Public Debt and Fiscal Policy Traps *

Antoine Camous† and Andrew R. Gimber‡

13 September 2017

Abstract

We present a theory linking the cyclicality of tax policy to inherited public debt. When debt is low, tax policy is countercyclical, in the sense that the government responds to low output by setting a low tax rate. Above a threshold level of debt, however, optimal tax policy becomes procyclical. This creates the possibility of self-fulfilling crises ("fiscal policy traps"), in which output is low because households expect high taxes, and the government sets high taxes because output is low. Our model suggests why highly indebted governments might implement procyclical tax policy even without facing high sovereign risk premia.

Keywords: Public debt, tax policy cyclicality, coordination failures, expectation traps, Laffer curve.

JEL Classification: E62, H63.

*Previously titled "Public Debt and the Cyclicality of Fiscal Policy". We thank...

†University of Mannheim, camous@uni-mannheim.de.

‡Bank of England, andrew.gimber@bankofengland.co.uk.

1 Introduction

Public debt to GDP ratios in advanced economies have been rising since the mid-1970s, and have recently reached levels not seen since just after World War II (Abbas et al., 2011). The recent financial crisis and the ensuing Great Recession exacerbated this trend through bailouts, stimulus packages, rising unemployment claims, and falling tax revenues. This has led to a heated debate over the pace of fiscal consolidation, with one side emphasizing the burden on economic growth imposed by high levels of public debt, and the other warning that pursuing austerity when output is low could be very costly or even self-defeating.

In this paper we present a new theory that provides a partial reconciliation of these two views. We show that there is a threshold level of debt above which the economy is vulnerable to self-fulfilling fiscal crises. However, the mechanism that makes such crises possible is that tax policy becomes procyclical, in the sense that the government's optimal response to low output is to set a high tax rate.[1] Thus, our model lends qualified support to both sides of the debate over fiscal consolidation: the proximate cause of the crisis is the government's desire to set a high tax rate when output is low, but the source of this desire is the high level of public debt.[2]

Even countries that did not face an increase in sovereign risk premia have pursued fiscal consolidation in the years since the onset of the Great Recession.[3] In a study of fiscal consolidation plans for the years 2009–2015, the OECD (2011) categorizes six countries (Estonia, Germany, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Slovakia and the United Kingdom) as implementing "pre-emptive" consolidation. The same study finds that revenue-based measures accounted for about a third of fiscal consolidation on average. In their dataset of tax rates in 62 countries for the period 1960–2013, **?** find that tax policy has tended to be procyclical, especially in developing countries.

To analyse the decision to set a high tax rate in response to low output, we modify a static model of taxpayer coordination failure proposed by Cooper (1999, 131–132), in which the government must finance a fixed level of expenditure through a proportional ex-post tax on labor income. In a static economy with fixed expenditure, the government has no choice but to respond to a revenue shortfall by raising the tax rate. This creates strategic complementarities among households and two Pareto-ranked equilibria: one with a low tax rate and high labour supply, and another on the inefficient side of the Laffer curve with low labour supply and a high

[1] Since "procyclical" can be used to describe both variables that are positively correlated with output and policies that exacerbate the business cycle, there is potential for ambiguity when describing the cyclicality of tax rates. Throughout this paper, we use "procyclical" to refer to a negative correlation of tax rates and output, that is, tax policy that could exacerbate output fluctuations.

[2] The mechanism by which a high tax rate reinforces low output in our model is that it disincentivizes labour supply, not that it reduces aggregate demand.

[3] In Calvo (1988) and related papers such as Cooper (2015) and Lorenzoni and Werning (2013), investors' expectations of sovereign default cause them to charge a risk premium that makes default more likely. Corsetti et al. (2013) argue that this sovereign risk channel provides a motivation for fiscal consolidation. Our focus in this paper is not on self-fulfilling expectations of sovereign default, but on another type of self-fulfilling macroeconomic crisis caused by high levels of public debt.

tax rate.

The combination of an inability to commit to a tax rate and an absolute requirement to balance the budget leads to the possibility of coordination failure. The first of these assumptions is reasonable: sovereign governments cannot in fact commit to keep tax rates constant regardless of the state of the economy.[4] However, the balanced-budget view of fiscal policy is less realistic because governments routinely borrow to cover revenue shortfalls when output is lower than expected (and even balanced-budget constitutional amendments can be overturned).

The focus of our paper is therefore to analyse what happens when the government can issue new debt rather than increase taxes in the event of a revenue shortfall. Does this allow the government to eliminate the source of taxpayer coordination failure and steer the economy to the more efficient outcome with a low tax rate and high labour supply? Our answer will be that this depends on the inherited debt level. If the outstanding debt burden is sufficiently low, then the government's ability to adjust its debt position in the event of a revenue shortfall will ensure that there is a unique, low-tax equilibrium. However, if the inherited stock of debt is large enough then the government will optimally respond to lower output with higher taxes, unleashing the possibility of a fiscal policy trap.

The government in our model takes households' current labour supply decisions and output as given when setting the contemporaneous tax rate and issuing new debt.[5] When the economy suffers a fall in output, there are two countervailing effects on the government's optimal choice of the contemporaneous tax rate. The first is that, for given tax rates, current consumption falls relative to future consumption. This provides the government with a *consumption-smoothing* motive to reduce the contemporaneous tax rate relative to the future tax rate. The second effect, which we call the *tax-base* effect, is that the contemporaneous tax base shrinks, meaning that the government must raise tax rates at some point in order to remain solvent in the long run.

When the inherited stock of public debt is low, the consumption-smoothing effect dominates. This means tax policy is countercyclical: the government's optimal response to low output is to set a low tax rate and issue debt, postponing the necessary tax collection to the future. A household that expected aggregate labour supply

[4]Income tax policy can change relatively quickly, particularly during crises, and even retroactive tax increases are not unheard of. On 6 November 2012, voters in California passed Proposition 30, which included increases in top marginal tax rates that applied retroactively to income earned since 1 January 2012. The Minnesota omnibus tax bill (HF 677), signed into law on 23 May 2013, included a new top income tax bracket and an increase in the alternative minimum tax rate, both of which applied retroactively to the beginning of 2013.

[5]In other words, the government acts under discretion, paving the way for strategic interactions with households. Whatever the level of public debt, the government always chooses a higher contemporaneous tax rate than a policymaker under commitment would choose, because it does not internalize the distortionary effect on current output. However, the key insight of our analysis is that the government's inability to commit to a tax rate can have even more severe consequences, because when debt is high tax policy becomes procyclical, thereby inducing a coordination problem among households.

to be low would therefore anticipate a low tax rate, and choose a high level of labour supply itself. This cannot be an equilibrium because all households face the same incentives. With low inherited debt, therefore, there is no scope for coordination failure and our economy has a unique equilibrium.

However, when the inherited level of public debt is high, the tax-base effect dominates. Optimal tax policy then becomes procyclical, because deferring all fiscal consolidation (tax increases) when output is low would impose an unacceptable burden on future consumption. This unleashes the possibility of multiple equilibria. In the good equilibrium, labour supply is high because households anticipate a low tax rate, and the government optimally chooses a low tax rate because output is high. In Pareto-dominated equilibria, which we label *fiscal policy traps*, households restrict their labour supply in anticipation of a high tax rate, and the resulting low output induces the government to fulfil their pessimistic expectations by setting a high tax rate.[6]

We conduct our analysis in a deliberately stylized game-theoretic environment, so as to clearly characterize the mechanism relating the level of debt to the cyclicality of tax policy and the possible occurrence of fiscal crises. This allows us to characterize the determinants of the critical debt threshold above which self-fulfilling fiscal crises can arise. Interestingly, this threshold does not depend on contemporaneous productivity, but only on current spending commitments, the future fiscal capacity of the government and the interest rate.

In our baseline economy we abstract away from household borrowing and saving decisions, and we assume that government spending is exogenous and that debt policy is subject to a hard no-default constraint. In section 5 we relax these simplifying assumptions in turn and show that our core results continue to hold. We also show how the debt threshold is affected by relaxing these assumptions. Allowing the government to default in the long run does not insulate the economy against fiscal crises, as lack of commitment to repaying debt only contracts the fiscal capacity of the government. In contrast, allowing the government to adjust government spending provides some extra fiscal space, increasing the debt threshold, but does not fully eliminate the mechanism we identify in our analysis.

The idea that high levels of public debt can pose a threat to the economy is most famously associated with Reinhart et al. (2012). In particular, they argue that countries with sovereign debt to GDP ratios above 90 percent have significantly lower rates of economic growth on average. The burden of distortionary taxation imposed by debt service could explain why high levels of debt might reduce growth, but not why there might be a discrete drop in growth above some threshold level of debt. Our model contributes a novel explanation for why there might be such a threshold effect, based on self-fulfilling beliefs about the stance of tax policy. In our

[6]Our paper is therefore related to Albanesi et al. (2003) and other papers in the literature on monetary policy expectation traps, in which a monetary authority without commitment finds it optimal to validate private-sector expectations of high inflation.

model, a country with a level of public debt just above the threshold is exposed to the risk of a high-tax, low-output equilibrium. If this equilibrium were selected, the country's economic performance would be significantly worse than that of a similar country with a public debt level just below the threshold.

Schmitt-Grohé and Uribe (1997) introduce similar concerns about taxpayer coordination failure into a dynamic model with income and capital taxation. In their set-up, the government runs a balanced budget each period. In contrast, we study an environment where debt issuance is a choice variable and we show how its inherited stock determines whether the economy is fragile or not. Similarly, Giannitsarou (2007) relates aggregate instability and the menu of tax instruments available to the government. Our stylized environment features a single tax instrument, which in our baseline model could be interpreted as either an income or a consumption tax. Nevertheless, we show how allowing spending adjustments affect the debt threshold, without eliminating the risk of fiscal crisis.[7]

Cole and Kehoe (2000) consider a dynamic environment in which the government is prone to self-fulfilling debt rollover crises. They assume a constant tax rate, and allow the government to adjust its debt level by varying its expenditure. In their model, there is a source of domestically initiated crisis, via capital accumulation. By reducing saving, households reduce capital next period and bring the economy into the crisis zone where market shutdown is an option, hence making the initial belief that drove the reduction in saving self-fulfilling.

Ortigueira and Pereira (2016) study the implications of retroactive taxation in an infinite-horizon economy with capital accumulation. They show that the government's lack of intra-period commitment to the income tax rate leads to a continuum of Markov-perfect equilibria, each with different steady-state tax rates and levels of public debt. Unlike in the present paper, the scope for coordination failure arises through households' consumption decisions rather than through their labour supply decisions.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we present the general framework of analysis. Section 3 sets out our main analytical results. Next, in section 4, we illustrate by way of an example the mechanism by which the cyclicality of tax policy depends on the inherited debt position and can lead to a self-fulfilling crisis. In section 5, we build on this example to demonstrate the robustness of our results to relaxing several of our baseline assumptions. Section 6 concludes.

2 A Model of Taxpayer Coordination Failure

We consider a two-period small open economy: $t = 1, 2$. The government inherits a level of debt B_1, owed to foreign investors. In period 1, households choose labour supply and produce accordingly. The government then sets its fiscal policy, choosing

[7] A related analysis is conducted by Guo and Harrison (2004), where aggregate stability is provided by the possibility to adjust not only taxes but also public spending.

the tax rate on labour income τ_1 and the new debt B_2 to be issued to foreign investors. This debt is backed by future primary fiscal surpluses and is always repaid in period 2, so the government can borrow at the risk-free rate R between periods 1 and 2.[8] We interpret the terminal period 2 as the long run.

