ECONSTOR
Make Your Publications Visible.

A Service of

ZBW Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft
Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Panteghini, Paolo M.

Working Paper

On the equivalence between labor and consumption taxation

CESifo Working Paper, No. 2593

Provided in Cooperation with:
Ifo Institute – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research at the University of Munich

Suggested Citation: Panteghini, Paolo M. (2009) : On the equivalence between labor and consumption taxation, CESifo Working Paper, No. 2593, Center for Economic Studies and ifo Institute (CESifo), Munich

This Version is available at:
https://hdl.handle.net/10419/26638

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.

WWW.ECONSTOR.EU

Mitglied der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

On the Equivalence between Labor and Consumption Taxation

PAOLO M. PANTEGHINI

CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 2593
CATEGORY 1: PUBLIC FINANCE
MARCH 2009

An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded
- *from the SSRN website: www.SSRN.com*
- *from the RePEc website: www.RePEc.org*
- *from the CESifo website: www.CESifo-group.org/wp*

CESifo *Working Paper No. 2593*

On the Equivalence between Labor and Consumption Taxation

Abstract

This article studies the equivalence between labor and consumption taxes in a stochastic context, where the government can undertake an active portfolio management strategy by investing in both risk-free and risky assets. Using a two-period model we show that such taxes let consumers make the same decisions, and can finance the same amount of government spending in each period.

JEL Code: H24.

Keywords: consumption and labor taxation, equivalence, risk.

Paolo M. Panteghini
University of Brescia
Department of Economics
Via S. Faustino 74/B
25122 Brescia
Italy
panteghi@eco.unibs.it

I wish to thank Enrico Minelli for helpful comments. I am responsible for any remaining errors.

1 Introduction

In the absence of risk, a consumption tax is equivalent to a labor tax (see, e.g., Salanié, 2003). When however we assume a stochastic context, this equivalence result may fail to hold, unless ad hoc conditions are met.

As shown by Ashan (1989, 1990), equivalence holds under uncertainty only if the wage tax is modified to account for excess returns, i.e., capital gains/losses net of the risk-free rate of return. Applying a risk-free discount rate, he shows indeed that the present value of revenues raised by this modified wage tax (hereafter MWT) is the same as under consumption-based taxation. Zodrow (1995) criticizes Ashan's use of the risk-free rate, by arguing that the government cannot absorb risk costlessy. This implies that the relevant discount rate must incorporate a risk premium. Zodrow (1995) proves that, if the government's discount rate is equal to the private expected return to saving, a consumption tax is equivalent to a standard labor tax (rather than to a MWT). In a more recent article, Ashan and Tsigaris (1998) have responded to Zodrow's (1995) critique by applying a certainty-equivalent approach. They show that if individuals hold efficient portfolios, the relevant discount rate is endogenously determined and, if applied by the government, ensures the equivalence between a consumption tax and a MWT.

It is worth noting that all these articles are based on the calculation of the present value of future tax revenue.[1] Therefore they share the use of an ex-ante approach. However the existence of an ex-ante equivalence does not necessarily imply that such taxes are equivalent from an ex-post perspective. To tackle the ex-post equivalence issue, Kaplow (1994) proposes a new approach, that lets the government invest in risky assets and thus manage resources actively.[2] Using a two-period model, he shows that equivalence holds on both an ex-ante and ex-post basis, provided that the government can manage its portfolio with no limits (i.e., it can take infinite short or long positions). Kaplow's (1994) findings are based on some restrictive assumptions. Indeed, he assumes that all the resources are invested at time 1 and consumed at time 2. Similarly, the government is assumed not to spend at time 1: all the resources raised are indeed spend at time 2. Given these limitations, Kaplow (1994) cannot deal with the fact that consumption taxes postpone tax payments relative to labor taxes. As pointed out by Summers (1981), indeed, under these two alternative systems, tax revenues

[1] For a detailed review of the relevant literature on taxation and risk taking see Schindler (2008).

[2] A similar reasoning is used by Fahri (2007). He shows indeed that capital ownership provides the government with a powerful hedging instrument. In such a context, the government can perfectly approximate the complete markets allocation by taking an infinitely long or short position in capital. However, even with smaller positions, a substantial welfare improvement can be achieved

may differ time by time, and therefore, the equivalence may fail to hold in an intertemporal context.

