

CAMA

Centre for Applied Macroeconomic Analysis

Redistribution and the Monetary–Fiscal Policy Mix

CAMA Working Paper 107/2020
December 2020

Saroj Bhattarai

University of Texas - Austin

Centre for Applied Macroeconomic Analysis, ANU

Jae Won Lee

University of Virginia

Choongryul Yang

Federal Reserve Board

Abstract

We show that the effectiveness of redistribution policy in stimulating the economy and improving welfare is directly tied to how much inflation it generates, which in turn hinges on monetary-fiscal adjustments that ultimately finance the transfers. We compare two distinct types of monetary-fiscal adjustments: In the monetary regime, the government eventually raises taxes to finance transfers while in the fiscal regime, inflation rises, effectively imposing inflation taxes on public debt holders. We show analytically in a simple model how the fiscal regime generates larger and more persistent inflation than the monetary regime. In a quantitative application, we use a two-sector, two-agent New Keynesian model, situate the model economy in a Covid-19 recession, and quantify the effects of the transfer components of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act. We find that the transfer multipliers are significantly larger under the fiscal regime—which results in a milder contraction—than under the monetary regime, primarily because inflationary pressures of this regime counteract the deflationary forces during the recession. Moreover, redistribution produces a Pareto improvement under the fiscal regime.

Keywords

Household heterogeneity, Redistribution, Monetary-fiscal policy mix, Transfer multiplier, Welfare evaluation, Covid-19, CARES Act

JEL Classification

E53, E62, E63

Address for correspondence:

(E) cama.admin@anu.edu.au

ISSN 2206-0332

[The Centre for Applied Macroeconomic Analysis](#) in the Crawford School of Public Policy has been established to build strong links between professional macroeconomists. It provides a forum for quality macroeconomic research and discussion of policy issues between academia, government and the private sector.

The Crawford School of Public Policy is the Australian National University's public policy school, serving and influencing Australia, Asia and the Pacific through advanced policy research, graduate and executive education, and policy impact.

Redistribution and the Monetary–Fiscal Policy Mix^{*}

Saroj Bhattarai[†]

Univ. of Texas-Austin and CAMA

Jae Won Lee[‡]

Univ. of Virginia

Choongryul Yang[§]

Federal Reserve Board

Abstract

We show that the effectiveness of redistribution policy in stimulating the economy and improving welfare is directly tied to how much inflation it generates, which in turn hinges on monetary-fiscal adjustments that ultimately finance the transfers. We compare two distinct types of monetary-fiscal adjustments: In the *monetary regime*, the government eventually raises taxes to finance transfers while in the *fiscal regime*, inflation rises, effectively imposing inflation taxes on public debt holders. We show analytically in a simple model how the fiscal regime generates larger and more persistent inflation than the monetary regime. In a quantitative application, we use a two-sector, two-agent New Keynesian model, situate the model economy in a Covid-19 recession, and quantify the effects of the transfer components of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act. We find that the transfer multipliers are significantly larger under the fiscal regime—which results in a milder contraction—than under the monetary regime, primarily because inflationary pressures of this regime counteract the deflationary forces during the recession. Moreover, redistribution produces a Pareto improvement under the fiscal regime.

JEL classification: E53; E62; E63

Keywords: Household heterogeneity, Redistribution, Monetary-fiscal policy mix, Transfer multiplier, Welfare evaluation, Covid-19, CARES Act

^{*}We thank Woong Yong Park for helpful comments. The views expressed here are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Federal Reserve Board or the Federal Reserve System. First version: Dec 2020.

[†]Department of Economics, University of Texas at Austin and CAMA, 2225 Speedway, Stop C3100, Austin, TX 78712, U.S.A. Email: saroj.bhattarai@austin.utexas.edu.

[‡]Department of Economics, University of Virginia, PO BOX 400182, Charlottesville, VA 22904, U.S.A. Email: jl2rb@virginia.edu.

[§]Federal Reserve Board of Governors, 20th Street and Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20551, U.S.A. Email: choongryul.yang@frb.gov.

1 Introduction

What are the macroeconomic effects of redistribution policies that transfer resources from one set of agents in the economy to another? What are the determinants of the transfer multiplier? When is the transfer multiplier large? What are the welfare implications of such redistribution policies?

Recently, the U.S. experienced the two largest contractions after World War II—the Great Recession and the Covid-19 recession—to which the government responded with unprecedented fiscal measures, namely the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 and the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act of 2020. These fiscal responses included significant transfer components and they have renewed interest in the effectiveness of transfer policies in terms of rebooting the economy and improving household welfare.

In a dynamic general equilibrium model, one would have to take numerous factors into account to answer the above questions.¹ In this paper, we focus on the source of financing and show how the government finances transfers has a first-order importance for their effectiveness. Our focus is motivated by the ongoing rapid increase in public debt caused by the large-scale transfer programs. This eventually requires fiscal and/or monetary adjustments, which would *ultimately* finance current transfers.

We compare two distinct ways to finance transfers in a two-agent new Keynesian (TANK) model. In the model, a set of households are unable to borrow and lend to smooth consumption over time. A transfer policy redistributes resources towards such "hand-to-mouth" (HTM) households, and away from "Ricardian" households who own government bonds.² In the first policy regime, the government raises taxes. Inflation is then stabilized in the usual way by the central bank. We call this case the "monetary regime." In the second regime, the government commits itself to no adjustments in taxes and the central bank allows inflation to rise to stabilize the real value of debt, thereby imposing "inflation taxes" on households who hold nominal government debt. In this "fiscal regime," the Fiscal Theory of the Price Level operates.

We find that the effectiveness of transfer policy is directly tied to how much inflation it generates. A transfer policy is inflationary irrespective of the policy regimes in the model. It is however, more inflationary in the fiscal regime than in the monetary regime.

¹We discuss previous findings in more detail later. Some well-known determinants of the fiscal multiplier are the marginal propensity to consume of targeted households and whether the economy is in a liquidity trap.

²As we describe in further detail later, in our application, we think of these HTM households as working in the service sector that is affected by a large negative sectoral shock.

Therefore, inflation-financed transfers can be used to fight deflationary pressures during recessions, thereby preventing output and consumption of both types of households from dropping significantly. As a result, the welfare of both household types is higher when transfers are inflation-financed than when they are tax-financed.

Furthermore, somewhat surprisingly, inflation-financed transfers can produce a Pareto improvement relative to the no-transfer case. Notice that, since the model features staggered Calvo-type price setting, inflation is not a free lunch: it, *ceteris paribus*, generates significant resource misallocation, which leads to a decrease in labor productivity and in welfare. These negative effects of inflation are however, outweighed by the positive effects of inflation in the low-inflation environment considered in this paper. In fact, without an inflationary intervention, the economy would experience deflation, so there is little cost of inflation.

Our paper starts with a simplified flexible-price version of the model which permits analytical results, thereby allowing us to illuminate the mechanism of the Fiscal theory in a heterogeneous-household framework. This model also serves as a useful reference point as the two policy regimes produce exactly the same multipliers for output and consumption and an identical level of household welfare, even if inflation dynamics are different. This is due to two features. First, *both* conventional taxes, which are assumed to be lump-sum, and inflation taxes are non-distortionary. Second, price flexibility shuts down any feedback effects from inflation on real variables.³

As for inflation, the fiscal regime gives rise to higher and more persistent inflation than the monetary regime. In particular, transfers affect inflation through two channels in this regime. First, an increase in transfers leads *directly* to an increase in public debt, which accumulates over time. Consequently, inflation rises to stabilize the real value of debt. Second, an increase in transfers may *indirectly* raises future public debt through an interest rate channel. Redistribution changes Ricardian household consumption, which in turn affects real interest rates, and thus outstanding public debt in the following periods. That is, redistribution generates a new valuation effect through real interest rate changes, an effect that is absent in the standard one-agent model often used to analyze the fiscal regime. This interest rate channel may lead to a further increase in inflation. Showing these two effects explicitly in a nonlinear two-agent model is a contribution of our paper.

We then build on the analytical results and proceed to a quantitative analysis employing a two-sector TANK model. Relative to the simplified version, the quantitative model

³The transfer multiplier for output is small, yet is still positive due to the classical labor supply channel. Redistribution causes Ricardian household consumption to fall creating a negative ‘wealth effect’ on labor supply. The households thus supply more hours for a given wage rate, which in turn raises output.

includes several realistic features that break the uniformity of the two regimes in terms of the multipliers. The two most important are nominal rigidities and the "Covid shocks." Sticky prices are important as transfers now can increase output through the usual new Keynesian channel by generating inflation—on top of the classical labor supply channel. Introducing shocks is also consequential as the multipliers are generally state-dependent. In particular, the Covid shocks cause the economy to fall into what we refer to as a "Covid recession" as well as a liquidity trap, in which the effects of redistribution can be different quantitatively. Finally, another difference from the analytical model is that the government raises (gradually) labor taxes, rather than lumpsum taxes, in the monetary regime, which through distortionary effects influences the transfer multipliers.

Specifically, in order to capture the salient characteristics of the Covid recession, we suppose that the Covid shocks consist of adverse aggregate and sector-specific demand shocks and sector-specific labor supply shocks. The sector-specific shocks intend to capture the observation that "locked out" of work and fear of "unsafe consumption" features are more pronounced in certain sectors of the economy. We decompose the U.S. economy into two sectors: transportation, recreation, and food service sector and the rest of the economy, and let the HTM households work in the former sector in our model.⁴ For convenience, we call this sector the HTM sector.

Figure 1 presents dynamics of employment, hours, inflation and consumption based on such a two-sector decomposition of the US economy. As is clear, there was a sharp adverse effect on employment/hours in the HTM sector following the Covid crisis. Moreover, inflation in this sector also fell. Finally, while the HTM sector was disproportionately affected, there was also an aggregate, economy-wide contraction and fall in inflation as well. We calibrate the Covid shocks to perfectly re-produce the dynamics of hours in the two sectors and that of inflation in the HTM sector, thereby situating the model economy in a Covid-recession-like environment. We then calibrate the size of transfers to match the transfer amount in the CARES Act and study how the economy responds to the redistribution policy under several alternative scenarios.⁵

We find that the transfer multipliers are significantly larger under the fiscal regime than under the monetary regime primarily because of the difference in inflation dynamics as mentioned above. For instance, the 4-year cumulative multiplier for aggregate output is 1.003 in the monetary regime while it is 6.553 in the fiscal regime. Notice that this multiplier is greater than unity even under the monetary regime, thanks to nominal rigidities

⁴We assume that the Ricardian households work in the other sectors that are less affected by the Covid pandemic.

⁵We also show with the vertical dashed line in Figure 1 when transfer payments from the CARES Act started to get mailed.




Figure 1: Aggregate and Sectoral Effects of Covid Crisis

Notes: This figure shows the dynamics of key variables from January 2020. Panels A and B show employment and total hours dynamics in U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, respectively. Black lines are dynamics of total variable and red lines represent retail, transportation, leisure, and hospitality sector, and blue lines represent all other sectors. Panels C and D present real personal consumption expenditure and PCE inflation in U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, respectively. Black lines are dynamics of total variable and red lines represent transportation, recreation and food services sector, and blue lines represent all other sectors.

Sources: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

and the binding zero lower bound. As strikingly different are the 4-year cumulative consumption multipliers. For the Ricardian households, it is -0.323 in the monetary regime and 5.024 in the fiscal regime while for the HTM households, it is 5.412 in the monetary regime and 11.767 in the fiscal regime.⁶

We isolate the role played by various model elements in driving our quantitative re-

⁶The positive consumption multiplier for the Ricardian household is unique, even qualitatively, in the fiscal regime.

sults using counterfactual exercises. The unusually large multipliers reported above, especially under the fiscal regime, result from the economy situated in the historically severe Covid-recession with large deflationary pressures. For example, shutting down the Covid shocks, the 4-year cumulative multiplier for aggregate output is 0.96 in the monetary regime while it is 1.475 in the fiscal regime. This result underscores the state-dependency of policy effects. Importantly, the difference in the multipliers for output and consumption between the two regimes gets larger in the presence of Covid shocks, which implies that, while both labor-tax-financed transfers and inflation-financed transfers are more effective in the Covid recession than in a normal environment, the latter is even more so. In addition, we also find that relying on labor taxes rather than lumpsum taxes in the monetary regime plays a role.

Overall, as a consequence, the contraction in output and consumption is much more muted when transfers are financed by inflation taxes. Specifically, transfers, when inflation-financed, would reduce the output loss caused by the Covid shocks roughly by 5 percentage points at the trough – compared to no intervention case. We also find that the expansionary effects of inflation-financed transfers is so large that such redistribution policy generates a Pareto improvement: It increases the welfare of both the recipients and sources of transfers, even taking into account the resources taken away from the Ricardian household and the fact that the Ricardian household’s leisure decreases resulting from output increases and distortions generated by high and persistent inflation.

