# A PARALLEL UNIVERSE? Countering the neo-liberal economic arguments for offshore

Mark P Hampton University of Kent

John Christensen Tax Justice Network

#### A Parallel Universe?

The paper's central points:

- Some neo-liberals inhabit a strange parallel universe
- Tax competition: argument, what argument?
- The 6 propositions are untenable
- Tax havens can't be defended using this logic

### Tax competition

- Tax competition & economic theory
- Firms compete & act as profit maximisers
- BUT states don't compete with each other as revenue maximisers
- So tax competition is an illogical concept

## The Heritage Foundation:

"Tax competition is a positive force in the global economy. It forces politicians to be more responsible, pushing tax rates down and allowing people to enjoy more of the money they earn."

(Daniel J. Mitchell, 2002, p.31, emphasis added)

## Tax competition

- "Tax competition is a healthy & natural economic process which weeds out stupid or inefficient taxes." (T. Dwyer, 2002, p.52)
- "No offshore centre is forcing any OECD country to have a bloated welfare state or impose high taxes on labour & capital" (T. Dwyer, 2002, p.61)

#### The six propositions. Tax havens:

- enable companies to legitimately maximize their 'tax efficiency'
- demonstrate healthy free markets in operation
- are conduits for capital
- are an 'antidote' (discipline) to High Tax High Spend governments
- are exemplars of successful government
- act as fiscal refuges for wealthy individuals

#### References

- Breton, A. (2001) 'Some political consequences of economic globalization.' Paper read at Conference on Re-inventing Society in a Changing Global Economy, Toronto, 8-10 March. Online version <a href="http://www.utoronto.ca/enthnicstudies/Breton\_paper.pdf">http://www.utoronto.ca/enthnicstudies/Breton\_paper.pdf</a>
- Dwyer, T. (2002) '"Harmful" tax competition and the future of offshore financial centres such as Vanuatu.' *Pacific Economic Bulletin*, 15 (1) 48-69.
- Teather, R. (2002) 'Harmful Tax Competition?' *Economic Affairs* 22 (4) 58-63.