

Dynamic Mirrlees Taxation under Political Economy Constraints*

Daron Acemoglu
MIT

Michael Golosov
MIT

Aleh Tsyvinski
Harvard and NES

February 2007.

Abstract

We study the structure of nonlinear incentive-compatible taxes, in a dynamic economy subject to political economy and commitment problems. In contrast to existing analyses of dynamic and/or nonlinear taxation problems, we relax the assumptions that taxes are set by a benevolent government and that there is commitment to policies. Instead, in our model economy taxes are set by a self-interested politician, without any commitment power. This politician is partly controlled by the citizens via elections. The resulting environment is one of a dynamic mechanism design without commitment. We focus on the best sustainable mechanism, which is the mechanism that maximizes the ex ante utility of the citizens. Towards a full characterization of the allocations implied by the best sustainable mechanism, we first prove that a version of the revelation principle applies in our environment and that attention can be restricted to direct truth-telling mechanisms. Using this result, we prove that the provision of incentives to politicians can be separated from the provision of incentives to, and from redistribution, across individuals. This also enables us to develop a method of characterizing the best sustainable mechanism as a solution to a standard dynamic mechanism design problem subject to additional political economy and commitment constraints formulated only as functions of aggregate variables. Using this formulation, we provide conditions under which distortions created by political economy and commitment problems persist or disappear in the long run. In particular, if politicians are as patient as (or more patient than) the citizens, these distortions disappear asymptotically, and they remain positive otherwise. Finally, we extend our analysis to the case where the government cares both about its own consumption and the future utility of the citizens. This extension generalizes our results to environments where the key constraint is the time-inconsistency of a (partially) benevolent government.

Keywords: dynamic incentive problems, mechanism design, optimal taxation, political economy, revelation principle.

JEL Classification: H11, H21, E61, P16.

*We thank audiences at many seminars for helpful comments and Oleg Itskhoki for excellent research assistance.

1 Introduction

The major insight of the optimal taxation literature pioneered by Mirrlees (1971) is that the tax structure ought to provide incentives to individuals to work, exert effort and invest, while also providing insurance. This insight is also central to the recent optimal dynamic taxation literature. This literature characterizes the structure of optimal (nonlinear) taxes assuming that policies are decided by a benevolent government with full commitment power. The optimal tax structure typically involves a significant amount of information gathered in the hands of the government as well as a range of transfers to and from the government using the available fiscal instruments. In practice, however, tax structures are designed by politicians, who care about reelection, self-enrichment or their own individual biases and cannot commit to future policies or to dynamic mechanisms. This observation gives greater weight to the famous quote by Juvenal, which is at the root of much of political economy analysis: “*who will guard the guardians?*”. In such environments “guarding the guardians” becomes even more challenging because of the amount of information and enforcement power concentrated in their—the government’s—hands.

In this paper, we study the structure of dynamic nonlinear taxation under political economy constraints—that is, when there is no commitment to policies and the government (politicians) also need to be “guarded” (controlled).¹ Although implications of the self-interested behavior of politicians for *feasible* optimal policies has not received much attention, the difficulties introduced by lack of commitment in the design of optimal policies are generally well-recognized. Chari and Kehoe (1990), for example, provide a comprehensive discussion of the implications of incorporating time-consistency constraints.

The challenges created by time inconsistency in dynamic nonlinear taxation environments are especially severe and were first pointed out by Roberts (1984). Roberts considered an example economy, where, similar to Mirrlees (1971), risk-averse individuals are subject to unobserved shocks affecting the marginal disutility of labor supply. But differently from the benchmark Mirrlees model, the economy is repeated T times, with individuals having perfectly persistent types. Under full commitment, a benevolent planner would choose the same allocation at every date, which coincides with the optimal solution of the static model. However, a benevolent government without full commitment cannot refrain from exploiting the information that it has collected at previous dates to achieve better risk sharing ex post. This turns the optimal taxation problem into a dynamic game between the government and the citizens.

¹Since in the literature following Mirrlees the optimal tax-transfer program is a solution to a mechanism design problem, we use the terms “optimal tax-transfer program,” “optimal nonlinear taxation” and “mechanism” interchangeably.

Roberts showed that as discounting disappears and $T \rightarrow \infty$, the unique sequential equilibrium of this game involves the highly inefficient outcome in which all individuals declare to be the worst type at all dates, supply the lowest level of labor and receive the lowest level of consumption. This example not only shows the potential inefficiencies that can arise once we depart from the unrealistic case of full commitment, even with benevolent governments, but also highlights that the main tool of analysis in dynamic taxation problems, the celebrated revelation principle, may also fail (in Roberts's economy there is no truthful reporting of types).

In light of this stark difficulty highlighted by Roberts (1984), is there any hope of constructing equilibrium taxation policies in the presence of political economy and commitment constraints that can provide incentives to and redistribution (risk sharing) among agents as in Mirrlees's baseline analysis? The main contribution of the current paper is to show that, under reasonable assumptions, taxation and redistribution policies resembling those resulting from the normative Mirrleesian analysis with commitment and a benevolent planner can be supported as equilibria. To present our main results in the clearest possible way, throughout the paper we focus on the equilibrium of the dynamic game between citizens and politicians that maximizes the ex ante utility of the citizens, and refer to this as the *best sustainable mechanism*. This terminology emphasizes that we are characterizing the best tax-transfer scheme that is sustainable in the sense of being incentive compatible both for the citizens and for the politicians entrusted with implementing the policies.

Two ingredients are essential for our approach. First, instead of a finite-horizon economy as in Roberts, we consider an infinite-horizon environment. This makes it possible for us to use standard repeated game strategies to sustain better equilibria than those emphasized in Roberts. Second, we choose a particularly tractable model of political economy and commitment problems. Specifically, we assume that politicians have no commitment power and can even deviate from their within-period commitments, but they are subject to electoral accountability. These assumptions are similar to those made in the baseline models of political economy based on the approach first proposed by Barro (1973) and Ferejohn (1986). In the Barro-Ferejohn model, politicians can choose any policy vector they prefer, but if their policy choice is not in line with the electorate's expectations, then they can be voted out of office (see Persson and Tabellini, 2000, Chapter 4, for a modern exposition and references).

These two ingredients enable us to develop a tractable framework for analysis of dynamic taxation in the presence of political economy and commitment constraints. Our first result is that because of the potential electoral controls on politicians, a version of the revelation principle, *truthful revelation along the equilibrium path*, applies in our environment regardless

of the discount factors of various parties (that is, this is *not* a folk theorem type result).² It should be noted that this result does not generalize to other dynamic mechanism design problems and exploits the specific structure of our economy.³

Our second result is key to a tractable analysis of dynamic nonlinear taxation problems in the presence of political economy and commitment constraints: we show that the best sustainable mechanism enables a separation between private and public incentives—that is, incentive compatibility for individuals can be treated separately from ensuring that the politician in power does not wish to deviate from the candidate *social plan* (proposed tax-transfer scheme). More specifically, this separation result enables us to characterize the best sustainable mechanism in two steps:

1. We first solve the problem of providing incentives to individuals given aggregate levels of consumption and labor supply. We call this a *quasi-Mirrlees problem* as it is a usual dynamic Mirrlees problem with two additional constraints on aggregate labor and consumption. Its solution leads to an *indirect utility functional* representing expected utility as a function of the aggregate levels of consumption and labor supply.
2. We then provide incentives to politicians by choosing aggregate variables and the level of rents paid to the politician.

This formulation not only provides us with a tractable strategy for characterizing the best sustainable mechanism, but also enables a direct comparison between the best sustainable mechanism and the full-commitment Mirrlees mechanism in terms of the *aggregate distortions* caused by the former relative to the full-commitment Mirrlees allocation. This result, therefore, implies that incorporating lack of commitment and self-interest of politicians does not necessarily invalidate the methodology of approaching dynamic taxation problems as one of dynamic mechanism design; it simply adds additional constraints on aggregates.

Our main results focus on the characterization of these aggregate distortions and their evolution. First, we show that political economy and commitment problems always introduce further distortions in the sustainable mechanism relative to the full-commitment Mirrlees

²One can always construct an extended game in which there is a *fictional* disinterested mechanism designer, with the government as an additional player that has the authority to tax and regulate and the ability to observe all the communication between the fictitious mechanism designer and individual agents. Although a version of the revelation principle would apply in this extended game, this does not circumvent the substantive issues raised here: the party entrusted with taxes and transfers has neither the same interests as those of the citizens nor much commitment power.

³There has recently been important progress in the characterization of dynamic mechanisms without commitment. See, in particular, the important work by Skreta (2006, 2007). Sleet and Yeltekin (2006) provide a proof of the revelation principle for sufficiently high discount factors in a dynamic economy with time inconsistency, but without political economy constraints.

mechanism. Intuitively, if the sustainability constraint of the politician were always slack, then the politician would receive zero consumption and would find it beneficial to deviate and expropriate some of the output. If, on the other hand, the sustainability constraint binds, then any increase in output must be associated with increased rents for the politician in power. This in turn increases the opportunity cost of production and leads to a reduction in labor supply and capital accumulation. Therefore, labor supply and capital are depressed in the best sustainable mechanism *as a way of relaxing the sustainability constraint* (and thus reducing the rents allocated to the politicians in power). Second, we provide precise conditions under which these political economy and commitment distortions disappear or persist over time. In particular, we show that when politicians are as patient as (more patient than) the citizens, additional distortions created by political economy disappear in the long run and the allocation of resources converges to that of a dynamic Mirrlees economy with an exogenous level of public good spending. In this limiting equilibrium, there are no additional taxes on labor beyond those implied by the optimal Mirrleesian taxation and no aggregate taxes on capital.⁴ In contrast, when politicians are (strictly) less patient than the citizens, the structure of taxes never converges to that of a dynamic Mirrlees economy and features additional labor and capital taxes even asymptotically. This last set of results is important, since it provides an exception to most existing models, which predict that long-run taxes on capital should be equal to zero (cf. footnote 4) and might provide a possible perspective for why capital taxation is pervasive in practice.

The final set of results focus on politicians that are at least partly benevolent. In this case, the main constraint on the form of taxation is commitment to the sequence of policies rather than the self-interested behavior of the politicians. This case is particularly important since it enables us to revisit the stark negative result in Roberts's (1984) seminal paper discussed above. We show that, in contrast to Roberts's analysis, aggregate distortions created by commitment problems disappear if the politician is as patient as the citizens.

Our paper is related to a number of different literatures. The relationship to papers characterizing dynamic mechanism design problems without commitment, such as Skreta (2006, 2007) or Sleet and Yeltekin (2006), has already been mentioned. Our paper is also related to the important paper by Bisin and Rampini (2005), who extend Roberts's analysis and show how the presence of anonymous markets acts as an additional constraint on the government, ameliorating the commitment problem. The role of anonymous markets in Bisin and Rampini's

⁴This result is therefore similar to that of zero limiting taxes on capital in the first-generation Ramsey-type models, e.g., Chamley (1986) or Judd (1985), but is derived here without any exogenous restriction on tax instruments (see Kocherlakota, 2005, for the zero capital tax result using the second-generation approach).

It is important to emphasize, however, that this limiting allocation can be decentralized in different ways, and some of those may involve positive taxes on individual capital holdings.

analysis is related to the lack of commitment by the self-interested government in our model. The most important distinction between the two approaches is the infinite horizon nature of our model, which enables us to construct sustainable mechanisms with the revelation principle holding along the equilibrium path. This enables us to analyze substantially more general environments, and to characterize the limiting behavior of distortions and taxes.

In addition to these papers, our work is related to the burgeoning literatures on dynamic political economy,⁵ and on dynamic nonlinear taxation. In particular, our framework incorporates the general model of dynamic nonlinear taxation considered in Golosov, Kocherlakota, and Tsyvinski (2003), Kocherlakota (2005), and Albanesi and Sleet (2005). A recent interesting paper by Albanesi and Armenter (2007) studies general structure of intertemporal distortions in a variety of contexts and uses a technique similar to those in this paper in separating aggregate from idiosyncratic distortions.

The results in this paper are also closely related to our previous work, Acemoglu, Golosov and Tsyvinski (2006, 2007a,b). Many of the results here were first presented in the working paper, Acemoglu, Golosov and Tsyvinski (2006).⁶ A special case of these results have been developed in Acemoglu, Golosov and Tsyvinski (2007a). That paper focuses on the problem of controlling a self-interested politician in a representative agent neoclassical growth model, and thus does not feature any incomplete information, heterogeneity or nonlinear taxation, which are our present focus. Consequently, the results in the current paper are significantly more general than those in Acemoglu, Golosov and Tsyvinski (2007a) and enable us to investigate questions related to the structure of taxation under political economy constraints. In particular, the key results of the present paper related to truthful revelation, separation of private and public incentives, the structure of nonlinear taxes and the interaction between nonlinear taxation, political economy and time-inconsistency are not present in that paper. The main parallel between the current paper and Acemoglu, Golosov and Tsyvinski (2007a) is the emphasis on the relative discount factors of politicians and citizens. The provision of incentives to politicians in our model is also related to the structure of optimal contracts in dynamic principal-agent analyses (see, among others, Harris and Holmstrom, 1982, Lazear, 1981, Ray, 2002). Ray (2002) provides the most general results in this context. Acemoglu,

⁵For general discussions of the implications of self-interested behavior of governments, petitions and bureaucrats, see, among others, Buchanan and Tullock (1962), North and Thomas (1973), North (1981), Olson (1982), North and Weingast (1989), and Dixit (2004). Austen-Smith and Banks (1999), Persson and Tabellini (2000) and Acemoglu (2007) provide introductions to various aspects of the recent developments and the basic theory. For dynamic analysis of political economy, focusing mostly on Markovian equilibria, see, among others, Krusell and Rios-Rull (1999), Acemoglu and Robinson (2006), Hassler et al. (2005), and Battaglini and Coate (2006).

⁶Results related to the comparison of market-based and government-controlled allocations in that working paper have been extended in Acemoglu, Golosov and Tsyvinski (2007b). None of these results are present in the current paper.

Golosov and Tsyvinski (2007a) extend Ray’s results to the case in which discount factors are different between the principal and the agent (or the citizens and the politician).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the general economic environment. Section 3 describes how the tax-transfer mechanisms are designed and the political economy environment. Section 4 establishes the result that in our economy there will be truthful revelation along the equilibrium path and allows us to focus on direct mechanisms (subject to the relevant incentive compatibility constraints). Section 5 shows how the provision of incentives to individuals can be separated from the provision of incentives to politicians, enabling a relatively tractable analysis of sustainable tax-transfer mechanisms. Section 6 contains our most general result, characterizing the additional distortions arising from political economy and commitment problems and how these disappear asymptotically when politicians are as patient as (or more patient than) the citizens. Section 7 provides a tighter characterization and additional results in two special cases (private histories and constant types). Section 8 provides a numerical example for a general best sustainable mechanism and illustrates how distortions created by political economy can disappear quite quickly when politicians and citizens have the same discount factor. Section 9 generalizes our results to an environment in which the government (politician) is partly benevolent, deriving utility from the expected utility of the average individual in the society. This model enables us to relate our findings more clearly to Roberts (1984) as well as to the literature on the ratchet effect (e.g., Freixas, Guesnerie and Tirole, 1985, and Bisin and Rampini, 2005). Section 10 concludes, while the Appendices contain additional technical materials and proofs omitted from the text.

2 Model

We consider a general dynamic Mirrlees optimal taxation setup in an infinite horizon economy. There is a continuum of individuals and we denote the set of individuals, which has measure 1, by I . The instantaneous utility function of individual $i \in I$ at time t is given by

$$u(c_t^i, l_t^i | \theta_t^i) \tag{1}$$

where $c_t^i \geq 0$ is the consumption of this individual, $l_t^i \in [0, \bar{l}]$ is labor supply, and θ_t^i is the individual’s “type”. This formulation is general enough to nest both preference shocks and productivity shocks.⁷

Let $\Theta = \{\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_N\}$ be a finite ordered set of real numbers denoting potential types, with the convention that θ_i corresponds to “higher skills” than θ_{i-1} , and in particular, θ_0 is the worst type. Let Θ^T be the T -fold product of Θ , representing the set of sequences of

⁷For example, productivity shocks would correspond to the case where $u(c_t^i, l_t^i | \theta_t^i) = u(c_t^i, l_t^i / \theta_t^i)$.

length $T = 1, 2, \dots, \infty$, with each element belonging to Θ . We think of each agent's lifetime type sequence θ^∞ as drawn from Θ^∞ according to some measure μ^∞ . Let $\theta^{i,\infty}$ be the draw of individual i from Θ^∞ . The t -th element of $\theta^{i,\infty}$, θ_t^i , is the skill level of this individual at time t . We use the standard notation $\theta^{i,t}$ to denote the history of this individual's skills up to and including time t , and make the standard measurability assumption that the individual only knows $\theta^{i,t}$ at time t . No other agent in the economy will directly observe this history. We assume that each individual's lifetime type sequence is drawn identically and independently from Θ^∞ according to the same measure μ^∞ , so that there is no aggregate uncertainty in the type distribution.⁸ We denote the distribution of the vector θ^t across agents by G^t .

All individuals have same discount factor $\beta \in (0, 1)$, thus at time t , they maximize

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \beta^s u(c_{t+s}^i, l_{t+s}^i \mid \theta_{t+s}^i) \mid \theta^{i,t} \right]$$

where $\mathbb{E}[\cdot \mid \theta^{i,t}]$ denotes the expectations conditional on having observed the history $\theta^{i,t}$. We impose the following standard assumption on the utility function.

Assumption 1 (utility function) For all $\theta \in \Theta$, $u(c, l \mid \theta) : \mathbb{R}_+ \times [0, \bar{l}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is twice continuously differentiable and jointly concave in c and l , and is non-decreasing in c and non-increasing in l .

The production side of the economy is described by the aggregate production function

$$Y = F(K, L),$$

where K is capital and L is labor, and the economy starts with a positive endowment of capital stock, $K_0 > 0$ at $t = 0$. In addition, we assume:

Assumption 2 (production structure) F is strictly increasing and continuously differentiable in K and L with partial derivatives denoted by F_K and F_L , exhibits constant returns to scale, and satisfies $\lim_{L \rightarrow 0} F_L(K, L) = \infty$ for all $K > 0$ and $\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} F_K(K, L) < 1$ for all $L \in [0, \bar{l}]$. Moreover, capital fully depreciates after use, and $F(K, 0) = 0$.

Both the full depreciation assumption and the assumption that labor is essential for production are adopted to simplify the notation. The condition that $\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} F_K(K, L) < 1$ together with $L \in [0, \bar{l}]$ implies that there is a maximum steady-state level of output that is uniquely defined by $\bar{Y} = F(\bar{Y}, \bar{l}) \in (0, \infty)$, where recall that \bar{l} is the maximum amount of labor supply per capita (and thus the maximum total labor supply). The condition that $\lim_{L \rightarrow 0} F_L(K, L) = \infty$ implies that in the absence of distortions there will be positive production.

⁸This structure imposes no restriction on the time-series properties of individual skills. Both identical independent draws and arbitrary temporal dependence are allowed.

3 Political Economy

3.1 Basics

The allocation of resources in this economy is entrusted to a politician, who is in charge of operations of the government. This politician has the power to tax and redistribute resources across agents, and can also allocate some of the tax revenue to himself as rents (government consumption). We interpret the government (and thus the politician) as being necessary for the operation of the tax-redistribution mechanisms (as well as other functions, such as implementation of law and order and provision of public goods). The key dilemma facing the society is how to control the government, once the powers to tax and redistribute resources have been vested with it.