Related Literature Our paper is related to the fiscal-monetary interactions literature as originally developed in [Leeper \(1991\)](#), [Sims \(1994\)](#), [Woodford \(1994\)](#), [Cochrane \(2001\)](#), and [Schmitt-Grohé and Uribe \(2000\)](#).⁷ [Sims \(2011\)](#) introduced long-term debt under this regime in a sticky price model while [Cochrane \(2018\)](#) developed it further to analyze the inflation implications following the Great Recession. Analytical characterization of the fiscal regime in a linearized sticky price model is in [Bhattarai, Lee and Park \(2014\)](#).

Our additional analytical contribution here is to derive the fully non-linear results of this fiscal regime in a tractable two-agent model. Motivated by the Covid crisis and the CARES Act, we then assess the quantitative effects of redistribution policy as well as its welfare implications, in a two-sector, two-agent non-linear model.

We build on two-agent models as originally developed in [Campbell and Mankiw \(1989\)](#), [Galí, López-Salido and Vallés \(2007\)](#), and [Bilbiie \(2018\)](#). Moreover, [Bilbiie, Monacelli and Perotti \(2013\)](#), closely related to this paper, show that different financing schemes affect the size of the output transfer multiplier in a TANK model. They however, only

⁷[Canzoneri, Cumby and Diba \(2010\)](#) and [Leeper and Leith \(2016\)](#) are recent surveys of this literature.

consider the monetary regime. Our main contribution is in assessing the effects of redistribution policy in such an environment and showing how it depends critically on the monetary-fiscal policy mix.

Recently there have been several contributions to an analysis of macroeconomic effects of the Covid crisis. Our quantitative two-sector, two-agent model is closest to the important work of [Guerrieri, Lorenzoni, Straub and Werning \(2020\)](#). In assessing the quantitative effects of fiscal policy during the pandemic using a model with household heterogeneity, we are also related to [Faria-e-Castro \(2020\)](#) and [Bayer, Born, Luetticke and Müller \(2020\)](#). Our relative contribution is in showing how the effects of redistribution depend on the monetary-fiscal policy regime, and then assessing both quantitative effects and welfare implications by matching some important aggregate and sectoral aspects of the US data.

Our paper is also related to recent papers that analyze monetary-fiscal policy interactions in TANK models, in particular, [Bhattarai, Lee, Park and Yang \(2020\)](#), [Bianchi, Faccini and Melosi \(2020\)](#), and [Motyovszki \(2020\)](#). [Bhattarai, Lee, Park and Yang \(2020\)](#) studies the effects of one-time permanent capital tax rate changes in a model that also features capital-skill complementarity. [Bianchi, Faccini and Melosi \(2020\)](#) and [Motyovszki \(2020\)](#) are motivated by the Covid crisis and are closely related to our analysis.⁸ Our relative contribution analytically is a non-linear solution of the simple TANK model under the two regimes. On the quantitative side, while these studies focus on the positive implications of transfers under the different regimes, we additionally provide welfare implications for different types of households. We also emphasize that the positive and normative implications of redistribution are state-dependent and inflation-financed transfers are *disproportionately* more effective than tax-financed transfers in a Covid-recession-like environment in which both sector-specific and aggregate shocks hit the economy.

Finally, our paper is also related to the government spending multiplier literature as the effects of transfer policy in two-agent models share some common elements with the effects of government spending policy in representative agent models. Thus, in connecting the effects to the nature of monetary policy, the binding zero lower bound, and the monetary-fiscal policy regime, our work builds on important contributions in the government spending multiplier literature by [Woodford \(2011\)](#), [Christiano, Eichenbaum and Rebelo \(2011\)](#), [Eggertsson \(2011\)](#), [Leeper, Traum and Walker \(2017\)](#), and [Jacobson, Leeper and Preston \(2019\)](#).

⁸[Bianchi, Faccini and Melosi \(2020\)](#) show that inflating away a targeted fraction of debt will increase the effectiveness of the fiscal stimulus in a rich medium-scale model while [Motyovszki \(2020\)](#) considers a small-open economy environment.

Layout The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 develops a simple model with two types of households and presents analytical results on how the effects of redistribution policy depend on the monetary-fiscal policy mix. Section 3 presents a quantitative model with an application focused on the Covid crisis and analyzes how the macroeconomic effects and welfare implications of transfer policy depend on the monetary-fiscal policy regimes. Section 4 concludes.

2 Simple Model and Redistribution Policy

We present a simple model with two types of household and provide analytical results on how the effects of redistribution policy depend on the monetary-fiscal policy regime.

2.1 Model

There are two types of households: Ricardian and Hand-to-mouth (HTM). The Ricardian household makes optimal labor supply and consumption/savings decisions while the HTM household simply consumes government transfers every period. In this set-up, we analytically show the effects on inflation of transferring resources away from the Ricardian households to the HTM households and point out that these effects depend critically on how the transfer policy is financed.

2.1.1 Households

Ricardian Households. There are Ricardian households of measure $1 - \lambda$. These households, taking prices as given, choose $\{C_t^R, L_t^R, B_t^R\}$ to maximize

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \left[\log C_t^R - \chi \frac{(L_t^R)^{1+\varphi}}{1+\varphi} \right]$$

subject to a standard No-ponzi-game constraint and a sequence of flow budget constraints

$$C_t^R + \frac{B_t^R}{P_t} = R_{t-1} \frac{B_{t-1}^R}{P_t} + w_t L_t^R + \Psi_t^R - \tau_t^R,$$

where C_t^R is consumption, L_t^R is hours, B_t^R is nominal government debt, Ψ_t^R is real profits, τ_t^R is lump-sum taxes, P_t is the price level, w_t is the real wage, and R_t is the nominal gross interest rate. The discount factor and the inverse of the Frisch elasticity are denoted by $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and $\varphi \geq 0$ respectively. The superscript, R , represents “Ricardian”. The flow

budget constraints can be written as

$$C_t^R + b_t^R = R_{t-1} \frac{1}{\Pi_t} b_{t-1}^R + w_t L_t^R + \Psi_t^R - \tau_t^R,$$

where $b_t^R = \frac{B_t^R}{P_t}$ is the real value of debt, and $\Pi_t = \frac{P_t}{P_{t-1}}$ is the gross rate of inflation.

Optimality conditions are given by the Euler equation, the intra-temporal labor supply condition, and the transversality condition (TVC):

$$\frac{C_{t+1}^R}{C_t^R} = \beta \frac{R_t}{\Pi_{t+1}}, \quad (2.1)$$

$$\chi \left(L_t^R \right)^\varphi C_t^R = w_t, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left[\beta^t \frac{1}{C_t^R} \left(\frac{B_t^R}{P_t} \right) \right] = 0. \quad (2.3)$$

Hand-to-Mouth Households. The hand-to-mouth (HTM) households, of measure λ , simply consume government transfers, s_t^H , every period

$$C_t^H = s_t^H,$$

and have no optimization problem to solve. The superscript, H , represents “HTM”.

2.1.2 Firm

A representative firm in the competitive product market chooses hours, L_t , in each period to maximize profits:

$$\Psi_t = Y_t - w_t L_t,$$

subject to the production function

$$Y_t = L_t. \quad (2.4)$$

Zero profit condition implies

$$w_t = 1. \quad (2.5)$$

2.1.3 Government

The government issues one-period nominal debt, B_t . Its budget constraint (GBC) is

$$\frac{B_t}{P_t} = R_{t-1} \frac{B_{t-1}}{P_t} - \tau_t + s_t,$$

where s_t is transfers and τ_t is taxes. It can be re-written as

$$b_t = \frac{R_{t-1}}{\Pi_t} b_{t-1} - \tau_t + s_t, \quad (2.6)$$

where $b_t = \frac{B_t}{P_t}$ is the real value of debt. Transfer, s_t , is exogenous and deterministic.

Monetary and tax policy rules are

$$\frac{R_t}{\bar{R}} = \left(\frac{\Pi_t}{\bar{\Pi}} \right)^\phi, \quad (2.7)$$

$$(\tau_t - \bar{\tau}) = \psi(b_{t-1} - \bar{b}), \quad (2.8)$$

where ϕ and ψ determine the responsiveness of the policy instruments to inflation and government indebtedness respectively. The steady-state values of inflation, debt, and transfers, $\{\bar{\Pi}, \bar{b}, \bar{s}\}$, are set by policymakers and given exogenously.

2.1.4 Aggregation and the Resource Constraint

Aggregating the variables over the households yields $s_t = \lambda s_t^H$, $\tau_t = (1 - \lambda) \tau_t^R$, $b_t = (1 - \lambda) b_t^R$, $L_t = (1 - \lambda) L_t^R$, and $\Psi_t = (1 - \lambda) \Psi_t^R$. Combining household and government budget constraints gives:

$$(1 - \lambda) C_t^R + \lambda C_t^H = Y_t.$$

The resource constraint above, together with the HTM household budget constraint, implies that output is simply divided between the two types of households as:

$$C_t^H = \frac{1}{\lambda} s_t, \quad C_t^R = \frac{1}{1 - \lambda} Y_t - \frac{1}{1 - \lambda} s_t. \quad (2.9)$$

2.2 Effects of Redistribution Policy

We now show the effects of transferring resources away from the Ricardian households to the HTM households. The government can finance such a transfer program in two distinct ways. In the first policy regime, the government raises taxes sufficiently. Inflation is then stabilized in the usual way by the central bank. In the second regime, the government does not raise taxes, and the central bank allows inflation to rise to stabilize the real value of debt, thereby imposing “inflation taxes” on the Ricardian households who hold nominal government debt. The Fiscal Theory of the Price Level operates in this case.

We solve for the equilibrium time path of $\{Y_t, C_t^R, C_t^H, \Pi_t, R_t, b_t, \tau_t\}$ given exogenous $\{s_t\}$. Output and consumption of the two households, and thus their welfare, are in-

dependent of whether the government relies on conventional or inflation taxes.⁹ We first consider those policy-invariant variables in Section 2.2.1. The alternative financing schemes, however, generate quite different inflation dynamics, which is the main focus of this simple model. The rise of inflation tends to be greater and more persistent in the second regime. The determination of the rate of inflation is detailed in Section 2.2.2.

2.2.1 Output and Consumption

We start with output. Equation (2.2) can be written as

$$Y_t = \chi^{-1} (1 - \lambda)^{1+\varphi} Y_t^{-\varphi} + s_t \quad (2.10)$$

using Equations (2.4), (2.5), and (2.9). Equation (2.10) implicitly defines output as a function of transfers: $Y_t = Y(s_t)$. Then, one can obtain the “transfer multiplier” as

$$\frac{dY(s_t)}{ds_t} = \frac{1}{1 + (1 - \lambda)^{1+\varphi} \frac{\varphi}{\chi} Y_t^{-(1+\varphi)}}.$$

Notice that $0 \leq \frac{dY_t}{ds_t} \leq 1$.

An increase in transfers raises output not for the Keynesian demand-side reason. The channel here instead is purely classical and supply-side: An increase in s_t causes Ricardian household consumption to fall, creating a negative “wealth effect” on labor supply. The households supply more hours for a given wage rate, which in turn raises output.¹⁰ The multiplier is maximized ($dY_t/ds_t = 1$) when labor supply is perfectly elastic ($\varphi = 0$) while it is minimized ($dY_t/ds_t = 0$) when the Ricardian household does not value leisure ($\chi = 0$), which shuts down the wealth effect.

The Ricardian household consumption is obtained from Equation (2.9) as

$$C_t^R = C^R(s_t) \equiv \frac{1}{1 - \lambda} [Y(s_t) - s_t]. \quad (2.11)$$

The derivative is

$$\frac{dC^R(s_t)}{ds_t} = \frac{1}{1 - \lambda} \left[\frac{dY(s_t)}{ds_t} - 1 \right] \leq 0.$$

As will be clear below, how Ricardian household consumption depends on transfers matter for inflation dynamics as it affects the real interest rate. That is, there is a valuation effect on government debt due to changes in the real interest rate. This *interest rate channel*

⁹This “neutrality” result does not hold in a model with nominal rigidities, as discussed in detail later.

¹⁰The channel thus is the same as the effect of government spending in a one-agent model.

of transfers is absent in the model with a representative household, where transfers have no redistributive role, or with a perfectly elastic labor supply.

Notice that both tax types are non-distorting in this model. Consequently, for given $\{s_t\}$, the alternative ways to finance transfers (i.e., the policy regimes) have no effect on output and consumption, as seen above.

2.2.2 Inflation

We now turn to the rest of the variables, $\{\Pi_t, R_t, b_t, \tau_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$, with a focus on inflation determination, given a path of $\{s_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$. The equilibrium time path of $\{\Pi_t, R_t, b_t, \tau_t\}$ satisfies the following conditions:

- Difference Equations from (2.1), (2.6), (2.7) and (2.8):

$$\Pi_{t+1} = \frac{C_t^R}{C_{t+1}^R} \beta R_t, \quad b_t = R_{t-1} b_{t-1} \frac{1}{\Pi_t} - \tau_t + s_t,$$

$$\frac{R_t}{\bar{R}} = \left(\frac{\Pi_t}{\bar{\Pi}} \right)^\phi, \quad (\tau_t - \bar{\tau}) = \psi(b_{t-1} - \bar{b}).$$

- Terminal condition, as given by TVC from Equation (2.3):

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left[\beta^t \frac{1}{C_t^R} b_t \right] = 0.$$

- Initial conditions:

$$b_{-1} \text{ and } R_{-1}.$$

We first solve for the deterministic steady state. When $s_t = \bar{s} \forall t$, the system of difference equations simplifies to

$$\bar{R} = \beta^{-1} \bar{\Pi}, \quad \bar{\tau} = (\beta^{-1} - 1) \bar{b} + \bar{s},$$

with the TVC trivially satisfied. Given \bar{s} , $\bar{\Pi}$ and \bar{b} , which we assume exogenously determined by policymakers, the equations above determine \bar{R} and $\bar{\tau}$. We set $R_{-1} = \bar{R}$ and $b_{-1} = \bar{b}$, without loss of generality.

