates in other countries, especially within the EU, but such a strategic relationship does not hold for other taxes. All of these studies suggest that international tax competition is an important ongoing phenomenon.

D. Competition in Allowing Tax Avoidance

As discussed above, the potential for tax avoidance and income shifting in general provides another explanation for why tax competition in statutory corporate income tax rates might be observed, as lower statutory rates reduce incentives for multinational enterprises

competition, or alternative explanations such as “yardstick competition” (under which voters evaluate their political representatives relative to those in neighboring jurisdictions).

²⁹ Devereux, Lockwood and Redoano also argue that the fact that the strategic tax interactions between countries that they observe occur only between relatively open economies implies that they cannot be explained by two alternative theories – “yardstick competition” and common intellectual trends, such as a move toward broader tax bases and lower rates.

(MNEs) to shift revenues out of, and deductions into, a country. However, possibilities for tax avoidance by MNEs also may temper tax competition. Specifically, tax avoidance opportunities may imply that the negative impact of relatively high statutory and effective tax rates on foreign direct investment may be significantly muted if MNEs are easily able to mitigate their effects on the cost of capital with tax planning. Indeed, the availability of strategies for tax planning that are available only to MNEs suggests an interesting “optimal capital income tax” strategy that might be pursued by countries attempting to attract FDI at minimal revenue cost. Specifically, to the extent that MNEs are more mobile than domestic firms (and neglecting the higher administrative and compliance costs of differential taxation), optimal tax theory suggests that the former should be taxed at relatively lower rates – indeed, as described above, at a zero rate if they are perfectly mobile (Gugl and Zodrow, 2006). In practice, political considerations generally preclude the taxation of foreign firms at rates that are explicitly lower than those applied to domestic firms. However, the same result can be achieved if host countries allow MNEs to have access to tax avoidance devices – e.g., through explicit regulations or lax enforcement – that are legally or effectively not available to domestic firms.

Indeed, Hong and Smart (2007) conclude that such a practice is highly desirable; specifically, they argue that facilitating the use of tax havens should be “praised” as a means of allowing host countries to approach the “zero tax result” for mobile international capital; they also argue that the existence of tax havens implies that real foreign direct investment will be less sensitive to tax rate differentials, thus allowing higher corporate tax rates in host countries to be welfare-increasing for their citizens.^{30 31}

³⁰ Similarly, Grubert and Mutti (2001) argue that because taxes due on repatriation can be easily avoided (e.g., through arbitrage transactions involving a conduit company in a third country), their distortionary (and revenue) impacts are relatively small (although the resources devoted to avoiding the tax are clearly wasted). Altshuler and

Altshuler and Grubert (2006) argue that this phenomenon provides an important explanation of the behavior of host countries in recent years, as tax competition among countries increasingly takes the form of allowing tax avoidance, most commonly in the form of allowing income shifting to low rate tax havens, rather than the explicit reductions in statutory or effective tax rates stressed in the traditional tax competition literature. Furthermore, they argue that home countries, including the U.S., face an incentive to allow or even facilitate tax avoidance by MNEs if they believe that the gains from increased competitiveness of their MNEs outweigh the associated revenue losses. The prime example of such behavior is the adoption of the “check-the-box” regulations in the U.S. in 1997, which allowed affiliated firms to choose their tax status as a subsidiary, subject to separate taxation, or a branch, taxed on a pass-through basis to the parent firm, and greatly facilitated various tax avoidance schemes.

Altshuler and Grubert provide several examples of tax avoidance activity made easier by the “check-the-box” rules. In general, these strategies involve circumvention of the “controlled foreign corporation” (CFC) rules that require current taxation of funds transferred to tax havens. For example, the new rules for the first time allow U.S. firms to utilize tax haven finance subsidiaries, which allows the injection by the U.S. parent of equity funds to an affiliated company in a low-tax tax haven that in turn loans the funds to another affiliated company in a high-tax country. Under the former regulations, the payment of interest to the company in the tax haven would have been taxable currently under the CFC rules. However, with the new regulations, the company in the high tax host country can be a “hybrid entity” – one that is treated as a corporation in the host country but as an unincorporated branch of the company in

Grubert (2006), however, acknowledge that the six-fold increase in inflows of repatriated funds into the U.S. in response to the recently enacted temporary rate reduction for repatriated funds calls this view into question.

the tax haven by the U.S. – so that transfers between them are intercompany transfers and thus not subject to the CFC rules. As a result, the company in the high tax country gets a deduction for interest at a relatively high rate, but the associated interest income is either tax exempt or taxed at a very low rate in the tax haven, with U.S. tax deferred, perhaps indefinitely.

