

Dluhosch, Barbara; Zimmermann, Klaus W.

Working Paper

Some Second Thoughts on Wagner's Law

Diskussionspapier, No. 54

Provided in Cooperation with:

Fächergruppe Volkswirtschaftslehre, Helmut-Schmidt-Universität (HSU)

Suggested Citation: Dluhosch, Barbara; Zimmermann, Klaus W. (2006) : Some Second Thoughts on Wagner's Law, Diskussionspapier, No. 54, Helmut-Schmidt-Universität - Universität der Bundeswehr Hamburg, Fächergruppe Volkswirtschaftslehre, Hamburg, <https://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:gbv:705-opus-16836>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/23641>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



Helmut-Schmidt-Universität
Universität der Bundeswehr Hamburg
University of the Federal Armed Forces Hamburg

Fächergruppe Volkswirtschaftslehre
Department of Economics

Discussion Paper No.
December 2006

54

Some Second Thoughts on Wagner's Law

Barbara Dluhosch
and
Klaus W. Zimmermann

Some Second Thoughts on Wagner's Law

Barbara Dluhosch and Klaus W. Zimmermann*)

Helmut Schmidt University – University FAF Hamburg

August 13, 2006

Abstract

We examine whether the Samuelsonian definition of public goods can be reconciled with "Wagner's Law", that is, public expenditures outpacing economic growth. While both predominantly focus on the demand-side, they differ with respect to their socio-political foundations. Taking the latter into account, and acknowledging that empirical studies are not generally supportive of individual income elasticities systematically differing between public and private goods, we find that Wagner's notion of the role of public-sector issues is even at odds with his own dictum. Implicit in Samuelson, by contrast, is the prediction that public spending decreases relative to GNP when income grows, provided that the income distribution remains constant. If this is not the case it can be shown that a growing inequality increases government's share et vice versa which can lead to counteractive forces on the GNP ratio.

JEL-Classification: D11, H11, H41, H50

Keywords: Wagner's Law, public expenditures, public goods, budget-to-GNP ratio

Thanks are due to Stefan Bayer, Charles B. Blankart, Johannes Hackmann, Daniel Horgos, Tobias Thomas, Lucinda Trigo Gamarra and Nikolai Ziegler for comments and suggestions on a previous version of the paper.

*) Department of Economics, Helmut Schmidt University – University of the Federal Armed Forces (FAF) Hamburg, Holstenhofweg 85, 22043 Hamburg, Germany; E-mail: dluhosch@hsu-hh.de; kwzi@hsu-hh.de

1. Introduction

In his book on "Allgemeine und theoretische Volkswirtschaftslehre" (1876), Adolph Wagner first acquainted the German readership with his "law of increasing state activity", saying that (as an empirical regularity) government expenditures tend to grow faster than the economy.¹ This notion of the state sector outgrowing the economy has ever since been referred to as "Wagner's Law". Peacock and Scott (2000) even write of a "curious attraction" of Wagner's law, since numerous empirical studies and international comparisons examine whether budget to GDP ratios do indeed reflect Wagner's famous law (see Peacock/Scott 2000 for a critique of the most prominent studies)². However, its theoretical and politico-economic foundations have less frequently been subjected to investigation. Nor are there studies available which address the question whether Wagner's notion of government's expanding relative to GNP is compatible with Paul Samuelson's (1954; 1955) economic theory of public goods and the role of government in a modern economic perspective. The paper tries to fill this gap by going back to the roots.

Wagner – with some reservations – as well as Samuelson focuses on the demand rather than the supply of public goods.³ Therefore, we exclusively consider demand-side issues

¹ Actually, Wagner mentioned the relative growth of government for the first time in a very obscure Austrian source of 1863, and restated it more precisely in several publications thereafter, including his 1893 book which we prefer to quote from here. The 1911 publication where the Peacock/Scott (2000) article is based on is a shorter and partly asymmetric reformulation of the relevant parts of his 1893 book.

² Empirical studies on Wagner's law, earlier most often of the cross-sectional determinant type, later as time-series-analyses had their boom in the 1950s and 1960s. Brown/Jackson (1982: 120) count almost 1.000 studies of this sort. Later on, the interest shifted towards the impact of the expansion of government on economic growth (e.g. Scully 1989; 1995; Barro 1991; Tanzi/Schuknecht 2000) or on the unemployment rate (Abrams 1999). Generally, Peacock and Scott (2000) criticize the empirical work absolutely correctly that all studies reviewed misspecify the "budget" - in Wagner's (1893:905) thinking - by the omission of public utilities, one of the major growing parts of the economy due to take-overs from the private sector and a major force leading to the relative expansion of the state activity.

³ It would be better to say that Wagner is predominantly interpreted that way. Indeed, there are some hints in this direction when he says that "the expansion of state activity is connected to the need for higher, better and more perfect goods and services" (1893:904) or when he implicitly recurs to the household optimum delivering an optimal budget of private and public goods (1893:894). But it is necessary to remark that Wagner's thinking is evolutionary in its core when he says that "this development (the relative expansion of the state, D/Z) explains itself and is justified because of the idea of the developed state" (1893:896) or "the circumstances of living on higher levels of culture" (1893:902). For Wagner, the decisive momentum behind that evolutionary process is the "change and progress in the production technique" (1893:902), and cultural and technical forces combined are seen as "mighty evolutionary phenomena against which the preference and will of the individual is a factor of

while supposing that there are no supply-side influences on the sectoral composition (private vs. public goods) of the economy. There are certainly many alternative explanations out there in the literature which compete with the demand-hypothesis when it comes to the relative growth of government. One popular example is Baumol's disease, that is, the proposition that the relative price of government services is generally higher and increasing; another explanation refers to population growth as it may affect public expenditures, and may imply a rise in budget to GNP ratios if the participation rate decreases and/or public expenditures on schooling and educational matters increase, as may other shifts in the age structure of the economy; the political process of preference aggregation may give rise to log-rolling with inefficient outcomes (like an oversized public sector), as may fiscal illusion, group interests and lobbying, and the incentives inherent in bureaucracy (see Blankart (1993), Miles/Myles/Preston (2003) or Borchering/Lee (2004) for surveys).

Though those approaches to the allocation of resources between the private and the public sector are interesting in and of themselves, in this paper we will ignore those reasons which may also contribute towards the growth of government. Instead, we will focus exclusively on the basic argument put forward in favor of Wagner's law, which originates from the demand for public goods, but which has to be interpreted differently in the worlds of Wagner or Samuelson.

However, even with reference to forces emanating from the demand-side, there are two competing explanations outstanding in the literature. Yet, none of them is really convincing: time and again, Wagner's law has been traced back to (exogenous) shifts in demand in favor of public goods due to individual income elasticities being larger than unity. However, those attempts to reconcile empirics with theory are fragile, for two reasons. First, rather than arriving at an individual income elasticity which is larger than one, the majority of empirical

subordinate importance" (1893:914). If we abstract from these autonomous processes, demand can play a significant role in determining government's share of GNP, and the prevailing demand side approach in the literature may be justified.

studies conclude that individual income elasticities with respect to public goods are hovering around unity (see, for instance, Borcharding/Deacon (1972); Bergstrom/Goodman (1973); Pommerehne (1978), or, the overview of that older literature by Blankart (2003)). The studies analyzed by Blankart, however, are mainly cross section studies or studies based on very short time series. Auteri/Constantini (2004) show in their recent survey of the literature⁴ that typically cross section studies of the income elasticity of public goods lead to values around unity whereas time series analyses often reveal values above or below unity.⁵ Summarizing their findings it can be said that according to the object of inquiry (the specific public good), the locality of inquiry (region/land) und the method of inquiry (cross section or time series studies) elasticity values differ a lot - above and below unity. So, since there are no income elasticity estimations of the overall budget, and the existing estimates for single public goods are so diverse, we stick to Blankart's statement of an overall elasticity around unity (which is also Peltzman's (1980) result), hence there seems to be no convincing empirical reason to assume that the overall elasticity values of public goods give rise to government expenditures systematically outpacing GNP.

