

INCOME TAXES, PROPERTY VALUES, AND MIGRATION

AMIHAI GLAZER
VESA KANNIAINEN
PANU POUTVAARA

CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 1075
CATEGORY 1: PUBLIC FINANCE
NOVEMBER 2003

An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded

- *from the SSRN website:* www.SSRN.com
- *from the CESifo website:* www.CESifo.de

INCOME TAXES, PROPERTY VALUES, AND MIGRATION

Abstract

We consider taxation by a Leviathan government and by a utilitarian government in the presence of heterogeneous locations within a country, when migration from one country to another is and is not possible. In a closed economy, a utilitarian government may transfer income from the poor to the rich to reduce rents earned by absentee landlords. When the rich are mobile, a tax on them induces little migration because the tax will reduce the rents on land inhabited by the rich. A race to the bottom need not appear.

JEL Classification: H21, H7 R21, R23.

Keywords: taxes, land rents, property values, migration, redistribution.

Amihai Glazer
Department of Economics
University of California, Irvine
Irvine, CA 92697
USA
aglazer@uci.edu

Vesa Kannianen
Department of Economics
University of Helsinki
P.O. Box 54
FIN-00014 University of Helsinki
Finland
kannian@valt.helsinki.fi

Panu Poutvaara
Centre for Economic and Business Research
Langelinie Alle 17
DK-2100 Copenhagen
Denmark
panu.poutvaara@cebr.dk

Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the research seminar of Department of Economics, University of Helsinki and at the Area Conference on Public Economics, CESifo, Munich. We thank Marko Köthenbürger, Niku Määttänen and Matthias Wrede for helpful comments on those drafts. The revision was completed while Poutvaara enjoyed the hospitality of CES in Munich.

1 Introduction

A state or other jurisdiction which imposes high taxes on the rich may induce some residents to move away. Such migration would appear to limit a state's ability to redistribute income or to finance generous social benefits. The problem may generate a "race to the bottom," with each state attempting to attract rich residents by taxing them at a lower rate than other states do; the equilibrium may have no redistributive taxes. Despite this theoretical possibility, we see governments engaged in large redistribution. Migration may be limited for several reasons: moving is costly; people prefer one location over another; property values decline in response to higher taxes, thereby reducing the incentives to move.

This paper examines the last two considerations. In particular, we suppose that good locations are scarce in any jurisdiction: people who want to live near the beach or on top of a mountain with a gorgeous view will find such locations limited.¹ We shall see that a small income tax imposed on the rich in a jurisdiction with heterogeneous locations reduces property values in desirable locations, reduces the utility of each rich person, and increases the utility of each poor person. Tax incidence, however, is complicated because a person's utility depends on three elements: his post-tax income, the rent he pays, and the location where he lives. The incomes of rich people, after paying taxes and rents, fall, but by differing amounts. Property values also fall, hurting landlords. These results, which relate to the research tradition in urban economics, thus extend the conventional public finance view on

¹The scarcity of desirable locations may also make the property tax attractive. We focus, however, on an income tax imposed on rich persons, with labor supply inelastic.

taxes and migration.

We find that incorporating the insights of urban economics, namely that taxes are partly capitalized in property values and rents, can change some conventional results in the public finance literature. A key insight of the literature on tax competition is that mobility of tax payers reduces the scope for redistribution, and that governments will impose low taxes on persons who may leave the country. This would imply that a utilitarian government which aims to transfer income from the rich to the poor would engage in less redistribution if the rich can emigrate. We find instead that migration can increase redistribution. We also find that even when taxation does not distort labor supply, a utilitarian government in a closed economy does not fully equalize incomes; it may even redistribute from the poor to the rich. But a utilitarian government will not impose a regressive tax if migration is possible.

2 Literature

Taxes and migration The economic analysis of tax competition owes much to Tiebout (1956). Analytic models began with studies of the incidence of local property taxation (Mieszkowski (1972), and Zodrow (2001)). Wilson (1999) reviews the conflict between the view of tax competition as wasteful and the view of it as efficiency-enhancing. The effects of taxes on migration is a central topic in studies of international tax competition; see, for example, Wildasin (1994) and Sinn (1997). Christiansen, Hagen and Sandmo (1994) show how differences in average income tax rates affect migration. Though migration is influenced by relative employment and earnings opportunities, they are considered elsewhere, and we do

not.² Wilson (2003) nicely summarizes and extends the results concerning property values and land taxation.

Voting Several papers consider the tax rates that a majority of voters in a jurisdiction will adopt; see Westhoff (1977), Epple, Filimon, and Romer (1984), Epple and Romer (1991), and Goodspeed (1989). The models assume that households differ along a single dimension, typically income. In these models, an appropriately defined marginal rate of substitution is assumed to vary monotonically across household. Use of such a monotonicity condition on the marginal rate of substitution was first introduced by Ellickson (1971). Under this assumption, households will be perfectly stratified by income across jurisdictions.

Epple and Platt (1998) model local jurisdictions in which households differ in both income and tastes, and can thus generate less stark income stratification. Hindricks (1999) considers how redistribution affects mobility, which in turn determines the identity of the voters and the levels of redistribution they favor.

Taxes and property values The effects of taxes on property values and on migration are studied by Epple and Romer (1991). They argue that though local redistribution induces sorting of the population, the induced changes in property values make redistribution feasible. But whereas in Epple and Romer (1991) land is homogeneous, in our model some locations

²See Bover, Muellbauer, and Murphy (1989) for labor market aspects and Haavio and Kauppi (2002) for the effects of liquidity constraints. Cameron and Muellbauer (1998) consider commuting as an alternative to migration. Wildasin (2003) provides a recent overview.

are preferred to others.³ We show that this leads to different implications even when people have identical preferences. Epple and Platt (1998) study redistribution in a system of local jurisdictions when households differ in their preferences and in their incomes. In most models, complete income stratification is a necessary condition for equilibrium. In our model the equilibrium can have rich people live in all communities.

Hansen and Kessler (2001) study the interaction of mobility and taxation, but with a focus different from ours. Their model explains why tax rates are lower in small countries than in large ones. People have different incomes and migration arises from self-selection. In their model, the political equilibrium has rich people voting for low taxes and low grants and poor people voting for high taxes and high grants. Their key asymmetry is geographical size, which differs between the countries. The basic difference between our model and theirs lies in the timing of decisions: they have budgetary policy determined after people move; as in the public finance tradition, we have tax rates set by governments before people move.

We shall analyze tax policy under two alternative assumptions of government preferences. The first type is a Leviathan government which maximizes tax revenue, while transferring a fixed fraction to the poor. The second type is a utilitarian government which aims to maximize the sum of the utilities of all residents, and does so by transferring income between the rich and the poor.

³Epple and Romer's model is, however more general than ours in their treatment of housing: unlike them we suppose that the size of a house and of a lot is fixed.

3 Assumptions

Residents Each resident is either rich or poor. All have the same utility function. The pre-tax income of each rich person is y^R ; the pre-tax income of each poor person is y^P . Land differs in its location and hence in its rent. Location is indicated by e , the elevation at which a person resides. Elevation ranges from 0 to $H = 1$ and is evenly distributed on $[0, 1]$. Each elevation can accommodate a density of one resident. If all the land on the hill is occupied, the population on the hill is unity. We can view quality differences in several ways. For example, the jurisdiction could have one hill, or else one major city. In the hill interpretation, higher elevations offer a better climate or a better view. In the city interpretation, quality declines with distance from the city.

