

Inequality and Growth: A Two-Player Dynamic Game with Production and Appropriation

Julio Huato*

February 15, 2005

*St. Francis College, Brooklyn, New York. E-mail: jhuato@sfc.edu.

Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Game	7
2.1	Framework	7
2.2	The first-order conditions	10
2.3	The Markovian Nash equilibrium	12
3	Analysis	13
3.1	Optimal consumption	13
3.2	Distributional conflict	14
3.3	The game's dynamics	15
3.4	The coordination game	18
4	Literature	20
4.1	Theoretical references	21
4.2	The empirical debate on inequality and growth	22
4.3	Random thoughts on cooperation	24
5	Conclusions	28
	Appendix	38

Abstract

This paper models a two-agent economy with production and appropriation as a noncooperative dynamic game, and determines its closed-form Markovian Nash equilibrium. The analysis highlights the parametric conditions that tip the economy from a nonaggressive or “cooperative” equilibrium to outright distributional conflict. The model includes parameters that capture the role of appropriation technology and destructiveness. The full dynamic implications of the game are yet to be explored, but the model offers a promising general framework for thinking about different technological and economic conditions as more or less conducive to cooperation or distributional conflict.

Key words: Differential game, dynamic game, growth, inequality, appropriation.

JEL Classification: O1, O5, P1

1 Introduction

Empirical studies conducted on various data sets show that, after controlling for other relevant factors, larger initial economic disparities in an economy are associated with lower subsequent economic performance.¹

Motivated by the finding of these empirical studies, this paper lays out a two-player differential game model of a simple economy with production and appropriation, determines its Markovian Nash equilibrium analytically, and examines its implications. Key insights about the dynamics of this artificial economy are gleaned from these results.

Although the nonlinearity of the Markovian Nash equilibrium's canonical system of differential equations may preclude a closed-form solution of its dynamic allocation problem, numerical solutions can be implemented. However, such numerical solutions and their analysis are outside the scope of this paper.

By *production*, it is meant that each player can use the stock of wealth under her possession to create a flow of net new wealth through a simple concave technology. *Appropriation* is defined as the set of costly actions undertaken to protect one's own possessions and/or to grab someone else's possessions.

In this context, ownership means degree of possession or disposability of wealth. In the practice of social life, legal and ethical rules, or rather the degree to which these are enforced, appear to determine ownership. But ownership in the sense used in this paper does not require legal or ethical recognition. It is entirely the outcome of the initial distribution of possessions, technological conditions of production and appropriation, and economic outcomes (shadow prices and actions chosen optimally over time) that flow from constrained utility maximization.² Thus, ownership is viewed in a continuum, with different degrees of force. In this light, the extent of appropriation can be interpreted as a negative or inverse measure of wealth *excludability*, as the force of ownership is called in the theoretical literature.³

¹A summary of the ongoing empirical debate on this matter is provided in section (4).

²The model includes as parameters the fraction of each player's wealth that is subject to appropriation, the "productivity" of appropriation outlays, and the fraction of the wealth taken away from the victim that winds up effectively appropriated by the aggressor. Each of these parameters can be viewed as reflecting institutional (political, legal, or ethical) conditions in the economy. However, this model does not require that. They can also be viewed as entirely determined by technology and economics.

³The model in this paper is consistent with both "political economy" and "social con-

This model highlights the inefficiencies resulting from appropriation and, in that sense, describes a mechanism by which a skewed initial distribution of wealth may lead to distributional conflict, large welfare losses, and thereby poor economic performance.⁴ But, this is hardly a surprising result. More importantly, the model provides a way to examine the effects of different economic settings – each with its corresponding system of incentives – on concurrent growth, where these economic settings can be proxied by boundary conditions and the relations among technological parameters.

In a one-period model, Grossman and Kim (1995) postulate appropriation in the form of two distinctive actions: defense (which they call “fortifications”) and attack (which they call “predation”). Their specification of the appropriation function, including parameters that capture the efficacy and destructiveness (wastefulness) involved in appropriation actions, has some attractive features. Appropriation actions enter the appropriation function inversely (hyperbolically). That is, the amount of her own wealth a player manages to retain is an increasing and smooth function of the appropriation actions she undertakes. On the other hand, the amount of player 2’s wealth that player 1 manages to appropriate is a decreasing and smooth function of player 1’s appropriation actions. Furthermore, the marginal products of appropriation (in the form of wealth retained and grabbed) are decreasing. Although slightly simplified, Grossman and Kim’s basic set-up is adopted in the model presented in this paper.⁵ In this sense, this model provides a dynamic generalization of these authors’ static results.

From a welfare analysis perspective, the natural Pareto-optimal baseline is that of a cooperative dynamic game, where the players agree to cooperate and share the dynamic efficiencies thus gained prior to their playing the game.⁶ In such case, the game effectively becomes a regular optimal control

flict” causality mechanisms as per the classification in Ferreira (1999). More generally, although the distinctions matter in practice, the concern here is not whether appropriation is conducted legitimately, lawfully (e.g., fiscal policy, eminent domain expropriation), or otherwise (e.g., blatant robbery).

⁴Other mechanisms can explain the negative relationship between initial wealth distribution and poor economic performance in the framework of a dynamic game. One such mechanism could be a players’ difference in time preferences specified as different rates of subjective discounting in the payoff function.

⁵The distinction between defensive and aggressive actions in Grossman and Kim (1995) is abandoned to ensure a closed-form Markovian Nash equilibrium.

⁶Also known in the literature as the “coordination game.” Section 4 summarizes this well-known case.

problem of the type studied in Ramsey’s (1928) and Koopmans’s (1965) models. However, the institutional setting that enables the players to make prior binding cooperative agreements is necessarily exogenous. At first sight, under the assumption of self-interested players, the cooperative case appears to have little practical relevance, since the institutional setting that induces cooperation is not fully explicated within the model.

The advantage of parameterizing the efficacy and destructiveness of appropriation is precisely that it allows us to explicate how such conditions may be brought about endogenously by two self-interested players in strategic interaction (e.g. individuals, classes, nations) with no *a priori* motivation to cooperate. In other words, we seek the conditions under which – given an initial distribution of wealth – self-interested players may optimally renounce appropriation actions, thus reaping and sharing the dynamic gains from cooperation, in the face of constraints in the technology and economics of production and appropriation. Grossman and Kim (1995) call this type of solution to the game a *nonaggressive equilibrium*.⁷

The theorem establishing the existence of Markovian Nash equilibria in differential games states that concavity in the controls of the Hamiltonian, which in turn requires concavity of the felicity function and of the state equation of motion, is sufficient to ensure the existence of at least one Markovian Nash equilibrium of the right sign, e.g. a “supremum” of the objective functional.⁸ But, determining Markovian Nash equilibria in practice is a vexing task. In particular, nonlinear interactions between state and control variables makes it extremely difficult to obtain a closed-form Markovian Nash equilibrium.⁹ This is undoubtedly the biggest analytical roadblock in solving

⁷In Grossman and Kim’s model, the nonaggressive equilibrium case is clearly distinguished from the coordination or cooperative case, because the former requires positive defensive outlays to the point of deterring all offensive expenditures, whereas the latter needs no appropriation outlays whatsoever. In other words, the latter is Pareto optimal whereas the former is Pareto suboptimal. However, in the model in this paper, a nonaggressive equilibrium entails zero appropriation outlays, effectively exhibiting the same Pareto superior properties of the cooperative case. For this reason only, at considerable semantic cost, in this paper, the terms *nonaggression* and *cooperation* are used interchangeably.

⁸See Dockner et al. (2000) for the statement and proof of the existence theorem.

⁹In a two-player game, the Markovian Nash equilibrium is obtained from the first-order conditions for each instantaneous (“static”) optimum for both players, by solving these conditions simultaneously for both players’ strategies in terms of the state and costate variables and parameters. A Nash equilibrium is a strategy that maximizes the payoff of each player under the assumption that the other player simultaneously chooses her

a differential game model and deriving clear economic implications from it. This is perhaps the chief reason why this method has so far attracted limited interest among economic theorists.

The unique contribution of this paper is the specification of a model that, without sacrificing the appealing nonlinearity in the interactions between actions and wealth in the appropriation function (and, thereby, in the equation of motion and the Hamiltonian) that Grossman and Kim (1995) suggested, has a *unique* closed-form Markovian Nash equilibrium that – in spite of its apparent complexity – yields significant insight into the economics of appropriation and growth.

Section 2.1 sets up the model in its more general form in the framework of a differential game. Section 3 analyzes the equilibrium conditions. Section 4 discusses relevant literature. Section 5 has a few concluding remarks.

2 Game

This section is organized as follows: Subsection 2.1 sets up the model. Subsection 2.2 finds the point-in-time conditions for an individual player’s optimal path, given feasible strategies chosen by the other player. Subsection 2.3 determines the general Markovian Nash equilibrium of the noncooperative game.

2.1 Framework

Consider a single-good economy with two utility-maximizing players $i = 1, 2$ over a period from the present $t = 0$ to a terminal time $t = T$. For each player i , the payoff functional is the sum of the instantaneous utility (*felicity*) of current consumption over the (continuous time) life of the game:

$$W_i = \int_0^T u[c_i(t)] dt \tag{1}$$

$$\tag{2}$$

optimal strategy. For each player, a Nash equilibrium is the best response to the Nash equilibrium strategies of the other player. Markovian strategies (also called “closed-loop” or “feedback strategies”) are dynamic decision rules in which the choice of a player’s current action depends entirely on the current state vector and the current time. The Nash equilibrium in a game played with Markovian strategies is said to be a Markovian Nash equilibrium.

where $u'(c) > 0$ and $u''(c) < 0$. That is, felicity $u[c(t)]$ is assumed to be a continuous, smooth, increasing, and strictly concave function of current (instantaneous) consumption, which is assumed to be nonnegative. For simplicity, there is no discounting of future utility.¹⁰

Each player $i = 1, 2$ is initially endowed with a given amount of wealth:

$$x_i(0) = x_{i0} \tag{3}$$

The initial endowments of wealth need not be equal for both players. In fact, as it will be established below, the difference in the initial endowments of wealth between the players, is a key parameter in the model.