Second, due to their ad-hoc character, "explanations" that hinge on preferences changing exogenously are generally vulnerable to criticism. Following Becker/Stigler (1977: 76) in that "... tastes neither change capriciously nor differ importantly between people",⁶ we thus dismiss the issue of preferences changing exogenously (in favor of public goods) as a driving force of an increase in public-goods related government expenditures relative to GNP. Rather, in this paper, we will track down the consequences for budget-to-GNP ratios by focusing on the (differing) socio-political assumptions implicitly underlying the perspectives of Wagner

⁴ Another interesting survey concentrating on time series analyses is presented by Borcharding/Ferris/Garzoni (2004).

⁵ Their own time series analysis of 18 selected OECD countries for different elements of social security expenditures between 1981 and 1999 show that dependent on the techniques of estimation income elasticities above or below unity can be calculated.

⁶ In very much the same manner as "explanations" that take recourse to changes in preferences, Becker/Stigler (1977: 89) consider arguments relying on differences in preferences "... a convenient crutch to lean on when the analysis has bogged down" and "... ad hoc arguments that disguise analytical failures".

and Samuelson on the aggregate demand for publicly provided goods. Hence, instead of preferences changing exogenously, in our analysis, the evolution of budget-to-GNP ratios in economic growth are exclusively attributed to changes in prices and incomes.

As we will show in this paper, Wagner's own approach implies that the relative size of government is in fact independent of the size of the economy while Samuelson's approach entails budget-to-GNP ratios that vary with GNP, even with preferences remaining stable and uniform. However, rather than increasing, the relative importance of the public sector declines with growing income when we adopt a Samuelsonian perspective, provided that the income distribution remains stable. Furthermore, in the Samuelsonian perspective, budget-to-GNP ratios increase when the income distribution becomes more skewed (with GNP unchanged), and even more so if some individuals lose their jobs or earnings capacity with incomes of the other individuals remaining the same. Although decreasing with preferences and income distributions being constant, there is a range of GNPs for which budget-to-GNP ratios under Samuelson are larger than those based on Wagner, whereas for all other values the opposite holds true. The latter result, though, is in line with socio-economic research and behavioral science in the tradition of Maslow (1987).

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we will construct the supply side of a model economy in which the sectoral composition is solely determined by demand; Section 3 illuminates how demand affects budget-to-GNP ratios with uniform preferences (and with a particular focus on implicit assumptions concerning preference aggregation). Section 4 is devoted to a comparison of the concepts of Wagner and Samuelson and their implications for the demand for publicly provided goods while Section 5 examines the impact of income distribution on budget-to-GNP ratios. Section 6 concludes.

2. Supply

Consider a model economy populated by two individuals who are going to decide on the budget-to-GNP ratio. Ignoring the difficulties posed by small numbers, the assumption concerning the population serves to facilitate the analysis, as the major differences between the approach by Wagner and by Samuelson already arise with the minimum number of two people in society. Each individual supplies inelastically some units of (homogenous) labor to the market, with total labor supply in the model economy \bar{L} .

For the moment (that is Sections 2 to 4), we will assume that all members of society supply the same amount and quality of labor so that they also receive the same income. Since this assumption obviously need not hold true with respect to real world matters, we will come back to this when we discuss distributional issues and the implications of the (redistributive) welfare state in particular (see Section 5 of this paper).

Leaving distributional issues aside, the economy basically consists of two sectors, a private and a public sector which supply private (x_p) and (genuine) public goods (x_s) respectively. With respect to the latter, we will follow the Samuelsonian notion of goods provided by the government as being characterized by non-rivalry and non-excludability in consumption. Though Wagner was less advanced with respect to the economic characteristics of public goods, it was exactly for these (genuine) tasks of the state that he expected government expenditures to outgrow GNP as societies become richer.

Public and private goods are denoted by subscripts s and p respectively. In order to facilitate the analysis, we assume that both goods are produced with (homogenous) labor according to a simple linear production technology

$$x_j = AL_j \tag{1}$$

with $j = p, s$, and with factors fully employed so that the sectoral employment levels add up to total labor supply $\bar{L} = L_s + L_p$. The (exogenous) technology parameter A serves to capture the impact of technical progress (and thus growth) on the economy and (in the subsequent analysis) on government growth relative to GNP. In order to concentrate on the role of demand for budget-to-GNP ratios, as did Wagner at least partly, we will assume that both of the goods are supplied efficiently. Hence, we will abstract from issues such as lack of competition in one or the other sector and the problems related to raising government revenue in the form of distortive taxation or to the revelation of preferences, all of which may affect supply. Rather, we will assume that Lindahl-pricing were possible with respect to public goods so that they have shadow prices which are in turn determined by their true costs of production, even if there is no market for those goods. Hence, we assume that they are produced according to least-cost technology.

With profit functions in each sector $\pi_j = p_j x_j - w_j L_j$ and given wages, the first order conditions for a profit maximum are in any case $A p_j = w_j$; if labor mobility is costless across sectors, both of the sectors pay the same wage, so that the first order conditions reduce to $A p_j = w$. Moreover, since $w_j = w$, it must be the case that $p_j = p$ (provided that the technology parameter is the same in both of the sectors), so that the price of the private good in terms of the public good is unity. The corresponding national income and production accounts then imply that labor income is $w\bar{L} = p_p x_p + p_s x_s = (w/A)x_s + (w/A)x_p$, or equivalently, after dividing by w and multiplying by A , $R \equiv A\bar{L} = x_s + x_p$.

For sake of completeness, we assume in addition that there is an extra good x_0 (the role of which will become clear in the next paragraph) which is produced by use of capital K (with K employed at the ongoing rental rate r) according to the production function $x_0 = aK$. Taking the extra good into account, income in our model economy is thus $GNP = r\bar{K} + w\bar{L}$.

However, since we are mainly interested in the size of the public sector *relative* to the private sector, we will for most of the time ignore the differences between \bar{AL} and GNP and will use both of the terms as if they were the same. Hence, $R \equiv \bar{AL}$ also symbolizes the resource constraint of the economy. Since the production possibilities frontier with reference to public and private goods is linear, the allocation of resources between the two sectors is determined by demand only, as is sectoral employment, and therefore, the budget-to-GNP ratio.

3. Demand

Since in any case, Wagner as well as Samuelson, the driving force of budget-to-GNP ratios originates from the demand rather than the supply side, we will examine the former more closely, while supposing that production takes place on the production possibilities frontier, that is with all resources fully and efficiently employed. Suppose, then, the i -th individual of our small society (with $i = 1, 2$) has the following additively separable utility function in x_0 on the one hand (which shall also serve as numéraire) and x_p and x_s on the other hand

$$U_i(x_0, \{x_p, x_s\}) = U_i(x_0) + U_i(x_p, x_s) \quad (2)$$

The introduction of the extra good x_0 ensures that the marginal utility of income is fixed, and, with $p_0 = 1$, is unity. However, in the following analysis, and as suggested in Section 2, we will largely ignore the extra good. Ignoring the extra good is legitimate in this framework, for two reasons: (i) we are exclusively interested in the allocation of resources between sectors p and s and the size of the government sector relative to the private sector. Yet, in our set up, the latter is unaffected by what happens to the extra good. (ii) Wagner's as well as Samuelson's considerations are in fact partial equilibrium approaches to the allocation of

resources with respect to the two alternative uses, private and public. The partial equilibrium approach implicitly assumes that the marginal utility of income is fixed.