The focus of our analysis is on the determinants of labour supply and tax policy in period 1. We next describe these choices.

2.1 Households' Preferences and Choices

There is a unit mass of households in the economy, indexed by $i \in [0,1]$, who live over the two periods. To simplify the exposition, we assume for the moment that none of the households borrow or save between periods 1 and 2.[9] Since households are atomistic, they do not internalize the impact of their labour supply choices on the government's choices of tax rate and debt issuance. In period 1, household i forms a belief about the tax rate τ_1 and solves:

$$\max_{n_{1,i}} \; u(c_{1,i}) - g(n_{1,i}) \tag{1}$$

$$\text{subject to}$$

$$c_{1,i} = (1-\tau_1) z_1 f(n_{1,i}). \tag{2}$$

Consumption utility is increasing and concave: $u'(\cdot) > 0$ and $u''(\cdot) < 0$; and labour disutility is increasing and convex: $g'(\cdot) > 0$ and $g''(\cdot) < 0$.

The individual production function is $y_{1,i} = z_1 f(n_{1,i})$, where $z_1 > 0$ is an aggregate productivity parameter and $f(\cdot)$ is an increasing and concave function that exhibits weakly decreasing returns to scale and is unbounded above: $f'(\cdot) > 0$, $f''(\cdot) \leq 0$ and $\lim_{n\to+\infty} f(\cdot) = +\infty$.

The labour supply decision $n(\tau_1)$ is implicitly defined by the following first-order condition:

$$(1-\tau_1) z_1 f'(n_{1,i}) u'\big((1-\tau_1) z_1 f(n_{1,i})\big) = g'(n_{1,i}). \tag{3}$$

We assume that the curvature of the utility function is such that substitution effects dominate income effects:

$$u'(c) + c u''(c) > 0 \quad \forall c \geq 0.$$

This ensures that labour supply is a decreasing function of the tax rate:

$$\frac{dn(\tau_1)}{d\tau_1} = \frac{z_1 f'(\cdot)\big(u'(\cdot) + c_1 u''(\cdot)\big)}{(1-\tau_1) z_1 f''(\cdot) u'(\cdot) + \big((1-\tau_1) z_1 f'(\cdot)\big)^2 u''(\cdot) - g''(\cdot)} < 0. \tag{4}$$

[8] We relax this assumption in section 5.3.

[9] We demonstrate in section 5.1 below that our analysis goes through whenever there is a strictly positive fraction $\lambda > 0$ of hand-to-mouth households who can neither borrow nor save.

2.2 Government's Preferences and Choices

The government faces an intertemporal tax-smoothing problem. It has an inherited stock of debt owed to foreign investors, B_1, which it is committed to repaying. In each period, the government also has to finance an exogenous amount of expenses $G_t \geq 0$, which do not enter into household utility directly.[10] Given inherited debt B_1 and aggregate labour supply n_1, it optimally sets the tax rate τ_1 and issues new debt B_2 to risk-neutral foreign investors. For now, we assume the government is committed to repaying its debt obligations.[11] Future fiscal capacity determines the maximum amount of debt $\bar{B}_2$ that can be issued in period 1.

The government's maximization problem is as follows:

$$\max_{\tau_1, B_2} \; u(c_1) - g(n_1) + \beta V(B_2) \tag{5}$$

subject to

$$B_1 + G_1 \leq \tau_1 z_1 f(n_1) + \frac{B_2}{R} \tag{6}$$

$$B_2 \leq \bar{B}_2. \tag{7}$$

The function $V(\cdot)$ captures the continuation utility of the economy when in period 1 the government issues bonds with face value B_2 to be repaid in period 2, understood as the long run. The government budget constraint (6) states that debt service and government expenditure in period 1 must be financed by proportional taxes on output and new debt issuance. Expression (7) states that, because of the long-run solvency requirement, the government also faces a borrowing limit $\bar{B}_2$.

The continuation utility function $V(\cdot)$ satisfies the following concavity assumptions:

$$V'(\cdot) < 0, \quad V''(\cdot) < 0. \tag{8}$$

In addition, we assume for now that

$$\lim_{B_2 \to \bar{B}_2} V'(\cdot) = -\infty, \tag{9}$$

which states that the marginal utility of a reduction in the future debt burden approaches infinity as the government approaches its debt limit. We verify below that this condition is satisfied for natural specifications of $V(\cdot)$ in which the cost of issuing additional debt in period 1 is higher taxes and lower consumption in period 2.

Since $V(\cdot)$ is decreasing in B_2, the government budget constraint (6) will be satisfied with equality. Substituting this into the government's objective function (5)

[10] In section 5.2, we endogenize short-run public expenditure G_1, in the spirit of Guo and Harrison (2004).

[11] This assumption is introduced to highlight the fact that the mechanism at play in our analysis, namely the link between inherited debt, the cyclicality of tax policy and the possibility of taxpayer coordination failure, is not driven by self-fulfilling increases in sovereign risk premia as in Calvo (1988) and related papers. In section 5.3, we relax this assumption and show that our results still hold.

and differentiating with respect to the short-run tax rate τ_1 yields the following first-order condition:

$$u'\big((1-\tau_1)z_1 f(n_1)\big) = -\beta R V'\big(R(B_1 + G_1 - \tau_1 z_1 f(n_1))\big). \tag{10}$$

Equation (10) implicitly defines the tax policy function $\tau(n_1, B_1)$. We demonstrate below that the optimal short-run tax rate is unambiguously increasing in the inherited debt level B_1, but that the sign of its derivative with respect to short-run labour supply n_1 is ambiguous. When $d\tau(\cdot)/dn_1 > 0$, we say that tax policy is *countercyclical*, meaning a drop in output induces the government to lower the tax rate; when $d\tau(\cdot)/dn_1 < 0$, we say that tax policy is *procyclical*, meaning a drop in output induces the government to raise the tax rate. We also show that the cyclicality of tax policy and the number of equilibria in this economy depend on the inherited level of debt.

For comparison, a government with the ability to commit within period 1 to a tax rate would solve maximization problem (5) subject to constraints (6) and (7) and the additional constraint $n_1 = n(\tau_1)$, implicitly defined by equation (3). Substituting the constraints into the objective function, a government with commitment would solve:

$$\max_{\tau_1} \quad u\left((1-\tau_1)z_1 f\left(n(\tau_1)\right)\right) - g\left(n(\tau_1)\right) + \beta V\left(R(B_1 + G_1 - \tau_1 z_1 f\left(n(\tau_1)\right)\right).$$

The associated first-order condition is:

$$z_1\left[(1-\tau_1)f'(\cdot)n'(\cdot) - f(\cdot)\right]u'(c_1) - g'(\cdot)n'(\cdot) + \beta R z_1\left[f(\cdot) + \tau_1 f'(\cdot)n'(\cdot)\right]V'(B_2) = 0.$$

Under commitment, the government would internalize the distortionary effect of taxes τ_1 on households' labor supply decisions. This would lead to a unique outcome, as households' decisions would be consistent with the government's pre-announced tax plan. The focus of this paper is to study what happens if the government's credibility is challenged by households' decisions. In other words, we relax the commitment assumption and model the interactions of households and the government as a game. The next section sets out the relevant equilibrium definition.

2.3 Equilibrium Definition

The relevant choices of households and the government are both made in period 1.[12] The government inherits an amount of debt B_1. Households form expectations about tax policy, supply labour and produce accordingly. Given its outstanding debt and the economy's tax base, the government sets fiscal policy to maximize the lifetime utility of the population.

[12]The game-theoric foundation of our environment comes at a cost, namely the restriction of players and policy instruments for tractability. We discuss in section 5.2 expanding the choice set of the government to G_1.

The relevant state variables for the government's decisions are aggregate labour supply, n_1, and the inherited amount of debt B_1. Given (n_1, B_1), the government sets the tax rate τ_1 and issues new bonds B_2. We denote the policy functions $\tau(n_1, B_1)$ and $B(n_1, B_1)$. In the long run, i.e. in period 2, debt is fully repaid.

Accordingly, an equilibrium in this environment is defined as follows:

Definition. *A rational expectations equilibrium is a labour supply decision n_1, a tax rate τ_1 and debt issuance B_2 such that:*

- *Given outstanding debt B_1, households form rational expectations about fiscal policy, and supply labour n_1 to maximize their intratemporal utility* (1).

- *Given (n_1, B_1), the government sets the tax rate τ_1 and issues debt B_2 to maximize aggregate lifetime utility* (5) *subject to its budget constraint* (6) *and borrowing limit* (7).

Some comments are in order. First, we spell out the game and equilibrium definition as sequential actions, where households supply labour and then the government sets taxes. Similar economic interactions would prevail if moves were simultaneous. On the other hand, it is essential that the government does not move first. Indeed, if the government had a way to commit to its policy, it would naturally solve the coordination problem by choosing a tax rate on the efficient side of the Laffer curve.

Second, although the government takes labour supply as given, Nash equilibrium requires consistency between the tax rate the private sector expects and the tax rate the government chooses. All equilibria must therefore be on the labour income Laffer curve, but not all points on the Laffer curve will be equilibria.

Third, our analysis below will yield conditions under which the equilibrium is unique or not. If the policy functions of households and the government exhibit strategic substitutability, which we interpret as tax policy being *countercyclical*, then there will be a unique equilibrium. If instead they exhibit strategic complementarity, i.e. if tax policy is *procyclical*, then there may be multiple equilibria.[13]

The next section is dedicated to deriving conditions on the inherited level of debt that give rise to strategic complementarities and create the possibility of fiscal policy traps.

3 Analysis

This section establishes the key result of the paper, namely that the level of debt is critical to the cyclicality of tax policy and can induce strategic complementarities that give rise to fiscal policy traps. The argument is built on a geometric interpretation of the model in (n_1, τ_1) space.[14] Equilibria in this environment can be

[13] Formally, since $dn(\tau_1)/d\tau_1 < 0$, the policy functions exhibit strategic complementarities if and only if $d\tau(n_1, B_1)/dn_1 \leq 0$.

[14] The geometric approach is very convenient, both for preserving generality of the results and for conveying the main intuitions underlying our analysis.

represented by intersections of the labour supply function $n(\tau_1)$ and the tax policy function $\tau(n_1, B_1)$. We show that there are three threshold levels of inherited debt, $B_1^* \leq \hat{B}_1 < \bar{B}_1$, such that when $B_1 < B_1^*$ a unique equilibrium is guaranteed, when $\hat{B}_1 < B_1 < \bar{B}_1$ there will be multiple equilibria, and when $B_1 > \bar{B}_1$ there will not be any equilibria. This result supports our key idea that the level of debt is critical in creating the potential for self-fulfilling fiscal crises.

The analysis is structured as follows. We begin by characterising the labour supply function, which is everywhere downward sloping and invariant to the inherited debt stock B_1. We then characterize the government's tax policy function, starting with the limits imposed by the government's budget constraint and borrowing limit. Unlike the labour supply function, the tax policy function's position and slope does depend on the inherited debt stock B_1.

We then show that when inherited debt is sufficiently low ($B_1 < B_1^*$), the tax policy function is upward sloping (countercyclical) at least until it crosses the labour supply function, thereby ensuring a unique equilibrium. Alternatively, when the inherited amount of debt is high enough ($B_1 > \hat{B}_1$), the tax policy function crosses the labour supply function at least twice. This situation gives rise to multiple equilibria.