Altshuler and Grubert provide several pieces of empirical evidence to support their view that international tax competition increasingly takes the form of allowing tax avoidance, examining various phenomena before and after the 1997 tax change. First, they examine changes in average effective tax rates, which continued to decline over the period 1992-2002, although at a slower rate than the decline documented in the studies cited above. They conclude that after 1998 tax avoidance behavior was much more important in explaining these declines in host country effective tax rates than the declines in statutory tax rates that occurred over the same period, as the correlation between effective and statutory tax rates declined significantly. Second, the extent to which the reported profitability of subsidiaries in low-tax countries exceeded that in high-tax countries grew considerably after 1997, as would be expected if profits were increasingly being shifted to low-tax jurisdictions. Third, Altshuler and Grubert show that intercompany tax payments and holding company income grew considerably after 1997, as would occur with the various strategies described above that are designed to shift income to lower-tax countries. They estimate that in 2002, U.S. multinationals saved \$7 billion per year, or 15 percent of their total foreign tax burden by using these techniques.

³¹ In marked contrast, however, Slemrod and Wilson (2006) argue that the impact of tax havens is negative once the analysis is expanded to consider the costs of labor income shifting and the costs of enforcement and administration.

IV. CONCLUSION

This paper has examined the literatures on two questions that are essential to any discussion of mobility and taxation – the extent to which capital is mobile internationally and the extent to which the mobility of capital has resulted in interjurisdictional capital tax competition. There is general agreement that capital is mobile and has become increasingly mobile over time, supported by evidence on the responsiveness of the allocation of investment to tax factors, recent empirical estimates of the incidence of the corporate income tax, and gradual reductions in cross country estimates of savings retention coefficients. There is, however, far less agreement as to whether capital is sufficiently mobile that it is reasonable to assume perfect international capital mobility, especially with respect to whether empirically observed high savings retention coefficients imply the existence of significant impediments to capital mobility, should be interpreted as reflecting other factors, or instead provide little information on the extent of capital mobility. A potentially interesting direction for future research would be dynamic models that explicitly and simultaneously consider differences in life-cycle savings behavior across countries, differences in country size and the degree of openness of the economy, and differences in the extent to which the intertemporal budget constraint is binding across countries,³² in an attempt to separate and identify the relative importance of each of these factors in explaining the persistence of relatively high savings retention coefficients. Similarly, additional empirical work testing a comprehensive measure of capital mobility defined in terms of equalization of rates of return adjusted for currency and political risk and information asymmetries would appear to be very useful.

The theoretical modeling of tax competition has progressed significantly since the basic models were developed some thirty years ago, encompassing a wide variety of important extensions including especially the modeling of the roles of both location-specific and firm-specific economic rents, tax avoidance, and competition in statutory tax rates. A promising

³² For example, some observers have recently argued that the relative attractiveness of investment opportunities in the U.S. imply that the intertemporal solvency constraint is not especially binding for the U.S.

avenue for future research is the development of models that consider explicitly the relative magnitudes of the various effects of tax competition, including beneficial ones, that have been identified but generally treated in isolation in the literature.³³ The bulk of the empirical literature, especially evidence on the evolution of tax rates and the estimation of tax reaction functions, suggests that both subnational and international tax competition is an important phenomenon, and that such tax competition is increasing over time. The most critical empirical question for the future is, given that the standard base-broadening measures in many countries presumably have been nearly exhausted in recent years, whether future tax competition will take the form of aggressive competition in marginal effective tax rates similar to that already observed for statutory rates.

³³ For some excellent recent examples, see Parry (2003) and Sorensen (2000, 2001).

