Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago

Speculative Runs on Interest Rate Pegs The Frictionless Case

Marco Bassetto and Christopher Phelan

WP 2012-16

Speculative Runs on Interest Rate Pegs
The Frictionless Case*

Marco Bassetto† and Christopher Phelan‡

Abstract

In this paper we show that *interest rate rules* lead to multiple equilibria when the central bank faces a limit to its ability to print money, or when private agents are limited in the amount of bonds that can be pledged to the central bank in exchange for money. Some of the equilibria are familiar and common to the environments where limits to money growth are not considered. However, new equilibria emerge, where money growth and inflation are higher. These equilibria involve a run on the central bank's interest target: households borrow as much as possible from the central bank, and the shadow interest rate in the private market is different from the policy target.

1 Introduction

Until the last couple of years, most central banks around the world conducted monetary policy by setting targets for short-term interest rates, and letting the quantity of money adjust in response to demand. Maneuvering interest rates as a way to achieve low and stable inflation is now regarded as a success story. Yet this was not always the case. As mentioned by Sargent [8],

*For valuable suggestions, we thank Fernando Alvarez, Gadi Barlevy, Robert Barsky, Mariacristina De Nardi, Robert E. Lucas, Jr., and Thomas J. Sargent. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago or the Federal Reserve System.

†Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago

‡University of Minnesota and Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis

the German Reichsbank also discounted treasury and commercial bills at fixed nominal interest rates in 1923; but, rather than contributing to stabilizing the value of the mark, the policy added fuel to the hyperinflation by causing the Reichsbank to greatly increase the money supply and transferring this money to the government and to those private entities lucky enough to borrow from the Reichsbank at the official discount rate. In our paper, we study the extent to which setting a short-term interest rate can be used as a way of implementing a unique equilibrium in a monetary economy.

We start our analysis in a simple environment where both the central bank and Treasury trade with all agents in the economy in every period and prices are flexible. In this setup, we consider the properties of an interest rate rule, whereby the central bank sets a price at which private agents are free to trade currency for one-period debt; this price need not be fixed, but rather may depend in arbitrary ways on all the information that the central bank has at the moment it makes its decision. We show that setting a policy rate in this way leads to multiple equilibria when the central bank faces a limit to its ability to print money, or when private agents are limited in the amount of bonds that can be pledged to the central bank in exchange for money. Some of the equilibria are familiar and common to the environments where limits to money growth are not considered. However, new equilibria emerge, where money growth and inflation are higher. These equilibria involve a run on the central bank's interest target: households borrow as much as possible from the central bank, and the shadow interest rate in the private market is different from the policy target.

To the extent that monetary policy is primarily conducted by open market operations that exchange money for government bonds (or government-backed bonds), fiscal policy plays a prominent role in defining the characteristics of equilibria that feature runs. This happens because the amount of bonds held by the private sector determines the size of the run in the event of a run. This is a new channel by which excessive deficits threaten price stability, and is independent of the familiar unpleasant monetarist arithmetic of Sargent and Wallace [9] and the fiscal theory of the price level (Leeper [6], Sims [10], Woodford [11]). In fact, we deliberately rule out these alternative channels of monetary-fiscal interaction by postulating fiscal rules that ensure long-term budget balance independently of the path of inflation.

Our research implies that interest-rate targets are an incomplete description of the way modern central banks have succeeded in establishing low and stable inflation, and suggests a new role for the "twin-pillar" doctrine of paying attention to monetary aggregates (both broad and narrow) as well as interest rates in designing appropriate monetary policy rules.[1]

2 The basic cash-in-advance model

Consider a version of the cash-in-advance model. There are a continuum of households of unit mass and a government/monetary authority. Time is discrete with dates $t \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$. In each period, the timing is as follows: First, households pay lump sum nominal taxes T_t levied by the government and asset markets open. In these asset markets, households can buy (or sell) government bonds, acquire money, as well as trade zero-net supply securities with other households. At this same time, the government can print and destroy money, borrow and lend.