In this article we aim to generalize Kaplow's (1994) model by letting the individuals consume also at time 1, and the government to spend in each period. We will then show that if the government can manage risky resources, labor and consumption taxes are equivalent in each period, and therefore, the stricter definition of time-by-time equivalence is achieved.

The structure of the article is as follows. Section 2 presents the model and proves our equivalence result. Section 3 summarizes our finding and discusses possible extensions of the model.

2 The model

Let us assume a representative individual who lives for two periods, and maximizes an expected utility function $u(c_t)$, that is strictly concave in c_t, i.e., consumption at time $t = 1, 2$.[3] By assumption, there are two assets: a risk-free asset with a certain return r, and a risky asset with an stochastic return equal to x. At time 1, the individual earns a wage income equal to y.[4]

[3] See, e.g., Sandmo (1985).

[4] Since income y is earned only at time 1, we can think of a representative individual who works only when he is young and consumes in both periods. However, the quality of

The sequence of the model is as follows.

At the beginning of time 1 the government chooses the tax rate and the level of government spending. Then, the individual decides how much to consume at time 1 and how much to invest in the risky and risk-free asset. Given the consumer's choice, the government raises revenues and finances public spending at time 1. Moreover, since the government can undertake an active portfolio strategy, it can invest its surplus in both the risky and risk-free assets.[5]

At time 2, the government earns the returns of its investment and, under consumption taxation, also raises revenues. All these resources are aimed at financing public spending at time 2.

Given these assumptions we want to find under what conditions:

1. consumers make the same decisions;

2. government spending in each period is the same under both regimes in each period.

If both conditions are met we can therefore say that these taxes are equivalent. Denoting τ_w and τ_c as the wage and consumption tax rate, respec-

results would not change if we assumed that the individual also works when he is old.

[5]If public spending is higher than tax revenue at time 1, the government can issue a bond, that will be repaid at time 2.

tively, s as saving at time 1, and a as the portion of resources invested in the risky asset, we can write the consumer's budget constraints at time 1 and 2, respectively:

$$(1-\tau_w)\, y = (1+\tau_c)\, c_1 + s \tag{1}$$

$$(1+\tau_c)\, c_2 = [1 + r + a\,(x-r)]\, s. \tag{2}$$

It is worth noting that (1) and (2) are the consumer's budget constraints in a general setting (i.e., with $\tau_w > 0$ and $\tau_c > 0$). In what follows however, we will focus on two alternative regimes: a pure labor-tax system, with $\tau_w > \tau_c = 0$, and a pure consumption-based one, i.e., with $\tau_c > \tau_w = 0$. Contrary to labor taxation, that ensures revenue raising only at time 1, consumption taxation is levied in both periods.

Assuming for simplicity that a representative individual's utility function is additively separable,[6] and defining β as the relevant discount factor, his/her problem will be:

$$\begin{gathered} V(c_1, c_2, a) = \max_{c_1, c_2, a} E\left[u(c_1) + \beta u(c_2)\right], \\ s.t.\ (1) \text{ and } (2). \end{gathered} \tag{3}$$

[6]Notice that the quality of results would not change if, following Zodrow (1995), we assumed that the utility function is not additively separable.

Before solving (3) we can rewrite it as follows. Let us solve (1) for s and substitute the result into (2) so as to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}(1+\tau_c)\,c_2 &= [1+r+a\,(x-r)]\,s \\ &= [1+r+a\,(x-r)]\,[(1-\tau_w)\,y-(1+\tau_c)\,c_1]\,,\end{aligned}$$

which gives:

$$c_2 = [1+r+a\,(x-r)]\left[\frac{(1-\tau_w)}{(1+\tau_c)}y - c_1\right]. \tag{4}$$

Let us next substitute (4) into (3), so as to rewrite a consumer's problem as follows:

$$V^*\,(c_1,a) = \max_{c_1,a} E\left\{u\,(c_1) + \beta u\left([1+r+a\,(x-r)]\left[\frac{(1-\tau_w)}{(1+\tau_c)}y - c_1\right]\right)\right\} \tag{5}$$

