Macroeconomic Dynamics, **20**, 2016, 582–600. Printed in the United States of America.
doi:10.1017/S136510051400025X

THE OPTIMAL INFLATION TARGET IN AN ECONOMY WITH LIMITED ENFORCEMENT

GAETANO ANTINOLFI
Washington University in St. Louis

COSTAS AZARIADIS
Washington University
and
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

JAMES BULLARD
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

We formulate a central bank's problem of selecting an optimal long-run inflation rate as the choice of a distorting tax by a planner who wishes to maximize discounted stationary utility for a heterogeneous population of infinitely lived households in an economy with constant aggregate income and public information. Households are segmented into agents who store value in currency alone and agents who have access to both currency and loans. We show that the optimum inflation rate is positive, because inflation reduces the value of the outside option for credit agents and raises their debt limits.

Keywords: Deflation, Debt Constraints, Limited Participation, Monetary Policy, Friedman Rule

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Overview

Central bankers have comfort zones for long-run inflation and nominal interest rates that deviate substantially from the prescriptions of economic theory. For example, Federal Reserve officials have at times stated a preference for core inflation in an annual range from one to two percent, in general agreement with the more explicit inflation targets of the European Central Bank, the Bank of England, the Reserve Bank of New Zealand, and other institutions. This target is typically achieved with a nominal interest rate near five percent.

For helpful comments on earlier versions of this research we thank Marcus Berliant, Steve Williamson, Randy Wright, and audiences at various universities and conferences. We thank Geetanjali Pande for research assistance. All errors are the responsibility of the authors. Any views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis or of the Federal Reserve System. Address correspondence to: Gaetano Antinolfi, Department of Economics, CB 1208, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO 63130-4899, USA; e-mail: gaetano@wustl.edu.

© 2014 Cambridge University Press 1365-1005/14

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136510051400025X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Economic theory, on the other hand, calls for an inflation target that is consistent with the Friedman rule of a zero nominal interest rate. That inflation target is minus the growth rate of real income in life cycle economies [Abel (1987), Freeman (1993)], or minus the sum of the rate of time preference plus an adjustment for income growth in representative household economies [Foley and Sidrauski (1969), Friedman (1969), Woodford (1990)].

Why do central banks prefer low inflation rates to outright deflation? One argument is that deflation subsidizes the holding of money at the expense of deposits and loans, causing disintermediation and a weakening of financial markets, as in Smith (2002). Another argument concerns the impact of the zero bound on nominal interest rates in environments where the central bank is committed to lower interest rates when economic activity weakens, as suggested by Summers (1991); for an analysis see Eggertsson and Woodford (2003) or Adam and Billi (2006).

In this paper we take the disintermediation argument seriously and use it in reverse: if a small deflation hurts asset markets, then a small inflation may help them. We explore an economy in which moderate inflation loosens debt constraints, deepens financial markets, and improves the ability of asset-trading households to smooth consumption. At the same time, inflation imposes a distortionary tax on money-trading households, which works in the opposite direction. The central bank must choose the inflation rate to balance improvements in financial markets with deadweight losses from inflation.

1.2. What We Do

We analyze an endowment economy with constant aggregate income, populated by a continuum of infinitely lived households whose income shares fluctuate over time. All individual characteristics are public information. There are two asset markets, for currency and consumption loans. Households are exogenously divided into two groups, called *cash* agents and *credit* agents. Members of the first group are anonymous and can store value only in currency, of which they hold nonnegative amounts. This group is made up of individuals who do not or cannot trade in asset markets, because they have defaulted in the past or face prohibitive transaction costs.

Members of the second group can participate in either market subject to endogenous participation or debt constraints that successfully deter default. This group may hold assets in positive or negative amounts. Default is punished with perpetual exclusion from the loan market but still permits households to take long positions in currency.

In this environment, deflation raises the payoff from using money and makes default more attractive for borrowers. That, in turn, tightens the participation constraint (lowers debt limits) and weakens the loan market. Conversely, inflation raises debt limits and deepens the loan market up to the point where constraints cease to bind.[1]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136510051400025X Published online by Cambridge University Press

1.3. Main Results

We formulate the central bank's problem of selecting an optimal long-run inflation rate as the choice of a distorting tax by a benevolent central planner who wishes to maximize a convex combination of discounted utilities for cash and credit agents, subject to a participation constraint that keeps credit agents from renouncing the loan market and switching to currency.[2]

When aggregate income is constant, the deflation required by the Friedman rule turns out to be an infeasible choice for any planner who assigns positive weight to credit households. Deflation subsidizes currency at the expense of consumption loans, and increases the payoff from cash-holding above the payoff to loan-trading, leading credit agents to default on their loans and forcing the credit market to shut down.

At the other end of possible inflation targets, an inflation rate higher than the minimum required to slacken debt constraints is equivalent to a distortionary income transfer from lower-welfare cash agents to higher-welfare credit agents. Planners who do not assign extraordinarily high weight to credit agents will reject inflation rates above the value needed to relax debt constraints on credit agents.

If the relative weight of credit households in the social welfare function is above zero and less than or equal to their population weight, we show that the optimum rate of inflation is positive and moderate. We interpret these findings to be consistent with the comfort zones articulated by some of the world's leading central banks and explain why fiscal tools cannot achieve constrained efficient outcomes.

1.4. Recent Related Literature

Several recent papers in the monetary theory literature have themes related to the ones in this paper.[3] The central theme in much of this literature is the infeasibility of the Friedman rule for monetary policy in economic environments with broadly defined private information such as hidden action, hidden information, lack of commitment, or search frictions. In all of these environments, households are able to evade the taxes required to implement the Friedman rule by withholding information about their type or by simply defaulting on their tax or loan obligations.