We adopt the simplest and most conventional approach to this problem, and incorporate the classic electoral accountability setup of Barro (1973) and Ferejohn (1986) into our environment. In particular, there is a large number of potential (and identical) politicians. We denote the set of politicians by \mathcal{I} . The utility of a politician at time t is given by

$$\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \delta^s v(x_{t+s}),$$

where x denotes the politician's consumption (rents), $v : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the politician's instantaneous utility function. Notice also that the politician's discount factor, δ , is potentially different from that of the citizens, β . To simplify the analysis, we assume that potential politicians are distinct from the citizens and never engage in production, and that once they are replaced they do not have access to capital markets.⁹

Assumption 3 (*politician utility*) v is twice continuously differentiable, concave, and satisfies $v'(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $v(0) = 0$. Moreover $\delta \in (0, 1)$.

Since the politician in power both lacks commitment power and has the ability to expropriate output for its own consumption, we model the interaction between the citizens and the politicians as a dynamic game following the literature on sustainable plans (Chari and Kehoe, 1990, 1993). Our purpose throughout is to characterize the equilibrium of this game between the politicians and the citizens, corresponding to the *best sustainable mechanism*—meaning the sustainable mechanism that maximizes the ex ante utility of citizens.¹⁰

⁹All of the results in this paper hold if a politician has access to capital markets after deviation, and only the right hand side of the sustainability constraints need to be modified.

¹⁰Since we are dealing with a dynamic game, our focus on the best sustainable mechanism is essentially a selection among the many equilibria. Alternatively, one can think of the “social plan” as being designed by the citizens to maximize their utility subject to the constraints placed by the self-interested behavior of the government. In addition, throughout the paper we focus on perfect Bayesian equilibria (see Definition 1).

The rest of this section formally defines the structure of the game. We first describe the feasible actions by citizens and the politicians, and the timing of events. We then provide a formal definition of mechanisms.

3.2 Timing and Actions in Period t

We define a *submechanism* (or mechanism at time t) as a subcomponent of the overall mechanism between the politician and the individuals. A submechanism specifies what happens at a given date. In particular, let Z_t be a general message space for time t , with a generic element z_t . This message space may include messages about current type of the individual, $\hat{\theta}_t^i \in \Theta$, and past types $\hat{\theta}^{i,t-1} \in \Theta^{t-1}$ (even though the individual may have made some different reports about his or her types in the past), and might also include other messages. Let $Z^t \equiv \prod_{s=0}^t Z_s$, z^t denote a generic element of Z^t and by Z the space of all such lifetime reports.

A submechanism consists of two mappings, i.e., $M_t \equiv (\tilde{c}_t, \tilde{l}_t)$ such that $\tilde{c}_t : Z^t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ assigns consumption levels for each complete history of messages and public histories, and $\tilde{l}_t : Z^t \rightarrow [0, \bar{l}]$ assigns corresponding labor supply levels.¹¹ However, as the timing of events below will make it clear, we also assume that there is *freedom of labor supply*, in the sense that each individual can always disobey the labor supply allocation implied by \tilde{l}_t and choose $l_t^i = 0$.¹² Instead of introducing an additional action designating this choice, we introduce a message z^\emptyset such that if $z^t = (z^{t-1}, z^\emptyset)$ for any $z^{t-1} \in Z^{t-1}$, then \tilde{l}_t specifies $l_t^i = 0$ for the individual in question. This is clearly without loss of any generality, since if such a message did not exist, the individual could always disobey \tilde{l}_t and choose $l_t^i = 0$ himself. We denote the set of feasible submechanisms, which allow for message z^\emptyset specified above and satisfy the relevant resource constraints (specified below), by \mathcal{M}_t .

The typical assumption in models with no commitment is that the mechanism designer can commit to a submechanism at a given date, but cannot commit to what mechanisms will be

¹¹The mechanisms we describe here allow for general message spaces, but impose two restrictions. First, they are non-stochastic. This is only to simplify notation in the text. In the Appendix, we consider potentially stochastic mechanisms to convexify the constraint set. Second, a more general mechanism would be a mapping from the message histories of all agents, not just the individual's history. Since there is a continuum of agents that do not share any information, this latter restriction is without loss of generality here (except that off the equilibrium path, some submechanisms would violate the resource constraint, though this is not important for our equilibrium analysis). Notice also that while the submechanism restricts each individual's allocations to be a function of only his own history of reports, as it will become clear below, the government's strategies allow submechanisms to be functions of the reports of *all* agents in the past.

Finally, we could define a submechanism as a mapping $M_t [K_t]$ conditional on the capital stock of the economy at that date to emphasize that what can be achieved will be a function of the capital stock. We suppress this dependence to simplify notation.

¹²In Acemoglu, Golosov and Tsyvinski (2006), we derive the "freedom of labor supply" endogenously using an environment in which individuals could be disabled and unable to supply any labor. Directly introducing the freedom of labor supply is without loss of generality for our main focus and simplifies the analysis.

offered in the future. A natural assumption in the political economy context is that there is an additional type of deviation for the politician in power whereby she can use her power to extract resources from the society even within the same period.

We next summarize the game between the politician in power and the citizens. At each time t , the economy starts with a politician $\iota_t \in \mathcal{I}$ in power and a stock of capital inherited from the previous period, K_t . Then:

1. At the beginning of period t , the politician offers a submechanism $\tilde{M}_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$.
2. Individuals send a message $z_t^i \in Z_t$. The message z_t^i together with the history of messages $z^{i,t-1} \in Z^{t-1}$ determine labor supplies $\tilde{l}_t(z^{i,t})$ according to the submechanism \tilde{M}_t , where $i \in [0, 1]$ indexes individuals and $z^{i,t} \in Z^t$ denotes the history of reports by individual i . At this point, individual i can also choose to supply zero labor and receive zero consumption.
3. Production takes place according to the labor supplies of the individuals, with $Y_t = F(K_t, L_t)$, where K_t is the capital stock inherited from the previous period, and $L_t = \int_{i \in I} \tilde{l}_t(z^{i,t}) di$.
4. The politician decides whether to deviate from the submechanism \tilde{M}_t , denoted by $\xi_t \in \{0, 1\}$. If $\xi_t = 0$, production is distributed among agents according to the pre-specified submechanism $\tilde{M}_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$, the politician chooses $\tilde{x}_t \leq F(K_t, L_t)$, and next period's capital stock is determined as $\tilde{K}_{t+1} = F(K_t, L_t) - \tilde{x}_t - \int_{i \in I} \tilde{c}_t(z^{i,t}) di$. If $\xi_t = 1$, the politician chooses $\tilde{x}'_t \leq F(K_t, L_t)$, and a new consumption function $\tilde{c}'_t : Z^t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, and next period's capital stock is: $\tilde{K}'_{t+1} = F(K_t, L_t) - \tilde{x}'_t - \int_{i \in I} \tilde{c}'_t(z^{i,t}) di$.¹³
5. Elections are held and citizens jointly decide whether to keep the politician or replace him with a new one, denoted by $\rho_t \in \{0, 1\}$, where $\rho_t = 1$ denotes replacement. Denote by $\mathcal{R}^t \in \{0, 1\}^t$ the set of all possible histories of electoral decisions at time t and by \mathcal{R} the set of all possible electoral decisions. Replacement of politicians is without any costs.

Note the difference between the standard models with no commitment and our setup, where, in stage 4, the politician can decide to expropriate the output produced in the economy, and citizens can replace the politician at the last stage. Notice that at stage 4 labor supply decisions have already been made according to the pre-specified submechanism \tilde{M}_t . However,

¹³More generally, we can allow the government to capture a fraction $\eta \leq 1$ of the total output of the economy when $\xi = 1$, where the level of η could be related to the institutional controls on government or politician behavior. In this case, the constraint on the government following a deviation would be $\tilde{K}'_{t+1}(h^t) = \eta F(K_t, L_t) - \tilde{x}'_t - \int_{i \in I} \tilde{c}'_t(z^{i,t}) di$, with the remaining $1 - \eta$ fraction of the output getting destroyed. This generalization has no effect on our results, and we set $\eta = 1$ to simplify notation.

consumption allocations cannot be made according to \tilde{M}_t , since the politician is expropriating some of the output for herself. Consequently, we also let the politician in power choose a new consumption allocation function, $\tilde{c}'_t : Z^t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ at this point.

The important feature of stage 5 is that even though individuals make their economic decisions independently, they make their political decisions—elections to replace the politician—jointly. This is natural since there is no conflict of interest among the citizens over the replacement decision. Joint political decisions can be achieved by a variety of procedures, including various voting schemes (see, for example, Persson and Tabellini, 2000, Chapter 4). Here we simplify the discussion by assuming that the decision $\rho_t \in \{0, 1\}$ is taken by a randomly chosen citizen.¹⁴

3.3 Histories and Reporting Strategies

Let $M = \{M_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ with $M_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$ be a mechanism (i.e., a sequence of submechanisms defined above), with the set of mechanisms denoted by \mathcal{M} . Let $x = \{x_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ be the sequence of politician's consumption levels (rents). We define a *social plan* as (M, x) , which is an implicitly-agreed sequence of submechanisms and consumption levels for the politician.

We represent the action of the politician at time t by $v_t = (\tilde{M}_t, \xi_t, \tilde{x}_t, \tilde{x}'_t, \tilde{c}'_t)$. The first element of v_t is the submechanism that the politician offers at stage 1 of time t , and the second is the politician's expropriation decision. The third element of v_t is what the politician consumes herself if $\xi_t = 0$. Since \tilde{M}_t specifies both total production and total consumption by the citizens, given \tilde{x}_t the capital stock for next period, \tilde{K}_{t+1} , is determined as a residual from the resource constraint and is not specified as part of the action profile of the politicians.¹⁵ The fourth element, \tilde{x}'_t , is the consumption level for the politician in power when $\xi_t = 1$. Finally, the fifth element is the function \tilde{c}'_t that the politician chooses after deviating from the original submechanism, with \mathcal{C}_t denoting the set of all such functions. Once again the capital stock for the following period, \tilde{K}'_{t+1} , is determined as a residual from the resource constraint. Government (politician) consumption levels must satisfy: $\tilde{x}_t \leq F(K_t, L_t)$ and $\tilde{x}'_t \leq F(K_t, L_t)$, but to simplify notation we write $\tilde{x}_t, \tilde{x}'_t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Let Υ_t be the set of v_t 's and $v^t \in \Upsilon^t$ denote the history of v_t 's up to and including time t , and assume that this is publicly observable.¹⁶

Let $\tilde{h}^t \equiv (K_0, \iota_0, v_0, \rho_0, K_1, \dots, K_t, \iota_t, v_t, \rho_t, K_{t+1})$ denote the public history of the game up

¹⁴Exactly the same equilibrium is obtained if there are majoritarian elections over the replacement decision and each individual votes sincerely or uses strategies that are not weakly dominated in the election.

¹⁵Since we are characterizing a (sustainable) mechanism, there is no need to specify the ownership of the capital stock \tilde{K}_{t+1} . Instead, this is simply the amount of resources used in production in the following period, and the government (the mechanism) decides how this production will be distributed.

¹⁶In fact, v^t includes the action \tilde{x}'_t and the function \tilde{c}'_t , which are not observed when $\xi_t = 0$. Thus, more appropriately, only a subset of v^t should be observed publicly. This slight abuse of notation is without any consequence for the analysis.

to date t , and \tilde{H}^t be the set of all such histories. The electoral decision at time t , ρ_t , is defined as

$$\rho_t : \tilde{H}^{t-1} \times v_t \rightarrow \{0, 1\},$$

given the public history at time $t - 1$ and actions of politicians at time t , the society chooses whether to replace a politician.

For the citizens, define $\alpha_t^i(\theta^t | z^{t-1}, \tilde{h}^{t-1})$ as the reporting action of an individual i at time t when her type history is θ^t , her history of messages so far is z^{t-1} and the publicly observed history up to time $t - 1$ are \tilde{h}^{t-1} . The action α_t^i specifies a message $z_t \in Z_t$, so:

$$\alpha_t^i : Z^{t-1} \times \tilde{H}^{t-1} \times \Theta^t \rightarrow Z_t.$$

We write $z^t(\alpha_t(\theta^t))$ to denote the message resulting from strategy α_t for an agent of type θ^t . A strategy is *truth telling* if it satisfies

$$\alpha^*(\theta^t | z^{t-1}, \tilde{h}^{t-1}) = z_t[\theta^t] \text{ for all } \theta^t \in \Theta^t, z^{t-1} \in Z^{t-1}, \text{ and } \tilde{h}^{t-1} \in \tilde{H}^{t-1}, \quad (2)$$

where the notation $z_t[\theta^t]$ means that the individual is sending a message that fully reveals her true type. To economize on notation, we represent the truth-telling strategy by $\alpha_t^i(\theta_t | z^{t-1}[\theta^{t-1}], \tilde{h}^{t-1}) = \alpha^*$. Notice that this strategy only imposes truth-telling following truthful reports in the past (because instead of an arbitrary history of messages z^{t-1} , we have conditioned on $z^{t-1}[\theta^{t-1}]$). In addition, let us define the null strategy

$$\alpha^\emptyset(\theta_t | z^{t-1}, \tilde{h}^{t-1}) = z^\emptyset \text{ for all } \theta^t \in \Theta^t, z^{t-1} \in Z^{t-1}, \tilde{h}^{t-1} \in \tilde{H}^{t-1},$$

where recall that z^\emptyset stands for the message corresponding to zero labor supply. We will use the notation $\alpha_t^i(\theta_t | z^{t-1}, \tilde{h}^{t-1}) = \alpha^\emptyset$ to denote that the individual is playing the null strategy.

Let $\underline{z}_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t$ be a profile of reports at time t .¹⁷ As usual, we define

$$\mathcal{Z}^t = \prod_{s=0}^t \mathcal{Z}_s.$$

We denote the *reporting strategy profile* of all the individuals in society by $\underline{\alpha}^{18}$, with \mathbf{A} corresponding to the set of all such reporting strategy profiles. We denote the *strategy profile* of all the individuals in society by $\{\underline{\alpha}, \rho\}$.

¹⁷More formally, \underline{z}_t assigns a report to each individual, thus it is a function of the form $\underline{z} : [0, 1] \rightarrow Z_t$, where $i \in [0, 1]$ denotes individual i , and \mathcal{Z}_t is the set of all such functions.

¹⁸More formally, $\underline{\alpha}_t$ assigns a report to each individual, thus it is a function of the form $\underline{\alpha} : [0, 1] \rightarrow Z$, where $i \in [0, 1]$ denotes individual i .

3.4 Definition of Equilibrium

The strategy of the politician in power at time t is therefore

$$\Gamma_t : \tilde{H}^{t-1} \times \mathcal{Z}^{t-1} \rightarrow \Upsilon,$$

that is, it determines $\tilde{M}_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$, $\xi_t \in \{0, 1\}$, $\tilde{x}_t \in [0, F(K_t, L_t)]$, $\tilde{x}'_t \in [0, F(K_t, L_t)]$ and $\tilde{c}'_t \in \mathcal{C}_t$ as a function of the public history and the entire history of reports by citizens. We denote the strategy profile of the politician's by Γ and the set of these strategies by \mathcal{G} .

Definition 1 A *(Perfect Bayesian) equilibrium* in the game between the politicians and the citizens is given by strategy profiles $\hat{\Gamma}$ and $\{\underline{\alpha}, \rho\}$ and a belief system \mathcal{B} , such that $\hat{\Gamma}$ and $\{\underline{\alpha}, \rho\}$ are **sequentially rational**, i.e., best responses to each other in all information sets, given \mathcal{B} , and whenever possible, the belief system \mathcal{B} is derived from Bayesian updating given the strategy profiles $\hat{\Gamma}$ and $\{\underline{\alpha}, \rho\}$. We write the requirement that these strategy profiles are best responses to each other as $\hat{\Gamma} \succeq_{\{\underline{\alpha}, \rho\}} \Gamma$ for all $\Gamma \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\{\underline{\alpha}, \rho\} \succeq_{\hat{\Gamma}} \{\underline{\alpha}', \rho'\}$ for all $\underline{\alpha}' \in \mathbf{A}$ and $\rho' \in \mathcal{R}$.

In what follows, there will be no need to explicitly characterize or condition on the belief system \mathcal{B} (though this is always in the background). Let us define $\Gamma_{M,x} = \left[\left\{ \tilde{M}_t, \xi_t, \tilde{x}_t, \tilde{x}'_t, \tilde{c}'_t \right\}_{t=0}^{\infty} \right]$ as the action profile of the politician induced by strategy Γ given a social plan (M, x) .

Definition 2 M is a **sustainable mechanism** if there exists $x = \{x_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$, a strategy profile $\{\underline{\alpha}, \rho\}$ for the citizens and a strategy profile $\Gamma_{M,x} \in \mathcal{G}$ for the government, which constitute an equilibrium and induce an action profile $\left[\left\{ \tilde{M}_t, \xi_t, \tilde{x}_t, \tilde{x}'_t, \tilde{c}'_t \right\}_{t=0}^{\infty} \right]$ for the politicians such that $\tilde{M}_t = M_t$, $\xi_t = 0$, and $\tilde{x}_t = x_t$ for all $h^t \in H^t$. In this case, we say that equilibrium strategy profiles $\Gamma_{M,x}$ and $\{\underline{\alpha}, \rho\}$ **support** the sustainable mechanism M .

In essence, this implies that the politician in power does not wish to deviate from the social plan (M, x) given the strategy profile, $\{\underline{\alpha}, \rho\}$, of the citizens. The notation $\hat{\Gamma} \succeq_{\{\underline{\alpha}, \rho\}} \Gamma$ makes this explicit, stating that given the strategy profile, $\{\underline{\alpha}, \rho\}$, of the citizens, the politician weakly prefers this strategy profile to any other strategy profile based on the same implicit agreement.

4 Truthful Revelation Along the Equilibrium Path

The revelation principle is a powerful tool for the analysis of mechanism design and implementation problems (see, e.g., MasCollé, Winston and Green, 1995). Since, in our environment, the politician in power, who operates the mechanism, cannot commit and has different interests than those of the agents, the simplest version of the revelation principle may not hold; as

Roberts's (1984) paper discussed in the Introduction demonstrates,¹⁹ there may exist situations in which no equilibrium would involve individuals reporting their true type.²⁰

The key result of this section will be that along the equilibrium path, a version of the revelation principle will hold (without introducing a fictional mechanism designer and for all positive discount factors). The main difference between our approach and the literature on dynamic mechanism design without commitment (e.g., with the ratchet effect) is that the possibility that the agents can punish the deviating politician (mechanism designer) by replacing him. Such punishments are natural in the context of political economy models, though they are typically not present in other mechanism design problems without commitment. Another important difference is that, as it will become clear below, the punishments that can be imposed on deviating politicians will be independent of the history of mechanisms to date. These differences are responsible for truthful revelation along the equilibrium path in our model.

4.1 Truthful Revelation

We focus on (Perfect Bayesian) equilibria that maximize utility of the citizens, which we refer to as the *best sustainable mechanism*. As we will see below, as long as the set of sustainable mechanisms (i.e., the constraint set, (4)-(6)) is nonempty, this is equivalent to choosing the best sustainable mechanism, given by the following program:

$$\mathbf{MAX}_0: \max_{\{\tilde{c}_t(\cdot), \tilde{l}_t(\cdot), \tilde{x}_t, K_{t+1}\}_{t=0}^{\infty}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u \left(\tilde{c}_t(z^t[\alpha_t(\theta^t)]), \tilde{l}_t(z^t[\alpha_t(\theta^t)]) \mid \theta_t^i \right) \right] \quad (3)$$

subject to an initial capital stock K_0 , the resource constraint,

$$K_{t+1} = F \left(K_t, \int \tilde{l}_t(z^t[\alpha_t(\theta^t)]) dG^t(\theta^t) \right) - \int \tilde{c}_t(z^t[\alpha_t(\theta^t)]) dG^t(\theta^t) - \tilde{x}_t, \quad (4)$$

a set of incentive compatibility constraints and electoral decisions for individuals,

$$\{\underline{\alpha}, \rho\} \text{ is a best response to } \Gamma_{M, \tilde{x}}, \quad (5)$$

and the *sustainability constraint* of the politician in power:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \delta^s v(\tilde{x}_{t+s}) \right] \geq \max_{\tilde{x}'_t, \tilde{K}'_{t+1}, \tilde{c}'_t} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ v(\tilde{x}'_t) + \delta v_t^c \left(\tilde{K}'_{t+1}, \tilde{c}'_t \mid \tilde{M}^t \right) \right\} \right], \quad (6)$$

¹⁹See also Bester and Strausz (2001) and Skreta (2006, 2007) for the more general use of the revelation principle.