The first order conditions of problem (5) are well known:[7]

$$(c_1): \qquad \tfrac{\partial u(c_1)}{\partial c_1} - E\left[\beta \tfrac{\partial u(c_2)}{\partial c_2}\,[1+r+a\,(x-r)]\right] = 0, \tag{6}$$

[7] For a detailed discussion of these conditions in a more general setting, see e.g. Sandmo (1985).

$$(a): \qquad E\left[\beta \frac{\partial u(c_2)}{\partial c_2}\left[(x-r)\right]\left(\frac{(1-\tau_w)}{(1+\tau_c)}y - czXs\right)\right] = 0. \tag{7}$$

As shown in (6), neither regime has a direct impact on consumption. On the other hand, Eq. (7) shows that the impact of these tax regimes on asset allocation is the same only if tax rates are such that the equality $(1-\tau_w) = \frac{1}{1+\tau_c}$ (or equivalently, $\tau_w = \frac{\tau_c}{1+\tau_c}$) holds.

Let us next analyze the government's policy, that consists of both tax rate setting and portfolio decisions. Given (6) and (7), we will calculate under what conditions, the government can make consumption and labor taxation equivalent.

Labor income tax Let us denote g_t as public spending at time $t = 1, 2$. Under labor taxation, the government's public budget constraint at time 1 is:

$$\tau_w y - g_1 = \alpha_w^s + \alpha_w^r, \tag{8}$$

where α_w^s and α_w^r are the amount of resources invested in the safe (s) and risky (r) activity.[8] Solving (8) for α_w^s gives $\alpha_w^s = \tau_w y - g_1 - \alpha_w^r$. At time 2,

[8]Notice that α_w^s and α_w^r can be either positive or negative, because we have assumed that the government can take both long or short positions. If for instance, g_1 is larger

government spending will be equal to the amount of resources earned by the government. Therefore the budget constraint will be:

$$\begin{aligned} g_2 &= (1+r)\,\alpha_w^s + (1+x)\,\alpha_w^r \\ &= (1+r)\,(\tau_w y - g_1) + \alpha_w^r\,(x-r)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Consumption tax Under a consumption tax, the amount of resources collected at time 1 is equal to $\tau_c c_1$.Given g_1, the public budget constraint is equal to:

$$\tau_c c_1 - g_1 = \alpha_c^s + \alpha_c^r, \tag{10}$$

where α_c^s and α_c^r are the amount of resources invested in the safe (s) and risky (r) asset.[9] Solving (10) for α_c^s gives $\alpha_c^s = \tau_c c_1 - g_1 - \alpha_c^r$. Therefore, public spending at time 2 will be equal to:

$$g_2 = (1+r)\,\alpha_c^s + (1+x)\,\alpha_c^r + \tau_c c_2, \tag{11}$$

Substituting (4) into (11) we therefore obtain:

than the amount of resources collected at time 1, the government can finance its deficit by issuing a risk-free bond. Resources raised by means of the debt issue can used to buy the risky asset too.

[9]Notice that α_c^s and α_c^r can be both positive and negative. Their sign depends on the governemnt's portfolio strategy.

$$
\begin{aligned}
g_2 &= (1+r)\,\alpha_c^s + (1+x)\,\alpha_c^r + \tau_c c_2 \qquad (12)\\
&= (1+r)\left(\frac{\tau_c}{1+\tau_c}y - g_1\right) + \left[\alpha_c^r + \tau_c a\left(\frac{1}{1+\tau_c}y - c_1\right)\right](x-r)\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

Let us next compare (9) with (12). We can show that, given g_1 and condition $\tau_w = \frac{\tau_c}{1+\tau_c}$, both regimes can finance the same amount public spending at time 2 if:

$$
\alpha_w^r - \alpha_c^r = \tau_c a\left(\frac{1}{1+\tau_c}y - c_1\right) > 0. \qquad (13)
$$

Condition (13) states that, given a, y, and c_1 (that are known to the government), the government can adjust the amount of resources invested in the risky asset so as to ensure the same value of public spending in both regimes. Since g_1 is the same and condition $\tau_w = \frac{\tau_c}{1+\tau_c}$ holds, if condition (13) is met, equivalence holds.