We conclude this section with an economic interpretation of why the slope of the tax policy function is ambiguous and depends on the inherited debt stock B_1. We decompose the government's optimal response to a change in labour supply into two countervailing effects: a tax-base effect and a consumption-smoothing effect.

3.1 Properties of the Labour Supply Function

From (4) we know that labour supply is a monotonically decreasing function of the tax rate, so the labour supply function $n(\tau_1)$ is downward sloping in (n_1, τ_1) space. Optimal labour supply is zero when the tax rate is 100 percent, and $n(0) > 0$ when the tax rate is zero. The labour supply function starts at $(0, 1)$ and cuts the horizontal axis at $(n(0), 0)$. It continues below the horizontal axis, because greater effort can be induced by negative tax rates (i.e. labour income subsidies).

Optimal labour supply depends only on the tax rate τ_1, so the labour supply function is unaffected by changes in the inherited debt stock B_1 or in the government's debt issuance B_2. Figure 1 summarizes the properties of $n(\tau_1)$, the reaction function of households.

3.2 Properties of the Tax Policy Function

The number of intersections (and hence the number of equilibria) therefore depends on the shape of the tax policy function, which, as we show in this section, *does* depend on the debt stock B_1 as well as on the quantity of labour supplied, n_1. We show that changes in B_1 both shift the tax policy function and alter its slope, thereby affecting the number of equilibria.



Figure 1: Labour Supply Function

3.2.1 Constraints on the Government's Choice of Tax Rate

Let us first consider the constraints the government faces. The *borrowing limit* $\bar{B}_2$ in (7) is the highest level of debt that the government can feasibly repay in period 2 (often referred to in the literature as the "natural" borrowing limit). This of course depends on the government's fiscal capacity in period 2. Let the *maximum rollover threshold* debt level,

$$\hat{B}_1 = \bar{B}_2/R - G_1, \tag{11}$$

be the inherited debt level at which the government is exactly solvent in period 2 if it collects zero revenue in period 1. For debt levels strictly above this threshold, the government cannot repay its debt in period 2 without collecting some tax revenue in period 1. For debt levels strictly below this threshold, on the other hand, the government has ample fiscal space, meaning it can choose whether to tax or subsidize labour income in period 1.

We define the *lower bound on short-run labour supply* $\underline{n}(B_1)$ as the level of short-run labour supply that guarantees our assumption of long-run solvency. Formally, we have:

$$\underline{n}(B_1) = \begin{cases} f^{-1}\left(\frac{B_1 - \hat{B}_1}{z_1}\right) & \text{if } B_1 > \hat{B}_1, \\ 0 & \text{if } B_1 \leq \hat{B}_1. \end{cases}$$

We also define the *minimum short-run tax rate* $\underline{\tau}(n_1, B_1)$ as the tax rate in period 1 that, given the inherited debt level B_1, the economy's tax base $y_1 = z_1 f(n_1)$ and the government's budget constraint (6), requires the government to issue debt up to its borrowing limit $\bar{B}_2$. The tax rate $\underline{\tau}(\cdot)$ is therefore the lowest tax rate in period 1 such that full repayment of the public debt is feasible in period 2. Formally, using the government budget constraint, $\underline{\tau}(\cdot)$ is given by:

$$\underline{\tau}(n_1, B_1) = \frac{B_1 - \hat{B}_1}{z_1 f(n_1)}, \quad n_1 > 0,\, n_1 \geq \underline{n}(B_1).$$

Figure 2 illustrates the characterization of the minimum short-run tax rate $\underline{\tau}(\cdot)$. As the inherited debt level B_1 increases, for a given labour supply n_1, the tax rate must rise to ensure long-run solvency, so the curve shifts up. If $B_1 > \hat{B}_1$, positive short-run tax revenue is needed to ensure long-run solvency, but the higher is the short-run labour supply n_1, the lower is the minimum tax rate. If $B_1 < \hat{B}_1$, the government can afford to set negative rates $\tau_1 < 0$ (i.e. to subsidize labour), but the higher is the short-run labour supply, the smaller this subsidy has to be. For $B_1 = \hat{B}_1$, no short-run revenue is needed to ensure long-run solvency, but the government cannot afford subsidies, either. Note that, as the borrowing limit depends on the government's long-run fiscal capacity, so does the minimum tax rate, via $\hat{B}_1$.



Figure 2: Minimum Short-Run Tax Rate $\underline{\tau}(n_1, B_1)$

This figure summarizes the constraints on the government's optimization problem. It displays the minimum short-run tax rate induced by inherited public debt, labour supply and future fiscal capacity.

Of course, if the inherited level of debt B_1 is too high, the government will be unable to raise enough revenue to remain solvent, and there will be no equilibrium. Clearly, if the required revenue in period 1 exceeds that which would be raised at the peak of the Laffer curve, repayment will not be feasible. However, the maximum inherited debt level that can be sustained in equilibrium is less than this level. The government's lack of commitment reduces the amount of tax revenue it can raise in equilibrium.[15]

Accordingly, we define $\bar{B}_1$ as the upper limit on the amount of inherited debt B_1 that the government can sustain in equilibrium. It is derived as follows. In equilibrium, households' expectations of the tax rate in period 1 must be correct,

[15] If households were to supply the amount of labour consistent with the peak of the Laffer curve, the government would optimally choose to raise the tax rate.

and labour supply must be optimal: $n_1 = n(\tau_1)$. Equilibrium also requires that the tax rate is set optimally given the level of output and the inherited debt level, that is, $\tau_1 = \tau(n_1, B_1)$. Equilibrium tax revenue in period 1 will therefore be given by the Laffer curve $\tau_1 z_1 f\big(n(\tau_1)\big)$. Therefore, the maximum inherited debt level $\bar{B}_1$ is such that, by raising the maximum tax revenue and issuing the maximum amount of debt $\bar{B}_2$, the government has just enough resources to finance its spending G_1 in period 1. It is the highest level of inherited debt B_1 that satisfies the following two equations:

$$R\left(\bar{B}_1 + G_1 - \tau(n_1, \bar{B}_1) z_1 f\left(n\left(\tau(n_1, \bar{B}_1)\right)\right)\right) = \bar{B}_2,$$
$$\tau_1 = \tau(n_1, \bar{B}_1).$$

To characterize equilibria, we first derive some key properties of the government's optimal policy.

3.2.2 Borrowing Limit Does Not Bind in Equilibrium

We have now defined all the ingredients necessary to prove that the borrowing limit (7) does not bind in equilibrium. This justifies restricting our attention to interior solutions of the government's maximization problem. This point is formalized in Lemma 1.

Lemma 1. *For all $B_1 < \bar{B}_1$ and for all $n_1 > \underline{n}(B_1)$, we have $B(n_1, B_1) < \bar{B}_2$ and $\tau(n_1, B_1) > \underline{\tau}(n_1, B_1)$. That is, the borrowing limit (7) does not bind, and the optimal short-run tax rate is strictly greater than what is required for long-run solvency.*

Proof. Suppose, on the way to a contradiction, that there exist $B_1 < \bar{B}_1$ and $n_1 > \underline{n}(B_1)$ such that the optimal debt issuance is $B(n_1, B_1) = \bar{B}_2$ and the optimal short-run tax rate is $\tau(n_1, B_1) = \underline{\tau}(n_1, B_1)$. From (9), we have $V'(\bar{B}_2) = -\infty$. Given $n_1 > \underline{n}(B_1)$ and our curvature assumptions on the utility function, for all $\tau_1 < 1$ we have $u'\big((1-\tau_1) z_1 f(n_1)\big) < +\infty$. The combination of $V'(\cdot) = -\infty$ and $u'(\cdot) < +\infty$ violates the government's first-order condition (10). Given $B_1 < \bar{B}_1$ and $n_1 > \underline{n}(B_1)$, it is feasible for the government to raise the short-run tax rate to $\tilde{\tau} \in \big(\underline{\tau}(n_1, B_1), 1\big)$ and reduce debt issuance to $\tilde{B}_2 < \bar{B}_2$. Relative to the candidate policy, this alternative policy produces an arbitrarily large long-run marginal benefit at a strictly finite short-run marginal cost, and so the candidate policy $B(n_1, B_1) = \bar{B}_2$ and $\tau(n_1, B_1) = \underline{\tau}(n_1, B_1)$ cannot be optimal. ■

This Lemma tells us that the optimal short-run tax rate $\tau(n_1, B_1)$ will be the interior solution implicitly defined by the first-order condition (10). Since the government's budget constraint (6) will be satisfied with equality, the debt issuance decision $B(n_1, B_1)$ will be given by:

$$B_2 = R\big(B_1 + G_1 - \tau(n_1, B_1) z_1 f(n_1)\big).$$

Since households' decisions depend only on the tax rate τ_1, we are interested mainly in the properties of the tax policy function $\tau(n_1, B_1)$.

3.2.3 Optimal Tax Rate Is Increasing in Inherited Debt

We first show that an increase in B_1 induces an increase in the tax rate τ_1 for any level of labour supply n_1.[16]

Lemma 2.

$$\frac{d\tau(n_1, B_1)}{dB_1} = \frac{\beta R^2 V''(\cdot)}{z_1 f(n_1)\big(u''(\cdot) + \beta R^2 V''(\cdot)\big)} > 0. \tag{12}$$

Proof. The expression is derived by totally differentiating the government's first-order condition (10) with respect to B_1 and rearranging. Standard assumptions on the curvature of the utility functions, $u''(\cdot) < 0$ and $V''(\cdot) < 0$, guarantee that the expression is positive. ■

The economic intuition behind this result is straightforward. An increase in the inherited debt stock B_1 means the government is poorer overall. In order to remain solvent, it must raise taxes in period 1, period 2, or both. Given that the marginal utility of consumption is decreasing in both periods, optimality requires the government to spread the pain of an increase in B_1 over both periods, meaning the short-run tax rate τ_1 must rise.

3.2.4 Tax Policy Function Is Upward Sloping Whenever Negative

We are mainly interested in the slope of the tax policy function, that is, how the optimal tax rate responds to changes in labour supply. Taking the total derivative of (10) with respect to n_1, we get:

$$\frac{d\tau(n_1, B_1)}{dn_1} = \frac{f'(n_1)}{f(n_1)} \left(\frac{(1-\tau_1)u''(\cdot) - \tau_1 \beta R^2 V''(\cdot)}{u''(\cdot) + \beta R^2 V''(\cdot)} \right). \tag{13}$$

In general the sign of this expression is ambiguous, and depends on the inherited debt stock B_1.[17] However, the expression is unambiguously positive (and therefore the tax policy function is upward sloping, i.e. countercyclical) whenever the short-run tax rate τ_1 is negative:

Lemma 3.

$$\frac{d\tau(n_1, B_1)}{dn_1} > 0 \quad \forall \tau(n_1, B_1) < 0.$$

[16] In (n_1, τ_1) space, this feature is represented by an upward shift of the tax policy function as the inherited debt stock B_1 increases.

[17] In section 3.4 below, we provide some economic analysis of this ambiguity by decomposing the government's response to a change in labour supply into a tax-base effect and a consumption-smoothing effect.