²⁰As noted in the Introduction, this statement refers to the case in which messages are sent to the politician in charge of the mechanism. It is possible to construct alternative environments with fictional mechanism designers with full commitment power, so that the revelation principle holds.

for all $t \geq 0$.

The last constraint, (6), encompasses all the possible deviations by the politician at date t : the left-hand side is what the politician will receive from date t onwards by sticking with the implicitly-agreed consumption schedule for herself. The right-hand side is the maximum she can receive by deviating. The potential deviations include a deviation at the last stage of the subgame at time t to expropriation, $\xi_t = 1$, together with a new consumption schedule for individuals, \tilde{c}'_t ; or $\xi_t = 0$ and a choice of \tilde{x}_t different from x_t ; or the offer of a new submechanism at time $t + 1$ (encapsulated into the continuation value v_t^c). In the case where $\xi_t = 1$, the politician chooses \tilde{x}'_t , \tilde{K}'_{t+1} and \tilde{c}'_t to maximize her deviation value, which is given by current utility, $v(\tilde{x}_t)$, and continuation value, written as $v_t^c(\tilde{K}'_{t+1}, \tilde{c}'_t | \tilde{M}^t)$, to emphasize that this continuation value depends on the entire history of submechanisms (thus on the information about individual types that has been revealed so far) up to time t , \tilde{M}^t , and on the capital stock from then on, \tilde{K}'_{t+1} , as well as potentially on \tilde{c}'_t . If this constraint, (6), were not satisfied, it is either because the politician prefers $\xi_t = 0$ and some sequence of submechanisms or consumption levels different from (M, x) , or because the politician prefers $\xi_t = 1$. In the former case, we can always change (M, x) to ensure that (6) is satisfied. The latter, i.e., $\xi_t = 1$, cannot be part of the best equilibrium allocation from the viewpoint of the citizens, since it involves government expropriation. Consequently, as long as the constraint set given by (4)-(6) is nonempty, the best allocation must satisfy (6) and is thus a solution to the program of maximizing (3) subject to (4)-(6). Finally, this constraint set is indeed nonempty, since the trivial allocation with zero production and zero consumption for all parties is in the set.

Let us also introduce the notation $\underline{\alpha} = (\alpha | \alpha')$ to denote a strategy profile where all individuals play α along the equilibrium path and α' off the equilibrium path. We then have:

Lemma 1 *Suppose Assumptions 1-3 hold. In any sustainable mechanism,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \delta^s v(x_{t+s}) \right] \geq v \left(F \left(K_t(\tilde{h}^{t-1}), L_t(\tilde{h}^t) \right) \right) \text{ for all } t, \quad (7)$$

is necessary. The allocation of resources in the best sustainable mechanism involves no replacement of the initial politician along the equilibrium path, is identical to the solution of the maximization problem in (\mathbf{MAX}_0) with $v_t^c(\tilde{K}'_{t+1}, \tilde{c}'_t | \tilde{M}^t) = 0$ for all $\tilde{M}^t \in \mathcal{M}^t$, $\tilde{K}'_{t+1} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\tilde{c}'_t \in \mathcal{C}_t$, and the sustainability constraint (6) is equivalent to (7).

Proof. Let $\{\tilde{M}, \tilde{x}_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ be a solution to (\mathbf{MAX}_0) . Introduce the following notation: $h^t = \hat{h}^t$ if $\{M_s, x_s\} = \{\tilde{M}_s, \tilde{x}_s\}$ for all $s \leq t$. Consider the strategy profile ρ^\varnothing for the citizens such that $\rho^\varnothing(\tilde{h}^t) = 0$ if $h^t = \hat{h}^t$ and $\rho^\varnothing(h^t) = 1$ if $h^t \neq \hat{h}^t$. That is, citizens replace the politician unless

the politician has always chosen a strategy inducing the allocation $\{\tilde{M}_t, \tilde{x}_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ in all previous periods. It is a best response for the politician to choose $\{\tilde{M}_t, \tilde{x}_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ after history \tilde{h}^t only if

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \delta^s v(\tilde{x}_{t+s}) \right] \geq \max_{\tilde{x}'_t, \tilde{K}'_{t+1}, \tilde{c}'_t} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ v(\tilde{x}'_t) + \delta v_t^c \left(\tilde{K}'_{t+1}, \tilde{c}'_t \mid \tilde{M}^t \right) \right\} \right]$$

where $v_t^c(\tilde{c}'_t, \tilde{K}'_{t+1})$ is the politician's continuation value following a deviation to a feasible $(\tilde{x}'_t, \tilde{c}'_t, \tilde{K}'_{t+1})$.

If (7) is violated following some public history h^t , the best deviation for the politician is $\xi_t = 1$ and $\tilde{x}'_t = F(\tilde{K}_t, \tilde{L}_t)$. This deviation payoff is greater than its equilibrium payoff following h^t , given by the left-hand side of (7). This contradicts sustainability and establishes that (7) is necessary in any sustainable mechanism.

To see that (7) is sufficient for the best sustainable mechanism, note that reducing $v_t^c(\tilde{K}'_{t+1}, \tilde{c}'_t \mid \tilde{M}^t)$ is equivalent to relaxing the constraint on problem (3), so is always preferred. Since from Assumption 3, $v_t^c \geq 0$ (i.e., $x \geq 0$ and $v(0) = 0$), we only need to show that $v_t^c(\tilde{K}'_{t+1}, \tilde{c}'_t \mid \tilde{M}^t) = 0$ is achievable for all $\tilde{M}^t \in \mathcal{M}^t$, $\Gamma' \in \mathcal{G}$, $\tilde{K}'_{t+1} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\tilde{c}'_t \in \mathcal{C}_t$. Under the candidate equilibrium strategy ρ^\emptyset , which involves replacing the politician when she deviates, the continuation value of the politician is clearly $v^c = 0$ regardless of the history of play up to this date. This establishes the sufficiency of (7).

Next suppose $\{\tilde{M}_t, \tilde{x}_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ that is a solution to **(MAX₀)** can be supported as a perfect Bayesian equilibrium with replacement of the initial politician. Now consider an alternative allocation $\{\tilde{M}'_t, \tilde{x}'_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ such that the initial politician is kept in power along the equilibrium path and receives exactly the same consumption sequence as the new politicians would have received after replacement. Since $\{\tilde{M}_t, \tilde{x}_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ satisfies (7) for the new politicians at all t , $\{\tilde{M}'_t, \tilde{x}'_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ satisfies (7) for all t for the initial politician. Moreover, since $\{\tilde{M}_t, \tilde{x}_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ must involve at least some positive consumption for the new politicians, $\{\tilde{M}'_t, \tilde{x}'_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ yields a higher $t = 0$ utility to the initial politician. Thus, x_0 can be reduced and consumption of agents at $t = 0$ can be increased without violating (7), so $\{\tilde{M}'_t, \tilde{x}'_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ cannot be a solution to **(MAX₀)**. This proves that there is no replacement of the initial politician along the equilibrium path.

To complete the proof, we only need to show that citizens' strategy (in particular, the replacement strategy ρ^\emptyset) is sequentially rational. This follows by considering the following continuation strategy for each politician: if $h^t \neq \hat{h}^t$, then $x_s = F(K_s, L_s)$ and $\xi_s = 1$, $\forall s \geq t$. This ensures that ρ^\emptyset and $\underline{\alpha} = \alpha^\emptyset$ are a best response for the citizens. ■

This lemma uses the fact that regardless of the history of submechanisms and the amount of capital stock left for future production, there is an equilibrium continuation play that replacing a politician gives the deviator zero utility from that point onwards (which is analogous to the results in repeated games where the most severe punishments against deviations are optimal,

e.g., Abreu, 1988). This continuation play is used as the threat against politician's deviation from the implicitly-agreed social plan. The implication is that, along the best sustainable mechanism, the best deviation for the politician involves $\xi_t = 1$ and expropriating the whole output, $\tilde{x}_t' = F(K_t, L_t)$. This enables us to simplify the sustainability constraints of the politician to (7), which also has the virtue of not depending on the history of submechanisms up to that point.²¹ Moreover, the lemma also shows that in any sustainable mechanism (7) is necessary.

Next, we define a *direct (sub)mechanism* as $M_t^* : \Theta^t \rightarrow [0, \bar{l}] \times \mathbb{R}_+$. In other words, direct mechanisms involve a restricted message space, $Z_t = \Theta_t$, where individuals only report their current type. We denote a strategy profile by the politician's inducing direct submechanisms along the equilibrium path by Γ^* .

Definition 3 *A strategy profile for the citizens, $\underline{\alpha}^*$, is **truthful** if, along the equilibrium path, we have that $\alpha_t^i(\theta^t | \theta^{t-1}, \tilde{h}^{t-1}) = \alpha^*$. We write $\underline{\alpha}^* = (\alpha^* | \alpha')$ to denote a truthful strategy profile.*

The notation $\underline{\alpha}^* = (\alpha^* | \alpha')$ emphasizes that individuals play truth-telling along the equilibrium path, but may play some different strategy profile, α' , off the equilibrium path. Clearly, a truthful strategy against a direct mechanism simply amounts to reporting the true type of the agent. Let us next define $\underline{c}[\Gamma, \underline{\alpha}]$, $\underline{l}[\Gamma, \underline{\alpha}]$ and $x[\Gamma, \underline{\alpha}]$ as, respectively, the equilibrium consumption and labor supply distributions across individuals (as a function of the history of their reports), and the sequence of government consumption levels resulting from the strategy profiles of the politicians and citizens, such that all of these functions only condition on information available up to time t for allocations of time t .

Theorem 1 (Truthful Revelation Along the Equilibrium Path) *Suppose Assumptions 1-3 hold and that Γ and $\{\underline{\alpha}, \rho\}$ form a combination of strategy profiles and electoral decisions that support a sustainable mechanism. Then, there exists another pair of equilibrium strategy profiles Γ^* and $\underline{\alpha}^* = (\alpha^* | \alpha')$ for some α' such that Γ^* induces direct submechanisms and $\underline{\alpha}^*$ induces truth telling along the equilibrium path, and moreover $\underline{c}[\Gamma, \underline{\alpha}] = \underline{c}[\Gamma^*, \underline{\alpha}^*]$, $\underline{l}[\Gamma, \underline{\alpha}] = \underline{l}[\Gamma^*, \underline{\alpha}^*]$, and $x[\Gamma, \underline{\alpha}] = x[\Gamma^*, \underline{\alpha}^*]$.*

Proof. Take equilibrium strategy profiles Γ and $\underline{\alpha}$ that support a sustainable mechanism. Then by definition $\xi_t = 0$ for all t , and from Lemma 1, (7) is satisfied. Let the best response

²¹This statement refers to the sustainability constraint, (7). The optimal mechanism will clearly make allocations depend on the history of individual messages.

of type θ^t at time t according to $\underline{\alpha}$ be to announce $z_{t,\Gamma}(\theta^t, \tilde{h}^{t-1})$ given a history of reports $z_{\Gamma}^{t-1}(\theta^{t-1}, \tilde{h}^{t-2})$ and public history \tilde{h}^{t-1} . Let $z_{\Gamma}^t(\theta^t, \tilde{h}^{t-1}) = (z_{\Gamma}^{t-1}(\theta^{t-1}, \tilde{h}^{t-2}), z_{t,\Gamma}(\theta^t, \tilde{h}^{t-1}))$.

Denote the expected utility of this individual under this mechanism given history \tilde{h}^{t-1} be $\tilde{u} [z_{\Gamma}^t(\theta^t, \tilde{h}^{t-1}) \mid \theta^t, \Gamma, \tilde{h}^{t-1}]$. By definition of $z_{\Gamma}^t(\theta^t, \tilde{h}^{t-1})$ being a best response, we have

$$\tilde{u} [z_{\Gamma}^t(\theta^t, \tilde{h}^{t-1}) \mid \theta^t, \Gamma, \tilde{h}^{t-1}] \geq \tilde{u} [\tilde{z}_{\Gamma}^t(\theta^t, \tilde{h}^{t-1}) \mid \theta^t, \Gamma, \tilde{h}^{t-1}] \text{ for all } \tilde{z}_{\Gamma}^t(\theta^t, \tilde{h}^{t-1}) \in Z^t \text{ and } \tilde{h}^{t-1} \in \tilde{H}^{t-1}.$$

Now consider the alternative strategy profile for the politician Γ^* , which induces the action profile $\left[\left\{ \tilde{M}_t, \xi_t, \tilde{x}_t, \tilde{x}'_t, \tilde{c}'_t \right\}_{t=0}^{\infty} \right]$ such that $\xi_t = 0$ for all t , $\tilde{M}_t = M_t^*$ (where M_t^* is a direct submechanism) and $\underline{c}[\Gamma^*, \underline{\alpha}^*, \underline{h}] = \underline{c}[\Gamma, \underline{\alpha}, \underline{h}]$, $\underline{l}[\Gamma^*, \underline{\alpha}^*, \underline{h}] = \underline{l}[\Gamma, \underline{\alpha}, \underline{h}]$, and $x[\Gamma, \underline{\alpha}, \underline{h}] = x[\Gamma^*, \underline{\alpha}^*, \underline{h}]$. Therefore, by construction,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u} [\theta^t, \tilde{h}^{t-1} \mid \theta^t, \Gamma^*, \tilde{h}^{t-1}] &= \tilde{u} [z_{\Gamma}^t(\theta^t, \tilde{h}^{t-1}) \mid \theta^t, \Gamma, \tilde{h}^{t-1}] \\ &\geq \tilde{u} [\tilde{z}_{\Gamma}^t(\theta^t, \tilde{h}^{t-1}) \mid \theta^t, \Gamma, \tilde{h}^{t-1}] = \tilde{u} [\hat{\theta}^t, h^{t-1} \mid \theta^t, \Gamma^*, \tilde{h}^{t-1}] \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

for all $\hat{\theta}^t \in \Theta^t$ and all $\tilde{h}^{t-1} \in \tilde{H}^{t-1}$. Equation (8) implies that $\underline{\alpha}^* = (\alpha^* \mid \alpha')$ is a best response along the equilibrium path for the agents against the mechanism M^* and politician strategy profile Γ^* . Moreover, by construction, the resulting allocation when individuals play $\underline{\alpha}^* = (\alpha^* \mid \alpha')$ against Γ^* is the same as when they play $\underline{\alpha}$ against Γ . Therefore, by the definition of Γ being sustainable, we have $\Gamma \succeq_{\{\underline{\alpha}, \rho\}} \Gamma'$ for all $\Gamma' \in \mathcal{G}$. Now choose α' to be identical to $\underline{\alpha}$ off-the-equilibrium path, which implies that $\Gamma^* \succeq_{\{\underline{\alpha}^*, \rho\}} \Gamma'$ for all $\Gamma' \in \mathcal{G}$ or that (7) is satisfied, thus establishing that $(\Gamma^*, \underline{\alpha}^*)$ is an equilibrium. ■

The most important implication of this theorem is that for the rest of the analysis, we can restrict attention to truth-telling (direct) mechanisms on the side of the agents.

The idea of the proof is as follows. On the equilibrium path, there is effective commitment by the ruler to obey the mechanism. Then, one can use the usual proof of the revelation principle and construct truthfull reports that give the same utility to the ruler on the equilibrium path. Off the equilibrium path, one can use the same punishment strategies as those used in the game without direct revelation. Therefore, the sustainability constraint is satisfied.

Two observations are worth making at this point. First, truthful revelation along the equilibrium path and the politician's decision to pursue the implicitly-agreed social plan are important to distinguish from truth telling and commitment that are present in the standard mechanism design problems. In these problems, there exists mechanisms that induce truth telling along all paths and there is unconditional commitment (i.e., again along all paths). In contrast, in our environment, there is no commitment *off the equilibrium path*, where the politician can exploit the information it has gathered or expropriate part of the output. Relatedly, off the equilibrium path, non-truthful reporting by the individuals is both present and

also important to ensure sustainability. However, along the equilibrium path induced by a sustainable mechanism, the politician prefers not to deviate from the implicitly-agreed social plan, and given this equilibrium behavior, individuals can report their types without the fear that this information or their labor supply will be misused. Second, the results in Theorem 1 are not related to “folk theorem” type results. In particular, Theorem 1 is not a limiting result and applies for all discount factors.

The reason why, despite the lack of commitment and the self-interested preferences of the mechanism designer (politician), a revelation principle type result holds is twofold. *First*, the setup where the politician has a deviation within the same period ensures that its continuation payoff after deviation is independent of the information revealed along the equilibrium path. If the continuation value of the politician depended on such information, ensuring truthful reporting would become more difficult. Note that deviation within the period, following production, is a very natural assumption in our setup, since the politician has the power to make transfers after production is realized, and thus there is no reason for him not to deviate and take a greater fraction of these resources for himself than specified in the mechanism if such a deviation is beneficial. *Second*, in our model individuals can use punishment strategies involving replacing the politician. The punishments strategies of citizens support a sustainable mechanism, making it the best response for the politician in power to pursue the implicitly-agreed social plan (M, x) . Given this sustainability, there is effective commitment on the side of the politician *along the equilibrium path*.

Finally, Theorem 1, like the rest of our analysis, focuses on Perfect Bayesian equilibria. One could also impose additional refinements, such as *renegotiation-proofness*. It can be shown that the main results in this paper (except those in Section 9) hold without any modification if we focus on renegotiation-proof equilibria. In other words, truthful revelation in Theorem 1 and the best sustainable mechanisms characterized in Theorems 2, 3, and 5 can be supported as renegotiation-proof equilibria. The argument is very similar to that developed in Acemoglu, Golosov and Tsyvinski (2007a) for an economy without incomplete information. The main idea is that citizens can punish a politician who deviates from the social plan by replacing him and following an equilibrium along the relevant Pareto frontier thereafter (thus there is no reason for punishments that are harmful for the citizens themselves). We do not provide the details here to economize on space.

4.2 The Best Sustainable Mechanism

Theorem 1 enables us to focus on direct mechanisms and truth-telling strategy α^* by all individuals. This implies that the best sustainable mechanism can be achieved by individuals simply

reporting their types. Recall that at every date, there is an invariant distribution of θ denoted by $G(\theta)$. This implies that θ^t has an invariant distribution, which is simply the t -fold version of $G(\theta)$, $G^t(\theta)$ (since there is a continuum of individuals, each history θ^t occurs infinitely often).²² Given this construction, we can write total labor supply as $L_t = \int_{\Theta^t} l_t(\theta^t) dG^t(\theta^t)$, and total consumption as $C_t = \int_{\Theta^t} c_t(\theta^t) dG^t(\theta^t)$.²³ Moreover, since Theorem 1 establishes that any sustainable mechanism is equivalent to a direct mechanism with truth-telling on the side of the agents, we obtain the main result of this section, which will be used throughout the rest of the paper:

Proposition 1 *Suppose Assumptions 1-3 hold. Then, the best sustainable mechanism is a solution to the following maximization program:*

$$\mathbf{MAX}_1 : \mathbf{U}^{SM} = \max_{\{c_t(\cdot), l_t(\cdot), K_{t+1}, x_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(c_t(\theta^{i,t}), l_t(\theta^{i,t}) \mid \theta_t^i) \right] \quad (9)$$

subject to some initial condition $K_0 > 0$, the resource constraint

$$K_{t+1} = F(K_t, L_t) - C_t - x_t, \quad (10)$$

a set of incentive compatibility constraints for individuals,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \beta^s u(c_{t+s}(\theta^{i,t+s}), l_{t+s}(\theta^{i,t+s}) \mid \theta_{t+s}^i) \mid \theta_t^i \right] \\ & \geq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \beta^s u(c_{t+s}(\hat{\theta}^{i,t+s}), l_{t+s}(\hat{\theta}^{i,t+s}) \mid \theta_{t+s}^i) \mid \theta_t^i \right] \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

for all t , all $\theta^{i,t} \in \Theta^t$ and all possible sequences of $\{\hat{\theta}_{t+s}^i\}_{s=0}^{\infty}$, and the sustainability constraint of the politician

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \delta^s v(x_{t+s}) \right] \geq v(F(K_t, L_t)), \quad (12)$$

for all t .