An individual's utility defined over consumption of goods (x) and elevation (e) is

$$U = u(x) + v(e) = \ln(x) + \ln(e).$$

Initially, the jurisdiction has n^R rich people; migration can change that number. The number of poor residents is fixed at n^P ; they cannot migrate. Assume that both the rich and the poor live on the hill, and that $n^P + 2n^R \leq 1$. Land is thus sufficiently abundant to house all people in the post-migration equilibrium.

Government policy Government can impose only one tax, a lump-sum of τ on each rich person or on each poor person. Below we shall make various assumptions about how the

revenue is redistributed. One assumption is that the government redistributes all tax revenue from the rich to the poor. Another assumption is that government is a Leviathan, keeping the tax revenue for its own purposes. We take a more general view, allowing the government to keep a share α of the tax revenue for itself, and redistributing the rest. Let the number of rich people in jurisdiction i in the equilibrium with migration be n_i^R ; total tax revenue is then $n_i^R \tau_i$. Thus, the waste by the government is $\alpha n_i^R \tau_i$. Let the transfer to each poor person be t , so that aggregate transfers are

$$n^P t_i = (1 - \alpha) n_i^R \tau_i.$$

We assume throughout that the tax is not confiscatory: the post-tax income of a rich person exceeds the post-transfer income of a poor person. This requires that

$$\tau_i \leq \frac{n^P (y^R - y^P)}{n^P + n_i^R (1 - \alpha)}.$$

Migration The poor migrate neither into nor out of any jurisdiction. The rich can migrate. This assumption is plausible for much of Europe, where language barriers are more severe for people with less education. The reservation utility to a rich person outside the jurisdiction is given by the standard of living abroad: no rich person will live in a jurisdiction in which his utility is less.

Land Housing (or land) is owned by absentee landlords. Each person within a jurisdiction chooses where to live; the rent at elevation e is c_e .

4 Closed economy

4.1 No poor

Consider first a closed economy with no poor people. Then, the rich populate locations $[1 - n^R, 1]$. In equilibrium, they all enjoy the same utility. The equilibrium rent at the lowest occupied location, $1 - n^R$, is zero. (Were the rent positive, the resident would be better off by moving to the neighboring unit with zero rent.) It follows from continuity of the utility function that $\lim_{e \rightarrow (1 - n^R)} c_e = 0$. Thus,

Lemma 1 *Rents decline smoothly towards zero when moving down: $\lim_{e \rightarrow (1 - n^R)} c_e = 0$.*

Above $1 - n^R$, property owners exploit the whole surplus generated by a better location. The rent at any elevation $e > 1 - n^R$ is determined by the condition that a rich person must enjoy the same utility at different locations occupied by the rich: $\ln(y^R - \tau - c_e) + \ln(e) = \ln(y^R - \tau) + \ln(1 - n^R)$, where $y^R - \tau - c_e = x^R$. This gives

$$c_e = \frac{(y^R - \tau)(e - 1 + n^R)}{e}. \quad (1)$$

The above relation determines the equilibrium rent for any given location, with $c_e > 0$ and $c'_e > 0$. Each rich person takes the rent as given when choosing his optimal location and

consumption. The willingness to pay for housing increases with elevation, at the expense of foregone consumption. At the top of the hill, the rent is $c_1 = (y^R - \tau)n^R$. Tax capitalization is given by the condition

$$\frac{\partial c_e}{\partial \tau} = -\frac{e - 1 + n^R}{e} < 0.$$

Tax capitalization increases with elevation and with the size of the rich population.

4.2 Poor present

When poor people are present, the population is $n^R + n^P$. Residences, however, are segregated: all rich people live at higher locations than do poor people. The rent paid by a rich person in the lowest elevation occupied by the rich is determined by the willingness to pay by the poor for locations $1 - n^R - n^P < e < 1 - n^R$. If the poor do not pay any tax or get any transfer, the rent paid by the poor is obtained from the condition $\ln(y^P - c_e) + \ln(e) = \ln(y^P) + \ln(1 - n^R - n^P)$:

$$c_e = \frac{y^P e - y^P(1 - n^R - n^P)}{e}, \quad 1 - n^R - n^P < e \leq 1 - n^R. \quad (2)$$

At the highest location occupied by a poor person, $e = 1 - n^R$. His willingness to pay is thus

$$c_{1-n^R} = \frac{y^P n^P}{(1 - n^R)} > 0. \quad (3)$$

Hence, an increase in the number of poor people hurts each rich person, who must pay strictly higher rents at all locations. The rent at location e above this is determined by the indifference condition

$$\ln(y^R - \tau - c_e) + \ln(e) = \ln\left(y^R - \tau - \frac{y^P n^P}{(1 - n^R)}\right) + \ln(1 - n^R).$$

Hence, with poor people present

$$c_e = \frac{(y^R - \tau)(e - 1 + n^R) + y^P n^P}{e}, \quad 1 - n^R < e \leq 1. \quad (4)$$

In the absence of a tax, the rent paid by a rich person is $c_e = \frac{y^R(e-1+n^R)+y^P n^P}{e}$.

Assume next that the government transfers a fraction $1 - \alpha$ of the tax revenue to the poor. Then each poor person receives

$$\frac{(1 - \alpha)n^R \tau}{n^P}.$$

Hence, consumption by each poor person is $y^P + \frac{(1-\alpha)n^R \tau}{n^P} - c_e = x^P$. With such an income transfer, the willingness to pay by the poor for location e is

$$\ln\left(y^P + \frac{(1 - \alpha)n^R \tau}{n^P} - c_e\right) + \ln(e) = \ln\left(y^P + \frac{(1 - \alpha)n^R \tau}{n^P}\right) + \ln(1 - n^R - n^P).$$

This indifference condition for the rental market allows us to determine the rent at the

highest location occupied by the poor:

$$c_{1-n^R} = \frac{y^P n^P + (1 - \alpha)n^R \tau}{(1 - n^R)}.$$

This must also be the rent paid by a rich person at this elevation. Income transfers will also increase the rents paid by all the rich people above this location. The rent paid by a rich resident at elevation e (above where the poor live) is⁴

$$c_e = \frac{(y^R - \tau)e - (y^R - \tau)(1 - n^R) + y^P n^P + (1 - \alpha)n^R \tau}{e}.$$

Thus the rent increases with $1 - \alpha$: the greater the fraction of tax revenue transferred to the poor, the higher the rents paid by the rich at all locations. At the highest elevation, the rent is

$$c_1 = (y^R - \tau)n^R + y^P n^P + (1 - \alpha)n^R \tau.$$

4.3 Some rich may consume less than some poor

Without taxes, three types of equilibria can appear:

- 1) Each rich person consumes more than each poor person.
- 2) Some rich people consume less than some poor people.
- 3) Each rich person consumes less than some poor people.

⁴This can be solved from the indifference condition that the utility of all the rich has to be equal, namely $\ln(y^R - \tau - c_e) + \ln(e) = \ln(y^R - \tau - \frac{y^P n^P + (1 - \alpha)n^R \tau}{(1 - n^R)}) + \ln(1 - n^R)$.