The Friedman rule typically turns out to violate truth-telling or participation constraints in economies with private information and related frictions. Small positive amounts of inflation, on the other hand, help relax these constraints by strengthening incentives to repay loans, by lowering the real rate of interest, or by encouraging the use of credit at the expense of currency.

An example of this line of work is Aiyagari and Williamson (2000), who study an environment with unobservable random endowments in which financial intermediaries sell debt contracts to households. These authors find that an increase in inflation raises the penalty for default, but they do not define an optimum rate of inflation. Akyol (1994) finds similarly that inflation can have a financial deepening

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136510051400025X Published online by Cambridge University Press

effect: because of a market-timing friction, bonds are underutilized at equilibrium at zero nominal interest rates, but positive inflation induces a demand for bonds that improves the possibility of consumption smoothing for certain types of agents. Boel and Camera (2006) also show that when agents have different rates of time preference, inflation may be socially desirable, as it allows the economy to achieve the constrained-efficient allocation. In their case, incentive constraints are resolved with the presence of illiquid bonds and positive nominal interest rates.

Optimum inflation is well defined in Berentsen et al. (2007), who study the role of credit in the search-theoretic framework of Lagos and Wright (2005). They analyze an environment with search frictions in which money is essential for exchange and financial intermediaries cannot enforce the repayment of loan contracts; they can only refuse future credit to defaulters. An increase in inflation again raises the penalty for default because it lowers the payoff to using money. Berentsen et al. (2007) show that the optimal rate of inflation is positive if the rate of time preference is less than the fraction of sellers in the total population of agents.

A related result appears in Andolfatto (2007), who looks at the search model of money without credit. Here the Friedman rule is feasible and optimal if agents are sufficiently patient, infeasible otherwise. In the latter case, the optimum rate of inflation is again positive. Broadly similar conclusions are reached by Ragot (2005), who studies a two-period life-cycle growth model with a cash-in-advance constraint and private information about the technology of intermediate goods production.

Deviatov and Wallace (2014) is a computational study of the Cavalcanti and Wallace (1999) environment with features similar to the ones emphasized in the present paper. In particular, an exogenous fraction of agents are monitored and hence have known histories, whereas the remainder are anonymous. Defaulters in credit arrangements become anonymous agents. The optimal monetary policy takes incentive constraints into account, as in the present paper, and inflation is a feature of the efficient computed allocation.[4]

The key difference between the recent literature and our paper is that we study monetary policy in economies with *public information and complete markets* in which money is a store of value and limited enforcement is the only friction allowed. An optimum inflation target in our class of environments is associated with a constrained optimum allocation achieved by a planner who can only extract voluntary taxes from households. This constrained optimum duplicates the competitive equilibrium outcome at an efficient steady state.[5]

A different but related literature on taxation considers the effects of inflation on the redistribution of income and not, as we do, on its allocation over time. For example, da Costa and Werning (2007) study the interaction between labor income taxation and the inflation tax and determine conditions under which the combination of these two forms of taxation is Pareto-efficient. Erosa and Ventura (2002) and Albanesi (2005) study the welfare costs of inflation in models where low-income agents tend to use cash more often than high-income agents; they

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136510051400025X Published online by Cambridge University Press

assess the welfare costs of inflation and the time consistency of monetary and fiscal policies. Bhattacharya et al. (2005) study economies in which the redistribution effects of inflation dominate, in a welfare sense, the direct effect of inflation on the desirability of money as a store of value, thus justifying departures from the Friedman rule. This result is related to that of Boel and Camera (2009), who show that when only some agents are constrained to save with money, the standard result that inflation hurts mostly the more productive agents is reversed, and thus some inflation can be optimal. Chiu and Molico (2010), however, find that even though in search models the redistributive effect of inflation is typically present, an increase in inflation is associated with a welfare loss for the average agent in a model calibrated to the U.S. economy.

2. ENVIRONMENT

We describe the optimal rate of long-run inflation and analyze the associated optimal consumption plans in an endowment economy populated by four types of infinitely lived household types, indexed by $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Household types 0 and 1 have mass $\lambda/2$ each, and households 2 and 3 have mass $1 - \lambda/2$ each, where $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$. Individual income shares fluctuate deterministically and total income is constant. Time is discrete and is denoted by $t = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. Agents have identical preferences given by

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u\left(c_t^i\right), \tag{1}$$

with $0 < \beta < 1$. Individual endowments and income shares are periodic,[6] given by

$$\left(\omega_t^0, \omega_t^1\right) = \left(\omega_t^2, \omega_t^3\right) = \begin{cases} (1+\alpha, 1-\alpha) & \text{if } t = 0, 2, \ldots \\ (1-\alpha, 1+\alpha) & \text{if } t = 1, 3, \ldots, \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. This endowment pattern means that type 0 and type 1 agents have negatively correlated income shares, as do type 2 and type 3 agents. We introduce a critical difference between these two agent-pairs: We call agents 0 and 1 *credit* agents, and agents 2 and 3 *cash* agents. Cash agents are anonymous households who may only use currency to smooth income fluctuations, as in Bewley (1980). No claims can be enforced on them or by them.[7] Credit agents may enter into loan arrangements to smooth consumption subject to endogenous debt limits that give them proper incentives to repay, as in Kehoe and Levine (1993).[8]

Incentives to repay loans are strongest, and debt limits are highest, when the payoff to default is lowest. We assume that credit agents who default are forever excluded from the loan market and must instead use money as a store of value. Clearly, the payoff to default at any point in time depends on future inflation rates.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136510051400025X Published online by Cambridge University Press

The government acts as a benevolent central planner who chooses a constant inflation tax under which cash agents can trade currency across periods, and directly selects consumption vectors for credit agents, who may either accept their allocations or behave like cash agents in perpetuity. The inflation target in this economy is similar to choosing an optimal tax subject to an incentive constraint. When the government chooses a positive rate of inflation, it imposes a tax on cash agents and confers two benefits on credit agents: a transfer of resources from the cash sector and a reduction in the default payoff that brings about higher debt limits. Inflation, up to a point, deepens the credit market.