REFERENCES

- Ahearne, Alan G., William L. Grier and Frank E. Warnock, 2004. "Information Costs and Home Bias: An Analysis of U.S. Holdings of Foreign Equities." *Journal of International Economics* 62 (2): 313-336.
- Altshuler, Rosanne and Timothy Goodspeed, 2002. "Follow the Leader? Evidence on European and U.S. Tax Competition," *Rutgers University Economics Department Working Paper No. 200226*.
- Altshuler, Rosanne and Harry Grubert, 2002. "Repatriation Taxes, Repatriation Strategies, and Multinational Financial Policy." *Journal of Public Economics* 87: 73-107.
- Altshuler, Rosanne and Harry Grubert, 2004. "Taxpayer Responses to Competitive Tax Policies and Tax Policy Responses to Competitive Taxpayers: Recent Evidence." *Tax Notes International* (June 28) 34 (13): 1349-1362.
- Altshuler, Rosanne and Harry Grubert, 2006. "Governments and Multinational Corporations in the Race to the Bottom." *Tax Notes* (February 6) 110: 459-474.
- Altshuler, Rosanne, Harry Grubert and T. Scott Newlon, 2001. "Has U.S. Investment Abroad Become More Sensitive to Tax Rates?" In *International Taxation and Multinational Activity*, by James R. Hines, Jr. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 9-32.
- Artis, Michael and Tamim Bayoumi, 1992. "Global Capital Market Integration and the Current Account," in *Money and Financial Markets*, edited by M. P. Taylor. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Arulampalam, Wiji, Michael P, Devereux and Giorgia Maffini, 2008. "The Direct Incidence of Corporate Income Tax on Wages," manuscript, University of Warwick.
- Auerbach, Alan J., 2006. "Why Have Corporate Tax Revenues Declined? Another Look." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 12463. Cambridge MA: NBER.
- Baldwin, Richard and Paul Krugman, 2004. "Agglomeration, Integration and Tax Harmonization." *European Economic Review* 48: 1-23.
- Barro, Robert J., N. Gregory Mankiw and Xavier Sala-i-Martin, 1995. "Capital Mobility in Neoclassical Models of Growth," *American Economic Review* 85: 103-115.
- Bartelsman, Eric J. and Roel M. W. J. Beetsma, 2003. "Why Pay More? Corporate Tax Avoidance Through Transfer Pricing in OECD Countries." *Journal of Public Economics* 87: 2225-52.
- Batista, Catia and Jacques Potin, 2007. "International Specialization and the Return to Capital, 1976-2000," manuscript.

- Baxter Marianne and Mario J. Crucini, 1993. "Explaining Savings-Investment Correlations," *American Economic Review* 83: 416-436.
- Becker, Johannes and Clemens Fuest, 2005. "Optimal Tax Policy when Firms are Internationally Mobile." Working Paper No. 1592, CESifo, Munich.
- Besley, Timothy, Rachel Griffith and Alexander Klemm, 2001. "Empirical Evidence on Fiscal Interdependence in OECD Countries," *Institute for Fiscal Studies Working Paper*.
- Bjorvatn, Kjetil and Guttorm Schjelderup, 2002. "Tax Competition and International Public Goods," *International Tax and Public Finance* 8(2): 111-120.
- Boskin, Michael J., and William G. Gale, 1987. "New Results on the Effects of Tax Policy on the International Location of Investment," in *The Effects of Taxation on Capital Accumulation*, edited by Martin S. Feldstein. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 201-219.
- Bretschger, Lucas and Frank Hettich, 2002. "Globalization, Capital Mobility and Tax Competition: The Theory and Evidence for OECD Countries," *European Journal of Political Economy* 18 (4): 695-716.
- Brett, C. and J. Pinsky, 2000. "The Determinants of Municipal Tax Rates in British Columbia," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 33: 695-714.
- Brueckner, Jan K., 2000. "A Tiebout/Tax Competition Model." *Journal of Public Economics* 77, 285-306.
- Brueckner, Jan K., 2003. "Strategic Interaction Among Governments: An Overview of Empirical Studies," *International Regional Science Review* 26 (2): 175-188.
- Brueckner, Jan K. and Luc A. Saavedra, 2001. "Do Local Governments Engage in Strategic Tax Competition?" *National Tax Journal* 54: 203-229.
- Bucovetsky, Sam and John D. Wilson, 1991. "Tax Competition with Two Tax Instruments." *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 21, 333-350.
- Buettner, Theiss, 2001. "Local Business Taxation and Competition for Capital: the Choice of the Tax Rate," *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 31: 215-245.
- Buettner, Theiss and Georg Wamser, 2007. "Intercompany Loans and Profit Shifting – Evidence from Company-Level Data," *International Tax and Public Finance*.
- Caselli, Francesco and James Feyrer, 2007. "The Marginal Product of Capital," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 122(2): 535-568.
- Coakley, Jerry and Farida Kulasi, 1997. "Cointegration of Long Run Saving and Investment," *Economics Letters* 54: 1-6.