To establish this, note first that the utility of each rich person is the same regardless of whether he lives at the top of the hill or at a lower location. But the marginal utilities from consumption and location differ. At the top, the marginal utility from consumption is large but from elevation is small. Moreover, the utility of each rich person from location, $\ln(e)$, is higher than that of any poor person. As a rich person pays a higher rent, his utility from consumption, $\ln(x)$ can be less than that of a poor person. At the elevation $1 - n^R$, the utility of the rich and the poor from location are equal and they pay an equal rent; the rich person enjoys a higher utility from consumption than does his neighboring poor person. At higher elevations, however, rents are higher and the utility from consumption of a rich person can be smaller than the utility of a poor person. A condition for this can be derived by comparing the utilities from consumption of the highest rich person and lowest poor person. When $\tau = 0$, the rent paid by the rich at the top is $y^R n^R + y^P n^P$. Then the condition in terms of consumption is

$$y^R - (y^R n^R + y^P n^P) < y^P.$$

$$y^R(1 - n^R) < y^P(1 + n^P).$$

$$y^R < y^P \frac{1 + n^P}{1 - n^R}.$$

As $\partial(\frac{1+n^P}{1-n^R})/\partial n^R > 0$ and $\partial(\frac{1+n^P}{1-n^R})/\partial n^P > 0$, we find that with a given y^P and y^R , when n^P and n^R are large this inequality holds: a rich resident at the top consumes less than a poor person at the bottom. To see why, consider an increase in the poor population. The

poor must live at the bottom, in locations previously unoccupied. This, however, means that the rents at higher elevations occupied by the poor must increase. The rich person living next to the poor person must also pay a higher rent. But then, for equal utilities, rents paid by the rich at higher elevations must also rise.

Consider next an increase in the rich population. Some rich people will now live at the higher elevations that had been occupied by the poor, inducing the poor to occupy yet lower elevations. The lowest poor person consumes as much as before, but suffers from living at a lower elevation. The poor person at the highest elevation occupied by the poor must suffer the same utility loss: he loses utility from residing at a lower elevation than he had before the number of rich people increased. This can be seen as follows. With $\tau = 0$ the rent paid by a rich person at elevation e is

$$c_e = \frac{y^R(e - 1 + n^R) + y^P n^P}{e}.$$

At the lowest residence of a rich person, $e = 1 - n^R$, and $c_e = y^P n^P / (1 - n^R)$. Taking the derivative, $\partial(y^P n^P / (1 - n^R)) / \partial n^R > 0$. Thus the rent paid by the lowest rich person rises. Therefore, all the rich throughout the hill must pay a higher rent. The greater the increase in the distance between the lowest rich person and the highest rich person, the greater the drop in consumption of goods by the rich at the top.

Even though a rich person may consume less goods than some poor persons, the utility

of a rich person must always exceed that of a poor person. For otherwise

$$\begin{aligned} \ln\left(y^R - \frac{y^P n^P}{1 - n^R}\right) + \ln(1 - n^R) &< \ln(y^P) + \ln(1 - n^R - n^P) \\ y^R(1 - n^R) - y^P n^P &< y^P(1 - n^R - n^P) \\ y^R &< y^P. \end{aligned}$$

This can never hold. Nevertheless, consumption of goods by the lowest rich person may be less than that of the lowest poor person. That is, in equilibrium it can hold that $\ln\left(y^R - \frac{y^P n^P}{1 - n^R}\right) < \ln(y^P)$, or that $y^P > y^R(1 - n^R)/(1 + n^P - n^R)$, for $n^P + n^R \gg 0$). If $n^P > 0$ this can hold even if $y^R > y^P$. Intuitively, if any income group is large, equilibrium rents may be high, reducing consumption by the rich.

Lemma 2 *A large population of the makes for high rents, thereby reducing consumption by the rich.*

4.4 Optimal tax in a closed economy

4.4.1 Leviathan government

Suppose the government maximizes tax revenue, subject to the constraint that it must return an exogenous fraction $1 - \alpha$ of the tax revenue to the poor. In a closed economy, this amounts to maximizing the tax rate subject to the condition that the post-tax income of an initially rich person exceeds the post-transfer income of an initially poor person.

4.4.2 Utilitarian government

Assume instead a benevolent utilitarian government which transfers all tax revenue to the poor ($\alpha = 0$), maximizing aggregate utility. If rents and residences would stay constant, this would amount to finding the tax rate on the rich which makes the marginal utilities across people equal. With endogenous rents, this cannot be achieved with a uniform tax on the rich and a uniform transfer to the poor. The reason is that the marginal utility from consumption depends on rents paid, which differ by location. Equalizing aggregate utility within each group requires differences in utility from consumption to compensate for differences in the utility from location. Social welfare is⁵

$$SWF = \int_{1-n^R}^1 [u^R(y^R - \tau - c_e(\tau)) + v(e)]de + \int_{1-n^R-n^P}^{1-n^R} [u(y^P + \frac{n^R\tau}{n^P} - c_e(\tau)) + v(e)]de.$$

We note that a person's marginal utility from consumption and the effect of a tax on his rent and on his consumption depend on where he lives. A rich person living at the top of the hill pays a high rent, may consume little, and so may have a higher marginal utility of consumption than does a poor person. This can make a negative tax, with a transfer from the poor to the rich, optimal.

Consider a per capita tax τ imposed on each rich person. The optimal tax for a utilitarian

⁵We assume absentee landlords whose income thus does not count in the social welfare analysis.

government satisfies

$$\frac{\partial SWF}{\partial \tau} = \int_{1-n^R}^1 \left(\frac{\partial u^R}{\partial x^R} \right) \left(\frac{\partial x^R}{\partial \tau} \right) de + \int_{1-n^R-n^P}^{1-n^R} \left(\frac{\partial u^P}{\partial x^P} \right) \left(\frac{\partial x^P}{\partial \tau} \right) de = 0.$$

Social optimality then requires that the tax equalize the sum of the weighted marginal utilities of consumption across income earners, $\frac{\partial u^R}{\partial x^R} = \frac{1}{x^R}$, $\frac{\partial u^P}{\partial x^P} = \frac{1}{x^P}$, but weighted by the relative population size and by the marginal tax effects on consumption, $\frac{\partial x^R}{\partial \tau} = -\frac{1}{e} < 0$, $\frac{\partial x^P}{\partial \tau} = \frac{(1-\alpha)n^R}{n^P} + \frac{1-e-\alpha n^R}{e} > 0$. Introducing $\alpha = 0$, we obtain $\frac{\partial x^P}{\partial \tau} = \frac{n^R}{n^P} + \frac{1-e}{e}$. Inserting, the social optimum satisfies

$$\frac{\partial SWF}{\partial \tau} = \int_{1-n^R}^1 \left(\frac{\partial u^R}{\partial x^R} \right) \left(-\frac{1}{e} \right) de + \int_{1-n^R-n^P}^{1-n^R} \left(\frac{\partial u^P}{\partial x^P} \right) \left(\frac{n^R}{n^P} + \frac{1-e}{e} \right) de = 0.$$

The optimal tax equalizes the weighted sum of the marginal utilities of consumption across income earners, adjusted for the differential direct and indirect tax effects on rents and hence on consumption.

