Overlapping Generations & Fiscal Policy

- Focus on Intergenerational Redistribution and other issues excluded in representative agent models.
- Assume lump-sum taxes:
  \[ T_{1t} = \text{per-capita net taxes on the young} \]
  \[ T_{2t+1} = \text{per-capita net taxes on the old. If negative, interpret as transfer TR}_{t+1} = -T_{2t+1}. \]
- Government debt = \( D_{t+1} \) (aggregate, at end of period \( t \)). Government spending = \( G_t \)

- Individual budget constraints with taxes:
  \[ C_{1t} + a_t = W_t - T_{1t} \quad \text{and} \quad C_{2t+1} = (1 + r_{t+1}) \cdot a_t - T_{2t+1} \]
  \[ \Rightarrow \text{IBC:} \quad C_{1t} + \frac{1}{1+r_{t+1}} \cdot C_{2t+1} = W_t - T_{1t} - \frac{1}{1+r_{t+1}} \cdot T_{2t+1} \]

- Consumption depends only on the present value of net taxes:
  \[ C_{1t} = C_1(W_t - T_{1t} - \frac{T_{2t+1}}{1+r_{t+1}}, r_{t+1}) \]
  - Illustration: Indifference curve diagram. Endowment point \((W_t - T_{1t}, -T_{2t+1})\)
  - Consider a marginal change in taxes by \((\Delta T_{1t}, \Delta T_{2t+1})\)
    If \( \Delta T_{2t+1} = -(1 + r_{t+1}) \cdot \Delta T_{1t} \) then \( \Delta C_{1t} = \Delta C_{2t+1} = 0 \) and \( \Delta a_t = -\Delta T_{1t} \)
    \[ \Rightarrow \text{No consumption effect; tax cut is saved.} \]

- Neutrality result: “Timing” of taxes over the life cycle does not influence consumption.
• Notes about individual behavior from the indifference curve diagram:

1. Consumption is
   - increasing in current income $W_t - T_{1t}$
   - increasing in future net transfers $(-T_{2l+1})$
   - influenced by interest rates though two effects:
     - the substitution effect;
     - the value of future taxes/transfers: if $(-T_{2l+1}) > 0$, high r reduces $\frac{(-T_{2l+1})}{1+r_{l+1}}$

2. Individual savings do depend on the timing of taxes:
   $a_t = W_t - T_{1t} - C_{1t} = a(W_{t-1} - T_{1t-1}, T_{2t}, r_t)$
   - increasing in current income $W_t - T_{1t}$
   - decreasing in future net transfers $(-T_{2l+1})$, which means increasing in $T_{2l+1}$
   - influenced by interest rates like consumption, but in the opposite direction.

• Note about derivatives for reference below:
  - From $C_{1t} = C_1(W_t - T_{1t} - \frac{T_{2l+1}}{1+r_{l+1}}, r_{l+1})$ => $\frac{\partial C_{1t}}{\partial T_{2l+1}} = -\frac{1}{1+r_{l+1}} \frac{\partial C_1}{\partial (W-T_{1t})} < 0$. Define $\frac{\partial C_1}{\partial TR} = -\frac{\partial C_{1t}}{\partial T_{2l+1}} > 0$.
  - Budget equations imply: $a_W \equiv \frac{\partial a}{\partial (W-T_{1t})} = 1 - \frac{\partial C_1}{\partial (W-T_{1t})}$ and $\frac{\partial a}{\partial T_{2l+1}} = -\frac{\partial C_1}{\partial T_{2l+1}}$, so
    $\frac{\partial a}{\partial T_{2l+1}} = -\frac{\partial C_{1t}}{\partial T_{2l+1}} = -\frac{1}{1+r_{l+1}} \frac{\partial C_1}{\partial (W-T_{1t})} = -\frac{1}{1+r_{l+1}} (1 - a_W)$. 

The Government Budget

• Budget equation:

\[ D_{t+1} = (1 + r_t) \cdot D_t + G_t - [L_t \cdot T_1 + L_{t-1} \cdot T_2] \]

- New element as compared to the representative agent model:

\textbf{Intergenerational redistribution} = Transfers from (or taxes on) retirees financed by taxes on (or transfers from) workers in same or other period

• Capital market equilibrium condition:

- Savings by the young are invested in capital and government bonds:

\[ K_{t+1} + D_{t+1} = L_t \cdot a(W_t - T_1, T_2, r_t) \]

- In a growing economy, balanced growth requires restrictions on policy.