Proof. Totally differentiating the government's first-order condition (10) with respect to n_1 and rearranging yields:

$$\frac{d\tau(n_1, B_1)}{dn_1} = \frac{f'(n_1)}{f(n_1)} \left(\frac{u''(c_1)}{u''(c_1) + \beta R^2 V''(B_2)} - \tau(n_1, B_1) \right).$$

Since $\beta \geq 0$, $u''(\cdot) < 0$ and $V''(\cdot) < 0$, we have

$$\frac{u''(c_1)}{u''(c_1) + \beta R^2 V''(B_2)} \in [0, 1].$$

Since $f(\cdot) > 0$ and $f'(\cdot) > 0$, the whole expression must be positive whenever $\tau(n_1, B_1) < 0$. ■

3.3 Equilibria

Combining the analysis of households' labour supply function and the government's tax policy function, we are now ready to derive conditions under which the equilibrium of the economy is unique or not, i.e. conditions under which fiscal policy traps can arise.

3.3.1 Unique Equilibrium When Debt Is Low

Combining Lemmas 2 and 3, we can show that there will be a unique equilibrium whenever the inherited debt stock B_1 is sufficiently low.

Proposition 1. *Let B_1^* be such that $\tau\left(n(0), B_1^*\right) = 0$. Then for all $B_1 < B_1^*$, there will be a unique equilibrium.*

Proof. From Lemma 2 we know that $\tau\left(n(0), B_1\right) < \tau\left(n(0), B_1^*\right) = 0$ for all $B_1 < B_1^*$, that is, the optimal tax rate will be negative whenever labour supply is $n(0)$ and inherited debt is less than the threshold value B_1^*. Then from Lemma 3 we know that whenever $B_1 < B_1^*$ the tax policy function will be negative valued and upward sloping for all values of labour supply $n_1 \leq n(0)$, and indeed will continue to slope upwards at least until it cuts the horizontal axis. Before it does so, it will cut the (downward-sloping) labour supply function exactly once. ■

3.3.2 Multiple Equilibria When Debt Is High

The government's budget constraint (6) means that if it inherits a sufficiently large stock of debt B_1, it will be forced to collect tax revenue in period 1 in order to stay within its borrowing limit (7). Whenever the inherited debt level B_1 is high enough that the government must collect taxes in period 1 (but not so high that repayment becomes infeasible), the economy will exhibit multiple equilibria.

Proposition 2. *Let $\hat{B}_1 = \bar{B}_2/R - G_1$, where $\bar{B}_2$ is the natural borrowing limit, and let $\bar{B}_1$ be the highest inherited debt level for which an equilibrium exists. Then for all $B_1 \in \left(\hat{B}_1, \bar{B}_1\right)$, the economy exhibits multiple equilibria.*



Figure 3: Existence of Fiscal Policy Traps

Proof. For all $B_1 \in \left(\hat{B}_1, \bar{B}_1\right)$, we have $\tau\left(\underline{n}(B_1), B_1\right) = \underline{\tau}\left(\underline{n}(B_1), B_1\right) = 1 > n^{-1}\left(\underline{n}(B_1)\right)$. That is, when inherited debt is above the maximum rollover threshold $\hat{B}_1$ and short-run labour supply is at its minimum value $\underline{n}(\cdot)$, the government's optimal short-run tax rate is 100 percent, because this is the only feasible choice. We know that 100 percent is higher than the tax rate that would induce labour supply of $\underline{n}(\cdot) > 0$, because labour supply is decreasing in the tax rate and it is optimal not to work when the tax rate is 100 percent.

For all $B_1 \in \left(\hat{B}_1, \bar{B}_1\right)$, we have $\tau\left(n(0), B_1\right) > \underline{\tau}\left(n(0), B_1\right) > n^{-1}\left(n(0)\right) = 0$. This says that, when inherited debt is above the maximum rollover threshold $\hat{B}_1$ and labour supply is at the value that would optimally be chosen if the tax rate were zero, the optimal tax rate is in fact strictly positive.

These two pieces tell us that the optimal tax curve lies above the labour supply curve at two points: when n_1 is at the minimum level consistent with solvency, $\underline{n}(B_1)$, and when n_1 is at the point consistent with zero taxes, $n(0)$. There cannot be an equilibrium to the left of (i.e. with a lower labour supply than) $\underline{n}(B_1)$, because solvency would be violated whatever tax rate the government chose. We also know that there cannot be an equilibrium to the right of (i.e. with a higher labour supply than) $n(0)$, because the labour supply curve is negative valued after that point, and $\underline{\tau}(n_1, B_1)$ is strictly positive for all n_1 whenever $B_1 > \hat{B}_1$. So if an equilibrium exists, it must be between $\underline{n}(B_1)$ and $n(0)$. Apart from the special case of tangency (with $B_1 = \bar{B}_1$), if the optimal tax curve crosses below the labour supply curve somewhere to the right of $\underline{n}(B_1)$, it must cross it again in order to be above it at $n(0)$. ■

3.3.3 Welfare Ordering of Equilibria

Proposition 3. *The equilibria in Proposition 2 with higher labour supply n_1 Pareto dominate those with lower labour supply.*

Proof. Since all households are ex ante identical and all equilibria are symmetric, the welfare ordering of equilibria depends on the utility of the representative household.

All equilibria must lie on the labour supply curve $n(\tau_1)$, which is downward sloping, so equilibria featuring higher short-run labour supply n_1 must also feature a lower short-run tax rate τ_1. The short-run tax rate τ_1 enters into the household budget constraint (2), and since labour supply cannot be negative, a reduction in τ_1 expands the household's choice set, meaning the household is (weakly) better off in period 1.

All that remains to be shown is that in equilibria with higher short-run labour supply, the representative household is also better off in period 2. Since $V'(B_2) < 0$, we need to show that the government's optimal debt issuance B_2 is lower in equilibria featuring higher short-run labour supply n_1. To see this, note that optimal fiscal policy must satisfy the first-order condition (10):

$$u'\big((1-\tau_1)z_1 f(n_1)\big) = -\beta V'(B_2).$$

Consider two equilibria, one "good" and one "bad", with $n_1^G > n_1^B$ and $\tau_1^G < \tau_1^B$. Now suppose (on the way to a contradiction) that the good equilibrium features higher debt issuance: $B_2^G > B_2^B$. Then from $V''(B_2) < 0$ we have $V'(B_2^G) < V'(B_2^B)$, meaning $-\beta V'(B_2^G) > -\beta V'(B_2^B)$. In order for the government's first-order condition to be satisfied in both equilibria, we would therefore need $u'\big((1-\tau_1^G)z_1 f(n_1^G)\big) > u'\big((1-\tau_1^B)z_1 f(n_1^B)\big)$. However, given that output is increasing in labour supply and $u''(\cdot) < 0$, this would require $\tau_1^G > \tau_1^B$, which cannot be the case because by hypothesis the good equilibrium features a lower tax rate. ■

A lower tax rate in period 1 means households are wealthier in period 1. Since substitution effects dominate income effects, their response is to increase their labour supply, which increases the government's tax base. This induces a reduction in the government's optimal debt issuance, so households are wealthier in period 2 as well.

3.4 Tax-Base and Consumption-Smoothing Effects

We now provide some economic intuition for our main result that optimal tax policy is procyclical when the burden of inherited debt is large. We do so by providing a decomposition of the effect of a change in labour supply on the optimal tax rate. We identify two countervailing effects at play, which we label *tax-base* and *consumption-smoothing* effects.

Consider a reduction in period 1 labour supply n_1. Ceteris paribus, this reduces period 1 consumption relative to period 2 consumption, thereby providing the government with a consumption-smoothing motive to reduce the period 1 tax rate relative to the period 2 tax rate. On the other hand, when the period 1 tax rate is positive, a reduction in period 1 labour supply shrinks the overall tax base. In order for the government to remain solvent, therefore, the average tax rate across

periods 1 and 2 must rise.

Similarly to how the effect of a price change on demand can be decomposed into a substitution and an income effect, we can decompose the effect of a change in labour supply on the optimal tax rate by rewriting the slope of the tax policy function (13) as follows:

$$\frac{d\tau(n_1, B_1)}{dn_1} = (1-\tau_1)\frac{f'(n_1)u''(\cdot)}{f(n_1)\big(u''(\cdot)+\beta R^2 V''(\cdot)\big)} - \tau_1 z_1 f'(n_1)\frac{d\tau(n_1, B_1)}{dB_1}.$$

The first term captures the consumption-smoothing effect, which is unambiguously positive (meaning a reduction in labour supply prompts a reduction in the tax rate i.e. that tax policy is countercyclical). The second term captures the tax-base effect, which operates through the impact of a change in labour supply on the total fiscal resources available to the government. It is therefore no mere coincidence that the size of the tax-base effect is linked to the effect of a change in the inherited debt stock on the optimal tax rate, $d\tau(n_1, B_1)/dB_1$.

The relative strength of the tax-base and consumption-smoothing effects will determine the cyclicality of the government's optimal tax policy. When the consumption-smoothing effect dominates, tax policy will be countercyclical and the tax policy function will be upward sloping. Noting that the size of both effects depends on the short-run tax rate τ_1, which itself depends positively on the inherited debt level B_1 as per Lemma 2, we can see that the cyclicality of tax policy will depend on the inherited debt level.

However, the effect of inherited debt on the cyclicality of tax policy is not guaranteed to be monotonic in all cases. This potential non-monotonicity means that there may not necessarily be a cut-off level of debt above which tax policy switches from being countercyclical to procyclical. Nevertheless, Proposition 1 guarantees that tax policy will always be countercyclical over the relevant range of labour supply when inherited debt is below the threshold B_1^*, ensuring a unique equilibrium. Similarly, Proposition 2 guarantees that there will be multiple equilibria (which requires that tax policy is at least locally procyclical) whenever inherited debt exceeds the maximum rollover threshold $\hat{B}_1$.

Note that the sign of the tax-base effect depends on whether the period 1 tax rate is positive or negative. This provides the intuition behind the result in Lemma 3 that the tax policy function is upward sloping whenever the tax rate is negative. With a negative tax rate (i.e. a labour subsidy), a reduction in labour supply actually *reduces* the fiscal burden on the government. This reverses the usual sign of the tax-base effect, meaning it reinforces rather than counteracts the consumption-smoothing effect. With both effects acting in the same countercyclical direction, the government's tax policy will be unambiguously countercyclical whenever the short-run tax rate is negative. We emphasize that a negative tax rate is a *sufficient* condition for tax policy to be countercyclical, but not a *necessary* condition. As the example in section 4 demonstrates, tax policy can be countercyclical for positive tax

rates, too.

4 Parameterized Example with Explicit Policy Function

In this section we present an analytical example of the class of economies described previously, and clearly highlight the general result of section 3. We build on this example in section 5 to relax some of our simplifying assumptions.

We adopt the following specification. In period 1, self-employed households convert labour effort into output using the following production function:

$$y_1 = z_1 n_1^{\alpha}, \quad \alpha > 0,$$

where α captures returns to scale. The government inherits a stock of debt B_1 owed to foreigners, chooses a proportional income tax rate τ_1 and issues bonds with a period-2 face value of B_2 (again to foreigners) at the risk-free interest rate R.