Using existing wealth as the sole input, at each point in time, each player can produce new wealth according to the following production function:

$$y_i(t) = y[x_i(t)] \tag{4}$$

where $y'(x) > 0$ and $y''(x) < 0$. In words, the production function is assumed to be a continuous, smooth, increasing, and strictly concave function of the stock of existing wealth. The stock of existing wealth is used as the input of the production function at each $t \in [0, T]$. It is assumed that all outlays of wealth for current consumption and other current actions are deductions from the flow of wealth produced at that point in time.

Besides using output to consume and/or produce for the next instant, each player may engage in *appropriation* actions, namely instantaneous outlays of wealth made to protect her existing wealth and/or grab the other player's existing wealth. It is also assumed that, at each point in time $t \in [0, T]$, under existing technology, only a fixed fraction $0 < \delta < 1$ of each player's existing stock of wealth is effectively subject to appropriation. In other words, the current (instantaneous) flows of production, consumption, or appropriation outlays are not subject to appropriation.

Appropriation actions are denoted by $a_i(t)$ and assumed to be nonnegative.¹¹

¹⁰Ramsey (1928), Pigou (1932), and Harrod (1948) view the discounting of utility of future generations as ethically indefensible. Subjective discounting does not alter the overall results in this model, since the discount factor can be factored out of the Hamiltonian after redefining the costate in terms of (loosely speaking) current "utils," rather than present-value-at-zero "utils." The only difference lies in the time interpretation of the costate.

¹¹From this point on, the time reference in parenthesis is omitted to streamline the notation.

At $t \in [0, T]$, the fraction of her own wealth player i retains (the *retention rate*) is:

$$p_i = \frac{1}{1 + \theta a_j} \quad (5)$$

for $i \neq j = 1, 2$, where $\theta > 1$ is a constant parameter that reflects the efficacy of appropriation actions. Clearly, $0 \leq p_i \leq 1$. More specifically, $\lim_{a_j \rightarrow 0} p_i = 1$ and $\lim_{a_j \rightarrow \infty} p_i = 0$. Also, p_i is a monotonically decreasing function of a_j : $dp_i/da_j = -\theta/(1 + \theta a_j)^2 < 0$.

The portion of the other player's wealth a given player can effectively grab is:

$$\gamma(1 - p_j) = \gamma \left(\frac{\theta a_i}{1 + \theta a_i} \right) \quad (6)$$

for $i \neq j = 1, 2$, where $0 < \gamma < 1$ is a constant parameter (the *salvage ratio*) that captures the portion of wealth lost to appropriation by one of the players that is actually appropriated by the aggressor. In other words, only a fraction γ of the portion of wealth that player j loses is effectively appropriated by player i . Somehow the fraction $(1 - \gamma)$ winds up as a deadweight loss in the process. It follows from the result about p_i that $(1 - p_j)$ is a monotonically increasing function of a_i .

The instantaneous rate of change of player i 's stock of wealth is given by:

$$\dot{x}_i = y(x_i) - c_i - a_i - \delta x_i + \delta x_i \left(\frac{1}{1 + \theta a_j} \right) + \gamma \delta x_j \left(\frac{\theta a_i}{1 + \theta a_i} \right) \quad (7)$$

where $\dot{x} \equiv dx/dt$. This is called the *equation of motion* of player i 's wealth. In words, the rate of change of a player's wealth equals the output of current production, current consumption, and appropriation outlays, minus the portion of wealth subject to appropriation, plus the portion of one's own wealth retained and the portion of the other player's wealth appropriated.

The equation of motion can be expressed in terms of the retention rates and simplified further:

$$\dot{x}_i = y(x_i) - c_i - a_i - \delta x_i(1 - p_j) + \gamma \delta x_j(1 - p_i) \quad (8)$$

This being a one-good economy, the exchange of the good at each $t \in [0, T]$ would be pointless. However, the value of each unit of wealth transferred to the next instant may mean different amount of "utils" to each

player. In other words, the instantaneous shadow price of each player's wealth may differ. With intertemporal exchange allowed between the players (i.e. borrowing and lending), the two players could in principle trade the good intertemporally up to the point where the instantaneous shadow prices of wealth are equalized.

To simplify matters and train the focus strictly on appropriation, this model does not allow intertemporal exchange between the players. To frame this assumption differently, any discrepancy between the instantaneous shadow price of player i 's wealth and player j 's wealth can only translate into appropriation actions between them.

Each player's dynamic problem is to choose a strategy (i.e. a set of time paths for her controls over the life of the game $\{c_i^*(t), a_i^*(t)\}_0^T$) that maximizes her payoff functional, subject to her own wealth equation of motion, boundary conditions, nonnegativity constraints, and the strategy chosen by the other player.¹² Player i 's individually-optimal strategy is a function of both players' existing stock of wealth.¹³

The transversality condition is given by:

$$x_i(T)\lambda_i(T) = 0 \tag{9}$$

for at least one of the players $i = 1, 2$, where T is given exogenously or is to be determined endogenously. In words, the transversality condition says that the game ends when either the wealth of (at least one of) the players or its instantaneous shadow price is zero. The case of a given terminal time requires that the terminal instantaneous shadow price of wealth be pushed down to zero, since wealth has no use after T . If one player loses all her wealth, the game turns into a regular Ramsey-type optimal control problem for the surviving player.

2.2 The first-order conditions

It is assumed that the players have no prior binding agreement to cooperate, i.e. each of them acts independently of the other to maximize her individual payoff functional (1).

¹²The states and controls are assumed to be nonnegative.

¹³In other words, this is a perfect-information differential game. Strategies that depend only on the current state of the system are known as *closed-loop* controls or Markovian strategies.

Player i 's full Hamiltonian function for each $t \in [0, T]$ is:

$$H_i = u(c_i) + \lambda_{ii} \left[y(x_i) - c_i - a_i - \delta x_i \left(\frac{\theta a_j}{1 + \theta a_j} \right) + \gamma \delta x_j \left(\frac{\theta a_i}{1 + \theta a_i} \right) \right] \\ + \lambda_{ij} \left[y(x_j) - c_j - a_j - \delta x_j \left(\frac{\theta a_i}{1 + \theta a_i} \right) + \gamma \delta x_i \left(\frac{\theta a_j}{1 + \theta a_j} \right) \right] \quad (10)$$

Unlike a regular optimal control problem, in the differential-game framework, two costates can be specified for player i . One of them, λ_{ii} captures the marginal effect on the objective functional of relaxing i 's own equation of motion by one unit of wealth. It is the instantaneous shadow price or gross return rate of a unit of the player's own wealth transferred to the next instant, expressed in utility units of the current instant. More simply, λ_{ii} is called the *own* instantaneous shadow price. The second costate variable, λ_{ij} , captures the marginal effect on i 's objective functional that results from a unit change in player j 's wealth dynamic constraint. It is called here the *cross* instantaneous shadow price.

The first-order necessary conditions for an optimal consumption and appropriation strategy for player i at each $t \in [0, T]$, holding constant the strategy chosen by player j ,¹⁴ are the same conditions required to maximize i 's Hamiltonian (10):

$$u'(c_i) = \lambda_i \quad (11)$$

$$\lambda_i - \lambda_i \gamma \delta x_j \left[\frac{\theta}{1 + \theta a_i} - \frac{\theta^2 a_i}{(1 + \theta a_i)^2} \right] = \lambda_j \delta x_j \left[\frac{\theta}{1 + \theta a_i} - \frac{\theta^2 a_i}{(1 + \theta a_i)^2} \right] \quad (12)$$

at $t \in [0, T]$ and for $i \neq j = 1, 2$. The detailed derivation of these conditions is shown in the Appendix.

Note that, since x_i affects H_i and H_j in the same way, through the equations of motion of x_i and x_j , then $-\partial H_i / \partial x_i = -\partial H_j / \partial x_i = \dot{\lambda}_{ii} = \dot{\lambda}_{ji} = \dot{\lambda}_i$. Also, $-\partial H_j / \partial x_j = -\partial H_i / \partial x_j = \dot{\lambda}_{jj} = \dot{\lambda}_{ij} = \dot{\lambda}_j$. Therefore, $\lambda_{ii} = \lambda_{ji} = \lambda_i$ and $\lambda_{jj} = \lambda_{ij} = \lambda_j$ by construction of the Hamiltonians and the transversality condition.

The second-order sufficient conditions for a maximal value of the Hamiltonian and, thereby, of player i 's payoff functional at each point in time are satisfied by the strict concavity of the felicity function and of the equation of

¹⁴Technically, the strategy chosen by player j is restricted to a set of feasible strategies. In this model, the feasibility of a player's strategy is given by its nonnegativity, given the nonnegativity of the state variables.

motion in both c_i and a_i , since – assuming the instantaneous price of wealth is nonnegative – a linear combination of two concave functions is itself a concave function.

2.3 The Markovian Nash equilibrium

A *Markovian Nash equilibrium* reconciles the first-order conditions for both players consistent with their respective first-order necessary conditions, at each $t \in [0, T]$. A Markovian Nash equilibrium is defined as the optimal consumption and appropriation strategy of a player under the assumption that the other player also chooses her own optimal strategy. If a Markovian Nash equilibrium exists and the players are at such an equilibrium, then they have no incentive to move away from it for a given set of parameters and boundary conditions.

