
Nonprofit Forum

**Reflections on Inurement, Private Benefit,
and Excess Benefit Transactions**

Harvey P. Dale*
October 17, 2001

Introduction

This paper contains reflections on three distinct but closely-related notions in the Internal Revenue Code. All concern charities described in § 501(c)(3)¹ but two also impact other types of tax-exempt organizations.² Two are creatures of the statute;³ the other is a child of the Treasury Regulations.⁴ Two are of fairly ancient lineage⁵ whereas

¹ All section references, unless otherwise indicated, are to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, or to the Treasury Regulations promulgated thereunder.

² As will be seen, the inurement proscription applies to many types of organizations described in § 501(c). The § 4958 excess benefit regime covers both § 501(c)(3) charities and § 501(c)(4) social welfare organizations. § 4958(e). The principal focus in this paper will be upon charitable, i.e., § 501(c)(3), organizations.

³ The inurement regime is based upon language in § 501(c)(3) and several other paragraphs of § 501(c), although substantially-identical words also appear in Treas. Reg. § 1.501(c)(5)-1(a)(1). The excess benefit rules are contained in § 4958.

⁴ The limitation on private benefit stems from Treas. Reg. § 1.501(c)(3)-1(d)(1)(ii), which reads:

“An organization is not organized or operated exclusively for one or more of the purposes specified in subdivision (i) of this subparagraph unless it serves a public rather than a private interest. Thus, to meet the requirement of this subdivision, it is necessary for an organization to establish that it is not organized or operated for the benefit of private interests such as designated individuals, the creator or his family, shareholders of the organization, or persons controlled, directly or indirectly, by such private interests.”

⁵ The statutory anti-inurement language in § 501(c)(3) dates from 1909. See text accompanying note 13 below. The regulatory private-benefit-limiting language was first adopted in 1958 by T.D. 6301. See text accompanying note 40 below.

⁶ § 4958 was added to the Code by § 1311(a) of the Taxpayer Bill of Rights 2, Pub. L. No. 104-168, 110 Stat. 1452 (1996), which was signed into law by President Clinton on July 30, 1996. It was made effective retroactively to Sept. 14, 1995. See note 125 below.

the third is not yet two years old.⁶ Taken together, they police the quintessential characteristic of charities: that they operate for the public benefit and do not permit their assets or activities to profit persons other than their intended beneficiaries.⁷

The three doctrines are: (1) the proscription against inurement, (2) the proscription against more-than-incidental private benefit, and (3) the rules imposing excise taxes on excess benefit transactions. They will be discussed in that order. The paper does not aspire to provide a comprehensive description or analysis of any of them. Rather, it contains selected observations stemming from the author's teaching and writing in this area for more than 15 years. A secondary purpose of the paper is to recount some ancient history⁸ and capture some current events.⁹ As an aid to the pilgrim, several appendices appear at the end of this paper to provide ready reference to rulings, G.C.M.'s, cases, and secondary-source materials bearing on these matters.¹⁰

⁶ § 4958 was added to the Code by § 1311(a) of the Taxpayer Bill of Rights 2, Pub. L. No. 104-168, 110 Stat. 1452 (1996), which was signed into law by President Clinton on July 30, 1996. It was made effective retroactively to Sept. 14, 1995. See note 125 below.

⁷ This paper focuses on federal tax rules. The I.R.S., however, is only one — and certainly not the most important one — of the agencies which police the nonprofit sector. State Attorneys General and other State charity officials have much broader powers and standing to patrol not-for-profit organizations. Under certain circumstances, others may also have standing, for example trustees, directors, donors, members, and actual or potential beneficiaries. See generally Mary Grace Blasko, Curt S. Crossley & David Lloyd, *Standing to Sue in the Charitable Sector* (4 Topics in Philanthropy, N.Y.U. Program on Philanthropy and the Law, 1993), also published in slightly different form as Mary Grace Blasko, Curt S. Crossley & David Lloyd, *Standing to Sue in the Charitable Sector*, 28 U.S.F.L. Rev. 37 (1993).

⁸ The history of the enactment of the first (1909) legislation containing anti-inurement language is discussed in the text accompanying notes 11 through 27 below.

⁹ The history of the enactment of the recent intermediate sanctions legislation — § 4958 — is discussed in the text accompanying notes 86 through 102 below.

¹⁰ Appendix A lists the principal published G.C.M.'s and Revenue Rulings. Appendix B

Inurement

Peril awaits anyone who attempts to understand the tax law without rigorously parsing the language of the Internal Revenue Code. Many results, happy or foolish, turn on a microscopic scrutiny of the words of that statute. It is tempting to carry that habit pattern forward into an understanding of the inurement proscription contained in § 501(c)(3). In this case, however, the temptation should be avoided. This paper will demonstrate, in three steps, why the relevant statutory language is close to meaningless, making it necessary to resort to other sources to understand the scope of the inurement rules.

Step 1: The Legislative History. The template for all of the inurement provisions was designed in 1909. Section 38 of the legislation¹¹ imposed a “special excise tax” on corporations.¹² Several types of organization were excepted, including “any corporation or association organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, or educational purposes, *no part of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any*

contains citations to the leading cases. Appendix C is a selected bibliography of secondary source materials.

¹¹ The Act is entitled, “An Act to Provide Revenue, Equalize Duties and Encourage the Industries of the United States, and for Other Purposes.” Pub. L. No. 61-5, 36 Stat. 11 (1909). It was signed on Aug. 5, 1909.

¹² The tax was structured as an excise, rather than as an income, tax because of Congressional concerns that an income tax might be unconstitutional under Pollock v. Farmers’ Loan & Trust Co., 157 U.S. 601 (1895). As Senator Flint put it, “The [Senate Finance] committee decided that, . . . in view of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Pollock case, it would be indelicate, at least, for the Congress of the United States to pass another [income tax] measure and ask the Supreme Court to pass upon it, when they had already passed upon the proposition in that case.” 44 Cong. Rec. 3936 (1909) (Proceedings on June 29, 1909).

¹³ Pub. L. No. 61-5, § 38, 36 Stat. 11, 115 (1909) (emphasis added).

*private stockholder or individual.*¹³ The legislative history of this language should, one might hope, provide a rich source of enlightenment. One hopes in vain. A few weak beams of light emerge, but most of the important issues remain shadowed.¹⁴

On the floor of the Senate, on July 2, 1909, Senator Augustus O. Bacon, from Georgia, offered an amendment to then-pending bill. Among the amendment's provisions was the following:

*"Provided, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any corporation or association organized and operated for religious, charitable, or educational purposes, no part of the profit of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, but all of the profit of which is in good faith devoted to the said religious, charitable, or educational purpose."*¹⁵

Although the amendment was then laid on the table, i.e., was defeated,¹⁶ it re-emerged several days later.

Senator Bacon moved his amendment again, in exactly the same language, on July 6, 1909.¹⁷ This time it was successful,¹⁸ but not before some interesting debate. Senator Clark of Wyoming first challenged Senator Bacon, asking whether the amendment would exempt the Trinity Church Corporation of New York City. Senator Clark said that Trinity Church took in hundreds of thousands of dollars each year as

¹³ Pub. L. No. 61-5, § 38, 36 Stat. 11, 115 (1909) (emphasis added).

¹⁴ Because no printed committee reports address the issue, all of the meager illumination comes from Congressional debates.

¹⁵ 44 Cong. Rec. 4061 (1909) (italics in original). Note that the phrase "organized and operated" is not at this point followed by the word "exclusively." See text accompanying note 23 below.

¹⁶ 44 Cong. Rec. 4061-62 (1909).

¹⁷ See generally 44 Cong. Rec. 4149-57 (1909).

¹⁸ 44 Cong. Rec. 4157 (1909).

rents, and thought it should be subject to taxation despite its lack of stockholders.¹⁹ After some discussion by various Senators (not including Senator Bacon) about the nature and size of the activities of Trinity Church, Senator Bacon replied:

“[I]f it be true that there are features in the business of that [Trinity Church] corporation which are not strictly religious, educational, or benevolent, they would not be screened by this amendment; and if they are all of them religious, benevolent, and educational, the fact of their magnitude would not, in my opinion, be any reason why we should exclude them from the beneficial provisions of this amendment.

“. . . [T]he corporation which I had particularly in mind as an illustration at the time I drew this amendment is the Methodist Book Concern, which has its headquarters in Nashville, which is a very large printing establishment, and in which there must necessarily be profit made, and there is a profit made exclusively for religious, benevolent, charitable, and educational purposes, in which no man receives a scintilla of individual profit.”²⁰

Senator Flint from California then joined the fray, asking Senator Bacon whether the exemption amendment was necessary, given that the taxing language only applied in the first instance to organizations which were “for profit.”²¹ Senator Bacon replied that the amendment was indeed required:

“I gave the illustration of the Methodist Book Concern for that reason. It is organized for profit, but it is not organized for individual profit. It is organized to make a profit to extend religious work and to extend benevolent work, charitable work, and educational work. It is organized for profit, and does make a profit. That is the very reason why I think the words of the amendment with reference to a corporation tax are not sufficient.”²²

Senator Bacon then proceeded to make a change in his own suggested exemption language by inserting “exclusively” after “organized and operated.” That

¹⁹ 44 Cong. Rec. 4149 (1909).

²⁰ 44 Cong. Rec. 4151 (1909).

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

change, he opined, "would make it as complete as it is possible to do."²³

After some far-ranging debate about other aspects of the amendatory language, concerning building and loan associations, labor unions, and the like, the amendment was finally approved. Thus, as the Bill emerged from the Senate, the exemption language read as follows:

*"Provided, however, that nothing in this section contained shall apply to . . . any corporation or association organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, or educational purposes, no part of the profit of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, but all of the profit of which is in good faith devoted to the said religious, charitable, or educational purposes."*²⁴

The quoted anti-inurement language was later changed in two ways prior to enactment: the word "profit" was changed to "net income" and the final clause (beginning "but all of the profit of which") was deleted.²⁵ The conference committee that adopted those two final changes did not provide, nor can one find from any other source, any explanation of its reasoning,²⁶ so one is left to wonder whether any change in substance was intended.²⁷

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ 44 Cong. Rec. 4157 (1909) (emphasis in original).

²⁵ The final statutory language is quoted in the text accompanying note 13 above.

²⁶ See 44 Cong. Rec. 4630, 4649 (1909), reporting the proceedings on July 30, 1909. The language of the anti-inurement provision, as the bill emerged from Congress on that date, remained unchanged; it was exactly as it appeared in the final statute. A careful search of the Congressional Record shows there was no discussion of the wording of the provision after the July 6 session. There is, therefore, no clarification of the changes that took place between July 6 and the adoption on July 30 of the conference committee version. There are no records of the deliberations of the conference committee. The legislative history on these points is therefore completely arid.

²⁷ One article speculates that the deletion of the final clause occurred "in all likelihood because it was redundant." Note, "The Inurement of Earnings to Private Benefit" Clause of Section 501(c): A Standard Without Meaning?, 48 Minn. L. Rev. 1149, 1151

While the debates provide some useful background to the development of the statutory language, they do not sufficiently explain why the words “profit,” “net income,” “private stockholder,” or “individual” were selected or rejected. The present version of the anti-inurement language contains two further changes: “net income” has become “net earnings” and “stockholder” has become “shareholder.”²⁸ Once again, it is impossible to discern any rationale for the verbal variations. As will be shown below, the words — if taken literally — would pose a number of important puzzles and problems. Given all of this opaque history, however, it seems wiser to treat the anti-inurement language as evocative rather than precise.

Step 2: A Comparison of the Words. Anti-inurement language appears in nine separate paragraphs of § 501(c)²⁹ and in at least 13 other places in the Code.³⁰ Although the theme is fairly clear, the notes vary.

The language is identical in four paragraphs of § 501(c).³¹ It varies trivially, and in ways which seem immaterial, in two others.³² In two further cases, the inurement language is modified to permit certain types of intended benefits to flow to intended beneficiaries.³³ In one case, however, the language is inexplicably different: the anti-

n. 10 (1964). Perhaps so, but no citation is provided for that speculation.

²⁸ § 501(c)(3).

²⁹ §§ 501(c)(3), (4)(B), (6), (7), (9), (11)(A), (13), (19)(C), and (26)(D).

³⁰ §§ 170(c)(2)(C), 170(c)(3)(B), 170(c)(5), 526, 528(c)(1)(D), 833(c)(3)(A)(vi), 2055(a)(2), 2055(a)(4), 2106(a)(2)(A)(ii), 2522(a)(2), 2522(b)(2), 2522(b)(5), and 4421(2)(B).

³¹ §§ 501(c)(3), (6), (13), and (19)(C).

³² § 501(c)(4)(B) uses “of such entity” rather than “of which.” § 501(c)(26)(D) uses “of the organization” rather than “of which.”

³³ § 501(c)(9), describing voluntary employees’ beneficiary associations which provide payments for “life, sick, accident, or other benefits” to their members, contains a

inurement prohibition for social clubs applies to “any private shareholder,” but does not extend, as in all of the other cases, to any “individual.”³⁴ Lacking any precedent or text explaining this distinction,³⁵ one could reason in one of two ways:

1. Language in the Code is important, so social clubs may retain tax-exempt status even if they *permit* inurement to the benefit of an individual, or
2. Language in this instance is not very important, so one should not expect the scope of the anti-inurement prohibition to differ when applied to social clubs.

The latter seems correct.³⁶

Although most of the anti-inurement rules are codified in the statute, one — dealing with labor, agricultural, and horticultural organizations³⁷ — is found only in the

parenthetical exception from the anti-inurement language reading “other than through such payments.” Similarly, § 501(c)(11)(A), describing teachers’ retirement fund associations, contains a parenthetical exception from that language reading “other than through payment of retirement benefits.”

³⁴ § 501(c)(7). The regulations track that language. Treas. Reg. § 1.501(c)(7)-1(a). In an earlier incarnation, the exemption for social clubs contained anti-inurement language which applied not only to “private shareholders” but also to “any member.” The “member” language was deleted in 1924. Revenue Act of 1924, § 231(9), 43 Stat. 253, 282. “Nevertheless, cases and rulings continue to refer to benefits that inure to *members*.” 1 Robert J. Desiderio & Scott A. Taylor, *Planning Tax-Exempt Organizations* 28-9 (1990) (emphasis in original).

³⁵ The author would be grateful for illumination should anyone know of guidance on this point.

³⁶ One leading treatise, for example, discusses the private inurement doctrine as applied to social clubs without ever mentioning the linguistic difference. Bruce R. Hopkins, *The Law of Tax-Exempt Organizations* 455-56 (7th ed. 1998).

³⁷ These are the organizations described in § 501(c)(5).