Common to express debt as debt/GDP ratio; express taxes as share of income = tax rates.

- Express market clearing in efficiency units:

\[ k_{t+1} + d_{t+1} = \frac{1}{(1+n)(1+g)} \cdot s(1 - \frac{T_1}{W_t}, \frac{T_2}{W_t}, r_{t+1}) \cdot W_t \]

where \( d_t = D_t / (A_t L_t) = \) debt per efficiency unit (if A constant: per-worker).
**Propositions on Tax Policy:** Analysis of marginal changes. Claims:

1. Intergenerational redistribution has real effects.
2. Public debt & deficits without intergenerational redistribution are neutral.
3. Public debt & deficits have real effects that are identical to their redistributional effects.

- Lessons:
  - Budget deficits “matter” in the OG model – can have effects consistent with traditional crowding out.
  - Budget deficits if and only if there serve as an indicator of intergenerational redistribution.
    - Focus of fiscal policy should be on redistribution across generations, not on deficit measures.

- Definition: [Generational Account](#) = Present value of current and expected future net taxes on a cohort.
  - Best measure of income effects in OG models.
  - Detailed empirical estimates available, but subject to projection errors.
Scenario #1. Unexpected one-time transfer from young to old

- Consider tax changes $\Delta T_{1t} = \Delta T > 0$ and $\Delta T_{2t} = -(1 + n)\Delta T < 0$.
- Assume normal consumption: $\frac{\partial C_1}{\partial (W_1 - T_1)} \in (0, 1)$ and $a_W = \frac{\partial a}{\partial (W_1 - T_1)} = 1 - \frac{\partial C_1}{\partial (W_1 - T_1)} \in (0, 1)$

1. Partial equilibrium effects: Individual responses at a given initial interest rate:
   - Young generation: $\Delta C_{1t} = - \frac{\partial C_{1t}}{\partial (W_t - T_{1t})} \cdot \Delta T < 0$, $\Delta a_t = -(1 - \frac{\partial C_{1t}}{\partial (W_t - T_{1t})}) \cdot \Delta T < 0$.
   - Old generation: $\Delta C_{2t} = -\Delta T_{2t} = (1 + n)\Delta T > 0$.
   - Result: Decline in savings & supply of credit. Increase in total consumption.

2. Equilibrium effects in period t (given $k_t$):
   - Condition: $K_{t+1} + D_{t+1} = L_t \cdot a(W_t - T_{1t}, T_{2t+1}, r_{t+1})$
   - Differentiate: $\Delta K_{t+1} = L_t \left(-a_W \Delta T + a_r \Delta r_{t+1}\right)$, where $\Delta r_{t+1} = f''(k) \Delta K_{t+1} / L_{t+1}$
   - $\Rightarrow \frac{\Delta K_{t+1}}{L_{t+1}} = -\frac{a_W}{1 + n + a_r (-f''(k))} \Delta T < 0$, provided $a_r f''(k) < 1 + n$. Result: reduced capital stock.

3. Dynamic effects in subsequent periods:
   - $k_{t+1} \downarrow \Rightarrow w_{t+1} \downarrow \Rightarrow (C_{1t+1} \downarrow, a_{t+1} \downarrow) \Rightarrow k_{t+2} \downarrow \ldots$ with slow return to steady state.
   - Graph: function $k_{t+1} = K(k_t)$ shifts down in period t; then returns to normal $\Rightarrow$ converge to old $k^*$.

- Overall conclusions: Reduced capital stock, higher interest rate, return to steady state.
- Note: government budget balanced in all periods. No changes in debt.
Scenario #2: Pre-announced transfer from young to old (one-time, one or more periods ahead)

- Consider tax changes $\Delta T_{t+1} = \Delta T > 0$ and $\Delta TR_{t+1} = -\Delta T_{2t+1} = (1 + n)\Delta T > 0$.
- Known to generation $t$ at time $t$ [Example: Retirement benefit enacted in period $t$.]

1. Individual responses in period $t$: Generation $t$ expects $\Delta TR_{t+1} = (1 + n)\Delta T > 0$ and consumes more:

   $\Delta C_{1t} = \frac{\partial C_1}{\partial TR} \cdot (1 + n)\Delta T > 0$ and $\Delta a_t = -\Delta C_{1t} = -\frac{\partial C_1}{\partial TR} \cdot (1 + n)\Delta T < 0$, where $\frac{\partial C_1}{\partial TR} = -\frac{\partial C_1}{\partial T^2} > 0$.