Since what matters are relative numbers, we will also disregard in what follows the part of income which is spent on the extra good. More specifically, we will assume that individuals maximize the following quadratic sub-utility function in goods x_p and x_s

$$U_i(x_p, x_s) = \alpha_{ip}x_p + \alpha_{is}x_s - \frac{1}{2}(\beta_{ip}x_p^2 + \beta_{is}x_s^2) \quad (3)$$

subject to the budget constraint $\sum_{j=1}^2 p_j x_{ij} \leq wL_i$, and (recalling that p_j equals w/A) income in terms of public goods $\sum_{j=1}^2 x_{ij} \leq E_i \equiv AL_i$, or, ignoring the extra good, GNP with $\sum_{i=1}^2 \sum_{j=1}^2 x_{ij} \leq R = \sum_{i=1}^2 E_i$. The corresponding inverse and direct demand functions for private and public goods of the i -th member of society are thus

$$p_{ij} = \alpha_{ij} - \beta_{ij}x_j \quad (4)$$

with $j = p, s$.

4. Wagner vs. Samuelson

Starting with a society in which income is evenly distributed so as to exclude distributional issues allows us to focus on the pure economic-growth effect on demand and the resulting allocation of resources between the private and the public sector. In any case, we are in the realm of social rather than private choice. Yet, Wagner himself focused on a single member of society, from which he extrapolated the socio-economic outcome on the aggregate level. Implicitly, he thus assumed that one person decides in lieu of all others on the allocation of

resources.⁷ Mathematically, there is no problem with this sort of preference aggregation. We simply define a statistical individual which completely reflects the prevailing preference mix of a society. Since according to (3) sub-utility functions are of the same quadratic type, individual demand functions only differ with respect to their slope and/or the intercepts with either the x - or the y -axis. Hence, we can easily construct a representative individual whose demand functions reflect sort of the "average" preference in society.

Adopting a Wagnerian perspective, the equilibrium allocation is achieved if the consumption of the private and the public good yield the same marginal utility. The corresponding budget-to-GNP ratio is obtained by equating the right hand sides of (4) for $j = p, s$. With R either spent on private or on public goods, we can rewrite the resulting equation by substituting $(R - x_s)$ for x_p . Solving for x_s and dividing by GNP, that is R (or, equivalently, \bar{AL}), then yields the budget to GNP ratio according to Wagner

$$\left(\frac{x_s}{R}\right)_W = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^2 (\alpha_{is} - \alpha_{ip}) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^2 \beta_{ip}\right)R}{\left(\sum_{i=1}^2 (\beta_{is} + \beta_{ip})\right)R} \quad (5)$$

Generally speaking, the ratio decreases in R for $\sum_{i=1}^2 \alpha_{is} > \sum_{i=1}^2 \alpha_{ip}$ and increases otherwise. Yet, if we adhere to the Becker-Stigler assumption of uniform preferences, this property vanishes. If the intercept of each direct demand function with the y -axis is the same for all individuals, the budget-to-GNP ratio in Wagnerian perspective reduces to

$$\left(\frac{x_s}{R}\right)_W \Big|_{\alpha_{ij}=\alpha} = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^2 \beta_{ip}\right)}{\left(\sum_{i=1}^2 (\beta_{is} + \beta_{ip})\right)} \quad (6)$$

⁷ Wagner's idea of the political system was clearly underdeveloped, better to say: he had none. He occasionally writes about the parliament exerting some control power in being less inclined to an expansion of state activity than the government but that was it. Basically, he took the position of a welfare economist, assuming a social planner (the government) working in the "public interest", and, characteristically, he speaks of an "authoritative measurement of needs" (1893:894), where "authoritative" – according to Webster's Collegiate Dictionary – means "preceeding from authority" and has an unmasking synonym: "dictatorial". Taking together this dictatorial touch with the pursuit of the public interest we arrive at the regime of the representative individual – being the average individual or the median voter where the latter would clearly be very remote from Wagner's thinking.

Notably, in this case, the size of the public sector is independent of the size of the economy. Yet, empirical studies do not lend support even to this (generalized) version. Rather, empirical studies found no systematic differences between both groups of goods with respect to individual income elasticities. If we consequently assume that the inverse demand functions for private and for public goods are identical, that is $\alpha_{ij} = \alpha$ and $\beta_{ij} = \beta$, the budget-to-GNP ratio attains exactly fifty percent – independent of GNP

$$\left(\frac{x_s}{R} \right)_W \Big|_{\alpha_{ij}=\alpha; \beta_{ij}=\beta} = 0.5 \quad (7)$$

Hence, if both individuals share the same preferences with respect to private and public goods which in turn give rise to the same direct demand functions (or at least with the α 's the same), the budget-to-GNP ratio remains constant, despite of income growth.

This result is not only at odds with Wagner's own dictum, according to which the public sector takes an ever larger bite of GNP as societies become richer, but also with the modern theory of public goods à la Samuelson. Rather than the representative individual deciding on social matters in an *authoritarian* (but authoritative) manner, following Samuelson, the society as a whole, that is, each and every member of society, *democratically* decides on everybody's consumption of public goods.⁸ Note the difference: in case of Wagner the budget-to-GNP ratio was obtained by assuming that the macro-result could be inferred from (the fiction of) a representative individual which decides in place of all members of society – notably, while incorporating possible differences in individual preferences. Yet, implicitly, this amounts to the notion that one individual is able to decide for the community as a whole (like a "benevolent dictator"). However, Samuelson's approach is fundamentally different:

⁸ To be more precise: The Samuelsonian view primarily has to do with efficiency in a world of public goods. But adding up the individual willingness to pay has a political meaning too: Instead of the representative (average) individual, the whole society is part of the process finding the optimal amount of public goods. We are aware of some difficulties of definition but call this procedure – relative to Wagner's authoritative-authoritarian style – "democratic" because nobody with a positive willingness to pay is left out and everyone can "vote" according to his/her monetary preferences.

applying his criteria according to which public goods are characterized by non-rivalry and non-excludability in consumption implies that we have to add the marginal willingness to pay of all individuals rather than to add up the quantities demanded individually in order to obtain the value the society places on public goods in terms of opportunities forgone.