3. INFLATION TARGETING AS A PLANNING PROBLEM

3.1. Overview

We now analyze inflation targeting as the solution to a particular stationary equal-treatment planning problem in which similar households are allocated similar consumption bundles independent of time. Allocations depend on household type only. To begin with, we suppose that the planner knows the following data:

(*a*) The common utility function and common income process of all households;
(*b*) The ability to identify agents $i = 0$ and $i = 1$, that is, to recognize all credit agents, as well as their current income.
However,
(*c*) The planner does not know the current incomes of cash households and cannot discriminate between agent types $i = 2$ and $i = 3$.
A complete list of feasible actions for the planner and households is as follows.

(i) No household can be forced to pay a tax or surrender any part of its endowment against its will.
(ii) Any cash agent may purchase from the planner a non-negative stock of enforceable IOUs. Each IOU costs one unit of current consumption and pays off $1/\pi$ units of consumption next period. We call the constant parameter $\pi > 0$ the implied "inflation factor."
(iii) Given the tax rate $1 - \frac{1}{\pi}$, cash agents choose the amount of IOUs they wish to buy from the planner. One option is zero IOUs, which amounts to autarky, that is, to consuming one's own endowment in perpetuity.
(iv) The planner collects all revenues from the "inflation tax" and asks all credit agents to surrender their endowments in return for a binding commitment from the planner to allocate forever $c_{\mathrm{H}} > 0$ units of consumption to each high-income credit agent, and $c_{\mathrm{L}} > 0$ units of consumption to each low-income credit agent. The planner's overall commitments to credit agents cannot exceed the combined endowment of that group plus the net revenue from the implied inflation tax. We call the marginal rate of substitution $u'(c_{\mathrm{H}})/[\beta u'(c_{\mathrm{L}})]$ the implied "real interest yield."
(v) Credit households reserve the right to reject the planner's proposal and behave instead like cash households. This includes the option to remain autarkic in perpetuity.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136510051400025X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Next we describe the planning problem in three steps:

- The monetary authority sets a constant inflation factor π or a tax rate $1 - \frac{1}{\pi}$.
- Given π, high-income cash agents choose a periodic consumption vector $(x_H, x_L) \geq 0$ to maximize stationary discounted utility

$$\frac{1}{1-\beta^2}[u(x_H) + \beta u(x_L)], \tag{3}$$

subject to

$$x_H \leq 1 + \alpha, \tag{4}$$

$$x_H + \pi x_L = 1 + \alpha + \pi(1 - \alpha), \tag{5}$$

and

$$u(x_H) + \beta u(x_L) \geq u(1 + \alpha) + \beta u(1 - \alpha). \tag{6}$$

The first inequality restricts excess demand for goods by high-income cash agents to be nonpositive, and purchases of IOUs from the planner to be nonnegative. The second relation is a two-period budget constraint that assumes that credit households completely use up the planner IOUs or "money balances" to smooth consumption in low-income dates. The third inequality allows households that dislike the announced inflation rate to renounce forever the use of IOUs and consume their endowments in perpetuity.

- Let $x_H(\pi)$ and $x_L(\pi)$ solve the previous problem. Given π, the planner now chooses consumption values $(c_H, c_L) \geq 0$ for credit households to maximize the equal-treatment welfare function,

$$\frac{1}{1-\beta^2}[u(c_H) + u(c_L)], \tag{7}$$

of the credit community, subject to the resource constraint,

$$\lambda(c_H + c_L) + (1 - \lambda)[x_H(\pi) + x_L(\pi)] = 2, \tag{8}$$

and the participation constraint,

$$u(c_H) + \beta u(c_L) \geq u[x_H(\pi)] + \beta u[x_L(\pi)]. \tag{9}$$

Equal treatment of high-income and low-income households means that the discounted utilities are weighted equally. High-income households are given the infinite periodic consumption vector $(c_H, c_L, \ldots)$ with payoff

$$\frac{u(c_H) + \beta u(c_L)}{1-\beta^2}.$$

Low-income households consume the periodic vector $(c_L, c_H, \ldots)$ with discounted value

$$\frac{u(c_L) + \beta u(c_H)}{1-\beta^2}.$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136510051400025X Published online by Cambridge University Press

The welfare function in equation (7) is a linear combination of these two discounted utilities with each group's weight equal to $1/(1+\beta)$. In addition, note that the resource constraint equates aggregate consumption with aggregate income. In other words, the planner allocates to the credit group the combined endowment of all credit households *plus* current revenue from IOUs just issued *minus* the redemption value of IOUs sold last period. Finally, the participation constraint ensures that high-income credit agents prefer the planner's proposed allocation to using planner IOUs, that is, prefer to smooth their consumption through "credit" rather than through "money."