Proof. The proof follows from Lemma 1 and Theorem 1. Suppose there exists an equilibrium $(\underline{\alpha}^{**}, \Gamma^{**})$, that maximizes (9). By the argument in the text, $(\underline{\alpha}^{**}, \Gamma^{**})$ will not feature $\xi_t = 1$ for any t . Therefore, $(\underline{\alpha}^{**}, \Gamma^{**})$ features a sequence of submechanisms $\{\hat{M}_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$, consumption levels for the politician, $\{\hat{x}_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ and $\xi_t = 0$ for all t . Setting $(M, x) =$

²²More formally, given the continuum of agents, we can apply a law of large numbers type argument, and each history θ^t will have positive measure. See, for example, Uhlig (1996).

²³From now on, we suppress the \sim 's to simplify notation and simply use c_t , l_t and x_t . Note also that \int_{Θ^t} here denotes Lebesgue integrals, and in what follows, we will suppress the range of integration, Θ^t .

$(\{\hat{M}_t\}_{t=0}^\infty, \{\hat{x}_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$ implies that $(\underline{\alpha}^{**}, \Gamma^{**})$ support a sustainable mechanism. Then, use Theorem 1 to find $(\underline{\alpha}^*, \Gamma^*)$ corresponding to a sustainable direct mechanism. This direct mechanism has to satisfy the resource constraint, (10), the incentive compatibility constraints of individuals at all dates, which instead of (5) can be written as (11) since Γ^* induces direct mechanisms. Finally, from Lemma 1, the constraint (12) ensures that Γ^* is a best response to citizens' strategies, $\{\underline{\alpha}^*, \rho\}$. ■

The role of Theorem 1 in this formulation is that it enables us to write the program for the best sustainable mechanism as a direct mechanism with truth-telling reports along the equilibrium path, thus reducing the larger set of incentive compatibility constraints of individuals to (11).²⁴ Also as noted after Theorem 1, the result in Proposition 1 can be supported as a renegotiation-proof equilibrium (see Acemoglu, Golosov and Tsyvinski, 2007a).

5 Separation of Private and Public Incentives

We next show the second main result of the paper that our analysis of the dynamic Mirrlees economy with self-interested politicians is simplified by separating the provision of incentives to individuals from the provision of incentives to politicians.

Let us first define the *dynamic Mirrlees program* (with full-commitment, benevolent government, and exogenous government expenditures). Imagine the economy needs to finance an exogenous government expenditure $X_t \geq 0$ at time t . Then the dynamic Mirrlees program of maximizing the time $t = 0$ (*ex ante*) utility of a representative agent, can be written as (e.g., Golosov, Kocherlakota and Tsyvinski, 2003, Kocherlakota, 2005):

$$\max_{\{c_t(\cdot), l_t(\cdot), K_{t+1}\}_{t=0}^\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(c_t(\theta^{i,t}), l_t(\theta^{i,t}) \mid \theta_t^i) \right] \quad (13)$$

subject to the incentive compatibility constraints, (11), and $C_t + X_t + K_{t+1} \leq F(K_t, L_t)$.

Next, we add the feasibility constraint that $\{X_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ should be such that

$$\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty \in \Lambda^\infty,$$

where

$$\Lambda^\infty = \{\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty \text{ such that } \exists \{c_t(\theta^t), l_t(\theta^t)\}_{t=0}^\infty \text{ satisfying (11)}\}. \quad (14)$$

In other words, $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty \in \Lambda^\infty$ implies that there exist incentive compatible and feasible $\{c_t(\theta^t), l_t(\theta^t)\}_{t=0}^\infty$. This set is important to define, since, given certain government expenditure sequences, $\{X_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$'s, the constraint set of this Mirrlees maximization problem can be

²⁴The equations in (11) focus on the incentive compatibility constraints that apply along the equilibrium path (expectations on both sides of the constraints are taken conditional on $\theta^{i,t}$). This is without any loss of generality, since (11) needs to hold for any sequence of reports $\{\hat{\theta}_{t+s}^i\}_{s=0}^\infty$, thus any potential deviation from time $t = 0$ is covered by this set of constraints.

empty (e.g., if $C_t = 0$ and $L_t > 0$, the incentive compatibility constraints of individuals cannot be satisfied).

For a sequence $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty \in \Lambda^\infty$, we can define the *quasi-Mirrlees program* as

$$\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty) \equiv \max_{\{c_t(\cdot), l_t(\cdot)\}_{t=0}^\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(c_t(\theta^{i,t}), l_t(\theta^{i,t}) \mid \theta_t^i) \right] \quad (15)$$

subject to the incentive compatibility constraints, (11), and two additional constraints

$$\int c_t(\theta^t) dG^t(\theta^t) \leq C_t, \quad (16)$$

and

$$\int l_t(\theta^t) dG^t(\theta^t) \geq L_t. \quad (17)$$

This program takes the sequence $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty \in \Lambda^\infty$ as given and maximizes ex ante utility of an agent subject to incentive constraints and two additional constraints. The first, (16), requires the sum of consumption levels across agents for all report histories to be no greater than some number C_t , while the second, (17), requires the sum of labor supplies to be no less than some amount L_t . The functional $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$ defines the maximum *ex ante* ($t = 0$) utility of an agent in this economy for a given sequence $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ and can be interpreted as the *indirect utility function* of the individuals (from the viewpoint of time $t = 0$). In Appendix A, we show that the functional $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$ is well-defined, nondecreasing in C_t , nonincreasing in L_t , concave and differentiable (as long as we allow for randomizations). In the text, we will make use of these properties of $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$ to characterize the best sustainable mechanism.

Returning to the dynamic Mirrlees program, for a given sequence of government expenditures $\{X_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$, this can be written as:

$$\max_{\{C_t, L_t, K_{t+1}\}_{t=0}^\infty} \mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty) \quad (18)$$

subject to an initial level of capital stock $K_0 > 0$ and to

$$C_t + X_t + K_{t+1} \leq F(K_t, L_t), \text{ and } \{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty \in \Lambda^\infty. \quad (19)$$

This derivation implies that we can represent the standard dynamic Mirrlees program as a solution to a two-step maximization problem, in which the first step is the quasi-Mirrlees formulation, yielding the functional $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$, and the second step is the maximization of $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$ over sequences $\{C_t, L_t, K_{t+1}\}$ subject to a resource constraint and to feasibility.

This representation is particularly useful because it highlights the parallel between the dynamic Mirrlees program and the best sustainable mechanism. In particular, the maximization problem characterizing the best sustainable mechanism, (9), can be written as one of

maximizing the indicated utility function subject to constraints:

$$\max_{\{C_t, L_t, x_t, K_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}} \mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}) \quad (20)$$

subject to

$$C_t + x_t + K_{t+1} \leq F(K_t, L_t) \text{ and } \{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty} \in \Lambda^{\infty}, \quad (21)$$

and also subject to (12). The only difference between the dynamic Mirrlees program in (18)-(19) and the best sustainable mechanism in (20)-(21)-(12) is the presence of the sustainability constraint for the politician in power, (12), which also makes $\{x_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ an endogenously chosen sequence instead of the exogenously given $\{X_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$. This formulation establishes the following theorem.

Theorem 2 (*Separation of Private and Public Incentives*) *Suppose Assumptions 1-3 hold. Then, the best sustainable mechanism solves a quasi-Mirrlees program for some sequence $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty} \in \Lambda^{\infty}$.*

Proof. This follows immediately from rewriting (9)-(12) from Proposition 1 as a two-step maximization program, and expressing (10) as $x_t = F(K_t, L_t) - C_t - K_{t+1}$. ■

The allocation induced by the best sustainable mechanism is therefore a solution to a problem that maximizes the ex ante utility of the citizens as given in (13), but must also choose levels of aggregate consumption and labor supply consistent with the sustainability constraint of the politician in power.²⁵ An important implication of this result is that political economy considerations do not fundamentally alter the optimal taxation problem; instead, they modify the aggregate constraints in this dynamic maximization problem. From a technical point of view, this theorem implies that we can separate the analysis of the political economy of dynamic taxation into two parts:

1. We first solve the problem of providing incentives to individuals given aggregate levels of consumption and labor supply.
2. We then provide incentives to politicians by choosing aggregate variables and the level of rents.

Accordingly, the best sustainable mechanism will be *undistorted* when it can achieve the same allocation as that of a full dynamic Mirrlees economy with the same sequence of $\{x_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$

²⁵The key feature necessary for Theorem 2 is that politicians' deviation payoffs depend only on aggregates. If, instead of $x_t = F(K_t, L_t)$, the maximum consumption for the politician were a nonlinear function of the entire distribution of labor supplies, $[l_{i,t}]_{i \in I}$, Theorem 2 would not necessarily hold.

(which naturally involves no marginal distortions in addition to those implied by Mirrleesian optimal taxation).

Another major role of Theorem 2 for our purposes is that it enables us to represent the differences between the dynamic Mirrlees program and the best sustainable mechanism purely in terms of *aggregate distortions*, corresponding to what the sequences $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty \in \Lambda^\infty$ are (and how they differ from the solution to the dynamic Mirrlees program in (18)-(19)). To make further progress along these lines, we show in Appendix A that $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$ is differentiable in the sequences $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty \in \Lambda^\infty$. We can therefore consider variations in sequences $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ where only one element, C_s or L_s for some specific s is varied (with all C_t, L_t for $t \neq s$ held constant). We denote the derivative of \mathcal{U} with respect to such variations by $\mathcal{U}_{C_s}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$ and $\mathcal{U}_{L_s}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$ or simply by \mathcal{U}_{C_s} and \mathcal{U}_{L_s} . We also denote the partial derivatives of the production function with respect to labor and capital at time s by F_{L_s} and F_{K_s} .

Definition 4 We say that the sequence $\{C_t, L_t, K_{t+1}, x_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ induced by the best sustainable mechanism Γ^* is **undistorted** at t' if $\{\hat{C}_t, \hat{L}_t, \hat{K}_{t+1}\}_{t=0}^\infty$ is a solution to (18) subject to (19) with $\{X_t\}_{t=0}^\infty = \{x_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ and $C_{t'} = \hat{C}_{t'}$, $L_{t'} = \hat{L}_{t'}$, $\hat{K}_{t'+1} = K_{t'+1}$. We say that $\{C_t, L_t, K_{t+1}, x_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ is **asymptotically undistorted** if it is undistorted as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

This definition states that an undistorted allocation is exactly the allocation that would result in the standard dynamic Mirrlees problem where, in addition to restriction across agents, the government also has to finance an exogenously-given sequence of public good expenditures $\{X_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$. If an allocation is *undistorted* and $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty \in \text{Int}\Lambda^\infty$, then

$$\mathcal{U}_{C_t} \cdot F_{L_t} = -\mathcal{U}_{L_t}, \quad (22)$$

$$F_{K_{t+1}} \cdot \mathcal{U}_{C_{t+1}} = \mathcal{U}_{C_t}. \quad (23)$$

at time t (or as $t \rightarrow \infty$). Here, the first condition states that the marginal cost of effort at time t given the utility function $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$ is equal to the increase in output from the additional effort times the marginal utility of additional consumption. The second one requires the cost of a decline in the utility by saving one more unit to be equal to the increase in output in the next period times the marginal utility of consumption then. Once again, these are aggregate conditions since they are defined in terms of the utility functional $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$, which represents the ex ante maximal utility of an individual subject to incentive constraints.

Moreover, if a steady state exists and the conditions in (22) and (23) hold as $t \rightarrow \infty$, then it is also clear that $\{C_t, L_t, K_{t+1}, x_t\}_{t \rightarrow \infty}$ must be undistorted. We then say that there are no asymptotic aggregate distortions on capital accumulation (or no aggregate capital taxation)

if $F_{K_{t+1}} \cdot \mathcal{U}_{C_{t+1}} = \mathcal{U}_{C_t}$ and no aggregate distortions on labor supply if $\mathcal{U}_{C_t} \cdot F_{L_t} = -\mathcal{U}_{L_t}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. By implication, an allocation $\{C_t, L_t, K_{t+1}, x_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ features *labor distortions* at time t if (22) is not satisfied at t . We refer to these as *downward labor distortions* if the left-hand side of (22) is strictly greater than the right-hand side. If (23) is not satisfied, then there are *intertemporal distortions* at time t , and if the left-hand side of (23) is strictly less than the right-hand side, then there are *downward intertemporal distortions*. Downward distortions imply that there is less labor supply and less capital accumulation than in an undistorted allocation.

6 Best Sustainable Mechanisms

We now present the main result of the paper, which characterizes the behavior of the sequences $\{C_t, L_t, K_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ (and $\{x_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$) and distortions under the best sustainable mechanism. Theorems 4 and 5 in the next section provide both further characterization results under additional assumptions on the persistence of individual types and information structure, and also clarify the interpretation of the results in the following theorem.

Theorem 3 (*Characterization of the Best Sustainable Mechanism*) *Consider the optimal dynamic Mirrlees economy with self-interested politicians described above. Suppose that Assumptions 1-3 hold and there exists $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty} \in \text{Int}\Lambda^{\infty}$ (with $L_t > 0$) for some t . Then, in the best sustainable mechanism:*

1. *there are downward labor distortions at some $t < \infty$ and downward intertemporal distortions at $t - 1$ (provided that $t \geq 1$).*

Let the best sustainable mechanism induce a sequence of consumption, labor supply and capital levels $\{C_t, L_t, K_{t+1}\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$. Suppose a steady state exists such that as $t \rightarrow \infty$, $\{C_t, L_t, K_{t+1}\}_{t=0}^{\infty} \rightarrow (C^, L^*, K^*)$, where (C^*, L^*) is interior. Moreover, let $\varphi \equiv \inf\{\varrho \in (0, 1] : \text{plim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} \varrho^{-t} \mathcal{U}_{C_t}^* = 0\}$, where $\varphi < 1$. Then:*

2. *if $\varphi = \delta$, then there are no asymptotic aggregate distortions on capital accumulation and labor supply;*
3. *if $\varphi > \delta$, then aggregate distortions on capital accumulation and labor supply do not disappear even asymptotically.*

Proof. We show in Appendix A that, when randomizations are introduced, $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty})$ is a well-defined functional and is continuous, concave, and differentiable. In this proof, we suppress randomization to simplify notation.

We write the problem of characterizing the best sustainable mechanism non-recursively following Marcat and Marimon (1998) as

$$\max_{\{C_t, L_t, K_t, x_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}} \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}) + \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta^t \{ \mu_t v(x_t) - (\mu_t - \mu_{t-1}) v(F(K_t, L_t)) \} \quad (24)$$

subject to

$$C_t + x_t + K_{t+1} \leq F(K_t, L_t), \text{ and} \quad (25)$$

$$\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty} \in \Lambda^{\infty},$$

for all t , where $\mu_t = \mu_{t-1} + \psi_t$ with $\mu_{-1} = 0$ and $\delta^t \psi_t \geq 0$ is the Lagrange multiplier on the constraint (12). The differentiability of $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty})$ implies that for $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty} \in \text{Int}\Lambda^{\infty}$, we have:

$$\mathcal{U}_{L_t} - \delta^t (\mu_t - \mu_{t-1}) v'(F(K_t, L_t)) F_{L_t} = -\mathcal{U}_{C_t} \cdot F_{L_t} \quad (26)$$

$$\mathcal{U}_{C_t} = [\mathcal{U}_{C_{t+1}} - \delta^t (\mu_{t+1} - \mu_t) v'(F(K_{t+1}, L_{t+1}))] F_{K_{t+1}} \quad (27)$$

Since $\mu_t \geq \mu_{t-1}$, there will be downward labor and intertemporal distortions whenever $\mu_t > \mu_{t-1}$ and $\mu_{t+1} > \mu_t$, respectively, i.e., whenever $\psi_t > 0$ and $\psi_{t+1} > 0$.

Part 1: Suppose to obtain a contradiction that $\mu_t = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$. Then, no consumption is allocated to the politician, $x_t = 0$ for all t . But in this case, if $L_t > 0$ for any t , then the politician can improve by expropriating the entire output at t . Thus we must have $L_t = 0$ for all t . Since, by hypothesis, $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty} \in \text{Int}\Lambda^{\infty}$ with $L_t > 0$ is feasible and the associated $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty} \in \text{Int}\Lambda^{\infty}$ necessarily gives higher ex ante utility to citizens than $L_t = C_t = 0$, the plan with $L_t = 0$ for all t cannot be optimal. Therefore, the sustainability constraint of politician (12) must bind at some t with $\psi_t > 0$. Then (26) implies that there will be downward labor distortions at that t , and (27) implies that there will be downward intertemporal distortions at $t - 1$.

Part 2: We start by proving that $\varphi \equiv \inf\{ \varrho \in [0, 1] : \text{plim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} \varrho^{-t} U_{C_t}^* = 0 \}$ is well-defined and strictly less than 1. To see this, recall that by hypothesis, a steady state exists, so that $\{C_t, L_t, K_{t+1}\}_{t=0}^{\infty} \rightarrow (C^*, L^*, K^*)$, thus $\{C_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ is in the space c of convergent infinite sequences (rather than simply in the space of all bounded infinite sequences, ℓ_{∞}). The dual of c is ℓ_1 , that is, the space of sequences $\{y_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ such that $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} |y_t| < \infty$. Since \mathcal{U}_{C_t} is equal to the Lagrange multiplier for the constraint (16), it lies in the dual space of $\{C_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ (see, e.g., Luenberger, 1969, Chapter 9), thus in ℓ_1 , which implies that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{U}_{C_t} = 0$, hence $\varphi < 1$.

Rearranging equations (26) and (27) and substituting for \mathcal{U}_{C_t} and taking the limit as $t \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$-\frac{\mathcal{U}_{L_t}^*}{\mathcal{U}_{C_t}^* F_{L_t}(K^*, L^*)} = 1 - \frac{(\mu_t - \mu_{t-1}) v'(F(K^*, L^*))}{\mu_t v'(x^*)} \quad (28)$$

and

$$\frac{F_{K_{t+1}}(K^*, L^*)\mathcal{U}_{C_{t+1}}^*}{\mathcal{U}_{C_t}^*} = 1 + \frac{(\mu_{t+1} - \mu_t)v'(F(K^*, L^*))F_{K_{t+1}}(K^*, L^*)}{\mu_t v'(x^*)}, \quad (29)$$

where all derivatives are evaluated at the limit (C^*, L^*, K^*) .