2. Equilibrium effects: $\Delta K_{t+1} = L_t \left(-\frac{\partial C_1}{\partial TR} \cdot (1 + n)\Delta T + a_r \Delta r_{t+1} \right)$

   $\Rightarrow \Delta K_{t+1} = \frac{L_t}{1+n+a_r(-f''(k))} \cdot (1 + n)\Delta T < 0$. Find: Decline in savings & supply of credit.

3. Dynamics over time: $k_{t+1} \downarrow \Rightarrow w_{t+1} \downarrow$

   - Impact on generation $t+1$: Higher taxes and lower wages $\Rightarrow (C_{1t+1} \downarrow, a_{t+1} \downarrow) \Rightarrow k_{t+2} \downarrow \ldots$
   - Graph: function $k_{t+1} = K(k_t)$ shifts down in period $t$; also down in $t+1$; then return to normal

   $\Rightarrow$ Converge to old $k^*$.

- Overall conclusions: Reduced capital stock, higher interest rate, return to steady state.
Scenario #3. Deficit-financed tax cut to be paid-off by future generations

• Consider Tax cut for period-t workers, financed by budget deficit $\Delta d > 0$.

• Resulting debt paid off by workers in period-(t+1). No taxes on retirees. No fiscal impact after (t+1).

  Period t: \[ \Delta T_{1t} = -\Delta d < 0, \text{ Implies public debt } \Delta D_{t+1} = L_t \cdot \Delta d > 0. \]

  Period t+1: \[ \Delta T_{1t+1} = \frac{1}{L_{t+1}} (1 + r_{t+1}) \cdot \Delta D_{t+1} = \frac{1 + r_{t+1}}{1 + n} \cdot \Delta d > 0. \]

1. Partial equilibrium effects in period-t: \[
\Delta C_{1t} = \frac{\partial C_1}{\partial (W - T_1)} \cdot \Delta d > 0, \quad \Delta a_t = (1 - \frac{\partial C_1}{\partial (W - T_1)}) \cdot \Delta d = a_w \Delta d > 0.
\]

2. General equilibrium effects in period t (given $k_t$):

   • Condition: \[ K_{t+1} = L_t \cdot a(W_t - T_{1t}, T_{2t+1}, r_{t+1}) - D_{t+1} \]

   • Differentiate: \[ \Delta K_{t+1} = L_t \left( a_w \Delta d + a_r \Delta r_{t+1} \right) - L_t \Delta d, \text{ where } \Delta r_{t+1} = f''(k) \frac{\Delta K_{t+1}}{L_{t+1}}. \]

   \[ \Rightarrow \frac{\Delta K_{t+1}}{L_{t+1}} = -\frac{(1-a_w)\Delta d}{1+n-a_r f''(k)} < 0, \text{ provided } 1 + n > a_r f''(k). \]

   • Result: Savings increase less than debt => “Crowding out” of capital investment.

3. Dynamics over time: \[ k_{t+1} \downarrow \Rightarrow w_{t+1} \downarrow. \]

   • Impact on generation t+1: Higher taxes and lower wages => \( (C_{1t+1} \downarrow, a_{t+1} \downarrow) \Rightarrow k_{t+2} \downarrow \ldots \)

   • Graph: function $k_{t+1} = K(k_t)$ shifts down in period t; also down in t+1; then return to normal

• Overall conclusion: Deficit-finance seems to have “traditional” crowding out effects.

• Note: Qualitative results are similar to Scenario #2. Claim: They are equivalent up to a scale factor.
Comparison between deficit-finance and intergenerational redistribution

- Redistribuition scenario: \( \Delta T_{1t+1} = \Delta T > 0 \) and \( \Delta T_{2t+1} = -(1+n)\Delta T < 0 \).
- Deficit finance scenario: \( \Delta T_{1t+1} = \frac{1+r_{t+1}}{1+n} \cdot \Delta d > 0 \) and \( \Delta T_{1t} = -\Delta d < 0 \).

Suppose \( \Delta T = \frac{1+r_{t+1}}{1+n} \cdot \Delta d \). Then

- Generation \( t+1 \) faces the same change in taxes \( \Delta T_{1t+1} = \Delta T \)
- Generation \( t \) faces the same change in the present value of taxes \( \Delta T_{1t} + \frac{\Delta T_{2t+1}}{1+r_{t+1}} = -\Delta d \)

=> Period-\( t \) consumption, savings, and capital accumulation responses are the same.