- If $c_{\mathrm{H}}(\pi)$ and $c_{\mathrm{L}}(\pi)$ solve the previous problem for a given $\pi > 0$, the planner selects the stationary implied inflation factor π to maximize the social welfare function (SWF)

$$\mathcal{W}(\pi, \delta) = \delta \{u[c_{\mathrm{H}}(\pi)] + u[c_{\mathrm{L}}(\pi)]\} + (1-\delta)\{u[x_{\mathrm{H}}(\pi)] + u[x_{\mathrm{L}}(\pi)]\}.$$

This SWF assigns equal weights to members of the same group but potentially different weights to different groups. In particular, it weights each credit community member by $\delta/(1+\beta)$, where $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and each cash community member by $(1-\delta)/(1+\beta)$. A strictly utilitarian welfare function, such as the one used by Deviatov and Wallace (2014), would have equal weights for all households, that is, $\delta = \lambda$.

3.2. Optimum Inflation without Incentive Constraints

To build up intuition, we solve the planner's problem outlined in Section 3.1, ignoring for the moment the incentive constraints laid out in equations (6) and (9). As a first step, we allow lump-sum income transfers from cash agents to credit agents, which permits us to ignore the cash agents' budget constraints (4) and (5) as well. All the planner has to do is maximize the SWF

$$\mathcal{W}(\pi, \delta) = \delta[u(c_{\mathrm{H}}) + u(c_{\mathrm{L}})] + (1-\delta)[u(x_{\mathrm{H}}) + u(x_{\mathrm{L}})], \tag{10}$$

subject to the economy's overall resource constraint

$$\lambda(c_{\mathrm{H}} + c_{\mathrm{L}}) + (1-\lambda)(x_{\mathrm{H}} + x_{\mathrm{L}}) = 2. \tag{11}$$

The obvious solution is $(c_{\mathrm{H}}, c_{\mathrm{L}}, x_{\mathrm{H}}, x_{\mathrm{L}}) = (c^*, c^*, x^*, x^*)$, where c^* and x^* solve the following pair of equations:

$$\delta u'(c) = (1-\delta) u'(x),$$

$$\lambda c + (1-\lambda) x = 1.$$

We call this solution the *first best*. The implied optimal inflation and nominal interest rates can be inferred from the consumption Euler equations for the two

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136510051400025X Published online by Cambridge University Press

household types, that is, from

$$\frac{\beta R^N}{\pi} = 1, \tag{12}$$

$$\frac{\beta}{\pi} = 1. \tag{13}$$

The first-best allocation is thus supported by Friedman's rule, that is, by $(\pi, R^N) = (\beta, 1)$.

Suppose next that the planner cannot impose a lump-sum tax on any agent but must instead use inflation or deflation, and redistribute the resulting seigniorage from one group to another. Inflation is a proportional tax on the excess supply of goods by high-income cash agents; it transfers resources from cash to credit households. Deflation does the exact opposite. The planner must now choose $(\pi, c_{\mathrm{H}}, c_{\mathrm{L}})$ to solve the problem outlined in Section 3.1 subject to all constraints except (6) and (9) . We call this outcome the *second best*.

To understand the optimum rate of inflation under the second-best allocation, we examine the two polar cases, $\delta = 1$ and $\delta = 0$. The first case, which assigns no welfare weight to the cash-using community, leads the planner to select that value of π that minimizes the consumption of that community. The maximum possible amount of seigniorage is transferred to the credit community, and the consumption of credit agents is smoothed completely.

Define the *maximal seigniorage inflation factor* from

$$\tilde{\pi} = \arg\min_{\pi \geq 1} \left[x_{\mathrm{H}}(\pi) + x_{\mathrm{L}}(\pi)\right] > 1. \tag{14}$$

Then the planner sets $(\pi, c_{\mathrm{H}}, c_{\mathrm{L}}) = (\tilde{\pi}, \tilde{c}, \tilde{c})$, where $\tilde{c}$ can be read from the resource constraint

$$2\lambda\tilde{c} + (1-\lambda)\left[x_{\mathrm{H}}(\tilde{\pi}) + x_{\mathrm{L}}(\tilde{\pi})\right] = 2. \tag{15}$$

In addition, $c_{\mathrm{H}} = c_{\mathrm{L}}$ implies that $\beta R^N = \tilde{\pi}$. The second-best allocation turns out to be supported by high rates of inflation and nominal interest, that is,

$$\left(\pi, R^N\right) = (\tilde{\pi}, \tilde{\pi}/\beta). \tag{16}$$

At the other extreme, $\delta = 0$ describes a society in which the planner cares about the cash community only. This planner will deflate the economy in order to reduce the aggregate consumption of credit households, pushing the inflation factor as close to zero as possible. That is obvious from Figure 1, which superimposes the budget constraint of the high-income cash household against two social indifference curves that turn out to be symmetric about the diagonal.

A utilitarian SWF with $\delta = \lambda$ represents a sensible compromise between the extremes just described. A planner endowed with a utilitarian SWF will choose a *second-best rule* that combines mild deflation with a small positive interest rate to guarantee smooth consumption for credit agents. The following result is proved in Antinolfi et al. (2012).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136510051400025X Published online by Cambridge University Press




FIGURE 1. Social indifference curves for $\delta = 0$.

THEOREM 1. *The second-best optimum allocation under a utilitarian SWF satisfies* $(c_H, c_L, x_H, x_L) = (c^{**}, c^{**}, x_H(\pi^{**}), x_L(\pi^{**}))$. *It is supported by a second-best rule for some inflation factor* $\pi^{**} \in (\beta, 1)$ *and a nominal yield such that* $R^N = \pi^{**}/\beta > 1$.