Applying Samuelson's theory of public goods we thus arrive at the budget-to-GNP ratio

$$\left(\frac{x_s}{R}\right)_S = \frac{(\alpha_{1s} - \alpha_{1p})\beta_{2p} + (\alpha_{2s} - \alpha_{2p})\beta_{1p} + \sum_{i=1}^2 \alpha_{is}\beta_{ip} + \Pi_{i=1}^2 \beta_{ip} R}{\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^2 \beta_{is}\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^2 \beta_{ip}\right) + \Pi_{i=1}^2 \beta_{ip}\right] R} \quad (8)$$

Hence, in the most general case, that is with $\alpha_{1j} \neq \alpha_{2j}$ and $\beta_{1j} \neq \beta_{2j}$ for $\forall j = p, s$, budget-to-GNP ratios differ depending on the perspective adopted, old or modern, Wagner or Samuelson. Nevertheless, both results have some properties in common: in the generalized version and employing Samuelson's theory of public goods, the impact of growth on the relative size of the public sector is again ambiguous: the budget-to-GNP ratio decreases if $\left(\sum_{i=1}^2 \alpha_{is}\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^2 \beta_{ip}\right) > \alpha_{1p}\beta_{2p} + \alpha_{2p}\beta_{1p}$, and increases otherwise. However, if the intercepts of the inverse demand curves with respect to the y -axis are the same for both, individuals and groups of goods,⁹ that is, if $\alpha_{ij} = \alpha$, the expression reduces to

$$\left(\frac{x_s}{R}\right)_S \Big|_{\alpha_{ij}=\alpha} = \frac{\alpha \left(\sum_{i=1}^2 \beta_{ip}\right) + \Pi_{i=1}^2 \beta_{ip} R}{\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^2 \beta_{is}\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^2 \beta_{ip}\right) + \Pi_{i=1}^2 \beta_{ip}\right] R} \quad (9)$$

Unlike in the case of Wagner, the equilibrium ratio remains a function of GNP, which even extends to the case of preferences and thus inverse demand curves being identical in every respect

⁹ Rather than sharing the y -intercept, the inverse demand functions could also be sharing the same x -intercept. In this case, the budget-to-GNP ratio decreases if $\alpha_{1p}\beta_{2p}/(\beta_{1p} + \beta_{2p}) < \alpha_{1s}\beta_{2s}/(\beta_{1s} + \beta_{2s})$ and increases otherwise provided that Wagner applies. If we adopt a Samuelsonian perspective instead, it decreases if $2\alpha_{1p}\beta_{2p}/(\beta_{1p} + \beta_{2p}) < \alpha_{1s}(\beta_{1s} + \beta_{2s})/\beta_{1s}$ and increases otherwise. However, naturally, with the demand curves identical, both concepts (that is the similarity with respect to either the x - or the y -intercept) collapse into one.

$$\left(\frac{x_s}{R}\right)_s \Big|_{\alpha_{ij}=\alpha; \beta_{ij}=\beta} = \frac{1}{5} + \frac{2\alpha}{5\beta R} \quad (10)$$

Hence, if Samuelson applies, the budget-to-GNP decreases in R : rather than the budget outpacing the economy in terms of growth the reverse holds true.¹⁰

If income is evenly distributed, we thus can summarize our main results on the Samuelsonian equilibrium budget to GNP ratio in the following manner:

1. for GNP large, the hyperbola (10) converges asymptotically to $1/(n^2 + 1)$. Hence, for GNP large enough, the budget-to-GNP ratio only depends (inversely) on the number of individuals;
2. economically meaningful results require $R > \alpha/2\beta$. For R smaller than $\alpha/2\beta$, there is no private sector. Rather, demand for public goods is so strong that these are the only type of goods which are produced and consumed. This applies independent of their marginal costs of production, provided that consumption is associated with net welfare gains.
3. however, for GNPs larger than $\alpha/2\beta$, the expenditure share spent on public goods decreases in R , provided that preferences and thus the marginal value placed on public and private goods remain stable.

¹⁰ Supposing instead that preferences are described by the otherwise due to its specific properties popular Cobb-Douglas function, i.e. $U_i = x_{is}^\alpha x_{ip}^{1-\alpha}$, yields the empirically implausible result that **budget-to-GNP** ratios are generally independent of the size of the economy: since the Cobb-Douglas function is characterized by the fraction of incomes spent on one or the other group of goods being constant, the Wagner-result is straight forward, and in the above mentioned case $(x_s/R)_w = \alpha$. However, taking the economic properties of public goods into consideration, we also obtain the result of a constant budget-to-GNP ratio. With the marginal rate of substitution described by the parameter α we obtain $(x_s/R)_s = 2^{1+\alpha} \alpha / ((1-\alpha) + 2^{1+\alpha} \alpha)$, which is strictly increasing in α (though at a decreasing rate), and generally larger than α as $2^{\alpha+1} > 1$. The latter result though is also hard to reconcile with the empirical fact that people tend to buy more privately instead of publicly provided goods as they become richer, even if those goods are associated with (positive) externalities. The shift of demand from public to private schools is just one case in point. We therefore reject the hypotheses of preferences along Cobb-Douglas lines and stick to the alternative of a utility function which gives rise to linear demand functions or which are obtained by linear approximation.

4. nevertheless, there is a GNP for which budget-to-GNP ratios along the lines of Wagner and Samuelson are the same, that is $(x_s / R)_W|_{\alpha_{ij}=\alpha; \beta_{ij}=\beta} = (x_s / R)_S|_{\alpha_{ij}=\alpha; \beta_{ij}=\beta}$, if

$$R|_{W=S} = 4\alpha / 3\beta .$$

Hence, in a modern perspective, the budget-to-GNP ratio can be smaller or larger than in case of Wagner. However, in any case, we should observe that the budget-to-GNP ratio declines as GNP increases.

Figure 1 displays the equilibrium budget-to-GNP ratio according to Wagner and Samuelson with preferences across individuals and thus direct demand for both groups of goods identical (the latter are the dotted lines sloping downwards): the intersection of the solid lines (that is the aggregation of the individual perspectives) in both of the panels show budget-to-GNP ratios if the representative individual à la Wagner decides on the allocation of resources. As can be seen, the budget-to-GNP ratio is always 50 percent, independent of GNP. Hence, the expenditure shares are the same in both of the panels, for GNP small (LHS) and large (RHS). Rather than increasing in GNP, Wagner's own approach to the allocation of resources between the private and the public sector results in government expenditures growing in proportion to GNP.




Figure 1. Wagner versus Samuelson as a function of the size of the economy

These results not only differ from "Wagner's Law"; they are also hard to reconcile with Samuelson's theory of public goods. Following Samuelson, the collective marginal willingness to pay for public goods is the sum of the willingness to pay of all the individuals (the dashed curve in both of the diagrams), hence the budget-to-GNP ratio may be either smaller or larger than in case of Wagner (or exactly the same). On the LHS, that is for GNP comparatively small, the budget-to-GNP ratio is larger in case of Samuelson than in case of Wagner while on the RHS, that is a relatively rich society, the opposite holds true. Or to put it differently: if Samuelson applies, poor countries are characterized by a comparatively large government sector while for rich countries the opposite holds true. And, it must be the case that there is exactly one size of GNP for which countries switch sides. This latter observation may give rise to some further (though somewhat tentative and speculative) thoughts: the Samuelsonian result may give rise to virtuous and vicious cycles (or poverty traps for that matter): if the country is poor and if a large government sector is detrimental to growth, the

budget-to-GNP ratio may continue to increase which further hampers growth, thus choking down the process of take off. However, once countries have managed to attain or even surpass a critical size in terms of GNP, the process described above may dominate and may feed into a self-sustaining process of economic growth.

5. Distribution(al) matters

Thus far, we have assumed that both of our individuals contribute equally to GNP and thus have the same income at their disposal. Admittedly, this is a very strong assumption as societies are seldom characterized by an absolutely even income distribution. Therefore, we will relax the assumption concerning the income distribution in the following paragraph. And, indeed, distributional matters will prove crucial for the results obtained. However, modifying our assumption by allowing for other income distributions requires an assumption about the existence or non-existence of a welfare state. For instance, in the US and in Europe there is a different attitude with respect to income inequality as is reflected in the relative size of the redistributive state (see Alesina et al 2004).¹¹ Interestingly, these attitudes also yield different results with respect to the provision of public goods (relative to the private sector).