The Markovian Nash equilibrium can be found by simultaneously solving the system of equations formed by the first-order conditions of both players, for the control variables (current consumption c and appropriation outlays a), in terms of the parameters δ, θ, γ , the stocks of wealth of the players x_i, x_j , and the respective instantaneous shadow prices λ_i, λ_j .

By Pontryagin's maximum principle in the context of a differential game, the solution to the game's dynamic allocation – i.e. the optimal time paths for the stocks of wealth of both players and for their respective instantaneous shadow prices – must satisfy the Markovian Nash equilibrium at each $t \in [0, T]$.

The general Markovian Nash equilibria of the game is given by:

$$c_i^* = u'^{-1}(\lambda_i) \quad (13)$$

$$a_i^* = \frac{\sqrt{\theta \delta x_j (\gamma \lambda_i - \lambda_j) / \lambda_i - 1}}{\theta} \quad (14)$$

for $i \neq j = 1, 2$ and for each $t \in [0, T]$, where $u'^{-1}(\cdot)$ indicates the implicit inverse of the marginal utility function (assuming it exists), the \pm sign preceding the square-root operator is eliminated by using the nonnegativity conditions imposed by assumption on the control and state variables, and the asterisk denotes point-in-time optimality. The detailed derivation of the Markovian Nash equilibria equations is shown in the Appendix.

3 Analysis

This section analyzes the Markovian Nash results derived in the previous section. Subsection 3.1 interprets the condition for the optimal consumption path. Subsection 3.2 sorts out the conditions for a nonaggressive versus an aggressive equilibrium. Some of the qualitative dynamics of the game are examined in subsection 3.3. Subsection 3.4 refers the well-known single-agent optimal-control case.

3.1 Optimal consumption

To examine the implications of the first-order conditions and the Markovian Nash equilibrium (which satisfies them for both players simultaneously), consider the *elasticity of substitution* between consumption at two discrete points in time, t and s :

$$\sigma[c_t] \equiv -\frac{u'(c_s)/u'(c_t)}{c_s/c_t} \frac{d(c_s/c_t)}{d\{u'(c_s)/u'(c_t)\}}$$

The well-known result that the limit of this elasticity as the difference between s and t becomes arbitrarily small yields

$$\sigma[c(t)] = -\frac{1}{c(t)} \left(\frac{u'[c(t)]}{u''[c(t)]} \right)$$

is shown in the Appendix. This expression says that the point or *instantaneous* elasticity of substitution, which turns out to be the reciprocal of the negative of the *elasticity of the marginal utility*, $\epsilon(c) \equiv [u''(c)c]/u'(c)$, a measure of the curvature of the felicity function. Thus, the following expressions for the growth rate of consumption $\hat{c} \equiv \dot{c}/c$ can be derived substituting into condition (11):

$$\hat{c}^*_i = -\frac{1}{\epsilon} \hat{\lambda}_i = \sigma(c^*_i) \hat{\lambda}_i \tag{15}$$

Note that $\sigma(c_i) \geq 0$, because felicity is increasing in c_i and strictly concave, i.e. $\epsilon \leq 0$. Hence, in this form, condition (11) says that the relation between the growth rate of consumption and the growth rate of the instantaneous shadow price of wealth is nonnegative in a proportion determined by the instantaneous elasticity of substitution between consumption now and

consumption in the next instant. This is a well-known result in the modern theory of economic growth.

In terms of the elasticity of marginal utility, condition (11) says that if felicity is more rather than less curved (i.e. if growing consumption yields a rapidly declining marginal utility) and consumption is strictly positive, then a player's growth rate of consumption will lag behind the growth rate of the instantaneous shadow price of her own wealth.

3.2 Distributional conflict

On the other hand, using the retention rate p defined above, condition (62) simplifies nicely to:

$$\frac{a_i^*}{(p_i^*)^2 - p_i^*} = \delta x_j \left(\frac{\lambda_j - \gamma \lambda_i}{\lambda_i} \right) \quad (16)$$

To derive the parametric conditions under which $a_i \geq 0$, L'Hôpital's rule can be used to take the limit of this expression as a_i approaches zero from the right:

$$\lim_{a_i^* \rightarrow 0^+} \left(\frac{a_i^*}{(p_i^*)^2 - p_i^*} \right) = -\frac{1}{\theta} \quad (17)$$

After some algebra, we obtain the following condition for $a_i \geq 0$:

$$\frac{\gamma \lambda_i - \lambda_j}{\lambda_i} \geq \frac{1}{\theta \delta x_j} \quad (18)$$

The detailed derivation of these results appears in the Appendix.

In words, player i 's optimal appropriation actions at a given point in time increase above zero as, holding all other constant, (1) the difference between player i 's instantaneous shadow price of own wealth and instantaneous shadow price of cross wealth, (2) the salvage ratio, (3) the efficacy of appropriation, or (4) the fraction of j 's wealth subject to appropriation increase above a certain point.

Equilibrium condition (14) or, equivalently, inequality (18) suggest that, at a given $t \in [0, T]$, for player i to move from zero to positive appropriation actions, she requires *sizeable* incentives in the form of relatively large differences between $\gamma \lambda_i$ and λ_j . Larger values of δ or θ can only scale up difference $(\gamma \lambda_i - \lambda_j)$, but it is this difference itself that determines the algebraic sign

of the argument in the square root operator of equilibrium condition (14). And this argument is required to be larger than one for $a_i > 0$. Less than large differences between the instantaneous shadow prices are insufficient to induce player i to employ any portion of her wealth in appropriation actions.

In the context of this model, parameters δ , θ , and γ can be viewed as reflecting exogenous technological conditions. On the other hand, given the salvage ratio, the ratio $(\gamma\lambda_i - \lambda_j)/\lambda_i$ is driven endogenously by the dynamics of the instantaneous shadow prices. This raises the question of what characterizes such dynamics.

3.3 The game's dynamics

To examine qualitatively the dynamics of the game, consider the Euler equation for player i :¹⁵

$$\dot{\lambda}_i = \lambda_i \left[\delta \left(\frac{\theta a_j^*}{1 + \theta a_j^*} \right) - y'(x_i) \right] - \lambda_j \delta \gamma \left(\frac{\theta a_j^*}{1 + \theta a_j^*} \right) \quad (19)$$

In terms of the retention rate, the growth rate of the instantaneous shadow price simplifies to:

$$\hat{\lambda}_i = \delta(1 - p_j^*) - (\lambda_j/\lambda_i) \delta \gamma (1 - p_j^*) - y'(x_i) \quad (20)$$

The Euler equation is known in the economic-growth literature as the Keynes-Ramsey rule. In the context of this game, equation (19) or (20) could be called the *modified* Keynes-Ramsey rule and be interpreted as saying that the marginal rate of substitution between consumption now and consumption at the next instant must equal the marginal rate of transformation of wealth now into wealth at the next instant via production and/or appropriation. In the case of production, the marginal output is valued at the player's own instantaneous shadow price. In the case of appropriation, the retained output of appropriation is valued at the player's own instantaneous shadow price, but the grabbed output of appropriation is valued at the cross instantaneous shadow price.

Substituting equation (20) into condition (15) above, the optimal growth rate of player i 's consumption can be expressed in terms of δ , θ , γ , p_j , her

¹⁵The Euler equation of each player results from equalizing the time derivative of the instantaneous shadow price of player i 's wealth and the negative of the partial derivative of the Hamiltonian with respect to the player's stock of wealth.

own marginal product $y'(x_i)$, and the ratio of cross to own instantaneous shadow prices of wealth:

$$\hat{c}_i^* = \sigma(c_i^*) \left\{ \delta(1 - p_j^*) \left[\frac{\lambda_i - \gamma\lambda_j}{\lambda_i} \right] - y'(x_i) \right\} \quad (21)$$

Clearly, if player i chooses to reduce one small portion of her wealth dc_i now and transfer it via production or appropriation in order to have more wealth for consumption at the next instant, the “utils” lost now will be $dc_i u'(c_i)$. On the other hand, the “utils” gained will be the sum of gains in “own utils” $dc_i \{ [1 + (y'(x_i) + \delta p_j)] / [1 + \delta] \}$ plus “cross utils” $dc_i [\delta \gamma (1 - p_j)]$.¹⁶ Along the optimal path, the “utils” lost and gained must be equal or else the path is not optimal.

Equation (21) also implies that the difference between the instantaneous shadow prices (as a fraction of own’s instantaneous shadow price), a crucial factor in tipping the players’ optimal strategies from zero to positive appropriation actions, is directly related to the dynamics of consumption and inversely related to the marginal product and the size of appropriation.¹⁷

$$\frac{\lambda_i - \gamma\lambda_j}{\lambda_i} = \frac{\hat{c}_i^* / \sigma(c_i^*) - y'(x_i)}{\delta(1 - p_j^*)} \quad (22)$$

If $a_i \rightarrow 0$, equation (20) and (21) turn into:

$$\hat{\lambda}_i|_{a_i \rightarrow 0} = -y'(x_i) \quad (23)$$

$$\hat{c}_i^*|_{a_i \rightarrow 0} = -\sigma(c_i^*) y'(x_i) \quad (24)$$

and equations (24), one per player, characterize entirely the dynamics of the optimal nonaggressive time path of the game’s economy. In other words, the outcome of the game is the same as the outcome of the coordination or cooperative game.¹⁸

¹⁶Remember that player i ’s instantaneous valuation of her own wealth coincides with player j ’s instantaneous valuation of i ’s wealth. So “cross utils” does not mean “utils” in the subjective sense of the other player only, but also own “utils” *as if* the one player had the same level of consumption as the other.

¹⁷At any stationary or steady state consistent with the Markovian Nash equilibrium conditions (i.e. the game’s optimal dynamic equilibrium path), the ratio $(\lambda_i - \gamma\lambda_j)/\lambda_i$ also turns out to be a measure of the inequality in the distribution of wealth at each point in time. See the discussion below.