It is worth noting that the differential $(\alpha_w^r - \alpha_c^r)$ is equal to the product between τ_c and the amount of resources invested in risky assets under consumption taxation. Since the RHS of (13) is positive, the amount of resources invested in risky assets is larger under a labor tax than under a consumption tax. The intuition behind this result is as follows: under a consumption tax

the amount collected at time 2 is stochastic. Therefore, consumption taxation has two sources of risk: that related to tax revenue collection and that due to investment in the risky asset. On the other hand, labor taxation is subject only to the latter source of risk. This means that in order for equivalence to hold, the amount of resources invested in the risky asset under a consumption tax must be less than that invested under a labor tax. If the difference $(\alpha_w^r - \alpha_c^r)$ is such that equality (13) holds, then the two sources of risk under consumption taxation entail the same riskiness as under labor taxation.

3 Concluding remarks

In this article we have shown that labor and consumption taxes are equivalent in each period. This result is guaranteed by the fact that the government has two objectives (i.e., g_1 and g_2) and two policy tools, i.e., tax rates and the portfolio management strategy.

It is worth noting that equivalence result has not been achieved by assuming the existence of complete markets. Rather, it can be obtained if the government can buy and sell, with no specific limitation, the same assets

managed by private investors.[10]

The equivalence conditions obtained in this article can be studied in a more general setting, where, for instance, there are more than two periods, and, like Summers (1981), overlapping generations exist. We leave these extensions to future research.

[10]I wish to thank Enrico Minelli for this comment.

References

[1] Ashan S.M. (1989), Choice of Tax Base under Uncertainty: Consumption or Income?, *Journal of Public Economics*, 40, pp. 99-134.

[2] Ashan S.M. (1990), Risk-Taking, Savings, and Taxation: A Re-examination of Theory and Policy, *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 23, pp. 408-433.

[3] Ashan S.M. and P. Tsigaris (1998), The Design of a Consumption Tax under Capital Risk, *Journal of Economics* (*Zeitschrift fur Nationalokonomie*), 68, pp. 53-78.

[4] Farhi E. (2007), Capital Taxation and Ownership when Markets are Incomplete, NBER Working Paper No. W13390.

[5] Kaplow L. (1994), Taxation and Risk Taking: A General Equilibrium Perspective, *National Tax Journal*, 47, pp. 789-798.

[6] Salanié B. (2003), *The Economics of Taxation*, Cambridge and London: MIT Press.

[7] Sandmo A. (1985), The Effects of Taxation on Savings and Risk Taking, in A.J. Auerbach and M. Feldstein (eds.), *Handbook of Public Economics*, Volume 1, pp. 265-311, New York and Oxford: North-Holland.

[8] Schindler D. (2008), Taxing Risky Capital Income - A Commodity Taxation Approach, *FinanzArchiv / Public Finance Analysis*, 64, pp. 311-333.

[9] Summers L.H. (1981), Capital Taxation and Accumulation in a Life Cycle Growth Model, *American Economic Review*, 71, pp. 533-544.

[10] Zodrow G.R. (1995), Taxation, Uncertainty and the Choice of a Consumption Tax Base, *Journal of Public Economics*, 58, pp. 257-265.

CESifo Working Paper Series

for full list see www.cesifo-group.org/wp
(address: Poschingerstr. 5, 81679 Munich, Germany, office@cesifo.de)

2529 Bas Jacobs, Dirk Schindler and Hongyan Yang, Optimal Taxation of Risky Human Capital, January 2009

2530 Annette Alstadsæter and Erik Fjærli, Neutral Taxation of Shareholder Income? Corporate Responses to an Announced Dividend Tax, January 2009

2531 Bruno S. Frey and Susanne Neckermann, Academics Appreciate Awards – A New Aspect of Incentives in Research, January 2009

2532 Nannette Lindenberg and Frank Westermann, Common Trends and Common Cycles among Interest Rates of the G7-Countries, January 2009

2533 Erkki Koskela and Jan König, The Role of Profit Sharing in a Dual Labour Market with Flexible Outsourcing, January 2009

2534 Tomasz Michalak, Jacob Engwerda and Joseph Plasmans, Strategic Interactions between Fiscal and Monetary Authorities in a Multi-Country New-Keynesian Model of a Monetary Union, January 2009