Period 2, the long run, is an endowment economy in which the government levies lump-sum taxes.[18] The per-capita endowment of output is y_2, and as consumption cannot be negative, y_2 also stands for the government's long-run fiscal capacity. To economize on notation we normalize period 2 government expenditure, G_2, to zero.[19]

The representative household's lifetime utility is given by:

$$U(c_1, n_1, c_2) = u(c_1) - g(n_1) + \beta u(c_2),$$

where instantaneous consumption utility is given by

$$u(c_t) = \frac{c_t^{1-\sigma}}{1-\sigma}, \quad \sigma \in (0, 1)$$

in both periods, and the disutility from labour effort in period 1 is given by

$$g(n_1) = \frac{n_1^{\gamma}}{\gamma}, \quad \gamma > 1.$$

Substituting the budget constraint $c_1 = (1 - \tau_1)y_1$ and the production function into the objective function and solving the household's first-order condition yields the following expression for optimal labour supply:

$$n(\tau_1) = \left(\alpha \left((1 - \tau_1) z_1\right)^{1-\sigma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma - \alpha(1-\sigma)}}.$$

The government faces the usual budget constraint (6). With lump-sum taxation in period 2, the natural borrowing limit $\bar{B}_2$ in (7) is given by the long-run endowment

[18] Our results do not depend on this particular specification of period 2, which we adopt because it is a particularly tractable example in which conditions (8) and (9) on the continuation utility function are satisfied.

[19] This normalization is innocuous because with lump-sum taxes in period 2, an increase in G_2 is equivalent to a decrease in y_2.

y_2, since long-run consumption $c_2 = y_2 - B_2$ cannot be negative. The government's continuation utility $V(B_2)$ from issuing an amount of debt B_2 is simply households' utility $u(y_2 - B_2)$ of consuming the amount left over after lump-sum taxes are levied on the endowment to pay off the debt. It follows immediately that conditions (8) and (9) on the continuation utility function are satisfied.[20]

The maximum rollover threshold level of inherited debt, above which the government must collect revenue in period 1 in order to remain solvent, is given by:

$$\hat{B}_1 = \bar{B}_2/R - G_1 = y_2/R - G_1. \tag{14}$$

This expression tells us that the threshold level of debt $\hat{B}_1$ depends not on contemporaneous productivity z_1, but rather on current spending commitments G_1, the potential for future fiscal surpluses, captured by y_2, and the interest rate R.[21] Although an increase in contemporaneous productivity reduces the optimal tax rate for a given level of labour supply, it cannot eliminate the possibility of fiscal policy traps. No matter how high is productivity, if debt is above the maximum rollover threshold then fiscal policy will be procyclical. This supports the idea that future fiscal capacity is essential in steering the economy away from fiscal policy traps.

4.1 Inherited Debt and the Cyclicality of Tax Policy

Solving the government's optimization problem yields the following tax policy function:

$$\tau(n_1, B_1) = \frac{(\beta R)^{1/\sigma}}{R + (\beta R)^{1/\sigma}} - \frac{R(\hat{B}_1 - B_1)}{\left(R + (\beta R)^{1/\sigma}\right) z_1 n_1^{\alpha}}. \tag{15}$$

This solution allows us to characterize precisely how the cyclicality of tax policy depends on the inherited level of debt.

Proposition 4. *The cyclicality of tax policy depends on the inherited debt level B_1 as follows:*

$$\frac{d\tau(n_1, B_1)}{dn_1} = \frac{R(\hat{B}_1 - B_1)\alpha}{\left(R + (\beta R)^{1/\sigma}\right) z_1 n_1^{1+\alpha}} \begin{cases} > 0 & \textit{(countercyclical) if } B_1 < \hat{B}_1 \\ = 0 & \textit{(acyclical) if } B_1 = \hat{B}_1 \\ < 0 & \textit{(procyclical) if } B_1 > \hat{B}_1. \end{cases}$$

Accordingly, the equilibrium of the economy is unique if and only if $B_1 < \hat{B}_1$, and fiscal policy traps may emerge for high levels of inherited debt $B_1 > \hat{B}_1$.

Proof. Differentiation of (15) and application of Propositions 1 and 2. ■

In the proof of Proposition 2, we saw the general result that when public debt is above the maximum rollover threshold level $\hat{B}_1$, the government's tax policy function

[20] Formally, $V'(B_2) = -u'(y_2 - B_2) = -(y_2 - B_2)^{-\sigma} < 0$, $V''(B_2) = u''(y_2 - B_2) = -\sigma(y_2 - B_2)^{-1-\sigma} < 0$ and $\lim_{B_2 \to \bar{B}_2} V'(B_2) = \lim_{B_2 \to y_2} u'(y_2 - B_2) = \lim_{c_2 \to 0} c_2^{-\sigma} = +\infty$.

[21] We show in section 5.2 that when the government can adjust government spending, only future fiscal capacity and the interest rate matter for the debt threshold.



(a) $B_1 < \hat{B}_1$ (countercyclical) (b) $B_1 = \hat{B}_1$ (acyclical) (c) $B_1 > \hat{B}_1$ (procyclical)

Figure 4: Inherited Debt and the Cyclicality of Tax Policy

Parameter values: $\alpha = 1$, $\beta = 0.95$, $\gamma = 2$, $\sigma = 0.5$, $G_1 = 0.2$, $R = \beta^{-1} \approx 1.05$, $y_2 = 1$, $z_1 = 1$.
Threshold debt level: $\hat{B}_1 = y_2/R - G_1 = 0.75$.
Panel (a): $B_1 = 0.56$, $n_1 = 0.86$, $\tau_1 = 0.37$.
Panel (b): $B_1 = 0.75$, $n_1 = 0.80$, $\tau_1 = 0.49$.
Panel (c): $B_1 = 1$, $n_1^G = 0.68$, $\tau_1^G = 0.69$, $n_1^B = 0.27$, $\tau_1^B = 0.98$.

must be at least *locally* procyclical, leading to multiple equilibria. Proposition 4 shows that there is a starker relationship between the level of public debt and the cyclicality of tax policy in this particular case. For levels of debt above $\hat{B}_1$, tax policy is procyclical for *all* values of labour supply.

Since for any given value of inherited debt B_1 the government's tax policy function is monotonic, we can guarantee that there is a unique cutoff value of B_1, below which there will be a unique equilibrium and above which there will be two equilibria.[22] The three cases are illustrated in Figure 4. In panel (a), debt is below the threshold $\hat{B}_1$ and so the tax policy function is upward sloping for all values of labour supply. It therefore crosses the labour supply function just once, ensuring a unique equilibrium. Panel (b) shows that the equilibrium is also unique when inherited debt is equal to the threshold $\hat{B}_1$ and the tax policy function is horizontal. Whenever inherited debt exceeds this threshold, as in panel (c), the tax policy function is downward sloping for all values of labour supply and there are two equilibria.

5 Robustness

Thus far we have made a number of simplifying assumptions, namely that no households can borrow or save, that government spending is exogenous, and that the

[22] This is true whenever the tax policy function is monotonic for all values of B_1, not just for the particular example we consider here.

government is fully committed to repaying its debt in the long run. In this section we present extensions of our baseline model that relax each of these assumptions in turn, and discuss how our results generalize.

5.1 Limited Asset Market Participation

Suppose now that some fraction $\lambda \in (0,1]$ of households cannot borrow or save, whereas the remainder $1-\lambda$ can borrow and save on international financial markets.[23] We denote the former group, the hand-to-mouth households, with the letter H. In period 1 they supply labour n_1^H and consume $c_1^H = (1-\tau_1)z_1 f\left(n_1^H\right)$. Households with access to international financial markets are denoted with the letter F. In period 1 they supply labour n_1^F, borrow an amount a from foreign investors at the risk-free rate R, and consume $c_1^F = (1-\tau_1)z_1 f\left(n_1^F\right) + a$.[24] Total period 1 output is given by $Y_1 \equiv \lambda z_1 f\left(n_1^H\right) + (1-\lambda) z_1 f\left(n_1^F\right)$.

As in section 4 above, period 2 is an endowment economy in which the government levies lump-sum taxes to repay its debt $B_2 = R(B_1 - \tau_1 Y_1)$. Type H households consume their endowment net of lump-sum taxes, $c_2^H = y_2 - R(B_1 - \tau_1 Y_1)$, and type F households consume their endowment net of lump-sum taxes and repayment of their own debt, $c_2^F = y_2 - R(B_1 - \tau_1 Y_1 + a)$. The benevolent government's objective function is given by a weighted average of the discounted lifetime utilities of the two types of households:

$$\lambda\big(u\left(c_1^H\right) - g\left(n_1^H\right)\big) + (1-\lambda)\big(u\left(c_1^F\right) - g\left(n_1^F\right)\big) + \beta\big(\lambda u\left(c_2^H\right) + (1-\lambda)u\left(c_2^F\right)\big).$$

The timing within period 1 is as before, with households of both types choosing their labour supply simultaneously. Type H households behave in exactly the same way as households in our baseline model above: they choose their labour supply in period 1 to satisfy their intratemporal first-order condition:

$$(1-\tau_1)z_1 f'\left(n_1^H\right) u'\big((1-\tau_1)z_1 f\left(n_1^H\right)\big) = g'(n_1^H).^{25} \tag{16}$$

Type F households choose their labour supply to satisfy their own intratemporal first-order condition:

$$(1-\tau_1)z_1 f'\left(n_1^F\right) u'\big((1-\tau_1)z_1 f\left(n_1^F\right) + a\big) = g'(n_1^F). \tag{17}$$

They also choose their borrowing a to satisfy their intertemporal first-order condition:

$$u'\big((1-\tau_1)z_1 f\left(n_1^F\right) + a\big) = \beta R u'\big(y_2 - R(B_1 - \tau_1 Y_1 + a)\big). \tag{18}$$

The government, which takes household labour supply decisions n_1^H and n_1^F and

[23] Our baseline model is nested as the special case with $\lambda = 1$.

[24] Negative values of a denote lending by type F households to foreign creditors.

[25] A corner solution with $n_1^H = 0$ is ruled out whenever $\tau_1 < 100\%$ by standard assumptions on the consumption utility and labour disutility functions.

type F household borrowing a as given, sets the period-1 tax rate τ_1 to satisfy its own intertemporal first-order condition:

$$z_1\big(\lambda f\left(n_1^H\right)u'\left(c_1^H\right)+(1-\lambda)f\left(n_1^F\right)u'\left(c_1^F\right)\big)=\beta R Y_1\big(\lambda u'\left(c_2^H\right)+(1-\lambda)u'\left(c_2^F\right)\big). \quad (19)$$

An equilibrium in the extended model with limited asset market participation will consist of a quadruple $\left(\tau_1, n_1^H, n_1^F, a\right)$ such that equations (16), (17), (18) and (19) are satisfied. A striking property common to all equilibria in this environment is that, no matter how small the fraction λ of hand-to-mouth households, the remaining $1-\lambda$ households behave as if they were themselves unable to borrow or save.

Proposition 5. *When a fraction $\lambda \in (0,1]$ of households cannot borrow or save, in equilibrium the remaining $1-\lambda$ households do not borrow or save either ($a=0$). The set of equilibria in which $a=0$ is the same as the set of equilibria in the baseline model, where no households have the ability to borrow or save ($\lambda=1$).*

Proof. We first demonstrate that equilibria exist in which type F households optimally choose not to borrow or save ($a=0$), and that these are the same equilibria that exist in our baseline model with only type H (hand-to-mouth) households. Observe from the intratemporal first-order conditions (16) and (17) that type H and type F households will optimally supply the same amount of labour if and only if $a=0$. With $a=0$ and $n_1^F=n_1^H$, the government's intertemporal first-order condition (19) simplifies to that of type F households, (18). This means that, given their correct anticipation of the tax rate τ_1, type H households' labour supply n_1^H, and the labour supply of their fellow type F households $n_1^F=n_1^H$, type F households will in fact optimally choose $a=0$ in order to satisfy (18). Equilibrium requires that type F households' intertemporal first-order condition (18) and the government's intertemporal first-order condition (19) are both satisfied. With $a=0$ and $n_1^F=n_1^H$, the two different types of households are behaving identically. It follows from this that the set of equilibria will be the same as in our baseline model.