³⁸ See also Temp. Treas. Reg. § 1.892-2T(b). § 892 exempts from taxation certain income of foreign governments and their controlled entities. The regulations require that none of the “net earnings” or “income” of the qualifying government or its controlled

regulations.³⁸ The current regulation was proposed in 1956³⁹ and adopted in 1958.⁴⁰ Its language is closely similar to the statutory proscriptions: it provides that qualifying entities must “[h]ave no net earnings inuring to the benefit of any member.”⁴¹ Similar language has appeared in the regulations under § 501(c)(5)’s predecessors since at least 1924, but the language prior to 1958 referred to “net income” rather than “net earnings.”⁴² Consistent with the arguments made above, that verbal distinction is probably without legal significance.

Step 3: Deconstruction of the Words. The statutory language prohibits the

entities may inure to the benefit of “any private person.” Temp. Treas. Reg. §§ 1.892-2T(a)(2) and –2T(a)(3)(iii). Temp. Treas. Reg. § 1.892-2T(b) then describes the circumstances under which such inurement will be deemed to occur. Because the purpose for and policies behind § 892 are different from those affecting § 501, however, it would be unwise to reason from the regulations under the former to the latter. To glimpse the purposes behind the anti-inurement rules under § 892, see Louis Vial v. Commissioner, 15 T.C. 403 (1950), acq., 1952-1 C.B. 4; Rev. Rul. 66-73, 1966-1 C.B. 174, revoked by Rev. Rul. 75-298, 1975-2 C.B. 290; and Rev. Rul. 88-7, 1988-1 C.B. 269.

³⁹ 21 Fed. Reg. 460, 465 (Jan. 21, 1956).

⁴⁰ T.D. 6301, 23 Fed. Reg. 5,192, 5,195 (July 28, 1958), 1958-2 C.B. 197, 203. Although the regulation was later amended by T.D. 8726, 62 Fed. Reg. 40,447 (1997), 1997-34 I.R.B. 7, this last amendment did not modify the anti-inurement language.

⁴¹ Treas. Reg. § 1.501(c)(5)-1(a)(1). Note that the word “member” replaces the words “any private shareholder or individual.” It is fascinating to contrast this regulatory language, referring only to “member” and not to “private shareholder or individual,” with the statutory language under § 501(c)(7), referring only to “private shareholder” and not to “individual” or “member.”

⁴² See and compare, e.g., Treas. Reg. Art. 512 (1924); Treas. Reg. Art. 101(1)-1 (1936), 1 Fed. Reg. 1868 (1936); and Treas. Reg. § 39.101 (1)-1 (1949).

⁴³ Recall that at earlier times, the words “profit” and “net income” were sometimes used in lieu of “net earnings.” See text accompanying notes 13, 15, 25, and 42 above.

inurement of “net earnings”⁴³ to the benefit of “any private shareholder or individual.”⁴⁴ A moment’s thought exposes so many problems with those words that it seems clear they cannot be read literally. For example, as one trenchant commentator recently put it, “Literally, this could apply to any individual regardless of his or her connection with the organization. The statute’s reach obviously cannot be this broad.”⁴⁵ All relevant precedent agrees. To hammer the nail firmly into place, nevertheless, each of the relevant words and phrases will be examined in more detail.

Should the proscription against inurement of “net earnings” be read to permit, without sanction, the inurement of *gross earnings*? Or “revenue”? Or “assets”? Certainly not. One early decision stated that the phrase may include “more than the term net profits as shown by the books of the organization or than the difference between gross receipts and disbursements in dollars.”⁴⁶ In 1974, the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals quoted that case with approval and added that “[e]arnings may inure to an individual in ways other than through the distribution of dividends.”⁴⁷ Other courts have agreed.⁴⁸ The Service has said that “the inurement prohibition, while stated in terms of

⁴³ Recall that at earlier times, the words “profit” and “net income” were sometimes used in lieu of “net earnings.” See text accompanying notes 13, 15, 25, and 42 above.

⁴⁴ The regulations provide that “[t]he words private shareholder or individual in section 501 refer to persons having a personal and private interest in the activities of the organization.” Treas. Reg. § 1.501(a)-1(c). To say, as one author wrote, that this statement is “not terribly helpful” is being unduly kind. Peter L. Faber, The Effect of Intermediate Sanctions on the Ultimate Sanction for Tax-Exempt Organizations, 16 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 587, 590 (1997).

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Northwestern Municipal Ass’n v. United States, 99 F.2d 460, 463 (8th Cir. 1938).

⁴⁷ Harding Hosp., Inc. v. United States, 505 F.2d 1068, 1072 (6th Cir. 1974).

⁴⁸ E.g., Lowry Hosp. Ass’n v. Commissioner, 66 T.C. 850, 858 (1976).

the net earnings of an organization, applies to any of [an organization's] charitable assets. It applies to more than just the net profits shown on the books of the organization or the surplus of gross receipts over disbursements in dollars."⁴⁹ It must be concluded that the words "net earnings" neither well aim at nor well circumscribe the target.

We next turn to the phrase "private shareholder." It is puzzling at the outset to ponder the meaning of the adjective: is there some difference intended, perhaps, between a "private" shareholder and some other type of shareholder, e.g., a "public" shareholder?⁵⁰ The more serious puzzle is: under what circumstances need we be concerned about inurement to *any* sort of "shareholder"? The I.R.S. will not generally permit a corporation to qualify as a charitable organization unless it is formed as a not-for-profit entity, i.e., unless it totally lacks shareholders.⁵¹ Thus, virtually no corporate

⁴⁹ G.C.M. 39,862 (Nov. 21, 1991) (citation omitted).

⁵⁰ For an early, but not very illuminating, discussion of this question, see T.B.R. 33, 1 C.B. 199 (1919).

⁵¹ For example, Rev. Rul. 56-185, 1956-1 C.B. 202, states:

"If provision is made in the bylaws for dividends, exemption will not be allowed even though no dividends have been declared. Exemption will not be defeated, however, merely because the shareholders or members might possibly at some future date share in the assets upon dissolution in the absence of a case of mala fides where there appears to be a plan on the part of the shareholder or individual to acquire assets on the dissolution of the corporation."

The second quoted sentence is clearly wrong. Treas. Reg. § 1.501(c)(3)-1(b)(4) provides that "an organization does not meet the organizational test if its articles or the law of the State in which it was created provide that its assets would, upon dissolution, be distributed to its members or shareholders." In Rev. Rul. 69-545, 1969-2 C.B. 117, the Service modified Rev. Rul. 56-185, stating:

". . . Revenue Ruling 56-185 is ambiguous in that it can be read as implying that the possibility of 'shareholders' or 'members' sharing in the assets of a hospital upon its dissolution will not preclude exemption of the hospital as a charity described in section 501(c)(3) of the Code. Section 1.501(c)(3)-1(b)(4) of the

charities have any shareholders (although they may indeed have members). The only known exceptions involve situations in which the entity, while formed under for-profit statutes for some special reason, has taken steps to denude the shares of any rights to dividends or other distributions both during its continued existence and upon

regulations promulgated subsequent to Revenue Ruling 56-185 makes it clear, however, that an absolute dedication of assets to charity is a precondition to exemption under section 501(c)(3) of the Code.”

This is consistent with one of the earliest pronouncements on the anti-inurement proscription. In it, the Service speculated that the accumulation of earnings, even if not distributed as dividends, would constitute inurement through enhancement to the value of the corporate stock. It held that it did not have to decide that question, however, because the payment of dividends on the stock was sufficient to disqualify the entity from tax-exempt status. T.B.R. 33, 1 C.B. 199 (1919).

⁵² The IRS has ruled that ownership of stock is not fatal to tax-exempt status if the stock has neither the right to dividends nor to receive assets upon dissolution. Rev. Rul. 68-222, 1968-1 C.B. 243, restating I.T. 3860, 1947-2 C.B. 70. (Both precedents involved title-holding companies for a § 501(c)(7) fraternity.) The IRS has issued several private letter rulings confirming the tax-exempt status of for-profit healthcare organizations when, under the relevant state law, nonprofit entities were not allowed to practice medicine. Three such entities held exempt, under § 501(c)(3), were North Shore Medical Specialists (Chicago) (P.L.R., unnumbered, dated Nov. 22, 1996, 96 Tax Notes (TA) Today 234-30 (Dec. 3, 1996)); Physicians Network P.C. (Poughkeepsie, N.Y.) (P.L.R., unnumbered, dated Oct. 23, 1996, 96 Tax Notes (TA) Today 216-21 (Nov. 5, 1996)); and Marietta Health Care Physicians Inc. (Marietta, Ohio) (P.L.R., unnumbered, dated Oct. 3, 1995, 95 Tax Notes (TA) Today 202-39 (Oct. 17, 1995)). In each case, of course, the corporate documents and shareholder agreements eliminated from the stock all rights to distributions. See Marlis L. Carson, IRS Approves Exemption for Chicago For-Profit Medical Corporation, 73 Tax Notes (TA) 1153 (1996). See also the private letter ruling granting exempt status under § 501(c)(3) to United Medical Associates, P.C., 98 TNT 22-41 (Jan. 28, 1998) (same). A confirmed cynic might note that use of the for-profit form contains some dangers even if the corporate documents do remove beneficial interests from the shares: a later amendment, just prior to dissolution, might restore those beneficial interests. Although this risk has been noticed, Note, “The Inurement of Earnings to Private Benefit” Clause of Section 501(c): A Standard Without Meaning?, 48 Minn. L. Rev. 1149, 1156 (1964), it has apparently not concerned the Service.

liquidation.⁵² The number of such exceptions is so miniscule that one cannot believe it should have been important to single out “shareholders” as a meaningful class of potential recipients of inurement.

⁵² The IRS has ruled that ownership of stock is not fatal to tax-exempt status if the stock has neither the right to dividends nor to receive assets upon dissolution. Rev. Rul. 68-222, 1968-1 C.B. 243, restating I.T. 3860, 1947-2 C.B. 70. (Both precedents involved title-holding companies for a § 501(c)(7) fraternity.) The IRS has issued several private letter rulings confirming the tax-exempt status of for-profit healthcare organizations when, under the relevant state law, nonprofit entities were not allowed to practice medicine. Three such entities held exempt, under § 501(c)(3), were North Shore Medical Specialists (Chicago) (P.L.R., unnumbered, dated Nov. 22, 1996, 96 Tax Notes (TA) Today 234-30 (Dec. 3, 1996)); Physicians Network P.C. (Poughkeepsie, N.Y.) (P.L.R., unnumbered, dated Oct. 23, 1996, 96 Tax Notes (TA) Today 216-21 (Nov. 5, 1996)); and Marietta Health Care Physicians Inc. (Marietta, Ohio) (P.L.R., unnumbered, dated Oct. 3, 1995, 95 Tax Notes (TA) Today 202-39 (Oct. 17, 1995)). In each case, of course, the corporate documents and shareholder agreements eliminated from the stock all rights to distributions. See Marlis L. Carson, IRS Approves Exemption for Chicago For-Profit Medical Corporation, 73 Tax Notes (TA) 1153 (1996). See also the private letter ruling granting exempt status under § 501(c)(3) to United Medical Associates, P.C., 98 TNT 22-41 (Jan. 28, 1998) (same). A confirmed cynic might note that use of the for-profit form contains some dangers even if the corporate documents do remove beneficial interests from the shares: a later amendment, just prior to dissolution, might restore those beneficial interests. Although this risk has been noticed, Note, “The Inurement of Earnings to Private Benefit” Clause of Section 501(c): A Standard Without Meaning?, 48 Minn. L. Rev. 1149, 1156 (1964), it has apparently not concerned the Service.

⁵³ The I.R.S. quite early held that “[t]he word ‘private’ modifies both the word ‘stockholder’ and the word ‘individual.’” T.B.R. 33, 1 C.B. 199, 200 (1919). (In 1919, the anti-inurement language referred to “stockholder” rather than, as now, “shareholder.”) That ruling went on to conjecture that presumably the use of the word “individual” “was necessary to bring within it members of corporations who were not technically stockholders.” Clearly the anti-inurement language has been interpreted, properly, much more broadly than that conjecture contemplated. G.C.M. 38,322 (Mar. 24, 1980) says: “The word ‘private’ is the antonym of ‘public’ — used to distinguish a private individual from the general public — and is intended to limit the scope of those persons who personally profit from the organization to the intended beneficiaries of the allowable activities.”

The statute also says that no benefits may inure to any private "individual."⁵³ It has already been noted that it would produce absurd results to read the word broadly because individuals are almost always the intended and perfectly-acceptable beneficiaries of charity.⁵⁴ As the Tax Court has said, "to equate an 'insider' with potentially the whole community would so gut the insider test as to transmogrify it from a test of some precision . . . to a test of such general application as to be useless."⁵⁵

Is the language also too narrow? For example, reasoning by negative implication, should the statute be read as permitting benefits to inure to partnerships or corporations? The relevant regulations define "private shareholder or individual" to include "persons,"⁵⁶ which should be taken to invoke the Code definition: "The term 'person' shall be construed to mean and include an individual, a trust, estate, partnership, association, company or corporation."⁵⁷ The Service has opined that "a

⁵³ The I.R.S. quite early held that "[t]he word 'private' modifies both the word 'stockholder' and the word 'individual.'" T.B.R. 33, 1 C.B. 199, 200 (1919). (In 1919, the anti-inurement language referred to "stockholder" rather than, as now, "shareholder.") That ruling went on to conjecture that presumably the use of the word "individual" "was necessary to bring within it members of corporations who were not technically stockholders." Clearly the anti-inurement language has been interpreted, properly, much more broadly than that conjecture contemplated. G.C.M. 38,322 (Mar. 24, 1980) says: "The word 'private' is the antonym of 'public' — used to distinguish a private individual from the general public — and is intended to limit the scope of those persons who personally profit from the organization to the intended beneficiaries of the allowable activities."

⁵⁴ See text accompanying note 45 above.

⁵⁵ Sound Health Ass'n v. Commissioner, 71 T.C. 158, 186-87 (1978).

⁵⁶ Treas. Reg. § 1.501(a)-1(c).

⁵⁷ § 7701(a)(1).

⁵⁸ G.C.M. 38,322 (March 24, 1980).

labor union . . . is a 'person' to whom the inurement proscription applies."⁵⁸ In G.C.M. 39,414,⁵⁹ the Service stated:

"In our opinion, a section 501(c)(3) organization may not loan its funds to private individuals *or corporations* for use in a business context without violating the statutory prohibition against private inurement." (Emphasis added.)

A leading commentator has written that "the private inurement doctrine can be triggered by the involvement of persons other than individuals."⁶⁰

Even the word "inurement" is problematical. It is, of course, perfectly clear that it cannot be read to prohibit the conferring of *any* benefit on an insider: G.C.M. 39,862 concedes (and all authorities agree) that "[t]he inurement proscription does not prevent the payment of reasonable compensation for goods or services." In its search for a touchstone, the G.C.M. suggests that the word "is aimed at preventing *dividend-like* distributions of charitable assets or expenditures to benefit a private interest."⁶¹ Even that suggestion, however, cannot be accepted. For example, if the organization lacked earnings and profits, it nevertheless would be susceptible to violating the anti-inurement rules.⁶² As noted previously, one court has properly observed that "[e]arnings may inure to an individual in ways other than through the distribution of dividends."⁶³ As the Tax Court recently confirmed, however, inurement cannot occur without the intentional

⁵⁸ G.C.M. 38,322 (March 24, 1980).