The first-order condition with respect to x_t then implies:

$$\frac{\mathcal{U}_{C_t}}{\delta^t v'(x_t)} = \mu_t \leq \mu_{t+1} = \frac{\mathcal{U}_{C_{t+1}}}{\delta^{t+1} v'(x_{t+1})}. \quad (30)$$

By construction, μ_t is an increasing sequence, so it must either converge to some value μ^* or go to infinity. Since as $t \rightarrow \infty$ an interior steady state (C^*, L^*, K^*, x^*) exists by hypothesis and $\mathcal{U}_{C_t}^*$ is proportional to φ^t , (30) can be written as

$$\frac{\varphi^t \mathcal{U}_{C_t}^*}{\delta^t v'(x^*)} = \mu_t \leq \mu_{t+1} = \frac{\varphi^{t+1} \mathcal{U}_{C_{t+1}}^*}{\delta^{t+1} v'(x^*)} \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (31)$$

Since $\varphi = \delta$, we have that (31) implies that as $t \rightarrow \infty$, $|\mu_{t+1} - \mu_t| \rightarrow 0$ and $\mu_t \rightarrow \mu^* \in (0, \infty]$ (where the fact that $\mu^* > 0$ follows from Part 1, since $\mu_{t+1} \geq \mu_t$ and $\mu_t > 0$ for some t). Therefore, $(\mu_t - \mu_{t-1})/\mu_t \rightarrow 0$, and distortions disappear asymptotically.

Part 3: Suppose that $\varphi > \delta$. In this case, (30) implies that $\mathcal{U}_{C_t}^*$ is proportional to φ^t as $t \rightarrow \infty$. This implies that $(\mu_t - \mu_{t-1})/\mu_t > 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, so from (26) and (27), aggregate distortions cannot disappear, completing the proof. ■

The first part of the theorem states that the sustainability constraint of the politician, (12), necessarily introduces a distortion. Intuitively, this additional (aggregate) distortion arises because, as output increases, the sustainability constraint (12) requires that more rents be given to the politicians in power. These additional rents increase the effective cost of production. The best sustainable mechanism creates distortions so as to reduce the level of output and thus the rents that have to be paid to the politician. Intuitively, starting from an undistorted allocation, a small reduction in labor supply and capital causes a second-order loss in output, but a first-order decline in the amount of rents that need to be paid to the politician. Consequently, some amount of distortion reducing labor supply and capital is optimal from the viewpoint of the citizens.

Part 2 states that as long as an interior steady state exists and $\mathcal{U}_{C_t}^*$ declines sufficiently rapidly (which is related to the rate of discounting by the citizens, see below), the multiplier of the sustainability constraint goes to zero. This result is important as it implies that in the long run there will be “efficient” provision of rents to politicians, with the necessary tax revenues raised without distortions. Intuitively, current incentives to the politician are provided by both consumption in the current period, x_t , and by consumption in the future. Future consumption by the politician not only relaxes the sustainability constraint in the future but does so in

all prior periods as well. Thus, all else equal, optimal incentives for the politician should be backloaded. Backloading leads to sustainability constraint not binding in the long run and distortions disappearing.

Notice that the results in this theorem compare δ to φ . Here φ is the rate at which the ex ante marginal utility of consumption $U_{C_t}^*$ is declining in the steady state. Clearly, in the case where $U(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$ is time separable, the rate at which $U_{C_t}^*$ declines is exactly equal to β . We will show in the next section that in two important cases, this will indeed be the case. In the more general case of present section, φ is the *fundamental discount factor* of the citizens, since it measures how one unit of resources at time t compares with one unit of resources at time $t + 1$. We will show in the next section that without any dynamic incentive linkages, e.g., with constant types, this fundamental discount factor coincides with β , though in general it may be different from β . Therefore, the case of $\varphi = \delta$ indeed corresponds to a situation in which the politician is as patient as the citizens.²⁶

Part 3, on the other hand, states that if the discount factor of the politician δ is sufficiently low compared to the fundamental discount factor φ , then aggregate distortions will not disappear, even asymptotically. The significance of this result is that it also implies *positive aggregate capital taxes* in contrast to the existing literature on dynamic fiscal policy. Since in many realistic political economy models politicians are—or act as—more short-sighted than the citizens, this part of the theorem implies that in a number of important cases, political economy considerations will lead to additional distortions that will not disappear even asymptotically.

7 Constant Types or Private Histories

Theorem 3 provided a complete characterization of the distortions introduced by political economy and commitment problems and their asymptotic behavior. In this section, we strengthen the results of Theorem 6. We first focus on economies with *constant types*, where $\theta_t^i = \theta_{t+1}^i$ for all i and t , that is, economies in which individual types are realized in the first date and remain constant thereafter. This is the assumption that is used in much of the literature on dynamic mechanisms without commitment (e.g., Roberts, 1984, Freixas, Guesnerie and Tirole, 1985, Bisin and Rampini, 2005). With constant types, we show that the fundamental discount factor φ is identical to the discount factor of the individuals, β . We next turn to economies with *private histories*, where individual histories will not be observed by the politicians (so in this case allocations can only be conditioned on current reports). This restriction enables us

²⁶In part 2 of this theorem, we limit attention to the case in which $\varphi = \delta$, since when $\varphi < \delta$ we will not converge to an interior steady state. Theorem 5 in the next section explicitly deals with non-interior steady states.

to focus on the main interplay between private and public incentives, without introducing the substantial complications that arise when individuals are given complex dynamic incentives. In this case, we will show not only that $\varphi = \beta$, but also that political economy and commitment distortions will be present starting at $t = 0$ and that the characterization results hold without assuming that the best sustainable mechanism induces an allocation converging to a steady state.

7.1 Best Sustainable Mechanism with Constant Types

Let us start with constant types. Since individual types do not change, truthful reporting along the equilibrium path (cf. Theorem 1) implies that individual incentive compatibility constraints can be simply written as

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(c_t(\theta), l_t(\theta) | \theta) \geq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(c_t(\hat{\theta}), l_t(\hat{\theta}) | \theta) \quad (32)$$

for all $\hat{\theta} \in \Theta$ and $\theta \in \Theta$. Since types are known at all dates, the only reason why aggregates, L_t and C_t , will vary in this case is because of changes in the rents paid to the politician in power, x_t . In this case, we have the following result.

Theorem 4 (*Best Sustainable Mechanisms with Constant Types*) *Consider the optimal dynamic Mirrlees economy with self-interested politicians described above. Assume that types are constant, that is, $\theta_t^i = \theta_{t+1}^i$ for all $i \in I$ and $t = 0, 1, \dots$. Suppose moreover that Assumptions 1-3 hold and there exists $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty} \in \text{Int}\Lambda^{\infty}$ (with $L_t > 0$) for some t . Then, in the best sustainable mechanism,*

1. *there are downward labor distortions at some $t < \infty$ and downward intertemporal distortions at $t - 1$ (provided that $t \geq 1$).*

Let the best sustainable mechanism induce a sequence of consumption, labor supply and capital levels $\{C_t, L_t, K_{t+1}\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$. Suppose a steady state exists such that as $t \rightarrow \infty$, $\{C_t, L_t, K_{t+1}\}_{t=0}^{\infty} \rightarrow (C^, L^*, K^*)$, where (C^*, L^*) is interior. Then:*

2. *if $\beta = \delta$, then there are no asymptotic aggregate distortions on capital accumulation and labor supply;*
3. *if $\beta > \delta$, then aggregate distortions on capital accumulation and labor supply do not disappear even asymptotically.*

Proof. Since this proof deals explicitly with randomizations, it is provided in Appendix A. ■

7.2 Best Sustainable Mechanism with Private Histories

In this subsection, we focus on private histories. We also simplify the exposition and the notation by assuming that within each period, there is an aggregate invariant distribution of types, denoted by G , and also by removing capital, so that the aggregate production function of the economy is

$$Y_t = L_t, \quad (33)$$

where $K_0 = 0$ and L_t denotes the aggregate labor supply at time t . These simplifications are without any significant consequences for our analysis.

Private histories imply that in admissible mechanisms, allocations must depend only on agents' current report. In such an environment the incentive compatibility constraints for agents can be separated across time periods, and written as

$$u(c_t(\theta_t), l_t(\theta_t) \mid \theta_t) \geq u(c_t(\hat{\theta}_t), l_t(\hat{\theta}_t) \mid \theta_t) \quad (34)$$

for all $\hat{\theta}_t \in \Theta$ and $\theta_t \in \Theta$, and for all t .

The best sustainable mechanism with private histories therefore maximizes (9) subject to (12), (34) and the resource constraint

$$C_t + x_t \leq L_t. \quad (35)$$

Returning to the quasi-Mirrlees program defined above, it is straightforward to see that with private histories, the optimal allocations of (c_t, l_t) depend only on the aggregate variables in the same period, C_t and L_t , and are independent of any C_s, L_s with $s \neq t$. This implies that $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty})$ is time separable, i.e., $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}) = \mathbb{E} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t U(C_t, L_t)$ for some real-valued differentiable function $U : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The results for $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty})$ in Appendix A immediately imply that $U(C, L)$ is also well defined, concave, and differentiable.

The program for the best sustainable mechanism, (20)-(21), can now be written as:

$$\max_{\{C_t, L_t, x_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t U(C_t, L_t) \quad (36)$$

subject to the resource constraint, (35), and the sustainability constraint,

$$w_t \equiv \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \delta^s v(x_{t+s}) \right] \geq v(L_t), \quad (37)$$

for all t , where w_t denotes the present value of utilities delivered to the politician at time t .

The incentive compatibility constraints for individuals in (34) play a similar role to (14) in our formulation above. In particular, we can define a static set of feasible aggregate consumption and labor supply levels,

$$\Lambda = \left\{ (C, L) \text{ such that } \exists \{c(\theta), l(\theta)\} \text{ satisfying (34), and} \right. \quad (38)$$

$$\left. C = \int c(\theta) dG(\theta), \text{ and } L = \int l(\theta) dG(\theta) \right\}.$$

Finally, we also adopt the following sustainability assumption, which will be used in establishing convergence to a steady state and in part 2 of the next theorem (in particular, when the utility provided to a politician reaches the boundary of the set of feasible values). Let $\bar{w} \equiv \max_{(C,L) \in \Lambda} v(L - C) / (1 - \delta)$.

Assumption 4 (*sustainability*) *There exists $(\bar{C}, \bar{L}) \in \arg \max_{(C,L) \in \Lambda} v(L - C) / (1 - \delta)$, such that $v(\bar{L} - \bar{C}) / (1 - \delta) > v(\bar{L})$.*

Intuitively, this assumption ensures that the highest discounted utility that can be given to the politician is sufficient to satisfy the sustainability constraint (37). Clearly this assumption is satisfied when the politician's discount factor, δ , is sufficiently large.

The concept of the aggregate distortion is also simpler in this setup. When $(C, L) \in \text{Int}\Lambda$ the solution to the dynamic (full-commitment) Mirrlees program (18)-(19) satisfies:

$$U_C(C, L) = -U_L(C, L), \quad (39)$$

where U_C and U_L are the partial derivatives of $U(C, L)$ with respect to C and L . We refer to a *downward labor distortions* if the left-hand side of (39) is strictly greater than the right-hand side.

The main result of this section is the following theorem:

Theorem 5 (*Best Sustainable Mechanisms with Private Histories*) *Consider the economy with no capital and with private histories. Suppose also that Assumptions 1, 3, and 4 hold.*

1. *At $t = 0$, there is an aggregate distortion.*
2. *Suppose that $\beta \leq \delta$. Let Γ^* be the best sustainable mechanism inducing a sequence of values $\{w_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$. Then $\{w_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ is a non-decreasing sequence in the sense that $w_{t+1} \geq w_t$ for all t . Moreover, a steady state exists in that $\{w_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ converges (almost surely) to some $w^* \in [0, \bar{w}]$ and $\{C_t, L_t, x_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ converges (almost surely) to some (C^*, L^*, x^*) , which is asymptotically undistorted.*

3. If $\beta > \delta$, then aggregate distortions do not disappear even asymptotically.

Proof. Most of the results in this theorem follow as corollaries of the corresponding results in Theorem 3. The three additional results are that there are distortions at the initial date, $t = 0$, rather than at some possible future date, that $\{w_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ is a non-decreasing, and that when $\delta \leq \beta$ a steady state necessarily exists. All three of these results follow from Theorem 1 and 2 in Acemoglu, Golosov, and Tsyvinski (2007a), and we do not repeat these proofs to economize on space. ■

Theorem 5 provides a tighter characterization of the best sustainable equilibrium for the important special cases of private histories than the general results in Theorem 3. It also enables us to see the role of the relative discount factors of the politicians and the citizens more clearly.

More specifically, Part 1 of Theorem 5 establishes that there is distortion in period 0, rather than at some period $t \geq 0$. It is possible to compare the discount factor of the politician δ to the discount factor of the agent as function $U(C, L)$ is separable across time. We show that a sequence of values delivered to politicians, $\{w_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ is non-decreasing providing an easily interpretable notion of backloading of incentives for politicians. The theorem also does not require existence of the interior steady state. Assumption 4 guarantees that if the boundary \bar{w} is reached the allocation will be undistorted. Finally, Part 2 of the Theorem extends results for the case of politicians being more patient than agents.

7.3 Interpretation of Distortions

We can also use the economies with private histories or with constant types to clarify the meaning of aggregate distortions. To do this in the cleanest possible fashion, let us focus on the economy with private histories (the results are identical with constant types) and introduce the following additional assumption, which is typically imposed in analyses of static and dynamic incentive problems:

Assumption 5 (single crossing) *Let the partial derivatives of u be denoted by u_c and u_l . Then $u_c(c, l | \theta) / |u_l(c, l | \theta)|$ is increasing in θ for all c and l and all $\theta \in \Theta$.*

Given this single crossing property, the set of incentive compatibility constraints with private histories, (34), can be reduced to a set of incentive compatibility constraints only for neighboring types. Since there are $N + 1$ types in Θ , this implies that (34) is equivalent to N incentive compatibility constraints. This then enables us to establish the following proposition, which illustrates the relationship between aggregate distortions and individual income taxes:

Proposition 2 *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 5 hold and suppose that the best sustainable mechanism does not involve randomization. Consider a sequence of $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$. Then:*

1. *the marginal labor tax rate on the highest type of agent, θ_N , at time t is given by $\tau_{N,t} = 1 + U_L(C_t, L_t)/U_C(C_t, L_t)$.*
2. *if $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ is undistorted at t , the labor supply decision of the highest type of agent is undistorted, i.e., $u_c(c_t(\theta_N), l_t(\theta_N) | \theta_N) = -u_l(c_t(\theta_N), l_t(\theta_N) | \theta_N)$.*

Proof. Assumption 5 implies that we only need to check incentive compatibility constraints for neighboring types. Let u_c and u_l be the partial derivatives of u (which exist by Assumption 1). Since there is no randomization, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_c(c_t(\theta_N), l_t(\theta_N) | \theta_N) (1 + \lambda_{Nt}) &= \nu_{Ct}, \\ u_l(c_t(\theta_N), l_t(\theta_N) | \theta_N) (1 + \lambda_{Nt}) &= -\nu_{Lt}, \end{aligned}$$

where λ_{Nt} is the multiplier on incentive compatibility constraint between types θ_N and θ_{N-1} at time t , ν_{Ct} is the multiplier on (16) at t and ν_{Lt} is the multiplier on (17) at t . By the differentiability of $U(C, L)$ and the definition of Lagrange multipliers, $\nu_{Ct} = U_C(C_t, L_t)$ and $\nu_{Lt} = -U_L(C_t, L_t)$. Combining these equations, we have

$$-\frac{u_l(c_t(\theta_N), l_t(\theta_N) | \theta_N)}{u_c(c_t(\theta_N), l_t(\theta_N) | \theta_N)} \equiv (1 - \tau_{N,t}) = -\frac{U_L(C_t, L_t)}{U_C(C_t, L_t)},$$

where the first equality defines $\tau_{N,t}$, and the second equality establishes the first part of the lemma. The second result follows immediately from setting $U_L(C_t, L_t) = -U_C(C_t, L_t)$ from the definition of an undistorted sequence, in particular, equation (39). ■

This proposition therefore further clarifies the meaning of the aggregate distortions, which have been our focus so far and shows that they are naturally linked to the marginal labor taxes in the standard Mirrlees problem. In particular, if in the standard Mirrlees problem, the marginal income tax on the highest type should be equal to zero, then the added distortion is exactly equal to the tax that will be imposed on the highest type under the best sustainable mechanism.

8 Example

We now briefly illustrate the results of Theorems 3 and 4 using a simple example and then provides some illustrative computations that show the dynamics of distortions and allocations under different values of the discount factors for the citizens and the politician. Suppose that

there are constant types, drawn from the set $\Theta = \{\theta_0, \theta_1\}$ and the utility function is

$$u(c, l | \theta) = u(c) - \chi(l/\theta),$$

where u is continuously differentiable, increasing and strictly concave and χ is continuously differentiable, increasing and strictly convex. Furthermore, suppose that u satisfies Inada-type conditions, so that first-order conditions are always satisfied as equality. We take $\theta_0 = 0$, so that the low type is again disabled and cannot supply any labor. Suppose that with probability π an individual is born, and remains, as high type, while with probability $1 - \pi$, he is a low type. To simplify discussion, let us again ignore randomizations across the consumption and labor supply levels of different types. Then, the quasi-Mirrlees problem can be written as

$$\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}) \equiv \max_{\{c_t(\theta_0), c_t(\theta_1), l_t(\theta_1)\}_{t=0}^{\infty}} \pi \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t [u(c_t(\theta_1)) - \chi(l_t(\theta_1)/\theta_1)] + (1 - \pi) \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t [u(c_t(\theta_0))], \quad (40)$$

subject to $\pi c_t(\theta_1) + (1 - \pi) c_t(\theta_0) \leq \pi l_t(\theta_1) - x_t$ for all t , and

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t [u(c_t(\theta_1)) - \chi(l_t(\theta_1)/\theta_1)] \geq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t [u(c_t(\theta_0))],$$

where $L_t = \pi l_t(\theta_1)$ and $C_t = L_t - x_t$. The first constraint is the resource constraint for each t , while the second constraint is the incentive compatibility constraint sufficient for the high type to reveal his identity given the presence of effective commitment along the equilibrium path. Assigning Lagrange multipliers $\beta^t \mu_t$ and η , respectively, to these constraints, the first-order necessary conditions of this problem can be written as:

$$(\pi + \eta) u'(c_t(\theta_1)) = \pi \mu_t \quad (41)$$

$$(1 - \pi - \eta) u'(c_t(\theta_0)) = (1 - \pi) \mu_t, \quad (42)$$

and

$$\frac{(\pi + \eta)}{\theta_1} \chi'(l_t(\theta_1)/\theta_1) = \mu_t \pi. \quad (43)$$

Equations (41)-(42) imply that

$$\frac{u'(c_t(\theta_1))}{u'(c_t(\theta_0))} = \frac{(1 - \pi - \eta)}{(\pi + \eta)}.$$

Consequently, there is constant risk-sharing between the two types in all periods. Moreover, if a steady state exists, so that $x_t \rightarrow x^*$, (41)-(43) combined imply that $c_t(\theta_1) \rightarrow c^{1*}$, $c_t(\theta_0) \rightarrow c^{0*}$, and $l_t(\theta_1) \rightarrow l^*$, and hence $\mu_t \rightarrow \mu^*$. Consequently, in this case $\varphi = \beta$ as claimed in the previous section. Put differently, in this particular case, the rate at which the derivative




Figure 1: The time path of distortions for constant types with $\beta = 0.9$ and $\delta = 0.6, 0.7, 0.8, 0.9$. Higher curves correspond to lower values of δ .

$\mathcal{U}_{C_t}^*$ declines is easy to determine, and it does so at the same rate as the discount factor of the citizens, i.e., $\varphi = \beta$.