2535 Michael Overesch and Johannes Rincke, What Drives Corporate Tax Rates Down? A Reassessment of Globalization, Tax Competition, and Dynamic Adjustment to Shocks, February 2009

2536 Xenia Matschke and Anja Schöttner, Antidumping as Strategic Trade Policy Under Asymmetric Information, February 2009

2537 John Whalley, Weimin Zhou and Xiaopeng An, Chinese Experience with Global 3G Standard-Setting, February 2009

2538 Claus Thustrup Kreiner and Nicolaj Verdelin, Optimal Provision of Public Goods: A Synthesis, February 2009

2539 Jerome L. Stein, Application of Stochastic Optimal Control to Financial Market Debt Crises, February 2009

2540 Lars P. Feld and Jost H. Heckemeyer, FDI and Taxation: A Meta-Study, February 2009

2541 Philipp C. Bauer and Regina T. Riphahn, Age at School Entry and Intergenerational Educational Mobility, February 2009

2542 Thomas Eichner and Rüdiger Pethig, Carbon Leakage, the Green Paradox and Perfect Future Markets, February 2009

2543 M. Hashem Pesaran, Andreas Pick and Allan Timmermann, Variable Selection and Inference for Multi-period Forecasting Problems, February 2009

2544 Mathias Hoffmann and Iryna Shcherbakova, Consumption Risk Sharing over the Business Cycle: the Role of Small Firms' Access to Credit Markets, February 2009

2545 John Beirne, Guglielmo Maria Caporale, Marianne Schulze-Ghattas and Nicola Spagnolo, Volatility Spillovers and Contagion from Mature to Emerging Stock Markets, February 2009

2546 Ali Bayar and Bram Smeets, Economic and Political Determinants of Budget Deficits in the European Union: A Dynamic Random Coefficient Approach, February 2009

2547 Jan K. Brueckner and Anming Zhang, Airline Emission Charges: Effects on Airfares, Service Quality, and Aircraft Design, February 2009

2548 Dolores Messer and Stefan C. Wolter, Money Matters – Evidence from a Large-Scale Randomized Field Experiment with Vouchers for Adult Training, February 2009

2549 Johannes Rincke and Christian Traxler, Deterrence through Word of Mouth, February 2009

2550 Gabriella Legrenzi, Asymmetric and Non-Linear Adjustments in Local Fiscal Policy, February 2009

2551 Bruno S. Frey, David A. Savage and Benno Torgler, Surviving the Titanic Disaster: Economic, Natural and Social Determinants, February 2009

2552 Per Engström, Patrik Hesselius and Bertil Holmlund, Vacancy Referrals, Job Search, and the Duration of Unemployment: A Randomized Experiment, February 2009

2553 Giorgio Bellettini, Carlotta Berti Ceroni and Giovanni Prarolo, Political Persistence, Connections and Economic Growth, February 2009

2554 Steinar Holden and Fredrik Wulfsberg, Wage Rigidity, Institutions, and Inflation, February 2009

2555 Alexander Haupt and Tim Krieger, The Role of Mobility in Tax and Subsidy Competition, February 2009

2556 Harald Badinger and Peter Egger, Estimation of Higher-Order Spatial Autoregressive Panel Data Error Component Models, February 2009

2557 Christian Keuschnigg, Corporate Taxation and the Welfare State, February 2009

2558 Marcel Gérard, Hubert Jayet and Sonia Paty, Tax Interactions among Belgian Municipalities: Does Language Matter?, February 2009

2559 António Afonso and Christophe Rault, Budgetary and External Imbalances Relationship: A Panel Data Diagnostic, February 2009

2560 Stefan Krasa and Mattias Polborn, Political Competition between Differentiated Candidates, February 2009

2561 Carsten Hefeker, Taxation, Corruption and the Exchange Rate Regime, February 2009

2562 Jiahua Che and Gerald Willmann, The Economics of a Multilateral Investment Agreement, February 2009

2563 Scott Alan Carson, Demographic, Residential, and Socioeconomic Effects on the Distribution of 19th Century US White Statures, February 2009