⁵⁹ Sept. 25, 1985.

⁶⁰ Bruce R. Hopkins, *The Law of Tax-Exempt Organizations* 428 (7th ed. 1998).

⁶¹ G.C.M. 39,862 (Nov. 21, 1991) (emphasis added).

⁶² A "dividend" is a distribution out of accumulated or current earnings and profits. § 316(a). A corporation without earnings and profits thus cannot pay a "dividend."

⁶³ Harding Hosp., Inc. v. United States, 505 F.2d 1068, 1072 (6th Cir. 1974), referred to in the text accompanying note 47 above.

participation of the charity — theft by insiders does not constitute inurement.⁶⁴

There is so little content, then, in the words of the anti-inurement language that the scope of the prohibition must be sought elsewhere. The anti-inurement phrases should be recognized as Code-speak rather than English. Brain cells should be cauterized against any temptation to resort to the words for meaning. Reference, instead, should be to the various cases and other precedents which have interpreted the proscription. Although it is outside the scope of this paper to analyze the precedents,⁶⁵ several observations are in order:

1. The determination is inherently fact specific.
2. Despite a fairly large number of precedents,⁶⁶ helpful guidance is scarce. As one court put it, more than 60 years after the anti-inurement language first appeared in the

⁶⁴ Variety Club Tent No. 6 Charities, Inc. v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo. 1997-575 (1997). The Court clarified its holding as follows:

“[the] suggestion that inurement means the *intentional* conferring of a benefit cannot be allowed to mean that there is no inurement unless ‘all the organizations’ officers and board members have actual knowledge of, and affirmatively act to cause, the prohibited benefit.’ By the same token, we do not believe that the Congress intended that a charity must lose its exempt status merely because a president or a treasurer or an executive director of a charity has skimmed or embezzled or otherwise stolen from the charity, at least where the charity has a real-world existence apart from the thieving official.” 1997 RIA TC Memo 3783, 3794.

The Court also said, in passing, “The boundaries of the term ‘inures’ have thus far defied precise definition.” *Ibid.* Both the holding and this last observation seem clearly correct.

⁶⁵ See generally Brian H. Redmond, Annotation, Federal Tax Exemption: When Do Earnings of Religious, Charitable, Educational, or Similar Organization Inure to Benefit of Private Shareholders or Individuals Within Meaning of 26 USCS § 501(c)(3), 92 A.L.R. Fed. 255 (1996); Bruce R. Hopkins, *The Law of Tax-Exempt Organizations* 427-60 (7th ed. 1998).

⁶⁶ See Appendices A and B below.

Code, “[t]here is very little material by way of guidance to this Court in the regulations or in any case law as to the application and meaning of that sentence.”⁶⁷

4. It is often fairly easy to decide what is and what is not prohibited, even though it is quite daunting to try to describe the test. As the Service’s then-Associate Chief Counsel (Employee Benefits and Exempt Organizations) put it: “In my view, the definition of inurement isn’t the problem — most practitioners and most agents know it when they see it.”⁶⁸
5. The scope of the inurement proscription has been and will be significantly affected by the adoption of § 4958.

Further comments on the fourth point will be made below.

Private Benefit

Precedent interprets the regulations under § 501(c)(3)⁶⁹ as creating a separate

⁶⁷ Universal Church of Scientific Truth v. United States, 74-1 U.S. Tax Cas. (CCH) ¶ 9,360, 32 A.F.T.R.2d 73-6122, 6123 (N.D. Ala. 1973).

⁶⁸ Speech by James McGovern to A.B.A. Tax Section, San Diego, Feb. 5, 1993, reprinted at 7 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 551, 556 (1993) [hereinafter *McGovern 1993 Talk*].

⁶⁹ The relevant language is quoted in footnote 4 above.

⁷⁰ For example, the Tax Court said: “while the prohibitions against private inurement and private benefits share common and often overlapping elements, . . . the two are distinct requirements which must independently be satisfied.” American Campaign Academy v. Commissioner, 92 T.C. 1053, 1068 (1989) (citations omitted). Congress has accepted this view. E.g., H.R. Rep. No. 104-506, at 53 n. 2 (1966) (“Even where no prohibited private inurement exists, however, more than incidental private benefits conferred on individuals may result in the organization not being operated ‘exclusively’ for an exempt purpose. See, e.g., American Campaign Academy v. Commissioner”)

test — the more-than-incidental-private-benefit test — for tax-exempt charitable status.⁷⁰ Prior to the late 1980s, there was little guidance on the differences between the inurement and private benefit doctrines; indeed, many earlier precedents seem muddled on this point, and the lines drawn, if any, seem indistinct and confused. More recently, however, various cases and Service pronouncements have sharpened the edges of the distinctions between the two.

The first clear exposition of the tests came in G.C.M. 39,862. It set forth two sorts of distinctions:

- *First*, while the inurement proscription applies only to benefits received by “insiders,” the private-benefit proscription applies to benefits received by anyone, including wholly disinterested persons.⁷¹
- *Second*, the receipt of any benefit by an “insider,” no matter how trivial, is fatal,⁷²

⁷⁰ For example, the Tax Court said: “while the prohibitions against private inurement and private benefits share common and often overlapping elements, . . . the two are distinct requirements which must independently be satisfied.” American Campaign Academy v. Commissioner, 92 T.C. 1053, 1068 (1989) (citations omitted). Congress has accepted this view. E.g., H.R. Rep. No. 104-506, at 53 n. 2 (1966) (“Even where no prohibited private inurement exists, however, more than incidental private benefits conferred on individuals may result in the organization not being operated ‘exclusively’ for an exempt purpose. See, e.g., American Campaign Academy v. Commissioner”)

⁷¹ As the Tax Court agreed, “nonincidental benefits conferred on disinterested persons may serve private interests.” American Campaign Academy v. Commissioner, 92 T.C. 1053, 1069 (1989).

⁷² As G.C.M. 39,862 puts it, “inurement may be found even though the amounts involved are small. . . . There is no de minimis exception to the inurement prohibition.” Nor is it a defense that the benefit received, even if added to actual compensation paid to the benefited “insider,” would be within the bounds of reasonable compensation. The G.C.M. cites, for this proposition, Founding Church of Scientology v. United States, 412 F.2d 1197, 1202 (Ct. Cl. 1969), cert. denied, 397 U.S. 1009 (1970); Lowry Hosp. Ass’n v. Commissioner, 66 T.C. 850 (1976); and People of God Community v. Commissioner, 75 T.C. 127 (1980). Consistent with this view, the G.C.M., after finding inurement to the

whereas purely “incidental” benefits received by others will *not* violate the private-benefit restriction.⁷³

The G.C.M. concludes that “[the] private benefit prohibition applies to all kinds of persons and groups, not just to those ‘insiders’ subject to the more strict inurement proscription,” and “the absence of inurement does not mean the absence of private benefit. Inurement, then, may be viewed as a subset of private benefit.”

The IRS’s later-issued Audit Guidelines for Hospitals contain the following succinct summary of these distinctions:

“Although the requirements for finding inurement or private benefit are similar, inurement and private benefit differ in two key respects. The first is that even a minimal amount of inurement results in disqualification for exempt status, whereas private benefit must be more than quantitatively or qualitatively incidental in order to jeopardize tax exempt status. The second is that inurement only applies to ‘insiders’ (individuals whose relationship with an organization offers them an opportunity to make use of the organization’s income or assets for personal gain), whereas private benefit may accrue to anyone.”⁷⁴

Thus, the inurement rules require the finding of an “insider” and are then trigger happy; the private benefit rules apply to any recipient of a private benefit but require a balancing of benefits to the public against the benefits to the recipient.

It follows from the distinctions between the inurement and excess-private-benefit

doctors; goes on to state “we need not consider. . . whether the benefit conferred on the physicians ever could be considered reasonable compensation” The wording of § 4958(c)(1)(A) confirms the same notion for purposes of the new intermediate-sanctions provisions: “[A]n economic benefit shall not be treated as consideration for the performance of services unless such organization clearly indicated its intent to so treat such benefit.”

⁷³ G.C.M. 39,862 (Nov. 21, 1991). Accord, American Campaign Academy v. Commissioner, 92 T.C. 1053, 1068 (1989); Bruce R. Hopkins, The Law of Tax-Exempt Organizations 459-62 (7th ed. 1998).

⁷⁴ Ann. 92-83, 1992-22 I.R.B. 59, § 333.2(2).

proscriptions that “insider” status for purposes of the former should *not* be determined by reference to the amount of the benefit received. If receipt of a sizeable benefit transforms the recipient into an “insider,” the inurement prohibition would threaten to subsume the excess-private-benefit rule. It is clear, however, that the two are distinct, and that — if anything — the inurement regime is a subset of the private benefit prohibition.⁷⁵

There is an argument to the contrary. It should be, and has proved to be, unsuccessful. It derives from the notion that the existence of “control” can be discerned from the ability to obtain a benefit from the controlled entity. For example, the § 482 regulations provide as follows:

“*Controlled* includes any kind of control, direct or indirect, whether legally enforceable or not, and however exercisable or exercised, including control resulting from the actions of two or more taxpayers acting in concert or with a common goal or purpose. It is the reality of the control which is decisive, not its form or the mode of its exercise. A presumption of control arises if income or deductions have been arbitrarily shifted.”⁷⁶

The first two sentences seem apposite even to the inurement test, because they correctly would not limit the definition of “insider” to those holding titles, and they would permit the inurement prohibition to extend to any persons *actually* having the control necessary to abuse the charitable status of the organization. The last quoted sentence, however, seems inappropriate in the inurement context, because its use would tend to blur or even obliterate the separate excess-private-benefit rule.

This point was made in a 1992 New York State Bar Association Tax Section Report.⁷⁷ There is some indication that it has been accepted by the Service.

⁷⁵ The Tax Court has written: “[W]hile the private inurement prohibition may arguably be subsumed within the private benefit analysis of the operational test, the reverse is not true.” American Campaign Academy v. Commissioner, 92 T.C. 1053, 1068-69 (1989).

⁷⁶ Treas. Reg. § 1.482-1(i)(4) (emphasis in original).

⁷⁷ Committee on Tax Exempt Entities, New York State Bar Ass’n Tax Section, Report

on Exempt Organization Inurement Issues in the Context of G.C.M. 39862 (Nov. 11, 1992), reprinted at 6 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 1397 (1992) [hereinafter *New York State Bar Ass'n Report on G.C.M. 39,862*]. The author was a principal drafter of the Report. The Report argued as follows:

“First, the section 482 regulation’s presumption of control arises only if the shift of income or deductions is ‘arbitrary,’ which implies ‘control.’ As a general rule, however, an amount of compensation may be determined to be unreasonable without the action that produced it being treated as arbitrary or leading to a presumption of control. Further, the role of the ‘control’ test in section 482 fundamentally differs from the role of the section 501(c)(3) inurement test. For section 482 purposes, a finding of ‘control’ permits only an adjustment, which could be quite small, of related-party pricing to an arm’s-length standard. By contrast, if ‘insider’ status is found for purposes of the inurement doctrine, any benefit, no matter how trivial, is fatal to tax exemption. Finally, unlike section 482 ‘control’ the inurement rule is not the exclusive Code method of policing receipt of benefits from a charity: even if ‘insider’ status is absent, the private-benefit doctrine will continue to apply, and tax exemption may still be lost if any such benefit is more than ‘incidental.’ For that reason, the boundaries of charitable activity can be policed even without unduly enlarging ‘insider’ status. Because the inurement doctrine is so strict and its consequences so severe, its reach should not be stretched beyond reasonable limits.

“There is an illogical circularity in testing for ‘insider’ status by looking for receipt of benefits. The inurement rules differ from the incidental-private-benefit doctrine precisely in *not* requiring a weighing of the amount of the benefit. To use the receipt of benefit, then, as a determinant of ‘insider’ status is to eliminate the independent status of the latter doctrine: any benefit received would serve to demonstrate ‘insider’ status, thus (a) making the finding of benefit invariably fatal to tax exemption, and (b) leaving no instance in which the incidental-private-benefit doctrine is required. That is not the law.

“We recommend, therefore, that the Service clarify that ‘insider’ status is not attained merely by the receipt of a benefit from an otherwise charitable organization.”

Id. at 1400 (Emphasis in original; citation omitted).

⁷⁸ Of course, the fact that the I.R.S. chose to assert the opposite view in the United Cancer Council litigation indicates that the Service has not *completely* accepted the point. See text accompanying notes 80 through 84 below.

⁷⁸ The Associate Chief Counsel of the I.R.S., addressing the American Bar Association Tax Section's Exempt Organizations Committee in early 1993, referred to the New York State Bar Association's Report as follows:

"The Report recommended that the Service clarify that 'insider' status is not attained automatically, solely by the receipt of a benefit from an otherwise charitable organization. I agree. The Service has never taken such a position. We never intended to suggest that receipt of a benefit should cause treatment as an insider. Insider status follows from a person's relationship to the charitable organization."⁷⁹

The 7th Circuit Court of Appeals, reversing the Tax Court, also has clearly rejected the notion that the receipt of even very significant benefits from a charity automatically makes the recipient an "insider." In United Cancer Council,⁸⁰ the outside fundraiser got \$26.5 million as compensation out of a total of \$28.8 million raised for the charity.⁸¹ The appellate court declined to accept the Tax Court's view that this caused the fundraiser to become an "insider," holding that "the ratio of expenses to net charitable receipts is unrelated to the issue of inurement."⁸² It concluded that the fundraiser "did not, by reason of being able to drive a hard bargain, become an insider .

⁷⁹ *McGovern 1993 Talk*, note 68 above, 7 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. at 555.

⁸⁰ United Cancer Council, Inc. v. Commissioner, 165 F.3d 1173 (7th Cir. 1999), rev'g and remanding 109 T.C. 326 (1997).

⁸¹ The other terms of the contract between the UCC and the fundraiser, Watson & Hughey, were also extremely favorable to the fundraiser. As the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals said, speaking with significant understatement, "[t]he terms of the contract were more favorable to the fundraiser than the terms of the average fundraising contract are." 165 F.3d at 1176. The Tax Court, somewhat more forcefully, had held that the fundraising contract "was not a reasonable contingent compensation arrangement" and that the fundraiser's "compensation under the Contract exceeded reasonable compensation" 109 T.C. at 397.

⁸² 165 F.3d at 1178.

⁸³ 165 F.3d at 1178.