We now illustrate the results presented in the last two sections numerically. Suppose that individual utility functions take the form

$$u(c, l | \theta) = \sqrt{c} - \frac{l^2}{5\theta}. \quad (44)$$

Suppose that type θ_0 is disabled and cannot supply any labor, so $\theta_0 = 0$, and we normalize $\theta_1 = 1$. Let us also assume that a fraction $\pi = 1/2$ of the population is of type θ_1 and that the utility function of the politician is given by $v(x) = \sqrt{x}$. We consider the case without capital, so that the production function is $F(K, L) = L$.

We show the aggregate distortion, $1 + \mathcal{U}_{L_t}/\mathcal{U}_{C_t}$, in Figure 1 for politician for the baseline case, with $\delta = 0.9$, and also for a range of lower discount factors for the politician, $\delta = 0.8, 0.7$, and 0.6 .

Consistent with part 2 of Theorem 3, when $\beta = \delta = 0.9$, the lowest curve shows that the aggregate distortion converges to zero and the convergence is rather fast—so that distortions resulting from political economy and commitment disappear very quickly. Instead, when $\delta < \beta$, the aggregate distortion converges to a positive, and potentially large, asymptotic value. For example, when $\delta = 0.6$, the aggregate distortion converges to an asymptotic value of 0.15 (the highest curve in the graph).

Another question concerns how much of the economy's output has to be allocated to the politician (as rents or government consumption). Figure 2 answers this question, again for

$\beta = 0.9$ and $\delta = 0.9, 0.8, 0.7,$ and 0.6 . When the politician’s discount factor is equal to that of the citizens, it receives a very small fraction of the output even in the asymptotic equilibrium. As we consider lower discount factors for the politician, its temptation to deviate increases and consequently, it receives a higher fraction of the output.




Figure 2: Time path of x_t/Y_t with $\beta = 0.9$ and $\delta = 0.6, 0.7, 0.8, 0.9$. Higher curves correspond to lower values of δ .

9 Benevolent Time-Inconsistent Governments

The analysis so far has focused on the case when politicians were purely self-interested. Although this case is of relevance for many political economy applications, it is also important to understand how the results generalize to the case considered by Roberts (1984), Freixas, Guesnerie and Tirole (1985), or Bisin and Rampini (2005), where the government is still benevolent, but “time inconsistent”, i.e., unable to commit to a full dynamic mechanism. To do this, we now consider a more general utility function for the government of the form:

$$\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \delta^s \left[(1 - a) v(x_{t+s}) + a \left(\mathbb{E}_{t+s} \int u(c_{t+s}, l_{t+s} | \theta^{t+s}) dG^{t+s}(\theta^{t+s}) \right) \right], \quad (45)$$

where the second term is the average (expected) utility of the citizens at time $t + s$, and $0 < a < 1$.²⁷ Therefore, this utility function is identical to that of a purely-self-interested government when $a = 0$.

²⁷We do not allow the case of $a = 1$ (purely benevolent government) as it requires a different proof strategy. Our environment obviously allows the government to be arbitrarily benevolent ($a \rightarrow 1$ and $\delta = \beta$)

To incorporate the case of a benevolent time-inconsistent government, we also need to change the political game. In particular, we no longer allow citizens to vote the current government out of office. Instead, the same government is always in power. Despite this, all of the main results so far continue to hold, since citizens have another effective punishment against the government, to produce zero. In particular, if the government deviates from the prescribed policy (or from the implicitly-agreed social plan), individuals can exercise their freedom on labor supply and produce zero output thereafter.²⁸ It can be verified that all of the results so far hold under this alternative game form (see Acemoglu, Golosov and Tsyvinski, 2006). The advantage of this alternative game form is that it naturally adapts to the case of a partly benevolent government. In addition, we also need to strengthen Assumption 1 and assume separable utility, which is a standard assumption in most analyses of dynamic taxation (e.g., Golosov, Kocherlakota and Tsyvinski, 2003, Kocherlakota, 2005).

Assumption 1' (separable utility) $u(c, l | \theta) = u(c) - \chi(l | \theta)$, where $u : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuously differentiable, strictly increasing and concave, and $\chi(\cdot | \theta)$ is continuously differentiable, strictly increasing and convex for all $\theta \in \Theta$, and satisfies $\chi(0 | \theta) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$.

The next theorem shows that Theorem 1 and Proposition 1 continue to hold in this more general environment.

Theorem 6 (Truthful Revelation with Benevolent Government) *Suppose that government utility is given by (45) and that Assumptions 1', 2 and 3 hold. Then for any combination of strategy profiles Γ and $\underline{\alpha}$ that support a sustainable mechanism, there exists another pair of equilibrium strategy profiles Γ^* and $\underline{\alpha}^* = (\alpha^* | \alpha')$ for some α' such that Γ^* induces direct submechanisms, $\underline{\alpha}^*$ induces truth telling along the equilibrium path, and $\underline{c}[\Gamma, \underline{\alpha}] = \underline{c}[\Gamma^*, \underline{\alpha}^*]$, $l[\Gamma, \underline{\alpha}] = l[\Gamma^*, \underline{\alpha}^*]$ and $x[\Gamma, \underline{\alpha}] = x[\Gamma^*, \underline{\alpha}^*]$. Moreover, the best sustainable mechanism is a solution to maximizing (9) subject to (10), (11) and the government sustainability constraint:*

$$\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \delta^s [(1-a)v(x_{t+s}) + a \left(\mathbb{E}_{t+s} \int [u(c(\theta^{t+s})) - \chi(l(\theta^{t+s}) | \theta_{t+s})] dG^{t+s}(\theta^{t+s}) \right)] \geq \max_{\tilde{x}'_t + \int \tilde{z}'_t(\theta^t) dG^t(\theta^t) \leq F(K_t, L_t)} (1-a)v(\tilde{x}_t) + a \int u(\tilde{c}_t(\theta^t)) dG^t(\theta^t), \quad (46)$$

for all t .

²⁸With these punishments strategies, equilibria are no longer renegotiation-proof. Nevertheless, it is possible to extend the game considered here, so that even though politicians are partially benevolent, there is still replacement of politicians (and a politician who is replaced still cares about the average utility of the citizens), and obtain similar results. We do not introduce this somewhat more involved game form to economize of space.

Proof. See Appendix B. ■

The difference in the proof with the previous environment is that instead of replacing politicians, now agents use the null strategy following the deviation by a politician. In particular imagine that the government has undertaken a deviation in which it has used some of its past information in order to improve the ex post allocation of resources. This could clearly be desirable given the utility function of the government in (45), but as illustrated with the Roberts' (1984) example, it may have very negative consequences ex ante. Therefore, the best sustainable mechanism will have to discourage such deviations. To do this, imagine a punishment strategy, in which following any type of deviation, all individuals supply zero labor. To establish Theorem 6, all we need to show is that such punishment strategies are sequentially rational. When all other agents choose zero labor supply, following any deviation to positive labor supply, the government would consume some of the increase in output itself, and would redistribute the rest equally among all agents given the separable utility function assumed in Assumption 1'. Since there is a very large number of citizens, this implies the deviating individual will receive no additional consumption from supplying positive labor, and thus it is sequentially rational for all citizens to supply zero labor following a deviation by the government.

This theorem therefore shows that revelation principle applies to the case of benevolent, but time-inconsistent governments as well, though under the additional assumption of Assumption 1'. The next example shows why this assumption is necessary:

Example 1 To avoid issues of deviation among continuum of agents, let us consider a finite economy with n agents for this example, where n is large (exactly the same example can be constructed in an economy with a continuum of agents). There are two types of agents, $\theta \in \{0, 1\}$, with $\theta = 0$ corresponding to the disabled type, who can only supply $l = 0$, and has utility $u(c, \cdot | \theta = 0) = u(c)$, while the utility of type $\theta = 1$ is $u(c, l | \theta = 1) = u(c - \chi_1(l))$, where with $\chi_1(\cdot)$ strictly increasing in l . Furthermore, suppose that aggregate output is linear in labor and that the government is fully benevolent, i.e., $a = 1$ in terms of the utility function in (45). Now imagine the economy has entered the punishment phase where each citizen is supposed to supply $l = 0$ and consume $c = 0$. Consider a deviation by an agent, i' , of type $\theta = 1$ to $l' > 0$ such that $\chi_1(l') < 1$. Following this deviation, the benevolent planner will distribute consumption (output $l' > 0$) to maximize its own utility, which involves maximizing average utility of the citizens, thus equating the marginal utility of consumption across agents, i.e.,

$$u'(c_i) = u'(c_{i'} - \chi_1(l')) \text{ for all } i \neq i'$$

thus, $c_{i'} = c_i + \chi_1(l')$ for all $i \neq i'$. The resource constraint is $(n-1)c_i + c_{i'} = l'$, or $c_i = (l' - \chi_1(l'))/n$ and $c_{i'} = (l' - \chi_1(l'))/n + \chi_1(l')$. The resulting utility of individual i' is

$$u\left(\frac{l' - \chi_1(l')}{n}\right) > u(0),$$

for any n , thus giving him greater utility than supplying zero labor. This proves that the punishment phase where each citizen is supposed to supply zero labor is not sequentially rational and thus cannot be part of a (Perfect Bayesian) equilibrium with this utility function.

The next theorem provides a characterization of the structure of distortions and their asymptotic behavior for the case of constant types and under the assumption that the politician and the citizens have the same discount factor, i.e., $\beta = \delta$. We start with this environment, since constant types constitute the most commonly-studied case and enable us to obtain the main results in a succinct fashion. Theorem 8 below generalizes the results of this theorem to non-constant types.

Theorem 7 (*Best Sustainable Mechanism with Benevolent Government and Constant Types*) *Suppose that government utility is given by (45) with $a \in (0, 1)$ and that Assumptions 1', 2 and 3 hold. Furthermore, assume that there are constant types, $\beta = \delta$ and $au'(0) \neq (1-a)v'(0)$. Then, asymptotically there are no aggregate distortions on labor supply and capital accumulation.*

Proof. See Appendix B. ■

This theorem implies that in an economy with constant types, aggregate distortions disappear regardless of the degree of benevolence of the government. Consequently, there will be no aggregate capital taxes and no further taxes on labor beyond those implied by the full-commitment Mirrlees economy.²⁹ In the case where $a \rightarrow 1$, the government is arbitrarily close to the fully-benevolent case, and the theorem contrasts with the results in Roberts (1984), where in a very similar environment, the equilibrium always involved extreme distortions. Once again, the main source of the difference is the infinite-horizon nature of our economy, which allows us to construct equilibria in which the government will be punished if it exploits the information it gathers via the earlier submechanisms.

We end this section and the paper with a generalization of Theorem 7, which parallels our general result, Theorem 3. This theorem illustrates the importance of the discount factor of the politicians in the environment with that partially benevolent government, though, now, the fundamental discount factor to which the discount factor of the politicians is being compared

²⁹The assumption that $au'(0) \neq (1-a)v'(0)$ rules out a special case in which our method of proof does not work (though other more complicated approaches may work even without this assumption).

to is a more complicated object than φ defined in Theorem 3, making the result somewhat weaker.

For this theorem, let $\{\mu_t^*\}_{t=0}^\infty$ denote the multipliers associated with the sustainability constraints of the government and let $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty; \{\mu_t^*\}_{t=0}^\infty)$ denote the indirect utility functional, which now has to be conditioned on this sequence of multipliers as well (see Appendix B). As in Theorem 3, let $\varphi \equiv \inf\{\varrho \in [0, 1] : \text{plim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} \varrho^{-t} U_{C_t}^*(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty; \{\mu_t^*\}_{t=0}^\infty) = 0\}$ (which is now a function of the sequence $\{\mu_t^*\}$ as well as $\{C_t^*, L_t^*\}$).

Theorem 8 (*Best Sustainable Mechanism with Benevolent Government: General Case*) *Suppose that government utility is given by (45) with $a \in (0, 1)$, that Assumptions 1', 2 and 3 hold, and that there exists $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty \in \text{Int}\Lambda^\infty$ (with $L_t > 0$) for some t . Then, in the best sustainable mechanism:*

1. *there are downward labor distortions at some $t < \infty$ and downward intertemporal distortions at $t - 1$ (provided that $t \geq 1$).*

Let the best sustainable mechanism induce a sequence of consumption, labor supply and capital levels $\{C_t, L_t, K_{t+1}\}_{t=0}^\infty$. Suppose a steady state exists such that as $t \rightarrow \infty$, $\{C_t, L_t, K_{t+1}\}_{t=0}^\infty \rightarrow (C^, L^*, K^*)$, where (C^*, L^*) is interior. Then:*

2. *if $\varphi = \delta$, then there are no asymptotic aggregate distortions on capital accumulation and labor supply;*
3. *if $\varphi > \delta$, then aggregate distortions on capital accumulation and labor supply do not disappear even asymptotically.*

Proof. See Appendix B. ■

This theorem therefore shows that the fundamental results from Theorem 3 generalize to the case with a partially benevolent government. Since the fundamental discount factor, φ , is now an even more complicated object and certainly not easy to compute, the results in this theorem are weaker than those in Theorem 3. Nevertheless, Theorem 7 showed that even in this case when types are constant, sharper results can be obtained. Moreover, these results are exactly those that are necessary for rethinking the efficiency of dynamic tax-transfer mechanisms in the presence of commitment problems on the side of the government.

10 Conclusions

In this paper, we took a first step towards a political-economic analysis of dynamic and nonlinear taxation. Political economy considerations become particularly important in the context of

nonlinear taxation, which involves a significant amount of information and enforcement power being concentrated in the hands of the government and policymakers. Unless these policymakers are benevolent and able to make commitments, the structure of taxation must not only provide incentives to individuals, but also respect political economy constraints—that is, it should provide the appropriate incentives to policymakers. Despite the complex set of issues that arise in balancing private and public incentives, it is possible to develop a relatively a tractable framework for the analysis of how political economy constraints affect the structure of taxation.

To achieve this objective, we focused on the best sustainable equilibrium, i.e., the best equilibrium that satisfies the incentive compatibility constraints of politicians. We showed how *sustainable mechanisms*, where the politician in power is given incentives not to misuse resources and information, can be constructed in the infinite-horizon economy we study. An important result of our analysis is the *revelation principle along the equilibrium path*, which shows that truth-telling mechanisms can be used despite the commitment problems and the different interests of the government (politicians) and the citizens. Using this tool, we provided a characterization of the best sustainable mechanism. Political economy considerations introduce additional constraints on the optimal taxation problem, but these constraints are intuitive and relatively simple to characterize. In particular, we showed that the provision of incentives to politicians can be separated from the provision of incentives and insurance to agents. Political economy constraints, instead, take the form of additional constraints on aggregate consumption and labor supply in the economy. These constraints then lead to new (political economy) distortions and change the structure of taxation.

Our main results provide a characterization of these distortions and their evolution over time. We showed that when politicians are as patient as, or more patient than, citizens, aggregate capital and labor distortions disappear in the long run. The politician in power still receives rents, but these rents are provided without additional distortions. This result therefore implies that the insights from Mirrlees’ classical analysis and from the more recent dynamic taxation literature may generalize to certain environments featuring political economy constraints and commitment problems. However, we also show that when politicians are less patient than the citizens, aggregate distortions remain positive even asymptotically. In this case, in contrast to the classical results in optimal taxation, there will be positive distortions and positive aggregate capital taxes even in the long run. To the extent that smaller discount factors for politicians than for the citizens are a reasonable approximation to reality, our results also suggest a possible explanation for understanding distortionary long run taxes on labor and capital.

Our analysis relied on the infinite horizon nature of the economy and especially on the infinite planning horizon of the politicians. Nevertheless, similar can be developed even when politicians have finite horizons, and a detailed investigation of this issue would be an interesting area for future research. For example, we conjecture that in a model with either finitely-lived politicians or with term limits, a society consisting of infinitely-lived citizens or overlapping generations of citizens will be able to commit to providing a continuation value (e.g., “pension”) to politicians that have not deviated from the social plan. In this case, even though distortions will not disappear in the long run, they should decline during the tenure of the politician. Such a model would also enable an analysis of the effects of term limits and other realistic institutional constraints on politicians.

Appendix A: Properties of $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$

Some Technical Results

We first present some technical results that will be useful in establishing the properties of the functional $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$.

Definition A1 *Let X and Z be Banach spaces and $G : X \rightarrow Z$ be a vector-valued mapping. Suppose that G is continuously (Fréchet) differentiable in the neighborhood of x_0 with the derivative denoted by $G'(x_0)$. Then x_0 is said to be a **regular point** of G if $G'(x_0)$ maps X onto Z .*

Lemma A1 *Let X and Z be Banach spaces. Consider the maximization problem of*

$$P(u) = \max_{x \in X} f(x) \quad (47)$$

subject to

$$g_0(x) \leq u \quad (48)$$

and

$$G(x) \leq \mathbf{0} \quad (49)$$

where $f : X \rightarrow R$ and $g_0 : X \rightarrow R$ are real-valued functions and $G : X \rightarrow Z$ is a vector-valued mapping and $\mathbf{0}$ is the zero of the Banach space Z . Suppose that f is concave and g_0 is convex, and moreover that the solution at $u = 0$, x_0 , is a regular point. Let μ be any multiplier of (48). Then μ is a subgradient of $P(0)$.

Proof. This lemma is a direct generalization of Proposition 6.5.8 of Bertsekas, Nedic and Ozdaglar (2003, p. 382) to an infinite dimensional maximization problem. ■

Theorem A1 *Let X and Z be Banach spaces. Consider the maximization problem of*

$$P(\mathbf{u}) = \max_{x \in X} f(x)$$

subject to

$$G(x) \leq \mathbf{0} + \mathbf{u}$$

where $f : X \rightarrow R$ is a real-valued concave function and $G : X \rightarrow Z$ is a convex vector-valued mapping and $\mathbf{0}$ is the zero of the vector space Z and \mathbf{u} is a perturbation. Suppose that x_0 is a solution to this program. Suppose also that x_0 is a regular point of G and that f and G are continuously (Fréchet) differentiable in the neighborhood of x_0 . Then $P(\mathbf{0})$ is differentiable.

Proof. From Lemma A1, it follows that if there is a unique multiplier, P has a unique subgradient and is thus differentiable. Proposition 4.47 in Bonnans and Shapiro (2000) establishes that under a weaker constraint qualification condition than regularity, this problem has a unique multiplier. ■

Theorem A2 *Let X be a compact metric space, then the space of probability measures defined on X is a compact metric space with the weak topology.*

Proof. See Parthasarathy (1967, p. 45). ■

Randomizations

We next introduce randomizations to show concavity and differentiability of $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$. To simplify notation, in this appendix, we suppress dependence on public histories h^t . The original maximization problem without randomization is to maximize (9) subject to (10), (11), and (12) as stated in Proposition 1. Recall also that $\theta_t \in \Theta$, where Θ is a finite set (with $N + 1$ elements). Therefore Θ^t for any $t < \infty$ is also a finite set. Consider next the functions $c_t : \Theta^t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and $l_t : \Theta^t \rightarrow [0, \bar{l}]$. By definition, these functions assign values to a finite number of points in the set Θ^t for any $t < \infty$, thus can simply be thought of as vectors of $(N(N + 1))^t$ dimension. Moreover

$$\int c_t(\theta^t) dG(\theta^t) \leq \bar{Y}, K_{t+1} \leq \bar{Y} \text{ and } x_t \leq \bar{Y}, \quad (50)$$

where $\bar{Y} = F(\bar{Y}, \bar{l}) < \infty$. Therefore, $X_t = \{c_t(\theta^t), l(\theta^t), K_{t+1}, x_t\}$ is a vector (of dimension $(N(N + 1))^{2t} + 2$). Let \mathbf{X}_t be the set of all such vectors that satisfy the inequalities in (50), and for $X_t \in \mathbf{X}_t$, let $X_t(i)$ denote the i th component of this vector, and T_t be the dimension of vectors in the set \mathbf{X}_t (i.e., $T_t = (N(N + 1))^{2t} + 2$). \mathbf{X}_t is a compact metric space with the usual Euclidean distance metric, $d_t(X_t, X') = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{T_t} (X'_t(i) - X_t(i))^2\right)^{1/2}$

Let us now construct the product space of the \mathbf{X}_t 's

$$\mathbf{X} = \prod_{t=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{X}_t$$

Clearly the sequence $\{c_t(\theta^t), l_t(\theta^t), K_{t+1}, x_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ must belong to \mathbf{X} . In fact, it must belong to the subset of \mathbf{X} , which satisfy (10), (11), and (12), denoted by $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$.