- Coakley, Jerry, Ana-Maria Fuertes and Fabio Spagnolo, 2004. "Is the Feldstein-Horioka Puzzle History? *The Manchester School* 72 (5): 569-590.
- Coakley, Jerry, Farida Kulasi and Ron Smith, 1994. "The Saving Investment Association," *Birbeck College Working Paper No. 10/94*.
- Coakley, Jerry, Farida Kulasi and Ron Smith, 1996. "Current Account Solvency and the Feldstein-Horioka Puzzle," *Birbeck College Working Paper Number No. 8/95R*.
- Coakley, Jerry, Farida Kulasi and Ron Smith, 1998. "The Feldstein-Horioka Puzzle and Capital Mobility: A Review," *International Journal of Finance and Economics* 3: 169-188.
- de Mooij, Ruud A. and Sjef Ederveen, 2003. "Taxation and Foreign Direct Investment: A Synthesis of Empirical Research." *International Tax and Public Finance* 11: 673-693.
- de Mooij, Ruud and Sjef Ederveen, 2005. "Explaining the Variation in Empirical Estimates of Tax Elasticities of Foreign Investment." Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper TI 2005-108/3. Rotterdam: Tinbergen Institute.
- Desai, Mihir, C. Fritz Foley and James R. Hines Jr., 2004. "Foreign Direct Investment in a World of Multiple Taxes," *Journal of Public Economics* 88 (12): 2727-2744.
- Desai, Mihir, C. Fritz Foley and James R. Hines Jr., 2006. "The Demand for Tax Havens," *Journal of Public Economics* 90 (3): 513-531.
- Devereux, Michael P., 2007. "Developments in the Taxation of Corporate Profit in the OECD since 1965: Rates, Bases and Revenues." Oxford University Centre for Business Taxation WP 07/04. Oxford: Oxford University Centre for Business Taxation.
- Devereux, Michael P. and Rachel Griffith, 1998. "Taxes and the Location of Production: Evidence from a Panel of U.S. Multinationals." *Journal of Public Economics* 68: 335-367.
- Devereux, Michael P. and Rachel Griffith, 2003. "The Impact of Corporate Taxation on the Location of Capital: A Review." *Economic Analysis and Policy* 33: 275-292.
- Devereux, Michael P., Rachel Griffith and Alexander Klemm, 2002. "Corporate Income Tax Reforms and International Tax Competition." *Economic Policy* 35: 451-495.
- Devereux, Michael P. and R. Glenn Hubbard, 2003. "Taxing Multinationals." *International Tax and Public Finance* 10: 469-487.
- Devereux, Michael P., Ben Lockwood and Michela Redoano, 2008. "Do Countries Compete over Corporate Tax Rates? *Journal of Public Economics* 92 (5-6): 1210-1235.
- Dornbusch, Rudiger, 1991. "Comment," in *National Saving and Economic Performance*, edited by B. Douglas Bernheim and John B. Shoven. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.
- Edwards, Jeremy and Michael Keen, 1996. "Tax Competition and Leviathan." *European Economic Review* 40, 113-134.