...⁸³ Judge Posner did agree, however, that the more-than-incidental-private-benefit doctrine might apply, even though the inurement proscription did not, and remanded the case to the Tax Court to decide that question.⁸⁴ The later-issued temporary regulations, under the so-called “intermediate sanctions” provisions of § 4958, responded to the United Cancer Council decision by adding an initial-contract exception to the definition of an excess benefit transaction.⁸⁵

Excess Benefit Transactions

Following a discussion of the history of the development of the so-called intermediate sanctions rules in the Code, this part of this paper will analyze the congruence between the scope of the prohibition against inurement and the scope of the new intermediate sanctions provision.

History

The history of the enactment of § 4958 is interesting. Prior to 1969, the only sanction for transgression was termination of tax-exempt status. As early as 1965, the New York State Bar Association commented that an “all or nothing sanction” could lead to a “breakdown of enforcement” because the harshness of the remedy could deter the

⁸³ 165 F.3d at 1178.

⁸⁴ In its original opinion, the Tax Court, having held for the Service on the question of inurement, did not decide the private benefit argument. See 109 T.C. at 399. Nor did it decide the issue on remand, because the parties settled the litigation before a further opinion could be issued by the Tax Court. See Closing Agreement on Final Determination Covering Specific Matters, between United Cancer Council, Inc., and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, dated April 7, 2000.

⁸⁵ Temp. Treas. Reg. § 53.4958-4T(a)(3). The Preamble to the Temporary Regulations makes clear that this was added specifically because of the United Cancer Council decision. See 66 Fed. Reg. 2144, 2150 (Jan. 10, 2001).

⁸⁶ Special Committee on Exempt Organizations, New York State Bar Ass'n Tax Section,

I.R.S. from invoking it and the courts from decreeing it.⁸⁶ The 1969 legislation affecting private foundations put in place, for the first time, a more measured regimen of sanctions: tiers of excise taxes to be imposed on various sorts of sins.⁸⁷ It applied, however, only to private foundations,⁸⁸ thus leaving other charitable organizations⁸⁹ under the pre-existing all-or-nothing system.

Comment on Treasury Foundation Report, in Additional Written Statements . . . on Treasury Department Report on Private Foundations (Comm. Print, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House 710-35) (1965), quoted in John G. Simon, The Tax Treatment of Nonprofit Organizations: A Review of Federal and State Policies, in The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook 67, at 89 (Walter W. Powell, ed., 1987). The problems of an all-or-nothing regime have also been noted by Congress. For example, the legislative history of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 observed that the IRS might “hesitate to revoke the exempt status of a charitable organization . . . in circumstances where that penalty may seem disproportionate.” H.R. Rep. No. 391, 100th Cong., 1st Sess., pt. 2, at 1623-24.

⁸⁷ Chapter 42 of the Code, §§ 4940-48, contains sections imposing excise-tax sanctions on self-dealing, failure to distribute income, excess business holdings, jeopardizing investments, and taxable expenditures. See generally Bruce R. Hopkins, The Law of Tax-Exempt Organizations 241-75 (7th ed. 1998).

⁸⁸ As defined in § 509.

⁸⁹ Private foundations are a subset of § 501(c)(3) organizations. There are many entities that are charitable under § 501(c)(3) but that are not private foundations. It is common to refer to them as “public charities.” In 1997, there were 55,113 private foundations reporting to the I.R.S. Data Release, Domestic Private Foundations and Charitable Trusts, 1996-1997, SOI Bulletin, Fall 2000, at 151. In the same year, the I.R.S. counted a total of 580,416 § 501(c)(3) organizations. Paul Arnsberger, Charities and Other Tax-Exempt Organizations, 1997, SOI Bulletin, Fall 2000, at 47. By subtraction, there were more than 525,000 public charities, in 1997, to which the chapter 42 excise tax rules did not apply. Put another way, there were approximately nine times as many public charities, immune from the chapter 42 rules, as there were private foundations subject to those rules. These data do have weaknesses, but a discussion of the problems is beyond the scope of this paper. See, e.g., Appendix A: Methods and Definitions, in David R. Stevenson, Thomas H. Pollak, & Linda M. Lapkin, State Nonprofit Almanac 1997: Profiles of Charitable Organizations 351-61 (1997).

Between 1969 and the early 1990s, there were occasional expressions of interest in applying some form of “intermediate sanctions” to public charities. For example, a 1989 report of an IRS Task Force on Civil Tax Penalties contains an extensive discussion of the private-foundation rules, including a policy analysis of the reasons why some or all of the chapter 42 rules might be applied to public charities. Its recommendations include this sentence: “The types of sanctions imposed on private foundations should be extended to some or all public charities with respect to self-dealing, excess business holdings, and taxable expenditures.”⁹⁰

In his opening statement at a June 15, 1993, hearing on public charities, Congressman J.J. Pickle, then-Chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee, made clear that he intended to consider legislation which would establish intermediate sanctions on public charities.⁹¹ In her testimony at that hearing, then-IRS Commissioner Margaret Richardson said in part:

“The lack of a sanction short of revocation of exemption in cases in which an organization violates the inurement standard or one of the other standards for exemption causes the Service significant enforcement difficulties. Revocation of an exemption is a severe sanction that may be greatly disproportional to the violation in issue. For example, assume that an examination of a large university reveals that the university is providing its president with inappropriate benefits.

⁹⁰ Executive Task Force, Commissioner’s Penalty Study, Report on Civil Tax Penalties at IX-41 (Internal Revenue Service Feb. 22, 1989). That particular recommendation was *not* implemented when the rest of the Task Force suggestions were largely adopted in the Improved Penalty Administration and Compliance Tax Act (“IMPACT”), Pub. L. No. 101-239, 103 Stat. 2388 (1989). There had been one prior instance of using intermediate sanctions to police the actions of public charities: in 1987, Congress imposed excise tax penalties on public charities which made improper political expenditures. § 10712(a) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987, Pub. L. No. 100-203, 101 Stat. 1330 (1987), adding § 4955 to the Code.

⁹¹ Federal Tax Laws Applicable to the Activities of Tax-Exempt Charitable Organizations: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Oversight of the House of Representatives Comm. on Ways and Means, 103d Cong. 6, 7 (1993) [hereinafter June 15, 1993 Hearing] (statement of Chairman Pickle).

The university may be paying the president a salary that appears excessive in comparison to that paid to presidents of comparable universities. Alternatively, the university may have provided the president with a substantial interest-free loan. It may have paid for costly and luxurious amenities in the president's official residence. Each of these facts would raise serious inurement questions. Revoking the university's exemption, however, may be an inappropriate penalty. Revocation could adversely affect the entire university community — employees, students, and area residents. Moreover, even if the organization's exemption were revoked, the president would be able to retain the benefits inappropriately received from the university. In short, the Service may be faced with the difficult choice of revoking an organization's exemption or taking no enforcement action as long as the compensation in question has been reported accurately on the individual's income tax return."⁹²

The example given is compelling. Revocation would punish the innocent, disrupting many important relationships and expectations. It would have little or no impact on the recipient of the inurement. Commissioner Richardson concluded, "it would be useful to provide the Service with a sanction short of revocation to address violations of these standards."⁹³

Shortly after the June 15th hearing, the nonprofit sector moved aggressively to become involved in the process. In part that was due to the perception that Chairman Pickle appeared to be ready to move things forward; better to join (and attempt to influence) the course of the march than to be left standing at the start. Another important motive, however, was more expansive and less self-defensive: some of the

⁹² June 15, 1993 Hearing, supra note 91, at 14, 18-19 (1993) (prepared statement of Hon. Margaret Milner Richardson, Commissioner of Internal Revenue).

⁹³ Id. at 19.

⁹⁴ As its press releases often describe it, Independent Sector, founded in 1980, is a nonprofit coalition of over 850 corporate, foundation, and voluntary organization members with a national interest in voluntary action and philanthropy. Since its founding, it states, "we have supported openness, accountability and accessibility as basic to nonprofit behavior." Press release, July 27, 1993, reprinted at 9 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 151 (1994) (hereinafter *IS July 27 Press Release*). It is probably the largest

major umbrella organizations — Independent Sector⁹⁴ in particular — believed that more accountability was desirable for the long-run health of the field, and that some form of intermediate sanctions would make that possible. As early as July of 1993, IS publicly stated that it “supports establishing intermediate sanctions, such as perhaps a 5% excise tax applicable to organizations and individuals, for acts of inurement or private benefit, provided that clear and reasonable definitions are developed for those acts.”⁹⁵

Sometime between the middle of August and early September of 1993, counsel for IS had his first conversation on this topic with an Attorney Advisor in the Treasury Department’s Tax Legislative Counsel’s office. IS counsel stated the view that the private foundation self-dealing rules were not an appropriate model for public charity intermediate sanctions, and urged the use of an arms-length standard instead.⁹⁶ The quick agreement to that principle by the Attorney Advisor paved the way to an ongoing

umbrella organization of § 501(c)(3) and § 501(c)(4) organizations, and is clearly the most active in following and attempting to influence federal legislative and regulatory policies affecting its members. For many years, including those here in question, the author was a member of its Government Relations Committee. Independent Sector will sometimes hereinafter be referred to as “IS.”

⁹⁵ *IS July 27 Press Release, supra* note 94.

⁹⁶ In some instances, the self-dealing provisions — which adopt a set of prophylactic rules — penalize even a transaction which is beneficial to the charitable organization. See, e.g., § 4941(d)(1), treating as self-dealing any “sale or exchange” between a private foundation and a disqualified person. As the regulations confirm, “it is immaterial whether the transaction results in a benefit or a detriment to the private foundation.” Treas. Reg. § 53.4941(d)-1(a). Accord, Treas. Reg. § 53.4941(d)-2(a)(1) (“The sale or exchange of property between a private foundation and a disqualified person shall constitute an act of self-dealing . . . regardless of the amount paid to the disqualified person . . .”).

⁹⁷ Oct. 2, 1997, letter to the author from Robert A. Boisture (on file with the author). Mr. Boisture, a partner at Caplin & Drysdale in Washington, D.C., was one of the principal

constructive dialog with the Treasury.⁹⁷

On September 20, 1993, the head of the IS Government Relations function, Bob Smucker, met with Beth Vance, the then-Staff Director of the Subcommittee on Oversight, to discuss intermediate sanctions legislation. In a September 29 letter following up on that meeting, Mr. Smucker confirmed IS's support for such legislation, and set forth five principal characteristics it should have:

1. Graduated penalty taxes should apply to unreasonable compensation and non-fair-market-value transactions involving public charities;
2. Intermediate sanctions should not adopt the self-dealing or mandatory payout rules from the 1969 private foundations legislation;
3. What is reasonable compensation should be determined under "the market-driven standard of current law";
4. The sanctions should be imposed on the individual malefactors rather than the public charities, but officers and directors should also be sanctioned if they "knowingly and willfully approve a prohibited transaction"; and
5. Appropriate safe harbors and de minimis rules should be adopted "to ensure that [the new sanctions] are not unduly burdensome, particularly to smaller charities."⁹⁸

A copy of the letter was sent to the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy.

By early November of 1993, IS had prepared draft legislation and a 22-page explanation.⁹⁹ These were shared with relevant officials on the Staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation.¹⁰⁰ At the same time, efforts were taken to enlist the support of

IS representatives on the intermediate sanctions project.

⁹⁸ Sept. 29, 1993, letter to Beth Vance from Robert Smucker (on file at Independent Sector).

⁹⁹ Copies of drafts of the legislation and the explanatory memorandum are on file at Independent Sector, the offices of its counsel (Caplin & Drysdale), and with the author.

¹⁰⁰ Nov. 19, 1993, letter (and enclosures) to Steve Arkin from Robert Boisture (on file at

other nonprofit groups. For example, on Jan. 10, 1994, the President of the Council on Foundations wrote to Chairman Pickle, on behalf of the Council, to endorse the proposal for intermediate sanctions as drafted and submitted by IS.¹⁰¹

It seems fair to conclude, then, that the ultimate enactment of § 4958 was due in large part to the energetic efforts of the nonprofit sector itself, acting through some of its major umbrella organizations. It is easy to confirm this. Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Leslie B. Samuels testified on March 16, 1994, at the third hearing on intermediate sanctions before the Oversight Committee. He explicitly recognized the contribution of IS in the development of the legislation:

“These types of [abuse] cases have shaken the public’s confidence in charitable organizations. Consequently, charities should be interested in reducing the occurrence of abuses, to prevent the further erosion of the reputation of the charitable community as a whole. In recognition of this fact, at least one large coalition of nonprofit organizations, INDEPENDENT SECTOR, has made proposals to improve the performance and accountability of public charities.”¹⁰²

Interpretation of § 4958

Given the policy behind § 4958, it should be interpreted so far as possible to be precisely congruent with the scope of the inurement proscription. Whenever prohibited inurement can occur without violating § 4958, the only sanction continues to be revocation of tax-exempt status. It was exactly that undesirable situation that led to the enactment of intermediate sanctions. The legislative history can be read to confirm the

Caplin & Drysdale and with the author).

¹⁰¹ Jan. 10, 1994, letter from James A. Joseph to Hon. J.J. Pickle (copy on file with the author).

¹⁰² U.S. Department of the Treasury’s Proposals to Improve Compliance by Tax-Exempt Organizations, Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Oversight of the House of Representatives Comm. on Ways and Means, 103d Cong. 16, 17 (1994) (prepared statement of Hon. Leslie B. Samuels, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury) (capitalization in original).

view that § 4958 should duplicate the reach of the anti-inurement rules. The report of the House Ways and Means Committee first states that § 4958 may be applied either “in lieu of (or in addition to) revocation of an organization’s tax-exempt status.”¹⁰³ The accompanying footnote, however, goes on to say:

“In general, the intermediate sanctions are the *sole* sanction imposed in those cases in which the excess benefit does not rise to the level where it calls into question whether, on the whole, the organization functions as a charitable or other tax-exempt organization. In practice, revocation of tax-exempt status, with or without the imposition of excise taxes, would occur only when the organization no longer operates as a charitable organization.”¹⁰⁴

If, as the footnote urges, § 4958 generally displaces the inurement prohibition, that section also should aspire to cover the same transactions; otherwise, lacunae will occur.¹⁰⁵

The argument here is not for precise overlap of § 4958 with the anti-inurement rules. The statute unfortunately will not permit that construction. Rather, the suggestion is for congruent interpretation *so far as possible*. This proposition will be analyzed in three steps:

First — Certain types of transfers, although potentially subject to the anti-inurement regime, will not be caught by the new intermediate-sanctions provisions. The easiest example involves a payment of excess benefits to an “insider” by a private foundation. Because private foundations are explicitly excluded from the coverage of §

¹⁰³ H.R. Rep. No. 104-506, at 59 (1996).

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, n.15 (emphasis added).

¹⁰⁵ The possible overlap between revocation of exempt status and invocation of § 4958 is further discussed in the text accompanying notes 120 through 124 below.