After the asset markets, a goods market opens. In the goods market, households produce the consumption good using their own labor for the use of other households (but, as usual, not their own household) and the government. Each household has one unit of time and a constant-returns-to-scale technology that converts units of time into units of the consumption good one for one. Households use money to purchase units of the consumption good produced by other households. The government uses either money or bonds (it is immaterial which) to purchase $G_t = \overline{G} \in (0, 1)$ units of the consumption good.

Let M_t denote the amount of money in circulation at the end of the asset market in period t, after taxes are paid. Let B_{t-1} be the nominal amount of government bonds payable at date t. (If $B_{t-1} < 0$ this implies households have agreed to pay the government B_{t-1} dollars at date t.) The households start with initial nominal claims W_{-1} against the government.[2]

Consider a price sequence $\{P_t, R_t, \hat{R}_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$, where P_t is the nominal price of a unit of the consumption good at date t, R_t is the nominal risk-free rate between period t and $t+1$ at which

[1] For a discussion of the twin-pillar doctrine, see Lucas [7].

[2] These claims represent money and maturing bonds, before paying period 0 taxes.

the government trades with private agents, and $\hat{R}_t$ is the rate at which households trade with each other. A government policy $\{T_t, M_t, B_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ is said to be feasible given $\{P_t, R_t, \hat{R}_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ if for all $t > 0$

$$B_t = (1 + R_t)\Big[P_{t-1}\overline{G} - T_t - M_t + M_{t-1} + B_{t-1}\Big], \tag{1}$$

with the initial condition

$$B_0 = (1 + R_0)[W_{-1} - M_0 - T_0]. \tag{2}$$

In what follows, we use lower-case letters to indicate individual household choices and upper-case variables to indicate aggregates: as an example, m_t are individual money holdings, and M_t are aggregate money holdings. In equilibrium, lower and upper-case variables will coincide, since we consider a representative household.

Households are subject to a cash-in-advance constraint: their consumption must be purchased with money. A household's path is given by $\{c_t, y_t, \hat{b}_t, b_t, m_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$, where $\hat{b}_t$ are holdings of privately-issued bonds maturing in period $t+1$.[3] In addition, households are potentially constrained in their holdings of government securities to a set $\mathcal{B}_t$. We will first explore the case in which $\mathcal{B}_t$ is the entire real line, and we will then explore the implications of setting a limit to private indebtedness against the government.

A household path is feasible if for all $t > 0$

$$\frac{\hat{b}_t}{1 + \hat{R}_t} + \frac{b_t}{1 + R_t} = P_{t-1}(y_{t-1} - c_{t-1}) - T_t - m_t + m_{t-1} + \hat{b}_{t-1} + b_{t-1}, \tag{3}$$

$$m_t \geq P_t c_t, \tag{4}$$

together with the initial condition

$$\frac{\hat{b}_0}{1 + \hat{R}_0} + \frac{b_0}{1 + R_0} = W_{-1} - m_0 - T_0 \tag{5}$$

and the no-Ponzi condition

$$\begin{aligned}&\hat{b}_t + b_t \geq \underline{A}_{t+1} := -P_t - m_t + T_{t+1} + \\ &\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\left\{\left(\prod_{v=1}^{j}\frac{1}{1+\hat{R}_{t+v}}\right)\left[T_{t+j+1} - P_{t+j} - \max_{\hat{b}\in\mathcal{B}_t}[\hat{b}\left(\frac{1}{1+\hat{R}_{t+j}} - \frac{1}{1+R_{t+j}}\right)]\right]\right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

[3] In equilibrium, $\hat{b}_t \equiv 0$.

Equation (6) imposes that households cannot borrow more than the present value of working 1 unit of time while consuming nothing, holding no money in every period after t, and maximally exploiting any price discrepancy between government-issued and private securities. This present value is evaluated at the sequence of intertemporal prices $\{\hat{R}_s\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$.