- Conclude: Deficit finance has real effects because it redistributes real resources.

Scenario #4 (Burden sharing): Share \( \varphi \in [0,1] \) of deficit \( \Delta d \) imposed on the next generation.

- Assume \( \Delta T_{1t} = -\Delta d < 0 \), \( \Delta T_{1t+1} = \frac{1+r_{t+1}}{1+n} \cdot \Delta d \cdot \varphi \), \( \Delta T_{2t+1} = (1+r_{t+1})\Delta d (1-\varphi) > 0 \).
- Implies same aggregate budget deficit and public debt \( \Delta D_{t+1} = L_t \cdot \Delta d > 0 \) as in Scenario #3.

- Partial equilibrium effects in period-\( t \):
  \[ \Delta C_{1t} = \frac{\partial C_1}{\partial (W-T)} \cdot \Delta d + \frac{\partial C_1}{\partial T_2} (1 + r_{t+1}) \Delta d (1-\varphi) = \varphi \frac{\partial C_1}{\partial (W-T)} \cdot \Delta d \]
  because \( \frac{\partial C_1}{\partial T_2} = -\frac{1}{1+r_{t+1}} \frac{\partial C_1}{\partial (W-T)} \).

\[ \Delta a_t = (1-\varphi \frac{\partial C_1}{\partial (W-T)}) \Delta d \]. Find: Real effects proportional to \( \varphi \). If \( \varphi = 0 \), \( \Delta a_t = \Delta d \) and \( \Delta k_{t+1} = 0 \).

Conclude: Deficit-finance has real effects only to the extent that it redistributes across generations.
Interpret observed budget deficits as noisy signals of intergenerational redistribution.
Repeated Intergenerational Transfers: Social security

• Distinguish two basic systems:

1. Fully funded: Contributions invested & returned to same generation.

\( \Delta T_{1t} = \Delta T > 0, \Delta T_{2t+1} = -(1 + r_{t+1})\Delta T < 0 \) for all \( t \).

   No intergenerational transfers \( \Rightarrow \) No real effects.

2. Pay-as-you-go: Contributions transferred to the old.

   \( \Rightarrow \) System of repeated intergenerational transfers \( \Rightarrow \) Crowds out capital.

   - Constant payment: \( \Delta T_{1t} = \Delta T > 0, \Delta T_{2t} = -(1 + n)\Delta T < 0 \) for all \( t \).
   
   - Constant tax rate: \( \Delta T_{1t} = W_t \cdot \tau > 0, \Delta T_{2t} = -(1 + n)W_{t+1} \cdot \tau < 0 \) for all \( t \).

   - Constant tax rates assumption consistent with balanced growth.

• Partial equilibrium impact of PAYG-social security depends on the present value of taxes:

\[
\Delta T_{1t} + \frac{\Delta T_{2t+1}}{1 + r_{t+1}} = W_t \cdot \tau - \frac{(1+n)W_{t+1}\tau}{1 + r_{t+1}} = W_t \cdot \tau \left( 1 - \frac{W_{t+1}}{W_t} \frac{1+n}{1 + r_{t+1}} \right)
\]

   which depends on the relationship between interest rates, wage growth, and population growth.

• Social security in steady state: \( W_{t+1} = (1 + g)W_t \Rightarrow \Delta T_{1t} + \frac{\Delta T_{2t+1}}{1 + r_{t+1}} = W_t \cdot \tau \left( 1 - \frac{(1+n)(1+g)}{1 + r^*} \right) \)

   Conclude: Pay-as-you-go social security is costly in steady state (positive taxes) if and only if the economy is dynamically efficient.


**Government debt (Diamond, 1965)**

- Assume no taxes on the old and no social security. Write $T_{tt}$ as function of debt:

  \[
  D_{t+1} = (1 + r_t) \cdot D_t + G_t - L_t \cdot T_{tt}
  \]

  \[
  \Rightarrow T_{tt} = \frac{1}{L_t} \left( G_t + (1 + r_t) \cdot D_t - D_{t+1} \right)
  \]

- Intuition: Initial debt is a burden. Budget can be shifted forward by issuing new debt (rolling over).