- Erkel-Rousse, Helene and Daniel Mirza, 2002. "Import Price Elasticities: Reconsidering the Evidence." *Canadian Journal of Economics* 35: 282-306.
- Evans, Paul, Bong-Han Kim and Keun-Yeob Oh, 2008. "Capital Mobility and Savings and Investment: A Time Varying Coefficients Approach," *Journal of International Money and Finance* 27: 806-815.
- Feldstein, Martin, 1983. "Domestic Saving and International Capital Movements in the Long Run and the Short Run," *European Economic Review* 21: 129-151.
- Feldstein, Martin, 1994. "Tax Policy and International Capital Flows." *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 4851* (September).
- Feldstein, Martin and Phillippe Bacchetta, 1991. "National Saving and International Investment," in *National Saving and Economic Performance*, edited by B. Douglas Bernheim and John B. Shoven. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.
- Feldstein, Martin S. and Charles Horioka, 1980. "Domestic Savings and Capital Flows," *Economic Journal* 90(2): 314-329.
- Felix, R. Alison, 2007. "Passing the Burden: Corporate Tax Incidence in Open Economies," manuscript, Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City.
- Frankel, Jeffrey A., 1986. "International Capital Mobility and Crowding Out in the US Economy: Imperfect integration of financial markets For a Good Markets? in *How Open Is the US Economy?* edited by R. Hafer. Lexington MA: Lexington Books.
- Frankel, Jeffrey A., 1992. "Measuring International Capital Mobility: A Review," *American Economic Review* 82(2): 197-202.
- Frankel, Jeffrey A., 1993. "Quantifying International Capital Mobility in the 1980s," in *On Exchange Rates*, collected papers of Jeffrey A. Frankel. Cambridge MA: Cambridge University Press.
- French, Kenneth R. and James M. Poterba, 1991. "Investor Diversification and International Equity Markets," *American Economic Review* 81(1): 222-226.
- Fuest, Clemens and Thomas Hemmelgarn, 2005. "Corporate Tax Policy, Foreign Firm Ownership and Thin Capitalization." *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 35: 508-526.
- Fuest, Clemens, Bernd Huber and Jack Mintz, 2003. "Capital Mobility and Tax Competition: A Survey." In *Foundations and Trends in Microeconomics* 1:1-62.
- Garretson, Harry and Jolanda Peeters, 2006. "Capital Mobility, Agglomeration and Corporate Tax Rates: Is the Race to the Bottom for Real?" De Nederlandsche Bank Working Paper No. 113 (September).

- Gentry, William H., 2007. "A Review of the Evidence on the Incidence of the Corporate Income Tax," *Office of Tax Analysis Paper No. 101*.
- Glaeser, Edward L. and Joseph Gyourko, 2005. "Urban Decline and Durable Housing," *Journal of Political Economy* 113(2): 345-375.
- Gomes, Pedro and Francois Pouget, 2008. "Corporate Tax Competition and the Decline of Public Investment," *European Central Bank Working Paper No. 928*.
- Gordon, Roger H. and A. Lans Bovenberg, 1996. "Why is Capital so Immobile Internationally? Possible Explanations and Implications for Capital Income Taxation." *American Economic Review* 86: 1057-1075.
- Gordon, Roger H. and James R. Hines, Jr., 2002. "International Taxation." In *Handbook of Public Economics, Volume 4*, edited by Alan J. Auerbach and Martin Feldstein. Amsterdam: North Holland/Elsevier.
- Gordon, Roger H. and Jeffrey K. MacKie-Mason, 1995. "Why is There Corporate Taxation in a Small Open Economy? The Role of Transfer Pricing and Income Shifting." In *The Effects of Taxation on Multinational Corporations*, edited by Martin Feldstein, James R. Hines, Jr. and R. Glenn Hubbard. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gordon, Roger H. and Joel Slemrod, 2000. "Are 'Real' Responses to Taxes Simply Income Shifting Between Corporate and Personal Income Tax Bases?" In Joel Slemrod (ed.), *Does Atlas Shrug? The Economic Consequences of Taxing the Rich*. New York and Cambridge MA: Russell Sage Foundation and Harvard University Press.
- Gordon, Roger H., 1986. "Taxation of Investment and Savings in the World Economy." *American Economic Review* 76: 1086-1102.
- Gorter, Joeri and Ruud de Mooij, 2001. *Capital Income Taxation in Europe: Trends and Tradeoffs*. The Hague: CPB Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis.
- Gravelle, Jane G. and Thomas L. Hungerford, 2007. "Corporate Tax Reform: Issues for Congress," *Congressional Research Service Report RL34229*.
- Gravelle, Jane G., and Kent A. Smetters, 2006. "Does the Open Economy Assumption Really Mean that Labor Bears the Burden of a Capital Income Tax?" *Advances in Economic Analysis and Policy* 6: 1-42.
- Grubert, Harry, 1998. "Taxes and the Division of Foreign Operating Income among Royalties, Interest, Dividends and Retained Earnings." *Journal of Public Economics* 68: 269-290.
- Grubert, Harry, 2001. "Tax Planning by Companies and Tax Competition by Governments: Is There Evidence of Changes in Behavior?" In James R. Hines, Jr., *International Taxation and Multinational Activity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 113-139.
- Grubert, Harry, 2003. "Intangible Income, Intercompany Transactions, Income Shifting, and the Choice of Location." *National Tax Journal* 56: 211-242.