4. THE ROLE OF INCENTIVE CONSTRAINTS

4.1. Basic Assumptions

We assume in what follows that the incentive constraints are restrictive enough to rule out both the first-best and the second-best allocations described in the preceding section, and defeat the planner's desire to smooth completely the consumption profile for both the credit and the cash community. Define $y(\pi)$ to be the combined consumption of a pair of high-income and low-income credit agents. This consumption is maximal when the implied inflation factor π is equal to the maximal seigniorage inflation factor $\tilde{\pi}$. From the resource constraint we obtain

$$c_H + c_L = y(\pi) \equiv \frac{1}{\lambda}\left[2 - (1-\lambda)\left(x_H(\pi) + x_L(\pi)\right)\right].$$

Our key assumptions are these:

A.1. $\bar{R} \equiv \frac{u'(1+\alpha)}{\beta u'(1-\alpha)} < 1$,
A.2. $u(1+\alpha) + \beta u(1-\alpha) > (1+\beta)u(1)$, and
A.3. $(1+\beta)u[\frac{y(\tilde{\pi})}{2}] > u[x_H(\tilde{\pi})] + \beta u[x_L(\tilde{\pi})]$.

Assumptions A.1 and A.2 state that individual income shares are neither very stable nor highly variable. In particular, A.1 asserts that autarky is an allocation with a low implied rate of interest $\bar{R}$ and therefore cannot be a constrained efficient allocation for the credit community.[9] Geometrically, we require the initial endowment point $\Omega = (1+\alpha, 1-\alpha)$ in Figure 2 to lie below the tangency point G on the budget

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136510051400025X Published online by Cambridge University Press




FIGURE 2. Assumptions A.1 and A.2.

line $c_H + c_L = 2$. Here we denote by $(x_g, 2 - x_g)$ the bundle associated with the tangency point G. This assertion is innocuous. It means that the income variability parameter α is large relative to the consumer's rate of time preference if α is the same for all households. If, however, α should vary across households, then autarky is a low-interest-rate equilibrium whenever the rate of time preference is small relative to the *largest* α in the population.[10] Roughly speaking, A.1 amounts to asserting that there is at least one household in the economy whose income share fluctuates more than three or four percent per year.[11]

The next assumption, A.2, rules out plans that combine perfect consumption smoothing for credit agents with a zero rate of inflation, which would decentralize the golden rule allocation for cash agents. Zero implied inflation means no transfers of income between groups. Perfect consumption smoothing for credit agents is achieved by the allocation $c_H = c_L = 1$, whose payoff is below autarky by Assumption A.2. In Figure 2, the flat-consumption allocation point E lies below the indifference curve that goes through the initial endowment point Ω.

This assumption, too, is empirically innocuous: It holds automatically for values of α near zero. If α were to vary across households, assumptions A.1 and A.2 would assert that income shares are nearly constant for some agents and quite variable for others. But because we have only one endowment profile in the entire economy, we need to assume that income shares are neither too smooth nor too variable. That is what is embodied in Assumptions A.1 and A.2.

It is worth noting that assumption A.2 is inconsistent with the Friedman rule for reasons similar to those advanced by Aiyagari and Williamson (2000), Andolfatto (2007), and Berentsen et al. (2007). Any constant, resource-feasible consumption plan $(c_H, c_L, x_H, x_L) = (c^*, c^*, 2 - c^*, 2 - c^*)$ will be vetoed by high-income credit agents, who will refuse to pay the implied deflation tax.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136510051400025X Published online by Cambridge University Press




FIGURE 3. Assumption A.3.

The last assumption is a bit more controversial. It claims that credit agents can achieve perfectly smooth consumption albeit at higher rates of inflation. A.3 asserts that it is within the power of the central planner, and of the central bank, to lower the rate of return facing users of cash to the point where the incentive constraint on credit users becomes slack. A.3 states that allocations with perfectly smooth consumption, $c_H = c_L = y(\pi)/2$, are feasible at the maximum seigniorage rate of inflation and also at lower rates. For all of these implied inflation rates, the payoff from credit use exceeds the payoff from cash use. Figure 3 illustrates.

Let

$$v(\pi) \equiv u[x_H(\pi)] + \beta u[x_L(\pi)]$$

denote the two-period payoff to any high-income household using planner IOUs or "money." Then, for any isoelastic utility function $u : \mathbf{R}_+ \to \mathbf{R}$ for which c_H and c_L are gross substitutes, the seigniorage function $y(\pi)$ is continuous, positive, and increasing in π for all $\pi \in (1, \tilde{\pi})$; positive and decreasing in π for all $\pi \in (\tilde{\pi}, 1/\bar{R})$; and zero at $\pi = 1$ and $\pi = 1/\bar{R}$. The demand for money by cash agents vanishes at $\pi = 1/\bar{R}$ as households switch to autarky.

Assumption A.3, together with the continuity of the function $y(\pi)$, guarantees the existence of an inflation factor $\bar{\pi}$ in the open interval $(1, \tilde{\pi})$ for which

$$(1+\beta)\, u[y(\bar{\pi})/2] = v(\bar{\pi}). \tag{17}$$

High-income credit households are indifferent between cash and credit at $\pi = \bar{\pi}$, and the participation constraint (9) becomes slack when inflation reaches that value. In a decentralized economy, debt constraints will cease to bind, and the loan market will smooth consumption perfectly, when inflation is in the closed interval $[\bar{\pi}, \tilde{\pi}]$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136510051400025X Published online by Cambridge University Press




FIGURE 4. Inflation and credit rationing.

Figure 4 illustrates the relationship between credit rationing and inflation by graphing the payoffs to "credit" and "money" users when the credit community enjoys constant consumption. These payoffs are exactly equal at $\pi = \bar{\pi}$ and again at some higher $\pi_m \in (\tilde{\pi}, 1/\bar{R})$. Discounted utility $v(\pi)$ from the use of money is a monotonically decreasing function of the inflation tax π for any π less than $1/\bar{R}$. When π reaches or exceeds $1/\bar{R}$, the rate of return on money falls below the implied yield on autarky, and the demand for money as a store of value vanishes altogether.