¹⁰⁶ § 4958(e) states that “the term ‘applicable tax-exempt organization’ . . . shall not include a private foundation (as defined in section 509(a)).”

¹⁰⁷ In most instances, such transactions will be subject to a different excise tax regime:

4958,¹⁰⁶ inurement transactions involving them will escape its claws.¹⁰⁷

Another example has been suggested. It rests on some statements in G.C.M. 39,862 to the effect that all doctors (and indeed all employees) are, for purposes of the inurement doctrine, “insiders” of the hospital where they work.¹⁰⁸ If those statements are correct, excessive payments to such doctors or employees would fall afoul of the anti-inurement doctrine even if the recipients were not “in a position to exercise substantial influence over the affairs of the organization.” Such payments would *not*, however, be subject to § 4958 sanctions because the recipients would not be “disqualified persons” as defined.¹⁰⁹ It seems clear, however, that those statements from the G.C.M. are wrong.¹¹⁰ In its report on G.C.M. 39,862, the New York State Bar

the self-dealing rules of § 4941. That will not *always* be the case, however. For example, “substantial contributors” are “disqualified persons” for purposes of § 4941, whereas § 4958 includes only persons “in a position to exercise substantial influence” within its own separate definition of “disqualified person.” Compare §§ 4946(a)(1)(A) and 4958(f)(1)(A). If someone with “substantial influence” does not appear within the class of “disqualified persons” defined in § 4946(a)(1), neither § 4958 nor § 4941 will apply if the organization in question is a private foundation. It is less clear whether there are also situations in which the substance of the benefit might constitute an excess benefit transaction but not fall within the § 4941 self-dealing rules.

¹⁰⁶ § 4958(e) states that “the term ‘applicable tax-exempt organization’ . . . shall not include a private foundation (as defined in section 509(a)).”

¹⁰⁸ G.C.M. 39,862 (Nov. 22, 1991) says that “all persons performing services for an organization . . . possess the requisite relationship to find inurement.” Read literally, that would include volunteers and independent contractors as well as employees.

¹⁰⁹ § 4958(f)(1)(A) defines “disqualified person” as “any person . . . in a position to exercise substantial influence over the affairs of the organization.” Thus, doctors or employees who lack such influence would not generally be covered by § 4958. This is confirmed by Temp. Treas. Reg. § 53.4958-3T(g), Example 10.

¹¹⁰ Interestingly, G.C.M. 39,862 (Nov. 22, 1991) contains a quite correct and useful definition: “The proscription against inurement generally applies to a distinct class of private interests — typically persons who, because of their particular relationship with an organization, have an opportunity to control or influence its activities.” It is only later

Association Tax Section argued that a janitor, for example, should *not* be treated as an insider.¹¹¹ Subsequently, the then-Associate Chief Counsel of the Service, referring to that portion of the Bar Association Report, said, "I understand the concern. We intend to clarify that issue in an upcoming GCM."¹¹²

The legislative history of § 4958 also casts doubt on those over-broad statements from G.C.M. 39,862:

"The IRS has issued a general counsel memorandum indicating that all physicians are considered 'insiders' for purposes of applying the private inurement proscription. The Committee intended that physicians will be disqualified persons only if they are in a position to exercise substantial influence over the affairs of an organization."¹¹³

Furthermore, the Service has acknowledged that the over-broad statements in G.C.M. 39,862 are inaccurate. In its so-called physician-recruitment ruling, it stated:

"The physicians described in the following recruiting transactions do not have substantial influence over the affairs of the hospitals that are recruiting them. Therefore, they are not disqualified persons as defined in § 4958, nor do they have any personal or private interest in the activities of the organizations that would subject them to the inurement proscription of § 501(c)(3)."¹¹⁴

This also confirms that employees and doctors who lack actual influence will *not* be treated as insiders.

in its text that it erroneously ignores that definition and suggests that all employees and doctors are "insiders" without regard to their influence over the organization.

¹¹¹ *New York State Bar Ass'n Report on G.C.M. 39,862*, note 77 above, 6 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. at 1400 (1992).

¹¹² *McGovern 1993 Talk*, note 68 above, 7 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. at 555. No such clarifying G.C.M. has emerged. See, however, the text accompanying note 114 below.

¹¹³ H.R. Rep. No. 104-506, at 58 n. 12 (1996). The footnote does not, of course, indicate whether the G.C.M. is a correct statement of law for non-§ 4958 purposes.

¹¹⁴ Rev. Rul. 97-21, 1997-1 C.B. 121.

The most definitive rejection of the overbroad statements in G.C.M. 39,862 came in the temporary regulations under § 4958. Certain employees of an applicable tax-exempt organization are explicitly excluded from the from the class of disqualified persons.¹¹⁵ It follows that the second example, above, of inurement rules applying when § 4958 does not is incorrect. It is clear that the over-broad statements from G.C.M. 39,862 were wrong.

Second — Conversely, there will be cases in which only § 4958, and not the inurement proscription, will apply. As one example, § 4958(f)(1)(A) defines a “disqualified person” to include anyone who had the requisite control “at any time during the 5-year period ending on the date of such [excess-benefit] transaction.” There is no known precedent that invokes any such look-back rule for purposes of the anti-inurement provisions. Other examples could easily be provided. For instance, by application of the attribution or affiliation rules in § 4958,¹¹⁶ a limited partnership in which a step-brother of an insider’s spouse owns a 36% “silent” profits interest automatically becomes a disqualified person for purposes of § 4958, even if there is no evidence whatsoever of that partnership (or the step-brother) being in a position to exercise any control over the nonprofit organization in question and even if the step-brother is in fact hated by both the insider and the spouse-sibling.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁵ See Temp. Treas. Reg. §§ 53.4958-3T(d)(3) and 53.4958-3T(g), Examples 1, 9, and 10.

¹¹⁶ §§ 4958(f)(1)(B), 4958(f)(3)(A)(ii), and 4958(f)(4).

¹¹⁷ Of course, sound tax administrators should, and probably would, prevent any such case from being pursued under § 4958. In other contexts, family hostility has generally be held not to mitigate against the strict application of attribution rules in the Code. See, e.g., David Metzger Trust v. Commissioner, 693 F.2d 459 (5th Cir. 1982), cert. denied, 463 U.S. 1207 (1983); Michael N. Cerone v. Commissioner, 87 T.C. 1 (1986); Rev. Rul. 80-26, 1980-1 C.B. 66. See generally Boris I. Bittker & James S. Eustice, *Federal Income Taxation of Corporations and Shareholders* ¶ 9.02[2] (7th ed. 2000).

Third — Thus, in conclusion, while the provisions overlap, each also has its own independent area of effectiveness; neither is a subset of the other. The argument, then, is for as much duplication of scope as possible in the common areas or “intersection” of the two regimes.

The examples, above, of non-overlap cases involve either the status of the recipient of the proscribed benefit or the status of the charity transferring it. In the first example, the charity was a private foundation, explicitly excluded from the operation of the intermediate sanctions legislation.¹¹⁸ In the second example, the recipient was a person who, while not an actual “insider” for purposes of the inurement prohibition, was explicitly included within the “disqualified person” category of § 4958 as a result of its attribution or affiliation rules.¹¹⁹ The argument for common interpretation, then, comes to this: the *substance* of a transaction — whether it constitutes inurement or an excess benefit — should be interpreted identically for purposes of both doctrines, even though the *status* issues, i.e., the status of either the person benefited or the charity making that payment, may have to be interpreted differently.

At first glance, it might seem that there would be little incentive to argue for § 4958 *not* being co-extensive with the scope of the inurement proscription: why would any organization risk loss of exempt status rather than the imposition of a fine on its disqualified persons? The litigation posture, however, will be different than that. § 4958 imposes its sanctions on the individual beneficiaries of excess benefit transactions, not on the entity involved.¹²⁰ They will argue against the imposition of

¹¹⁸ See text accompanying notes 106 and 107 above.

¹¹⁹ See text accompanying notes 116 and 117 above.

¹²⁰ §§ 4958(a) and (b). This was one of the “first principles” urged by Independent Sector more than three years before the final enactment of § 4958. See text accompanying note 98 above.

excise taxes, perhaps caring little whether the exemption of the charitable organization in question would be put at risk. It might be tempting for diligent government litigators to assert parallel claims — one against the individuals under § 4958 and another against the organization under § 501(c)(3). The temptation should be resisted. Succumbing to it would violate the Congressional intention that § 4958 usually be the exclusive remedy,¹²¹ and it would needlessly create litigation costs (both time and money) for the public charity. The Service should adopt — and should publicly announce — a policy of using *only* § 4958 to police inurement violations except in extreme cases.¹²²

Although the Treasury Department had indicated, in the preamble to the 1998 Proposed Regulations under § 4958, that this would be done in final regulations,¹²³ the Temporary Regulations promulgated in early 2001 took a different tack. They backed off the earlier undertaking, saying instead:

“The temporary regulations do not foreclose revocation of tax-exempt status in appropriate cases. The IRS and the Treasury Department believe that to do so would effectively change the substantive standard for tax-exempt status under sections 501(c)(3) and (4). Accordingly, the IRS intends to exercise its administrative discretion in enforcing the requirements of sections 4958, 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) in accordance with the direction given in the legislative history. The IRS will publish guidance concerning the factors that it will consider in exercising its discretion as it gains more experience administering the section 4958 regime.”¹²⁴

¹²¹ See text accompanying note 104 above.

¹²² The Congressional injunction was to use only § 4958 except in situations in which the inurement abuse is so substantial that “it calls into question whether, on the whole, the organization functions as a charitable or other tax-exempt organization.” The text of the entire footnote from which the preceding quotation is taken appears in the text accompanying note 104 above.

¹²³ See the Preamble to the Proposed Regulations, 63 Fed. Reg. 41486, 41489 (Aug. 4, 1998).

¹²⁴ Preamble to the Temporary Regulations, 66 Fed. Reg. 2144, 2155 (Jan. 10, 2001).

It is hoped the I.R.S. will publish guidance on this issue before long. Doing so will assist counsel in guiding their exempt clients into appropriate compliance with good practices in order to avoid revocation of exempt status following the occurrence of an excess benefit transaction.

Although § 4958 was signed into law on July 30, 1996, it was made effective retroactively: it applies generally to excess benefit transactions occurring on or after Sept. 14, 1995.¹²⁵ It has thus been in force for more than six years. Regulations were first proposed in 1998; Temporary Regulations were adopted in January of 2001. Even the latter are neither complete nor final: treatment of revenue-sharing transactions is reserved,¹²⁶ and they expire, by their own terms, on Jan. 9, 2004.¹²⁷ It is to be hoped that final regulations will be promulgated in a timely fashion, certainly prior to the expiration of the temporary regulations. In the meantime, the Service can and should vigorously assert these excess-benefit excise taxes in appropriate cases. Doing so will help to develop more coherent and rational legal precedents dealing with issues of inurement.

Conclusion

Although the inurement proscription has been in the statute for nearly a century, there is very little authority helpfully interpreting it. The specific statutory language is of almost no help in marking out the scope of the rule; indeed, this paper argues that the

See also the first sentence of Temp. Treas. Reg. § 53.4958-8T(a).

¹²⁵ § 1311(d)(1) of the Taxpayer Bill of Rights 2, Pub. L. No. 104-168, 110 Stat. 1452 (1996). A binding-written-agreement exception to this retroactive effective date was provided in § 1311(d)(2). See generally Temp. Treas. Reg. § 53.4958-1T(f).

¹²⁶ See Temp. Treas. Reg. § 53.4958-5T

¹²⁷ Temp. Treas. Reg. § 53.4958-8T(c).

words ought generally to be disregarded. To some extent, the paucity of precedent probably follows from the harshness of what long was the only available penalty: revocation of tax exemption. Because the intermediate sanctions legislation now provides a more measured remedy, and because the substantive scope of § 4958 should be interpreted to be closely identical to the anti-inurement doctrine, there is reason to hope that better guidance will emerge in the months and years ahead. That is a consummation devoutly to be wished, because of the critical importance to this country of the work of its charitable community and the consequent importance of making sure that charity's quintessential nature is protected and polished — that is, that charitable assets are deployed only for the benefit of the intended beneficiaries and not to other persons, and that this is also seen to be the case as the result of an appropriate level of scrutiny and accountability.

Appendix A
General Counsel Memoranda
and
Revenue Rulings
on
Inurement, Private Benefit, and Excess Benefit Transactions

General Counsel Memoranda

1. G.C.M. 39,884 (Oct. 29, 1992).
2. G.C.M. 39,876 (July 29, 1992).
3. G.C.M. 39,873 (Apr. 15, 1992).
4. G.C.M. 39,867 (Dec. 18, 1991).
5. G.C.M. 39,862 (Nov. 22, 1991).
6. G.C.M. 39,818 (May 10, 1990).
7. G.C.M. 39,817 (May 9, 1990).
8. G.C.M. 39,674 (Oct. 23, 1987).
9. G.C.M. 39,670 (Oct. 14, 1987).
10. G.C.M. 39,562 (Oct. 8, 1986).
11. G.C.M. 39,498 (Apr. 24, 1986).
12. G.C.M. 39,414 (Sept. 25, 1985).
13. G.C.M. 38,905 (Oct. 6, 1982).
14. G.C.M. 38,827 (Mar. 23, 1982).
15. G.C.M. 38,821 (Feb. 3, 1982).
16. G.C.M. 38,638 (Feb. 20, 1981).
17. G.C.M. 38,459 (July 31, 1980).
18. G.C.M. 38,425 (June 30, 1980).
19. G.C.M. 38,322 (Mar. 24, 1980).
20. G.C.M. 38,283 (Feb. 15, 1980).
21. G.C.M. 37,789 (Dec. 18, 1978).
22. G.C.M. 37,596 (July 3, 1978).
23. G.C.M. 37,490 (Apr. 3, 1978).

-
24. G.C.M. 37,289 (Oct. 7, 1977).
 25. G.C.M. 37,180 (June 24, 1977).
 26. G.C.M. 37,065 (Mar. 25, 1977).
 27. G.C.M. 37,030 (Mar. 3, 1977).
 28. G.C.M. 36,918 (Nov. 11, 1976).
 29. G.C.M. 36,902 (Oct. 29, 1976).
 30. G.C.M. 36,539 (Dec. 29, 1975).
 31. G.C.M. 36,435 (Sept. 23, 1975).
 32. G.C.M. 36,253 (May 5, 1975).
 33. G.C.M. 36,247 (Apr. 28, 1975).
 34. G.C.M. 36,114 (Dec. 20, 1974).
 35. G.C.M. 36,057 (Oct. 21, 1974).
 36. G.C.M. 35,951 (Aug. 16, 1974).
 37. G.C.M. 35,869 (June 21, 1974).
 38. G.C.M. 35,865 (June 21, 1974).
 39. G.C.M. 35,855 (June 17, 1974).
 40. G.C.M. 35,771 (Apr. 9, 1974).
 41. G.C.M. 35,719 (Mar. 11, 1974).
 42. G.C.M. 35,638 (Jan. 28, 1974).
 43. G.C.M. 35,586 (Dec. 10, 1973).
 44. G.C.M. 35,234 (Feb. 7, 1973).
 45. G.C.M. 35,210 (Jan. 26, 1973).
 46. G.C.M. 34,796 (Mar. 2, 1972).
 47. G.C.M. 34,437 (Feb. 19, 1971).
 48. G.C.M. 34,325 (July 31, 1970).
 49. G.C.M. 34,259 (Jan. 23, 1970).
 50. G.C.M. 34,256 (Jan. 22, 1970).
 51. G.C.M. 33,971 (Nov. 19, 1968).
 52. G.C.M. 33,803 (Apr. 22, 1968).