Consider first a situation in which there is no redistributive state. If, rather than being equally distributed, all income accrues to just one individual while the other gets none (with GNP the same as previously though), only the first individual can develop a demand for private goods. However, in the political process, both are active and both decide democratically on the consumption of public goods which means that there is a fictitious

¹¹ Amazingly, Wagner as a member of a group of scientists disparagingly called "Kathedersozialisten" (academic socialists) was obviously not aware of the momentum that social policy and redistribution could exert on his law one time – his view is very static when he speaks of the "right combination of the private, public and caritative systems" (1893:900) and rather defensive when he advocates a transfer of firms from the private to the public sector if private firms have no better performance than public ones but have unfavourable characteristics from a social policy view (1893:903).

equal distribution of GNP among the two individuals. The resulting equilibrium budget-to-GNP ratio in Samuelsonian perspective is thus

$$\frac{x_s}{R} = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{\alpha}{3\beta R} \quad (11)$$

which is larger than in case the same income is equally distributed (10) for $R > \alpha/2\beta$, and since $R = \alpha/2\beta$ represents the lower bound for government's share to be meaningful (that is, ≤ 1) in both cases, (11) is always larger than (10). Moreover, the absolute and relative decrease in the budget-to-GNP ratio is smaller than if the income is equally distributed when incomes or GNP grow by the same amount. Hence, if the income distribution changes (with GNP unchanged), so does the budget-to-GNP ratio. That is, for any given GNP, a rise in society's homogeneity decreases budget-to-GNP ratios. Likewise, (in a dynamic perspective,) the more homogeneous its distribution, the faster does growing income reduce the government's share of GNP.

The extreme case of a homogeneous distribution is the equal distribution which was a decisive part of our model developed in Sections 2-4, and can be interpreted also as tax revenues being redistributed in a lump sum fashion so that both individuals again have the same resources at their disposal.

Notably, the fact that budget-to-GNP ratios may increase if inequality increases is not due to inefficiencies related to government such as lack of competition and distortions related to taxes and transfers as we assumed that public goods are perfectly supplied to the market and that redistribution takes place in a lump sum fashion; the result above is solely the consequence of the characteristics of private and public goods. In any case, with GNP growing, budget-to-GNP ratios are getting smaller et vice versa, but it may be possible that a temporary polarization of the income distribution during the growth process may spoil the result of the budget-to-GNP ratio decreasing in GNP which can be seen as a typical part of a

dualistic development process as in Russia today. When GNP is high enough and the peak of the polarization process is surpassed, those counteractive forces will vanish, and both forces – income growth and decreasing inequality – will work together in only one direction: lowering government's share of GNP.

6. Conclusions

The paper shows that "Wagner's Law" is hard to reconcile with the modern theory of public goods as developed by Paul Samuelson. The two views deliver dissenting results, in particular if, (i) preferences are uniform (as Becker/Stigler suggest) and (ii) individual income elasticities for public goods hover around unity (as a large part of the empirical studies claim and as we state as a plausible hypothesis for the overall budget). Rather than increasing, the Samuelsonian perspective yields a budget-to-GNP ratio which is *decreasing* in GNP. Hence, public-goods related expenditures will tend to grow more slowly than the economy. Yet, "Wagner's Law" is even incompatible with his own statement as the relative size can be expected to remain constant if the Wagnerian approach is formalized with (i) and (ii). The differences between Wagner and Samuelson can be largely attributed to differences in the philosophy of the state, namely authoritative-authoritarian vs. democratic.

However, distributional issues matter. While budget-to-GNP ratios in the Samuelsonian perspective continue to decline as economies become richer, changes in the income distribution may be associated with changes in the budget-to-GNP, too. Hence, there certainly is a GNP at which the distribution is neutral with respect to the relative size of the public sector. Yet, the budget-to-GNP ratio unambiguously increases if the primary income distribution becomes more uneven due to some individuals losing their earnings capacity with the others retaining theirs – independent of whether there is a redistributive welfare state or not, provided that the first operates in lump-sum manner. With a growing GNP and

decreasing inequality as (has been observed) in the continental states of Europe for the last 30 years, both forces work in the same direction, and hence, the relative growth of government cannot be traced back to the basic allocative functions of government but must be rooted elsewhere.

References

- Abrams, B.A. (1999). "The Effect of Government Size on the Unemployment Rate". *Public Choice* 99: 395-401.
- Alesina, A.; DiTella, R. and R. MacCulloch.(2004). "Inequality and Happiness: Are Europeans and Americans Different?" *Journal of Public Economics* 88: 2009-42.
- Auteri, M. and M. Constantini (2004). "Is social protection a necessity or a luxury good? New multivariate cointegration panel results." *Applied Economics* 36: 1887-98.
- Barro, R.J. (1991). "Economic Growth in a Cross-Section of Countries." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 51: 407-43.
- Becker, G.S. and G.J. Stigler (1977). "De Gustibus Non Est Disputandum". *American Economic Review* 67: 76-90.
- Bergstrom, Th. and R.P. Goodman (1973). "Private Demand for Public Goods". *American Economic Review* 63: 280-96.
- Blankart, Ch.B. (2003). *Öffentliche Finanzen in der Demokratie*. 5th edition, Munich: Vahlen.
- Borcherding, T.E. and R. Deacon (1972). "The Demand for Services of Non-Federal Governments". *American Economic Review* 62: 227-35.
- Borcherding, T.E. and D. Lee. (2004). "The Growth of the Relative Size of Government". In: Rowley, Ch.K. and F. Schneider, eds., *The Encyclopedia of Public Choice*. Dordrecht: Kluwer: 273-78.

- Borcherding, T.E.; Ferris, J.S. and A. Garzoni (2004). "Growth in the Real Size of Government since 1970." In: Backhaus, J.G. and R.E. Wagner, eds., *Handbook of Public Choice*, Boston: Kluwer: 77-108.
- Brown, C.V. and P.M. Jackson (1982). *Public Sector Economics*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.
- Maslow, A. (1987). *Motivation and Personality*. 3rd ed. New York: Harper & Row.
- Miles, D.; Myles, G. and I. Preston. (2003). "Introduction". In: Miles, D., G. Myles and I. Preston, eds. *The Economics of Public Spending*, Oxford: Oxford University Press: 1-30
- Peacock, A. and A. Scott (2000). "The Curious Attraction of Wagner's Law". *Public Choice* 102: 1-17
- Peltzman, S. (1980). "The Growth of Government". *Journal of Law and Economics* 23: 209-88.
- Pommerehne, W.W. (1978). "Institutional Approaches to Public Expenditure". *Journal of Public Economics* 9: 255-80.
- Samuelson, P.A. (1954). "The Pure Theory of Public Expenditures". *Review of Economics and Statistics* 36: 387-89.
- Samuelson, P.A. (1955). "Diagrammatic Exposition of a Theory of Public Expenditures". *Review of Economics and Statistics* 37: 350-56.
- Scully, G.W. (1989). "The Size of the State, Economic Growth and the Efficient Utilization of National Resources". *Public Choice* 63: 149-64.
- Scully, G.W. (1995). "The 'Growth Tax' in the United States". *Public Choice* 85: 71-80.
- Tanzi, V. and L. Schuknecht (2000). *Public Spending in the Twentieth Century: A Global Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wagner, A. (1863). *Die Ordnung des österreichischen Staatshaushalts*. Wien: Gerold.
- Wagner, A. (1876). *Allgemeine und theoretische Volkswirtschaftslehre – Erster Theil: Grundlegung*. Leipzig: Winter.

