



Leonardo Marques dos Santos

Donations and Tax: The Corporate Conundrum

IBFD DOCTORAL SERIES

63

Donations and Tax: The Corporate Conundrum

Why this book?

This book is focused on the concept and functions of corporate charitable donations.

Charitable giving practices have always been a feature of society and will continue to be so in the future. In any case, the current and more widespread understanding of what corporate charitable donations are and of what their functions are, i.e. as mostly altruistic and non-commercial actions, is obsolete. There is still a prevailing misconception regarding the absence of economic benefits for corporations that grant charitable donations. This misconception leads to a misunderstanding of what motivates corporations to donate. This greatly impacts the way tax systems are designed and drafted. In addition, it generates suspicion regarding corporate charitable actions.

This book provides a unique insight into the essential features of corporate charitable donations and their respective functions. It suggests a paradigm shift from an altruism-based approach to a functional approach that allows viewing donations as intrinsically bilateral relations, with benefits arising for both donor and donee. Building on this analysis, and with due consideration for constitutional and international law constraints, the book analyses how to improve the tax technical treatment of corporate charitable donations and perfect tax policy choices behind the tax system. It also provides a research breakthrough in legal and policy analysis, allowing for a move beyond the status quo, which is still mainly grounded in the understanding that any measures associated with donations are exceptional, qualifying as incentives or benefits that do not really form part of the structural features of a sound tax regime.

This book is of value to academics, tax practitioners, tax policymakers and politicians, but also to non-profit organizations, as well as to anyone interested in the topic of taxation of charitable donations and of the charitable sector.

Title:	Donations and Tax: The Corporate Conundrum
Author(s):	Leonardo Marques dos Santos
Date of publication:	12 May 2022
ISBN:	978-90-8722-750-0 (print), 978-90-8722-751-7 (ePub), 978-90-8722-752-4 (PDF)
Type of publication:	Book
Number of pages:	556
Terms:	Shipping fees apply. Shipping information is available on our website
Price (print/online):	EUR 120 / USD 145 (VAT excl.)
Price (eBook: ePub or PDF):	EUR 96 / USD 116 (VAT excl.)

Order information

To order the book, please visit www.ibfd.org/IBFD-Products/shop. You can purchase a copy of the book by means of your credit card, or on the basis of an invoice. Our books encompass a wide variety of topics, and are available in one or more of the following formats:

- IBFD Print books
- IBFD eBooks – downloadable on a variety of electronic devices
- IBFD Online books – accessible online through the IBFD Tax Research Platform



IBFD, Your Portal to Cross-Border Tax Expertise

IBFD

Visitors' address:
Rietlandpark 301
1019 DW Amsterdam
The Netherlands

Postal address:
P.O. Box 20237
1000 HE Amsterdam
The Netherlands

Telephone: 31-20-554 0100
Email: info@ibfd.org
www.ibfd.org

© 2022 IBFD

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the written prior permission of the publisher. Applications for permission to reproduce all or part of this publication should be directed to: permissions@ibfd.org.

Disclaimer

This publication has been carefully compiled by IBFD and/or its author, but no representation is made or warranty given (either express or implied) as to the completeness or accuracy of the information it contains. IBFD and/or the author are not liable for the information in this publication or any decision or consequence based on the use of it. IBFD and/or the author will not be liable for any direct or consequential damages arising from the use of the information contained in this publication. However, IBFD will be liable for damages that are the result of an intentional act (*opzet*) or gross negligence (*grove schuld*) on IBFD's part. In no event shall IBFD's total liability exceed the price of the ordered product. The information contained in this publication is not intended to be an advice on any particular matter. No subscriber or other reader should act on the basis of any matter contained in this publication without considering appropriate professional advice.

The IBFD and/or the author cannot be held responsible for external content, broken links or risks within the external websites that are referenced as hyperlinks within this publication.

Where photocopying of parts of this publication is permitted under article 16B of the 1912 Copyright Act jo. the Decree of 20 June 1974, Stb. 351, as amended by the Decree of 23 August 1985, Stb. 471, and article 17 of the 1912 Copyright Act, legally due fees must be paid to Stichting Reprorecht (P.O. Box 882, 1180 AW Amstelveen). Where the use of parts of this publication for the purpose of anthologies, readers and other compilations (article 16 of the 1912 Copyright Act) is concerned, one should address the publisher.

ISBN 978-90-8722-750-0 (print)
ISBN 978-90-8722-751-7 (eBook, ePub); 978-90-8722-752-4 (eBook, PDF)
ISSN 1570-7164 (print); 2589-9619 (electronic)
NUR 826

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	v
Preface	xvii
Foreword	xxi
Note to Readers	xxiii
List of Abbreviations	xxv

Part I Introduction

Chapter 1:	The Conundrum	3
1.1.	Gifts and donations as a pre-regulatory reality	3
1.2.	The subjective benefits of giving	5
1.3.	From individuals to corporations	7
1.4.	Overcoming the conundrum: A roadmap of the thesis	12
Chapter 2:	Scope and Objectives	15
2.1.	Terminology and descriptive methodology	15
2.2.	Object	17
2.3.	Goals of the book	20
2.4.	Sequence	22

Part II
Donations, Governments and Corporations

Chapter 3:	Charitable Donations and Public Policy	27
3.1.	The need for regulation in corporate charitable donations and its underlying justification	27
3.1.1.	Initial approach	27
3.1.2.	Government and market shortages	28
3.1.2.1.	The need to respond to shortages of charitable supplies	28
3.1.2.2.	Charitable supplies: Material and immaterial	34
3.1.3.	Corporate charitable donations as a democratic exercise of promotion of social integration, awareness and socially accepted values	37
3.1.4.	Prevention of abuse and reduction of suspicion	40
3.1.4.1.	Donor abuse and suspicion regarding abusive practices	40
3.1.4.2.	Depletion of public and private resources and distortion of competition	44
3.1.5.	Constitutional and international law requirements	46
3.1.6.	Reduction of the volume of corporate charitable donations and specific charitable practices	47
3.2.	The tax system as an efficient regulatory or policy instrument	48
3.2.1.	Introductory notes	48
3.2.2.	The tax system and regulatory purposes	49
3.2.3.	The underlying rationale of the charitable deduction: A unified theory of corporate charitable donations	52
3.2.4.	Rethinking the qualification of philanthropic regimes as tax incentives or tax benefits	59
3.2.5.	Exceptionality vis-à-vis structural provisions	64
3.2.6.	Business expenses without a consideration/reciprocation	65
3.2.7.	The efficiency of the tax system as a regulatory or policy instrument	69
3.2.7.1.	The need for philanthropic regimes as tax frameworks applicable to charitable donations	69
3.2.7.2.	The use of the tax system to respond to shortages of charitable supplies	71