-
53. G.C.M. 33,058 (Aug. 6, 1965).
 54. G.C.M. 32,518 (Feb. 20, 1963).
 55. G.C.M. 31,081 (Jan. 26, 1959).

Revenue Rulings

1. Rev. Rul. 97-21, 1997-18 I.R.B. 8.
2. Rev. Rul. 89-74, 1989-1 C.B. 311.
3. Rev. Rul. 86-98, 1986-2 C.B. 74.
4. Rev. Rul. 85-175, 1985-2 C.B. 276.
5. Rev. Rul. 81-60, 1981-1 C.B. 335.
6. Rev. Rul. 81-127, 1981-1 C.B. 357.
7. Rev. Rul. 80-286, 1980-2 C.B. 179.
8. Rev. Rul. 80-130, 1980-1 C.B. 117.
9. Rev. Rul. 80-106, 1980-1 C.B. 113.
10. Rev. Rul. 78-232, 1978-1 C.B. 69.
11. Rev. Rul. 77-206, 1977-1 C.B. 149.
12. Rev. Rul. 77-70, 1977-1 C.B. 150.
13. Rev. Rul. 76-257, 1976-2 C.B. 52.
14. Rev. Rul. 76-38, 1976-1 C.B. 157.
15. Rev. Rul. 76-91, 1976-1 C.B. 149.
16. Rev. Rul. 76-441, 1976-2 C.B. 147.
17. Rev. Rul. 74-148, 1974-1 C.B. 138.
18. Rev. Rul. 73-313, 1973-2 C.B. 174.
19. Rev. Rul. 73-14, 1973-1 C.B. 117.
20. Rev. Rul. 73-126, 1973-1 C.B. 220.
21. Rev. Rul. 70-566, 1970-2 C.B. 128.
22. Rev. Rul. 70-48, 1970-1 C.B. 133.
23. Rev. Rul. 69-636, 1969-2 C.B. 126.
24. Rev. Rul. 69-383, 1969-2 C.B. 113.

25. Rev. Rul. 69-538, 1969-2 C.B. 116.
26. Rev. Rul. 69-545, 1969-2 C.B. 117.
27. Rev. Rul. 69-633, 1969-2 C.B. 121.
28. Rev. Rul. 69-176, 1969-1 C.B. 150.
29. Rev. Rul. 69-256, 1969-1 C.B. 151.
30. Rev. Rul. 69-266, 1969-1 C.B. 151.
31. Rev. Rul. 69-279, 1969-1 C.B. 152.
32. Rev. Rul. 69-219, 1969-1 C.B. 153.
33. Rev. Rul. 69-220, 1969-1 C.B. 154.
34. Rev. Rul. 69-232, 1969-1 C.B. 154.
35. Rev. Rul. 69-281, 1969-1 C.B. 155.
36. Rev. Rul. 68-638, 1968-2 C.B. 220.
37. Rev. Rul. 68-639, 1968-2 C.B. 220.
38. Rev. Rul. 68-373, 1968-2 C.B. 206.
39. Rev. Rul. 68-119, 1968-1 C.B. 268.
40. Rev. Rul. 67-251, 1967-2 C.B. 196.
41. Rev. Rul. 66-149, 1966-1 C.B. 146.
42. Rev. Rul. 65-6, 1965-1 C.B. 229.
43. Rev. Rul. 65-63, 1965-1 C.B. 240.
44. Rev. Rul. 65-64, 1965-1 C.B. 241.
45. Rev. Rul. 65-269, 1965-2 C.B. 159.
46. Rev. Rul. 65-219, 1965-2 C.B. 168.
47. Rev. Rul. 64-258, 1964-2 C.B. 134.
48. Rev. Rul. 64-217, 1964-2 C.B. 153.
49. Rev. Rul. 61-170, 1961-2 C.B. 112.
50. Rev. Rul. 61-137, 1961-2 C.B. 118.
51. Rev. Rul. 60-324, 1960-2 C.B. 173.
52. Rev. Rul. 58-501, 1958-2 C.B. 262.
53. Rev. Rul. 58-588, 1958-2 C.B. 265.

- 54. Rev. Rul. 58-589, 1958-2 C.B. 266.
- 55. Rev. Rul. 58-190, 1958-1 C.B. 15.
- 56. Rev. Rul. 56-475, 1956-2 C.B. 308.

Appendix B
Leading Cases
on
Inurement, Private Benefit, and Excess Benefit Transactions

1. Airlie Found., Inc. v. United States, 826 F. Supp. 537 (D.D.C. 1993), *aff'd*, 55 F.3d 684 (D.C. Cir. 1995).
2. Alive Fellowship of Harmonious Living v. Commissioner, 47 T.C.M. (CCH) 1134 (1984).
3. American Campaign Academy v. Commissioner, 92 T.C. 1053 (1989).
4. Aviation Club of Utah v. Commissioner, 7 T.C. 377 (1946), *aff'd*, 162 F.2d 984 (10th Cir. 1947).
5. B.H.W. Anesthesia Found. v. Commissioner, 72 T.C. 681 (1979).
6. B. S. W. Group, Inc. v. Commissioner, 70 T.C. 352 (1978).
7. Baltimore Health and Welfare Fund v. Commissioner, 69 T.C. 554 (1978).
8. Basic Bible Church v. Commissioner, 74 T.C. 846 (1980).
9. Basic Unit Ministry of Alma Karl Schurig v. United States, 511 F. Supp. 166 (D.D.C. 1981).
10. Best Lock Corp. v. Commissioner, 31 T.C. 1217 (1959).
11. Beth-El Ministries, Inc. v. United States, 79-2 U.S. Tax Cas. (CCH) ¶ 9,412 (D.D.C. 1986).
12. Birmingham Bus. College, Inc. v. Commissioner, 276 F.2d 476 (5th Cir. 1960).
13. Broadway Theatre League, Inc. v. Commissioner, 293 F. Supp. 346 (W.D.Va. 1968).
14. Bubbling Well Church of Universal Love, Inc. v. Commissioner, 74 T.C. 531 (1980), *aff'd*, 670 F.2d 104 (9th Cir. 1981).
15. Callaway Family Ass'n v. Commissioner, 71 T.C. 340 (1978).
16. Canada v. Commissioner, 82 T.C. 973 (1984).
17. Carter v. United States, 973 F.2d 1479 (9th Cir. 1992).
18. Church by Mail, Inc. v. Commissioner, 48 T.C.M. (CCH) 471 (1984), *aff'd*, 765 F.2d 1387 (9th Cir. 1985).
19. Church in Boston v. Commissioner, 71 T.C. 102 (1978).
20. Church of Gospel Ministry, Inc. v. United States, 640 F. Supp. 96 (D.D.C. 1986).
21. Church of Scientology of Cal. v. Commissioner, 83 T.C. 381 (1984), *aff'd*, 823 F.2d 1310 (9th Cir. 1987).

22. Church of the Visible Intelligence that Governs the Universe v. United States, 4 Cl. Ct. 55 (1983).
23. Church of Transfiguring Spirit v. Commissioner, 76 T.C. 1 (1981).
24. Commissioner v. Johnson, 30 T.C. 909 (1958), *aff'd*, 267 F.2d 382 (1st Cir. 1959).
25. Commissioner v. Orton, 9 T.C. 533 (1947), *aff'd*, 173 F.2d 483 (6th Cir. 1949).
26. Davis v. Commissioner, 81 T.C. 806 (1983).
27. Dube v. United States, 169 B.R. 886 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1994).
28. Duck v. Commissioner, 47 T.C.M. (CCH) 1654 (1984).
29. Dumaine Farms v. Commissioner, 73 T.C. 650 (1980).
30. Easter House v. United States, 12 Cl. Ct. 476 (1987).
31. Enterprise Ry. Equip. Co. v. United States, 161 F. Supp. 590 (Ct. Cl. 1958).
32. Estate of Reis v. Commissioner, 87 T.C. 1016 (1987).
33. Founding Church Of Scientology v. United States, 412 F.2d 1197 (Ct. Cl. 1969), *cert. denied*, 397 U.S. 1009 (1970).
34. Freedom Church of Revelation v. United States, 588 F. Supp. 693 (D.D.C. 1984).
35. Ft. Scott Clinic & Hosp. Corp. v. Brodrick, 99 F. Supp. 515 (D. Kan. 1951).
36. Gemological Inst. of America v. Commissioner, 17 T.C. 1604 (1952).
37. General Contractors' Ass'n Of Milwaukee v. United States, 202 F.2d 633 (7th Cir. 1953).
38. Golden Rule Church Ass'n v. Commissioner, 41 T.C. 719 (1964).
39. Gookin v. United States, 707 F. Supp. 1156 (N.D. Cal. 1988).
40. Granzow v. Commissioner, 739 F.2d 265 (7th Cir. 1984).
41. Hall v. Commissioner, 729 F.2d 632 (9th Cir. 1984).
42. Hancock Acad. of Savannah, Inc. v. Commissioner, 69 T.C. 488 (1977).
43. Harding Hosp., Inc. v. United States, 358 F. Supp. 805 (S.D. Ohio 1973), *aff'd*, 505 F.2d 1068 (6th Cir. 1974).
44. Hofer v. United States, 64 Ct. Cl. 672 (1928).
45. Home Oil Mill v. Willingham, 68 F. Supp. 525 (N.D. Ala. 1945), *aff'd*, 181 F.2d 9 (5th Cir. 1950).
46. Housing Pioneers v. Commissioner, 49 F.3d 1395 (9th Cir. 1995).
47. Huron Clinic Found. v. United States, 212 F. Supp. 847 (D.S.D. 1962).

-
48. International Postgraduate Med. Found. v. Commissioner, 56 T.C.M. (CCH) 1140 (1989).
 49. John Marshall Law Sch. v. United States, 228 Ct. Cl. 902 (Ct. Cl. 1981).
 50. John Marshall Law Sch. v. United States, 81-2 U.S. Tax Cas. (CCH) ¶ 9,514 (Ct. Cl. 1981).
 51. Kenner v. Commissioner, 318 F.2d 632 (7th Cir. 1963).
 52. Lewis v. United States, 189 F. Supp. 950 (D. Wyo. 1961).
 53. Lorain Ave. Clinic v. Commissioner, 31 T.C. 141 (1958).
 54. Lowry Hosp. Assoc. v. Commissioner, 66 T.C. 850 (1976).
 55. Mabee Petroleum Corp. v. United States, 203 F.2d 872 (5th Cir. 1953).
 56. Maynard Hosp., Inc. v. Commissioner, 52 T.C. 1006 (1969).
 57. McGahen v. Commissioner, 76 T.C. 468 (1981).
 58. Michigan Mobile Home and Recreational Vehicle Inst. v. Commissioner, 66 T.C. 770 (1976).
 59. Moody v. Commissioner, 69 T.C.M. (CCH) 2517 (1995).
 60. National Found., Inc. v. United States, 13 Cl. Ct. 486 (1987).
 61. New Concordia Bible Church v. Commissioner, 49 T.C.M. (CCH) 176 (1984).
 62. New Life Tabernacle v. Commissioner, 49 T.C.M. (CCH) 176 (1982).
 63. Ohio Furnace Co., v. Commissioner, 25 T.C. 179 (1955).
 64. Orange County Agricultural Society, Inc. v. Commissioner, 893 F.2d 529 (2^d Cir. 1990).
 65. Parshall Christian Order v. Commissioner, 45 T.C.M. (CCH) 488 (1983).
 66. People of God Community v. Commissioner, 75 T.C. 127 (1980).
 67. Petersen v. Commissioner, 53 T.C.M. (CCH) 235 (1987).
 68. Presbyterian & Reformed Publ'g Co. v. Commissioner, 743 F.2d 148 (3^d Cir. 1984).
 69. Pulpit Resources v. Commissioner, 70 T.C. 594 (1978).
 70. Puritan Lawn Mem'l Park Cemetery v. United States, 15 Cl. Ct. 234 (1988).
 71. Randall Found. Inc. v. Riddell, 244 F.2d 803 (9th Cir. 1957).
 72. Rapco, Inc. v. Commissioner, 85 F.3d 950 (2^d Cir. 1996).
 73. Riker v. Commissioner, 244 F.2d 220 (9th Cir. 1957).
 74. Saint Germain Found. v. Commissioner, 26 T.C. 648 (1956).

-
75. Scholarship Endowment Found. v. Nicholas, 106 F.2d 552 (10th Cir. 1939).
 76. Science & Research Found., Inc. v. United States, 181 F. Supp. 526 (S.D. Ill. 1960).
 77. Sonora Community Hosp. v. Commissioner, 46 T.C. 519 (1966).
 78. Southern Church of Bhd. v. Commissioner, 74 T.C. 1223 (1980).
 79. Spokane Motorcycle Club v. United States, 222 F. Supp. 151 (E.D. Wash. 1963).
 80. Stephenson v. Commissioner, 748 F.2d 331 (6th Cir. 1984).
 81. Texas Trade School v. Commissioner, 272 F.2d 168 (5th Cir. 1959).
 82. The Inc. Trustees of the Gospel Worker Soc'y v. United States, 510 F. Supp. 374 (D.D.C. 1981), *aff'd*, 672 F.2d 894 (D.C. Cir. 1981), *cert. denied*, 456 U.S. 944 (1982).
 83. Triune of Life Church, Inc. v. Commissioner, 85 T.C. 45 (1985).
 84. Truth Tabernacle v. Commissioner, 41 T.C.M. (CCH) 1405 (1981).
 85. Unitary Mission Church v. Commissioner, 74 T.C. 507 (1980), *aff'd*, 647 F.2d 163 (2^d Cir. 1981).
 86. United Cancer Council, Inc. v. Commissioner, 109 T.C. 326 (1997), *rev'd and remanded*, 165 F.3d 1173 (7th Cir. 1999).
 87. United Libertarian Fellowship, Inc. v. Commissioner, 65 T.C.M. (CCH) 2175 (1993).
 88. United States v. Daly, 756 F.2d 1076 (5th Cir. 1985).
 89. Universal Church of Scientific Truth v. United States, 74-1 U.S. Tax Cas. (CCH) ¶ 9,360 (N.D. Ala. 1973).
 90. Wendy L. Parker Rehabilitation Found., Inc. v. Commissioner, 74 T.C. 507 (1986).
 91. Western Catholic Church v. Commissioner, 73 T.C. 196 (1979), *aff'd*, 631 F.2d 736 (7th Cir. 1980), *cert. denied*, 450 U.S. 981 (1981).
 92. William L. Powell Found. v. Commissioner, 21 T.C. 279 (1953), *rev'd*, 222 F.2d 68 (7th Cir. 1955).
 93. World Family Corp. v. Commissioner, 81 T.C. 958 (1983).