Wagner, A. (1893). *Grundlegung der politischen Ökonomie*. 3th ed. Leipzig: Winter

Wagner, A. (1911). „Staat in nationalökonomischer Hinsicht“. *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, 4th ed, Book VII, Jena: Fischer, 771-779.

Bisher erschienen:

Diskussionspapiere der Fächergruppe Volkswirtschaftslehre

- Dluhosch, Barbara and Klaus W. Zimmermann, Some Second Thoughts on Wagner's Law, No. 54, (December 2006).
- Dewenter, Ralf, Das Konzept der zweiseitigen Märkte am Beispiel von Zeitungsmonopolen, Nr. 53 (November 2006), erscheint in: *MedienWirtschaft: Zeitschrift für Medienmanagement und Kommunikationsökonomie*.
- Napel, Stefan und Andrea Schneider, Intergenerational talent transmission, inequality, and social mobility, No. 52 (October 2006).
- Papenfuss, Ulf und Tobias Thomas, Eine Lanze für den Sachverständigenrat?, Nr. 51 (Oktober 2006).
- Kruse, Jörn, Das Monopol für demokratische Legitimation: Zur konstitutionellen Reform unserer staatlichen und politischen Strukturen, Nr. 50 (Juli 2006).
- Hackmann, Johannes, Eine reinvermögenszugangstheoretisch konsequente Unternehmensbesteuerung, Nr. 49 (Juni 2006).
- Carlberg, Michael, Interactions between Monetary and Fiscal Policies in the Euro Area, No. 48 (March 2006).
- Bayer, Stefan & Jacques Méry, Sustainability Gaps in Municipal Solid Waste Management: The Case of Landfills, No. 47 (February 2006).
- Schäfer, Wolf, Schattenwirtschaft, Äquivalenzprinzip und Wirtschaftspolitik, Nr. 46 (Januar 2006).
- Sepp, Jüri & Diana Eerma, Developments of the Estonian Competition Policy in the Framework of Accession to the European Union, No. 45 (January 2006).
- Kruse, Jörn, Zugang zu Premium Content, Nr. 44 (Dezember 2005).
- Dewenter, Ralf & Jörn Kruse, Calling Party Pays or Receiving Party Pays? The Diffusion of Mobile Telephony with Endogenous Regulation, No. 43 (November 2005).
- Schulze, Sven, An Index of Generosity for the German UI-System. No. 42 (October 2005).
- Bühler, Stefan, Ralf Dewenter & Justus Haucap, Mobile Number Portability in Europe, No. 41. (August 2005), erschienen in: *Telecommunications Policy* 30(7), 385-399.
- Meyer, Dirk, Manuskriptstaus behindern den Wissenschaftsbetrieb: Zur Möglichkeit von Einreichungsgebühren, Autorenhonoraren und Gutachterentgelten, Nr. 40 (Juni 2005).
- Carlberg, Michael, International Monetary Policy Coordination, No. 39 (March 2005).
- Zimmermann, Klaus W. & Reto Schemm-Gregory, Eine Welt voller Clubs, Nr. 38 (März 2005), erscheint in: *Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftspolitik*.
- Hackmann, Johannes, Die Bestimmung der optimalen Bevölkerungsgröße als (wirtschafts-) ethisches Problem, Nr. 37 (März 2005).

- Josten, Stefan Dietrich, Middle-Class Consensus, Social Capital and the Mechanics of Economic Development, No. 36 (January 2005).
- Dewenter, Ralf & Ulrich Kaiser, Anmerkungen zur ökonomischen Bewertung von Fusionen auf dem Printmedienmarkt, Nr. 35 (Januar 2005), erschienen unter dem Titel „Horizontale Fusionen auf zweiseitigen Märkten am Beispiel von Printmedien“ in *Perspektiven der Wirtschaftspolitik* 7(3), 335-353.
- Göbel, Markus & Tobias Thomas, Informal Institutions and the “Weaknesses” of Human Behavior, No. 34 (January 2005).
- Dewenter, Ralf & Justus Haucap, Estimating Demand Elasticities for Mobile Telecommunications in Austria, No. 33 (Dezember 2004).
- Meyer, Dirk, Die Entmachtung der Politik: Zur Frage der Überlebensfähigkeit demokratischer Nationalstaaten in einer globalisierten Weltwirtschaft, Nr. 32 (Dezember 2004).
- Josten, Stefan Dietrich & Klaus W. Zimmermann, Unanimous Constitutional Consent and the Immigration Problem, No. 31 (Dezember 2004), erscheint in: *Public Choice*.
- Bleich, Torsten, Importzoll, Beschäftigung und Leistungsbilanz: ein mikrofundierter Ansatz, Nr. 30 (September 2004).
- Dewenter, Ralf, Justus Haucap, Ricardo Luther & Peter Rötzel, Hedonic Prices in the German Market for Mobile Phones, No. 29 (August 2004), erscheint in: *Telecommunications Policy*, 2007.
- Carlberg, Michael, Monetary and Fiscal Policy Interactions in the Euro Area, No. 28 (März 2004).
- Dewenter, Ralf & Justus Haucap, Die Liberalisierung der Telekommunikationsbranche in Deutschland, Nr. 27 (März 2004), erschienen in: *Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftspolitik* 53, 2004, 374-393.
- Kruse, Jörn, Ökonomische Konsequenzen des Spitzensports im öffentlich-rechtlichen und im privaten Fernsehen, Nr. 26 (Januar 2004).
- Haucap, Justus & Jörn Kruse, Ex-Ante-Regulierung oder Ex-Post-Aufsicht für netzgebundene Industrien?, Nr. 25 (November 2003), erschienen in *Wirtschaft und Wettbewerb* 54, 2004, 266-275.
- Haucap, Justus & Tobias Just, Der Preis ist heiß. Aber warum? Zum Einfluss des Ökonomie- studiums auf die Einschätzung der Fairness des Preissystems, Nr. 24 (November 2003), erschienen in *Wirtschaftswissenschaftliches Studium (WiSt)* 33 (9), 2004, 520-524.
- Dewenter, Ralf & Justus Haucap, Mobile Termination with Asymmetric Networks, No. 23 (October 2003), erschienen unter dem Titel “The Effects of Regulating Mobile Termination Rates for Asymmetric Networks” erschienen in: *European Journal of Law and Economics* 20, 2005, 185-197.
- Dewenter, Ralf, Raising the Scores? Empirical Evidence on the Introduction of the Three-Point Rule in Portugese Football, No. 22 (September 2003).
- Haucap, Justus & Christian Wey, Unionisation Structures and Innovation Incentives, No. 21 (September 2003), erschienen in: *The Economic Journal* 114, 2004, C145-C165.

