Comments on measures of progressivity in Saez and Zucman "Triumph of injustice" (plus some other comments)

> Wojciech Kopczuk Columbia University

> Columbia University October 2019

> > イロト 不得 トイヨト イヨト

1/28

average tax rate of a group = $\frac{\text{sum of taxes}}{\text{sum of income}}$

average tax rate of a group = $\frac{\text{sum of taxes}}{\text{sum of income}}$

Group — who do we consider?

average tax rate of a group = $\frac{\text{sum of taxes}}{\text{sum of income}}$

Sum of taxes — what is a tax and what's not a tax

average tax rate of a group = $\frac{\text{sum of taxes}}{\text{sum of income}}$

Sum of taxes — how do we measure tax liability

average tax rate of a group = $\frac{\text{sum of taxes}}{\text{sum of income}}$

Sum of income — what is income and what's not income

average tax rate of a group = $\frac{\text{sum of taxes}}{\text{sum of income}}$

Sum of income — how do we measure income

average tax rate of a group = $\frac{\text{sum of taxes}}{\text{sum of income}}$

Group — who do we consider?

- Sum of taxes what is a tax and what's not a tax
- Sum of taxes how do we measure tax liability
- Sum of income what is income and what's not income
- Sum of income how do we measure income
- What are we doing all of it for?

Sum of income



3 / 28

Sum of income — imputations, things we do not know

Table 4: Decomposition of top one percent income shares by approaches

Auten-Splinter approach	PSZ approach	Percentage point			Percentage point difference in changes	
		1962	1979	2014	1979-2014	1962-2014
Pre-tax income						
Underreported income by IRS audit data	Underreported income by positive income	0.1	1.0	2.2	1.2	2.1
Include distributed & other retirement income	PSZ private retirement distribution	0.3	0.2	1.3	1.1	1.1
Non-retirement pre-tax corporate income	PSZ non-retirement pre-tax corp. income	0.5	0.2	0.7	0.4	0.2
Other taxes by disposable income less savings	Other taxes by factor income less savings	0.4	0.2	0.7	0.5	0.3
Various corrections to tax income definition	Use uncorrected tax return market income	-0.1	-0.1	0.4	0.6	0.5
Imputed rent by property tax deductions	Imputed rent by housing wealth estimates	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.1	-0.2
Limit returns to adult residents	No adjustment	-0.1	0.2	0.2	-0.1	0.3
Groups by individuals/size-adjusted incomes	Groups by adults/equal-split married inc.	-0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.4
Non-profits/govt. income half per capita	Non-profits/govt. income all by income	*	*	0.1	*	*
Social insurance benefits/deficit excluded	Social insur, ben./def. incl., taxes deducted	0.2	*	-0.1	-0.1	-0.2
Federal Reserve payments by mortgage interest	Fed. Res. payments by income	*	*	0.1	0.1	0.1
Inflation correction	No correction	*	-0.5	-0.1	0.5	*
Pre-tax differences (PSZ less AS) & totals		1.6	1.7	5.9	4.3	4.4
After-tax income						
Govt. consumption allocated half per capita	Govt, consumption all by after-tax income	0.8	0.7	1.2	0.5	0.4
Non-SS deficits by federal income taxes	Half by government transfers half taxes	-0.2	0.1	0.6	0.5	0.7
Government transfers as described in text	PSZ transfers distribution	-0.3	-0.2	*	0.2	0.3
Estate tax by prior decade decedent income	Estate tax by wealth distribution	*	*	*	*	*
Corporate taxes by wages and corp. ownership	Corporate taxes by capital ownership	-0.2	-0.3	-0.3	*	-0.1
Other taxes by disposable income less savings	Other taxes by factor income less savings	-0.2	-0.1	-0.3	-0.2	-0.1
After-tax differences (PSZ less AS) & totals		0.2	0.3	1.1	0.8	0.9

4 / 28

Progressivity in 1962 — SZ (2019) vs PSZ (2018)

Total average tax rates, federal and state, PSZ vs SZ (book, NYT) 1962



Progressivity in 2014 — SZ (2019) vs PSZ (2018)

Total average tax rates, federal and state, PSZ vs SZ (book, NYT) 2014



6/28

Progressivity top 0.01% — SZ (2019) vs PSZ (2018)

Total average tax rates, federal and state, PSZ (2018) vs SZ (2019) Top 0.01%



7/28

Progressivity — other sources: Auten-Splinter (2019)



Figure 3: Average tax rates

Notes: Average tax rates are all taxes divided by income. Both PSZ and Auten-Splinter exclude the refundable portion of tax credits, which are categorized as transfers in the national accounts—adding them would lower bottom 50 percent tax rates up to 3 percentage points. Forecasted rates apply Tax Policy Center (2017) estimated changes to 2014 rates. To match the 2014 PSZ groups, the Saez-Zucman bottom groups are averaged for the P0–50 bin, P99–99.9 values are applied to separate groups, and the top 400 rate is excluded.