- Tax burden in steady state:
  - Assume new debt issues are constant share $\theta$ of wage income (consistent with constant debt/GDP)
  - Assume real government spending is constant share $\gamma$ of wage income:

    \[
    D_t = \theta \cdot W_{t-1} L_{t-1}, \quad D_{t+1} = \theta \cdot W_t L_t, \quad \text{and} \quad G_t = \gamma \cdot W_t L_t \quad \text{where wages grow at rate } g.
    \]

    \[
    \Rightarrow T_{tt} = \gamma \cdot W_t + (1 + r_t) \cdot \theta \cdot W_{t-1} \frac{L_{t-1}}{L_t} - \theta \cdot W_t
    \]

    \[
    \Rightarrow \frac{T_{tt}}{W_t} = \gamma + \theta \cdot \left( \frac{1+r_t}{(1+n)(1+g)} - 1 \right), \quad \text{so} \quad \frac{T_{tt}}{W_t} > \gamma \quad \text{for} \quad 1 + r_t > (1 + n)(1 + g)
    \]

- Conclude: Tax rate depends on the relationship between interest rates, wage growth, and population growth.
  - Debt is a burden in steady state if and only if the economy is dynamically efficient
  - Equivalence of debt and social security: Present value of retirement benefits is a government obligation.
Scenario: Dynamics of a permanent increase in debt/income:

- Initial period: $\Delta T_{1t} = -W_t \Delta \theta < 0 \Rightarrow (C_{1t} \uparrow, a_t \uparrow)$
  - Increase in savings is LESS than the increase in debt: $K_{t+1} = L_t \cdot a_t - D_{t+1}$ down $\Rightarrow k_{t+1} \downarrow$.
  - Generation $t$ is better off: lower taxes and higher return to savings.
- Subsequent periods ($t+i, i>0$): $\Delta T_{t+i} = -W_{t+i} \left(1 - \frac{1+r_t}{(1+n)(1+g)}\right) \Delta \theta$.
  - Assume $\frac{1+r_t}{(1+n)(1+g)} > 1$. Then $\Delta T_{t+i} > 0$ and $\Delta W_{t+i} - \Delta T_{t+i} \downarrow \Rightarrow (C_{t+i} \downarrow, a_{t+i} \downarrow)$
    Mapping $k_{t+1} = K(k_t)$ shifts down permanently $\Rightarrow$ Reduced $k^*$.
  - Generations $t+i$ are worse off: higher taxes and (due to reduced capital stock) lower wage.

- Common applied questions: for a given policy change, determine
  (a) the impact on consumption, savings, and the capital stock over time;
  (b) the impact on the utility of different generations (i.e. on their consumption opportunities).

Alternative scenarios:
- Case of external debt without international capital movements (in Diamond): then $K_{t+1} = L_t \cdot a_t$
  Then savings not diverted to government debt, less negative impact on capital stock.
- Case of a small open economy: no impact on $r$, no impact on $k$, foreign debt covers all gaps between $K_{t+1} + D_{t+1}$ and $L_t \cdot a_t$. 

Optional Exercise: Show that an expansion in social security has similar effects as higher debt.
Altruism and Bequests

- Define: \( b_{t+1} \) = bequests from generation \( t \) to \( t+1 \)

1. Return to OG model without government: budget equations

\[
C_{1t} + a_t = W_t + b_t \\
C_{2,t+1} + (1 + n) \cdot b_{t+1} = (1 + r_{t+1}) \cdot a_t
\]

- Constraint: \( b_{t+1} \geq 0 \). Every person has \( 1+n \) children.

- Motives for bequests are an empirical issue – many possible motives.

- Here focus on pure altruism to show that it yields a dynamic model with Ricardian neutrality.

- Preferences: define \( V_t = \) utility from own consumption plus discounted utility of children.

\[
V_t = u(C_{1t}) + \beta \cdot u(C_{2,t+1}) + \gamma(n) \cdot V_{t+1}
\]

- Utility depends on bequests \( \Rightarrow \) Value \( V_{t+1} = V(b_{t+1}) \). [Defer details: example of dynamic programming.]

- Each generation has in effect preferences over an infinite horizon (over two “goods”):

\[
V_t = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \gamma(n)^i [u(C_{1t+i}) + \beta \cdot u(C_{2,t+i+1})] = u(C_{1t}) + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \gamma(n)^i [u(C_{1t+i}) + \frac{\beta}{\gamma(n)} \cdot u(C_{2t+i})]
\]

- Similar to representative agent model, except that generation \( t \) does not control all resources:

  - Applies only if desired bequests are non-negative – called “operational bequests”.