3.2.7.3.	Corporate charitable donations and happiness	75
3.2.7.4.	Corporate charitable donations, social integration and awareness of social issues	78
3.2.7.5.	Corporate charitable donations and the promotion of socially accepted values	79
3.2.7.6.	Corporate charitable donations and democracy	80
3.2.7.7.	The tax system, the prevention of abuse and the need for neutrality	80
3.3.	Additional elements	82
Chapter 4:	Donations and Corporations	85
4.1.	Donations as a business tool	85
4.1.1.	Introduction	85
4.1.2.	A closer relationship between corporations and charities	85
4.1.2.1.	Initial approach	85
4.1.2.2.	The benefits of corporate social responsibility	87
4.1.2.3.	Corporate social responsibility and charitable donations	92
4.2.	New philanthropic models	93
4.2.1.	Personal preferences and strategic philanthropy	93
4.2.2.	New approaches to philanthropy: The new role of charities in today's societies	96
4.3.	The economic benefits of corporate charitable donations	99
4.3.1.	Corporate giving motivations	99
4.3.2.	Motivational case studies	101
4.3.2.1.	Philanthropy and patronage as evolving concepts: Effects on donor's motivations	101
4.3.2.2.	Motivations	102
4.3.2.2.1.	Social convention and commercial practices	102
4.3.2.2.2.	Marketing, advertising, overall promotion, networking and public acknowledgement	105
4.3.2.2.3.	Whitewashing and greenwashing effects: Halo effect	110
4.3.2.2.4.	Motivational instrument towards human resources and head-hunting strategies	112

4.3.2.2.5.	Acknowledgement of the quality and necessity of charitable services	114
4.4.	The financial benefits of corporate charitable donations	114
4.5.	Deterrents	116
4.5.1.	Lack of benefits	116
4.5.2.	Emotional and physical fatigue and forced giving or lack of involvement	117
4.5.3.	The belief that there is no obligation to donate more	118
4.5.4.	Scepticism, distrust and lack of transparency as to the use of the funds donated	118
4.5.5.	Lack of alignment with beneficiaries and/or charitable purposes	119
4.5.6.	Lack of time	119
4.5.7.	Unfavourable tax framework	120

Part III

Legal Constraints on the Design and Drafting of Philanthropic Regimes

Chapter 5:	The Impact of Constitutional and International Law	123
5.1.	Constitutional law constraints	123
5.1.1.	Introductory notes	123
5.1.2.	Obligation to implement philanthropic regimes and the legal qualification of reliefs	124
5.1.2.1.	The ability-to-pay principle: Business-driven donations	124
5.1.2.2.	Tax base refinements and mandatory features of the tax system	127
5.1.3.	Constitutional restrictions on philanthropic regimes	133
5.1.3.1.	Restrictions based on equality	133
5.1.3.2.	Restriction of social rights	136
5.2.	Corporate charitable donations and international law	137
5.2.1.	Initial approach	137

5.2.2.	The territorial link of philanthropic regimes	141
5.2.3.	EU primary law	147
5.2.3.1.	From <i>Stauffer</i> to <i>Persche</i>	147
5.2.3.2.	The importance of the substitutive effect of charities regarding governmental functions	150
5.2.3.3.	Acceptable cases of territorial restrictions in the ECJ's case law: From <i>Stauffer</i> to <i>X</i>	153
5.2.3.4.	The roadmap for territorial restrictions	156
5.2.3.5.	Charitable donations to third countries under the free movement of capital	163
5.2.3.6.	The object of the donations	165
5.2.3.7.	The concept of consideration: The court's contribution	166
5.2.3.8.	State aid	170
5.2.4.	Tax and estate, inheritance and gift treaties	174
5.2.4.1.	Tax Treaties and cross-border corporate charitable donations	174
5.2.4.2.	The deductibility non-discrimination provision: Application to corporate charitable donations	178
5.2.5.	Globalization and law	185

Part IV

Tax Policy and Design: In Search of a Balanced Framework

Chapter 6:	How Governments Should Draft Their Philanthropic Regimes	191
6.1.	A design and drafting methodology	191
6.2.	Four essential questions	192
6.3.	The five fundamental premises	194
6.3.1.	First premise: Clarity as to the function, purpose and significance of each provision	194
6.3.2.	Second premise: Societal sensitivity	197
6.3.3.	Third premise: The acknowledgement that donations are multi-functional instruments	199
6.3.4.	Fourth premise: A balance between the achievement of charitable functions and the prevention of out-of-system situations	200
6.3.5.	Fifth premise: Efficiency	201

6.4.	An absolute need to obtain further information	202
6.5.	The concept of corporate charitable donations	204
6.5.1.	Features of the concept	204
6.5.2.	Meaning of voluntary and final transfer	206
6.5.2.1.	Freedom to donate: The sliding scale	206
6.5.2.2.	A final transfer	209
6.5.2.2.1.	Non-refundable nature of corporate charitable donations	209
6.5.2.2.2.	Conditions	211
6.5.3.	The object of the donation	213
6.5.3.1.	Admissible donation objects	213
6.5.3.2.	Non-monetary donations	214
6.5.3.2.1.	Overview of the existing issues	214
6.5.3.2.2.	In favour of in-kind donations	217
6.5.3.2.3.	Regulatory models and ways of dealing with existing issues	219
6.5.3.2.4.	The proposed solution to the appraisal of in-kind donations	224
6.5.3.2.5.	Specific cases	226
6.5.3.2.5.1.	Usufruct, partial interest and other assignments of use	226
6.5.3.2.5.2.	Auctions and discounts	227
6.5.3.2.5.3.	Debt forgiveness and free loans	231
6.5.3.2.5.4.	Volunteer work	232
6.5.3.2.5.5.	Donation of services tout court	236
6.5.3.2.5.6.	Donations of inventory	237
6.5.4.	The appraisal of in-kind charitable donations	238
6.5.4.1.	Introduction and proposed approach: The fair market value	238
6.5.4.2.	The relevance of the appraisal method suggested	239
6.5.4.3.	Meaning of fair market value	242
6.5.4.4.	Fairness to the donor	243
6.5.4.5.	The donor's ability to pay	245
6.5.4.6.	A balance between neutrality and the achievement of charitable functions: Non-monetary and monetary donations	246
6.5.4.7.	A potential double-dip effect: The case of assets subject to a fast depreciation rate	249
6.5.4.8.	Safe harbours	250
6.5.4.9.	Simplification measures: Official quotations or other official values	252