The system of difference equations can be simplified as¹¹:

$$\left(\frac{\Pi_{t+1}}{\bar{\Pi}}\right) = \frac{C_t^R}{C_{t+1}^R} \left(\frac{\Pi_t}{\bar{\Pi}}\right)^\phi, \quad (2.12)$$

$$(b_t - \bar{b}) = \left[\beta^{-1} \frac{C_t^R}{C_{t-1}^R} - \psi \right] (b_{t-1} - \bar{b}) + (s_t - \bar{s}) + \bar{b} \left[\beta^{-1} \frac{C_t^R}{C_{t-1}^R} - \beta^{-1} \right] \quad \forall t \geq 1 \quad (2.13)$$

$$(b_0 - \bar{b}) = \beta^{-1} \left(\frac{\bar{\Pi}}{\Pi_0} - 1 \right) \bar{b} + (s_0 - \bar{s}) \quad \text{at } t = 0, \quad (2.14)$$

which determines $\{\Pi_t, b_t\}$ given $\{s_t\}$ and $\{C_t^R\}$, where note that from Equation (2.11), the latter is a simple function of transfers.

Equation (2.12), obtained by combining the Euler equation and the monetary policy rule, shows how future inflation (Π_{t+1}) depends on current inflation (Π_t) and the real rate captured by C_{t+1}^R/C_t^R . Equation (2.13) is the GBC for $t \geq 1$ after we substitute out the nominal interest rate (R_{t-1}) and taxes (τ_t) using the Euler equation and the fiscal policy rule. Equation (2.14) is the GBC at $t = 0$. This looks different from Equation (2.13) because R_{-1} is exogenous, and thus cannot be replaced by the Euler equation.

Equation (2.13) describes how the deviation of the real value of debt from the steady state, $(b_t - \bar{b})$, evolves over time. An increase in transfers over its steady state value ($s > \bar{s}$) affect debt dynamics directly and indirectly. First, *ceteris paribus*, such an increase causes b_t , debt carried over to the next period, to rise above \bar{b} . This direct effect is captured by the second term, $(s_t - \bar{s})$, on the right hand side of Equation (2.13). Second, a change in transfers affects Ricardian household consumption as shown in Equation (2.11) and hence the real interest rate, which in turn influences debt dynamics. This indirect effect is reflected by $r_{t-1} \equiv \beta^{-1} \frac{C_t^R}{C_{t-1}^R}$ in Equation (2.13), and operates even when the current period debt stays at the steady state (i.e. $b_{t-1} = \bar{b}$). The reason is a change in interest payments for a given amount of debt – as shown in the last term, $\bar{b} \left[\beta^{-1} \frac{C_t^R}{C_{t-1}^R} - \beta^{-1} \right]$.

In solving the system, we consider a redistribution program in which $\{s_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ can have arbitrary values greater than \bar{s} until a time period T , and then $s_t = \bar{s}$ for $t \geq T + 1$. In this case, regardless of the history until time $T + 1$, starting $T + 2$, Equation (2.13) becomes

$$(b_t - \bar{b}) = (\beta^{-1} - \psi) (b_{t-1} - \bar{b}).$$

How the TVC is satisfied depends on the fiscal policy parameter ψ . When $\psi > 0$, debt dynamics satisfies the TVC regardless of the value of b_{T+1} .¹² When $\psi \leq 0$, however, the

¹¹The online appendix provides detail.

¹²In addition, ψ should not be too big. We do not explicitly consider such empirically irrelevant cases.

TVC requires $b_{T+1} = \bar{b}$, which can be achieved when monetary policy allows inflation to adjust by the required amount. Below, we discuss each case in turn.

Inflation under the Monetary Regime. When $\psi > 0$, , inflation is solely determined by Equation (2.12) which becomes

$$\left(\frac{\Pi_{t+1}}{\bar{\Pi}} \right) = \left(\frac{\Pi_t}{\bar{\Pi}} \right)^\phi \quad \text{for } t \geq T + 1,$$

as C_t^R , Ricardian household consumption, is constant. In this case, if we were to consider $\phi < 1$, the system of Equations (2.12)–(2.14) does not pin down initial inflation Π_0 , and the model permits multiple non-explosive solutions.

We therefore, instead consider the standard case, $\phi > 1$, which we call the *monetary regime*. This regime produces multiple equilibria in which inflation is unbounded and a unique bounded equilibrium.¹³ Here we focus on the bounded equilibrium. In this case, it is necessary that

$$\frac{\Pi_{T+1}}{\bar{\Pi}} = 1.$$

Given this “stability” condition on inflation, one can pin down Π_t from $t = 0$ to T along the *saddle path*. In particular, inflation before $T + 1$ can be solved backward using Equation (2.12). The initial inflation is given by

$$\frac{\Pi_0}{\bar{\Pi}} = C^R(\bar{s})^{\frac{1}{\phi^{T+1}}} \left[\frac{1}{C^R(s_T) C^R(s_{T-1}) \cdots C^R(s_0)} \right]^{\frac{1}{\phi}} = \prod_{t=0}^T \left[\frac{C^R(\bar{s})}{C^R(s_t)} \right]^{\frac{1}{\phi}}. \quad (2.15)$$

Inflation in the following periods is then determined by Equation (2.12).

Equation (2.15) shows that an increase in transfers is inflationary as the Ricardian household consumption declines below the pre-transfer level. The magnitude of the effect depends on the response of monetary policy (measured by ϕ), the size of transfer increases, and the duration of the redistribution program. Most importantly, the effect is *transitory*: When the redistribution program ends, inflation returns immediately to the steady-state value. Finally, redistribution programs with the same value of total transfer payments, but with different payment schedules, have different implications for the real interest rate and inflation dynamics. We discuss this in more detail below.

Inflation under the Fiscal Regime. We now consider the *fiscal regime* where $\psi \leq 0$ and $\phi < 1$. Solving for inflation involves a similar procedure as in the monetary regime. We first identify a terminal condition and follow the saddle path to pin down initial inflation.

¹³We rule out the case in which the price level approaches zero by the TVC.

As mentioned above, when $\psi \leq 0$, the TVC requires $b_{T+1} = \bar{b}$. Given this terminal condition, debt in preceding periods can be solved backward using Equation (2.13). Finally, given the solved b_0 , the time-0 GBC Equation (2.14) determines initial inflation Π_0 , after which Equation (2.12) produces a non-explosive time path of inflation.

Before presenting the general solution, we consider a simple example that is helpful to develop the intuition. Suppose transfers increase only for one period: $s_0 > \bar{s}$ and $s_t = \bar{s}$ afterwards. In the single-period redistribution program, it is necessary that $b_1 = \bar{b}$; otherwise, the TVC would be violated. The GBC at $t = 1$ is then given as

$$\underbrace{(b_1 - \bar{b})}_{=0} = \left[\beta^{-1} \frac{C^R(\bar{s})}{\underbrace{C^R(s_0)}_{>1}} - \psi \right] (b_0 - \bar{b}) + \underbrace{(s_1 - \bar{s})}_{=0} + \bar{b} \left[\beta^{-1} \frac{C^R(\bar{s})}{\underbrace{C^R(s_0)}_{>1}} - \beta^{-1} \right], \quad (2.16)$$

from which we can obtain the initial debt level b_0 ensuring that b_1 equals \bar{b} :

$$b_0 = \bar{b} - \bar{b} \left[\beta^{-1} \frac{C^R(\bar{s})}{C^R(s_0)} - \psi \right]^{-1} \left[\beta^{-1} \frac{C^R(\bar{s})}{C^R(s_0)} - \beta^{-1} \right].$$

The terminal condition ($b_1 = \bar{b}$) requires b_0 to decline below \bar{b} . For this to happen, Π_0 adjusts according to Equation (2.14):

$$\frac{\Pi_0}{\bar{\Pi}} = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\beta}{\bar{b}} (s_0 - \bar{s}) - \beta \left[\beta^{-1} \frac{C^R(\bar{s})}{C^R(s_0)} - \psi \right]^{-1} \left[\beta^{-1} \frac{C^R(\bar{s})}{C^R(s_0)} - \beta^{-1} \right]}. \quad (2.17)$$

The redistribution policy is more inflationary under the fiscal regime than under the monetary regime. Inflation rises by more on *impact*: Π_0 in Equation (2.17) is greater than Π_0 in Equation (2.15) even under the most dovish monetary regime (i.e. when $\phi \rightarrow 1$). More importantly, the one-time transitory increase in transfers has *persistent* effects on inflation here, while the effect lasts only for one period under the monetary regime.

The result above holds without the interest rate channel. The presence of the third term in the denominator, $-\beta [r_0 - \psi]^{-1} [r_0 - \bar{r}]$, however, does cause Π_0 to increase by *more* than it would in an analogous model with a representative household where transfer changes have no effect on the real interest rate.¹⁴ This term results from increased interest payments that exert an upward pressure on b_1 (see Equation (2.16)). The upward pressure is offset by a further decrease in b_0 , which is generated by a greater increase in Π_0 .

The effects of the interest rate channel on inflation, however, is subtler in a multi-

¹⁴In that model, the term would drop because $\frac{C_1^R}{C_0^R} = 1$.

period redistribution program. The initial inflation in the general case is given by¹⁵

$$\frac{\Pi_0}{\bar{\Pi}} = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\beta}{b} \sum_{k=0}^T \Omega_k (s_k - \bar{s}) - \beta \sum_{k=1}^{T+1} \Omega_k \left[\beta^{-1} \frac{C^R(s_k)}{C^R(s_{k-1})} - \beta^{-1} \right]}, \quad (2.18)$$

where the “discount factor” Ω_k is defined as:

$$\Omega_k \equiv \Omega_{k-1} \left[\beta^{-1} \frac{C^R(s_k)}{C^R(s_{k-1})} - \psi \right]^{-1} = \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^k \left[\beta^{-1} \frac{C^R(s_j)}{C^R(s_{j-1})} - \psi \right] \right\}^{-1},$$

$$\Omega_0 \equiv 1.$$

The solution (2.18) reveals that the interest rate channel can in principle, work in both directions. On the one hand, as shown in the one-period transfer increase case, a redistribution program that raises the real interest rate leads to an increase in interest payments and a larger rise in inflation – as captured by the last term in the denominator. On the other hand, such redistribution decreases the discount factor Ω_k . The economy thus discounts future primary surplus/deficits more heavily, which causes inflation to adjust by less when *future* transfers rise.¹⁶ Therefore, generally, the net effect on inflation through the interest rate channel of a multi-period redistribution program is difficult to isolate analytically, without further restrictions on the path of transfers.¹⁷

In this paper, we focus on programs with constant s_t for $0 \leq t \leq T$. In such a case, the interest rate channel works in the same way as described in the simple example, and leads to a larger response of inflation. To show this, we use the property that the real interest rate is constant throughout except for the last period of a program; that is, $r_t = \bar{r}$ for $0 \leq t \leq T-1$ and $r_T > \bar{r}$, if $s_t = s_0 > \bar{s}$ for $0 \leq t \leq T$. Equation (2.18) then simplifies to

$$\frac{\Pi_0}{\bar{\Pi}} = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\beta}{b} (s_0 - \bar{s}) \sum_{k=0}^T (\beta^{-1} - \psi)^{-k} - \beta (r_T - \psi)^{-1} (r_T - \bar{r}) (\beta^{-1} - \psi)^{-T}}.$$

¹⁵The online appendix provides detail.

¹⁶Another way to understand this is to look at Equation (2.16). To achieve a target level of b_1 , b_0 needs not decrease as much when the coefficient (which is increasing in the real rate) is greater; consequently, inflation increases by less.

¹⁷Another difficulty associated with a multi-period redistribution program is a significant flexibility in the schedule of transfer payments. The time path of transfers $\{s_t\}_{t=0}^T$ can be constant, (weakly) monotonic, or neither. Depending on the time path, the real interest rate, $\beta^{-1} \frac{C^R(s_t)}{C^R(s_{t-1})}$, needs not be greater than or equal to its steady-state value β^{-1} for the entire duration of a redistribution program. Interest payments thus can be lower than the pre-program level in some periods. Generally, different transfer schedules would result in different dynamics of the real interest rate. A constant or monotonic schedule is most commonly used in quantitative models.

which looks similar to Equation (2.17).