We now demonstrate that equilibria with $a=0$ are the only equilibria that can exist. Consider, on the way to a contradiction, an equilibrium in which type F households decide to borrow ($a>0$). In period 2, both types of households receive the same endowment y_2 and pay lump-sum taxes equal to B_2, but type F households will also have to repay an amount Ra. This means that type F households' consumption in period 2 will be lower than that of type H households: $c_2^F=y_2-B_2-Ra<y_2-B_2=c_2^H$. Since the marginal utility of consumption is decreasing, $u''(\cdot)<0$, this means that $u'(c_2^F)>u'(c_2^H)$. Using this fact, we can derive the following inequality by combining type F households' intertemporal first-order condition (18) with a transformed version of the government's intertemporal first-order condition (19) which has been divided through by Y_1:

$$u'(c_1^F)=\beta R u'(c_2^F)>\beta R\big(\lambda u'(c_2^H)+(1-\lambda)u'(c_2^F)\big)=\frac{\lambda f(n_1^H)u'(c_1^H)+(1-\lambda)f(n_1^F)u'(c_1^F)}{\lambda f(n_1^H)+(1-\lambda)f(n_1^F)}.$$

Simplifying this expression yields $u'(c_1^F) > u'(c_1^H)$. Substituting in the households' intratemporal first-order conditions (16) and (17) and simplifying yields

$$\frac{g'(n_1^F)}{f'(n_1^F)} > \frac{g'(n_1^H)}{f'(n_1^H)}.$$

Total differentiation of (17) with respect to a confirms that $dn_1^F/da < 0$, and so for $a > 0$ we have $n_1^F < n_1^H$. Combining this with the convexity of the labour disutility function, $g''(\cdot) > 0$, and the concavity of the production function, $f''(\cdot) < 0$, we have $g'(n_1^F) < g'(n_1^H)$ and $f'(n_1^F) > f'(n_1^H)$, which produces a contradiction with the expression above. (The same reasoning as above applies to the case with $a < 0$, with the signs of all the relevant inequalities reversed.) ■

A corollary of the fact that the set of equilibria does not depend on the fraction $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ of hand-to-mouth households is that the threshold level of inherited debt $\hat{B}_1$ does not depend on λ either.

The intuition for the result that no households borrow or save in equilibrium is as follows. The government's ability to choose the tax rate after labour supply and borrowing or saving decisions have already been made allows it to determine the allocation of households' consumption across the two periods. Whenever the marginal utility of hand-to-mouth households' consumption is not equalized across time, the government has an incentive to change the tax rate in order to better smooth hand-to-mouth households' consumption. In equilibrium, households with access to international financial markets perfectly anticipate the government's incentive to use the tax rate to smooth hand-to-mouth households' consumption, and adjust their own borrowing or saving accordingly. Therefore, even those households that are able to smooth their own consumption find it optimal in equilibrium to delegate this task to the government. In this way, the government's optimal reaction to an arbitrarily small degree of financial market incompleteness completely crowds out private-sector consumption smoothing.

Limited asset market participation in fact plays an important role here in constraining the set of equilibrium outcomes. The government in our model sets the tax rate after labour supply has been chosen, so it will behave as if the tax base were inelastic and will fail to account for the impact of the tax rate on labour supply in equilibrium. The presence of hand-to-mouth households nevertheless deters the government from setting a very high short-run tax rate, because if it did so then the marginal utility of short-run consumption for those households would be very high.[26]

[26] In the extreme case in which all households can borrow or save on international financial markets ($\lambda = 0$) there is a continuum of equilibria, again driven by taxpayer coordination failure.With $\lambda = 0$, the government always finds it optimal to validate households' expectations about the tax rate. Details of this corner case are provided in Appendix A.

5.2 Endogenous Government Spending

Consider a government with a high inherited level of debt. Facing a low value of labour supply, would the government prefer to increase its tax rate or to reduce government expenditure?

To endogenize the choice of public expenditure, we assume that households derive utility from a combination of private and public goods that enters the utility function with a constant elasticity of substitution (CES) aggregator:

$$u(c_1, G_1) = \frac{\Big[\big(c_1^{\frac{\epsilon-1}{\epsilon}} + G_1^{\frac{\epsilon-1}{\epsilon}}\big)^{\frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon-1}}\Big]^{1-\sigma}}{1-\sigma},$$

where ϵ is the elasticity of substitution. Public and private goods are complements if $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ and substitutes if $\epsilon > 1$.

As in (6), the government can costlessly transform a unit of the private consumption good into a unit of the public good, so the resource constraint is:

$$c_1 + G_1 = zf(n_1) + B_2/R - B_1.$$

Households' labour supply decision $n(\tau_1, G_1)$ is implicitly defined by

$$\alpha\big[(1-\tau_1)z_1 f(n_1)\big]^{\eta}\Big(\big((1-\tau_1)z_1 f(n_1)\big)^{\eta} + G_1^{\eta}\Big)^{1-\sigma-\eta} - n_1^{\gamma} = 0,$$

where $\eta \equiv 1 - \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ is a convenient transformation. We verify in Appendix B that the labour supply decision satisfies condition (4), i.e. that optimal labour supply is decreasing in the tax rate.

Given (n_1, B_1), the government solves:

$$\max_{\tau_1, G_1, B_2} \; u\Big((1-\tau_1)z_1 f(n_1), G_1\Big) - g(n_1) + \beta u(y_2 - B_2),$$

subject to the usual government budget constraint (6) and borrowing constraint (7).

With endogenous G_1, the maximum rollover threshold level of debt becomes:

$$\hat{B}_1 = \bar{B}_2/R = y_2/R, \tag{20}$$

because the government has the option to set $G_1 = 0$. The solution to the government's maximization problem gives the following tax policy function:[27]

$$\tau(n_1, B_1) = \frac{R + (\beta R/2^{\frac{1-\sigma-\eta}{\eta}})^{1/\sigma}}{2R + (\beta R/2^{\frac{1-\sigma-\eta}{\eta}})^{1/\sigma}} - \frac{R(\hat{B}_1 - B_1)}{\big(2R + (\beta R/2^{\frac{1-\sigma-\eta}{\eta}})^{1/\sigma}\big) z_1 n_1^{\alpha}}. \tag{21}$$

The next Proposition shows that the key result of the baseline model still holds, even if the possibility of adjusting government expenditure provides the government

[27] Details are provided in Appendix B.

with some "breathing room": the threshold level of debt is higher, but above this threshold, tax policy is procyclical and there is still the risk of fiscal policy traps.

Proposition 6. *The cyclicality of tax rate policy depends on the inherited debt level* B_1 *as follows:*

$$\frac{d\tau(n_1, B_1)}{dn_1} = \frac{R(\hat{B}_1 - B_1)\alpha}{\left(2R + (\beta R/2^{\frac{1-\sigma-\eta}{\eta}})^{1/\sigma}\right) z_1 n_1^{1+\alpha}} \begin{cases} > 0 & \textit{(countercyclical) if } B_1 < \hat{B}_1 \\ = 0 & \textit{(acyclical) if } B_1 = \hat{B}_1 \\ < 0 & \textit{(procyclical) if } B_1 > \hat{B}_1. \end{cases}$$

Accordingly, the equilibrium of the economy is unique if and only if $B_1 < \hat{B}_1$*, and fiscal policy traps may emerge for high levels of inherited debt* B_1*.*

Proof. Differentiation of (21) and application of Propositions 1 and 2. ■

This result might be surprising, as one would expect that the reaction of government spending would depend on the elasticity of substitution ϵ and temper the procyclical nature of tax policy at high levels of debt. Still, as discussed in section 3.4 for the policy function $\tau(\cdot)$, the reaction of government spending $G(\cdot)$ to changes in labor supply n_1 is subject to multiple economic forces. In particular, for high levels of inherited debt, government spending is unambiguously procyclical.[28]

Proposition 7. *The cyclicality of government spending policy is characterized by the following expression:*

$$\frac{dG(n_1, B_1)}{dn_1} = (1 - \tau_1) z_1 f'(n_1) - z_1 f(n_1) \frac{d\tau(n_1, B_1)}{dn_1}.$$

For $B_1 > \hat{B}_1$*, a reduction in labor supply is associated with a reduction in government spending for any value of* ϵ*.*

Proof. Details are provided in Appendix B. The sign of the expression derives from Proposition 6. ■

Intuitively, for high levels of public debt, when G_1 and c_1 are complements or imperfect substitutes ($\eta < 1$, $\epsilon < +\infty$), the government will optimally choose to reduce G_1 in proportion to c_1 when labour supply n_1 decreases and the country is poorer. This allows the government to raise the tax rate by less than in the case with exogenous government expenditure. Nevertheless, once the government is above its short-run borrowing limit, it will have to raise the tax rate, preserving the risk of fiscal policy traps. Hence, the debt threshold (20) when spending is endogenous is higher than the debt threshold (14) when spending is exogenous, as adjusting

[28] When $dG_1/dn_1 > 0$ we say that government spending is procyclical, in the sense that the government's optimal response to an increase in output is to increase spending on the public good. When $dG_1/dn_1 < 0$ we say that government spending is countercyclical, meaning that the government's optimal response to an increase in output is to reduce spending on the public good.

government spending allows some leeway before future fiscal capacity constrains the government into a procyclical stance.

5.3 Allowing for Default on Newly Issued Debt

In our baseline model, we assume that the government is committed to repaying its debt in full in period 2. This commitment implies the limit $\bar{B}_2$ to the amount of debt the government can issue in period 1 (see equation (7)). This debt issuance limit, together with the tax-base effect that becomes stronger as the government approaches it, causes optimal tax policy to be procyclical when the inherited debt level is high.

We now relax the hard solvency constraint and allow the government to choose strategically in period 2 whether or not to repay its debt. We show that this does not eliminate the possibility of self-fulfilling fiscal crises. In fact, the lack of commitment to debt repayment, i.e. the prospect of default in period 2, tightens the borrowing constraint in period 1. This in turn decreases the threshold level of debt $\hat{B}_1$ above which the economy is susceptible to fiscal policy traps.

5.3.1 Stochastic Long-Run Output and Strategic Default

To develop this idea, we amend the model as follows. Let long-run output y_2 be stochastic, distributed uniformly on $\left[\underline{y}_2, \bar{y}_2\right]$. We denote by $F(\cdot)$ the cumulative distribution function of y_2. As in section 4 above, the government can use lump-sum taxes in period 2 to repay its debt B_2, in which case period 2 consumption will be $c_2 = y_2 - B_2$. If instead the government chooses to default in period 2, the economy suffers the loss of a proportion δ_2 of output, so period 2 consumption becomes $c_2 = (1 - \delta_2)y_2$.