- Quitzau, Jörn, Erfolgsfaktor Zufall im Profifußball: Quantifizierung mit Hilfe informations-effizienter Wettmärkte, Nr. 20 (September 2003).
- Reither, Franco, Grundzüge der Neuen Keynesianischen Makroökonomik, Nr. 19 (August 2003), erschienen in: *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftswissenschaften* 54, 2003, 131-143.
- Kruse, Jörn & Jörn Quitzau, Fußball-Fernsehrechte: Aspekte der Zentralvermarktung, Nr. 18 (August 2003).
- Bühler, Stefan & Justus Haucap, Mobile Number Portability, No. 17 (August 2003), erschienen in: *Journal of Industry, Competition and Trade* 4, 2004, 223-238.
- Zimmermann, Klaus W. & Tobias Just, On the Relative Efficiency of Democratic Institutions, No. 16 (July 2003).
- Bühler, Stefan & Justus Haucap, Strategic Outsourcing Revisited, No. 15 (July 2003), erschienen in *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 61, 2006, 325-338.
- Meyer, Dirk, Die Energieeinsparverordnung (EnEV) - eine ordnungspolitische Analyse, Nr. 14 (Juli 2003).
- Zimmermann, Klaus W. & Tobias Thomas, Patek Philippe, or the Art to Tax Luxuries, No. 13 (June 2003).
- Dewenter, Ralf, Estimating the Valuation of Advertising, No. 12 (June 2003).
- Otto, Alkis, Foreign Direct Investment, Production, and Welfare, No. 11 (June 2003).
- Dewenter, Ralf, The Economics of Media Markets, No. 10 (June 2003).
- Josten, Stefan Dietrich, Dynamic Fiscal Policies, Unemployment, and Economic Growth, No. 9 (June 2003).
- Haucap, Justus & Tobias Just, Not Guilty? Another Look at the Nature and Nurture of Economics Students, No. 8 (June 2003).
- Dewenter, Ralf, Quality Provision in Interrelated Markets, No. 7 (June 2003), erschienen unter dem Titel "Quality Provision in Advertising Markets" in: *Applied Economics Quarterly* 51, 5-28.
- Bräuninger, Michael, A Note on Health Insurance and Growth, No. 6 (June 2003).
- Dewenter, Ralf, Media Markets with Habit Formation, No. 5 (June 2003).
- Haucap, Justus, The Economics of Mobile Telephone Regulation, No. 4 (June 2003).
- Josten, Stefan Dietrich & Achim Truger, Inequality, Politics, and Economic Growth. Three Critical Questions on Politico-Economic Models of Growth and Distribution, No. 3 (June 2003).
- Dewenter, Ralf, Rational Addiction to News?, No. 2 (June 2003).
- Kruse, Jörn, Regulierung der Terminierungsentgelte der deutschen Mobilfunknetze?, Nr. 1 (Juni 2003).

Frühere Diskussionsbeiträge zur Wirtschaftspolitik

- Bräuninger, Michael & Justus Haucap, Das Preis-Leistungs-Verhältnis ökonomischer Fachzeitschriften, Nr. 120 (2002), erschienen in: *Schmollers Jahrbuch* 123, 2003, S. 285-305.

- Kruse, Jörn, Competition in Mobile Communications and the Allocation of Scarce Resources: The Case of UMTS, Nr. 119 (2002), erschienen in: Pierre Buigues & Patrick Rey (Hg.), *The Economics of Antitrust and Regulation in Telecommunications*, Edward Elgar: Cheltenham 2004.
- Haucap, Justus & Jörn Kruse, Predatory Pricing in Liberalised Telecommunications Markets, Nr. 118 (2002), erschienen in: Christian von Hirschhausen, Thorsten Beckers & Kay Mitusch (Hrsg.), *Trends in Infrastructure Regulation and Financing*, Edward Elgar: Cheltenham 2004, S. 43-68.
- Kruse, Jörn, Pay-TV versus Free-TV: Ein Regulierungsproblem?, Nr. 117 (2002), erscheint in: Mike Friedrichsen (Hg.), *Kommerz - Kommunikation - Konsum. Zur Zukunft des Fernsehens in konvergierenden Märkten*, 2003.
- Kruse, Jörn, Regulierung der Verbindungsnetzbetreiberauswahl im Mobilfunk, Nr. 116 (2002), als Kurzform erschienen in: *Multimedia und Recht*, Januar 2003, S. 29-35.
- Haucap, Justus & Jörn Kruse, Verdrängungspreise auf liberalisierten Telekommunikationsmärkten, Nr. 115 (2002), erschienen in: *Perspektiven der Wirtschaftspolitik* 5, 2004, 337-361.
- Haucap, Justus & Helmmar Schmidt, Kennzeichnungspflicht für genetisch veränderte Lebensmittel: Eine ökonomische Analyse, Nr. 114 (2002), erschienen in: *Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftspolitik* 53, 2002, S. 287-316.
- Kruse, Jörn & Jörn Quitzau, Zentralvermarktung der Fernsehrechte an der Fußball-Bundesliga, Nr. 113 (2002), erschienen in: *Zeitschrift für Betriebswirtschaft, Ergänzungsheft zur Sportökonomie*, 2002, S. 63-82.
- Kruse, Jörn & Justus Haucap, Zuviel Wettbewerb in der Telekommunikation? Anmerkungen zum zweiten Sondergutachten der Monopolkommission, Nr. 112 (2002), erschienen in: *Wirtschaftsdienst* 82, 2002, S. 92-98.
- Bräuninger, Michael & Justus Haucap, What Economists Think of Their Journals and How They Use Them: Reputation and Relevance of Economics Journals, Nr. 111 (2002), erschienen in *Kyklos* 56, 2003, S. 175-197.
- Haucap, Justus, Telephone Number Allocation: A Property Rights Approach, Nr 110 (2001), erschienen in: *European Journal of Law and Economics* 15, 2003, S. 91-109.
- Haucap, Justus & Roland Kirstein, Government Incentives when Pollution Permits are Durable Goods, Nr. 109 (2001), erschienen in: *Public Choice* 115, 2003, S. 163-183.
- Haucap, Justus, Konsum und soziale Beziehungen, Nr. 108 (2001), erschienen in: *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftswissenschaften* 52, 2001, S. 243-263.
- Bräuninger, Michael & Justus Haucap, Was Ökonomen lesen und schätzen: Ergebnisse einer Umfrage, Nr. 107 (2000), erschienen in: *Perspektiven der Wirtschaftspolitik* 2, 2001, S.185-210.
- Haucap, Justus, Uwe Pauly & Christian Wey, Collective Wage Setting When Wages Are Generally Binding: An Antitrust Perspective, Nr. 106 (2000), erschienen in: *International Review of Law and Economics* 21, 2001, S. 287-307.

- Haucap, Justus, Selective Price Cuts and Uniform Pricing Rules in Network Industries, Nr. 105 (2000), erschienen in: *Journal of Industry, Competition and Trade* 3, 2003, 269-291.
- Bräuninger, Michael, Unemployment Insurance, Wage Differentials and Unemployment, Nr. 104 (2000) erschienen in: *Finanzarchiv* 75, 2000, S. 485-501.
- Kruse, Jörn, Universaldienstlast etablierter Postunternehmen, Nr. 103 (2000) erschienen in: *Zeitschrift für Betriebswirtschaft*, Ergänzungsheft 3, 2002, S. 99-117.
- Kruse, Jörn, Sportveranstaltungen als Fernsehware, Nr. 102 (2000) erschienen in: Schellhaaß, Horst-Manfred (Hg.), *Sportveranstaltungen zwischen Liga- und Medien-Interessen*, Hofmann: Schorndorf 2000, S. 15-39.