2.3 Summary and an Extension to Nominal Rigidities

To summarize, transferring resources from Ricardian to HTM households is inflationary regardless of the financing schemes considered. The fiscal regime, in which the government effectively imposes “inflation taxes” on Ricardian households that hold nominal government debt, however, generates *greater and more persistent inflation* than the monetary regime that finances transfers raising “conventional taxes.”

When it comes to output, consumption and hours, the policy regimes are “neutral.” As we mentioned before, this result does not carry over to a model with nominal rigidities. In the online appendix, we provide a simple sticky-price model that permits some analytical results with simplifying assumptions. The model nests the flexible-price model presented so far as a special case.¹⁸ The result on inflation is essentially the same in that model. A redistribution program generates greater and more persistent inflation under the fiscal regime. Analytical results on inflation are more difficult to obtain as Ricardian household consumption now also depends on inflation. Thus the solution involves finding a fixed point in an equation analogous to Equation (2.17). Nevertheless, the mechanisms discussed in Sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 still apply.

The policy regimes are no longer neutral for output, consumption, and hours with sticky prices because of the short-run relationship between output and inflation. Abusing the notation, and in comparison to output in Equation (2.10), it is convenient to regard output now as a function of transfers and inflation, where inflation in turn is also a function of the entire schedule of transfers:

$$Y_t = Y \left(s_t, \Pi_t \left(\{s_t\}_{t=0}^T \right) \right).$$

Therefore, output would increase not only through the (labor) supply channel. When wealth redistribution is inflationary, output would increase further due to the demand-side channel. Consequently, Ricardian household consumption in Equation (2.9) would not decrease as much as in the flexible-price case, while HTM household consumption would still be unaffected.

Since inflation generally increases by more under the fiscal regime compared to the monetary regime, alternative financing schemes now have different welfare implications.

¹⁸The next section presents a quantitative sticky-price model. In addition, the role of nominal rigidities (in this simple model) is relatively easy to understand as discussed below. Therefore, for brevity, we do not present this sticky price extension of the simple model in the main text.

With inflation taxes, Ricardian household consumption would not decrease as much, which would increase their welfare. At the same time, the Ricardian households would have to work more not only to produce more output but in addition, high and persistent inflation in the fiscal regime produces resource misallocations, which increase labor hours required to produce the same amount of final output. Therefore, it is unclear a priori that inflation taxes are a better or worse way to finance a redistribution program compared to other taxes. We explore this question in a quantitative model in the next section.

3 Quantitative Model and Covid Application

We now present a quantitative version of the model with an application focused on the economic crisis induced by Covid. Compared to the simple model, the main extension is a development of a two-sector production structure with sticky prices as well as introduction of distortionary taxes such that the trade-off between different sources of financing government debt is meaningful and interesting. We then analyze how the implications of increasing transfers to Hand-to-mouth households, that are hit disproportionately in a Covid crisis, depends on the monetary-fiscal policy mix.

3.1 Model

There are two distinct sectors where the two types of household work. Labor is immobile across these two sectors. Each sector produces a distinct good, which is in turn produced in differentiated varieties. Firms in both sectors are owned by the Ricardian household. The government finances transfers to the Hand-to-mouth household by levying distortionary labor taxes on the Ricardian household. In the policy regime where monetary policy is accommodative, the fiscal regime, partial financing also happens by inflating away nominal debt.

3.1.1 Ricardian Sector

Households There are Ricardian (R) households of measure $1 - \lambda$. The optimization problem of this type households is to

$$\max_{\{C_t^R, L_t^R, \frac{B_t^R}{P_t^R}\}} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \exp(\eta_t^{\xi}) \left[\frac{(C_t^R)^{1-\sigma}}{1-\sigma} - \chi \frac{(L_t^R)^{1+\varphi}}{1+\varphi} \right]$$

subject to a standard No-ponzi-game constraint and sequence of flow budget constraints

$$C_t^R + b_t^R = R_{t-1} \frac{1}{\Pi_t^R} b_{t-1}^R + (1 - \tau_{L,t}^R) w_t^R L_t^R + \Psi_t^R,$$

where σ is the coefficient of relative risk aversion, η_t^ξ is a preference shock, C_t^R is consumption, L_t^R is labor supply, $b_t^R = \frac{B_t^R}{P_t^R}$ is the real value of government issued debt, Π_t^R is inflation, R_{t-1} is the nominal interest rate, w_t^R is the real wage, and Ψ_t^R is real profits (this household owns firms in both sectors). We introduce a labor tax, $(1 - \tau_{L,t}^R)$, which constitutes one way in which the government finances transfers to the Hand-to-mouth household.¹⁹

Consumption good C_t^R is a CES aggregator ($\varepsilon > 0$) of the consumption goods produced in the two sectors

$$C_t^R = \left[(\alpha_R)^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \left(C_{R,t}^R \right)^{\frac{\varepsilon-1}{\varepsilon}} + (1 - \alpha_R)^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \left(\exp(\zeta_{H,t}) C_{H,t}^R \right)^{\frac{\varepsilon-1}{\varepsilon}} \right]^{\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon-1}}$$

where $C_{R,t}^R$ and $C_{H,t}^R$ are R -household's demand for R -sector and for HTM -sector goods, respectively. α_R is Ricardian households' consumption weight on R -sector goods and $\zeta_{H,t}$ is a demand shock that is specific for HTM goods. Let us define for future use, one of the relative prices, $S_{R,t} \equiv \left(\frac{P_{R,t}^R}{P_t^R} \right)$, where $P_{R,t}^R$ is the Ricardian sector's good price while P_t^R is the CPI price index of the Ricardian sector.

Within each sector, differentiated varieties are produced under monopolistic competition. Thus, $C_{R,t}^R$ and $C_{H,t}^R$ are Dixit-Stiglitz aggregata of a continuum of varieties. That is, with $\theta > 1$,

$$C_{R,t}^R = \left[\int_0^1 \left(C_{R,t}^R(i) \right)^{\frac{\theta-1}{\theta}} di \right]^{\frac{\theta}{\theta-1}}, C_{H,t}^R = \left[\int_0^1 \left(C_{H,t}^R(i) \right)^{\frac{\theta-1}{\theta}} di \right]^{\frac{\theta}{\theta-1}}.$$

Firms Firms produce differentiated varieties using the linear production function

$$Y_{R,t}(i) = L_t^R(i),$$

and set prices according to the Calvo friction, where ω^R is the probability of not getting a chance to adjust prices. Profit maximization problem of firms that get to adjust prices is given by

$$\max_{\{P_{R,t}^{R*}(i)\}} \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \left(\omega^R \beta \right)^s \left(\frac{C_{t+s}^R}{C_t^R} \right)^{-\sigma} \left[\left(\frac{P_{R,t+s}^{R*}(i)}{P_{R,t+s}^R} \right) S_{R,t+s} - w_{t+s}^R \right] \left(\frac{P_{R,t+s}^{R*}(i)}{P_{R,t+s}^R} \right)^{-\theta} Y_{R,t+s}$$

¹⁹Note that as we make clear below, we set up the model generally so that there could be two "CPI" indices in the economy, due to different baskets. So here, we are deflating nominal variables by the "CPI" index of the Ricardian household (defined as P_t^R).

where $P_{R,t}^{R*}(i)$ denotes the optimally chosen price. Notice that there is no price discrimination across sectors for varieties, and we impose the law of one price (with notation introduced later, $P_{RR,t}(i) = P_{HR,t}(i)$). This allows us to write the demand directly in terms of $Y_{R,t}(i) = \left(\frac{P_{R,t}^R(i)}{P_{R,t}^R}\right)^{-\theta} Y_{R,t}$, which is derived from the household's expenditure minimization problem. Relative prices, $S_{R,t}$, appear here, because of different price levels of the sectoral good and CPI, where we use CPI to deflate wages in the household problem.²⁰

3.1.2 Hand-to-Mouth Sector

Households There are Hand-to-mouth (HTM) households of measure λ . HTM household's labor endowment is exogenously fixed and can change with a shock. The HTM household then consumes, every period, wage income and government transfers

$$C_t^H = w_t^H \overline{L^H} (1 + \eta_t^{\tilde{\zeta}}) + \left(\frac{P_t^R}{P_t^H}\right) s_t^H,$$

where $\eta_t^{\tilde{\zeta}}$ is HTM labor supply shock. Note that the relative price, $Q_t \equiv \left(\frac{P_t^H}{P_t^R}\right)$, appears as for transfers/government variables we use the Ricardian household CPI as deflator.

The utility function of the HTM then is (again, labor supply is inelastic)

$$\frac{(C_t^H)^{1-\sigma}}{1-\sigma}$$

where the aggregate consumption C_t^H is a CES aggregator of sector-specific goods

$$C_t^H = \left[(\alpha_H)^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \left(\exp(\zeta_{H,t}) C_{H,t}^H \right)^{\frac{\varepsilon-1}{\varepsilon}} + (1 - \alpha_H)^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \left(C_{R,t}^H \right)^{\frac{\varepsilon-1}{\varepsilon}} \right]^{\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon-1}}$$

and where α_H is HTM households' consumption weight on *HTM*-sector goods and $\zeta_{H,t}$ is a demand shock specific for *HTM*-sector goods. Let us define for future use one of the relative prices, $S_{H,t} \equiv \frac{P_{H,t}^H}{P_t^H}$. This implies that $Q_t S_{H,t} = \frac{P_{H,t}^H}{P_t^R}$ which will be useful later.

$C_{HH,t}$ and $C_{HR,t}$ are Dixit-Stiglitz aggregates of a continuum of varieties. That is, with $\theta > 1$,

$$C_{H,t}^H = \left(\int_0^1 \left(C_{H,t}^H(i) \right)^{\frac{\theta-1}{\theta}} di \right)^{\frac{\theta}{\theta-1}}, \quad C_{R,t}^H = \left(\int_0^1 \left(C_{R,t}^H(i) \right)^{\frac{\theta-1}{\theta}} di \right)^{\frac{\theta}{\theta-1}}.$$

²⁰This is clear from the flow profit expression above. Moreover, linearity of production function gives marginal cost as w_t^R .

Firms Firms in the *HTM*-sector produce differentiated varieties using the linear production function

$$Y_{H,t}(i) = L_t^H(i)$$

and set prices according to the Calvo friction, where ω^H is the probability of not getting a chance to adjust prices. Profit maximization problem of firms that get to adjust prices is given by (they are owned by R households)

$$\max_{\{P_{H,t}^{H*}(i)\}} \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \left(\omega^H \beta \right)^s \left(\frac{C_{t+s}^R}{C_t^R} \right)^{-\sigma} \left[\left(\frac{P_{H,t}^{H*}(i)}{P_{H,t+s}^H} \right) Q_{t+s} S_{H,t+s} - Q_{t+s} w_{t+s}^H \right] \left(\frac{P_{H,t}^{H*}(i)}{P_{H,t+s}^H} \right)^{-\theta} Y_{H,t+s}$$

where $P_{H,t}^{H*}(i)$ denotes the optimally chosen price. Relative prices, $Q_t S_{H,t} = \frac{P_{H,t}^H}{P_t^R}$, show up here, because of a different price levels of the sectoral good and CPI, where we use CPI to deflate wages in the household problem.²¹

3.1.3 Government

The government flow budget constraint is (deflating by CPI of the Ricardian household)

$$B_t + T_t^L = R_{t-1} B_{t-1} + P_t^R s_t,$$

where tax revenues T_t^L are

$$T_t^L = (1 - \lambda) \tau_{L,t}^R P_t^R w_t^R L_t^R.$$

Transfer, s_t , is exogenous and deterministic. Note that, $s_t = \lambda s_t^H$ and $b_t = (1 - \lambda) b_t^R$.

Monetary and tax policy rules are of the feedback types given by

$$\frac{R_t}{\bar{R}} = \left(\frac{(1 - \lambda) \Pi_t^R + (\lambda) \Pi_t^H}{\bar{\Pi}} \right)^\phi,$$

$$\tau_{L,t}^R - \bar{\tau}_L^R = \psi_L (b_{t-1} - \bar{b}).$$

The steady state value of inflation, debt, and the exogenous variables, $\bar{\Pi}$, \bar{b} , and \bar{s} are policy choices and given exogenously.

As in the simple model, the monetary regime will feature a large enough monetary and tax rule response coefficients, ϕ and ψ_L , such that government debt dynamics is not stabilized via inflation. In contrast, in the fiscal regime, a low enough tax rule coefficient, ψ_L , implies that monetary policy has to be accomodative via a low enough ϕ , such that debt is (at least partly) financed via inflation.

²¹Moreover, relative price Q_t shows up as we deflate the real profits by the Ricardian household's CPI as they own the firms while the linearity of production function gives marginal cost as w_t^R .