The proportional output loss δ_2 determines the government's degree of commitment to repaying its debt in period 2. The extreme case of $\delta_2 = 1$ induces a strong commitment to repay and captures the hard solvency constraint assumed up to now. At the opposite extreme of $\delta_2 = 0$, default is costless, so the government would always default. Given outstanding bonds B_2, it is optimal for the government to repay its debt in period 2 whenever output y_2 satisfies:

$$y_2 - B_2 \geq (1 - \delta_2)y_2.$$

This relation gives the threshold $\hat{y}_2(B_2)$, realizations of y_2 below which the government defaults on its bonds B_2:

$$\hat{y}_2(B_2) = B_2/\delta_2. \tag{22}$$

Risk-neutral foreign investors anticipate the strategic default decision of the government. Accordingly, the price schedule $q(B_2)$ satisfies the following no-arbitrage

condition:

$$q(B_2) = \frac{1 - F\left(\hat{y}_2(B_2)\right)}{R}, \tag{23}$$

where R is the risk-free interest rate. In this expression, the credit risk associated with the issuance of bonds B_2 is captured by $F\big(\hat{y}_2(B_2)\big)$, the probability that long-run output will be below the default threshold $\hat{y}_2(B_2)$. The possibility of strategic default can lead to indeterminacy in the price schedule (23), as studied in Calvo (1988) and Cooper (2015). As our focus is on the occurrence of fiscal policy traps rather than self-fulfilling increases in sovereign risk premia, whenever several prices satisfy the price schedule (23) we assume that investors select the "fundamental" outcome with the lowest risk premium. In this case, the price of debt $q(B_2)$ is decreasing in the amount of bonds B_2 issued, reflecting the increased probability of default.

5.3.2 Lack of Commitment to Repay Reduces Borrowing Limit

We are now ready to prove that despite its capacity to default on debt in period 2, the government may still be susceptible to fiscal policy traps. As in our baseline model, government borrowing between period 1 and 2 is constrained. This is turn induces a maximum level of inherited debt $\hat{B}_1$ such that the government can roll over its obligations without having to collect tax revenue in period 1. As in the baseline model, the economy is under the threat of fiscal policy traps whenever inherited debt B_1 is above this threshold. Interestingly, this threshold is increasing in the commitment parameter δ_2. In other words, the less committed a country is to repaying its debt, the lower is the debt threshold at which it becomes vulnerable to fiscal policy traps.

Proposition 8. *Whenever the government can default on its debt in period 2, there is a maximum rollover threshold level of debt $\hat{B}_1$ above which the country is subject to fiscal policy traps. The threshold is increasing in the output loss parameter δ_2 (i.e. an increase in commitment increases debt capacity).*

Proof. We first demonstrate that there is a maximum amount of revenue that the government can raise in period 1, and that this amount is decreasing in δ_2. The revenue raised in period 1 by issuing B_2 bonds is $q(B_2)B_2$, where the price schedule $q(B_2)$ satisfies (23). Using the default threshold (22), resources from debt issuance are

$$q(B_2)B_2 = \frac{1 - F(B_2/\delta_2)}{R} B_2.$$

The right-hand side is equal to 0 for $B_2 = 0$ and for $B_2 = \delta_2 \bar{y}_2$, and is strictly positive for any value of B_2 in between. Hence the right-hand side reaches a maximum for $B_2 = \bar{B}_2 \in (0, \delta_2 \bar{y}_2)$. The maximum period 1 revenue from debt issuance is therefore $q(\bar{B}_2)\bar{B}_2$. Since the price of debt is strictly increasing in δ_2, the revenue collected $q(B_2)B_2$ is also increasing in δ_2, and so is the maximum amount that can be collected.

As in (11) above, there is a maximum amount of debt $\hat{B}_1$ that can be rolled over without raising any tax revenue in period 1. This threshold is increasing in the maximum amount of revenue that can be raised by issuing new debt, and therefore in δ_2:

$$\hat{B}_1 = q(\bar{B}_2)\bar{B}_2 - G_1.$$

If the stock of inherited debt B_1 exceeds the maximum rollover threshold $\hat{B}_1$, then as in our baseline model the government will have to gather revenue in period 1. Indeed, to remain within this limit the government must set a short-run tax rate at least equal to

$$\underline{\tau}(n_1, B_1) = \frac{B_1 - \hat{B}_1}{z_1 f(n_1)}.$$

It follows that, as before, when $B_1 > \hat{B}_1$ the optimal tax policy function is at least locally procyclical, and Proposition 2 applies.

■

The intuition behind this result is as follows. As the proportional default cost δ_2 falls, investors know that the government will default in more states of the world in period 2 because it faces a lower penalty for doing so. This causes them to charge a higher risk premium, thereby reducing the amount of revenue the government can raise in period 1 by issuing new debt. This in turn reduces the threshold level of inherited debt $\hat{B}_1$ above which the government is forced to collect tax revenue in period 1. Allowing the government to default on its debt in period 2 does not, therefore, eliminate the possibility of self-fulfilling fiscal crises. In fact, it reduces the threshold level of inherited debt above which they become possible.[29]

6 Conclusion

It was not only countries facing increased borrowing costs that pursued contractionary fiscal policies during the Great Recession. In this paper we have proposed a potential explanation for why governments might pursue procyclical tax policies despite not facing increased sovereign risk premia. When the inherited stock of public debt is sufficiently high, concerns about the burden of future taxes may overwhelm concerns about preserving consumption in the face of low output today, making even optimal fiscal policy procyclical. This procyclicality unleashes the possibility of a different kind of crisis, fuelled not by self-fulfilling fears of higher sovereign spreads but by self-fulfilling fears of low output.

[29] In Appendix C we consider the possibility of the government defaulting on its *inherited* debt. We show that there can be a self-fulfilling crisis in which households restrict their labour supply in anticipation of the proportional output loss associated with default, thereby increasing the tax rate necessary to repay inherited debt and inducing the government to default. There are circumstances in which the ability to default on inherited debt in period 1 can eliminate fiscal policy trap equilibria without introducing a self-fulfilling default equilibrium, but only if inherited debt is sufficiently low.

Our model is silent on how the inherited stock of public debt is determined, so a formal analysis of optimal debt ceilings is beyond the scope of the present paper. Nevertheless, our analysis suggests that debt ceilings could be a double-edged sword. From a period 0 perspective, a suitably calibrated debt ceiling might prevent public debt from reaching the threshold level above which self-fulfilling fiscal crises are possible. However, from a period 1 perspective, an arbitrary limit on the government's ability to issue new debt could have dire consequences by forcing it to respond to low output by setting a high tax rate.

Other avenues for future research include introducing domestically held government debt, households facing idiosyncratic income risk and incomplete markets, and a government with a richer set of fiscal policy instruments.

References

Abbas, S. M. A., N. Belhocine, A. El-Ganainy, and M. Horton (2011): "Historical Patterns and Dynamics of Public Debt—Evidence From a New Database," *IMF Economic Review*, 59, 717–742.

Albanesi, S., V. V. Chari, and L. J. Christiano (2003): "Expectation Traps and Monetary Policy," *Review of Economic Studies*, 70, 715–741.

Calvo, G. A. (1988): "Servicing the Public Debt: The Role of Expectations," *American Economic Review*, 78, 647–661.

Cole, H. L. and T. J. Kehoe (2000): "Self-Fulfilling Debt Crises," *Review of Economic Studies*, 67, 91–116.

Cooper, R. (2015): "Debt Fragility and Bailouts," NBER Working Paper 18377, previously circulated as "Fragile Debt and the Credible Sharing of Strategic Uncertainty", October 2012.

Cooper, R. W. (1999): *Coordination Games: Complementarities and Macroeconomics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corsetti, G., K. Kuester, A. Meier, and G. J. Müller (2013): "Sovereign Risk, Fiscal Policy, and Macroeconomic Stability," *Economic Journal*, 123, F99–F132.

Giannitsarou, C. (2007): "Balanced Budget Rules and Aggregate Instability: The Role of Consumption Taxes," *Economic Journal*, 117, 1423–1435.

Guo, J.-T. and S. G. Harrison (2004): "Balanced-budget rules and macroeconomic (in)stability," *Journal of Economic Theory*, 119, 357–363.

Lorenzoni, G. and I. Werning (2013): "Slow Moving Debt Crises," NBER Working Paper 19228.

OECD (2011): "Fiscal consolidation: targets, plans and measures," *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 11, 15–67.

Ortigueira, S. and J. Pereira (2016): "Lack of Commitment, Retroactive Tax Changes, and Macroeconomic Instability," University of Miami Department of Economics Working Paper WP2016-05.

Reinhart, C. M., V. R. Reinhart, and K. S. Rogoff (2012): "Public Debt Overhangs: Advanced-Economy Episodes since 1800," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 26, 69–86.

Schmitt-Grohé, S. and M. Uribe (1997): "Balanced-Budget Rules, Distortionary Taxes, and Aggregate Instability," *Journal of Political Economy*, 105, 976–1000.

A Full Asset Market Participation

If there were no hand-to-mouth households at all, then there would exist a continuum of equilibria. In each such equilibrium, households anticipate a certain short-run tax rate, supply labour and borrow or save accordingly, and the government then finds it optimal to choose the tax rate that households anticipated. If households can borrow or save, the set of equilibria includes equilibria that are Pareto dominated by the fiscal policy trap equilibrium from the version of the model with limited asset market participation.

Proposition 9. *Let all households have access to international financial markets ($\lambda = 0$), and let $a(\tau_1, n(\tau_1))$ denote optimal household borrowing when the short-run tax rate is τ_1 and all households are supplying labour $n(\tau_1)$. Then there is a continuum of equilibria, each with a tax rate τ_1 that satisfies*

$$\tau_1 z_1 f(n(\tau_1)) \geq B_1 + G_1 - \big(y_2/R - a(\tau_1, n(\tau_1))\big). \tag{24}$$

Proof. If households anticipate a tax rate τ_1 that satisfies condition (24), then they will optimally supply labour according to $n(\tau_1)$, which is implicitly defined by their intratemporal first-order condition (17). Households will borrow or save according to $a(\tau_1, n(\tau_1))$, which is implicitly defined by their intertemporal first-order condition (18) and the fact that, since households are ex ante identical and face the same incentives, in equilibrium they will all supply the same amount of labour $n(\tau_1)$. With $\lambda = 0$, the government's intertemporal first-order condition (19) simplifies to type F households' intertemporal first-order condition (18). Given that households have chosen labour supply $n(\tau_1)$ and borrowing $a(\tau_1, n(\tau_1))$ to satisfy condition (18) based on their expectations of the tax rate τ_1, the only way the government can satisfy condition (19) is to set the tax rate τ_1 that households expected. Condition (24)

ensures that the government's budget constraint is satisfied and that it can repay its debt in period 2. ■

B Details for Endogenous Government Spending

This Appendix refers to section 5.2. Public consumption enters households' utility function with the following CES aggregator:

$$u(c_1, G_1) = \frac{\left[(c_1^{\frac{\epsilon-1}{\epsilon}} + G_1^{\frac{\epsilon-1}{\epsilon}})^{\frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon-1}}\right]^{1-\sigma}}{1-\sigma},$$

where $\epsilon = \frac{1}{1-\eta}$ is the elasticity of subtitution, and $\eta < 1$.