To evaluate this social optimality condition requires considering the effect of taxation and transfers on rents. Finding the optimal tax rate, however, is simplified by recognizing the key property of the model that the rents adjust so that, in equilibrium, citizens with the same income enjoy the same utility regardless of their location. It is also useful to note that the utility of all the poor must equal that of the poor person paying zero rent. Thus, to determine the optimal tax rate, it suffices to derive the effect of the tax on the resident at the lowest location in each income class. Social welfare is then the product of the size of

each income group and the utility of any member in that group, say of the person at the lowest location. Social welfare is thus

$$SWF = n^R U^R + n^P U^P.$$

The utility of the poor person living at the lowest elevation is

$$\begin{aligned} U^P &= \ln\left(y^P + \frac{n^R \tau}{n^P}\right) + \ln(1 - n^R - n^P) \\ &= \ln\left(\left(y^P + \frac{n^R \tau}{n^P}\right)(1 - n^R - n^P)\right). \end{aligned}$$

The utility of the rich person living at a lower elevation than any other rich person is

$$\begin{aligned} U^R &= \ln\left(y^R - \tau - \frac{y^P n^P + n^R \tau}{(1 - n^R)}\right) + \ln(1 - n^R) \\ &= \ln\left((y^R - \tau)(1 - n^R) - y^P n^P - n^R \tau\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} SWF &= n^R \ln\left((y^R - \tau)(1 - n^R) - y^P n^P - n^R \tau\right) + n^P \ln\left(\left(y^P + \frac{n^R \tau}{n^P}\right)(1 - n^R - n^P)\right) \\ &= n^R \ln\left(y^R(1 - n^R) - \tau - y^P n^P\right) + n^P \ln\left(\left(y^P + \frac{n^R \tau}{n^P}\right)(1 - n^R - n^P)\right). \end{aligned}$$

The first-order condition for maximizing this social welfare is⁶

$$n^R \frac{-1}{y^R(1 - n^R) - \tau - y^P n^P} + n^P \frac{\frac{n^R}{n^P}}{y^P + \frac{n^R \tau}{n^P}} = 0.$$

The optimal tax by a utilitarian government is therefore

$$\tau = \frac{1}{n^R/n^P + 1} (-y^P(1 + n^P) + y^R(-n^R + 1)). \quad (5)$$

The optimal tax depends on the incomes y^P and y^R and on the population sizes n^P and n^R .

Proposition 1 *A utilitarian government may impose either a positive or a negative tax on the rich.*

Proof. From (5), $\tau \geq 0 \iff y^R/y^P \geq \frac{1+n^P}{1-n^R}$. ■

A negative tax means that the government transfers from the poor to the rich. The condition that the after-tax income of the rich is not smaller than the after-transfer income of the poor translates into the condition

$$\tau \leq \frac{n^P(y^R - y^P)}{n^R + n^P} \quad (6)$$

The condition that τ in (5) fulfills (6) is satisfied. We find an even stronger result that

Proposition 2 *A utilitarian government does not fully equalize incomes.*

⁶The second-order condition reveals that this gives the wage tax rate maximizing SWF.

Proof. We show that the tax rate chosen by a utilitarian government is less than $\frac{n^P(y^R - y^P)}{n^R + n^P}$ in (6). This holds when

$$\frac{1}{n^R/n^P + 1} (-y^P(1 + n^P) + y^R(-n^R + 1)) < \frac{n^P(y^R - y^P)}{n^R + n^P}.$$

This reduces to the condition $n^P y^P + n^R y^R > 0$, which always holds. ■

To gain further understanding of utilitarian taxation, assume that $y^R = 1$ and that $n^P = 0.2$. The first normalization is without loss of generality. The second assumption ensures a sufficient number of poor persons. Then the condition for a positive τ is that

$$y^P < \frac{5}{6}(1 - n^R). \quad (7)$$

If this condition is not satisfied, then a utilitarian government transfers from the poor to the rich.

Thus, a utilitarian government does not fully equalize the incomes of the rich and the poor, and may even transfer income from the poor to the rich. Moreover, the optimal utilitarian tax policy does not equalize the marginal utilities of consumption across citizens. Rather, it is optimal to equalize the marginal utility of disposable income weighted by the shares of population and the marginal tax effects on consumption.

The intuition for the result relates to the insight made by Mirrlees (1972). He shows that when otherwise identical people live in different locations and so spend different amounts on transportation, different people will have different marginal utilities of income. Maximizing

social welfare calls not for equalizing incomes, but for equalizing the marginal utilities of income. In other words, even with identical people, inequality of income distribution is part of the social optimum. In our model, the rich may consume less than the poor, and so enjoy a higher marginal utility of consuming goods; maximizing social welfare would then call for transfers to the rich. Another explanation for our finding lies in the property market. By transferring income from the poor, the government reduces the rents that these are willing to pay. This, in turn, directly reduces the rent paid by each rich person. Thus, by transferring income from the poor to the rich, the government reduces rents and thus increases consumption by some people.

We can also consider a utilitarian government which chooses different weights for different income-earners. A government with Rawlsian preferences would maximize the welfare of the poor,

$$SWF = n^P \ln\left(\left(y^P + \frac{n^R \tau}{n^P}\right)(1 - n^R - n^P)\right).$$

Then, not surprisingly, as $\frac{\partial SWF}{\partial \tau} > 0$: unlike an equal-weighting utilitarian government, a Rawlsian government would equalize the after-tax income of all citizens. This naturally satisfies the constraint that the post-tax income of the rich does not fall below that of the poor.

5 Open economy

5.1 Migration

We now turn our attention to migration between countries. Assume two countries, a and b with n^R rich people in each country. Migration is costless and people exhibit no home-country preference. Each jurisdiction has $n^P \geq 0$ poor citizens, who do not migrate. Taxes are paid in the jurisdiction where the citizen resides. Then a domestic tax on the rich creates an incentive to emigrate abroad. We thus make the lowest locations occupied in each country endogenous. To ensure sufficient space in each jurisdiction for immobile domestic poor and mobile rich from both jurisdictions, we assume that $n^P + 2n^R \leq 1$. As we are concerned with tax competition, in our time line governments simultaneously choose their tax rates; people observe the tax rates when deciding to migrate.

The government redistributes a fraction $1 - \alpha$ of tax revenue to the poor. This generates a feed-back between taxation and migration of the rich. The larger the transfer to the poor, the higher the poor bid rents. This in turn makes the jurisdiction less desirable to the rich. Thus, we expect more people to migrate in response to any given tax difference the greater the fraction of tax revenue the government transfers to the poor. But counteracting this, migration of the rich reduces transfers to the poor, thus reducing their willingness to pay for good locations. This in turn limits migration in response to a given tax difference.

The migration equilibrium for any given tax is determined by a simultaneous system of six equations. These are per capita transfers to the poor and the rents paid by the rich

at the lowest elevation that they occupy in the two countries, population identity, and the arbitrage condition that the utility of the rich is the same in the two jurisdictions.