6.5.5.	Parties to corporate charitable donations	253
6.5.5.1.	The baseline	253
6.5.5.2.	Charitable donations from a financial standpoint:	
	A multilateral relationship	254
6.5.5.2.1.	First approach: A non-legal/non-tax perspective	254
6.5.5.2.2.	Donors and beneficiaries	254
6.5.5.2.3.	Taxpayers and governments	257
6.5.5.2.4.	Shareholders and customers	258
6.5.5.3.	Charitable donations from a tax standpoint:	
	A bilateral relationship	259
6.5.5.3.1.	The baseline	259
6.5.5.3.2.	The first and second parties	260
6.5.5.3.3.	The third and fourth parties	264
6.5.5.3.4.	The fifth party	265
6.5.5.4.	The donors	269
6.5.5.4.1.	The criterion to qualify as a corporate donor	269
6.5.5.4.2.	Donors' motives and profiles	270
6.5.5.5.	Beneficiaries	273
6.5.5.5.1.	Eligible beneficiaries and the allocation to charitable purposes	273
6.5.5.5.2.	Legal entities v. individuals	275
6.5.5.5.3.	Legal personality	277
6.5.5.5.3.1.	Suggested approach: Existence of tax personality	277
6.5.5.5.3.2.	Ring-fenced parts of a legal entity as eligible beneficiaries	279
6.5.5.5.4.	The profitability profiles	279
6.5.5.5.5.	Eligibility requirements: Approval of projects and name-by-name lists	281
6.5.5.5.6.	Residency of the beneficiary	286
6.5.6.	Charitable functions and charitable purposes	291
6.5.6.1.	Introductory notes	291
6.5.6.2.	Eligible charitable purposes	291
6.5.6.3.	Allocation of objects to charitable purposes	292
6.5.6.4.	How to set the boundaries of each charitable purpose	296
6.5.6.5.	Timeframe to allocate objects to charitable purposes	297
6.5.6.6.	The non-allocation of objects to specific charitable purposes	298
6.5.7.	The absence of a consideration	299
6.5.7.1.	Concept of consideration for philanthropic purposes	299

6.5.7.2.	A counter-supply in response to a transfer	300
6.5.7.3.	Source of the obligation to reciprocate	306
6.5.7.4.	Social convention and commercial practices and their impact on the qualification/disqualification of a corporate charitable donation	308
6.5.7.5.	The economic value of the consideration	311
6.5.7.6.	Consideration and benefits: Corporate charitable donations as bilateral arrangements	313
6.5.7.7.	Acceptable advantages: A practical criterion	314
6.5.7.8.	The underlying intent	316
6.6.	Anonymity and public giving	317
6.7.	The technical features	321
6.7.1.	Introduction	321
6.7.2.	Credit schemes	322
6.7.3.	Deduction schemes	322
6.7.3.1.	Definition	322
6.7.3.2.	Full deductibility schemes	323
6.7.3.3.	Limited deductibility schemes	324
6.7.3.3.1.	Concept and general overview	324
6.7.3.3.2.	Cap schemes	325
6.7.3.3.3.	Floor schemes	327
6.7.3.3.4.	Corridor schemes	328
6.7.3.3.5.	Other restrictions	328
6.7.3.3.6.	Proposed approach: The full deductibility scheme	329
6.7.4.	Incremental credits/deductions	332
6.7.5.	Top-up schemes	333
6.7.6.	Tax designation schemes	334
6.7.7.	Matching grants	335
6.7.8.	Carry-forward (and backwards) of charitable deductions	336
Chapter 7:	In Search of a Philanthropic Tax Regime for Portugal: A Thought Experiment	339
7.1.	Introduction	339
7.2.	Background and description of the regime currently in force	342
7.2.1.	Background	342
7.2.2.	The Portuguese patronage regime	344

7.3.	The goals and sources of funding of the regime: The four essential questions in practice	355
7.3.1.	Introduction	355
7.3.2.	The goals of the regime	356
7.3.3.	The regime's source of funding	361
7.3.4.	How to fund the regime	364
7.3.5.	Goals of the parties to the philanthropic relationship	364
7.4.	The application of the five fundamental premises in a regime for Portugal	365
7.4.1.	Introduction	365
7.4.2.	First premise: Clarity on the function, purpose and significance of each provision	365
7.4.3.	Second premise: Societal sensitivity	369
7.4.3.1.	Main points	369
7.4.3.2.	Motives that justify the approval of the regime and justification of the charitable functions	370
7.4.3.3.	Impact of the Portuguese philanthropic roots	374
7.4.3.4.	The importance of charities in Portuguese society	375
7.4.3.5.	The giving inclinations of Portuguese donors	376
7.4.4.	Third premise: Acknowledgement that donations are a multifunctional instrument	377
7.4.5.	Fourth premise: A balance between the functions and the prevention of out-of-system situations	378
7.4.6.	Fifth premise: Efficiency	380
7.5.	Periodic revision of the regime	381
7.6.	Proposed definition of "corporate charitable donation"	383
7.6.1.	Tax nature of the concept	383
7.6.2.	Switch from a delivery to a voluntary and final transfer	384
7.6.3.	Conditions	385
7.6.4.	The object of the donation	387
7.6.4.1.	Monetary donations	387
7.6.4.2.	Non-monetary donations	389
7.6.4.3.	Specific cases: The Portuguese standpoint	392
7.6.4.3.1.	Usufruct, partial interest and other assignments of use	392
7.6.4.3.2.	Supplies over market price, discounts and auctions	393