¹⁸See section 3.4.

The canonical system of differential equations whose solutions are required to determine the optimal time paths of wealth for each player, as well as the optimal time paths of the shadow prices, is given by the equation of motion (7), Euler equation (19), given initial conditions $x_i(0) = x_{i0}$, and transversality condition (9) for both players $i = 1, 2$. Valued for the Markovian Nash equilibrium, the latter becomes:

$$x_i(T)u'[c_i^*(T)] = 0 \quad (25)$$

This condition says that, if the instantaneous value of the marginal utility at the terminal point T is positive, then it is not optimal for a player to keep a positive stock of wealth at that point, since she could increase the value of her objective functional by consuming it.

From the analysis above, it is clear that the stationary states in the game, defined by $\dot{c}_i^* = \dot{a}_i^* = \dot{x}_i = 0$, must satisfy the following conditions:

$$y'(x_i) = \delta(1 - p_j^*) \left[\frac{\lambda_i - \gamma\lambda_j}{\lambda_i} \right] \quad (26)$$

$$\hat{\lambda}_i = \hat{\lambda}_j - \hat{x}_j \left(\frac{\gamma\lambda_i - \lambda_j}{\lambda_j} \right) \quad (27)$$

$$y(x_i) + \gamma\delta(1 - p_i^*) = c_i^* + a_i^* + \delta x_i(1 - p_j^*) \quad (28)$$

for each player $i = 1, 2$ over the life of the game $[0, T]$.

The first condition follows from equation (21), which in turn results from substituting the Euler equation (19) into first-order condition (11). The second condition for stationarity results from taking the time derivative of Markovian Nash solution (14) and setting it equal to zero. The third condition follows from the wealth equation of motion (7).

It is trivially true that a stationary state of the game is given by $c_i^* = a_i^* = x_i^* = 0$ for at least one of the players. More importantly, since by assumption $y'(x_i) < 0$ and $y''(x_i) > 0$, equation (26) implies that, at any steady state, player i 's stock of wealth and her wealth's instantaneous shadow price are negatively related. Moreover, equation (27) implies that the growth rate of player i 's own instantaneous shadow price is positively related to the player j 's stock of wealth.¹⁹

In words, at a steady state satisfying the Markovian Nash equilibrium conditions (i.e. a dynamic optimal equilibrium), the higher the stock of

¹⁹The detailed proof of these two assertions is shown in the Appendix.

wealth of a player, the lower her wealth's instantaneous shadow price, and the higher her level of current consumption. And, vice versa, the lower the stock of wealth of a player, the higher her wealth's instantaneous shadow price, and the lower her level of current consumption.²⁰

This should not be a surprising result. In this game, aside from their difference in the (given) initial endowments of wealth, the players are otherwise identical. The values of the parameters apply for both players. Felicity, the production function, and the appropriation function are all the same for both players, smooth and strictly concave. Also, each player's optimal appropriation actions depend only on the other player's stock of wealth at t .

Therefore, in the dynamic solution of the game, the ratio $(\gamma\lambda_i - \lambda_j)/\lambda_i$, the decisive factor that tips the economy from its nonaggressive equilibrium to outright distributional conflict, reflects not only a difference between the players in their respective instantaneous shadow prices, but also the inequality in their levels of current consumption and in their stocks of wealth. In other words, this ratio is *a measure of the wealth inequality* prevailing in the economy.

The explicit determination of interior dynamic solutions for this game requires further work. Given the nonlinearity of the canonical system of differential equations of the game, computing specific numerical solutions, i.e. based on specific forms of the felicity and production functions and boundary conditions, may be required to examine in more detail the comparative dynamics of the game.

3.4 The coordination game

This section summarizes results that apply to the game if, before the game, the players strike a binding cooperative agreement whereby they eliminate appropriation outlays and share the game by coordinating their respective consumption rates. The following will consider this case. However, these same results apply to (1) the degenerate case of the differential game when the boundary conditions and relations between the parameters do not ensure the strict inequality case in (18), i.e. when $a_i = 0$, and to (2) any of the players individually, if the other player's stock of wealth or its own shadow price approach zero.

²⁰This is the game's analog of Ramsey's model condition (36) below.

The economy's state and control variables are:

$$x = \pi x_1 + (1 - \pi)x_2 \quad (29)$$

$$c = \pi c_1 + (1 - \pi)c_2 \quad (30)$$

$$a = \pi a_1 + (1 - \pi)a_2 \quad (31)$$

where π is the agreed-upon weight of player i in the economy, assumed constant across the welfare function, the distribution of wealth, and the division of actions.

Assuming a simple additive welfare function, both players coordinate the choice of their control trajectories to maximize the joint objective functional:

$$W = \int_0^T u[c(t)]dt \quad (32)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$, subject to the boundary conditions, the nonnegativity constraints, and the following equation of motion:

$$\dot{x} = y(x) - c \quad (33)$$

For the players, maximizing equation (32) is equivalent to maximizing the Hamiltonian:

$$H = u(c) + \lambda[y(x) - c] \quad (34)$$

at each $t \in [0, T]$, since δ and a_i for $i = 1, 2$ are zero by agreement.

This is a streamlined version of Ramsey's (1928) model of growth, which has been studied extensively.²¹ For reference purposes, the first-order condition for a maximum value of the functional at each point in time is:

$$u'(c) = \lambda \quad (35)$$

The time path of the aggregated stock of wealth in the economy is given by the equation of motion and the time path of the instantaneous shadow price of wealth is given by:

$$\dot{\lambda} = -\lambda y'(x) \quad (36)$$

²¹The extra simplifying assumptions adopted in this paper (zero depreciation and zero population growth) lead to a golden rule level of production that is at once the optimal and the maximal rates of consumption.

By Pontryagin's maximum principle, the optimal paths of consumption and wealth $\{c^*(t), x^*(t)\}_0^T$ must satisfy the system of differential equations formed by (33) and (36) valued at the first-order condition. Given a boundary condition on initial wealth $x(0) = x_0$ and on the terminal instantaneous shadow price of wealth $\lambda(T) = 0$, the system can be solved for the optimal paths of wealth and its shadow price.

Perhaps a more intuitive description of the dynamics of the system can be attained by taking the time derivative of the costate in the point-in-time first-order condition, substituting in the state and costate differential equations, and using the instantaneous elasticity of substitution $\sigma(c) \equiv -u'/(u''c)$, so that the system of differential equations becomes:

$$\dot{c} = \sigma(c) c y'(x) \tag{37}$$

$$\dot{x} = y(x) - c \tag{38}$$

Thus, the dynamics of consumption and wealth accumulation in this economy can be summarized by contrast to the steady or stationary state where $\hat{c} = \hat{x} = 0$ (in which the levels of consumption \bar{c} and wealth stock \bar{x} are constant over time) and summarized as follows:

$$\hat{c} > 0 \text{ if } y'(x) > 0 \text{ i.e. if } x < \bar{x} \tag{39}$$

$$\hat{c} < 0 \text{ if } y'(x) < 0 \text{ i.e. if } x > \bar{x} \tag{40}$$

$$\hat{c} = 0 \text{ if } y'(x) = 0 \text{ i.e. if } x = \bar{x} \tag{41}$$

$$\hat{x} > 0 \text{ if } y(x) > c \tag{42}$$

$$\hat{x} < 0 \text{ if } y(x) < c \tag{43}$$

$$\hat{x} = 0 \text{ if } y(x) = c \tag{44}$$

4 Literature

This section discusses narrow slivers of literature relevant to the model in this paper. Subsection 4.1 refers to some predecessors of the model in this paper. Subsection 4.2 summarizes the empirical research that motivated the model. Subsection 4.3 closes the section with references and thoughts on the notion of cooperation between self-interested economic agents.

4.1 Theoretical references

The key theoretical predecessor for this paper is Grossman and Kim's (1995) pioneering two-player static game. The model in this paper owes to Grossman and Kim the specification of the appropriation function as a hyperbolic function. However, this paper modifies the set-up of the appropriation function in a crucial respect: it abandons the distinction between defensive and offensive actions.

The decision to alter Grossman and Kim's specification of the appropriation function can be justified on two grounds. First, not much is lost by shedding the distinction. Arguably, the key element in the specification is the smooth concavity of the appropriation function. The second reason is tractability. With defense specified as a type of action separate from attack, the first-order necessary condition for an individual optimum that determines the optimal level of appropriation actions (defense and attack) become dependent on the player's own wealth, aside from depending on the other player's wealth. This turns the derivation of a Markovian Nash equilibrium into a combinatorial nightmare. On the other hand, without the distinction, the Markovian Nash conditions are easy to pin down.

Doubtlessly, the determination of the Markovian Nash equilibrium is the biggest analytical roadblock in solving differential game models and deriving clear economic insight from them. This is perhaps the main reason why this method has so far attracted little interest among economic theorists. This is remarkable, since early theoretical results and applications of differential game theory date back to the mid 1950s and early 1960s. Isaacs (1965) compiles the seminal papers. Friedman (1971) provides a systematic and general description of the mathematics of differential games, including the theorem of the existence of a Markovian Nash equilibrium (at the time referred as "the saddle point solution"). Intriligator (1971) introduces differential games to students of economics. Dockner et al. (2000) has a modern version of the existence theorem.