The per-capita transfer to the poor in country i , $i \in \{a, b\}$, is

$$t_i = \frac{(1 - \alpha)n_i^R \tau_i}{n^P}. \quad (8)$$

The arbitrage condition in the rental market gives the rent paid by the poor in country i in the highest location that they occupy

$$\begin{aligned} & \ln\left(y^P + \frac{(1 - \alpha)n_i^R \tau_i}{n^P} - c_{1-n_i^R}\right) + \ln(1 - n_i^R) \\ = & \ln\left(y^P + \frac{(1 - \alpha)n_i^R \tau_i}{n^P}\right) + \ln(1 - n_i^R - n^P). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

This condition states that the utility of the poor living at the highest location occupied by the poor equals the utility of the poor living at the lowest occupied location (where the rent is zero). Equation (9) yields

$$c_{1-n_i^R} = \frac{y^P n^P + (1 - \alpha)n_i^R \tau_i}{(1 - n_i^R)}. \quad (10)$$

Population identity states that the sum of post-migration rich populations equals the sum of initial rich populations:

$$n_a^R + n_b^R = 2n^R. \quad (11)$$

The arbitrage condition imposed by migration by the rich across the two jurisdictions

states

$$\ln(y^R - \tau_a - c_{1-n_a^R}) + \ln(1 - n_a^R) = \ln(y^R - \tau_b - c_{1-n_b^R}) + \ln(1 - n_b^R). \quad (12)$$

The arbitrage conditions in the rental market state that the utility of a rich person is the same at all locations occupied by the rich, so it suffices to present migration equilibrium as equating utilities of arbitrarily chosen rich individuals in the two countries. We choose those rich people living at the lowest elevation occupied by rich people in each country. As utility functions are continuous functions of elevation, rents are also continuous. Thus, the rent paid by the rich at the border between the rich and the poor equals the rent that would be paid by a poor person at the same location. Substituting $c_{1-n_a^R}$ and $c_{1-n_b^R}$ from (10) and inserting (11), we can solve from the migration arbitrage condition the post-migration rich population in country a :

$$n_a^R = \frac{(y^R - \tau_a) - (y^R - \tau_b)(1 - 2n^R) + (1 - \alpha)2n^R\tau_b}{2y^R - \alpha\tau_a - \alpha\tau_b}. \quad (13)$$

Similarly, in the post-migration equilibrium the number of rich persons living in country b is

$$n_b^R = \frac{(y^R - \tau_b) - (y^R - \tau_a)(1 - 2n^R) + (1 - \alpha)2n^R\tau_a}{2y^R - \alpha\tau_a - \alpha\tau_b}. \quad (14)$$

Note that (13) and (14) do not depend on the number of poor persons. Though migration depends on the share of tax revenue transferred to the poor, it does not depend on how many

poor receive the transfer.⁷ If there are no poor persons, then α must equal 1. Equations (13) and (14) then simplify to

$$n_a^R(n^P = 0) = \frac{(y^R - \tau_a) - (y^R - \tau_b)(1 - 2n^R)}{2y^R - \tau_a - \tau_b} \quad (15)$$

and

$$n_b^R(n^P = 0) = \frac{(y^R - \tau_b) - (y^R - \tau_a)(1 - 2n^R)}{2y^R - \tau_a - \tau_b}. \quad (16)$$

5.2 Nash equilibria with tax competition

5.2.1 Leviathan governments

A government which aims to maximize its tax revenue in a closed economy raises the tax rate to equalize the after-tax income of the rich and the poor. In an open economy, the ability of the rich to emigrate imposes an additional constraint. Therefore, even a revenue maximizing government may choose a tax rate that leaves incomes unequal: potential migration by the rich disciplines government, as suggested by Brennan and Buchanan (1980). With endogenous property values, this intuition needs to be re-examined. This is our agenda here.

Assume that each government maximizes its tax revenue, subject to the constraint that the post-tax income of a rich person exceeds the post-transfer income of a poor person, and that a fraction $1 - \alpha$ of tax revenue is transferred to the poor. If there are no poor, then

⁷Recall, however, the requirement that the rich cannot be made poorer than the poor.

$\alpha = 1$; $\alpha = 1$ may hold also in the presence of the poor. By (13), tax revenue in jurisdiction a is

$$t^a = \tau_a \frac{(y^R - \tau_a) - (y^R - \tau_b)(1 - 2n^R) + (1 - \alpha)2n^R\tau_b}{2y^R - \alpha\tau_a - \alpha\tau_b}.$$

Maximizing with respect to the tax rate, τ_a , yields the first-order condition

$$(-2\tau_a + \tau_b + 2n^R y^R - \alpha 2n^R \tau_b)(2y^R - \alpha\tau_a - \alpha\tau_b) + \alpha\tau_a(-\tau_a + \tau_b + 2n^R y^R - \alpha 2n^R \tau_b) = 0.$$

By the negativity of the second-order condition, the first-order condition yields tax rates maximizing tax revenue. In a symmetric equilibrium, $\tau_a = \tau_b = \tau^N$. The first-order condition therefore simplifies to

$$(-\tau^N + 2n^R y^R - \alpha 2n^R \tau^N)(2y^R - 2\alpha\tau^N) + \alpha\tau^N(2n^R y^R - \alpha 2n^R \tau^N) = 0.$$

This leads to a second-order algebraic equation in the tax rate. The only solution satisfying the restrictions $y^R > 0$, $n^R > 0$ and $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ is

$$\tau^N = \frac{2n^R y^R}{n^R \alpha + 1}. \quad (17)$$

We see that an increase in the share of tax revenue government retains reduces the tax in both countries. For intuition, recall that each government aims to maximize the product of $\alpha\tau_i$ and n_i^R , $i \in \{a, b\}$. For any given tax rate assumed to be chosen by the other government, a decrease in the country's tax rate increases the tax base by encouraging immigration, but

reduces the tax revenue collected from the initial tax base. Each government balances these effects. For any given tax rate, an increase in α increases the value to the government of each taxpayer, thus intensifying incentives to compete for tax payers. Each government then gains from reducing the tax on the rich. A government which imposed a high tax would lose tax base to the other government which imposes a lower tax. The Nash equilibrium in tax rates thus requires lower tax rates in both economies. To summarize.

Proposition 3 *Assuming that the Leviathan government is not constrained by (6), the optimal tax on the rich increases with the share of tax revenue transferred to the poor.*

Proof. The result follows from $\partial\tau^N/\partial\alpha < 0$. ■

It remains to verify that the tax rate is not so high that it would make the after-tax income of the rich be less than that of the poor. This requires that

$$\alpha \geq \frac{2n^R y^R (n^P + n^R) - n^P (y^R - y^P)}{n^R n^P (y^R - y^P) + n^R 2n^R y^R}.$$

Were α low, the government would transfer much of its tax revenue to the poor in each country. The required condition may then be violated. On the other hand, high α helps satisfy this condition for the further reason that it encourages the governments to lightly tax the rich.

If the governments transfer all revenue ($\alpha = 0$), the tax rate is $\tau = \min(2n^R y^R, \frac{n^P (y^R - y^P)}{n^P + n^R})$, where $2n^R y^R$ is from (17) and $\frac{n^P (y^R - y^P)}{n^P + n^R}$ is the tax rate when incomes of the rich and the poor are fully equalized after taxes and transfers.