Constant consumption for credit households rises as the inflation factor increases from 1 to $\tilde{\pi}$ and then falls as π increases further from $\tilde{\pi}$ to $1/\bar{R}$. Seigniorage dries up at that point, and $c_{\mathrm{H}} = c_{\mathrm{L}} = 1$ for all $\pi \geq 1/\bar{R}$. However, for implied inflation factors in the interval $(\bar{\pi}, \pi_m)$, "credit" pays off more than "money." This means that imposing the incentive or participation constraint (9) on credit households improves the planner's ability to smooth the consumption profile of the credit community.[12]

4.2. Inflation and Social Welfare

We are now ready to deal with the complete planning problem described in Section 3.1. Our strategy is to show that the SWF $\mathcal{W}(\pi, \delta)$

- is continuously differentiable for all $\pi \geq 1$;
- is undefined for $\pi < 1$ because deflation contradicts the participation constraint (9);
- increases rapidly in π at $\pi = 1$;
- decreases in π for all $\pi \in [\bar{\pi}, 1/\bar{R}]$ if $\delta \leq \lambda$; and
- is constant for π larger than $1/\bar{R}$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136510051400025X Published online by Cambridge University Press

These properties guarantee the existence of an optimum inflation factor

$$\pi^{\star}(\delta) = \arg \max_{\pi \in [1, 1/\bar{R}]} \mathcal{W}(\pi, \delta) \geq 1, \quad > 1 \text{ if } \delta > 0.$$

Antinolfi et al. (2012) contains proofs for the following lemmas.

LEMMA 2. *Define* $\mathcal{W}_{\pi}(\pi, \delta) = \partial \mathcal{W} / \partial \pi$. *Then (a)* $\mathcal{W}_{\pi}(\pi, \delta) < 0 \; \forall (\pi, \delta) \in [\bar{\pi}, \tilde{\pi}] \times [0, \lambda]$; *(b)* $\mathcal{W}_{\pi}(\pi, \delta)$ *is increasing in* $\delta \; \forall \; \pi \in [\bar{\pi}, \tilde{\pi}]$; *and (c)* $lim_{\pi \to 1} \mathcal{W}_{\pi}(\pi, \delta) = +\infty$ *when* π *converges from above.*

The intuition for part (a) is fairly simple. For any $\pi > \bar{\pi}$, assumption A.3 says that smoothing the consumption of credit households is consistent with the participation constraint. Raising π above $\bar{\pi}$ does not improve the ability of the planner to smooth the consumption of the credit community any further. Doing so merely transfers income from the cash community, who are consuming less than two units of total income, to the credit community, who are consuming more. This transfer will reduce social welfare except in cases where the favored credit households are extraordinarily important to the central planner, that is, when $\delta > \lambda$.

Part (b) can be understood in a similar way. At very low positive rates of inflation, the aggregate consumption of each community is proportional to its population weight and, by assumption A.2, c_{H} is substantially different from c_{L}. A tiny increase in the inflation tax transfers a tiny amount of resources between two groups with roughly the same marginal utility of income. This insignificant transfer has essentially no impact on the social welfare function, except that it lowers the discounted utility of money for the credit community, allowing the central planner to dramatically smooth the consumption vector $(c_{\mathrm{H}}, c_{\mathrm{L}})$. The reason for this improvement is that the planner is able to set up at a zero inflation rate a credit market that cannot function under deflation.

LEMMA 3. $\mathcal{W}(\pi, \delta)$ *is not defined for* $\pi < 1$. *It is decreasing in* π *for* $\pi \in \left(\tilde{\pi}, 1/\bar{R}\right)$ *and constant for* $\pi \geq 1/\bar{R}$.

The key part of Lemma 3 is understanding why the reduced-form social welfare function $\mathcal{W}(\pi, \delta)$, defined at the end of Section 3.1, does not exist for $\pi < 1$ or, equivalently, why deflation violates the participation constraint for high-income credit households. Deflation means that each high-income cash household will consume a vector $(x_{\mathrm{H}}, x_{\mathrm{L}})$ such that $x_{\mathrm{H}} + x_{\mathrm{L}} > 2$, attaining a point above the budget line $x_{\mathrm{H}} + x_{\mathrm{L}} = 2$. The corresponding high-income credit household will consume $(c_{\mathrm{H}}, c_{\mathrm{L}})$ such that $c_{\mathrm{H}} + c_{\mathrm{L}} < 2$, reaching a point below the previous budget line. The outcome of any deflation is that money has a higher payoff than credit.[13]

The main result of this section, which follows directly from Lemmas 2 and 3, is stated next.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136510051400025X Published online by Cambridge University Press




FIGURE 5. Inflation and social welfare.

THEOREM 4. *Suppose assumptions* A.1, A.2, *and* A.3 *hold, and* $\delta > 0$. *Then the optimum inflation factor is* $\pi^\star(\delta) > 1$. *Optimum inflation is an increasing function of the welfare weight* δ *of credit agents and such that* $\pi(0) = 1, \pi(1) = \tilde{\pi}$.

Figure 5 uses Lemmas 2 and 3 to illustrate the planner's SWF for some welfare weight $\delta \in (0, \lambda)$ and any inflation factor $\pi \geq 1$. Assumption A.3 generates large improvements in the planner's consumption smoothing power from relatively low inflation rates. As inflation goes up, these improvements taper off, and beyond the optimum value $\pi^\star(\delta)$ they are negated by the deadweight loss of the inflation tax.