2564 Philipp Harms, Oliver Lorz and Dieter Urban, Offshoring along the Production Chain, February 2009

2565 Patricia Apps, Ngo Van Long and Ray Rees, Optimal Piecewise Linear Income Taxation, February 2009

2566 John Whalley and Shunming Zhang, On the Arbitrariness of Consumption, February 2009

2567 Marie-Louise Leroux, Endogenous Differential Mortality, Non-Contractible Effort and Non Linear Taxation, March 2009

2568 Joanna Bęza-Bojanowska and Ronald MacDonald, The Behavioural Zloty/Euro Equilibrium Exchange Rate, March 2009

2569 Bart Cockx and Matteo Picchio, Are Short-Lived Jobs Stepping Stones to Long-Lasting Jobs?, March 2009

2570 David Card, Jochen Kluve and Andrea Weber, Active Labor Market Policy Evaluations: A Meta-analysis, March 2009

2571 Frederick van der Ploeg and Anthony J. Venables, Harnessing Windfall Revenues: Optimal Policies for Resource-Rich Developing Economies, March 2009

2572 Ondřej Schneider, Reforming Pensions in Europe: Economic Fundamentals and Political Factors, March 2009

2573 Jo Thori Lind, Karl Ove Moene and Fredrik Willumsen, Opium for the Masses? Conflict-Induced Narcotics Production in Afghanistan, March 2009

2574 Silvia Marchesi, Laura Sabani and Axel Dreher, Agency and Communication in IMF Conditional Lending: Theory and Empirical Evidence, March 2009

2575 Carlo Altavilla and Matteo Ciccarelli, The Effects of Monetary Policy on Unemployment Dynamics under Model Uncertainty - Evidence from the US and the Euro Area, March 2009

2576 Falko Fecht, Kjell G. Nyborg and Jörg Rocholl, The Price of Liquidity: Bank Characteristics and Market Conditions, March 2009

2577 Giorgio Bellettini and Filippo Taddei, Real Estate Prices and the Importance of Bequest Taxation, March 2009

2578 Annette Bergemann and Regina T. Riphahn, Female Labor Supply and Parental Leave Benefits – The Causal Effect of Paying Higher Transfers for a Shorter Period of Time, March 2009

2579 Thomas Eichner and Rüdiger Pethig, EU-Type Carbon Emissions Trade and the Distributional Impact of Overlapping Emissions Taxes, March 2009

2580 Antonios Antypas, Guglielmo Maria Caporale, Nikolaos Kourogenis and Nikitas Pittis, Selectivity, Market Timing and the Morningstar Star-Rating System, March 2009

2581 António Afonso and Christophe Rault, Bootstrap Panel Granger-Causality between Government Budget and External Deficits for the EU, March 2009

2582 Bernd Süssmuth, Malte Heyne and Wolfgang Maennig, Induced Civic Pride and Integration, March 2009

2583 Martin Peitz and Markus Reisinger, Indirect Taxation in Vertical Oligopoly, March 2009

2584 Petra M. Geraats, Trends in Monetary Policy Transparency, March 2009

2585 Johannes Abeler, Armin Falk, Lorenz Götte and David Huffman, Reference Points and Effort Provision, March 2009

2586 Wolfram F. Richter, Taxing Education in Ramsey's Tradition, March 2009

2587 Yin-Wong Cheung, Menzie D. Chinn and Eiji Fujii, China's Current Account and Exchange Rate, March 2009

2588 Alexander Haupt and Silke Uebelmesser, Voting on Labour-Market Integration and Education Policy when Citizens Differ in Mobility and Ability, March 2009

2589 Hans Jarle Kind, Marko Koethenbuerger and Guttorm Schjelderup, Should Utility-Reducing Media Advertising be Taxed?, March 2009

2590 Alessandro Cigno, How to Avoid a Pension Crisis: A Question of Intelligent System Design, March 2009

2591 Helmut Lütkepohl and Fang Xu, The Role of the Log Transformation in Forecasting Economic Variables, March 2009

2592 Rainald Borck, Hyun-Ju Koh and Michael Pflüger, Inefficient Lock-in and Subsidy Competition, March 2009

2593 Paolo M. Panteghini, On the Equivalence between Labor and Consumption Taxation, March 2009