For (6) not to bind, we must have $2n^R y^R \leq \frac{n^P(y^R - y^P)}{n^P + n^R}$.

The findings suggest that when each government aims to maximize its revenues, tax competition does not lead to a race to the bottom. This can be verified from (17) with strictly positive tax rate $\tau^N = \frac{2n^R y^R}{n^R \alpha + 1} > 0$ for all $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. This result arises from the rental markets when desirable locations are scarce, so that the tax is capitalized in rents. The fall in rents ensures that differences in taxes do not lead to corner solutions with all the rich moving to the country with a lower tax. In the absence of a rental market and of land scarcity, tax competition would lead to zero tax rates. But in our model the equilibrium tax is positive.

We summarize with

Proposition 4 *Even when the rich are mobile, taxes do not show a race to the bottom. Capitalization of taxes in rents which makes landlords bear some of the tax burden, and migration which raises rents in the destination country, reduce the incentives to migrate. With identical jurisdictions, the equilibrium has no migration. The equilibrium tax on the rich is either equal to or lower than it would be in a closed economy.*

For numerical illustration, let $y^R = 1$ and $n^P = 0.2$. This limits the number of the rich to $0 < n^R \leq 0.4$, thus letting us analyze the cases where the relative number of the rich varies from arbitrarily low values to twice the number of the poor. The tax is then

$$\tau = \begin{cases} 2n^R, & \text{if } y^P \leq 1 - 2n^R - 10(n^R)^2 \\ \frac{1-y^P}{1+5n^R}, & \text{if } y^P > 1 - 2n^R - 10(n^R)^2 \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

If instead each government retains all the tax revenue, the tax rate is $\tau = \min(\frac{2n^R y^R}{n^R + 1}, y^R - y^P)$. For our numerical values,

$$\tau = \begin{cases} \frac{2n^R}{1+n^R}, & \text{if } y^P \leq \frac{1-n^R}{1+n^R} \\ 1 - y^P, & \text{if } y^P > \frac{1-n^R}{1+n^R} \end{cases} . \quad (19)$$

Therefore, a Leviathan government chooses a higher tax when it redistributes to the poor if the income of the poor is sufficiently low; it chooses a higher tax when it retains all the tax revenue if the income of the poor is sufficiently high. We summarize these results as

Proposition 5 *If the income of the poor is sufficiently low, then tax competition between Leviathan governments leads to a higher tax rate if the governments distribute their tax revenue to the poor. If the income of the poor is sufficiently high, then tax competition between Leviathan governments leads to a higher tax rate if the governments do not distribute their tax revenue to the poor.*

We notice that the tax equilibrium may differ if the government in either jurisdiction has other objectives. For example, the government in one jurisdiction may maximize tax revenue, while the other has a Rawlsian welfare function.

5.2.2 Utilitarian governments

Assume instead that each government maximizes the utility of citizens initially living in the country.⁸ Our qualitative results do not depend on the particular functional form of the utility function assumed below, but hold for any linear transformation of it.

In choosing the tax, a government must take into account the public budget constraint, the effects of a tax on rents, and migration responses that equalize the utility of the rich between the two jurisdictions. A heavy tax on the rich reduces their utility, and causes their emigration, thus reducing tax revenue from them. But the emigration of the rich can also reduce rents paid by the poor and let the poor live at better locations. The effects of mobility by the rich on the optimal utilitarian tax is ambiguous a priori.

To find the optimal tax, we must first determine the migration responses by the rich and the equilibrium in the rental market. These are derived in the previous section. The social welfare function for the government of country a is

$$SWF = n^P \ln(y^P + t_a) + n^P \ln(1 - n^P - n_a^R) + n^R \ln(y^R - \tau_a - c_{1-n_a^R}) + n^R \ln(1 - n_a^R).$$

⁸This assumption is needed because if the government maximizes the sum of the utilities of citizens living in the country after migration, and if the utility functions would have negative values, then each government would want a zero population.

Inserting (8), (10) and (13) results in

$$\begin{aligned}
SWF &= n^P \ln(2y^R n^P y^P - \tau_a^2 + \tau_a \tau_b + 2\tau_a n^R y^R) \\
&\quad + n^P \ln(2y^R + \tau_a - \tau_b - 2n^R y^R - 2y^R n^P) \\
&\quad + n^R \ln(y^R(2y^R - \tau_a - \tau_b - 2n^R y^R) - 2y^R y^P n^P) \\
&\quad - n^P \ln(2y^R n^P) - n^P \ln(2y^R) - n^R \ln(2y^R).
\end{aligned}$$

Differentiate with respect to τ_a to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial SWF}{\partial \tau_a} &= \frac{n^P(-2\tau_a + \tau_b + 2n^R y^R)}{2y^R n^P y^P - \tau_a^2 + \tau_a \tau_b + 2\tau_a n^R y^R} \\
&\quad + \frac{n^P}{2y^R + \tau_a - \tau_b - 2n^R y^R - 2y^R n^P} \\
&\quad + \frac{-n^R}{y^R(2y^R - \tau_a - \tau_b - 2n^R y^R) - 2y^R y^P n^P}.
\end{aligned}$$

The analysis of Nash equilibria must distinguish between solutions in which the condition that the tax cannot make the after-tax income of the rich less than the after-transfer income of the poor does or does not bind. This condition is given by $\tau \leq \frac{n^P(y^R - y^P)}{n^R + n^P}$. When this condition does not bind, we can simplify by using the symmetry property that $\tau_a = \tau_b = \tau$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{n^P(-\tau + 2n^R y^R)}{2y^R n^P y^P + 2\tau n^R y^R} + \frac{n^P}{2y^R - 2n^R y^R - 2y^R n^P} \\
&\quad + \frac{-n^R y^R}{(y^R(2y^R - 2\tau - 2n^R y^R) - 2y^R y^P n^P)} = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Numerical analysis gives our main result:

Proposition 6 *Utilitarian governments may choose either lower or higher taxes on the rich when migration is possible than when it is not.*

Proof. We prove existence with numerical examples exhibiting the claimed qualitative results. If $n^P = n^R = y^P = 0.1$ and $y^R = 1$, the optimal tax in a closed economy (with migration not possible) is 0.395; the optimal tax under tax competition (with migration possible) is 0.195. If $n^P = n^R = 0.1$, $y^P = 0.5$ and $y^R = 1$, the optimal tax in a closed economy is 0.175, and the optimal tax under tax competition is 0.183. ■

It is no surprise that migration (or tax competition) can lead to lower taxes: the ability of the rich to migrate constrains the government's ability to tax them. But the opposite result appears novel and surprising. The reason tax competition can increase tax rates is because of the effects that appear in the rental market for land. Emigration by rich tax payers reduces competition for desirable locations and so reduces rents. The reduced rents benefit the poor, either because they pay lower rents, or because they live in better locations. The immigration of the rich, on the other hand, generates two effects for the receiving country. Rich migrants generate more tax revenue. But they also bid up rents. When the rent effect dominates, a utilitarian government would prefer to induce part of the domestic rich to migrate to the other country. As symmetric countries choose in a Cournot-Nash equilibrium identical tax rates, there is no migration in equilibrium. A government, however, may impose a higher tax than in a closed economy. Thus, the ability of the rich to avoid taxes by migrating hurts them by inducing both countries to impose higher taxes.