7.6.4.3.3.	Debt forgiveness and free loans	395
7.6.4.3.4.	Volunteer work and services	396
7.6.4.4.	Appraisal of in-kind donations	399
7.6.4.4.1.	Introduction	399
7.6.4.4.2.	The use of transfer pricing rules for appraisal	399
7.6.4.4.3.	Safe harbours	401
7.6.4.4.4.	Simplification measures	402
7.6.4.4.4.1.	Organized market quotations	402
7.6.4.4.4.2.	Real estate	403
7.6.4.4.4.3.	Donations of time	403
7.6.5.	Eligible donors	404
7.6.6.	Publication of donor lists	405
7.6.7.	Beneficiaries and charitable purposes	407
7.6.7.1.	Introductory notes	407
7.6.7.2.	Individuals as eligible beneficiaries	408
7.6.7.3.	Donations to platforms without legal personality	410
7.6.7.4.	Donations to for-profit beneficiaries	411
7.6.7.5.	Suitability of the project and creation of a name-based list of beneficiaries	414
7.6.8.	Deduction scheme, caps and incremental deductions	418
7.6.9.	Matching grants	420
7.6.10.	Consideration	421
7.7.	Carry-forward charitable donations	423
7.8.	Territorial features and cross-border scenarios	424
7.9.	Anti-abuse provisions	425
Final Conclusions		429
Annex		451
List of Case Law of the Court of Justice of the European Union		465
List of Advocate General's Opinions		469
Select Bibliography		471
Other References		523

Preface

This book is focused on the concept of corporate charitable donation. It aims to explore the different tax policy considerations that should be taken into account by decision makers around the globe in the design of philanthropic regimes that are adjusted to their specific temporal and geographic idiosyncrasies. The book is also intended to suggest a legal setting able to stimulate the social functions of donation for the fulfilment of critical societal challenges and needs. It aims to provide a research breakthrough in legal and policy analysis, allowing progression beyond the current predominant legal theory, which is still mainly grounded in the understanding that any measures associated with donations are exceptional, qualifying as incentives or benefits that do not really belong to the structural features of a sound tax regime.

The book is based on the understanding that corporate charitable donations are evolutive. They are pre-regulatory realities grounded in social, behavioural, moral, ethical and even religious elements. This factor needs to be considered in the design of any philanthropic regime.

In addition, the research aims to allow a paradigm shift from an *altruistic approach* to a *functional approach*. It departs from the fundamental premise that a disposal should be considered a corporate charitable donation depending on the *societal functions* achieved. As such, a donation will exist as long as a disposal contributes to the reduction of charitable shortages, to further social integration, to promote widespread values or to raise awareness of social issues, even if there is no *animus donandi*. This allows viewing donations as occurring in the context of intrinsically bilateral relations, with benefits arising for both donee and donor.

There is certainly a material/physical dimension to most donations. However, and breaking with some traditional approaches, this book acknowledges that there is also an important immaterial dimension, as many charitable donations have effects at the level of the habits, knowledge and/or personal development of community members (e.g. cultural development). The acceptance of this immaterial facet is a first step towards an understanding of giving practices as bilateral relations, with benefits for both parties. Corporate donors, simply by participating in a philanthropic relationship, become exposed to a setting that allows them to be beneficiaries of their own donations (e.g. by donating to a museum, donors become exposed to a cultured setting).

In addition, charitable donations' societal functions go far beyond reducing shortages of charitable supplies. By allowing a strengthening of relationships between donors and charitable beneficiaries, donations also contribute to social integration, bringing together social classes and different segments of society. They further contribute to the dissemination of core societal values and principles worthy of protection and raise awareness of social issues that otherwise could remain unknown.

Moreover, in the current state of development, the survival of modern corporations depends on their social integration with the communities with which they interact. Anti-social behaviours tend to be frowned upon by the community and affect business. Thus, donations must be seen as instruments of communal integration that allow corporate donors to demonstrate their social concerns to their customers, and even to their collaborators and employees. Even if it seems counter-intuitive, corporate donations should not be seen as a conundrum but rather perceived as instruments allowing corporations to pursue their business objectives, observe social conventions and commercial practices and, in a nutshell, potentiate their search for profit.

Considering all of the above, this book suggests a tax concept of corporate charitable donations and describes how corporate philanthropic regimes should be designed from a tax policy perspective. The proposal is a particularly broad-minded one in terms of eligible objects, in that it sustains the admissibility of in-kind donations, notably volunteer work or assignments of use. It also recommends expanding the scope of beneficiaries, whether they be individuals or other for-profit entities. Driven by the need to maximize the business objectives underlying most corporate charitable donations, the proposal describes which economic benefits can be derived from giving practices that do not disqualify a donation (by constituting a consideration).

The impact of international law on the design of domestic philanthropic regimes is also considered. The case law of the Court of Justice of the European Union on cross-border donations is critically reviewed, in a way that allows for a wider reading of the court's rulings. Despite the limitations, the book clearly points out that Member States retain much more leeway than traditional doctrine recognizes, particularly in the inclusion of certain territorial features.

Despite the absence of specific international law instruments regulating the subject matter, the book provides new insights into the functions and limits emerging from the non-discrimination provisions included in most tax

treaties. Inter alia, those provisions clearly point in the direction of requiring a mandatory deduction of corporate charitable donations in a significant number of cases.

As in any regime, the prevention of abusive practices and the fight against the traditional veil of suspicion hovering over the use of resources by charities are also a concern. As such, a cross-checking methodology is suggested. Accordingly, both donors and donees should contribute to controlling the accuracy of the elements to be taken into account for the production of any legal and tax entitlements.

Based on the understanding that charitable deductions/credits should mostly be seen as structural features of each tax system, the book suggests the elimination of any tax incentives or benefits from philanthropic regimes (e.g. incremental deductions).

In conclusion, this book aims at leading to a new understanding of the concept, role and functions of corporate charitable donations. Besides its theoretical merits, this new understanding is used as the basis for a discussion of the tax policy elements that should be used by decision makers throughout the world in the design of new philanthropic regimes. Their revision in the light of the coordinates provided by this book is crucial, since this allows, on the one hand, reconciling the regimes with constitutional imperatives and, on the other hand, strengthening the role of corporate charitable donations in the construction of better communities and societies.

Note to Readers

The research that forms the basis of this book was concluded on 30 September 2020, prior to its submission as a doctoral thesis to the Portuguese Catholic University, and updated on July 2021, following the defence of the thesis. Subsequent developments in legislation and case law have not been considered.