Now by Tychonoff's theorem (e.g., Dudley, 2002, Theorem 2.2.8), \mathbf{X} is compact in the product topology. Since (10), (11), and (12) are (weak) inequalities, $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$ is a closed subset of \mathbf{X} , and therefore it is also compact in the product topology. Moreover, \mathbf{X} with the product topology is metrizable, with the metric

$$d(X, X') = \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \phi^t d_t(X_t, X'_t) \quad (51)$$

for some $\phi \in (0, 1)$ and $X \equiv \{X_t\}_{t=0}^\infty \in \mathbf{X}$. This shows that \mathbf{X} endowed with the product topology is a metric space, and so is $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$.

From Theorem A2, the set of probability measures defined over a compact metric space is compact in the weak topology. This establishes that the set of probability measures \mathcal{P}^∞ defined over $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$ is compact in the weak topology.

We are concerned not with all probability measures, but those that condition at t on information revealed up to t . Let $\mathcal{C} = \{(c, l) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 \leq c \leq \bar{c}, 0 \leq l \leq \bar{l}\}$ be the set of possible consumption-labor allocations for agents, so that \mathcal{P}^∞ defined above is the set of all probability measures over \mathcal{C}^∞ . Now, for each $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\theta^{t-1} \in \Theta^{t-1}$, let $\mathcal{P}[\theta^{t-1}]$ be the space of $N + 1$ -tuples of probability measures on Borel subsets of \mathcal{C} for an individual with history of reports θ^{t-1} . Thus each element $\zeta(\cdot | \theta^{t-1}) = [\zeta(\theta_0 | \theta^{t-1}), \dots, \zeta(\theta_N | \theta^{t-1})]$ in a $\mathcal{P}^t[\theta^{t-1}]$ consists of $N + 1$ probability measures for each type θ_i given their past reports, θ^{t-1} , and is thus closed. Consider $\mathcal{P} \equiv \bigcup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{\theta^t \in \Theta^t} \mathcal{P}^t[\theta^{t-1}]$, which is a closed subset of \mathcal{P}^∞ . Since a closed subset of a compact space is compact (e.g., Dudley, 2002, Theorem 2.2.2), \mathcal{P} is compact in the weak topology.

Finally, choosing $\phi \leq \beta$ in (51) shows that the objective function is continuous in the weak topology. This establishes that including randomizations, we have a maximization problem over probability measures in which the objective function is continuous in the weak topology, and the constraint set is compact in the weak topology, and thus there exists a probability measure that reaches the maximum.

Properties of $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$

We now established the main properties of $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$. The only additional restriction is that in all the proofs we assume that the solution to the maximization problem (9) is at a regular point. This needs to be imposed an assumption, since it is not possible to check that the solution is indeed at a regular point. Nevertheless, this assumption is not a strong one, since if the solution is not at their regular point, a perturbation of the utility functions or the production function should ensure that the solution shifts to a regular point (i.e., solutions that are not at regular points in this context are “non-generic,” though we do not present a precise mathematical statement of this property to economize on further notation and space).

Lemma A2 *$U(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$ is continuous and concave on Λ^∞ , nondecreasing in C_s and non-increasing in L_s for any s and differentiable in $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$.*

Proof. The above argument established that in the problem of maximizing (9) subject to (10), (11), and (12) over probability measures, a maximum exists and $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$ is

therefore well defined.

To show concavity, consider (C^0, L^0) and (C^1, L^1) and corresponding ζ^0, ζ^1 . We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int (u(c, l; \theta) - u(c, l; \hat{\theta})) \zeta^\alpha(d(c, l), \theta) \\ &= \alpha \int (u(c, l; \theta) - u(c, l; \hat{\theta})) \zeta^0(d(c, l), \theta) + (1 - \alpha) \int (u(c, l; \theta) - u(c, l; \hat{\theta})) \zeta^1(d(c, l), \theta) \\ &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

In a similar way we can show that ζ^α satisfies (10), (11), and (12), this convex combination is feasible and it gives the same utility as $\alpha \zeta^0 \cdot u(\theta) + (1 - \alpha) \zeta^1 \cdot u(\theta)$.

Next, note that the constraint set expands if C_s increases or L_s decreases for any s , therefore U must be weakly increasing in C_s and weakly decreasing in L_s .

Finally, returning to the original topology, $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$ is defined over a Banach space. Given the assumption that the solution to (9) is at their regular point, we can use Theorem A1 to conclude that $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$ is differentiable in $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$, completing the proof. ■

Lemma A3 Λ^∞ is compact and convex.

Proof. (Convexity) Consider $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ and $\{C'_t, L'_t\}_{t=0}^\infty \in \Lambda^\infty$ and some ζ^0, ζ^1 feasible for $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ and $\{C'_t, L'_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ respectively. Now for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ $\zeta^\alpha \equiv \alpha \zeta^0 + (1 - \alpha) \zeta^1$ is feasible for $(\alpha \{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty + (1 - \alpha) \{C'_t, L'_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$, so that this set is non-empty. Moreover, since ζ^0, ζ^1 satisfy the incentive compatibility constraints, ζ^α satisfies it as well. Similarly, ζ^α satisfies the constraints on aggregate $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$.

(Compactness) For any sequence $\{C_t^n, L_t^n\}_{t=0}^\infty \in \Lambda^\infty, \{C_t^n, L_t^n\}_{t=0}^\infty \rightarrow \{C_t^\infty, L_t^\infty\}_{t=0}^\infty$, there exists a sequence $\{\zeta^n\}_{t=0}^\infty$ corresponding to $\{C_t^n, L_t^n\}_{t=0}^\infty$, such that $\zeta^n \rightarrow \zeta^\infty$, satisfying the incentive compatibility, aggregate constraints and feasibility, therefore $\{C_t^\infty, L_t^\infty\}_{t=0}^\infty \in \Lambda^\infty$ is closed. Boundedness follows from boundedness of C and L . ■

Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. The first part is identical to Theorem 3 and Parts 2 and 3 follow readily Theorem 3 once we establish that $\beta = \varphi$. The rest of the proof establishes that $\beta = \varphi$ in this case.

By Theorem 2, the best sustainable mechanism also solves in the problem of maximizing (15) subject to incentive compatibility constraints (32), as well as (16) and (17) (for a given sequence $\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$). We now write this quasi-Mirrlees program explicitly taking into account randomizations. To simplify exposition, we focus on randomizations across individuals and ignore randomizations across different levels of x_t 's. Applying Caratheodory's Theorem (e.g., Proposition 1.3.1 in Bertsekas, Nedic and Ozdaglar, 2003, pp. 37-38) to the problem of

providing a certain level of utility to each type at a given date, it is sufficient to focus on a finite number of consumption levels for each type $\theta \in \Theta$ at each date. Let the set of these finite consumption levels for type θ at time t be $M_t(\theta)$. Denote these consumption levels for each $m(\theta) \in M_t(\theta)$ by $c_t^{m(\theta)}(\theta)$ for $\theta \in \Theta$ and time t , and denote the probability that this consumption level will be given to an individual who has announced his type as θ by $q_t^m(\theta)$. Finally, let us denote the probability that an individual will be of type θ by $\pi(\theta)$. Then the quasi-Mirrlees program can be written as

$$\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty) \equiv \max_{\{c_t^{m(\theta)}, l_t^{m(\theta)}\}_{t, m(\theta) \in M_t(\theta), \theta \in \Theta}} \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} \pi(\theta) \sum_{t=0}^\infty \beta^t \sum_{m(\theta) \in M_t(\theta)} \left[q_t^{m(\theta)}(\theta) u \left(c_t^{m(\theta)}(\theta), l_t^{m(\theta)}(\theta) \mid \theta \right) \right]$$

subject to the incentive compatibility constraints (equivalent of (32)), which take the form

$$\sum_{t=0}^\infty \beta^t \pi(\theta) \left[q_t^{m(\theta)}(\theta) u \left(c_t^{m(\theta)}(\theta), l_t^{m(\theta)}(\theta) \mid \theta \right) \right] \geq \sum_{t=0}^\infty \beta^t \sum_{m(\hat{\theta}) \in M_t(\theta)} \left[q_t^{m(\hat{\theta})}(\theta) u \left(c_t^{m(\hat{\theta})}(\hat{\theta}), l_t^{m(\hat{\theta})}(\hat{\theta}) \mid \theta \right) \right]$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$ and $\hat{\theta} \in \Theta$, and versions of (16) and (17), which take the form

$$\sum_{\theta \in \Theta} \sum_{m(\theta) \in M_t(\theta)} \pi(\theta) q_t^{m(\theta)}(\theta) c_t^{m(\theta)}(\theta) \leq C_t \quad (52)$$

$$\sum_{\theta \in \Theta} \sum_{m(\theta) \in M_t(\theta)} \pi(\theta) q_t^{m(\theta)}(\theta) l_t^{m(\theta)}(\theta) \geq L_t \quad (53)$$

for all t . Denote the multiplier of (52) by λ_t . Then, the differentiability of $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$ implies that $\mathcal{U}_{C_t}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty) = \lambda_t$. Let the multipliers for the incentive compatibility constraints be denoted by $\eta(\theta, \hat{\theta})$. There will exist a type θ^* , typically the highest type θ_N , such that $\eta(\theta, \theta^*) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$. Then the first-order conditions with respect to consumption allocations in the quasi-Mirrlees program imply

$$\beta^t u_c \left(c_t^{m(\theta^*)}(\theta^*), l_t^{m(\theta^*)}(\theta^*) \mid \theta^* \right) \left[1 + \sum_{\theta \neq \theta^*} \eta(\theta^*, \theta) \right] = \lambda_t. \quad (54)$$

Note that $1 + \sum_{\theta \neq \theta^*} \eta(\theta^*, \theta)$ here is a constant independent of time and we denote it by $\bar{\eta}$. Since the (stochastic) sequences $\{c_t(\theta)\}_{t=0}^\infty$ and $\{l_t(\theta)\}_{t=0}^\infty$ are bounded by feasibility and u is continuously differentiable, $\left\{ u_c \left(c_t^{m(\theta)}(\theta), l_t^{m(\theta)}(\theta) \mid \theta \right) \right\}_{t=0}^\infty$ is a bounded stochastic sequence.

Fix a sequence $\{m_t(\theta^*)\}$ such that $m_t(\theta^*) \in M_t(\theta^*)$ for all t and $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} q_t^{m_t(\theta^*)} > 0$ (such a sequence clearly exists). Then, every subsequence of $\left\{ u_c \left(c_t^{m_t(\theta^*)}(\theta^*), l_t^{m_t(\theta^*)}(\theta^*) \mid \theta^* \right) \right\}_{t=0}^\infty$ is bounded, and in particular, $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} u_c \left(c_t^{m_t(\theta^*)}(\theta^*), l_t^{m_t(\theta^*)}(\theta^*) \mid \theta^* \right) = \bar{u}_c^*$ and $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} u_c \left(c_t^{m_t(\theta^*)}(\theta^*), l_t^{m_t(\theta^*)}(\theta^*) \mid \theta^* \right) = \underline{u}_c^*$ exist. This implies from (54) that for t sufficiently large, λ_t is sandwiched between $\beta^t \bar{u}_c^* \bar{\eta}$ and $\beta^t \underline{u}_c^* \bar{\eta}$. Therefore, either $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \beta^{-t} \lambda_t = \underline{u}_c^* \bar{\eta}$ or $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \beta^{-t} \lambda_t = \bar{u}_c^* \bar{\eta}$. In either case, $\varphi \equiv \inf \{ \varrho \in (0, 1] : \text{plim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} \varrho^{-t} \mathcal{U}_{C_t}^* = 0 \} = \beta$, establishing that $\varphi = \beta$. This completes the proof of the theorem. ■

Appendix B: Proofs for Section 9

Proof of Theorem 6

The proof of this theorem follows the structure of the proofs of Lemma 1, Theorem 1 and Proposition 1. The main difference here is that instead of replacing the politician, citizens play a null strategy of supplying zero labor.

Proof. Define the following combination. Denote $\tilde{c}'_t = \tilde{c}'_t{}^\emptyset$ be the mapping that allocates zero consumption to all individuals irrespective of past and current reports. Let $\tilde{h}^t = \hat{h}^t$ if $\tilde{x}_{t-s}(\tilde{h}^{t-s}) = x_{t-s}(\hat{h}^{t-s})$ and $\tilde{M}_{t-s} = M_{t-s}$ for all $s > 0$. Then the following strategy combination would ensure $v_t^c(\tilde{K}'_{t+1}, \tilde{c}'_t | \tilde{M}^t) = 0$ for all t : (1) for the citizens, $\underline{\alpha} = (\tilde{\alpha} | \alpha^\emptyset)$, for some $\tilde{\alpha}$, which means that for each citizen i and for all t , we have that if $\tilde{h}^{t-1} = \hat{h}^{t-1}$, then $\alpha_t^i = \tilde{\alpha}$, and if $\tilde{h}^{t-1} \neq \hat{h}^{t-1}$, then $\alpha_t^i = \alpha^\emptyset$; (2) for the politician, Γ , such that if $\tilde{h}^{t-1} = \hat{h}^{t-1}$, then Γ involves $\tilde{x}_t = x_t$, $\tilde{M}_t = M_t$, and $\xi_t = 0$ for all $\tilde{h}^t \in \tilde{H}^t$; and if $\tilde{h}^{t-1} \neq \hat{h}^{t-1}$, then it involves $\xi_t = 1$, $\tilde{x}'_t = F(K_t, L_t)$ for all $\tilde{h}^t \in \tilde{H}^t$, and $\tilde{c}'_t = \tilde{c}'_t{}^\emptyset$.

A difference from the proof with Lemma 1 is that we need to show that there exists a sequentially rational continuation play in which all agents supply zero labor. Suppose that the government has announced a submechanism \tilde{M}_t at time t and has capital stock K_t , and $\alpha_{t+s}^i = \alpha^\emptyset$ for all $i \in [0, 1]$ and for all $s \geq 0$. We first show that a deviation by an individual, i' with type $\theta_t^{i'} \neq \theta_0$ to some other strategy that involves supplying positive labor is not profitable (we think of an individual with positive measure ε deviating, and take the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, since there is a continuum of agents). Without the deviation, i' obtains utility $u(0)/(1-\beta)$ (since from Assumption 1', $\chi(0 | \theta) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$ and there will be no labor supply for any type in the continuation game). Now imagine a deviation to a message that corresponds to positive labor supply, say l' , with $\chi(l' | \theta_t^{i'}) > \chi(0 | \theta_t^{i'}) = 0$ by definition. This will generate output $F(K_t, \varepsilon l')$, since all other agents are supplying zero labor. Now imagine the behavior of the government at the last stage of the game, conditional on $\alpha_{t+s}^i = \alpha^\emptyset$ for all $i \in [0, 1]$ and for all $s \geq 1$. Then the sequentially rational strategy of the government is to maximize (45) with $K_{t+1} = 0$, since there will be no production in future periods. Consequently, the utility-maximizing program of the government in the information set following the deviation is:

$$\max_{\tilde{x}'_t, \tilde{c}'_t} (1-a)v(x_t) + a \left(\int [u(\tilde{c}'_t(z^t(\alpha_t(\theta^t)))) - \chi(l_t(z^t(\alpha_t(\theta^t))) | \theta_t)] dG^t(\theta^t) \right),$$

subject to $x_t + \int \tilde{c}'_t(z^t(\alpha_t(\theta^t))) dG^t(\theta^t) \leq F(K_t, \varepsilon l')$, where recall that $z^t(\alpha_t(\theta^t))$ is the history of reports up to time t by an individual of type θ^t given strategy profile $\underline{\alpha}$. In view of Assumption 1', this expression is concave in c for any strategy profile $\underline{\alpha}$, so the optimal

policy for the government in this information set is to redistribute consumption (what it does not consume itself) equally across agents, i.e., $\tilde{c}'_t(z^t(\alpha_t(\theta^t))) = c_t$ for all $z^t(\alpha_t(\theta^t)) \in Z^t$. This implies that as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, $c_t \rightarrow 0$, and thus the deviation payoff of i' is $u(0) - \chi(l' | \theta^{i'}) + \beta(u(0) - \chi(0 | \theta^{i'})) / (1 - \beta) < (u(0) - \chi(0 | \theta^{i'})) / (1 - \beta)$, showing that a continuation strategy profile where all agents supply zero labor is sequentially rational.

Now consider two different types of deviations by the government. First, imagine the government offers $\tilde{M}_t \neq M_t$, i.e., a different mechanism at the beginning of time t than the one implicitly agreed in the social plan (M, x) . Given the above-constructed continuation equilibrium, $\alpha_{t+s}^i = \alpha^\emptyset$ for all $i \in [0, 1]$ and for all $s \geq 0$ is a best response against this deviation. Since maximal punishments are optimal, $\alpha_{t+s}^i = \alpha^\emptyset$ for all $i \in [0, 1]$ and for all $s \geq 0$ is optimal against this deviation, implying that such a deviation would never be profitable for the government.

Second, the government can deviate at the last stage of time t . Again $\alpha_{t+s}^i = \alpha^\emptyset$ for all $i \in [0, 1]$ and for all $s \geq 1$ is the maximal sequentially rational punishment against such a deviation. Consequently, after any deviation by the government, there will not be any further production. Thus the optimal deviation for the government involves $\tilde{K}'_{t+1} = 0$, and again exploiting the concavity of the government's continuation payoff in c , the sustainability constraint is equivalent to:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_t \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \delta^s \left[(1-a)v(x_{t+s}) + a\mathbb{E}_{t+s} \left(\int [u(c_t(z^t(\alpha_t(\theta^t)))) - \chi(l_t(z^t(\alpha_t(\theta^t))) | \theta_t)] dG^t(\theta^t) \right) \right] \\ & \geq \max_{\tilde{x}'_t + \tilde{c}'_t \leq F(K_t, L_t)} (1-a)v(\tilde{x}_t) + a \int u\tilde{c}'_t(\theta^t) dG^t(\theta^t) \text{ for all } t. \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

Now, given an equilibrium pair of strategy profiles Γ and $\underline{\alpha}$, exactly the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 1 implies that there exists another pair of equilibrium strategy profiles Γ^* and $\underline{\alpha}^* = (\alpha^* | \alpha')$ for some α' such that Γ^* induces direct submechanisms. Consequently, we can write (55), in terms of a direct mechanism, which gives (46).