- Grubert, Harry and Rosanne Altshuler, 2008. "Corporate Taxes in the World Economy: Reforming the Taxation of Cross-Border Income." In *Fundamental Tax Reform: Issues, Choices and Implications*, edited by John W. Diamond and George R. Zodrow. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Grubert, Harry and John Mutti, 2000. "The Influence of Taxation on Industrial Location," *National Tax Journal* 53(4): 825-839.
- Grubert, Harry and John Mutti, 2001. "*Taxing International Business Income: Dividend Exemption Versus the Current System.*" Washington DC: AEI Press.
- Gugl, Elisabeth and George R. Zodrow, 2006. "International Tax Competition and Tax Incentives for Developing Countries." In *The Challenges of Tax Reform in a Global Economy*, edited by James Alm, Jorge Martinez-Vasquez and Mark Rider. New York: Springer, pp. 167-191.
- Harberger, Arnold C., 1980. "Vignettes on the World Capital Market," *American Economic Review* 70 (2): 331-337.
- Harberger, Arnold C., 1995. "The ABCs of Corporate Tax Incidence: Insights into the Open-economy Case." In *Tax Policy and Economic Growth*. Washington D.C.: ACCF Center for Policy Research.
- Harberger, Arnold C., 2008. "Corporate Tax Incidence: Reflections on What is Known, Unknown, and Unknowable." In *Fundamental Tax Reform: Issues, Choices and Implications*, edited by John W. Diamond and George R. Zodrow. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Hartman, David G., 1984. "Tax Policy and Foreign Direct Investment in the United States." *National Tax Journal* 37: 475-487.
- Hartman, David G., 1985. "Tax Policy and Foreign Direct Investment." *Journal of Public Economics* 26: 107-121.
- Hartman, David G., 1986. "On the Optimal Taxation of Income in the Open Economy." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 1550.
- Hassett, Kevin A. and Aparna Mathur, 2006. "Taxes on Wages," *American Enterprise Institute Working Paper No. 128*.
- Hassett, Kevin A. and Kathryn Newmark, 2008. "Taxation and Business Behavior: A Review of the Recent Literature." In *Fundamental Tax Reform: Issues, Choices and Implications*, edited by John W. Diamond and George R. Zodrow. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Haufler, Andreas and Guttorm Schjelderup, 2000. "Corporate Tax Systems and Cross Country Profit Shifting." *Oxford Economic Papers* 52: 306-325.