3.1.4 Market Clearing, Aggregation, Resource Constraints

We now discuss market clearing conditions as well as some key aggregate relationships. All equilibrium conditions are derived in detail in the online appendix. Labor market clearing conditions are

$$(1 - \lambda) L_t^R = \int L_{R,t}(i) di, \quad \lambda \bar{L}^H (1 + \eta_t^\xi) = \int L_{H,t}(i) di,$$

while the goods market clearing conditions, imposing law of one price, are

$$Y_{R,t}(i) = (1 - \lambda) C_{R,t}^R(i) + \lambda C_{R,t}^H(i) = \left(\frac{P_{R,t}(i)}{P_{R,t}} \right)^{-\theta} Y_{R,t},$$

$$Y_{H,t}(i) = (1 - \lambda) C_{H,t}^R(i) + \lambda C_{H,t}^H(i) = \left(\frac{P_{H,t}(i)}{P_{H,t}} \right)^{-\theta} Y_{H,t},$$

where $Y_{R,t} = (1 - \lambda) C_{R,t}^R + \lambda C_{R,t}^H$ and $Y_{H,t} = (1 - \lambda) C_{H,t}^R + \lambda C_{H,t}^H$.

To derive an aggregate resource constraint, we combine households' budget constraints and government budget constraint to obtain

$$(1 - \lambda) C_t^R + \lambda Q_t C_t^H = \int \left(\frac{P_{H,t}(i)}{P_t^R} Y_{H,t}(i) + \frac{P_{R,t}(i)}{P_t^R} Y_{R,t}(i) \right) di.$$

Define economy-wide consumption as $C_t = (1 - \lambda) C_t^R + \lambda Q_t C_t^H$. Then, using goods market clearing conditions above, we get

$$C_t = S_{R,t} Y_{R,t} + S_{H,t} Q_t Y_{H,t}.$$

To derive aggregate sectoral outputs, we aggregate firms' product functions and get

$$(1 - \lambda) L_t^R = Y_{R,t} \Xi_{R,t}, \quad \lambda \bar{L}^H (1 + \eta_t^\xi) = Y_{H,t} \Xi_{H,t}, \quad (3.1)$$

where $\Xi_{R,t}$ and $\Xi_{H,t}$ are price dispersion terms given by

$$\Xi_{R,t} = \left(1 - \omega^R \right) \left(\frac{P_{R,t}^*}{P_{R,t}} \right)^{-\theta} + \omega^R (\pi_{R,t})^\theta \Xi_{R,t-1},$$

$$\Xi_{H,t} = \left(1 - \omega^H \right) \left(\frac{P_{H,t}^*}{P_{H,t}} \right)^{-\theta} + \omega^H (\pi_{H,t})^\theta \Xi_{H,t-1}.$$

3.2 Data and Calibration

A summary of the calibrated values of the parameters is presented in Table 1. Our parameterization strategy is to pick values based on long-run averages or from the literature for

the structural and policy parameters while calibrating the shocks to match employment and inflation dynamics during the Covid crisis. The data we use is described in more detail in Appendix Section A.

Table 1: Calibration

	Value	Description	Sources
<u>Households</u>			
β	0.9932	Time preference	2-month frequency
σ	1.7	Inverse of EIS	Del Negro et al. (2015)
φ	2.2	Inverse of Frisch elasticity	Del Negro et al. (2015)
χ	99.6	Labor supply disutility parameter	Steady-state $\bar{L}^R = 0.3$
λ	0.23	Fraction of HTM households	Employment share of retail, transportation, leisure/hospitality
α_R	0.72	Ricardian consumption weight on Ricardian goods	Consumer Expenditure Surveys data
α_H	0.28	HTM consumption weight on HTM goods	Consumer Expenditure Surveys data
<u>Firms</u>			
θ	6.0	Elasticity of substitution across firms	Steady-state markup: 20% (Hall, 2018)
ε	0.8	Elasticity of substitution between Ricardian and HTM goods	Assigned
ω^R	0.833	Calvo parameter for Ricardian sector	Del Negro et al. (2015)
ω^H	0.0	Calvo parameter for HTM sector	Assigned
<u>Government</u>			
$\frac{\bar{b}}{\bar{Y}}$	0.509	Steady-state debt to GDP	Data (1990Q1–2020Q1)
$\frac{\bar{\tau}^L}{\bar{Y}}$	0.122	Steady-state labor tax revenue to GDP	Data (1990Q1–2020Q1)
$\frac{\bar{s}}{\bar{Y}}$	0.127	Steady-state transfers to GDP	Data (1990Q1–2020Q1)
<u>Monetary and Fiscal Policy Rules</u>			
ϕ	(1.3, 0.0)	Interest rate response to inflation	Del Negro et al. (2015)
ψ_L	(0.6, 0.0)	Labor tax rate response to debt	Assigned
<u>Shocks</u>			
η_t^H	(-17%, -19%, -13%)	Size of HTM labor supply shock	Total hours for retail, transportation, leisure/hospitality
η_t^ξ	(-20%, -26%, -19%)	Size of preference shock	Total hours excluding retail, transportation, leisure/hospitality
$\zeta_{H,t}$	(-5%, -4%, -1%)	Size of HTM sector demand shock	PCE Inflation for recreation, transportation, food services
s_t	26.8%	Size of transfer distribution	2020 CARES Act

Notes: This table shows model parameter values we use for our baseline model simulation. We use 2019 Consumer Expenditure Surveys data to calibrate α_R and α_H . We assume households in the top 80 percentile of the income distribution as Ricardian households and set α_R as their consumption share for transportation, entertainment, and food away from home. Similarly, we assume households in the bottom 20 percentile income distribution as HTM households and set $1 - \alpha_H$ as their consumption share for transportation, entertainment, and food away from home. See Section 3.2 for details.

Our benchmark model is calibrated at a two-month frequency with a time discount factor of $\beta = 0.9983$. We set the inverse of the Frisch elasticity (φ) to be 2.2 and the inverse of the elasticity of intertemporal substitution (σ) to be 1.7, which are the estimates

in [Del Negro, Giannoni and Schorfheide \(2015\)](#). We set the elasticity of substitution across firms to be six ($\theta = 6$), which corresponds to a recent estimate of average markup of 20 percent ([Hall, 2018](#)). We assume that the Ricardian and HTM goods are complements by setting the elasticity (ϵ) as 0.8, which is broadly consistent with the estimates in [Hobijn and Nechio \(2018\)](#).²² We assume flexible prices in the HTM sector for simplicity, while we set the Calvo parameter for the Ricardian sector to be 0.833, which implies 12 months of duration of price changes. This price duration is consistent with estimates in [Del Negro, Giannoni and Schorfheide \(2015\)](#). Finally, steady-state inflation rate is 1.

We set the fraction of HTM households (λ) to be 0.23, which is chosen to be consistent with the employment share of retail trade, transportation and warehousing, and leisure and hospitality sectors in the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). We use the 2019 Consumer Expenditure Surveys (CEX) data to calibrate α_R and α_H , the share parameters in the consumption baskets. We assume households in the top 80 percentile of the income distribution as Ricardian households and set $1 - \alpha_R$ as 0.28 to match their consumption share for transportation, entertainment, and food away from home. Similarly, we assume households in the bottom 20 percentile of the income distribution as HTM households and set α_H as 0.28 to match their consumption share for transportation, entertainment, and food away from home.

For the steady-state of fiscal variables, we use federal debts, federal receipts, government current transfer payments data from 1990Q1 through 2020Q1. We set the Taylor rule parameter under the monetary regime to be 1.3, as estimated in [Del Negro, Giannoni and Schorfheide \(2015\)](#). We set the tax rule parameter (ψ_L) to be 0.6 under the monetary regime, and do a sensitivity analysis later. We assume both the Taylor rule (ϕ) and tax rule parameters (ψ_L) to be zero under the fiscal regime, which is the parameterization often used in the literature.

To examine the dynamic effects of transfer policy, we calibrate the size of transfer distribution using the transfer amounts specified in Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economy Security Act (CARES Act), which came into operation in mid-April. In particular, we target the sum of three key components of the Act: \$293 billion to provide one-time tax rebates to individuals; (ii) \$268 billion to expand unemployment benefits; (iii) \$150 billion in transfers to state and local governments. These three components of the CARES Act consist of around 3.4 percent of GDP. Given our calibration of steady-state government transfers, this in turn amounts to an increase in government transfers of 26.8 percentage.

²²[Hobijn and Nechio \(2018\)](#) estimate the elasticity to be 1 at a level of aggregation that distinguishes across 10 categories of goods and services. Since we only have 2 sectors in the model, we set an elasticity slightly below 1 as baseline. Then, in a sensitivity analysis we do an alternate calibration of 1.2. The results are very similar, as we show later.

Table 2: Data and Model Moments

	Time	Data	Model
<i>Panel A: Targeted moments (percent deviation from January)</i>			
Total Hours for retail, transportation, leisure/hospitality	April	-16.7%	-16.7%
	June	-18.8%	-18.8%
	August	-13.2%	-13.2%
Total Hours excluding retail, transportation, leisure/hospitality	April	-6.58%	-6.58%
	June	-8.57%	-8.57%
	August	-6.13%	-6.11%
PCE Inflation for recreation, transportation, food services	April	-0.99%	-0.99%
	June	-0.39%	-0.39%
	August	-0.37%	-0.37%
<i>Panel B: Non-targeted moments (percent deviation from January)</i>			
PCE Inflation excluding recreation, transportation, food services	April	-0.14%	-4.58%
	June	-0.06%	-2.11%
	August	0.74%	-0.36%
Real PCE for recreation, transportation, food services	April	-41.1%	-16.7%
	June	-37.6%	-18.8%
	August	-25.2%	-13.2%
Real PCE excluding recreation, transportation, food services	April	-7.74%	-8.61%
	June	-3.78%	-10.5%
	August	-1.06%	-7.78%
Real GDP (percent deviation from Q1)	Q2	-8.99%	-9.85%

Notes: This table shows moments of the data and simulated series from the baseline model parameterized at the values in Table 1. Panel A shows targeted moments and Panel B shows non-targeted moments. Data moments are expressed as the percent deviation from the average values of outcome variables in January and February.

In our baseline exercise of transfer policy in Section 3.3.1, we assume that the total amount of transfer is equally distributed over 6 months, that is, 3 periods.

A key component of our calibration is how we choose the shock sizes. The size of the three shocks are estimated $(\eta_t^H, \eta_t^{\tilde{\zeta}}, \zeta_{H,t})$ to match the dynamics, under the monetary regime without transfer policy, of total hours for both the HTM and Ricardian sectors and inflation for the HTM sector. In our baseline calibration, we assume that three shocks in the model are over after three periods.

In particular, we set the size of HTM sector labor supply shocks to match BLS total hours changes from April through August in HTM sectors (retail trade, transportation and warehousing, and leisure and hospitality sectors). We then calibrate the size of the preference shocks to match BLS total hours changes for sectors excluding HTM sectors, also from April through August. Finally, we set the size of HTM sector-specific demand shocks to match the PCE inflation for recreation, transportation, and food services sectors

from the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. The three shocks series can precisely match the dynamics of total hours and inflation from April through August, as reported in Panel A of Table 2.²³

Moreover, Panel B of Table 2 shows that our calibration is reasonable at matching several non-targeted moments. First, our model implied dynamics of aggregate output is quite close to the data, even though we did not use any output data in our calibration. The consumption dynamics of the Ricardian sector is also close to the data. Finally, model dynamics of consumption in the HTM sector is also fairly close to the dynamics of the real PCE data, even though our calibration only matches the dynamics of PCE inflation for the HTM sector. In terms of a non-targeted moment that we do not match well, our calibration implies a bigger drop in inflation in the Ricardian sector than the data.

3.3 Quantitative Results

We now present our baseline quantitative results.

3.3.1 Dynamic Effects of Transfer Policy

We show how key variables evolve over time in response to the "Covid" shocks – a combination of aggregate and sector-specific demand and supply shocks as discussed above. Moreover, we illustrate the effects of an increase in transfers for the monetary and fiscal regimes.

These results are in Figure 2, which presents four different scenarios: the monetary regime with and without transfers to the HTM households and the fiscal regime with and without transfers. As mentioned before, we calibrate the "Covid" shocks to match the targeted moments under the monetary regime in the absence of transfers. This case thus serves as our baseline. Throughout, the duration of the redistribution policy is 3 periods (6 months), which coincides with the duration of the shocks.²⁴

In the baseline, where the policymakers just stick to the usual policy, the Covid shocks generate significant short-run contractions in aggregate output and household consumption of both types, as shown by the solid blue lines in the first row of the figure.²⁵ The contraction leads to a decline in inflation (as shown in the second row) and in labor tax

²³Since the transfer payments from the CARES Act started mid-April while our calibration strategy matches model dynamics without transfer policy to the data, there is a slight mismatch between the data and model counterparts, especially for August.

²⁴We solve the model non-linearly under perfect foresight.

²⁵As we show in Table 2, while we do not target the aggregate output drop in our calibration, our model matches the data quite closely on that front.




Figure 2: Redistribution Policy with Different Policy Regimes

Notes: This figure shows dynamics of key variables in response to the Covid shocks under different regimes. Blue solid lines represent the baseline model under the monetary regime without transfers and red dashed lines represent the model under the fiscal regime without transfers. Green dotted lines represent the model dynamics under the monetary regime with transfers and orange dashed lines represent the model dynamics under the without transfers short-run welfare gains for the models under the fiscal regime with transfers.

revenues, both of which in turn increase the real value of government debt. The government responds by increasing the tax rate to stabilize debt under this standard monetary regime. Meanwhile, the central bank decreases the nominal interest rate in response to the decline in inflation. These policy responses are shown in the bottom row of the figure. Notice that the zero lower bound (ZLB) binds in our model during the pandemic.