Finally, the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 1 implies that the best sustainable mechanism is a solution to maximizing (9) subject to (10), (11), and the sustainability constraints of the government given by (46). ■

Proof of Theorem 7

Proof. Suppose again that there are $N+1$ types, i.e., $\Theta = \{\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_N\}$, ranked in ascending order of skills, and with respective probabilities $\{\pi_0, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_N\}$. Given the assumptions of the

theorem (and again suppressing h^t -dependence to simplify notation), we can write the program for the best sustainable mechanism as:

$$\max_{\{c_t(\theta_i), l_t(\theta_i)\}_{i=0, x_t, K_{t+1}}^N}_{t=0}^{\infty} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \sum_{i=0}^N \pi_i [u(c_t(\theta_i)) - \chi(l_t(\theta_i) | \theta_i)]$$

subject to the constraints

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t [u(c_t(\theta_i)) - \chi(l_t(\theta_i) | \theta_i)] \geq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t [u(c_t(\theta_{i-1})) - \chi(l_t(\theta_{i-1}) | \theta_i)] \quad (56)$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, N$,

$$\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \beta^{t+s} \left\{ (1-a)v(x_{t+s}) + a \left(\sum_{i=0}^N \pi_i [u(c_{t+s}(\theta_i)) - \chi(l_{t+s}(\theta_i) | \theta_i)] \right) \right\} \geq V(K_t, L_t) \quad (57)$$

for all t , and

$$x_t + K_{t+1} + \sum_{i=0}^N \pi_i u(c_t(\theta_i)) \leq F \left(K_t, \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i l_t(\theta_i | \theta_i) \right) \quad (58)$$

for all t , and that $c_t(\theta_i) \geq 0$ for all i and t and $x_t \geq 0$ for all t .

The first set of constraints, (56), ensure incentive compatibility for the citizens. Given Theorem 6, there is truthful revelation along the equilibrium path. This, together with Assumption 5, implies that we only need one constraint for each type other than the disabled type, θ_0 , where type i could deviate to claim to be type $i-1$. The second set of constraints, (57), one for each date, impose sustainability, with the definition $V(K_t, L_t) \equiv \max_{\tilde{x}'_t + \tilde{c}'_t \leq F(K_t, L_t)} (1-a)v(\tilde{x}'_t) + a \sum_{i=0}^N \pi_i u(\tilde{c}'_t(\theta_i))$, and finally, the last set of constraints, one for each date, impose the aggregate resource constraint.

We again follow Marcet and Marimon (1998) and form the Lagrangian:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i [u(c_t(\theta_i)) - \chi(l_t(\theta_i) | \theta_i)] \\ & + \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \mu_t \left\{ (1-a)v(x_t) + a \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i [u(c_t(\theta_i)) - \chi(l_t(\theta_i) | \theta_i)] \right\} \\ & - \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t (\mu_t - \mu_{t-1}) V \left(K_t, \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i l_t(\theta_i | \theta_i) \right) \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \{ [u(c_t(\theta_i)) - \chi(l_t(\theta_i) | \theta_i)] - [u(c_t(\theta_{i-1})) - \chi(l_t(\theta_{i-1}) | \theta_i)] \} \right\} \\ & - \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \eta_t \left\{ x_t + K_{t+1} + \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i c_t(\theta_i) - F \left(K_t, \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i l_t(\theta_i | \theta_i) \right) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where λ_i is the multiplier on the incentive-compatibility constraint of type i , $\beta^t \eta_t$ is the multiplier on the resource constraint at time t , and we have left the constraints that $c_t(\theta_i) \geq 0$ for all i and t and $x_t \geq 0$ for all t implicit.

For $c_t(\theta_i) > 0$ and $x_t > 0$, we can take first-order conditions, which, after canceling out the β^t terms and defining $\lambda_0 = 0$ and $\lambda_{N+1} = 0$, yield:

$$(1 + a\mu_t) \pi_i u'(c_t(\theta_i)) + (\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}) u'(c_t(\theta_i)) - \eta_t \pi_i = 0 \text{ for all } i = 0, \dots, N \text{ and all } t, \quad (59)$$

$$(1 + a\mu_t) \pi_i \chi'(l_t(\theta_i) | \theta_i) + (\lambda_i \chi'(l_t(\theta_i) | \theta_i) - \lambda_{i+1} \chi'(l_t(\theta_i) | \theta_{i+1})) \quad (60)$$

$$+ (\mu_t - \mu_{t-1}) \pi_i V_L(K_t, L_t) - \eta_t \pi_i F_L(K_t, L_t) = 0 \text{ for all } i = 0, \dots, N \text{ and all } t,$$

$$- (\mu_t - \mu_{t-1}) V_K(K_t, L_t) + \eta_t F_K(K_t, L_t) - \beta^{-1} \eta_{t-1} = 0 \text{ for all } t, \quad (61)$$

$$\mu_t (1 - a) v'(x_t) = \eta_t \text{ for all } t. \quad (62)$$

Recall that $\{\mu_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ is a nondecreasing sequence, thus it possesses a unique limit point on the extended real line. First suppose that $\mu_t \rightarrow \mu^* < \infty$, then (59)-(62) establishes that there exists an allocation with $\eta_t \rightarrow \eta^*$, $c_t(\theta_i) \rightarrow c_i^* > 0$ for all i , and $x_t \rightarrow x^*$, in which distortions disappear as claimed in the theorem.

To complete the proof, we need to show that there does not exist any solution to the above maximization problem with $\mu_t \rightarrow \infty$. To obtain a contradiction suppose that $\mu_t \rightarrow \infty$. Combine (59) for type N with (62) and using the fact that $\mu_{t+1} \geq \mu_t > 0$ and that $\lambda_{N+1} = 0$ (by definition), we have that for all $c_t(\theta_N) > 0$ and $x_t > 0$,

$$\frac{\left(1 + \frac{\lambda_N}{\pi_N}\right)}{(1 - a) \frac{v'(x_t)}{u'(c_t(\theta_N))} - a} = \mu_t \leq \mu_{t+1} = \frac{\left(1 + \frac{\lambda_N}{\pi_N}\right)}{(1 - a) \frac{v'(x_{t+1})}{u'(c_{t+1}(\theta_N))} - a}. \quad (63)$$

Both sides of this equation are strictly positive by the fact that $\mu_{t+1} \geq \mu_t > 0$. The hypothesis that $\mu_t \rightarrow \infty$ implies that as $t \rightarrow \infty$, $\mu_t < \mu_{t+1}$.

Next combine (59) for some i and $i' \neq i$ to obtain:

$$u'(c_t(\theta_i)) + \frac{(\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1})}{\pi_i (1 + a\mu_t)} u'(c_t(\theta_i)) = u'(c_t(\theta_{i'})) + \frac{(\lambda_{i'} - \lambda_{i'+1})}{\pi_{i'} (1 + a\mu_t)} u'(c_t(\theta_{i'})). \quad (64)$$

The fact that $\mu_t \rightarrow \infty$ implies that as $t \rightarrow \infty$, $|c_t(\theta_i) - c_t(\theta_{i'})| \rightarrow 0$. This argument then establishes that $c_t(\theta_i) \downarrow c^*$ for all $i = 0, \dots, N$. From the freedom of labor supply, this also implies that we must have $l_t(\theta_i) \downarrow l^* = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$, since otherwise at some point all $\theta_i \neq \theta_0$ would claim to have become disabled). From Assumption 2 and the resource constraint, this also implies that as $t \rightarrow \infty$, $c_t(\theta_i) \downarrow 0$ for all $i = 0, \dots, N$ and $x_t \downarrow 0$.

Now, suppose first that $l^* = 0$ and $c^* = 0$ are reached in finite time, i.e., $c_{t'}(\theta_i) = 0$ for all i and all $t \geq t'$ for some $t' < \infty$. We will show that this cannot be part of a sustainable mechanism. We have that for all $t \geq t'$, $c_t(\theta_i) = l_t(\theta_i) = 0$ for all i and $x_t = 0$, so the continuation utility of the government is $(1 - a)u(0)/(1 - \delta)$ (since $v(0) = 0$ and $\chi(0 | \cdot) = 0$). However, by hypothesis, $c_{t'-1}(\theta_i) > 0$ for at least some i , so there is positive output at $t' - 1$. Moreover, from (64), $c_{t'-1}(\theta_i) \neq c_{t'-1}(\theta_{i'})$ for some i and i' . This implies that the government would prefer to deviate at $t' - 1$ to $\xi_{t'-1} = 1$, and redistribute the output between x_t and equal consumption across all individuals (i.e., $c_{t'-1}(\theta_i) = c_{t'-1}^*$ for all i and some $c_{t'-1}^*$). This deviation will necessarily increase government utility at $t' - 1$ (since $c_{t'-1}(\theta_i) \neq c_{t'-1}(\theta_{i'})$ for all i and i' in the original allocation), and its continuation utility from t' onwards would still remain at $(1 - a)u(0)/(1 - \delta)$. Since this argument applies for any $t' > 0$, it proves that there cannot be a sustainable mechanism that reaches $l^* = 0$ and $c^* = 0$ in finite time. Hence, it must be the case that $c_t(\theta_i) \downarrow 0$ and $l_t(\theta_i) \downarrow 0$, but $c_t(\theta_i) > 0$ for all t . Then, combining (63) and (64) implies that, as long as $au'(0) \neq (1 - a)v'(0)$, $\mu_{t+1} - \mu_t \downarrow 0$, contradicting $\mu_t \rightarrow \infty$, and thus establishing the theorem. ■

Proof of Theorem 8

Proof. In this case, the best sustainable mechanism can be represented as the solution to the following maximization problem:

$$\mathbf{MAX}_2 : \mathbf{U}^{SM} = \max_{\{c_t(\cdot), l_t(\cdot), x_t, K_{t+1}\}_{t=0}^{\infty}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(c_t((\theta^{i,t})), l_t(\theta^{i,t}) | \theta_t^i) \right]$$

subject to the initial capital stock $K_0 > 0$, (10), (11) and the modified sustainability constraint,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \delta^s \{(1 - a)v(x_{t+s}) + au(c_t((\theta^{i,t})), l_t(\theta^{i,t}) | \theta_t^i)\} \right] \geq v(F(K_t, L_t)), \quad (65)$$

which again takes into account that after deviation there will be zero labor supply and thus the highest continuation value of the government after deviation is $v(F(K_t, L_t))$. As before, denote the Lagrange multipliers on the sustainability constraint by $\delta^t \psi_t$, with $\mu_t = \mu_{t-1} + \psi_t$, and rewrite \mathbf{MAX}_2 recursively as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{MAX}_2 : \mathbf{U}^{SM} = & \max_{\{c_t(\cdot), l_t(\cdot), x_t, K_{t+1}\}_{t=0}^{\infty}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(c_t((\theta^{i,t})), l_t(\theta^{i,t}) | \theta_t^i) + \mu_t \delta^t au(c_t((\theta^{i,t})), l_t(\theta^{i,t}) | \theta_t^i) \right] \\ & + \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta^t \{\mu_t (1 - a)v(x_t) - (\mu_t - \mu_{t-1})v(F(K_t, L_t))\} \end{aligned}$$

subject to (10) and (11). Denote the Lagrange multipliers in the solution to this problem by $\{\mu_t^*\}$. Then as in the text, consider the quasi-Mirrlees program corresponding to \mathbf{MAX}_2 , which is given by

$$\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty; \{\mu_t^*\}_{t=0}^\infty) \equiv \max_{\{c_t(\theta^t), l_t(\theta^t)\}_{t=0}^\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^\infty (\beta^t + \mu_t^* \delta^t a) u(c_t(\theta^{i,t}), l_t(\theta^{i,t}) \mid \theta_t^i) \right]$$

subject to (11), and the two additional constraints,

$$\int c_t(\theta^t) dG(\theta^t) \leq C_t,$$

and

$$\int l_t(\theta^t) dG(\theta^t) \geq L_t.$$

Here $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty; \{\mu_t^*\}_{t=0}^\infty)$ has exactly the same interpretation as $\mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty)$ in the text, except that it is also a function of the sequence of Lagrange multipliers. Then, with the same arguments as in the text, the maximization problem \mathbf{MAX}_2 becomes

$$\max_{\{C_t, L_t, x_t, K_t\}_{t=0}^\infty} \mathcal{U}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty; \{\mu_t^*\}_{t=0}^\infty) + \sum_{t=0}^\infty \delta^t \{ \mu_t^* (1-a) v(x_t) - (\mu_t^* - \mu_{t-1}^*) v(F(K_t, L_t)) \}$$

subject to (10) and (65).

Proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 3, we obtain

$$\frac{\mathcal{U}_{C_t}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty; \{\mu_t^*\}_{t=0}^\infty)}{\alpha \delta^t v'(x_t)} = \mu_t^* \leq \mu_{t+1}^* = \frac{\mathcal{U}_{C_{t+1}}(\{C_t, L_t\}_{t=0}^\infty; \{\mu_t^*\}_{t=0}^\infty)}{\alpha \delta^{t+1} v'(x_{t+1})}.$$

Using the definition of φ , this can be rewritten as

$$\frac{\varphi^t \mathcal{U}_{C^*}^*}{(1-a) \delta^t v'(x^*)} = \mu_t^* \leq \mu_{t+1}^* = \frac{\varphi^{t+1} \mathcal{U}_{C^*}^*}{(1-a) \delta^{t+1} v'(x^*)} \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

which is identical to (31) in the proof of Theorem 3, and the rest of that proof applies and yields the conclusions in the theorem. In particular, when $\varphi = \delta$, then we must have $\mu_t^* \rightarrow \bar{\mu}^*$ and distortions disappear. If, on the other hand, $\varphi > \delta$, $\mu_{t+1}^* > \mu_t^*$ and those $\psi_t > 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and asymptotic distortions remain. ■

A References

Abreu, Dilip (1988) “On the Theory of Repeated Games with Discounting” *Econometrica*, 56, 383-396.

Acemoglu, Daron (2007) “Modeling Inefficient Institutions,” *Advances in Economic Theory, Proceedings of World Congress 2005*, edited by Richard Blundell, Whitney Newey, and Torsten Persson, Cambridge University Press.

Acemoglu, Daron, Michael Golosov and Aleh Tsyvinski (2006) “Markets Versus Governments: Political Economy of Mechanisms” NBER Working Paper No 12224.

Acemoglu, Daron, Michael Golosov and Aleh Tsyvinski (2007a) “Political Economy of Mechanisms,” forthcoming *Econometrica*.

Acemoglu, Daron, Michael Golosov and Aleh Tsyvinski (2007b) “Markets Versus Governments,” forthcoming *Journal of Monetary Economics, Carnegie-Rochester Conference Proceedings*.

Acemoglu, Daron and James Robinson (2006) *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, Cambridge University Press.

Albanesi, Stefania and Roc Armenter (2007) “Intertemporal Distortions in the Second Best”, NBER Working Paper #13629.

Albanesi, Stefania and Christopher Sleet (2005) “Dynamic Optimal Taxation with Private Information”, *Review of Economic Studies*, 72, 1-29.

Austen-Smith, David, and Jeffrey S. Banks (1999) *Positive Political Theory I: Collective Preference*. Ann Arbor MI: University of Michigan Press.

Barro, Robert (1973) “The Control of Politicians: An Economic Model,” *Public Choice*, 14, 19-42.

Battaglini, Marco and Stephen Coate (2006) “A Dynamic Theory of Spending, Taxation, and Debt” NBER Working Paper #12100.

Bertsekas, Dimitri, Angelia Nedic and Asuman Ozdaglar (2003) *Convex Analysis and Optimization*, Athena Scientific Boston.

Bester, Helmut and Richard Strausz (2001) “Contracting with Imperfect Commitment and the Revelation Principle: The Single Agent Case.” *Econometrica*, 69, 1077-1098.

Bisin, Alberto and Adriano Rampini (2005) “Markets as Beneficial Constraints on the Government”, *Journal of Public Economics*, 90, 601-629.

Bonnans, J. Frederic and Alexander Shapiro (2000) *Perturbation Analysis of Optimization Problems*, Springer Series in Operations Research, Springer, New York.

Buchanan, James M. and Gordon Tullock (1962) *The Calculus of Consent*. Ann

Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Chamley, Christophe (1986) “Optimal Taxation of Capital Income in General Equilibrium and Infinite Lives” *Econometrica*, 54, 607-622.

Chari, V.V. and Patrick Kehoe (1990) “Sustainable Plans” *Journal of Political Economy*, 94, 783-802.

Chari, V.V. and Patrick Kehoe (1990) “Sustainable Plans and Mutual Default” *Review of Economic Studies*, 60, 175-195.

Dasgupta, Partha, Peter Hammond and Eric Maskin (1979) “The Implementation of Social Choice Rules: Some General Results on Incentive Compatibility”, *Review of Economic Studies*, 46(2), 185-216

Dixit, Avinash K. (2004) *Lawlessness and Economics: Alternative Modes of Governance*, Princeton; Princeton University Press.

Ferejohn, John (1986) “Incumbent Performance and Electoral Control,” *Public Choice*, 50, 5-25.

Freixas, Xavier, Roger Guesnerie and Jean Tirole (1985) “Planning under Incomplete Information and the Ratchet Effect” *Review of Economic Studies*, 52, 173-192.

Golosov, Michael, Narayana Kocherlakota and Aleh Tsyvinski (2003) “Optimal Indirect and Capital Taxation”, *Review of Economic Studies*, 70, 569-587.

Golosov, Michael, Aleh Tsyvinski, and Ivan Werning (2006) “New Dynamic Public Finance: A User’s Guide”, *NBER Macroeconomics Annual 2006*.

Harris, Milton and Bengt Holmstrom (1982) “A Theory of Wage Dynamics” *Review of Economic Studies*, 49, 315-333.

Hassler, John, Per Krusell, Kjetil Storesletten and Fabrizio Zilibotti (2005) “The Dynamics of Government: A Positive Analysis,” mimeo, Stockholm.

Judd, Kenneth (1985) “Redistributive Taxation in a Simple Perfect Foresight Model” *Journal of Public Economics*, 28, 59-83.

Kocherlakota, Narayana (2005) “Zero Expected Wealth Taxes: A Mirrlees Approach to Dynamic Optimal Taxation”, *Econometrica*, 73(5), 1587-1621.

Krusell, Per and José-Victor Rios-Rull (1999) “On the Size of Government: Political Economy in the Neoclassical Growth Model,” *American Economic Review*, 89(5), 1156–1181.

Luenberger, David G. (1969) *Optimization by Vector Space Methods*, John Wiley & Sons New York.

Marcet, Albert and Ramon Marimon (1998) “Recursive Contracts”. Mimeo. University of Pompeu Fabra

Mas-Colell, Andreu, Michael D. Whinston and Jerry R. Green (1995) *Microeco-*

conomic Theory, Oxford University Press, New York, Oxford

Mirrlees, James A. (1971) “An exploration in the theory of optimum income taxation”, *Review of Economic Studies* 38, 175-208.

North, Douglass C. (1981) *Structure and Change in Economic History*, W.W. Norton & Co., New York.

North, Douglass C. and Robert P. Thomas (1973) *The Rise of the Western World: A New Economic History*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK.

North, Douglass C. and Barry R. Weingast (1989) “Constitutions and Commitment: Evolution of Institutions Governing Public Choice in Seventeenth Century England”, *Journal of Economic History*, 49, 803-832.

Olson, Mancur (1982) *The Rise and Decline of Nations: Economic Growth, Stagflation, and Economic Rigidities*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London.

Parthasarathy, K. R. (1967) *Probity Measures on Metric Spaces*, Academic Press, New York.

Persson, Torsten and Guido Tabellini (2000) *Political Economics: Explaining Economic Policy*, The MIT Press, Cambridge MA

Ray, Debraj (2002) “Time Structure of Self-Enforcing Agreements” *Econometrica*, 70, 547-82.

Roberts, Kevin (1984) “Theoretical Limits to Redistribution” *Review of Economic Studies*, 51, 177-195.

Skreta, Vasiliki (2006) "Optimal Auction Design under Non-Commitment", mimeo.

Skreta, Vasiliki (2007) “Sequentially Optimal Mechanisms” *Review of Economic Studies*, 73, pp. 1085-1111.

Sleet, Christopher and Sevin Yeltekin (2004) “Credibility and Endogenous Social Discounting,” *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 9, 410-437.

Uhlig, Harald (1996) “A Law of Large Numbers for Large Economies” *Economic Theory*, 8, 41-50.

Werning, Ivan (2002) “Optimal Dynamic Taxation and Social Insurance”, University of Chicago Ph.D. dissertation.