A related result in a search-theoretic framework is Proposition 5 in Berentsen et al. (2007), where the optimum inflation rate is $\bar{\pi}$, that is, the rate at which borrowers become unrationed. This result obtains when the rate of time preference is less than the population fraction of agents who are selling consumption goods for money.

5. EXTENSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

What factors should a benevolent, independent central bank consider when it sets a long-run inflation target? Summers (1991) has expressed the view that the zero lower bound on nominal interest rates dictates an inflation target above zero. This paper suggests that a very different mechanism may be at work. In particular, Theorem 4 shows that, for an economy with limited enforcement, constant aggregate income, and no collateral, the inflation target should strike a balance between the deadweight loss from inflation and the potential improvement in credit market conditions.

How does economic growth affect inflation targets? Suppose, for example, that all the endowments described in equation (2) are multiplied by a growth factor

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136510051400025X Published online by Cambridge University Press

$g \geq 1$, and that the utility function is isoelastic, that is,

$$u(c) = \frac{c^{1-\gamma} - 1}{1-\gamma},$$

where $\gamma \geq 0$ and $\beta_g \equiv \beta g^{1-\gamma} < 1$. In this growing economy the mathematical structure of the planning problem, defined in Section 3.1, remains the same if we replace the original discount factor β with a modified discount factor β_g and the original inflation factor π with a modified inflation factor $\pi_g \equiv g\pi$.

For any utility function with $\gamma \leq 1$ (which implies gross substitutability of intertemporal consumption goods), increases in g effectively raise the planner's patience and slacken the incentive constraints. We conjecture that this increase in effective patience will allow the planner to smooth consumption better at any given rate of inflation and will lessen the need to subsidize the loan market at the expense of the currency market. The outcome should be a lower inflation target $\pi^\star$ for any given welfare weight δ. This conjecture is easily verified for the logarithmic utility function with $\gamma = 1$. In this case, the planner's effective discount rate remains at β, and by Theorem 4 the optimum inflation rate should be $\pi_g = \pi^\star(\delta)$ or $\pi = \pi^\star(\delta)/g$. In other words, the sum of the inflation target plus the growth rate is a constant independent of the growth rate itself.

In principle, fiscal policy alone can achieve socially optimal outcomes just as well as monetary policy can, but the required lump-sum policies bear no resemblance to the linear or progressive income taxes we observe in practice. For example, debt limits on credit agents improve if we redistribute income from low to high endowments and thus raise the gains from trading in loan markets. Optimal outcomes can also be supported directly if we replace pretax endowments with the constrained efficient allocations desired by the planner. In this case, the demands for money and loans vanish and asset markets become superfluous.

The main conclusion of this paper is that independent central banks will set low positive inflation targets in economies that possess highly developed financial markets. This finding seems to be broadly consistent with the comfort zones articulated by some of the world's leading central bankers. Less fortunate societies with relatively undeveloped asset markets will choose higher inflation targets to improve credit market performance. Slower growth tends to raise inflation targets, and the highest targets should be expected from stagnating economies with poorly developed financial institutions.

NOTES

1. Levine (1990) was probably the first to argue that positive inflation may be optimal in the presence of individual income volatility and credit constraints.

2. Antinolfi et al. (2012) provides the setup of the corresponding competitive economy, where the inflation rate selected by the planner can be sustained as an equilibrium.

3. The intellectual origins of this literature date back to Bewley (1980), who showed that the Friedman rule is inconsistent with competitive equilibrium in an exchange economy with uninsurable idiosyncratic risks when currency is the only store of value.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136510051400025X Published online by Cambridge University Press

4. The idea that an increase in inflation may deter activity in certain sectors of the economy, and through this effect produce desirable consequences in the economy as a whole, is a theme that has been analyzed from other points of view. For example, He et al. (2008) study banking in an environment where money is essential for exchange, and in addition theft is possible. Here banks have an additional safekeeping role; positive inflation may then be desirable because it taxes thieves.

5. We leave for a future paper the question of how a market economy reaches this desirable steady state. An earlier paper of ours, Antinolfi et al. (2007), shows that economies with limited enforcement typically have many Pareto-ranked equilibrium outcomes when monetary policy is passive, and that active monetary policy may serve as an equilibrium selection device.

6. In a growing economy, individual incomes need not be negatively correlated, but income *shares* must be. This simple deterministic endowment process is the degenerate case of a stochastic economy with two Markovian states and a zero probability of remaining in the same state. Markovian endowments with two states are a straightforward and interesting extension that permits persistent shocks to individual incomes. The assumption of two states or dates has obvious geometric advantages, but it is not innocuous where policy is concerned. We discuss this point further in the concluding section.

7. A note of interpretation is useful at this point. Cash agents have a periodic income stream that, in autarky, would force an equal periodicity in consumption. This pattern of consumption, under the conditions that we impose is costly relative to a smooth consumption pattern. The alternating endowment is what allows money to have value. Therefore, money draws its value here because it allows agents to transfer consumption over time, and should be interpreted much as in overlapping-generations models.

8. One interpretation of the model is that the cash agents correspond to an "unbanked sector" in actual economies, and that the credit agents correspond to the remainder of the population, which has better access to unsecured credit facilities. Recent studies suggest that the proportion of households that are unbanked is perhaps 9 to 15 percent of the U.S. population, although this can be higher, depending on the definition of "unbanked." For a discussion of these issues, see Caskey et al. (2006) and Vermilyea and Wilcox (2002). In Mexico City, the proportion is much higher: 76.4 percent according to Caskey et al. (2006). Respondents in surveys often cite factors related to anonymity to explain why they do not use bank accounts.