  - Note on \( \gamma(n) \): obtain discrete-time version of Ramsey model if weight is proportional to \( 1+n \).
2. Combine bequests and government bonds

- **Claim:** Ricardian neutrality applies when altruistic bequests are operative (Barro 1974).

  - Individual budget equations:
    \[ C_{1t} + a_t = W_t + b_t - T_{1T} \quad \text{and} \quad C_{2t+1} + (1 + n) \cdot b_{t+1} = (1 + r_{t+1}) \cdot a_t - T_{2t+1} \]
    
    Assume \( T_{2t+1} = 0 \) because tax timing within a generation is neutral.
  
    - FOC for assets: \( u'(C_{1t}) = \beta \cdot (1 + r_{t+1}) \cdot u'(C_{2t+1}) \)
  
    - FOC for bequests: \( \frac{\gamma(n)}{1+n} u'(C_{1t+1}) \leq \beta u'(C_{2t+1}) \), with equality if \( b_{t+1} > 0 \).

- **Scenario:** Consider a deficit-financed tax cut in an equilibrium allocation with strictly positive bequests:

  - Tax cut for period-\( t \) workers; resulting debt paid off by period-(\( t+1 \)) workers. No tax change for retirees.

    - Recall effects without bequests: \( T_{1t} \downarrow \Rightarrow (C_{1t}, a_t) \uparrow \Rightarrow C_{2t+1} \uparrow \) and \( T_{1t+1} \uparrow \Rightarrow (C_{1t+1}, a_{t+1}) \downarrow \)

    - Recall the bequest condition: \( \frac{\gamma(n)}{1+n} u'(C_{1t+1}) = \beta u'(C_{2t+1}) \).

    - Condition is violated if \( (C_{2t+1} \uparrow, C_{1t+1} \downarrow) \Rightarrow \) Bequests must increase.

    - How much? Suppose savings \& bequests change by \( \Delta a_t = -\Delta T_{1t} \) and \( (1 + n) \Delta b_{t+1} = (1 + r_{t+1})(-\Delta T_{1t}) \)

      - Generation \( t \): \( \Delta T_{1t} + \frac{1+n}{1+r_{t+1}} \Delta b_{t+1} = 0 \) so present value of consumption unchanged

      => on change in assets, no change in \( K_{t+1} \), no change in \( r_{t+1} \) => no real effects in period \( t \).

      - Generation \( t+1 \): \( \Delta T_{1t+1} = \Delta b_{t+1} \) so present value of consumption unchanged => no real effect.

      - Both generations face unchanged consumption opportunities – FOCs remain satisfied.

- **Intuition:** Generation \( t \) buys all the new government bonds and gives them to their children.
The Controversy about Ricardian Equivalence


• Issue #1: Where are the disagreements?
  - Agreement: Distortionary taxes have incentive effects
  - Agreement: Income effects of temporary tax changes are small
    Ricardian: MPC=0; Life cycle MPC~1/(planning horizon)
  - Dispute is about income effects of “generation-length” tax changes
    Numerical examples: Poterba-Summers (JME 1987)

• Issue #2: Do we ever observe “Ricardian experiments”?
  - Experiment: Tax cut followed by tax increases with equal present value.
  - Assumes exogenous spending; cf. Bohn (JME 1991): Budget deficits are corrected about 50% by lower spending, 50% by higher taxes
  => Budget deficits signal reduced spending; MPC>0 is rational.

• Issue #3: Suppose Ricardian equivalence is approximately correct, should economists still care about government debt & deficits?
  - Political economy issues – dynamic games between generations about redistribution; games between citizens about size of government.
Application to Demographic Change: Do Bequests Matter?

- Bohn (2006): Calibrated world economy. Fact: Large fraction of individual wealth is due to bequests.
  - Version #1: OG without altruism: “Accidental bequests” due to incomplete annuity markets
    (Model assumes each generation inherits an exogenous fraction of the previous generation’s resources.)
  - Version #2. OG with altruistic/dynastic bequests. Experiment: Decline in birth rates; rising longevity.
- Result with accidental bequests: Bequests remain high => Return on capital declines.
- Results with dynastic bequests: decline => Return on capital remains high, determined by time preferences.