- Hayashi, Masayoshi and Robin Boadway, 2001. "An Empirical Analysis of Intergovernmental Tax Interaction: The Case of Business Income Taxes in Canada," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 34: 481-503.
- Heinemann, Friedrich, Michael Overesch and Johannes Rincke, 2008. "Rate Cutting Tax Reforms and Corporate Tax Competition in Europe," *Center for European Economic Research (ZEW) Discussion Paper No. 08-20*.
- Hertel, Thomas, David Hummels, Maros Ivanic and Roman Keeney, 2004. "How Confident Can We Be in CGE-Based Assessments of Free Trade Agreements?" Center for Global Trade Analysis Working Paper 26. West Lafayette IN: Purdue University.
- Heyndels, Bruno and Jef Vuchelen, 1998. "Tax Mimicking among Belgian Municipalities," *National Tax Journal* 51: 89-101.
- Hines, James R., Jr., 1999. "Lessons From Behavioral Responses to International Taxation." *National Tax Journal*, June, 305-322.
- Hines, James R., 2007. "Corporate Taxation and International Competition," in *Taxing Corporate Income*, edited by Alan J. Auerbach, James R. Hines and Joel Slemrod. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 268-295.
- Hines James R., Jr., and Eric M. Rice, 1994. "Fiscal Paradise: Foreign Tax Havens and American Business." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 109: 149-182.
- Hoffman, Mathias, 2004. "International Capital Mobility in the Long Run and the Short Run: Can We Still Learn from Saving Investment Data?" *Journal of International Money and Finance* 23: 113-131.
- Hong, Quing and Michael Smart, 2007. "In Praise of Tax Havens: International Tax Planning and Foreign Direct Investment," *CESifo Working Paper 1942* (March).
- Huber, Bernd and Marco Runkel, 2004. "Tax Competition, Excludable Public Goods and User Charges," *CESifo Working Paper Series No. 1172*.
- Huizinga, Harry and Soren Bo Nielsen, 1997. "Capital Income and Profit Taxation with Foreign Ownership of Firms." *Journal of International Economics* 42: 149-165.
- Huizinga, Harry, Luc Laeven and Gaetan Nicodème, 2006. "Capital Structure and International Debt Shifting." *European Economy Economic Paper No. 263* (December). Brussels: European Commission.
- Judd, Kenneth L., 1997. "The Optimal Tax Rate for Capital Income Is Negative." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 6004. Cambridge MA: NBER.
- Judd, Kenneth L., 2001. "The Impact of Tax Reform in Modern Dynamic Economies." In *Transition Costs of Fundamental Tax Reform*, edited by Kevin A. Hassett and R. Glenn Hubbard. Washington, DC: AEI Press.

- Keen, Michael and Alejandro Simone, 2004. "Is Tax Competition Harming Developing Countries More Than Developed?" *Tax Notes International* 34(13) (June 28): 1317-1325.
- Kim, Sunghyun Henry, 2001. "The Saving-Investment Correlation Puzzle is Still a Puzzle," *Journal of International Money and Finance* 20: 1017-1034.
- King, Mervyn A., and Don Fullerton (eds.), 1984. *The Taxation of Income from Capital*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago.
- Lemmen, Jan J. and Sylvester C.W. Eijffinger, 1995. "The Quantity Approach to Financial Integration: The Feldstein-Horioka Criterion Revisited," *Open Economies Review* 6: 145-165.
- Lutz, Byron F., 2006. "How Elastic is Residential Capital Investment to Property Taxation? Evidence from Court Induced Tax Changes," Manuscript.
- Maddison, Angus, 1991. *Dynamic Forces in Capitalist Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mamingi, Nlandu, 1994. "Saving Investment Correlations and Capital Mobility in Developing Countries," *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 1211*.
- Mankiw, N. Gregory, David Romer and David N. Weil, 1992. "A Contribution to the Imperative Economic Growth," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 107: 407-437.
- McDaniel, Christine A. and Edward J. Balistreri, 2002. "A Discussion on Armington Trade Substitution Elasticities." U.S. International Trade Commission Office of Economics Working Paper, January.
- McLure, Charles E., Jr., 1986. "Tax Competition: Is What's Good for the Private Goose Also Good for the Public Gander?" *National Tax Journal* 39: 341-348.
- Murphy, Robert G., 1984. "Capital Mobility in the Relationship between Saving and Investment Rates in OECD Countries," *Journal of international Money and Finance* 3: 327-342.
- Nason, James M. and John H. Rogers, 2003. "The Present Value Model of the Current Account Has Been Rejected: Round up the Usual Suspects," *International Finance Discussion Paper 760*, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC.
- Obstfeld, Maurice, 1986. "Capital Mobility in the World Economy: Theory and Measurement," *Carnegie Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy* 24: 55-104.
- Obstfeld, Maurice, 1995. "International Capital Mobility in the 1990s," in *Understanding Interdependence: and the Macro Economics of the Open Economy*, edited by Peter B. Kenen. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Obstfeld, Maurice and Kenneth Rogoff, 2000. "The Six Major Puzzles and International Microeconomics: Is There a Common Cause?" in *NBER Macroeconomics Annual 2000*, edited by Ben Bernanke and Kenneth Rogoff. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