Sources: PSZ, AS, Saez and Zucman (2019), and author's calculations.

Progressivity — other sources: CBO

Average Tax Rates by Before-Tax Income Distribution, 2016

Percent of Income Before Taxes and Transfers



Credit: Jason Furman, https://twitter.com/jasonfurman/status/1181276490047975425

Progressivity — other sources: CBO

Average Tax and Federal Means-tested Transfer Rates for Nonelderly Households by Before-Tax Income Distribution, 2016

Percent of Income Before Taxes and Transfers



General measurement comments



Paul Krugman 🤡 @paulkrugman

I guess my point is that excluding transfers and consideration of incidence sound like rigorous criteria, but are actually more problematic, involving more judgement calls, than they seem 8/

1:30 PM · 15 Oct 19 · Twitter Web App



```
Paul Krugman 🤣
@paulkrugman
```

Saez and Zucman make this point brilliantly, and also tell us a lot about how that happened. So the important thing is not to get too hung up on the technical disputes. The core SZ insight is totally robust 11/

1:37 PM · 15 Oct 19 · Twitter Web App

- Allocate everything consistently with national accounts.
 it does not directly answer any well-defined questions related to consequences of tax-and-transfer system on well-being
- Rely on <u>statutory</u> incidence of taxation
 it is much more arbitrary than you may think and does not answer any well-defined questions related to consequences of tax-and-transfer system on well-being

Measurement at the bottom

sum of taxes ignore transfers, refundable credits,

- sum of taxes •allocate sales/excise tax based on consumption (transfer income not counted!); payroll tax all on employees
 - Sales/excise tax of 10% at the bottom sales tax rates 6-7% with lots of exemptions (food, rent!); gasoline, alcohol, tobacco

• Aside: statutory incidence of payroll tax partially on employers; statutory incidence of sales/excise tax on sellers.

- division sign sales tax based on consumption but no transfer income accounted for \rightarrow infinite/very large tax rate
 - group drop 27 million very low income people when talking about tax rates , still use them for inequality statistics
 - transfers still relevant higher up
 - low income people include: college students (adults 20 and up), institutionalized population, retirees. Demographic trends.
 no economies of scale



Total average tax rates, federal and state, PSZ (2018) vs SZ (2019) Top 0.01%



Year



sum of taxes Big one: corporate tax incidence

• familiar question: does labor bear any burden? Both PSZ and SZ assume no (good recent evidence though that it is > 0, AER papers by Suarez-Serrato and Zidar (2016) and Fuest, Peichl and Siegloch (2018))

• less familiar: does other capital bear burden? Everybody (including PSZ) assumes so. SZ do not.

• why does it matter? Historical trend. According to the wealth data they rely on (I have issues with it, but let's put aside), top 1% owned directly

- 40% of equities and 20% of fixed income in the 1970s
- 60% of equities and 60% of bonds now.

• Move everything to shareholders \rightarrow increase tax liability of the rich in the past. It creates strong trend where there was not much of it.

Total average tax rates, federal and state, PSZ (2018) vs SZ (2019) Top 0.01%



Year







Sum of income Treatment of capital gains

- "Pure" capital gains (over 3%) included in income
- It breaks national accounts (so much for that principle)
- Included in year when realized not earned; double counting if CGs reflect future profits; corresponding losses not fully accounted for

Sum of income

• Recall Auten-Splinter. Put wide confidence bands on measures of inequality

• Where is economic income of Forbes 400 coming from? It's based on Forbes estimates. Best evidence shows about 50% of Forbes estimate on estate tax returns. Maybe evasion, but also (1) debt (2) family ownership (3) errors.

• 2017 and 2018 are projections, no tax data yet

Measurement: bottom line

- Tons of assumptions, inconsistent with the literature but very consequential
- The principle of reliance statutory incidence is economically meaningless, you cannot run away from counterfactuals
- It is also not consistently applied (employer share of payroll, sales tax). Neither is reliance on national accounts consistently applied (population, capital gains)
- Read the book if you can see past the numbers

= The New York Times

Opinion

How to Tax Our Way Back to Justice

It is absurd that the working class is now paying higher tax rates than the richest people in America.

By Emmanuel Saez and Gabriel Zucman

The authors are economists at the University of California, Berkeley.

Oct. 11, 2019

Revenue (%GDP) — VAT and excise



% GDP

Revenue (%GDP) — income and corporate tax



Revenue (%GDP) — Social Security and payroll taxes



Revenue (%GDP) — estate/gift and wealth taxes



Bonus: wealth inequality — Saez-Zucman (2016)

(a) Top 0.1% wealth share



Bonus: wealth inequality — Smith-Zidar-Zwick (2019)

A. Top 0.1% Share of Total Wealth