Foreign research materials were quoted in their official or authorized English translations. All other translations not specifically attributed to a source are the responsibility of the author.

Chapter 1

The Conundrum

1.1. Gifts and donations as a pre-regulatory reality

Giving is an existential imperative inherent in the cooperation that entails being – as man is – a social creature.¹

As Francis Bacon stated, “the inclination to goodness is imprinted deeply in the nature of man”.² Mutual help and support, as well as feelings of personal satisfaction and accomplishment that arise from helping or pleasing someone, have always featured in human relationships. To quote from the Prayer of Saint Francis, “it is in giving that we receive”. The human ability to love and care for others, which involves the capacity to give without receiving back, has, in effect, been reported since the beginning of time.³

Giving thus predates modern legal and tax systems. It is a pre-regulatory reality associated with the very existence of human beings and their organization in communities.⁴ As noted by Bruce R. Sievers, the “allocation of private resources to important public needs is an idea deeply grounded in human history”.⁵ This implies a concept of charitable donation strongly linked to each society and culture, with well-known anthropological,

1. See Aristotle, *Politics*, translated by C. Lord (University of Chicago Press 2013).

2. F. Bacon, *Essays of Francis Bacon* p. 54 (Charles Scribner’s Sons 1908).

3. See R.H. Bremner, *Giving: Charity and Philanthropy in History* p. 5 (Transaction Publishers 2000); and F.H.M. Grapperhaus, *Taxes through the Ages: A Pictorial History* p. 4 (IBFD 2009).

4. For feelings of love and benevolence, as well as acts of sharing in animal and vegetable species, see C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*, vol. II, p. 109 inter alia (Princeton University Press 1981); and L.A. Dugatkin, *Cooperation among Animals: An Evolutionary Perspective* (Oxford University Press 1997).

5. B.R. Sievers, *Civil Society, Philanthropy and the Fate of the Commons* p. 12 (Tufts University Press 2010). For examples of charitable giving throughout the ages, see also P.D. Hall, *Historical Perspectives of Nonprofit Organizations in the United States*, in *The Jossey-Bass Handbook of Nonprofit Management and Leadership* p. 3 (R. Herman ed., 2nd ed., Jossey-Bass Publishers 2004); *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History* (L.J. Friedman & M.D. McGarvie eds., Cambridge University Press 2004); P.D. Hall, *A Historical Overview of Philanthropy, Voluntary Associations, and Nonprofit Organizations in the United States, 1600-2000*, in *The Non-Profit Sector: A Research Handbook* p. 34 (W.W. Powell & R. Steinberg eds., 2nd ed., Yale University Press 2006); and G. McCully, *Philanthropy Reconsidered: Private Initiatives – Public Good – Quality of Life* (AuthorHouse 2008).

sociological, psychological and even religious roots.⁶ The result is that humans, formally or informally, to a greater or lesser extent, volunteer time, services, resources and goods to help others.⁷

Gifts and charitable donations, as well as other types of disposals, are on the border of what is subject to legal protection. Some disposals do not even match any legal concepts and only bear significance in terms of societal notions of honour.⁸ Melvin Aron Eisenberg goes so far as to defend the claim that the affective values of love, friendship, affection, gratitude and comradeship, which are the prime motivating forces behind acts of giving, are too important to be enforced by law.⁹

Bearing in mind the above, the social “genetic markers” that feature charitable donations must be duly appreciated if one intends to fully understand the concept. Also, given that donations are a pre-regulatory reality, it is difficult to ignore the fact that, to a certain extent, the tax concept of charitable donation is, or should be, built upon societal, behavioural, moral, ethical and even religious rules of conduct.¹⁰ Thus, when it comes to the regulation of charitable donations, the law cannot stand isolated from the social setting it aims to regulate. The law comes second to an already existing (and socially regulated) reality.

The consequences of such non-legal roots are, as far as the author is concerned, many:

- the core characteristics of the concept of charitable donation tend to remain unaltered. However, being a social phenomenon, the specific features of corporate charitable donations change according to the

6. See K.C. Robbins, *The Nonprofit Sector in Historical Perspective: Traditions of Philanthropy in the West*, in *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook* (W.W. Powell & R. Steinberg eds., 2nd ed., Yale University Press 2006); H.K. Anheier & L.M. Salamon, *The Nonprofit Sector in Comparative Perspective*, in *The Non-Profit Sector: A Research Handbook* pp. 13-31 and 89-114 (W.W. Powell & R. Steinberg eds., 2nd ed., Yale University Press 2006); and R.L. Payton & M.P. Moody, *Understanding Philanthropy: Its Meaning and Mission* pp. 13-14 and 31 (Indiana University Press 2008). For references to giving in literature throughout the ages, see *The Perfect Gift: The Philanthropic Imagination in Poetry and Prose* (A.A. Kass ed., Indiana University Press 2002).

7. See R.L. Payton & M.P. Moody, *Understanding Philanthropy: Its Meaning and Mission* p. 16 et seq. (Indiana University Press 2008).

8. See J.M. Vieira Gomes & A.F. de Sousa, *Acordos de Honra, Prestações de Cortesia e Contratos*, in *Estudos dedicados ao Prof. Doutor Mário Júlio de Almeida Costa* pp. 861-862 (Universidade Católica Editora 2002).

9. See M.A. Eisenberg, *The World of Contract and the World of Gift*, 85 California Law Review 4, p. 849 (1997).

10. See A. Luks & P. Payne, *The Healing Power of Doing Good* p. 157 et seq. (iUniverse.com 2001).

geographic and temporal framework of the charitable actions. This requires not only the periodic revision of philanthropic regimes but also accepting an evolving understanding of the functions that donations serve for society and for donors. Important tax policy ramifications result from this assertion;

- there is a pre-legal understanding of the features of the concept of charitable donation;
- the law often relies on pre-existing notions to implement specific philanthropic policy options;
- the legal and tax features of both the notion of charitable donation and philanthropic regimes should not be bluntly disruptive of their ontological characteristics. What can be considered admissible as a token of appreciation when receiving a charitable donation, for instance, is based on a sociological understanding. That understanding must be taken into consideration when drafting tax regimes; and
- the ontological concept and, consequently, the tax concept of charitable donation may not fully match with any (or any single) legal regime.