- Parry, Ian W. H., 2003. "How Large are the Welfare Losses from Tax Competition?" *Journal of Urban Economics* 54: 39-60.
- Pelgrin, Florian and Sebastian Schich, 2008. "International Capital Mobility: What Do National Saving Investment Dynamics Tell Us?" *Journal of International Money and Finance* 27: 331-334.
- Randolph, William C., 2006. "International Burdens of the Corporate Income Tax." CBO Working Paper. Washington DC: Congressional Budget Office.
- Razin, Assaf and Efraim Sadka, 1991. "International Tax Competition and Gains from Tax Harmonization." *Economics Letters* 37: 69-76.
- Sercu, Piet and Rosanne Vanpée, 2007. "Home Bias in International Equity Portfolios: A Review," manuscript, Katholieke Universiteit.
- Sinn, Stefan, 1992. "Saving Investment Correlations and Capital Mobility: On The Evidence from Annual Data," *Economic Journal* 102: 1162-1170.
- Slemrod, Joel and John D. Wilson, 2006. "Tax Competition with Parasitic Tax Havens," *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. W12225*.
- Slemrod, Joel, 1990. "Tax Effects on Foreign Direct Investment in the United States: Evidence from a Cross-Country Comparison." In *Taxation in the Global Economy*, edited by Assaf Razin and Joel Slemrod. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Slemrod, Joel, 2004. "Are Corporate Tax Rates, or Countries, Converging?" *Journal of Public Economics* 88: 1169-1186.
- Smallwood, Aaron and Stefan C. Norrbin, 2008. "An Encompassing Test of Real Interest Rate Equalization," *Review of International Economics* 16(1): 114-126.
- Sorensen, Peter Birch, 2000. "The Case for International Tax Co-ordination Reconsidered," *Economic Policy* 15, 431-472.
- Sorensen, Peter Birch, 2001. "International Tax Coordination: Regionalism Versus Globalism." *CESifo Working Paper Number 483*.
- Sorensen, Peter Birch, 2006. "Can Capital Income Taxes Survive? And Should They?" *CES-ifo Working Paper No. 1793*.
- Summers, Lawrence, 1988. "Tax Policy and Competitiveness," in *International Aspects of Fiscal Policy*, edited by Jeffrey A. Frankel. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tesar, Linda L., 1993. "Saving, Investment and International Capital Flows," *Journal of International Economics* 35: 69-89.
- Tesar, Linda L. and Ingrid M. Werner, 1992. "Home Bias and the Globalization of Securities Markets," *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 4218*.

- Wildasin, David E. and John D. Wilson, 2004. "Capital Tax Competition: Bane or Boon?" *Journal of Public Economics* 88: 1065-1091.
- Wilson, John D., 1986. "A Theory of Interregional Tax Competition." *Journal of Urban Economics* 19: 296-315.
- Wilson, John D., 1991. "Tax Competition with Interregional Differences in Factor Endowments." *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 21, 423-452.
- Wilson, John D., 1999. "Theories of Tax Competition." *National Tax Journal* 52: 269-304.
- Winner, Hannes, 2005. "Has Tax Competition Emerged?" *International Tax and Public Finance* 12 (5): 667-687.
- Young, K.H., 1988. "The Effects of Taxes and Rates of Return on Foreign Direct Investment in the United States." *National Tax Journal* 41: 109-121.
- Zodrow, George R., 2003. "Tax Competition and Tax Coordination in the European Union." *International Tax and Public Finance* 10: 651-671.
- Zodrow, George R. 2006. "Capital Mobility and Source-Based Taxation of Capital Income in Small Open Economies." *International Tax and Public Finance* 13: 269-294.
- Zodrow, George R. and Peter Mieszkowski, 1983. "The Incidence of the Property Tax: The Benefit View versus the New View." In *Local Provision of Public Services: The Tiebout Model after Twenty-Five Years*, edited by George R. Zodrow. New York: Academic Press.
- Zodrow, George R. and Peter Mieszkowski, 1986. "Pigou, Tiebout, Property Taxation, and the Underprovision of Local Public Goods." *Journal of Urban Economics* 19: 356-370.
- Zodrow, George R., 2007. "Should Capital Income be Subject to Consumption-Based Taxation?" In *Taxing Capital Income*, edited by Henry Aaron, Leonard Burman and C. Eugene Steuerle. Washington DC: The Urban Institute.