Appendix C
Selected Bibliography
on
Inurement, Private Benefit, and Excess Benefit Transactions

1. Robert J. Alter & Eileen O'Donnell, *Dealing with IRS Hospital Audits*, N.J. L.J., Dec. 19, 1994, at 22.
2. American Bar Ass'n Section of Tax'n Comm. on Exempt Org's., *Comments Concerning New Section 4958 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986*, 50 Tax Law. 817 (1997).
3. *American Bar Association Task Force Comments on Intermediate Sanctions and Regulations*, 8 J. Tax'n Exempt Org. (WGL) 269 (1997).
4. Ellen P. Aprill, *Private Inurement, Private Benefit, and Exempt Purpose: Implications of Airlie Foundation, Inc. v. United States*, 46 Major Tax Plan. 23 (1994).
5. David W. Ball, *Internal Revenue Service General Counsel's Memorandum Threatens Tax Exemption for Charitable Hospitals*, 1 Annals Health L. 71 (1992).
6. Deanna Bellandi, *Regulation Mania: IRS Unleashes Long-Awaited Rules on Intermediate Sanctions Law*, Mod. Healthcare, Jan. 15, 2001, at 8.
7. Harvey J. Berger, *Intermediate Sanctions Need Work, Commentator Says*, 16 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 290 (1997).
8. Irwin M. Birnbaum & Jacob I. Friedman, *Proposals Allow IRS to Impose Milder Penalties*, N.Y. L.J., Aug. 8, 1994, at 5.
9. Robert A. Boisture & Beth Sellers, *Treasury Issues the Long-Awaited Proposed Regulations on Intermediate Sanctions*, 10 J. Tax'n Exempt Org. (WGL) 99 (1998).
10. Robert A. Boisture, *Proposed Ruling on Physician Recruitment Signals Positive Shift by IRS*, 7 J. Tax'n Exempt Org. (WGL) 32 (1995).
11. Robert A. Boisture, *Treasury Proposes Intermediate Sanctions on Public Charities and Section 501(c)(4) Organizations*, 9 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 799 (1994).
12. Robert A. Boisture & Milton Cerny, *Treasury Proposes Intermediate Sanctions on Public Charities and Section 501(c)(4) Organizations*, 63 Tax Notes (TA) 353 (1994).
13. Robert A. Boisture & Milton Cerny, *Hearings Raise the Prospect of Intermediate Sanctions and New Disclosure Requirements for Public Charities*, 8 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 121 (1993), reprinted at 60 Tax Notes (TA) 225 (1993).

14. Robert A. Boisture, *Intermediate Sanctions: New Public Charity Rules for Insider Transactions*, 21 A.L.I.-A.B.A. 5 (1997).
15. Bonnie S. Brier, *Compensation: How to Attract Good People Without Losing Tax Exemption*, in *Tax Exempt Charitable Organizations* 163 (ALI-ABA Course of Study No. C875, 1993).
16. Bernadette M. Broccolo et al., *Rules to Live By: IRS Releases Intermediate Sanctions Regulations*, 80 Tax Notes (TA) 1209 (1998).
17. Evelyn Brody, *Troubling Lessons from the Bishop Estate Settlement for Administering the New Intermediate Sanctions Regime*, 33 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 431 (2001).
18. Evelyn Brody, *Administrative Troubles in the Intermediate Sanctions Regime*, 92 Tax Notes (TA) 423 (2001).
19. Robert S. Bromberg, *The Charitable Hospital*, 20 Cath. U. L. Rev. 237 (1970).
20. Thomas J. Brorby, *Compensating Executives Fairly Under Intensifying Scrutiny*, CA06 A.L.I.-A.B.A. 235 (1995).
21. Caplin & Drysdale, *Intermediate Sanctions: What You Need to Know about the Proposed IRS Regulations* (1998).
22. Marlis L. Carlson & Fred Stokeld, *New Intermediate Sanctions Present Many Questions, Few Answers*, 72 Tax Notes (TA) 1727 (1996).
23. Arthur D. Cassill & Susan E. Anderson, *Tax-exempts Face IRS Scrutiny*, 183 J. Acct. 35 (1997).
24. Milton Cerny & Catherine E. Livingston, *IRS Intermediate Sanctions: How They Will Impact Colleges and Universities*, 25 J. Coll. & Univ. L. 865 (1999).
25. Milton Cerny, *Outlook for Intermediate Sanctions Seems More Certain Than the Content*, 5 J. Tax'n Exempt Org. (WGL) 221 (1994).
26. Milton Cerny, *Treasury Proposal Defines the Issues on Intermediate Sanctions*, 6 J. Tax'n Exempt Org. (WGL) 35 (1994).
27. John D. Colombo, *Are Associations of Doctors Tax-Exempt? Analyzing Inconsistencies in the Tax-Exemption of Health Care Providers*, 9 Va. Tax Rev. 469 (1990).
28. *Compensation Dilemmas under Intermediate Sanctions*, *Philanthropy Monthly*, Mar. 1997, at 37.
29. Diane Cornwell, Anne M. McGeorge, Jeffrey D. Frank & Vincent J. Crowley, *Arthur Andersen Guide to Navigating Intermediate Sanctions: Compliance and Documentation Guidelines for Health Care and Other Tax-Exempt Organizations* (2000).

30. John A. Corry, *NYSBA Report Examines Private Inurement Issues*, 6 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 1397 (1992).
31. Eugene Cowan et al., *Tax-Exempt General Partners and the IRS: Defenestrating the Myth of Private Inurement and Public Benefit*, 7 J. Affordable Housing & Community Dev. L. 69 (1997).
32. Brian W. Crozier, *Intermediate Sanctions Will Affect Exempt Organizations' Hiring and Compensation Policies*, 8 J. Tax'n Exempt Org. (WGL) 61 (1996).
33. Brian W. Crozier & Thomas J. Brorby, *Salary Levels of Exempts Should Not Be Controlled by Intermediate Sanctions*, 5 J. Tax'n Exempt Org. (WGL) 163 (1994).
34. H. Thomas Davis, Jr. & M. Antoinette Thomas, *Exempt Organizations Should Support Intermediate Sanctions Legislation*, 8 J. Tax'n Exempt Org. (WGL) 51 (1996).
35. J. Davis & L. J. Henzke, *Assessing the Reasonableness of Compensation Under the Intermediate Sanctions*, 9 J. Tax'n Exempt Org. (WGL) 118 (1997).
36. J. Davis & L. J. Henzke, *Avoiding Excise Taxes for Officers and Directors of Exempt Organizations Under the Intermediate Sanctions*, 5 J. Tax'n Employee Benefits (WGL) 226 (1998).
37. Deborah A. DeMott, *Self-Dealing Transactions in Nonprofit Corporations*, 59 Brook. L. Rev. 131 (1995).
38. Robert A. Desilets, Jr., *The Effect of Private Inurement on Physician Recruitment: When Is Too Little Too Much and Too Much Not Enough?*, 13 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 449 (1996).
39. Mark O. Dietrich, *Taxation and Health Care*, 23 Tax Adviser 513 (1992).
40. John A. Edie, *How Much Is Too Much? Determining Compensation Levels for Executives*, 16 NYU Tax Plan. Charitable Sector § 5 (1988).
41. Albert B. Ellentuck & James J. Milano, *The American Campaign Academy Case: The Tax Court Clarifies How the Private Benefit Restriction Can Jeopardize Section 501(c)(3) Tax-Exempt Status*, 22 Tax Adviser 316 (1992).
42. Fredric J. Entin, *Hospital Group Comments on Intermediate Sanctions Regs*, 16 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 286 (1997).
43. J. David Epstein, *Lawyer Wants Clarification on Application of Intermediate Sanction Regs.*, 15 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 432 (1996).
44. Amitai Etzioni & Pamela Doty, *Profit in Not-for-Profit Corporations: The Example of Health Care*, 91 Pol. Sci. Q. 433 (1976).
45. *Exempt Organization Serving as Conduit for Inurement from Other Exempt Organization is Itself Guilty of Inurement*, 28 Tax Mgmt. Memo. 235 (Sept. 14,

-
- 1987).
47. Peter L. Faber, *Comments on the Temporary Intermediate Sanctions Regulations*, 90 Tax Notes (TA) 945 (2001), reprinted at 31 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 163 (2001).
 48. Peter L. Faber, *Comments on Proposed Intermediate Sanctions Regulations*, 22 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 49 (1998).
 49. Peter L. Faber, *The Effect of Intermediate Sanctions on the Ultimate Sanction for Tax-Exempt Organizations*, 16 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 587 (1997).
 50. Nicholas Fiore, *Sanctioning Public Charities for Improper Dealings*, J. Acct. (WGL), Mar. 1999, at 28.
 51. Edward W. Fitzgerald, *CPA Suggests De Minimis Rule for Intermediate Sanctions*, 16 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 117 (1997).
 52. Daniel M. Ford, *Insiders and Inurement: The Seventh Circuit's Reversal of the Tax Court in United Cancer Council v. Commissioner*, 50 Case W. Res. L. Rev. 909 (2000).
 53. Marion R. Fremont-Smith, *Public Charity Intermediate Sanctions*, Tax Exempt Charitable Organizations 51 (ALI-ABA Study Materials 1994).
 54. Harry G. Gourevitch, *The Tax Treatment of Exempt Organizations: Intermediate Sanctions*, Cong. Res. Service Rep. 94-901S (1994).
 55. Martin E. Greif, *Intermediate Sanctions for "Excess Benefit Transactions"*, CPA J., Dec. 1996, at 54.
 56. Gerald M. Griffith, *Impact of the Taxpayer Bill of Rights 2 on Exempt Organizations*, 74 Taxes (CCH) 467 (1996).
 57. Gerald M. Griffith, *Compensation and Fraud Issues Trigger First Health Care Audit Revocation of the 1990s*, 6 J. Tax'n Exempt Org. (WGL) 259 (1995).
 58. Alyce C. Halchak & Peter J. Ulrich, *Hospital-Doctor Joint Ventures Under IRS Scrutiny*, N.J. L.J., June 22, 1992, at S6.
 59. Newman T. Halvorsen, Jr., *The Intermediate Sanctions Regs: Many Questions Remain*, 80 Tax Notes (TA) 1197 (1998) and 22 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 65 (1998).
 60. Shane T. Hamilton, *The Need for Guidance on the Use of Physician Recruitment Incentives by Nonprofit Hospitals*, 15 Va. Tax Rev. 739 (1996).
 61. Henry B. Hansmann, *Reforming Nonprofit Corporation Law*, 129 U. Pa. L. Rev. 497 (1981).
 62. Lu Hardin et al., *Managing the Effects of Intermediate Tax Sanctions on Tax-Exempt Healthcare Organizations*, Healthcare Fin. Mgmt., July 1997, at 59.

-
63. Bertrand M. Harding & Edgar D. McClellan, *Unreasonable Compensation: The Hidden Issue in the IRS College and University Examination Guidelines*, 20 J.C. & U.L. 111 (1993).
 64. C. Thompson Hardy et al., *Impact of Tax Sanctions on Physician Practice Acquisition and Employment*, Healthcare Fin. Mgmt., July 1997, at 62.
 65. Leonard J. Henzke, Jr., *Fringe Benefits for Staff of Exempt Organizations — How Much Is Too Much?*, 16 NYU Tax Plan. Charitable Sector § 9 (1988).
 66. Bruce R. Hopkins & D. Benson Tesdahl, *Intermediate Sanctions: Curbing nonprofits' Abuse* (1997).
 67. Bruce R. Hopkins, *Court Finds Private Inurement in Tangle of Organizations and Transactions*, 8 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 258 (1993).
 68. Bruce R. Hopkins, *The Law of Tax-Exempt Organizations* ch. 19 (7th ed. 1998).
 69. William T. Hutton & Cynthia R. Rowland, *The Inurement Rule and Ownership of Copyrights*, 9 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 813 (1994).
 70. Thomas K. Hyatt, *Physician Recruitment and Retention for Charitable Hospitals: In the Midst of a Sea Change?*, 6 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 1314 (1992).
 71. *Independent Sector Submits Comments on Intermediate Sanctions*, 16 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 503 (1997).
 72. *Intermediate Sanctions Against Unreasonable Compensation*, 14 Tax Mgmt. Wkly. Rep. (BNA) 1145 (1994).
 73. *Intermediate Sanctions: New Public Charity Rules for Insider Transactions*, ALI-ABA Course Materials J., June 1997, at 5.
 74. *Inurement*, 1983 Exempt Organizations Annual Technical Review Institutes § F.
 75. *IRS Provides Guidance on Private Inurement Prohibition for Charitable Organizations*, 15 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 118 (1996).
 76. Darryll K. Jones, *"First Bite" and the Private Benefit Doctrine: A Comment on Temporary and Proposed Regulation 53.4958-4T(a)(3)*, 62 Pitts. L. Rev. ____ (2001).
 77. Darryll K. Jones, *Private Benefit and The Unanswered Questions From Redlands*, 89 Tax Notes (TA) 121 (2000).
 78. Darryll K. Jones, *The Scintilla of Individual Profit: In Search of Private Inurement and Excess Benefit*, 19 Va. Tax Rev. 575 (2000).
 79. Darryll K. Jones, *Intermediate Sanctions, Revenue Sharing, and Too Many EOs* Anyway, 69 Tax Notes (TA) 1529 (1995).