6 Conclusion

The urban economics view of taxation and migration complements the traditional public finance view of taxation with mobility. The fall in property values reduces the incentive of the rich to migrate, thereby allowing for more redistributive taxation than is predicted by standard models in public finance. Our paper established two conditions that together create scope for income redistribution from the rich to the poor even in the absence of mobility costs or complementarities between the rich and the poor: (i) the scarcity of desirable locations, and (ii) lower willingness to pay by the poor for favorable locations. If either condition fails the scope for redistribution is limited.

We found that when rents are endogenous, a utilitarian government in a closed economy may redistribute from the poor to the rich. The intuition is that by taxing the poor, the government reduces rents that both the poor and the rich pay. The resultant utility gains may exceed the decline in consumption by the poor. Related to this, we also find that some or, in some cases even all, the rich may consume less non-housing goods than do the poor. The marginal utility of consumption for a rich person may exceed the marginal utility of consumption for a poor person, further justifying transfers to the rich.

When the rich can migrate, and government disregards the welfare of landlords, a utilitarian government may impose a higher tax than when the rich cannot migrate. The result can arise because a tax which induces emigration by the rich reduces demand for desirable locations, allowing the poor to pay lower rents or to enjoy better locations. The increased number of rich people in the other country can also generate an externality, reducing the

welfare of the poor in that country. Tax competition can then lead both countries to tax the rich more heavily than they otherwise would. Though such a strong result does not always apply, it suggests that accounting for responses in the housing market can reverse common views on the effects of migration on income redistribution.

References

- [1] Bover, Olympia, John Muellbauer and Anthony Murphy (1989) "Housing, wages and UK labour markets." *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 51(2): 97-136.
- [2] Brennan, Geoffrey, and James M. Buchanan (1980) *The Power to Tax: Analytical Foundations of a Fiscal Constitution*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [3] Christiansen, Vidar, Kare P. Hagen, and Agnar Sandmo (1994) "The scope for taxation and public expenditures in an open economy." *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 96(3): 289-309.
- [4] Ellickson, Bryan (1971) "Jurisdictional fragmentation and residential choice." *American Economic Review*, 61(2): 334-339.
- [5] Epple, Dennis, Radu Filimon and Thomas Romer (1984) "Equilibrium among local jurisdictions: Towards an integrated treatment of voting and residential choice." *Journal of Public Economics*, 24(3): 281-308.
- [6] Epple, Dennis and Glenn J. Platt (1998) "Equilibrium and local redistribution in an urban economy when households differ in both preferences and incomes." *Journal of Urban Economics*, 43(1): 23-51.
- [7] Epple, Dennis and Thomas Romer (1991) "Mobility and redistribution." *Journal of Political Economy*, 99(4): 828-858.

- [8] Goodspeed, Timothy J. (1989) "A re-examination of the use of ability to pay taxes by local governments." *Journal of Public Economics*, 38(3): 319-342.
- [9] Haavio, Markus and Heikki Kauppi (2002) "Housing markets and labor mobility." Manuscript, University of Helsinki.
- [10] Hansen, Nico A. and Anke S. Kessler (2001) "The political geography of tax h(e)avens and tax hells." *American Economic Review*, 91(4): 1103-1115.
- [11] Hindriks, Jean (2001) "Mobility and redistributive politics." *Journal of Public Economics Theory*, 3: 95-120.
- [12] Mieszkowski, Peter (1972) "The property tax: Excise tax or profits tax?" *Journal of Public Economics*, 1(1): 73-95.
- [13] Mirrlees, James (1972) "The optimum town." *Swedish Journal of Economics*, 74: 114-136.
- [14] Muellbauer, John and Gavin Cameron (1998) "The housing market and regional commuting and migration choices." Centre for Economic Policy Research, Discussion Paper No. 1945.
- [15] Sinn, Hans-Werner. (1997) "The selection principle and market failure in systems competition." *Journal of Public Economics*, 66: 247-274.
- [16] Tiebout, Charles M. (1956) "A pure theory of local expenditures." *Journal of Political Economy*, 64: 416-424.

- [17] Westhoff, Frank H. (1977) "Existence of equilibria in economies with a local public good." *Journal of Economic Theory*, 14: 84-112..
- [18] Wildasin, David E. (1994) "Income redistribution and migration." *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 27: 637-656.
- [19] Wildasin, David E. (2003) "Economic integration and its implications for equity, efficiency, political economy, and the organization of the public sector." Third Norwegian-German Seminar on Public Economics, CESifo, 20-21 June 2003.
- [20] Wilson, John D. (1999) "Theories of tax competition", *National Tax Journal* 52, 296-315.
- [21] Wilson, John D. (2003) "The property tax: Competing views and a hybrid theory" in Sijbren Cnossen and Hans-Werner Sinn, eds., *Public Finance and Public Policy in the New Century*, Cambridge: MIT Press. Pages 217-235.
- [22] Zodrow, George R. (2001) "The property tax as a capital tax: A room with three views." *National Tax Journal*, 54: 139-156.

CESifo Working Paper Series

(for full list see www.cesifo.de)

- 1009 Marco Runkel, Optimal Contest Design when the Designer's Payoff Depends on Competitive Balance, August 2003
- 1010 Donald O. Parsons, Torben Tranaes and Helene Bie Lilleør, Voluntary Public Unemployment Insurance, August 2003
- 1011 Rüdiger Pethig and Andreas Wagener, Profit Tax Competition and Formula Apportionment, August 2003
- 1012 Johan Willner, Privatisation and Public Ownership in Finland, August 2003
- 1013 Seppo Kari and Jouko Ylä-Liedenpohja, Taxation and Valuation of International Real Investments, August 2003
- 1014 James Heckman, Rosa Matzkin and Lars Nesheim, Simulation and Estimation of Hedonic Models, August 2003
- 1015 Biswa N. Bhattacharyay, Towards a Macro-Prudential Leading Indicators Framework for Monitoring Financial Vulnerability, August 2003
- 1016 J. Stephen Ferris and Stanley L. Winer, Searching for Keynes: With Application to Canada, 1870-2000, August 2003
- 1017 Massimo Bordignon, Luca Colombo and Umberto Galmarini, Fiscal Federalism and Endogenous Lobbies' Formation, August 2003
- 1018 Annette Alstadsæter, The Dual Income Tax and Firms' Income Shifting through the Choice of Organizational Form and Real Capital Investments, August 2003
- 1019 Peter Fredriksson and Bertil Holmlund, Optimal Unemployment Insurance Design: Time Limits, Monitoring, or Workfare?, August 2003
- 1020 Kashif S. Mansori, Following in their Footsteps: Comparing Interest Parity Conditions in Central European Economies to the Euro Countries, August 2003
- 1021 Christoph Borgmann and Matthias Heidler, Demographics and Volatile Social Security Wealth: Political Risks of Benefit Rule Changes in Germany, August 2003
- 1022 Kjell Erik Lommerud, Bjørn Sandvik and Odd Rune Staume, Good Jobs, Bad Jobs and Redistribution, August 2003
- 1023 Patrick Karl O'Brien, The Governance of Globalization: The Political Economy of Anglo-American Hegemony, 1793-2003, September 2003