Frühere Diskussionsbeiträge aus dem Institut für Theoretische Volkswirtschaftslehre

- Bräuninger, Michael, Social Capital and Regional Mobility, Nr. 4/2002.
- Schäfer, Wolf, EU-Erweiterung: Anmerkungen zum Balassa-Samuelson-Effekt, Nr. 3/2002, erschienen in: Stefan Reitz (Hg.): *Theoretische und wirtschaftspolitische Aspekte der internationalen Integration*, Duncker & Humblot: Berlin 2003, S. 89-98.
- Bräuninger, Michael, The Budget Deficit, Public Debt and Endogenous Growth, Nr. 2/2002.
- Rösl, Gerhard, Die Umverteilung der Geldschöpfungsgewinne im Eurosystem: Das Earmarking-Verfahren seit dem 1.1.2002, Nr. 1/2002, als Kurzform erschienen in: *Wirtschaftsdienst* 82, 2002, S.352-356.
- Schniewindt, Sarah, Two-Way Competition in Local Telecommunication Networks, Nr. 2/2001.
- Reither, Franco, Optimal Monetary Policy when Output Persists: On the Equivalence of Optimal Control and Dynamic Programming, Nr. 1/2001.
- Schäfer, Wolf, MOEL-Wechselkursarrangements, Nr. 1/2000, erschienen in: Günther Engel & Peter Rühmann (Hg.): *Geldpolitik und Europäische Währungsunion*, Göttingen 2000, S. 217-228.
- Heppe, Kirsten, On the Existence of the Credit Channel in Poland, Nr. 8/1999.
- Bräuninger, Michael, Unemployment and International Lending and Borrowing in an Overlapping Generations Model, Nr. 8/1999.
- Henning, Andreas & Wolfgang Greiner, Organknappheit im Transplantationswesen - Lösungsansätze aus ökonomischer Sicht, Nr. 7/1999.
- Chung, Un-Chan, East Asian Economic Crisis - What is and What Ought to be Done: The Case of Korea, Nr. 6/1999, erschienen in: *Research in Asian Economic Studies* 10, 2002, S. 93-121.
- Carlberg, Michael, Europäische Währungsunion: Der neue Policy Mix, Nr. 5/1999, erschienen in *Wirtschaftswissenschaftliches Studium (WiSt)* 29(1), 2000, S. 8-13.
- Carlberg, Michael, European Monetary Union: The New Macroeconomics, Nr. 4/1999, erschienen in: Gerhard Rübél (Hg.), *Real and Monetary Issues of International Economic Integration*, Duncker & Humblot: Berlin 2000, S. 155-175.

- Bräuninger, Michael & J.-P. Vidal, Private versus Financing of Education and Endogenous Growth, Nr. 3/1999, erschienen in: *Journal of Population Economics* 13, 2000, S. 387-401.
- Reither, Franco, A Monetary Policy Strategy for the European Central Bank, Nr. 2/1999 erschienen in: Rolf Caesar & Hans-Eckart Scharrer (Hg.), *European Economic and Monetary Union: Regional and Global Challenges*, Nomos Verlag: Baden-Baden 2001, S. 213-226.
- Bräuninger, Michael, Wage Bargaining, Unemployment and Growth, Nr. 1/1999 erschienen in: *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics* 156, 2000, S. 646-660.

Frühere Diskussionsbeiträge zur Finanzwissenschaft

- Josten, Stefan, Crime, Inequality, and Economic Growth. A Classical Argument for Distributional Equality, 2002, erschienen in: *International Tax and Public Finance* 10, 2003, S. 435-452.
- Zimmermann, Klaus W. & Tobias Thomas, Öffentliche Güter, natürliche Monopole und die Grenze marktlicher Versorgung, 2002, erschienen in: *Wirtschaftswissenschaftliches Studium (WiSt)* 32, 2003, S. 340-344.
- Holm-Müller, Karin & Klaus W. Zimmermann, Einige Anmerkungen zur Internalisierungsstrategie mit dem produktorientierten Konzept der Pigousteuer, 2002, erschienen in: *Zeitschrift für Umweltpolitik und Umweltrecht* 25, 2002, S. 415-420.
- Josten, Stefan, Nationale Schuldenpolitik in der EWU, 2002, erschienen in: *Wirtschaftsdienst* 82, 2002, S. 219-225.
- Hackmann, Johannes, Der Sonderabgabenbezug nach dem Lebenspartnerschaftsergänzungsgesetz, 2002, erschienen in: *Wirtschaftsdienst*, 82, 2002, S. 241-248.
- Josten, Stefan, Das Theorem der Staatsschuldneutralität. Eine kritisch-systematische Rekonstruktion, 2001, erschienen in: *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftswissenschaften* 53, 2002, S. 180-209.
- Zimmermann, Klaus W., Komplikationen und Fallstricke in der Pigou-Analyse von Externalitäten, 2001, erschienen in: *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftswissenschaften* 53, 2002, S. 245-267
- Josten, Stefan, National Debt in an Endogenous Growth Model, 2001, erschienen in: *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftswissenschaften* 53, 2002, S. 107-123.
- Hackmann, Johannes, Vom Ehegattensplitting zum Partnerschaftssplitting?, 2001, erschienen in: Volker Arnold (Hg.), *Wirtschaftsethische Perspektiven VI*, Schriften des Vereins für Socialpolitik 228/VI, Ducker & Humblot: Berlin 2002, S. 189-222.
- Zimmermann, Klaus W. & Tobias Just, Politische Glaubwürdigkeit und der Euro: Eine verfassungsökonomische Perspektive, 2000, erschienen in: Fritz Söllner & Arno Wilfert (Hg.), *Die Zukunft des Steuer- und Sozialstaates*, Physica Verlag 2001, S. 373-397.
- Josten, Stefan, National Debt, Borrowing Constraints, and Human Capital Accumulation in an Endogenous Growth Model, 2000, erschienen in: *FinanzArchiv* 58, 2001, S. 317-338.
- Zimmermann, Klaus W. & Tobias Just, The Euro and Political Credibility in Germany, 2000, erschienen in: *Challenge* 44, 2001, S. 102-120

- Josten, Stefan, Public Debt Policy in an Endogenous Growth Model of Perpetual Youth, 1999, erschienen in *FinanzArchiv* 57, 2000, S. 197-215.
- Zimmermann, Klaus W., Internalisierung als Nirwana-Kriterium der Umweltpolitik, 1999, erschienen in: Kilian Bizer, Bodo Linscheidt & Achim Truger (Hg.), *Staatshandeln im Umweltschutz. Perspektiven einer institutionellen Umweltökonomik*, Duncker & Humblot: Berlin 2000.
- Hackmann, Johannes, Die unterlassene Besteuerung der Nutzungswerte selbstgenutzten Wohnungseigentums: Vergebene Reformpotentiale, 1999, erschienen in: R. Lüdeke, W. Scherf & W. Steden (Hg.), *Wirtschaftswissenschaft im Dienste der Verteilungs-, Geld- und Finanzpolitik*, Festschrift für A. Oberhauser, Berlin 2000, S. 387-412.
- Zimmermann, Klaus W. & Tobias Just, Interest Groups, Referenda, and the Political Process: On the Efficiency of Direct Democracy, 1999, erschienen in: *Constitutional Political Economy* 11, 2000, S. 147-163.
- Josten, Stefan, Staatsverschuldung und Wirtschaftswachstum in einem Diamond-OLG-Modell mit AK-Technologie, 1999, erschienen in: *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftswissenschaften* 51, 2000, S. 237-254.