Now, let us introduce the redistribution program to the monetary regime baseline case, the results of which are shown by the dotted green lines in Figure 2.²⁶ Overall, the effects of the redistribution program are largely in line with what we have shown using the simple model in Section 2. One major difference from the simple model is that the redistribution program is more expansionary here because not only the classical labor

²⁶As we discussed in the calibration section, transfers increase by 26.8 percentage.

supply channel, but also the Keynesian channel operates thanks to nominal rigidities – as we discussed in Section 2.3.

Clearly, transfers increase HTM household consumption and decrease Ricardian household consumption (due to the resulting increase in the tax rate) relative to the baseline. These are the direct effects of the redistribution. As discussed in Section 2, however, the redistribution program is inflationary – as shown by the difference between the solid blue lines and the dotted green lines in the second row. This indirectly has a positive effect on household consumption of both types through general equilibrium. In particular, the decline of Ricardian household consumption caused by the redistribution is very small and in fact in this parameterization, nearly indistinguishable visually from the baseline case.

Let us now turn to the fiscal regime where neither the tax rate nor the nominal interest rate changes. The results for this case are shown by the red (without transfers) and orange (with transfers) lines in Figure 2. The Covid shocks are also contractionary in this regime, and moreover, redistribution leads to an increase in HTM consumption as well as aggregate output.²⁷ In this fiscal regime, the main aspect we want to highlight is that aggregate output and consumption of both types do not drop as much as in the monetary regime. There are three main reasons, which all also help understand how the transmission of shocks and transfer policy is different in this regime.

First, irrespective of whether there is redistribution or not, the fiscal regime generates greater and more persistent inflation than the monetary regime, as that stabilizes the real value of government debt without relying on labor taxes. Due to nominal rigidities, this in turn has larger and longer-lasting positive effects on output and consumption of both types, as presented in the first row of Figure 2. Second, as shown in the simple model in Section 2.2.2, the redistribution program is more inflationary in the fiscal regime than in the monetary regime. This result is illustrated in the second row of the figure. The fifth and sixth panels reveal that the gap between the orange and the red lines is greater than that between the green and the blue lines. Finally, the ZLB binds in the monetary regime as we discussed above, which prevents the central bank from decreasing the policy rate according to the monetary policy rule, and leads to a bigger drop in the monetary regime with the shocks. This mechanism is not relevant for the fiscal regime.

²⁷In contrast to the monetary regime, redistribution actually increases Ricardian consumption in the fiscal regime as the aforementioned indirect effect on consumption through inflation dominates the direct effect under our current parameterization. This result, however, is difficult to see in the figure. We revisit this result in Section 3.3.2.

3.3.2 Transfer Multipliers

As a way to summarize these dynamic responses with and without redistribution policy in various regimes, we now present results in terms of transfer multipliers. In Table 3, we show present value transfer multipliers under the two regimes for output and consumption. The output multiplier, for instance, under regime $i \in \{M, F\}$ is

$$\mathcal{M}_t^i(Y) = \left(\frac{\sum_{h=0}^t \beta^h (\tilde{Y}_h^i - Y_h^M)}{\sum_{h=0}^t \beta^h s_h} \right)$$

where \tilde{Y}_h^i is output at horizon h under i -regime *with* transfers, Y_h^M is output at horizon h under the monetary regime *without* transfers, and s_h is transfers at horizon h . Similarly, we define Ricardian sector output and the two consumption multipliers ($\mathcal{M}_t^i(Y^R)$, $\mathcal{M}_t^i(C^R)$ and $\mathcal{M}_t^i(C^H)$) under i -regime.

Note that in calculating these multipliers, our baseline case is always the monetary regime without transfers. This is the most interesting case to study as we want to study the question: given a transfer policy we want to implement, what are the differences if conventional labor taxes or inflation taxes are used to finance the resulting increase in government debt? Finally, following the fiscal multiplier literature, we consider impact multiplier ($t = 0$) as well as 2-year ($t = 12$) and 4-year ($t = 24$) cumulative multipliers, which allows for a consideration of dynamic effects in the model.

Table 3: Transfer Multipliers with M-Regime Baseline

	Monetary Regime				Fiscal Regime			
	$\mathcal{M}_t^M(Y)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^M(Y_R)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^M(C^R)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^M(C^H)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^F(Y)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^F(Y_R)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^F(C^R)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^F(C^H)$
Impact Multipliers	1.092	1.348	-0.225	5.503	3.626	4.517	2.277	8.372
2-Year Cumulative Multipliers	1.041	1.275	-0.286	5.456	6.181	7.430	4.670	11.341
4-Year Cumulative Multipliers	1.003	1.231	-0.323	5.412	6.553	7.863	5.024	11.767

Notes: This table shows the transfer multipliers for the models under monetary and fiscal regimes. $\mathcal{M}_t^i(X)$ represent the cumulative transfer multiplier of variable X at t -horizon under i regime. We report impact multipliers, 2-year, and 4-year cumulative multipliers when government distributes transfers equally over 6 months.

Table 3 shows that aggregate output and Ricardian sector output multipliers are both above 1 in the monetary regime. The binding ZLB and sticky prices play an important role in this result.²⁸ Moreover, the C^H multiplier is above the simple model benchmark of $(1/\lambda)$, which would be 4.35 according to our calibration.

²⁸Note that in the simple model, we showed analytically that the Ricardian sector output multiplier is below 1. Later in an extension, we consider various versions of the model that are closer to the simple model as well as those that show clearly the role played by a binding ZLB.

Table 3 also shows that multipliers are even higher in the fiscal regime, even though the ZLB is binding in our simulations under the monetary regime. The aggregate output/consumption multiplier is significantly higher in the fiscal regime. Moreover, multiplier is higher for both types of consumption. In fact, uniquely, the C^R multiplier is positive in the fiscal regime, which is different from the monetary regime.²⁹ The persistent inflation dynamics in this regime lead to persistent real effects due to sticky prices, which contributes to these higher multipliers.

3.3.3 Welfare Effects of Transfer Policy

We finally show the effects on household welfare of the recession created by the Covid shocks under the four different scenarios discussed above. In particular, we consider both short- and long-run welfare effects. To this end, we implicitly define our measure of welfare gain for household of type $i \in \{R, H\}$, $\mu_{t,k}^i$, as

$$\sum_{j=0}^t \beta^j U(C_j^i, L_j^i) = \sum_{j=0}^t \beta^j U\left(\left(1 + \mu_{t,k}^i\right) \bar{C}^i, \bar{L}^i\right),$$

where $\{\bar{C}^i, \bar{L}^i\}$ is steady-state of type- i household's consumption and hours and $\{C_j^i, L_j^i\}$ are the time path of type- i household's consumption and hours under the different transfer duration policies (indexed by k). We denote by $\mu_{t,k}^i$ the welfare gains of type- i household when government distributes transfers for k -period. In this way, $\mu_{t,k}^i$ measures welfare gains from period 0 till (arbitrary) period t in units of a percentage of the level of normalized initial consumption.³⁰ The lifetime (total) welfare gain is then measured by $\mu_{\infty,k}^i \equiv \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{t,k}^i$, often the focus of the business cycle literature.

We find that whether the government introduces the redistribution program, for how long the program continues, and how it is financed make a very small difference for the lifetime welfare for both types of households. This result is presented in Table 4. For example, the redistribution program financed by inflation taxes, increases the HTM households' lifetime welfare by 0.175 percentage points and increases the Ricardian households' lifetime welfare by 0.032 percentage point, compared to the baseline. This result is expected because the Covid shocks under consideration are short-lived, which implies the recession is only a small bump in the lifetime.³¹

²⁹Also note that in the simple model where inflation is neutral for real variables, we showed analytically that this multiplier is negative.

³⁰It thus measures welfare gains at the point when the agents are t quarters old.

³¹We shut down all shocks other than the 3-period Covid shocks over the lifetime. Therefore, this exercise is different from the usual ones in the business cycle literature.

Table 4: Welfare Gains (Duration of Transfer Distribution: $k = 3$)

Transfer Distribution	Monetary Regime		Fiscal Regime	
	Long-run	Short-run ($t = 4$)	Long-run	Short-run ($t = 4$)
Ricardian Household	-0.014	-0.883	0.032	0.445
HTM Household	0.072	3.309	0.175	5.140

Notes: This table shows long- and short-run welfare gains for the models with three-period of transfer distribution ($k = 3$) under different regimes. The numbers represent the percentage point deviations from the welfare gains under monetary regime without transfers. Under monetary regime without transfers, the long-run welfare gains for Ricardian households and for HTM households are -0.235 and -0.208 percent of consumption goods at steady state, respectively.

What is more interesting are the welfare effects in the short run, which are presented in detail in Figure 3. We ask two different, yet related questions. First, taking as given the redistribution program enacted, what is the better way to finance it? Second, should the government enact the redistribution policy at all?

On the first question, we find that taking the redistribution program as given, inflation taxes, as used in the fiscal regime, produce far better welfare outcomes than labor taxes, as used in the monetary regime. For example, at the point when the pandemic is over (at $t = 4$), as given in Table 4, the redistribution program, financed by inflation taxes (i.e., the fiscal regime), would have increased the welfare of the HTM households and that of the Ricardian households by 5.140 percentage point and 0.445 percentage point respectively. This result on the welfare gains under the fiscal regime can be inferred from the second and third panel of Figure 3. In contrast, if the government relied on labor taxes, the HTM households' welfare gain resulting from the redistribution would amount to 3.3 percentage point of the steady-state level of consumption at the end of the pandemic. Therefore, labor-tax financed transfers are less effective. Moreover, the redistribution now decreases the welfare of the Ricardian households by 0.89 percentage point as these households work more hours with little change in consumption.

We now consider the second question, that is, whether the redistribution policy is desirable at all. The answer obviously is that it depends. Figure 3 shows that the inflation-financed redistribution program under the fiscal regime benefits the HTM households the most, but it is not the best option for the Ricardian households. But if the policy objective were simply to maximize the aggregate welfare, which is although not likely the most realistic case, the redistribution program by itself would do very little *given the policy regime* in this model – as shown in the first panel of Figure 3. With transfer payments, in either policy regime, the HTM households would consume more, which would also lead to an




Figure 3: Short-Run Welfare Gains Comparison

Notes: This figure shows short-run welfare gains for the models under different regimes (monetary and fiscal regimes). We compare the welfare gains without transfer policy ($\mu_{t,k=0}^R, \mu_{t,k=0}^H$) and those with transfer distribution for three-period ($\mu_{t,k=3}^R, \mu_{t,k=3}^H$). The numbers are in units of a percentage of the steady-state level of consumption.

increase in aggregate output. At the same time, the Ricardian households would have to work more for two reasons. First, to produce more output. Second, inflation created by the redistribution generates resource misallocation, which increases labor hours required to produce a given amount of output, as shown in Equation (3.1). In our calibration here, these two welfare effects almost cancel each other out in both regimes.

3.4 Extensions and Sensitivity Analysis

We now consider some important extensions and sensitivity analysis.

3.4.1 Transfer Multipliers without a Covid Scenario

We present results on transfer multipliers when the economy is not hit with the Covid shocks. The first case has sticky prices while the second has fully flexible prices. Moreover, under fully flexible price case, we further remove distortionary labor taxes. This version then is quite close to our simple, analytical model. These exercises are particularly useful as they allow us to illustrate the quantitative role of binding ZLB in the monetary regime, which only happens due to the Covid shocks, as well as that of general state-dependence. They also progressively allow an analysis of which elements are responsible for differences between the simple and the quantitative model results.

Table 5: Transfer Multipliers without Covid Shocks (Transfer Duration: $k = 3$)

	Monetary Regime				Fiscal Regime			
	$\mathcal{M}_t^M(Y)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^M(Y_R)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^M(C^R)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^M(C^H)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^F(Y)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^F(Y_R)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^F(C^R)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^F(C^H)$
<i>Panel A: Without Covid Shocks under sticky price</i>								
Impact Multipliers	0.742	0.867	-0.597	5.125	1.488	1.743	0.115	5.984
2-Year Cumulative Multipliers	1.007	1.178	-0.344	5.430	1.474	1.725	0.101	5.967
4-Year Cumulative Multipliers	0.96	1.123	-0.389	5.376	1.475	1.727	0.103	5.968
<i>Panel B: Without Covid Shocks under flexible price</i>								
Impact Multipliers	0.465	0.543	-0.861	4.807	0.465	0.543	-0.861	4.807
2-Year Cumulative Multipliers	0.214	0.251	-1.101	4.520	0.465	0.543	-0.861	4.807
4-Year Cumulative Multipliers	0.095	0.111	-1.215	4.383	0.465	0.543	-0.861	4.807
<i>Panel C: Without Covid Shocks under flexible price and lump-sum tax adjustment</i>								
Impact Multipliers	0.465	0.543	-0.861	4.807	0.465	0.543	-0.861	4.807
2-Year Cumulative Multipliers	0.465	0.543	-0.861	4.807	0.465	0.543	-0.861	4.807
4-Year Cumulative Multipliers	0.465	0.543	-0.861	4.807	0.465	0.543	-0.861	4.807

Notes: This table shows the transfer multipliers without Covid shocks under different regimes (monetary and fiscal regimes). $\mathcal{M}_t^i(X)$ represent the cumulative transfer multiplier of variable X at t -horizon under i regime. Panel A shows multipliers under the sticky-price model without Covid shocks. Panels B shows multipliers under the flexible-price model without Covid shocks. Panels C shows multipliers under the flexible-price model without Covid shocks when non-distortionary lump-sum tax adjusts. We set the duration of transfer distribution to be 6 months ($k = 3$).