Simpler (more tractable) forms of specifying the appropriation function seem much less interesting or have been tried by other authors. Lancaster (1973) and Hoel (1978) use the differential game approach to highlight what Lancaster calls the "dynamic inefficiency of capitalism." Their specification allows them to obtain elegant and straightforward "bang-bang" solutions to their models. They achieve simplicity by ruling out extra-economic appropriation – and the nonlinearities that arise from its specification. They

postulate “workers” and “capitalists” as players engaged in regular exchange in the labor and product markets. Since their definition of “capitalism” is such that capitalists own all the physical wealth and the workers only their labor power, Lancaster’s and Hoel’s papers are similar to mine insofar as they all show that a dynamic welfare loss ultimately results from inequality. The difference is that, in their models, the inequality between workers and capitalists translates not into appropriation, but into a separation between the current consumption (and thereby saving) and investment decisions *à la* Keynes.

To judge by the topical literature, engineering and operations research specialists are rather comfortable with numerical approximate solutions to *both* the Markovian Nash equilibria and the solution to the dynamic allocation problem.²² The theoretical economic literature is far from having adopted this attitude. Instead, it usually expects sharp analytical solutions and qualitative and – even – quantitative predictions that can be demonstrably reconciled with the tested tenets of basic economic intuition. While there is some acceptance of numerical solutions to the dynamic allocation problem proper, the suspicion remains. The concern seems to be that – given the complexity of the relations involved – the numerical approximation of a Markovian Nash equilibrium, when fed into the derivation of the dynamic allocation solution, could limit or even distort the outcome to the point of rendering it useless.

4.2 The empirical debate on inequality and growth

Galor and Zeira (1993) are credited with reviving interest in the causal mechanism between initial inequality and subsequent growth. The empirical finding that larger initial income inequality is associated with lower subsequent growth is due to Person and Tabellini (1994) and Alesina and Rodrik (1994). Bénabou (1996) and Perotti (1996) surveyed the empirical literature and reported that most studies found the same result.

In a 1997 paper (published in the *American Economic Review*), Forbes (2000) challenged this finding and, using a new data panel developed by Deininger and Squire (1996), reported instead a positive relation between initial income inequality and subsequent growth. Li and Zou (1998) also

²²For a rare paper using numerical approximation to compute both the Markovian Nash equilibrium and the dynamic solution to an economic differential game, see Itaya (2000).

claimed to have found a positive relation. Deininger and Squire (1998) themselves conducted an analysis of their data set and found that the negative relation was robust. Székely and Hilgert (1999) questioned the quality of the Deininger and Squire data for Latin America and showed that Forbes' results might have been dependent upon the method used to compute inequality. Birdsall and Londono (1997) found a negative relation between initial human-capital inequality and subsequent growth.

Barro (1999), analyzing an extended data set, found “little overall relation between income inequality and rates of growth and investment.” However, “higher inequality tends to retard growth in poor countries and encourage growth in richer places.” Since most countries in the world are classified as poor and most people in the world live in poor countries, it is apparent that the former conclusion has a larger relevance in global welfare than the latter. Lucas (1988) has suggested compellingly that there are massive gains in efficiency to be made in the world economy by helping poor and large economies to grow.²³

Sokoloff and Engerman (2000) and Engerman and Sokoloff (2002) marshalled a large body of historiographic information to draw a contrast between Latin America and Anglo America, where the former started off with a more skewed distribution of its factor endowments, which in turn led it to evolve weaker legal and political institutions and, through them, experience a poorer economic performance. Easterly (2001a) and Easterly (2001b) used a careful econometric specification to validate Engerman and Sokoloff's hypothesis. While the challenge by Forbes (2000) and Li and Zou (1998) was based on panel regressions, Panizza (2002) analyzed a cross-state data panel for the United States. He found no evidence of a positive relation and “some evidence” of a negative relation, although sensitive to the method used to measure inequality.²⁴

²³“Is there some action a government of India could take that would lead the Indian economy to grow like Indonesia's or Egypt's? If so, *what*, exactly? If not, what is it about the ‘nature of India’ that makes it so? The consequences for human welfare involved in questions like these are simply staggering: Once one starts to think about them, it is hard to think about anything else.” Lucas (1988).

²⁴The initial inequality considered in the empirical literature refers to consumption, income, and ownership of an array of assets, physical, human, and even intangibles. Some studies include markers such as race, ethnicity, language, gender, or age, where such markers lead to social ranking. The conceptual and empirical relations among physical wealth, human wealth, income, and consumption are reasonably well established. In this paper, we refer to ‘wealth inequality’ in the broadest sense.

4.3 Random thoughts on cooperation

It is common in the general equilibrium literature to contrast the decentralized markets result to that derived without appeal to separation theorems, i.e. by invoking the existence of some sort of “social planner.” In the welfare analysis of general equilibrium, the social planner results are used as the baseline to compare the results obtained for the decentralized markets case. Implicit in the exercise is the notion that an economy in which all self-interested economic agents perfectly coordinate their individual actions is superior to any conceivable alternative.²⁵ More realistic economic arrangements (e.g. decentralized markets) can only aspire to match the welfare heights that such a perfect economy would attain if it could only come about.

In spite of the highly abstract – in fact, heroic – character of the assumptions underpinning general equilibrium (perfect information, perfect markets, convexity of preferences and technology, and zero externalities), the decentralized markets case appears as much more realistic, more robust, and more likely to emerge out of actual historical economic evolution than perfect coordination as personified in the abstract role of the “social planner.” After all, the chief role of the social planner, i.e. to provide a “consistent” (not self-contradictory) mapping from individual utility to the welfare function, is left completely unexplained.

Arrow (1963) looked carefully into this mapping from individual utility functions to a general welfare function and derived very stringent conditions for such a mapping to exist and for the resulting welfare function to meet some basic “rationality” criteria. One of the conditions is, precisely, the existence of a “dictator” able to form a consistent welfare function, thus getting around the “impossibility” of interpersonal utility comparisons. The “social planner” can thus be viewed as a sort of “benevolent dictator.”

Arrow’s Impossibility Theorem notwithstanding, welfare and economic policy analysis continue to depend on the notion of social welfare. Considering how pervasive redistributive actions (e.g., fiscal policy) are, in virtually every economy, it is clear that the criterion of Pareto efficiency, by eluding distributive judgments, is too restrictive to be of practical use in welfare economics and policy analysis. In most cases, policymakers face re-distributive

²⁵For an example of this practice, see Stokey and Lucas (1989), chapter 1.

tradeoffs associated with different economic policy choices. It is rarely the case that there is a clearly Pareto-superior choice.²⁶ It is no surprise then that, in the absence of uncontroversial results (similar to Pareto efficiency) to guide welfare economists and policymakers in redistributive dilemmas, theorists are forced to forge more restrictive welfare notions and even flirt with the old cardinalism.²⁷

Other strands of the literature suggest how the idea of cooperation in the strategic interaction between economic agents may be an optimal response. For instance, one way to view the cooperative game is as the outcome of a merger of the two players' interests in order to internalize the external costs from their nonmarket-mediated interaction (i.e., appropriation). In our model, intertemporal exchange between the players is excluded by assumption. Therefore, a formal real interest rate does not emerge. However, this does not mean that prices are absent. The instantaneous *shadow prices* implicit in production and appropriation are in the nature of what Coase calls "prices in their widest sense." Thus, the negative externalities of appropriation can be viewed as large-scale Coasian transaction costs that might be better handled by a merger of the players' interests into a single economic entity. Examples of this are "firms":

It is clear that an alternative form of economic organization which could achieve the same result at less cost than would be incurred by [bargaining between private owners] would enable the value of production to be raised. [...] [T]he firm represents such an alternative to organizing production through [...] transactions [between private parties]. Within the firm, individual bargains between the various co-operating factors of production are eliminated and for a [...] transaction [between private owners] is substituted an administrative decision. [...] In effect, [...] the firm would acquire the legal rights of all the parties, and the rearrangement of activities would not follow on a rearrangement of

²⁶Stiglitz (2003) claims that facing gray-area situations with no evident Pareto-improving policies in sight is the rule in actual policymaking.

²⁷On the former, see Bardhan, Bowles, and Gintis (1998), who replace the notion of "Pareto efficient," unable to judge the welfare effects of nonmarket-mediated asset redistribution, with that of "productivity enhancing," which denotes welfare gains from nonmarket-mediated asset redistribution, in situations where informational imperfections lead to incomplete or too-costly-to-enforce contracts. On the latter, see for instance Layard (2003).

rights by contract but as a result of an administrative decision as to how the rights should be used.” Coase (1960, pp. 115-116).

However, in this case as well, the precise mechanism by which the merger is designed and implemented remains exogenous.

Sen (1997) argues elegantly that a Pareto superior solution to the prisoner’s dilemma game would be achieved by self-interested players if they behaved paradoxically, i.e., by turning it into an “assurance game” (under a principle of reciprocity, players give each other prior assurances that they will not shirk) or under the assumption of “socially conscious” play (each player prefers to do the right thing whether or not the other does the same):

That the Prisoner’s Dilemma could disappear if people had different preferences is true but hardly interesting. What is, however, quite significant is the fact that even if the people involved continued to have the same Prisoner’s Dilemma type preferences, but behaved as if their preferences were as in the Assurance Game (or better still *as if* they had [...] “socially conscious” preferences [...]), they could be better off *even in terms of their true preferences*. This is precisely where the question of cultural orientation comes in, and it may provide a social case for encouraging values that reorient a person’s choices and actions even if his personal welfare functions remain unaltered. In a sense, this is a matter of morality, and there are of course many other spheres of life as well in which a society throws up moral values that attempt to dissociate choice from individualistic rational calculus. Indeed, this is a common phenomenon for “homely virtues” like honesty, keeping promises, etc., but what is important to recognize here is the relevance of all this to the problem of work motivation and therefore to income distribution.²⁸

Sen’s scenario is that of prisoner’s dilemma games in which self-interested players remain self-interested in their felicity function while behaving *as if* it (their felicity function) were altruistic. This is a more sophisticated view than that of invoking the altruistic behavior of the players as a *deus ex machina*.²⁹

²⁸Sen (1997), pp. 98-99.