1.2. The subjective benefits of giving

Most of the literature on the underlying reasons for giving acknowledges some form of subjective advantage for the donor emerging from the donation.¹¹

Research carried out in different fields of knowledge reveals that charitable actions among humans lead to a sense of self-fulfilment, happiness and success, or even to future benefits for the donor.¹² It has also demonstrated that acts of generosity, such as volunteering, activate a part of the brain usually

11. See L. Anik et al., *Feeling Good about Giving: The Benefits (and Costs) of Self-Interested Charitable Behavior* pp. 1-22 (Harvard Business School Working Paper 10-012 2009); M.A. Livingston & D.S. Gamage, *Taxation: Law, Planning, and Policy* p. 387 (LexisNexis 2010); and E.W. Dunn, L.B. Aknin & M.I. Norton, *Prosocial Spending and Happiness: Using Money to Benefit Others Pays Off*, 3 *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 1, pp. 41-47 (2014). Michael Gurven et al. also propose that certain animals that gather more food than they consume and share the remainder are also more likely to receive additional food during hard times (e.g. in the face of sickness, disease, injury or accidents). See M. Gurven et al., *It's a Wonderful Life: Signaling Generosity among the Ache of Paraguay*, 21 *Evolution and Human Behavior*, pp. 263-282 (2000).

12. On the practical effects derived from the premise that helping others produces positive effects for the helper (e.g. so-called helper therapy and its application in the method of peer assistance used by Alcoholics Anonymous), see F. Riessman, *The "Helper" Therapy Principle*, 10 *Social Work* 2, pp. 27-32 (1965). See also W.D. Andrews, *Personal Deductions*

associated with the enjoyment of food, sex or drugs.¹³ A landmark study conducted by Allan Luk refers to the term “helper’s high” to describe such effects.¹⁴ According to this author, regular helpers are much more likely to be in good physical and emotional health than non-helpers. James Andreoni, an economist, invokes the concept of a “warm glow” and maintains that people are impure in their giving actions (a phenomenon he calls “impure altruism”), as they gain benefits from donating, i.e. a positive emotional response derived from acts of charity.¹⁵ Charlie L. Hardy and Mark van Vugt reached the conclusion that “in a reputation environment when contributions were public, people were more altruistic”.¹⁶ As noted by Mark G. Kelman, an altruistic action at least “buys the scarce resource of looking altruistic”.¹⁷

Moreover, historically, there have even existed numerous contexts in which gifts are not truly unilateral, in the sense that there is a social obligation to reciprocate. The gift creates a bond between donor and donee, apart from the boundaries of legal regimes, based on honour or integrity, which imposes an obligation to reciprocate. Several societies have, in fact, been based on gifts (so-called gift-based economies). Traces of such principles still exist in current societies. A gift for a special occasion (a wedding or a birthday) creates an obligation to reciprocate both to the invitation and to the act of giving (the principle of *do ut des*: I give so that you may give in return).¹⁸ This adds to the social and sociological background behind the concept of charitable donation.

in an Ideal Income Tax, 86 Harvard Law Review 2, p. 314 (1972); and H.K. Anheier & R.A. List, *A Dictionary of Civil Society, Philanthropy and the Non-Profit Sector* pp. 196 and 250-251 (Routledge 2005).

13. See D.J. Linden, *The Compass of Pleasure: How Our Brains Make Fatty Foods, Orgasm, Exercise, Marijuana, Generosity, Vodka, Learning, and Gambling Feel So Good* (Penguin Group 2011); and J. Santi, *The Giving Way to Happiness: Stories and Science behind the Life-Changing Power of Giving* p. 7 (Penguin Random House 2015).

14. See A. Luks, *Helper’s High*, 22 Psychology Today 10, pp. 34-42 (1988); and A. Luks & P. Payne, *The Healing Power of Doing Good* (iUniverse.com 2001).

15. See J. Andreoni, *Giving with Impure Altruism: Application to Charity and Ricardian Equivalence*, 97 The Journal of Political Economy, pp. 1447-1458 (1989); and J. Andreoni, *Impure Altruism and Donations to Public Goods: A Theory of Warm-Glow Giving*, 100 The Economic Journal 401, pp. 464-477 (1990).

16. See C.L. Hardy & M. van Vugt, *Nice Guys Finish First: The Competitive Altruism Hypothesis*, 32 Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, pp. 1402-1413 (2006).

17. M.G. Kelman, *Personal Deductions Revisited: Why They Fit Poorly in an “Ideal” Income Tax and Why They Fit Worse in a Far from Ideal World*, 31 Stanford Law Review 5, p. 880 (1979).

18. See M. Mauss, *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies* (Routledge Classics 1990); and M.A. Eisenberg, *The World of Contract and the World of Gift*, 85 California Law Review 4, pp. 821-866 (1997).

Although there are multiple reasons to adopt giving patterns, as per the above, what is distinctive, as follows from research done in multiple areas, is that giving also results in benefits to the donor: if not other benefits, at least peace of mind, a sense of achievement that results from obeying the rules of society or avoidance of the guilt that arises as a result of breaching those rules.

However, to accept – as the author does – the premise that giving brings benefits to the giver implies that giving entails a mutually beneficial relationship between giver and receiver.

In the author's view, acknowledging the reciprocity of benefits leads to a change of paradigm in philanthropic relationships, because it means that donations, ontologically, are not (or are not always) disinterested. Donations are also triggered by donors' intentions of obtaining certain benefits. These benefits may be more or less explicit and may play a larger or a smaller role in the individual psychological decision to engage in an act of giving. But they do tend to be present.

Accordingly, from a tax policy standpoint, the mere existence of benefits per se should not disqualify a charitable donation. As stated by Mark A. Hall and John D. Colombo, "all gifts partake of some form of self-interest".¹⁹ The existence of benefits just makes it harder to set the boundaries of the concept of charitable donation with precision.

1.3. From individuals to corporations

At first sight, the notion of *corporate* charitable donations seems almost paradoxical. The (apparent) paradox is due to the difficulties in reconciling fundamentally existential actions of individuals with legal entities and acts of giving with profitable activities: this is *the conundrum*.²⁰

It seems difficult to reconcile a behaviour that is triggered, notably, by personal psychological feelings with acts of legal entities that are emotionally

19. M.A. Hall & J.D. Colombo, *The Donative Theory of the Charitable Tax Exemption*, 52 Ohio State Law Journal, p. 1406 (1991).