As Panel A of Table 5 shows, even without the Covid shocks, the transfer multipliers are higher in the fiscal regime compared to the monetary regime, as in our baseline results. Moreover, uniquely in the fiscal regime, the Ricardian consumption multiplier is positive. At the same time however, the transfer multipliers are lower than our baseline results presented earlier in Table 3.³² This is the case for both the monetary and the fiscal regimes. For the monetary regime, the key reason is that now there is no binding ZLB, which means that increases in inflation due to transfer policy do not lead to as strong a boost in consumption as the real interest rate does not decrease strongly. For the fiscal regime, this reflects state dependence in the multipliers, as now the economy does not have have shocks and therefore, the no-transfer case is not the one where there is an economic contraction.

Next, Panel B of Table 5 shows that the multipliers decrease further with flexible prices, as is often also found in the government spending multiplier literature. In fact, now the impact multipliers are the same across the regimes, as was the case in our simple, analytical model. Moreover, output multipliers are now below 1, Ricardian consumption multiplier is negative, and the Hand-to-mouth consumption multiplier is close to 4.35,

³²Without the Covid shocks, when we compute the multipliers, for both the monetary and fiscal regimes, the baseline case is that of the economy in steady-state.

the analytical model solution.³³ The cumulative multipliers are different from the impact multiplier in the monetary regime, unlike the simple, analytical model due to dynamics of distortionary labor taxes.³⁴

To make this clear, Panel C of Table 5 shows the case where the increase in transfers are financed by lump-sum taxes on the Ricardian household. Then, all the multipliers are the same across the regimes and over horizons, as in the simple model.

3.4.2 Different Duration of Transfers

As one of our main extensions, we do additional analysis related to the length of the transfer policy. In our baseline analysis, we had considered transfer policy to coincide with the length of the Covid shocks, that is, of 6 months. We now show results for three different durations of redistribution policy: The program last for 2, 6 and 12 months. This exercise can be important as our model features HTM households. Moreover, the timing of transfers can also matter because there are distortionary labor taxes in the model and additionally, also when the economy is at ZLB under the monetary regime, as is the case in our baseline calibration. For the different durations of transfer policy program, we fix the present value of transfers to be the same, which implies that the amount of transfers each period is smaller when the program lasts longer.

Figures 4 and 5 present the responses of the variables with different duration of the redistribution program under the monetary and fiscal regimes respectively. We find that the results are overall quite similar across different lengths of the redistribution policy. Where a more significant difference is observed is in the responses of HTM household consumption. The second panel of the figures shows that the difference in HTM household consumption between no-transfer case and transfer cases, for obvious reasons, is more evenly distributed across time periods when the duration of the program is longer.

Table 6 presents the multiplier results under different duration of transfer policy for the monetary and fiscal regimes. As in our baseline analysis, we present impact multipliers as well as 2- and 4-year cumulative multipliers. The multipliers are clearly higher under the monetary regime when transfer is distributed over a longer duration. For the fiscal regime, the cumulative multipliers, which capture dynamics in the model, are relatively insensitive to the duration of transfer policy.³⁵

³³The solution for multipliers in the simple model that we derive would predict a Ricardian sector output multiplier of 0.644 and Ricardian consumption multiplier of -0.464. Note that the simple model imposes log utility and is also a one-sector environment.

³⁴This is not the case in the fiscal regime as labor taxes are fixed over time.

³⁵Appendix Table B.1 presents the long-run welfare results under different duration of transfer policy for the monetary and fiscal regimes. Consistent the the multiplier results, in the monetary regime, the longer




Figure 4: Monetary Regime: Different Duration of Redistribution Policy

Notes: This figure shows dynamics of key variables in response to the Covid shocks under monetary regime with different duration of transfer distribution. Blue solid lines represent the baseline model without transfers. Red dashed lines represent the case of one-time transfer distribution. Green dotted lines represent the case where the transfers are distributed over three-period (6 months) and orange dashed lines represent the case where the transfers are distributed over six-period (12 months). We set the total present value of transfer amounts are the same across different duration of distribution policy.

3.4.3 Sensitivity Analysis

We now do some sensitivity analysis with respect to two assigned parameters. We first consider a cross-sector elasticity of substitution (ϵ) greater than 1, equal to 1.2. Our baseline parameterization was 0.8. Next, we consider different parameterization of the tax rule response coefficient (ψ_L) under the M regime. Compared to our baseline choice of 0.6, we now set it at 0.1, such that labor tax rates respond less strongly to debt.³⁶ In these

duration transfer policy leads to an improvement in welfare, for both the Ricardian and Hand-to-mouth households.

³⁶This would be in line with the estimates in [Bhattarai, Lee and Park \(2016\)](#), which however did not have distortionary labor taxes.




Figure 5: Fiscal Regime: Different Duration of Redistribution Policy

Notes: This figure shows dynamics of key variables in response to the Covid shocks under fiscal regime with different duration of transfer distribution. Blue solid lines represent the baseline model without transfers. Red dashed lines represent the case of one-time transfer distribution. Green dotted lines represent the case where the transfers are distributed over three-periods (6 months) and orange dashed lines represent the case where the transfers are distributed over six-periods (12 months). We set the total present value of transfer amounts are the same across different duration of distribution policy.

exercises, we keep the rest of the parameters the same as baseline.³⁷ The results of this section are presented in the Appendix.

Appendix Figure B.1 presents the responses of the variables with and without transfer policy when $\varepsilon = 1.2$. The results are very similar to our baseline results. Appendix Table B.2 next presents the transfer multipliers when $\varepsilon = 1.2$. Again, overall the results are similar to our baseline results. One noticeable difference is that as the sectoral goods are more substitutable now, under both regimes, the consumption multiplier for the Hand-to-mouth household is lower while that for the Ricardian household is higher.

Appendix Figure B.2 present the responses of the variables with and without trans-

³⁷These different sensitivity analysis exercises thus will not match the targeted moments anymore. In particular, we find that now they do not match the inflation dynamics in the HTM sector.

Table 6: Multipliers with Different Transfer Distribution

Transfer Duration	Monetary Regime			Fiscal Regime		
	$k = 1$	$k = 3$	$k = 6$	$k = 1$	$k = 3$	$k = 6$
<i>Panel A: Impact multiplier</i>						
$\mathcal{M}_0^i(Y)$	1.021	1.092	1.841	1.887	3.626	6.169
$\mathcal{M}_0^i(Y_R)$	1.269	1.348	2.271	2.367	4.517	7.670
$\mathcal{M}_0^i(C^R)$	-0.296	-0.225	0.516	0.557	2.277	4.792
$\mathcal{M}_0^i(C^H)$	5.426	5.503	6.345	6.413	8.372	11.241
<i>Panel B: 2-year cumulative multiplier</i>						
$\mathcal{M}_{12}^i(Y)$	0.986	1.042	1.631	6.184	6.181	6.046
$\mathcal{M}_{12}^i(Y_R)$	1.228	1.275	1.948	7.457	7.430	7.237
$\mathcal{M}_{12}^i(C^R)$	-0.330	-0.286	0.272	4.682	4.670	4.529
$\mathcal{M}_{12}^i(C^H)$	5.387	5.456	6.134	11.34	11.341	11.189
<i>Panel C: 4-year cumulative multiplier</i>						
$\mathcal{M}_{24}^i(Y)$	0.945	1.003	1.647	6.561	6.553	6.397
$\mathcal{M}_{24}^i(Y_R)$	1.181	1.231	1.967	7.896	7.863	7.646
$\mathcal{M}_{24}^i(C^R)$	-0.369	-0.323	0.287	5.042	5.024	4.864
$\mathcal{M}_{24}^i(C^H)$	5.34	5.412	6.153	11.772	11.767	11.592

Notes: This table shows the transfer multipliers with different duration of transfer distribution under different regimes (monetary and fiscal regimes). $\mathcal{M}_t^i(X)$ represent the cumulative transfer multiplier of variable X at t -horizon under i regime. Panel A shows impact multipliers and Panels B and C present 2-year and 4-year cumulative multipliers, respectively. We consider three cases of different duration of transfer distribution: 2-month ($k = 1$), 6-month ($k = 3$), and 12-month ($k = 6$).

fer policy, when $\psi_L = 0.1$ under the monetary regime. The results are very similar to our baseline results, with some visible differences in debt dynamics under the monetary regime. Appendix Table B.3 next presents the transfer multipliers when $\psi_L = 0.1$. Again, overall the results are similar to our baseline results. As expected, now that labor tax rates increase less strongly, under the monetary regime, the multipliers are somewhat higher.³⁸

4 Conclusion

Our paper makes clear that how transfers are ultimately financed is a first-order issue for their effectiveness. It arguably matters more than other factors identified in the literature which typically reports moderate transfer multipliers. In particular, inflation-financed

³⁸For the fiscal regime, the only reason the multiplier results are different from our baseline is that the monetary regime under no transfers now has different dynamics. Otherwise, this alternate parameterization of the tax rule has no effect in the fiscal regime.

transfers are significantly more effective than tax-financed transfers in boosting the economy and improving welfare. As the Fiscal Theory of the Price Level suggests, an inflation-financed transfer program can be implemented by a fiscal authority committing itself to no tax adjustments in the foreseeable future, coupled with an accommodative monetary authority. We call such the fiscal-monetary policy mix the fiscal regime – in contrast to the (conventional) monetary regime where monetary policy stabilizes inflation.

We first consider a simple two-agent model that permits analytical results and illuminate the mechanism through which redistribution generates inflation in the two policy regimes. In particular, the fiscal regime produces high and persistent inflation through the direct and the indirect (that we also called the interest rate or valuation) channels. In comparison, inflation is lower and shorter-lived in the monetary regime.

We then build on the analytical results and proceed to a quantitative analysis in a two-sector TANK model. Our quantitative exercise shows that inflation-financed transfers fight deflationary pressures in a Covid-recession-like environment, thereby preventing output and consumption from dropping significantly. Such inflation-induced expansionary effects are so large that redistribution can in fact produce a Pareto improvement.

In future work, we can take additional steps in several directions. First, the model may be extended to feature a richer form of heterogeneity across sectors as well as households and, in addition, more elaborate matching between sectors and households. Although we expect that our main argument will hold in such a complex environment, it will be interesting to see whether such an extension affects the quantitative results significantly.

Second, while our analysis suggests a clear path to the success of a redistribution policy (at least in theory), the Great Recession taught policymakers that generating inflation during, and in the aftermath of, a severe recession is easier said than done, possibly due to credibility problems. Relatedly, implementation would not be as straightforward in an environment where economic agents take into account the possibility of regime switching by policymakers when the recession is over, as suggested in this paper. We leave a more comprehensive analysis with such interesting issues for future research.

References

Bayer, Christian, Benjamin Born, Ralph Luetticke, and Gernot Müller, “The Coronavirus Stimulus Package: How Large is the Transfer Multiplier?,” CEPR Discussion Papers 14600, C.E.P.R. Discussion Papers 2020.

- Bhattarai, Saroj, Jae Won Lee, and Woong Yong Park**, “Inflation Dynamics: The Role of Public Debt and Policy Regimes,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 2014, 67, 93–108.
- , —, —, and —, “Policy Regimes, Policy Shifts, and U.S. Business Cycles,” *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 2016, 98 (5), 968–83.
- , —, —, —, and **Choongryul Yang**, “Macroeconomic Effects of Capital Tax Rate Changes,” Globalization and Monetary Policy Institute Working Paper 391 2020.
- Bianchi, Francesco, Renato Faccini, and Leonardo Melosi**, “Monetary and Fiscal Policies in Times of Large Debt: Unity is Strength,” NBER Working Papers 27112, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc May 2020.
- Bilbiie, Florin O.**, “Monetary Policy and Heterogeneity: An Analytical Framework,” CEPR Discussion Paper DP12601 2018.
- , **Tommaso Monacelli, and Roberto Perotti**, “Public Debt and Redistribution with Borrowing Constraints,” *The Economic Journal*, 2013, 123 (566), F64–F98.
- Campbell, John Y. and N. Gregory Mankiw**, “Consumption, Income, and Interest Rates: Reinterpreting the Time Series Evidence,” *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, 1989, 4, 185–216.
- Canzoneri, Matthew, Robert Cumby, and Behzad Diba**, “The Interaction Between Monetary and Fiscal Policy,” in Benjamin M. Friedman and Michael Woodford, eds., *Handbook of Monetary Economics*, Vol. 3, Elsevier, 2010, pp. 935–999.
- Christiano, Lawrence, Martin Eichenbaum, and Sergio Rebelo**, “When Is the Government Spending Multiplier Large?,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 2011, 119 (1), 78–121.
- Cochrane, John H.**, “Long-Term Debt and Optimal Policy in the Fiscal Theory of the Price Level,” *Econometrica*, 2001, 69 (1), 69–116.
- , “Michelson-Morley, Fisher, and Occam: The Radical Implications of Stable Quiet Inflation at the Zero Bound,” *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, 2018, 32, 113–226.
- Del Negro, Marco, Marc P. Giannoni, and Frank Schorfheide**, “Inflation in the Great Recession and New Keynesian Models,” *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, January 2015, 7 (1), 168–96.
- Eggertsson, Gauti B.**, “What Fiscal Policy Is Effective at Zero Interest Rates?,” *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, 2011, 25, 59–112.