²⁹There is a growing literature on the evolution of altruistic preferences and cooperation from first economic principles, partly spanned by Axelrod’s (1984) work. For an example, see Bowles and Gintis (2000).

But, still, it requires, rather implausibly, that the set of preferences individuals use to subjectively map their actions to their wellbeing be different by assumption from the preferences that guide their actual behavior in the face of constraints.

Sen's reflections are a reply to Marx, whose description of "pure" communism is that of a "coordinated-game" type of society in which common ownership excludes formal exchange. Marx held the view that the emergence of a communist society was necessary because the "socialization of production" (and life in general) would increasingly require the "socialization of ownership." By the phrase "socialization of production," he meant an increasing interdependence between producers, mainly due to technological progress.³⁰ Marx seemed to have envisioned the emergence of a pure communist society, without formal exchange, as the result of a long transition that required the suppression of the main forms of economic inequality and the gradual development of a new ethics of cooperation and publicly-minded outlook.³¹

In modern terms, Marx envisioned technological progress as a process leading to the emergence of ever larger and more pervasive externalities that markets, based on private ownership, would be unable to handle efficiently. The agency for the transition to communism would be the "propertyless

³⁰"Let us imagine an association of free men, working with the means of production held in common, and expending their many different forms of labor-power in full self-awareness as one single social labor force." (1976, p. 171.) "Within the collective society based on common ownership of the means of production, the producers do not exchange their products; just as little does the labor employed on the products appear here as the value of these products, as a material quality possessed by them, since now, in contrast to capitalist society, individual labor no longer exists in an indirect fashion but directly as a component part of total labor." (1938, p. 85.) "On the basis of communal production, the determination of time remains, of course, essential. The less time the society requires to produce wheat, cattle, etc., the more time it wins for other production, material or mental. Just as in the case of an individual, the multiplicity of its development, its enjoyment and its activity depends on the economization of time. Economy of time, to this all economy ultimately reduces itself. Society likewise has to distribute its time in a purposeful way, in order to achieve a production adequate to its overall needs; just as the individual has to distribute his time correctly in order to satisfy the various demands on his activity. Thus, economy of time, along with the planned distribution of labor time among the various branches of production, remains the first economic law on the basis of communal production. It becomes law, there, to an even higher degree. (1973, p. 172-173.)

³¹A brief discussion of the transitional process leading to pure communism is in Marx (1938). Sen (1995) provides an erudite and meticulous discussion of the difficulties of the notion of economic and/or social equality.

direct producers,” the workers, who would have the least vested interest in the *status quo*.³² However, the specifics of this transitional process are missing in Marx’s writings or vaguely described as a process of workers’ collective self-growth through their struggle against the capitalists. It is not clear the extent to which Marx understood the major sources of moral hazard arising from the common disposition of productive wealth, let alone how to deal with them in practice.³³

Keeping in mind that the notion of cooperation used in this paper does not distinguish explicitly between direct cooperation and cooperation mediated by exchange in markets,³⁴ a loose interpretation of the implications of the model above is that – at least when considering a given point in time – the conditions that enable self-interested players to cooperate may be much more robust than usually thought. Again, at least for a given point in time, distributional conflict appears to be the exception.

5 Conclusions

This paper presented a dynamic model of a two-agent economy with production and appropriation using the framework of differential games. The closed-form Markovian Nash equilibrium of this economy was determined and information about the economics of appropriation and growth was extracted from it.

Given initial conditions and parameter values, for a given point in time, the model implies that appropriation is unlikely, requiring as it does *extreme*

³²Another way to frame Marx’s view of technological progress in modern terms is as a process by which an ever larger set of goods becomes *public*. A public good is both *nonrivalrous* (on the extreme, *nondepletable*) and *nonexcludable*. While the nonrivalrous (and nondepletable) character of goods depends on their physical or technical attributes, their excludability is socially conditioned. As suggested above, excludability is another name for the ability of individuals or their agencies to enforce their ownership rights and, in the terms of our model, is inversely related to the extent of appropriation.

³³Private ownership can be viewed as a rough form of private insurance in the face of economic uncertainty. Similarly, public ownership can be viewed as social insurance aimed to eliminate unsystematic risk. For a modern treatment of the topic of social insurance, see Shiller (1996).

³⁴In fact, free voluntary exchange through markets (as opposed to appropriation) could be viewed as an organized form of cooperation. On the other hand, direct voluntary cooperation, in which reciprocity is not regulated by prices or even enforced, can be viewed as an informal mode of exchange.

conditions of inequality in wealth possession, levels of consumption, and – therefore – instantaneous shadow prices of wealth.

However, the full dynamic implications are not yet clear. One possibility is that, as a result of the strict concavity of the appropriation function, the system has a self-correcting mechanism built in that prevents initial disparities from exploding to the point where one of the players loses all her wealth.

Another possibility is that the nonlinearities in the canonical system of differential equations, that the dynamic allocation optimal paths must satisfy, build up initial small disparities in wealth possession (and shadow prices) over time to the point of creating conditions that induce distributional conflict. And clearly, the introduction of randomness in the model would make it more likely to generate distributional conflict situations.

The full solution of the dynamical allocation problem of the game, and the analysis of its implications, is left for future work.

References

- [1] Adelman, Irma and Sherman Robinson, "Income Distribution and Development," *Handbook of Development Economics*, vol. II, edited by H. Chenery and T.N. Srinivasan, 1989, Elsevier.
- [2] Adelman, Irma and C. T. Morris, *Society, Politics, and Economic Development: A Quantitative Approach*, Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1967.
- [3] Aghion, Phillipe "A Theory of Trickle-Down Growth and Development," *Review of Economic Studies*, 64, 151-172, 1997.
- [4] Alesina, Alberto, and Dani Rodrik, "Distributive Politics and Economic Growth," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, May 1994.
- [5] Arrow, Kenneth J., *Social Choice and Individual Values*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1963.
- [6] Axelrod, Robert, *The Evolution of Cooperation*, New York: Basic Books, 1984.
- [7] Bardhan, Pranab, Samuel Bowles, and Herbert Gintis, "Wealth Inequality, Wealth Constraints and Economic Performance," Unpublished Paper, 1998 (forthcoming in A. Atkinson and F. Bourguignon (Eds), *Handbook of Income Distribution*, North-Holland).
- [8] Barro, Robert J., "Inequality, Growth, and Investment," NBER Working Paper No. w7038, March 1999.
- [9] Barro, Robert and Xavier Sala-i-Martin, *Economic Growth*, McGraw-Hill, 1995.
- [10] Bénabou, R., "Inequality and Growth", in Bernanke, B. and J. Rotemberg (editors), NBER Macro Annual 1996, MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, pp. 11-76, 1996.
- [11] Bertola, Giuseppe, "Macroeconomics of Distribution and Growth," *Handbook of Income Distribution*, vol. I, edited by A.B. Atkinson and F. Bourguignon, 1999, Elsevier.

- [12] Bertkovicz, L.D., "Necessary Conditions for Optimal Strategies in a Class of Differential Games and Control Problems," *Annals of Mathematics*, Study No. 52, ed. M. Dresher, L.S. Shapley, and A.W. Tucker, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1964.
- [13] Bertkovicz, L.D., "A Survey of Differential Games," in A.V. Balakrishnan and L.W. Neustadt (editors), *Mathematical Theory of Control*, New York: Academic Press, 1967.
- [14] Birdsall, N. and J.L. Londono, "Asset Inequality Matters: An Assessment of the World Bank's Approach to Poverty Reduction," *American Economic Review*, Vo. 82, No. 2, pp. 32-37, 1997.
- [15] Bleaney, Michael and Akira Nishiyama, "Explaining Growth: A Contest Between Models," *Journal of Economic Growth*, 7, 259-281, 2002, Norwell, Mass.: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- [16] Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis, "The Evolution of Strong Reciprocity," Unpublished Paper, University of Massachusetts Amherst, 2000.
- [17] Chou, Chien Fu and Gabriel Talmain, "Redistribution and Growth: Pareto Improvements," *Journal of Economic Growth*, 1: 505-523, December 1996.
- [18] Clemhout, S. and H.Y. Wan, Jr., "Differential Games: Economic Applications," in Aumann, R.J. and S. Hart (editors), *Handbook of Game Theory with Economic Applications*, Vol. II, Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1994.
- [19] Coase, Ronald, "The Problem of Social Cost," *Journal of Law and Economics*, 1960, republished in Ronald H. Coase, *The Firm, the Market and the Law*, The University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- [20] Clarke, George R. G., "More Evidence on Income Distribution and Growth," University of Rochester, Unpublished Paper, June 1993.
- [21] Conley, Timothy G. and Ethan Ligon "Economic Distance and Cross-Country Spillovers," *Journal of Economic Growth*, 7, 157-187, 2002, Norwell, Mass.: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- [22] Decornez, S. S. "An Empirical Analysis of the American Middle Class (1968-1992)," Ph.D. Dissertation, Vanderbilt University.
- [23] Deininger, K. and L. Squire, "A New Data Set Measuring Income Inequality," *World Bank Economic Review*, Vol. 10, pp. 565-591, 1996.
- [24] Deininger, K. and L. Squire, "New Ways of Looking at Old Issues," *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 57, pp. 259-87, 1998.
- [25] Dockner, Engelbert J., Steffen Jørgensen, Ngo Van Long, and Gerhard Sorger, *Differential Games in Economics and Management Science*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [26] Easterly, William, "The Middle Class Consensus and Economic Development," *Journal of Economic Growth*, 6, 317-335, 2001, Norwell, Mass.: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- [27] Easterly, William, "Inequality does Cause Underdevelopment: New Evidence from Commodity Endowments, Middle Class Share, and Other Determinants of Per Capita Income," Preliminary Paper, Washington, DC: Development Research Group, World Bank, 2001.
- [28] Easterly, William and R. Levine, "Africa's Growth Tragedy: Policies and Ethnic Divisions," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112 (4), 1203-1250.
- [29] Engerman, Stanley L. and Kenneth L. Sokoloff, *Factor Endowments, Inequality, and Paths of Development Among New World Economies*, NBER, Working Paper 9259, October 2002.
- [30] Feldstein, Martin, "Social Insurance," in *Income Redistribution*, Colin D. Campbell (editor), Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1976.
- [31] Ferreira, Francisco H.G., "Inequality and Economic Performance: A Brief Overview to Theories of Growth and Distribution," Text for World Bank's Web Site on Inequality, Poverty, and Socio-economic Performance, <http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/inequal/index.htm>, June 1999.