B.1 Households' Labour Supply

Given (τ_1, G_1), households solve:

$$\max_{n_1} \; u\Big((1-\tau_1)z_1 n_1^{\alpha}, G_1\Big) - g(n_1).$$

The first-order condition that implicitly defines $n(\tau_1, G_1)$ is:

$$\alpha\big[(1-\tau_1)z_1 n_1^{\alpha}\big]^{\eta}\Big(\big((1-\tau_1)z_1 n_1^{\alpha}\big)^{\eta} + G_1^{\eta}\Big)^{\frac{1-\sigma-\eta}{\eta}} - n_1^{\gamma} = 0. \tag{25}$$

We verify that labour supply is decreasing in the tax rate, i.e. $dn_1/d\tau_1 < 0$. Totally differentiating (25) with respect to n_1 and τ_1 yields

$$X dn_1 + Y d\tau_1 = 0,$$

with:

$$X = -\alpha c_1^{\eta} n_1^{\alpha\eta-2}\big[c_1^{\eta} + G_1^{\eta}\big]^{\frac{1-\sigma-2\eta}{\eta}}\big[\big(1-\alpha(1-\sigma)\big)c_1^{\eta} + (1-\alpha\eta)G_1^{\eta}\big] - (\gamma-1)n_1^{\gamma-2} < 0,$$
$$Y = -\frac{\alpha c_1^{\eta}}{(1-\tau_1)n_1}\big[c_1^{\eta} + G_1^{\eta}\big]^{\frac{1-\sigma-2\eta}{\eta}}\Big[\eta G_1^{\eta} + (1-\sigma)c_1^{\eta}\Big] < 0.$$

The signs of these expressions derive from the following parametric assumptions: $\sigma \in (0,1)$, $\gamma > 1$, $\alpha \in (0,1]$, $\eta < 1$.

B.2 Tax and Spending Policy Functions

Given (B_1, n_1), the government solves

$$\max_{\tau_1, G_1, B_2} u\big((1-\tau_1)z_1 n_1^{\alpha}, G_1\big) - g(n_1) + \beta u(y_2 - B_2)$$

subject to the government budget constraint

$$B_1 + G_1 = \tau_1 z_1 n_1^{\alpha} + \frac{B_2}{R}.$$

Letting μ be the Lagrange multiplier associated with the government budget constraint, the first-order conditions are:

$$\begin{aligned} &- c_1^{\eta-1}\left[c_1^{\eta} + G_1^{\eta}\right]^{\frac{1-\sigma-\eta}{\eta}} + \mu = 0, \\ &G_1^{\eta-1}\left[c_1^{\eta} + G_1^{\eta}\right]^{\frac{1-\sigma-\eta}{\eta}} - \mu = 0, \\ &- \beta R u'(y_2 - B_2) + \mu = 0. \end{aligned}$$

from where we get $G_1 = c_1$ and using the third expression:

$$B_2 = y_2 - \Big[\frac{\beta R}{2^{\frac{1-\sigma-\eta}{\eta}}}\Big]^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} c_1.$$

Substituting this into the government budget constraint and rearranging yields:

$$\tau(n_1, B_1) = \frac{R + (\beta R/2^{\frac{1-\sigma-\eta}{\eta}})^{1/\sigma}}{2R + (\beta R/2^{\frac{1-\sigma-\eta}{\eta}})^{1/\sigma}} - \frac{R(\hat{B}_1 - B_1)}{\big(2R + (\beta R/2^{\frac{1-\sigma-\eta}{\eta}})^{1/\sigma}\big) z_1 n_1^{\alpha}}.$$

Finally, using $G_1 = c_1$, we get

$$G_1(n_1, B_1) = (1 - \tau_1) z_1 n_1^{\alpha}.$$

C Allowing Default on Inherited Debt

We have seen in section 5.3 above that allowing the government to default on its newly issued debt in period 2 only tightens its borrowing constraint in period 1, thereby strengthening the forces that lead to procyclical tax policy and multiple Pareto-ranked equilibria. We now consider whether allowing the government to default on its inherited debt B_1 can eliminate fiscal policy trap equilibria. We will show that it can, but that this only improves welfare when inherited debt is low. When inherited debt is high, the ability to default on it may make no difference, or even be harmful relative to the case of full commitment to repay it.

For simplicity, in this section we normalize both G_1 and G_2 to zero.[30] Let δ_1 be the proportional output loss that the economy suffers in period 1 whenever the government defaults on its inherited debt B_1. We assume that if the government defaults in period 1, the economy automatically suffers a proportional output loss δ_2 in period 2 as well. Under this assumption, the government has no incentive to repay debt in period 2 and so will be unable to issue new debt in period 1. The optimal period 1 tax rate is therefore $\tau_1 = 0$, and the value of the government's

[30] This is without loss of generality, since G_1 enters into the government's maximization problem in exactly the same way as B_1, and similarly an increase G_2 is equivalent to a decrease in y_2.

objective function will be:

$$u\big((1-\delta_1)z_1 f(n_1)\big) - g(n_1) + \beta \int_{\underline{y}_2}^{\bar{y}_2} \frac{u\big((1-\delta_2)y_2\big)}{\bar{y}_2 - \underline{y}_2} dy_2,$$

where period 2 output is uniformly distributed on $\big[\underline{y}_2, \bar{y}_2\big]$.

If the government chooses to repay its inherited debt B_1, then it can issue new debt B_2. As in section 5.3 above, depending on the realization of period 2 output y_2, the government will choose strategically whether to collect lump-sum taxes to repay its newly issued debt B_2 or to default and incur the proportional output loss δ_2. The expected value of the government's objective function when it repays inherited debt B_1 and issues new debt B_2 is therefore:

$$u\big((1-\tau_1)z_1 f(n_1)\big) - g(n_1) + \beta \left(\int_{\underline{y}_2}^{B_2/\delta_2} \frac{u\big((1-\delta_2)y_2\big)}{\bar{y}_2 - \underline{y}_2} dy_2 + \int_{B_2/\delta_2}^{\bar{y}_2} \frac{u(y_2 - B_2)}{\bar{y}_2 - \underline{y}_2} dy_2 \right).$$

We use $n^*(B_1, \delta_1)$ to denote the threshold level of labour supply below which the government prefers to set $\tau_1 = 0$ and incur the costs of defaulting in period 1. When the government does so, households will face an effective period 1 tax rate of δ_1 due to the proportional output loss, meaning their optimal labour supply is $n(\delta_1)$. An equilibrium in which the government defaults on its inherited public debt B_1 exists if and only if $n(\delta_1) < n^*(B_1, \delta_1)$, that is, if the optimal labour supply response to an anticipation of default is low enough that the government indeed prefers to default.

Let $n^B(B_1)$ denote the labour supply associated with the fiscal policy trap equilibrium.[31] Then the ability to default on inherited public debt B_1 eliminates the fiscal policy trap equilibrium if and only if $n^B(B_1) < n^*(B_1, \delta_1)$, that is, if the government would choose to default if households were to supply an amount of labour consistent with the fiscal policy trap equilibrium.

The intuition for how the government's ability to default on its inherited debt can eliminate the fiscal policy trap equilibrium is as follows. In a fiscal policy trap, households expect one another to supply very little labour, and correctly anticipate that the government would set a very high tax rate in response. If households knew that the government would prefer to default on its inherited debt when labour supply was so low, then they should expect instead to face an effective tax rate equal to the associated proportional output loss δ_1. If the optimal labour supply given this effective tax rate is greater than it would have been in the fiscal policy trap, then the fiscal policy trap cannot be an equilibrium.

We assume that the existence of an equilibrium in which the government defaults on its inherited debt B_1 does not affect the selection probability of the "good" equilibrium, in which the government repays its inherited debt B_1 with a high short-run labour supply n_1 and a low short-run tax rate τ_1.

[31] Throughout this section we assume that there is at most one such equilibrium, which is ensured whenever the tax policy function is monotonic.

Proposition 10. *The ability to default on inherited public debt B_1 can only increase welfare if $n^B(B_1) < n(\delta_1)$. This condition can only be satisfied if B_1 is below a threshold level $\tilde{B}_1$.*

Proof. We proceed by enumerating the equilibrium regimes that are possible when the government is able to default on its inherited debt, and comparing the outcome in each of these regimes to the outcome when the government is committed to repaying its inherited debt. We will show that $n^B(B_1) < n(\delta_1)$ is a necessary condition for each of the regimes in which welfare is higher when the government can default on its inherited debt.

No default equilibrium

Consider first the cases in which $n^*(B_1, \delta_1) \leq n(\delta_1)$, so that there is no equilibrium in which the government defaults on its inherited debt. If $n^*(B_1, \delta_1) \leq n^B(B_1)$, both repayment equilibria survive because the government finds it optimal to repay even if labour supply is at the low level associated with the fiscal policy trap repayment equilibrium. Since the set of equilibria is unchanged from a situation in which the government is fully committed to repaying its inherited debt, the government's ability to default does not affect welfare in this case.

By contrast, if $n^*(B_1, \delta_1) > n^G(B_1)$, then the government would optimally default on its inherited debt even if labour supply were higher than the level associated with the good repayment equilibrium. This eliminates both repayment equilibria, and since $n^*(B_1, \delta_1) \leq n(\delta_1)$ there is no default equilibrium either. In this region of the parameter space there is no equilibrium when the government can default on its inherited debt, so no welfare comparison is possible with the case where the government is committed to repaying its inherited debt.

If $n^*(B_1, \delta_1) \in \left(n^B(B_1), n^G(B_1)\right)$, then the government's ability to default eliminates the fiscal policy trap equilibrium, leaving only the good repayment equilibrium. Welfare is therefore greater when the government can default on its inherited debt than when it is committed to repay. The combination of $n^*(B_1, \delta_1) \leq n(\delta_1)$ and $n^*(B_1, \delta_1) \in \left(n^B(B_1), n^G(B_1)\right)$ implies $n^B(B_1) < n(\delta_1)$.

Default equilibrium does exist

Consider now the cases in which $n^*(B_1, \delta_1) > n(\delta_1)$, so that there is an equilibrium in which the government defaults on its inherited debt. Then in order for the ability to default on inherited public debt to be welfare increasing, this equilibrium with period 1 default must be preferred to the fiscal policy trap equilibrium.

If we had $n^B(B_1) \geq n(\delta_1)$, this would mean that labour supply was lower in the default equilibrium than in the fiscal policy trap equilibrium. Households must be on their labour supply curve in equilibrium, so the lower labour supply in the default equilibrium implies that the effective tax rate imposed by the default penalty δ_1 is higher than the tax rate in the fiscal policy trap equilibrium. This means that welfare is lower in period 1 in the default equilibrium than in the fiscal policy trap equilibrium.

By assumption, defaulting in period 1 also imposes the default penalty δ_2 in period 2, just as if the government were to default on newly issued debt in period 2. Since the government can choose strategically whether or not to repay its newly issued debt in period 2, welfare in period 2 is higher when the government has not already defaulted in period 1. Having seen that welfare is lower in both periods in the default equilibrium than in the fiscal policy trap equilibrium whenever $n^B(B_1) \geq n(\delta_1)$, we can infer that $n^B(B_1) < n(\delta_1)$ is a necessary condition for the ability to default to improve welfare.

Low inherited debt necessary

Labour supply in the default equilibrium, $n(\delta_1)$, does not depend on the inherited debt level B_1. Labour supply in the fiscal policy trap equilibrium, $n^B(B_1)$, is increasing in B_1, because the tax policy function crosses the labour supply function from above. This means that $n^B(B_1) < n(\delta_1)$ if and only if inherited debt B_1 is below some threshold level $\tilde{B}_1$.

■