- Faria-e-Castro, Miguel**, “Fiscal Policy during a Pandemic,” Working Papers 2020-006, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis 2020.
- Galí, Jordi, J. David López-Salido, and Javier Vallés**, “Understanding the Effects of Government Spending on Consumption,” *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 2007, 5 (1), 227–70.
- Guerrieri, Veronica, Guido Lorenzoni, Ludwig Straub, and Iván Werning**, “Macroeconomic Implications of COVID-19: Can Negative Supply Shocks Cause Demand Shortages?,” Working Paper 26918, National Bureau of Economic Research April 2020.
- Hall, Robert E**, “New Evidence on the Markup of Prices over Marginal Costs and the Role of Mega-Firms in the US Economy,” Working Paper 24574, National Bureau of Economic Research May 2018.
- Hobijn, Bart and Fernanda Nechio**, “Sticker Shocks: Using VAT Changes to Estimate Upper-Level Elasticities of Substitution,” *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 04 2018, 17 (3), 799–833.
- Jacobson, Margaret M., Eric M. Leeper, and Bruce Preston**, “Recovery of 1933,” NBER Working Papers 25629, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc March 2019.
- Leeper, Eric M.**, “Equilibria under ‘Active’ and ‘Passive’ Monetary and Fiscal Policies,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 1991, 27 (1), 129–47.
- **and Campbell Leith**, “Understanding Inflation as a Joint Monetary-Fiscal Phenomenon,” in John B. Taylor and Harald Uhlig, eds., *Handbook of Macroeconomics*, Vol. 2, Elsevier, 2016, chapter 30, pp. 2305–2415.
- **, Nora Traum, and Todd B. Walker**, “Clearing Up the Fiscal Multiplier Morass,” *American Economic Review*, August 2017, 107 (8), 2409–54.
- Motyovszki, Gergo**, “Monetary-Fiscal Interactions and Redistribution in Small Open Economies,” EUI Working Papers 2020/03, ECO 2020.
- Schmitt-Grohé, Stephanie and Martín Uribe**, “Price Level Determinacy and Monetary Policy under a Balanced-Budget Requirement,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 2000, 45 (1), 211–246.
- Sims, Christopher A.**, “A Simple Model for Study of the Determination of the Price Level and the Interaction of Monetary and Fiscal Policy,” *Economic Theory*, 1994, 4 (3), 381–99.

— , “Stepping on a Rake: The Role of Fiscal Policy in the Inflation of the 1970s,” *European Economic Review*, 2011, 55 (1), 48–56.

Woodford, Michael, “Monetary Policy and Price Level Determinacy in a Cash-in-Advance Economy,” *Economic Theory*, 1994, 4 (3), 345–80.

— , “Simple Analytics of the Government Expenditure Multiplier,” *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 2011, 3 (1), 1–35.

APPENDIX

A Data Appendix

Employment and Total Hours We use total employment and total hours data from U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. We define HTM sector as the sum of the following three sectors: Retail Trade (NAICS 44–45), Transportation and Warehousing (NAICS 48–49), and Leisure and Hospitality (NAICS 71–72).

Consumption and Inflation We use real Personal Consumption Expenditure (PCE) data and PCE inflation from U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. We define HTM sector as the sum of the following three sectors: Transportation services, Recreation services, and Food services and accommodations.

We also use 2019 Consumer Expenditure Surveys (CEX) data to calibrate both Ricardian and HTM households' share parameters in the consumption baskets. We assume households in the top 80 percentile income distribution as Ricardian households and match their consumption share for transportation, entertainment, and food away from home. Similarly, we assume households in bottom 20 percentile income distribution as HTM households and match their consumption share for transportation, entertainment, and food away from home.

Fiscal Variables We use government current transfer payments (A084RC1Q027SBEA in FRED) to calibrate steady-state transfers to GDP ratio. We also use federal debt held by the public data (FYGFDPU in FRED) to calibrate debt to GDP ratio. Finally, we use compensation of employees, paid: wages and salaries (A4102C1Q027SBEA in FRED), proprietors' income (PROPINC in FRED), and federal government current receipts: contributions for government social insurance (W780RC1Q027SBEA in FRED) data to calibrate steady-state labor tax revenue to GDP ratio. The sample period for these variables is from 1990Q1 through 2020Q1.

Transfer Distribution from CARES Act We calibrate the size of transfer distribution using the transfer amounts specified in Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economy Security Act (CARES Act), which came into operation in mid-April. In particular, we target the sum of three key components of the Act: \$293 billion to provide one-time tax rebates to individuals; (ii) \$268 billion to expand unemployment benefits; (iii) \$150 billion in transfers to state and local governments. These three components of the CARES Act consist of around 3.4 percent of GDP.

B Appendix Tables and Figures

Appendix Table B.1: Long-run Welfare Gains

Transfer Duration	Monetary Regime			Fiscal Regime		
	$k = 1$	$k = 3$	$k = 6$	$k = 1$	$k = 3$	$k = 6$
Ricardian Household	-0.011	-0.014	-0.004	0.042	0.032	0.024
HTM Household	0.047	0.072	0.089	0.149	0.175	0.180

Notes: This table shows the long-run welfare gains for the models with different regimes and horizons of transfer distributions. The numbers represent the percentage point deviations from the welfare gains under monetary regime without transfers. We consider three cases of different duration of transfer distribution: 2-month ($T = 1$), 6-month ($T = 3$), and 12-month ($T = 6$).

Appendix Table B.2: Transfer Multipliers ($k = 3$) with M-Regime Baseline ($\varepsilon = 1.2$)

	Monetary Regime				Fiscal Regime			
	$\mathcal{M}_t^M(Y)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^M(Y_R)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^M(C^R)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^M(C^H)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^F(Y)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^F(Y_R)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^F(C^R)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^F(C^H)$
Impact Multipliers	1.155	1.315	-0.013	5.019	3.770	4.312	2.915	6.699
2-Year Cumulative Multipliers	1.143	1.293	-0.033	5.043	6.413	7.184	5.797	8.515
4-Year Cumulative Multipliers	1.119	1.266	-0.059	5.003	6.766	7.573	6.185	8.753

Notes: This table shows the transfer multipliers for the models under monetary and fiscal regimes when $\varepsilon = 1.2$. $\mathcal{M}_t^i(X)$ represent the cumulative transfer multiplier of variable X at t -horizon under i regime. We report impact multipliers, 2-year, and 4-year cumulative multipliers when government distributes transfers equally over 6 months.

Appendix Table B.3: Transfer Multipliers ($k = 3$) with M-Regime Baseline ($\psi_L = 0.1$)


	Monetary Regime				Fiscal Regime			
	$\mathcal{M}_t^M(Y)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^M(Y_R)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^M(C^R)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^M(C^H)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^F(Y)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^F(Y_R)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^F(C^R)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^F(C^H)$
Impact Multipliers	1.101	1.359	-0.216	5.513	3.660	4.558	2.311	8.410
2-Year Cumulative Multipliers	1.146	1.399	-0.186	5.577	5.872	7.068	4.373	10.986
4-Year Cumulative Multipliers	1.134	1.384	-0.198	5.562	6.195	7.446	4.683	11.357

Notes: This table shows the transfer multipliers for the models under monetary and fiscal regimes when $\psi_L = 0.1$. $\mathcal{M}_t^i(X)$ represent the cumulative transfer multiplier of variable X at t -horizon under i regime. We report impact multipliers, 2-year, and 4-year cumulative multipliers when government distributes transfers equally over 6 months.

Appendix Table B.4: Transfer Multipliers Comparison (Transfer Duration: $k = 3$)


	Monetary Regime				Fiscal Regime			
	$\mathcal{M}_t^M(Y)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^M(Y_R)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^M(C^R)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^M(C^H)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^F(Y)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^F(Y_R)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^F(C^R)$	$\mathcal{M}_t^F(C^H)$
<i>Panel A: Baseline Model</i>								
Impact Multipliers	1.092	1.348	-0.225	5.503	3.626	4.517	2.277	8.372
2-Year Cumulative Multipliers	1.041	1.275	-0.286	5.456	6.181	7.430	4.670	11.341
4-Year Cumulative Multipliers	1.003	1.231	-0.323	5.412	6.553	7.863	5.024	11.767
<i>Panel B: Baseline with Half-Sized Shocks</i>								
Impact Multipliers	0.996	1.197	-0.337	5.406	2.429	2.933	1.054	7.042
2-Year Cumulative Multipliers	0.995	1.191	-0.334	5.410	3.700	4.395	2.253	8.511
4-Year Cumulative Multipliers	0.950	1.139	-0.386	5.358	3.890	4.617	2.434	8.730
<i>Panel B: Baseline with One-Fourth-Sized Shocks</i>								
Impact Multipliers	0.663	0.785	-0.667	5.031	1.790	2.130	0.418	6.323
2-Year Cumulative Multipliers	0.870	1.029	-0.470	5.271	2.490	2.938	1.081	7.129
4-Year Cumulative Multipliers	0.812	0.962	-0.526	5.204	2.583	3.047	1.170	7.236
<i>Panel D: Without Preference Shocks</i>								
Impact Multipliers	0.584	0.741	-0.729	4.939	3.854	4.942	2.487	8.687
2-Year Cumulative Multipliers	0.586	0.765	-0.734	4.955	2.152	2.766	0.800	6.753
4-Year Cumulative Multipliers	0.502	0.667	-0.815	4.858	2.259	2.892	0.903	6.876
<i>Panel E: Without Preference and HTM-Sector Demand Shocks</i>								
Impact Multipliers	0.660	0.820	-0.682	5.052	4.700	5.921	3.125	9.854
2-Year Cumulative Multipliers	0.690	0.886	-0.657	5.100	2.401	3.035	0.957	7.129
4-Year Cumulative Multipliers	0.611	0.793	-0.733	5.009	2.549	3.209	1.098	7.299
<i>Panel F: Without Covid Shocks under sticky price</i>								
Impact Multipliers	0.742	0.867	-0.597	5.125	1.488	1.743	0.115	5.984
2-Year Cumulative Multipliers	1.007	1.178	-0.344	5.430	1.474	1.725	0.101	5.967
4-Year Cumulative Multipliers	0.96	1.123	-0.389	5.376	1.475	1.727	0.103	5.968
<i>Panel G: Without Covid Shocks under flexible price</i>								
Impact Multipliers	0.465	0.543	-0.861	4.807	0.465	0.543	-0.861	4.807
2-Year Cumulative Multipliers	0.214	0.251	-1.101	4.520	0.465	0.543	-0.861	4.807
4-Year Cumulative Multipliers	0.095	0.111	-1.215	4.383	0.465	0.543	-0.861	4.807

Notes: This table shows the transfer multipliers without Covid shocks under different regimes (monetary and fiscal regimes). $\mathcal{M}_t^i(X)$ represent the cumulative transfer multiplier of variable X at t -horizon under i regime. We set the duration of transfer distribution to be 6 months ($k = 3$).



Appendix Figure B.1: Redistribution Policy with Different Policy Regimes ($\varepsilon = 1.2$)

Notes: This figure shows dynamics of key variables in response to the Covid shocks under different regimes when $\varepsilon = 1.2$. Blue solid lines represent the baseline model under the monetary regime without transfers and red dashed lines represent the model under the fiscal regime without transfers. Green dotted lines represent the model dynamics under the monetary regime with transfers and orange dashed lines represent the model dynamics under the without transfers short-run welfare gains for the models under the fiscal regime with transfers.



Appendix Figure B.2: Redistribution Policy with Different Policy Regimes ($\psi_L = 0.1$)

Notes: This figure shows dynamics of key variables in response to the Covid shocks under different regimes when $\psi_L = 0.1$. Blue solid lines represent the baseline model under the monetary regime without transfers and red dashed lines represent the model under the fiscal regime without transfers. Green dotted lines represent the model dynamics under the monetary regime with transfers and orange dashed lines represent the model dynamics under the without transfers short-run welfare gains for the models under the fiscal regime with transfers.