- [32] Fishman, Arthur and Avi Simhon, "The Division of Labor, Inequality, and Growth," *Journal of Economic Growth*, 7, 117-136, 2002, Norwell, Mass.: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- [33] Forbes, Kristin J., "A Reassessment of the Relationship Between Inequality and Growth", *American Economic Review*, Vol. 90, No. 4, pp. 869-887, September 2000.
- [34] Friedman, A., *Differential Games*, New York: Wesley & Son, 1971.
- [35] Friedman, Milton, *Capitalism and Freedom*, The University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- [36] Galor, Oded and Joseph Zeira, "Income Distribution and Macroeconomics," *Review of Economic Studies*, 60, pp. 35-52, 1993.
- [37] Grossman, Herschel I. and Minseong Kim, "Swords or Plowshares? A Theory of the Security of Claims to Property," *Journal of Political Economy*, 1995, Vol. 103, No. 6.
- [38] Haavelmo, Trygve, *A Study in the Theory of Economic Evolution*, Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1954.
- [39] Harrod, Roy F., *Towards a dynamic economics*, London: Macmillan, 1948.
- [40] Hoel, Michael, "Distribution and Growth as a Differential Game between Workers and Capitalists," *International Economic Review*, Vol. 19, No. 2, June 1978.
- [41] Intriligator, Michael D., *Mathematical Optimization and Economic Theory*, New York: Prentice-Hall, 1971.
- [42] Isaacs, Rufus, *Differential Games: A Mathematical Theory with Applications to Warfare and Pursuit, Control and Optimization*, New York: Wesley & Sons.
- [43] Itaya, Yuji, "Dynamic Optimization and Differential Games with Applications to Economics," Manuscript, Gifu, Japan, 2000.

- [44] Kalemli-Ozcan, Sebnem “Does the Mortality Decline Promote Economic Growth?” *Journal of Economic Growth*, 7, 411-439, 2002, Norwell, Mass.: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- [45] Kanbur, Ravi, “Income Distribution and Development,” *Handbook of Income Distribution*, vol. I, edited by A.B. Atkinson and F. Bourguignon, 2000, Elsevier.
- [46] Krasovskii, N.N. and A.I. Subbotin, *Game-Theoretical Control Problems*, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1990.
- [47] Kremer, Michael “Income Distribution Dynamics with Endogenous Fertility” *Journal of Economic Growth*, 7, 227-258, 2002, Norwell, Mass.: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- [48] Kristol, Irving, “Thoughts on Equality and Egalitarianism,” in *Income Redistribution*, Colin D. Campbell (editor), Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1976.
- [49] Lancaster, Kelvin, “The Dynamic Inefficiency of Capitalism,” *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 81, No. 5, September-October 1973.
- [50] Landes, David, *The Wealth and Poverty of Nations*, New York, NY: Norton, 1998.
- [51] Layard, Richard, “Happiness: Has Social Science a Clue?” Lionel Robbins Memorial Lectures 2002/3, London School of Economics, March 2003.
- [52] Leitmann, G., *Cooperative and Non-cooperative Many Players Differential Games*, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1974.
- [53] Li, Hongyi and Heng-fu Zou, “Income Inequality is not Harmful for Growth: Theory and Evidence,” *Review of Development Economics*, Vol. 2, No. 3, October 1998.
- [54] Lucas, Robert E., Jr., “On the Mechanics of Economic Development,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 22, July 1988.
- [55] Mankiw, N. Gregory, David Romer, and D. Weil, “A Contribution to the Empirics of Economic Growth,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 101, 407-437, 1992.

- [56] Marx, Karl, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, volumes 1, New York: Vintage Books, 1977.
- [57] Marx, Karl, *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy (Rough Draft)*, Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1973.
- [58] Marx, Karl, *Critique of the Gotha Program*, in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, volume II, Moscow: International Publishers, 1938.
- [59] Marx, Karl and Friederich Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, 1848, in *Collected Works*, volume 6, 1976, New York: International Publishers.
- [60] McDermott, John “Development Dynamics: Economic Integration and the Demographic Transition,” *Journal of Economic Growth*, 7, 371-409, 2002, Norwell, Mass.: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- [61] Mendez, Rodrigue “Creative Destruction and the Rise of Inequality,” *Journal of Economic Growth*, 7, 259-281, 2002, Norwell, Mass.: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- [62] Okun, Arthur M. *Equality and Efficiency: The Big Tradeoff*, Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1975.
- [63] Okun, Arthur M. “Further Thoughts on Equality and Efficiency,” in *Income Redistribution*, Colin D. Campbell (editor), Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1976.
- [64] Panizza, Ugo “Income Inequality and Economic Growth: Evidence from American Data,” *Journal of Economic Growth*, 7, 25-41, 2002, Norwell, Mass.: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- [65] Perotti, R. “Political Equilibrium, Income Distribution, and Growth,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 60, 1993, pp. 755-776.
- [66] Perotti, R. “Growth, Income Distribution, and Democracy: What the Data Say” *Journal of Economic Growth*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 149-187, June 1996.
- [67] Persson T. and G. Tabellini, “Is Inequality harmful for Growth? Theory and Evidence,” *American Economic Review*, Vol. 84, No. 3, pp. 600-621, 1994.

- [68] Petit, M.L., *Control Theory and Dynamic Games in Economic Policy Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [69] Pigou, A.C., *The economics of Welfare*, Fourth Edition, London: Macmillan, 1932.
- [70] Pontryagin, L.S., et al. *The Mathematical Theory of Optimal Processes*, Translation: K. N. Trirogoff, Edition: L. W. Neustadt, New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1962.
- [71] Quah, Danny, "One Third of the World's Growth and Inequality," Unpublished Paper, London School of Economics, April 2002.
- [72] Ramsey, Frank P., "A Mathematical Theory of Saving," *Economic Journal*, 38, 1928.
- [73] Sala-i-Martin, Xavier "Transfers, Social Safety Nets, and Economic Growth" *IMF Staff Papers*, Vol. 44, 81-102, March 1997, International Monetary Fund.
- [74] Sen, Amartya *On Economic Inequality*, Expanded Edition, 1997, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- [75] Sen, Amartya *Inequality Reexamined*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- [76] Shiller, Robert, *Macro Markets*, TIAA-CREF Paul Samuelson Award, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- [77] Sokoloff, Kenneth L. and Stanley L. Engerman, Institutions, Factor Endowments, and Paths of Development in the New World, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 14, No. 3, 217-32, 2000.
- [78] Stokey, Nancy L. and Rober E. Lucas, Jr. (with Edward C. Prescott), *Recursive Methods in Economic Dynamics*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- [79] Stiglitz, Joseph, *The Roaring Nineties*, New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2003.

- [80] Székely, Miguel and Marianne Hilgert, “What’s Behind the Inequality We Measure?” Inter-American Development Bank, Research Department Working Paper 409, 1999.
- [81] Taylor, Lance and Persio Arida, “Long-Run Income Distribution and Growth,” *Handbook of Development Economics*, vol. I, edited by H. Chenery and T.N. Srinivasan, 1988, Elsevier.
- [82] Tobin, James, “Considerations Regarding Taxation and Inequality,” in *Income Redistribution*, Colin D. Campbell (editor), Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1976.

Appendix

Retention ratio

I define the retention ratio as:

$$p_i \equiv 1/(1 + \theta a_i) \quad (45)$$

Then, the derivative of the retention rate with respect to appropriation is:

$$\frac{dp_i}{da_i} = -\frac{\theta}{(1 + \theta a_i)^2} \quad (46)$$

$$\frac{dp_i}{da_i} = -\left(\frac{\theta}{1 + \theta a_i}\right)\left(\frac{1}{1 + \theta a_i}\right)\left(\frac{a_i}{a_i}\right) \quad (47)$$

$$\frac{dp_i}{da_i} = -\frac{(1 - p_i)p_i}{a_i} \quad (48)$$

$$\frac{dp_i}{da_i} = \frac{p_i^2 - p_i}{a_i} \quad (49)$$

On the other hand, the derivative of the loss rate with respect to appropriation is:

$$\frac{d(1 - p_i)}{da_i} = \frac{(1 + \theta a_i)\theta - \theta a_i \theta}{(1 + \theta a_i)^2} \quad (50)$$

$$\frac{d(1 - p_i)}{da_i} = \frac{\theta + \theta^2 a_i - \theta^2 a_i}{1 + \theta a_i} \quad (51)$$

$$\frac{d(1 - p_i)}{da_i} = \frac{\theta}{(1 + \theta a_i)^2} \quad (52)$$

$$\frac{d(1 - p_i)}{da_i} = \frac{(1 - p_i)p_i}{a_i} \quad (53)$$

$$\frac{d(1 - p_i)}{da_i} = \frac{p_i - p_i^2}{a_i} \quad (54)$$

First-order conditions

The Hamiltonian is defined as:

$$H_i = u(c_i) + \lambda_{ii}[y(x_i) - c_i - a_i - \delta x_i(1 - p_j) + \gamma \delta x_j(1 - p_i)] \\ + \lambda_{ij}[y(x_j) - c_j - a_j - \delta x_j(1 - p_i) + \gamma \delta x_i(1 - p_j)] \quad (55)$$