- 1024 Antonio Ciccone and Giovanni Peri, Skills' Substitutability and Technological Progress: U.S. States 1950-1990, September 2003
- 1025 Bjørn Sandvik, Optimal Taxation and Normalisations, September 2003
- 1026 Massimo Bordignon and Gilberto Turati, Bailing Out Expectations and Health Expenditure in Italy, September 2003
- 1027 José A. Herce, Namkee Ahn, Ricard Génova, and Joaquín Pereira, Bio-Demographic and Health Aspects of Ageing in the EU, September 2003
- 1028 John Komlos and Marieluise Baur, From the Tallest to (One of) the Fattest: The Enigmatic Fate of the American Population in the 20th Century, September 2003
- 1029 Stefan Napel and Mika Widgrén, Bargaining and Distribution of Power in the EU's Conciliation Committee, September 2003
- 1030 Kai Li and Dale J. Poirier, Relationship Between Maternal Behavior During Pregnancy, Birth Outcome, and Early Childhood Development: An Exploratory Study, September 2003
- 1031 Ivar Ekeland, James J. Heckman, and Lars Nesheim, Identification and Estimation of Hedonic Models, September 2003
- 1032 Kjetil Bjorvatn and Alexander W. Cappelen, Decentralization and the Fate of Minorities, September 2003
- 1033 Lars-Erik Borge and Jørn Rattsø, The Relationships Between Costs and User Charges: The Case of a Norwegian Utility Service, September 2003
- 1034 Maureen Were and Nancy N. Nafula, An Assessment of the Impact of HIV/AIDS on Economic Growth: The Case of Kenya, September 2003
- 1035 A. Lans Bovenberg, Tax Policy and Labor Market Performance, September 2003
- 1036 Peter Birch Sørensen, Neutral Taxation of Shareholder Income: A Norwegian Tax Reform Proposal, September 2003
- 1037 Roberta Dessi and Sheilagh Ogilvie, Social Capital and Collusion: The Case of Merchant Guilds, September 2003
- 1038 Alessandra Casarico and Carlo Devillanova, Capital-skill Complementarity and the Redistributive Effects of Social Security Reform, September 2003
- 1039 Assaf Razin and Efraim Sadka, Privatizing Social Security Under Balanced-Budget Constraints: A Political-Economy Approach, September 2003
- 1040 Michele Moretto, Paolo M. Panteghini, and Carlo Scarpa, Investment Size and Firm's Value under Profit Sharing Regulation, September 2003

- 1041 A. Lans Bovenberg and Peter Birch Sørensen, Improving the Equity-Efficiency Trade-off: Mandatory Savings Accounts for Social Insurance, September 2003
- 1042 Bas van Aarle, Harry Garretsen, and Florence Huart, Transatlantic Monetary and Fiscal Policy Interaction, September 2003
- 1043 Jerome L. Stein, Stochastic Optimal Control Modeling of Debt Crises, September 2003
- 1044 Thomas Stratmann, Tainted Money? Contribution Limits and the Effectiveness of Campaign Spending, September 2003
- 1045 Marianna Grimaldi and Paul De Grauwe, Bubbling and Crashing Exchange Rates, September 2003
- 1046 Assar Lindbeck and Dennis J. Snower, The Firm as a Pool of Factor Complementarities, September 2003
- 1047 Volker Grossmann, Firm Size and Diversification: Asymmetric Multiproduct Firms under Cournot Competition, September 2003
- 1048 Dan Anderberg, Insiders, Outsiders, and the Underground Economy, October 2003
- 1049 Jose Apesteguia, Steffen Huck and Jörg Oechssler, Imitation – Theory and Experimental Evidence, October 2003
- 1050 G. Abío, G. Mahieu and C. Patxot, On the Optimality of PAYG Pension Systems in an Endogenous Fertility Setting, October 2003
- 1051 Carlos Fonseca Marinheiro, Output Smoothing in EMU and OECD: Can We Forego Government Contribution? A Risk Sharing Approach, October 2003
- 1052 Olivier Bargain and Nicolas Moreau, Is the Collective Model of Labor Supply Useful for Tax Policy Analysis? A Simulation Exercise, October 2003
- 1053 Michael Artis, Is there a European Business Cycle?, October 2003
- 1054 Martin R. West and Ludger Wößmann, Which School Systems Sort Weaker Students into Smaller Classes? International Evidence, October 2003
- 1055 Annette Alstadsaeter, Income Tax, Consumption Value of Education, and the Choice of Educational Type, October 2003
- 1056 Ansgar Belke and Ralph Setzer, Exchange Rate Volatility and Employment Growth: Empirical Evidence from the CEE Economies, October 2003
- 1057 Carsten Hefeker, Structural Reforms and the Enlargement of Monetary Union, October 2003
- 1058 Henning Bohn and Charles Stuart, Voting and Nonlinear Taxes in a Stylized Representative Democracy, October 2003

- 1059 Philippe Choné, David le Blanc and Isabelle Robert-Bobée, Female Labor Supply and Child Care in France, October 2003
- 1060 V. Anton Muscatelli, Patrizio Tirelli and Carmine Trecroci, Fiscal and Monetary Policy Interactions: Empirical Evidence and Optimal Policy Using a Structural New Keynesian Model, October 2003
- 1061 Helmuth Cremer and Pierre Pestieau, Wealth Transfer Taxation: A Survey, October 2003
- 1062 Henning Bohn, Will Social Security and Medicare Remain Viable as the U.S. Population is Aging? An Update, October 2003
- 1063 James M. Malcomson, Health Service Gatekeepers, October 2003
- 1064 Jakob von Weizsäcker, The Hayek Pension: An efficient minimum pension to complement the welfare state, October 2003
- 1065 Joerg Baten, Creating Firms for a New Century: Determinants of Firm Creation around 1900, October 2003
- 1066 Christian Keuschnigg, Public Policy and Venture Capital Backed Innovation, October 2003
- 1067 Thomas von Ungern-Sternberg, State Intervention on the Market for Natural Damage Insurance in Europe, October 2003
- 1068 Mark V. Pauly, Time, Risk, Precommitment, and Adverse Selection in Competitive Insurance Markets, October 2003
- 1069 Wolfgang Ochel, Decentralising Wage Bargaining in Germany – A Way to Increase Employment?, November 2003
- 1070 Jay Pil Choi, Patent Pools and Cross-Licensing in the Shadow of Patent Litigation, November 2003
- 1071 Martin Peitz and Patrick Waelbroeck, Piracy of Digital Products: A Critical Review of the Economics Literature, November 2003
- 1072 George Economides, Jim Malley, Apostolis Philippopoulos, and Ulrich Woitek, Electoral Uncertainty, Fiscal Policies & Growth: Theory and Evidence from Germany, the UK and the US, November 2003
- 1073 Robert S. Chirinko and Julie Ann Elston, Finance, Control, and Profitability: The Influence of German Banks, November 2003
- 1074 Wolfgang Eggert and Martin Kolmar, The Taxation of Financial Capital under Asymmetric Information and the Tax-Competition Paradox, November 2003
- 1075 Amihai Glazer, Vesa Kannianen, and Panu Poutvaara, Income Taxes, Property Values, and Migration, November 2003