20. See I.C. Bouúuert, *Tax Problems of Cultural Foundations and Patronage in the European Community* pp. 50-51 (Kluwer Law and Taxation Publishing Division 1976); and J.L. Himmelstein, *Looking Good and Doing Good: Corporate Philanthropy and Corporate Power* p. 7 et seq. (Indiana University Press 1997).

detached and, in many cases, profit-driven.²¹ Apparently, there is nothing more antithetical to profit than a donation (that does not require a consideration).

However, corporations do have an existential substrate. Though they do not have a physical existence, they do have a legal one, i.e. they also *exist*. Naturally, the feelings of satisfaction and self-fulfilment derived by individuals will not arise at the level of legal entities, as they are, after all, creatures of law.²² In addition, the emotions that may arise for individuals in governance bodies do not allow the establishment of a direct parallel with the reciprocity identified at a purely the human level. This is because a legal entity cannot be misidentified with the individuals acting on its behalf.

Nonetheless, as the author will demonstrate, disposals in a corporate setting are not completely outside the paradigm of interpersonal relations.²³

Corporations do not stand in isolation from the rest of society. Their existence, as well as their survival, depends, as with individuals, on the cooperative actions established between them and with human beings. Thus, corporate charitable donations are still granted based on an agenda ultimately linked to the survival of the entity.

Existence and survival in a corporate setting, however, differ from existence and survival in the case of human beings, as corporations rely on maintaining a reasonable level of earnings. It is true that, in some cases, corporations are not profitable and are mostly maintained for emotional reasons (for instance). However, this is neither the rule nor the real purpose of corporations, which exist to pursue profits. Thus, corporate giving actions still relate to the pursuance of economic or financial advantages (directly or indirectly, in the short run or in the long run).

Ultimately, by accepting that corporate donors derive benefits from charitable actions, one must also accept that the obtention of such benefits may drive donations. In addition, if the benefits to society arising from such giving actions are not diminished by the search for business advantages, the donor's intention is, to some extent, irrelevant to the concept of corporate

21. See A.M. Portugal, *A Dedutibilidade dos Custos na Jurisprudência Fiscal Portuguesa* p. 147 (Coimbra Editora 2004).

22. The expression "companies are creatures of the law" was disseminated in UK: ECJ, 27 Sept. 1988, Case 81/87, *The Queen v. H.R. Revenue and Customs of Inland Revenue, ex parte Daily Mail and General Trust plc*, [1988] ECR 5483, Case Law IBFD, at para. 19.

23. See ch. 4.

charitable donation. Consequently, elements such as altruism or donative intent, for instance – which are more personal in nature – are not relevant to the concept either.

In the author's opinion, the qualification of a disposal as a corporate charitable donation mostly depends on the charitable function it achieves from a societal standpoint. As such, this research will demonstrate that corporate charitable donations can be construed as acts of business.²⁴

To have corporations follow giving practices that, at their genesis, are linked to living beings is contingent on three requirements: (i) their being *possible*; (ii) their being *necessary*; and (iii) their being *adequate*.²⁵

First and foremost, charitable donations are granted by corporations because this possibility tends to result from the legal framework applicable (i.e. corporate donations are *possible*). This *lapalissade* comes, however, with severe caveats. After all, corporate charitable donations – as any other corporate actions – may be restricted by the law, notably regarding the amount, the periodicity, the features of the donors and the sorts of beneficiaries.

This much is to say that, if corporate charitable donations were not legally possible (because they were null/void) or triggered severe consequences (incurring civil or criminal liability or leading to the dismantling of the legal entity), charitable donations would not be a legitimate option for corporations.²⁶

Corporate charitable donations are also *necessary*. It is stressed that this necessity respects the needs of the community, but also the needs of corporations. Chapters 3 and 4 will expand on these issues. For now, let it be simply stated that corporate charitable donations are necessary, given the need to secure certain charitable functions. These relate to supplies of charitable goods and services that are not provided on the conditions and in the amounts necessary either by governments or by the market. Moreover, these functions also respect the need to further social integration, spread

24. See M.E. Porter & M.R. Kramer, *The Competitive Advantage of Corporate Philanthropy*, 80 Harvard Business Review, pp. 5-16 (Dec. 2002).

25. For a conceptual analysis on adequacy, necessity and proportionality, see J.F. Pinto Nogueira, *Direito Fiscal Europeu – o paradigma da proporcionalidade, a proporcionalidade como critério central da compatibilidade de normas tributárias internas com as liberdades fundamentais* pp. 99-109 inter alia (Wolters Kluwer/Coimbra Editora 2010).

26. Note that, even though the legal capacity to execute liberalities is extremely debatable from a corporate law standpoint, the author will not tackle such issues in the current work.

(charitable) values deemed worthy by each society, induce social and democratic behaviours and raise awareness of social issues.²⁷

The need for corporate charitable donations must not be based only on purely financial metrics but also on axiological advantages (the so-called moral imagination).²⁸ Corporations, being an essential part of society – and, in many cases, an instrument that shapes society – must respond to the same core moral standards as individuals. For this to happen, it is important to have them executing charitable donations.

To restrict acts of giving to individuals would also limit the efficacy of charitable donations. By broadening the range of donors by means of adding legal entities that feature specific (favourable) characteristics (e.g. access to funds, the need to pursue these actions and multinational influence), charitable giving becomes more effective.

Corporate charitable donations are also an *adequate* societal and corporate instrument, given that businesses will benefit from being fully integrated with society (i.e. in their relevant market).

Donations are, therefore, an efficient response to what makes corporate giving actions necessary. This ultimately means that corporations have an incentive to donate.²⁹ Otherwise, no donations would be granted and their charitable functions would not be fulfilled.

Corporations donate to charity because it is in line with their business agenda. As Ineke Koele notes, some authors even defend the proposition that “any expenditure not made for a business purpose must be inspired by the personal motive of the shareholders and, therefore, constitutes a dividend distribution. Thus, a true gift, that is, a donation with *animus donandi*, out of kindness, with no ulterior (business) motive – cannot be attributed to the corporation, but to its shareholders”.³⁰

Still, in the author’s opinion, there are several underlying reasons for corporations to donate. These range from purely internally motivated to externally

27. See R.L. Payton & M.P. Moody, *Understanding Philanthropy: Its Meaning and Mission* p. 11 (Indiana University Press 2008).