The first-order necessary conditions for the Hamiltonian to be maximized for each player and t are derived as follows. First, with respect to consumption:

$$\frac{\partial H_i}{\partial c_i} = u'(c_i) - \lambda_{ii} = 0 \quad (56)$$

Therefore:

$$u'(c_i) = \lambda_{ii} \quad (57)$$

And then with respect to appropriation:

$$\frac{\partial H_i}{\partial a_i} = \lambda_{ii}[-1 + \gamma \delta x_j \frac{\partial(1 - p_i)}{\partial a_i}] + \lambda_{ij}[-\delta x_j \frac{\partial(1 - p_i)}{\partial a_i}] = 0 \quad (58)$$

Using equation (54) above, one can derive a nice-looking expression for this first-order condition:

$$\lambda_{ii} \left[\gamma \delta x_j \left(\frac{p_i - p_i^2}{a_i} \right) \right] - \lambda_{ii} - \lambda_{ij} \left[\delta x_j \left(\frac{p_i - p_i^2}{a_i} \right) \right] = 0 \quad (59)$$

$$\lambda_{ii} \left[\gamma \delta x_j \left(\frac{p_i - p_i^2}{a_i} \right) \right] - \lambda_{ij} \left[\delta x_j \left(\frac{p_i - p_i^2}{a_i} \right) \right] = \lambda_{ii} \quad (60)$$

$$\delta x_j (\gamma \lambda_{ii} - \lambda_{ij}) \left(\frac{p_i - p_i^2}{a_i} \right) = \lambda_{ii} \quad (61)$$

$$\frac{a_i}{p_i - p_i^2} = \delta x_j \frac{(\gamma \lambda_{ii} - \lambda_{ij})}{\lambda_{ii}} \quad (62)$$

Substitution and marginal utility elasticity

The instantaneous elasticity of substitution is the reciprocal of the negative of the elasticity of the marginal utility.

To see this, consider two points in time t and s . The elasticity of substitution of consumption between them is defined as:

$$\sigma(c_t) \equiv -\frac{u'(c_s)/u'(c_t)}{c_s/c_t} \frac{d(c_s/c_t)}{d[u'(c_s)/u'(c_t)]} \quad (63)$$

Take the limit of the expression above as $s \rightarrow t$:

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow t} \sigma(c_t) = \sigma[c(t)] = -\lim_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{u'(c_s)/u'(c_t)}{c_s/c_t} \times \lim_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{d(c_s/c_t)}{d[u'(c_s)/u'(c_t)]} \quad (64)$$

$$\sigma[c(t)] = -\frac{\lim_{s \rightarrow t} [u'(c_s)/u'(c_t)]}{\lim_{s \rightarrow t} [c_s/c_t]} \times \lim_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{d(c_s/c_t)}{d[u'(c_s)/u'(c_t)]} \quad (65)$$

$$\sigma[c(t)] = -\frac{1}{1} \times \lim_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{d(c_s/c_t)}{d[u'(c_s)/u'(c_t)]} \quad (66)$$

$$\sigma[c(t)] = -\frac{\lim_{s \rightarrow t} d(c_s/c_t)}{\lim_{s \rightarrow t} d[u'(c_s)/u'(c_t)]} \quad (67)$$

$$\sigma[c(t)] = -\frac{\lim_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{c_t(dc_s/dc_t)dc_t - c_sdc_t}{c_t^2}}{\lim_{s \rightarrow t} \frac{u'(c_t)[du'(c_s)/du'(c_t)]u''(c_t)dc_t - u'(c_s)[u''(c_t)]dc_t}{[u'(c_t)]^2}} \quad (68)$$

$$\sigma[c(t)] = -\frac{\lim_{s \rightarrow t} -(c_s/c_t)(dc_t/c_t)}{\lim_{s \rightarrow t} -[u'(c_s)/u'(c_t)][u''(c_t)/u'(c_t)]dc_t} \quad (69)$$

$$\sigma[c(t)] = -\frac{\lim_{s \rightarrow t} (dc_t/c_t)}{\lim_{s \rightarrow t} [u''(c_t)/u'(c_t)]dc_t} \quad (70)$$

$$\sigma[c(t)] = -\frac{[1/c(t)]}{u''[c(t)]/u'[c(t)]} \quad (71)$$

$$\sigma[c(t)] = -\frac{u'[c(t)]}{c(t)u''[c(t)]} \quad (72)$$

Since $\epsilon \equiv \{u''[c(t)]c(t)\}/u'[c(t)]$ is the elasticity of the marginal utility, then:

$$\sigma[c(t)] = -\frac{1}{\epsilon} \quad (73)$$

Markovian Nash equilibrium

The Markovian Nash optimal consumption rule at t follows directly from first-order condition (11).

The Markovian Nash optimal appropriation rule for a_i can be derived directly from equations (49) and (50). And then by simplifying first-order condition (62):

$$-\frac{(1 + \theta a_i)^2}{\theta} = \delta x_j \left(\frac{\gamma \lambda_{ii} - \lambda_{ij}}{\lambda_{ii}} \right) \quad (74)$$

$$(1 + \theta a_i)^2 = -\theta \delta x_j \left(\frac{\gamma \lambda_{ii} - \lambda_{ij}}{\lambda_{ii}} \right) \quad (75)$$

$$(1 + \theta a_i)^2 = \theta \delta x_j \left(\frac{\lambda_{ij} - \gamma \lambda_{ii}}{\lambda_{ii}} \right) \quad (76)$$

$$1 + \theta a_i = \pm \sqrt{\theta \delta x_j \left(\frac{\lambda_{ij} - \gamma \lambda_{ii}}{\lambda_{ii}} \right)} \quad (77)$$

$$\theta a_i = \pm \sqrt{\theta \delta x_j \left(\frac{\lambda_{ij} - \gamma \lambda_{ii}}{\lambda_{ii}} \right)} - 1 \quad (78)$$

$$a_i = \frac{1}{\theta} \left[\pm \sqrt{\theta \delta x_j \left(\frac{\lambda_{ij} - \gamma \lambda_{ii}}{\lambda_{ii}} \right)} - 1 \right] \quad (79)$$

The nonnegativity condition for a_i requires that:

$$\pm \sqrt{\theta \delta x_j \left(\frac{\lambda_{ij} - \gamma \lambda_{ii}}{\lambda_{ii}} \right)} \geq 1 \quad (80)$$

The plus-minus sign can be dropped, since only the positive square root case satisfies the condition:

$$\sqrt{\theta \delta x_j \left(\frac{\lambda_{ij} - \gamma \lambda_{ii}}{\lambda_{ii}} \right)} \geq 1 \quad (81)$$

$$\theta \delta x_j \left(\frac{\lambda_{ij} - \gamma \lambda_{ii}}{\lambda_{ii}} \right) \geq 1 \quad (82)$$

$$\frac{\lambda_{ij} - \gamma \lambda_{ii}}{\lambda_{ii}} \geq \frac{1}{\theta \delta x_j} \quad (83)$$

Steady state

The growth rate of the Markovian Nash optimal consumption rule is:

$$\hat{c}_i^* = \sigma(c_i^*) \left\{ \delta(1 - p_j^*) \left[\frac{\lambda_i - \gamma \lambda_j}{\lambda_i} \right] - y'(x_i) \right\} \quad (84)$$

If $\hat{c}_i^* = 0$, then:

$$\sigma(c_i^*) \left\{ \delta(1 - p_j^*) \left[\frac{\lambda_i - \gamma \lambda_j}{\lambda_i} \right] - y'(x_i) \right\} = 0 \quad (85)$$

$$\delta(1 - p_j^*) \left[\frac{\lambda_i - \gamma \lambda_j}{\lambda_i} \right] - y'(x_i) = 0 \quad (86)$$

$$\delta(1 - p_j^*) \left[\frac{\lambda_i - \gamma \lambda_j}{\lambda_i} \right] = y'(x_i) \quad (87)$$

$$\delta(1 - p_j^*) [\lambda_i - \gamma \lambda_j] = \lambda_i y'(x_i) \quad (88)$$

Wealth inequality

This shows that a player's stock of wealth and her instantaneous shadow price are negatively related. From equation (88) :

$$y'(x_i) = \delta(1 - p_j^*) \left[\frac{\lambda_i - \gamma \lambda_j}{\lambda_i} \right] \quad (89)$$

$$y'(x_i) = \delta(1 - p_j^*) \left[1 - \frac{\gamma \lambda_j}{\lambda_i} \right] \quad (90)$$

The partial derivative of the marginal output with respect to the stock of wealth is:

$$\frac{\partial [y'(x_i)]}{\partial x_i} = -\delta(1 - p_j^*) \gamma \lambda_j \left[\frac{\partial (1/\lambda_i)}{\partial x_i} \right] \quad (91)$$

$$y''(x_i) = -\delta(1 - p_j^*)\gamma\lambda_j \left[\frac{\partial(1/\lambda_i)}{\partial x_i} \right] \quad (92)$$

By assumption, $y''(x_i) > 0$ and $\delta(1 - p_j^*)\gamma\lambda_j \geq 0$. Therefore:

$$\frac{\partial(1/\lambda_i)}{\partial x_i} = -\frac{\partial\lambda_i/\partial x_i}{\lambda_i^2} \leq 0 \quad (93)$$

$$-\frac{\partial\lambda_i/\partial x_i}{\lambda_i^2} \leq 0 \quad (94)$$

which implies that x_i and λ_i are negatively related.