9. On this point, see Alvarez and Jermann (2000).

10. That is so because an autarkic allocation is decentralized as a competitive equilibrium by assigning a zero debt limit to all agents except the one with the lowest income growth rate, and by assuming a competitive interest factor that exactly matches the autarkic marginal rate of substitution of the household with the lowest income growth rate.

11. Just as an illustrative example, consider the case of log preferences, for which the condition reduces to $\alpha > \frac{1-\beta}{1+\beta}$. In this case, a fluctuation of three to four percent would be associated with a rate of time preference between 0.92 and 0.94.

12. The planner may in principle attempt to smooth the credit community's consumption vector by transfers of "money," that is, by selling IOUs to credit agents. However, nonnegative IOU balances will not be demanded by rationed low-income credit agents who wish to go short or by unconstrained high-income credit agents for whom money as a store of value yields less than loans.

13. Money is less useful as an asset in a growing economy, which permits the planner to let the inflation rate drop below zero when the growth rate of aggregate income is positive. See Section 5 for details.

REFERENCES

Abel, A. (1987) Optimal monetary growth. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 19, 437–450.

Adam, K. and R. Billi (2006) Optimal monetary policy under commitment with a zero bound on nominal interest rates. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 38(7), 1877–1905.

Aiyagari, S.R. and S. Williamson (2000) Money and dynamic credit arrangements with private information. *Journal of Economic Theory* 91, 248–279.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136510051400025X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Akyol, A. (2004) Optimal monetary policy in an economy with incomplete markets and idiosyncratic risk. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 51, 1245–1269.
Albanesi, S. (2005) Optimal and Time Consistent Monetary and Fiscal Policy with Heterogeneous Agents. Manuscript, Columbia University.
Alvarez, F. and U. Jermann (2000) Efficiency, equilibrium, and asset pricing with risk of default. *Econometrica* 68(4), 775–797.
Andolfatto, D. (2007) Incentives and the Limits to Deflationary Policy. Discussion paper 07-14, Simon Fraser University.
Antinolfi, G., C. Azariadis, and J. Bullard (2007) Monetary policy as equilibrium selection. *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review* 89(4), 331–341.
Antinolfi, G., C. Azariadis, and J. Bullard (2012) The Optimal Inflation Target in an Economy with Limited Enforcement. Working paper 2012-044A, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis.
Berentsen, A., G. Camera, and C. Waller (2007) Money, credit, and banking. *Journal of Economic Theory* 135(1), 171–195.
Bewley, T. (1980) The optimum quantity of money. In J. Kareken and N. Wallace (eds.), *Models of Monetary Economies*, pp. 169–210. Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis.
Bhattacharya, J., J. Haslag, and A. Martin (2005) Heterogeneity, redistribution, and the Friedman rule. *International Economic Review* 46(2), 437–454.
Boel, P. and G. Camera (2006) Efficient monetary allocations and the illiquidity of bonds. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 53, 1693–1715.
Boel, P. and G. Camera (2009) Financial sophistication and the distribution of the welfare cost of inflation. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 56, 968–978.
Caskey, J., C.R. Duran, and T.M. Solo (2006) The Urban Unbanked in Mexico and the United States. World Bank policy research working paper #3835.
Cavalcanti, R. and N. Wallace (1999) Inside and outside money as alternative media of exchange. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 31(2), 443–457.
Chiu, J. and M. Molico (2010) Liquidity, redistribution, and the welfare cost of inflation. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 57, 428{438.
da Costa, C. and I. Werning (2007) On the optimality of the Friedman rule with heterogeneous agents and non-linear income taxation. *Journal of Political Economy* 116(1), 82–112.
Deviatov, A. and N. Wallace (2014) Optimal inflation in a model of inside money. *Review of Economic Dynamics*. Forthcoming.
Eggertsson, G. and M. Woodford (2003) The zero bound on interest rates and optimal monetary policy. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* 2003(1), 139–211.
Erosa, A. and G. Ventura (2002) On inflation as a regressive consumption tax. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 49(4), 761–795.
Foley, D. and M. Sidrauski (1969) Optimal fiscal and monetary policy and economic growth. *Journal of Political Economy* 77(4), 698–719.
Freeman, S. (1993) Resolving differences over the optimal quantity of money. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 25(4), 801–811.
Friedman, M. (1969) The optimum quantity of money. In *The Optimum Quantity of Money*, pp. 1–50. New York: Aldine.
He, P., L. Huang, and R. Wright (2008) Money, banking, and monetary policy. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 55, 1013–1024.
Kehoe, T. and D. Levine (1993) Debt-constrained asset markets. *Review of Economic Studies* 60, 868–888.
Lagos, R. and R. Wright (2005) A unified framework for monetary theory and policy analysis. *Journal of Political Economy* 113(3), 463–484.
Levine, D. (1990) Asset trading mechanisms and expansionary policy. *Journal of Economic Theory* 54(1), 148–164.
Ragot, X. (2005) A Theory of Low Inflation in a Non-Ricardian Economy with Credit Constraints. Working paper 2005-20, PSE-Paris Jourdan.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136510051400025X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Smith, B.D. (2002) Monetary policy, banking crises, and the Friedman rule. *American Economic Review* 92(2), 128–134.

Summers, L. (1991) How should long term monetary policy be determined? *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 23, 625–631.

Vermilyea, T. and J.A. Wilcox (2002) Who is unbanked, and why: Results from a large, new survey of low-and-moderate income adults. In D. Evanoff (ed.), *Conference on Bank Structure and Competition, Proceedings*, pp. 442–468. Chicago: Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago.

Woodford, M. (1990) The optimum quantity of money. In B. Friedman and F. Hahn (eds.), *Handbook of Monetary Economics*, Volume II, pp. 1067–1152. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S136510051400025X Published online by Cambridge University Press