28. See R.L. Payton & M.P. Moody, *Understanding Philanthropy: Its Meaning and Mission* p. 132 (Indiana University Press 2008).

29. See A. Malani & E.A. Posner, *The Case for For-Profit Charities*, 93 Virginia Law Review, p. 22 (2007).

30. I. Koele, *The Netherlands*, in *International Charitable Giving* p. 381 (C. Cutbill, A. Paines & M. Hallam eds., Oxford University Press 2012).

motivated decisions. Corporate charitable donations are internally motivated when they are actively used with a business agenda (e.g. promotion, in the same way as buying advertising time on television).³¹ Corporate charitable donations are externally motivated when they are granted as a reaction to a social expectation that corporations should adopt a certain behaviour. The breach of such expectations may, notably, affect market demand. In addition, there may be externally motivated decisions of a legal nature. In these cases, the motivation (or main motivation) results from a specific tax/legal regime, such as tax incentives, tax benefits or other advantages.

According to Richard A. Posner, most people would feel guilty about stealing, even if not caught.³² A similar point, so the author believes, can be made with respect to not giving, in specific settings. In such cases, there may be a sense of shame or embarrassment arising from not respecting what can be perceived as a social demand. This is because social censure may arise as a result of not meeting certain societal practical expectations.

In the corporate context, in contrast to the individual context, guilt cannot be, using Posner's expression, a "self-enforcing" sanction, given that corporations are per se amoral entities.³³ In any case, further to the individuals presiding over corporate bodies, compliance with ethical standards or social conventions may affect businesses because of the perceptions created among consumers or stakeholders, who might not be able to understand why a corporation would not show any social concern.

Broadly speaking, in many marketplaces, especially consumers' markets, there is a corporate downside to not showing any real social integration. Studies conducted in this field, notably by Baruch Lev, Christine Petrovits and Suresh Radhakrishnan, do point to an increase in customer satisfaction when corporations engage in charitable actions.³⁴

Donations are also made to incorporate social status, to develop networking channels, to open new markets, to promote future business deals and to access qualified employees, among other reasons.

31. See ch. 3.

32. See R. Posner, *Frontiers of Legal Theory* p. 291 (Harvard University Press 2001).

33. See R. Posner, *Frontiers of Legal Theory* p. 291 (Harvard University Press 2001).

34. See B. Lev, C. Petrovits & S. Radhakrishnan, *Is Doing Good for You? How Corporate Charitable Contributions Enhance Revenue Growth*, 31 Strategic Management Journal, pp. 182-200 (2010).

The above-described motives trigger – willingly or unwillingly – corporate donations, making them *adequate* to meet a corporate function and, consequently, allowing them to comply with their social functions.

1.4. Overcoming the conundrum: A roadmap of the thesis

As described in section 1.3., corporate charitable donations are triggered by different underlying motivations, have different features and are used to pursue different goals. In this book, the author argues that corporate charitable donations can be a business instrument, motivated by reasons either internal or external to the corporation. That is to say, corporate charitable donations must, in non-pathological scenarios (i.e. when corporate assets are not used abusively, notably by individuals wanting to pursue personal agendas), be treated as a business expense.

The refusal to identify altruism as a *sine qua non* requirement for a corporate charitable donation and the acceptance of the notion that benefits may arise for donors as a result of their giving actions are the elements that solve the (apparent) corporate conundrum. Removing altruism from the equation means that an underlying business purpose may exist in corporate charitable donations, and this leads to accepting the proposition that corporations may grant donations and still be pursuing their corporate agenda. In short, by accepting the idea that benefits arise for the donor and that these do not disqualify the charitable donation, even ontologically, it must also be accepted that the trigger for the donation may be the attainment of such benefits. Thus, donations may be (and in most cases are) business-driven.

In any case, the settings in which corporate charitable donations are granted and the aims pursued by corporate charitable donations, as well as the very elements of the concept of a corporate charitable donation itself must be broken down so that its tax regime can be accurately built up.

Michael E. Porter and Mark R. Kramer identify a “convergence of interests”, as, in many cases, corporate charitable expenditures produce, on the one hand, social benefits but, on the other hand, bring economic advantages to corporate donors.³⁵ These authors defend the claim that such a convergence of interests does not happen in all situations. However, to accept that

35. See M.E. Porter & M.R. Kramer, *The Competitive Advantage of Corporate Philanthropy*, 80 Harvard Business Review, pp. 5-16 (2002).

these social expenditures may yield economic benefits automatically allows, at least, an assessment of whether the decision was business-driven.

The existence of a business intent, being a subjective element, is extremely difficult to define from a theoretical standpoint, and even harder to prove. In the author's opinion, the business driver cannot be assessed by trying to find the donor's intent. Simply put, in cases in which the business driver is not evident, there must be a consistent line of reasoning by the donor demonstrating that, in each specific context, there is a link between the donation and the business activity.

Given that donations will not have a consideration, the elements that allow a more objective assessment are more difficult to find. However, difficult as it may sometimes be to confirm the business driver of corporate charitable donations, questions as to the business link of expenses are not an issue that is specific to charitable giving. Such uncertainties regularly exist in corporate settings regarding several types of expenses incurred.

In addition, one should never discount the existence of a certain level of promiscuity in respect of business expenses. There is always a certain degree of confusion between the private lives of businesspeople and the business sphere (e.g. taking the family out to dinner with the family of an important client who is particularly fond of these contexts). The two spheres can and do overlap, even in the absence of any abuse. This confusion adds complexity to the act of distinguishing between cases in which the business driver is present and those in which it is not.

This much is to say that the business-purpose test must not be based on suspicion just because donations do not trigger a consideration. A business-purpose test must, however, be carried out.

In this regard, the author will expand on the most paradigmatic business drivers in chapter 4 in order to demonstrate how such a business test must be carried out in the case of corporate charitable donations.

Notes

Contact

IBFD Head Office
Rietlandpark 301
1019 DW Amsterdam
P.O. Box 20237
1000 HE Amsterdam
The Netherlands

Tel.: +31-20-554 0100 (GMT+1)

Email: info@ibfd.org

Web: www.ibfd.org



IBFD, Your Portal to Cross-Border Tax Expertise