-
80. Stuart R. Josephs, *No "Insider" Inurement Finding Reinstates Charitable Exemption*, 30 Tax Adviser 298 (1999).
 81. Laura Kalick, *Influence Determines When a Physician Is a Disqualified Person*, 8 J. Tax'n Exempt Org. (WGL) 152 (1997).
 82. Howard Kaplan, *Real Estate Opportunities for Tax-Exempt Organizations: Potential and Pitfalls after Plumstead Theatre*, 61 Taxes (CCH) 291 (1983).
 83. Pamela S. Kaufmann, *A Selective Review of the Intermediate Sanctions Temp. Regs. — Generally, Improved All Around*, 94 J. Tax'n (WGL) 301 (2001).
 84. Consuelo Lauda Kertz, *Executive Compensation Dilemmas in Tax-Exempt Organizations: Reasonableness, Comparability, and Disclosure*, 71 Tul. L. Rev. 819 (1997).
 85. Barbara L. Kirschten & Cynthia M. Lewin, *D.C. Bar Comments on Intermediate Sanctions Rules*, 16 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 280 (1997).
 86. Barbara L. Kirschten, *Intermediate Sanctions for Public Charities*, 23 N.Y.U. Conf. on Tax Plan. for 501(c)(3) Org. 6-1 (1995).
 87. Consuelo Lauda Kertz, *New Sanctions Aimed at Noncompliant Tax-Exempt Groups*, 25 Tax'n for Law. 219 (1997).
 88. Daniel L. Kurtz & Sarah E. Paul, *Determining Reasonable Compensation for Nonprofit Executives: Avoiding Private Inurement and the Imposition of Intermediate Sanctions*, 24 N.Y.U. Conf. on Tax Plan. for 501(c)(3) Org. 4 (1997).
 89. Andrew S. Lang & George E. Cowperthwaite, *A Powerful New Tool for the IRS: New Penalty Taxes Affect Transactions Occurring On or After September 14, 1995, and Must Be Reported on Your Association's Form 990*, Ass'n Mgmt., Oct. 1996, at 49.
 90. Kenneth Liles & Cynthia Blum, *Development of the Federal Tax Treatment of Charities: A Prelude to the Tax Reform Act of 1969*, L. & Contemp. Probs., Autumn 1975, at 6.
 91. Robert C. Louthian, *How Intermediate Sanctions May Be Applied to IDSs*, Healthcare Fin. Mgmt., Apr. 1999, at 33.
 92. Robert C. Louthian III & Elizabeth M. Mills, *Physician Recruitment after Hermann Hospital*, 4 Annals Health. L. 1 (1995).
 93. Douglas M. Mancino, *New "Intermediate Sanctions" May Cause Public Charities to Change the Way They Do Business*, 85 J. Tax'n (WGL) 368 (1996).
 94. Douglas M. Mancino, *Intermediate Sanctions and Changes in Use Are Factors in Conversion of Tax Status*, 9 J. Tax'n Exempt Org. (WGL) 58 (1997).

-
95. Douglas M. Mancino, *Final Physician Recruitment Ruling Provides Welcome Guidelines*, 87 J. Tax'n (WGL) 50 (1997).
 96. Joseph C. Mandarino, *Intermediate Sanctions Flow Charts*, 32 J. Health L. 169 (1999).
 97. McDermott et al., *What You Should Know About the New Intermediate Sanction Rules for Tax-Exempt Organizations*, 11 Prac. Tax Law. 51 (1997).
 98. James J. McGovern, *Intermediate Sanctions*, 30 Bus. Officer 42 (1996).
 99. James J. McGovern, *Intermediate Sanctions: Former IRS Official Explains the New Law's Effect on Colleges*, 15 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 365 (1996).
 100. Charles F. McKelvie et al., *Practitioner-Provider Joint Ventures, the OIG, and the IRS: Part 2*, Healthcare Fin. Mgmt., Nov. 1992, at 51.
 101. Steven T. Miller, *Rebuttable Presumption is Key to Easy Intermediate Sanctions Compliance*, 91 Tax Notes (TA) 1735 (2001).
 102. Rosalie Murphy, *Intermediate Sanctions: A New Hazard for Public Charities*, 137 Tr. & Est. 18 (1998).
 103. John Holt Myers, *Law of Private Inurement and Unrelated Income Taxation: Implications for Colleges and Universities*, 3 J.C. & U.L. 96 (1975).
 104. *New Law Loosens Ban on Self-Dealing by Trustees of Charitable Groups*, Health L. Rep. (BNA), July 4, 1996, at 27.
 105. Note, *"The Inurement of Earnings to Private Benefit" Clause of Section 501(c): A Standard Without Meaning?*, 48 Minn. L. Rev. 1149 (1964).
 106. Celia Roady & Ward Osteen, *Intermediate Sanctions: A New IRS Weapon Against Tax-Exempt Compensation Abuse*, 9 Benefits L.J. 49 (1996).
 107. *Overview of Inurement/Private Benefit Issues*, 1990 Exempt Organizations Continuing Professional Education Technical Instruction Program § C.
 108. Michael W. Peregrine, *Intermediate Tax Sanctions: An Overview*, Healthcare Fin. Mgmt., July 1997, at 56.
 109. Michael W. Peregrine, *Complying with the New Intermediate Sanctions Law*, 14 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 245 (1996).
 110. Michael W. Peregrine & Ralph W. DeJong, *Director Compensation Plans for Nonprofits: Addressing the Key Legal Issues*, 30 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 29 (2000).
 111. *Political Consanguinity and Intermediate Sanctions*, Philanthropy Monthly, July 1998, at 5.
 112. Anthony P. Polito, *Private Inurement and the Intermediate Sanctions Regime*, 77 Tax Notes (TA) 599 (1997).

-
113. *Private Benefit, Inurement and Combatting Community Deterioration*, 1981 Exempt Organizations Continuing Professional Education Technical Instruction Program § F.
 114. *Private Inurement: Charity's Medicaid Reimbursement to Physicians Not Private Benefit*, Health L. Rep. (BNA), Apr. 25, 1996, at 36.
 115. Wm. L. Raby & Eli Gerver, *Dominated, but Exempt*, Nat'l L.J., Feb. 27, 1984, at 3.
 116. Burgess J.W. Raby & William L. Raby, *Private Inurement, Private Benefit, UCC, and Intermediate Sanctions*, 82 Tax Notes (TA) 1979 (1999).
 117. Cynthia F. Reaves, *Intermediate Sanctions Aim Penalties at Those with Substantial Influence over Exempt Organizations*, in Health Law Handbook 1997 Edition 259 (Alice G. Grosfield ed., 1997).
 118. Brian H. Redmond, Annotation, *Federal Tax Exemption: When Do Earnings of Religious, Charitable, Educational, or Similar Organization Inure to Benefit of Private Shareholders or Individuals Within Meaning of 26 USCS § 501(c)(3)*, 92 A.L.R. Fed. 255 (1996).
 119. *Religious Foundation Flunks Operational, Private Inurement Tests (Alamo Foundation v. Comm'r)*, 5 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 687 (1992).
 120. D. Alexander Ritchie, Note, *Intermediate Sanctions: Controlling the Tax Exempt Organization Manager*, 18 Va. Tax Rev. 875 (1999).
 121. Markeley S. Roderick, *Taxing Partners: Hospitals, Doctors and the IRS*, N.J. L.J., Jan. 11, 1993, at 10.
 122. Edward J. Rodriguez, *Federal Tax Exemption Status of the Private Nonprofit Art Association*, 10 Conn. L. Rev. 653 (1978).
 123. David G. Samuels, *Executive Compensation by Charitable Organizations*, N.Y. L.J., Dec. 20, 1995, at 1.
 124. Thomas J. Schenkelberg, *Intermediate Sanctions on the Eve of the Final Regulations*, 25 Tax Mgmt. Est. Gifts & Tr. J. (BNA) 129 (2000).
 125. Thomas J. Schenkelberg & Virginia C. Gross, *Guidance Issued on Intermediate Sanctions But No Finality*, 26 Tax Mgmt. Est. Gifts & Tr. J. (BNA) 94 (2001).
 126. Michael H. Schill, Note, *The Participation of Charities in Limited Partnerships*, 93 Yale L.J. 1355 (1984).
 127. Howard M. Schoenfeld, *Current Tax Issues Affecting Religious Organizations*, 36 Cath. Law. 335 (1996).
 128. Marshall Scott, Thomas Flannery & K. Khiem Ting, *Intermediate Sanctions Proposed Regs. Highlight Dangers of Excess Benefit Transactions*, 6 J. Tax'n Employee

-
- Benefits (WGL) 110 (Sept./Oct. 1998).
130. Edward J. Schnee & Walter A. Robbins, *Profit-Sharing Plans and Tax-Exempt Organizations — A New Benefit for All*, 62 Taxes (CCH) 220 (1984).
 131. Howard M. Schoenfeld & David M. Repass, "Intermediate Sanctions" — *Issues, Pitfalls, and Protective Measures*, 72 Tax Notes (TA) 1033 (1996).
 132. Richard L. Sevcik, *Inurement of Net Earnings to Shareholders or Individuals: A Challenge and a Danger to Exempt Organizations*, 65 Taxes (CCH) 519 (1987).
 133. Michael A. Shea, *New Intermediate Sanctions Regulations for Executive and Consultant Compensation*, Colo. Law., Nov. 1998, at 51.
 134. Lee A. Sheppard, *Did Book Deal Cause Private Inurement to Gingrich?*, 72 Tax Notes (TA) 550 (1996).
 135. Lee A. Sheppard, *HMO Conversions and Self-Dealing*, 61 Tax Notes (TA) 15 (1993).
 136. Julie C. Shifman, *The New Intermediate Sanctions Regulations*, 13 Practical Tax L. 23 (1999).
 137. Frances G. Sieller et al., *Administration Takes Aim at Compensation and Benefit Practices of Tax-Exempt Employers*, 20 Employee Rel. L.J. 467 (1994).
 138. Steven D. Simpson, *Tax-Exempt Organizations: Organization, Operation and Reporting Requirements*, 870 Tax Mgmt. Estates, Gifts & Trusts Portfolio (BNA), at A-131 (1997).
 139. *Social Welfare: What Does It Mean? How Much Private Benefit Is Permissible? What Is a Community?*, 1981 Exempt Organizations Continuing Professional Education Technical Instruction Program § G.
 140. Fred Stokeld, *EO Community Finally Comments on Intermediate Sanctions Regs*, 91 Tax Notes (TA) 378 (2001).
 141. Fred Stokeld, *Treasury, IRS Officials Discuss Intermediate Sanctions Regs at ABA*, 22 Tax Notes Int'l (TA) 365 (2001).
 142. Fred Stokeld, *Intermediate Sanctions Regs Are 'Significant Change,' Owens Says*, 80 Tax Notes (TA) 885 (1998).
 143. Fred Stokeld, *IRS Officials Preview Forthcoming Intermediate Sanctions Regs.*, 79 Tax Notes (TA) 1687 (1998).
 144. Fred Stokeld, *Religious Groups Concerned over Effects of Intermediate Sanctions*, 75 Tax Notes (TA) 173 (1997).
 145. Fred Stokeld, *EO Input on Intermediate Sanctions Wanted, Treasury Official Says*, 14 Exempt Org. Tax Rev. 359 (1996).

-
146. Paul Streckfus, *Is NAACP's Payment to Settle Suit Private Inurement?*, 64 Tax Notes (TA) 859 (1994).
 147. Henry C. Suhrke, *Can Process Justify the Trespass of Intermediate Sanctions?*, *Philanthropy Monthly*, June 1995, at 13.
 148. Henry C. Suhrke, *What's Wrong with Intermediate Sanctions?*, *Philanthropy Monthly*, Nov. 1993, at 5.
 149. T.J. Sullivan, *Tastes Great, Less Filling: IRS Releases Temporary Intermediate Sanctions Regulations*, 31 *Exempt Org. Tax Rev.* 177 (2001).
 150. Conrad Teitell & Richard A. Siegal, *Avoiding Intermediate Sanctions* (1998).
 151. Conrad Teitell & Richard A. Siegal, *When Is a Benefit "Excessive" Under the Intermediate Sanctions Rules?*, 9 *J. Tax'n Exempt Org's (WGL)* 196 (1998).
 152. Conrad Teitell, *Charitable v. Private Purposes*, N.Y. L.J., Sept. 28, 1992, at 3.
 153. Eric Ten Broeck, *Preventing Private Inurement by Measuring the Reasonableness of Compensation for Executives*, 6 *J. Tax'n Exempt Org. (WGL)* 21 (1994).
 154. Jeffrey S. Tenenbaum, *A Tax on Excess Benefits: A Proposed Penalty to End Abuses by Nonprofit Organizations*, *Ass'n Mgmt.*, May 1994, at 57.
 155. D. Benson Tesdahl, *IRS Bends Private Inurement and Self-Dealing Rules*, *Philanthropy Monthly*, June 1994, at 33.
 156. *Third-Party Fundraiser was "Insider" Despite Arm's-Length Contract, Resulting in Loss of Charity's Exempt Status*, 88 *J. Tax'n (WGL)* 101 (1998).
 157. Daniel Tinkelman, *What a Difference Knowledge Makes: A Guide To Intermediate Sanctions for Tax-Exempt Organizations and Their Leaders*, *CPA J.*, Mar. 2001, at 13.
 158. Michael R. Watters, *Documentation is Key to Compliance With Proposed Intermediate Sanctions Regs*, 22 *Exempt Org. Tax Rev.* 59 (1998).
 159. J. Patrick Whaley, *Tax Tips — Intermediate Tax Sanctions for Exempt Organizations*, *L.A. Law.*, July 1, 1999, at 18.
 160. J. Patrick Whaley, *Compensation Techniques for Executives and Other Employees of Charities*, 19 *NYU Tax Plan. Charitable Sector § 4* (1991).
 161. Roy Whitehead, Jr., & Pam Spikes, *Court Rules Bad Contract Does Not Equal "Inurement"*, 70 *CPA J.* 36 (2000).
 162. Spence L. Wise, *Consequences of Physician Recruitment Incentive Agreements*, 26 *Tax Adviser* 537 (1995).
 163. Carolyn G. Wolff & Daniel J. Schwartz, *Employee Benefits for Tax-Exempt*

-
- Organizations*, 373 Tax Mgmt. Portfolio (BNA), at A-44 (1997).
165. John V. Woodhull & Vreni Jones, *Hospital Recruitment Policies Can Endanger a Hospital's Exemption*, 4 J. Tax'n Exempt Org. (WGL) 31 (1992).
 166. John V. Woodhull & Vreni Jones, *New Chapter of Revenue Manual Will Guide Agents Through Intermediate Sanctions*, 12 J. Tax'n Exempt Org. (WGL) 3 (2000).
 167. Carolyn D. Wright, *Witnesses Say Intermediate Sanctions Regs Need Work*, 82 Tax Notes (TA) 1734 (1999).
 168. Carolyn D. Wright & Fred Stokeld, *IRS's Haney, Practitioners Discuss Intermediate Sanctions Regs.*, 90 Tax Notes (TA) 873 (2001).
 169. Carolyn D. Wright & Fred Stokeld, *IRS Win in UCC Is Appropriate, Say Practitioners*, 77 Tax Notes (TA) 1096 (1997).
 170. Jean Wright & Jay H. Rotz, *Reasonable Compensation*, 1992 Exempt Organizations Continuing Professional Education Technical Instruction Program (for FY 1993) § I.
 171. Alan J. Yanowitz & Elizabeth A. Purcell, *Contingent Compensation Arrangements That Lack Safeguards May Jeopardize Exemption*, 58 J. Tax'n (WGL) 208 (1983).
 172. Barnaby W. Zall, *Welcome to Our Board — Oh, By the Way, Now You Owe Taxes: A New Element in the World of Nonprofits*, Bus. L. Today, Jan./Feb. 2000, at 9.