When $\mathcal{B}_t = \mathbb{R}$, a no-arbitrage condition will ensure $\hat{R}_{t+j} = R_{t+j}$, making the corresponding term disappear from (6). When limits to household indebtedness against the government are present, we will study equilibria where government securities have a different price than equivalent privately-issued securities, in which case household can profit from the mispricing (at the expense of the government), and the corresponding profits are part of their budget resources.[4] Facing prices $\{P_t, R_t, \hat{R}_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$, tax policy $\{T_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$, and given initial nominal wealth, a household's problem is to choose $\{c_t, y_t, \hat{b}_t, b_t, m_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ to solve

$$\max \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(c_t, y_t) \tag{7}$$

subject to (3), (4), (5), (6), and $b_t \in \mathcal{B}_t$. We assume that u is continuously differentiable, that both consumption and leisure are normal goods, and that the following conditions hold:

$$\lim_{c \to 0} u_c(c, y) = \infty \quad \forall\ y > 0, \quad \lim_{y \to 1} u_y(c, y) = -\infty \quad \forall\ c > 0, \tag{8}$$

and

$$\forall\ y > 0\ \exists\ \underline{u}_y(y) > 0 : |u_y(c, y)| > \underline{u}_y(y) \quad \forall\ c \geq 0. \tag{9}$$

Equation (8) is a standard Inada condition; it will ensure an interior solution to our problem. Equation (9) imposes that the marginal disutility of labor is bounded away from zero in equilibria in which production is also bounded away from zero.

3 An interest rate policy

In this section, we construct equilibria for an economy in which the government/monetary authority sets an interest rate rule, without imposing limits to household trades with the central

[4] Of course, in equilibrium the aggregate profits of the households from this activity are matched by lump-sum taxes that the government has to impose, so that in the aggregate this limited arbitrage opportunity is a zero-sum game.

bank. In particular, suppose the central bank offers to buy or sell any amount of promises to pay \$1 at date $t+1$ for $1/(1+R_t) < 1$ dollars at date t.[5] This interest rate R_t can be an arbitrary function of past history, and $\mathcal{B}_t = \mathbb{R}$.

We suppose that the government sets a "Ricardian" fiscal rule, i.e., a rule such that the set of equilibrium price levels is not restricted by the requirement of the present-value budget constraint of the government. We choose such a fiscal policy because we are interested in the set of equilibria that can arise when money is not directly backed by tax revenues, as it happens when the fiscal theory of the price level holds. We will specify a class of fiscal rules that satisfies sufficient conditions for this requirement below.

An equilibrium is then a sequence $\{P_t, \hat{R}_t, R_t, T_t, C_t, Y_t, \hat{B}_t, B_t, M_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ such that $\{C_t, Y_t, \hat{B}_t, B_t, M_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ solves the household's problem taking $\{P_t, \hat{R}_t, R_t, T_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ as given, and such that markets clear for all $t \geq 0$:

$$C_t = Y_t - \overline{G} \tag{10}$$

and

$$\hat{B}_t = 0. \tag{11}$$

In order for the household problem to have a finite solution, it is necessary that the prices of government and private assets be the same:

$$\hat{R}_t = R_t. \tag{12}$$

When (12) fails, households can exploit the difference in price to make infinite profits. In addition to (6) and (12), necessary and sufficient conditions from the household optimization problem yield the following conditions for all $t \geq 0$:

$$-\frac{u_y(C_t, Y_t)}{u_c(C_t, Y_t)} = \frac{1}{1+\hat{R}_t}, \tag{13}$$

$$\frac{u_y(C_{t+1}, Y_{t+1})}{u_y(C_t, Y_t)} = \frac{1}{\beta(1+\hat{R}_{t+1})} \frac{P_{t+1}}{P_t}, \tag{14}$$

$$M_t/P_t = C_t, \tag{15}$$

[5] We assume that nominal interest rates remain strictly positive ($R_t > 0$). This greatly simplifies the analysis, since the cash-in-advance constraint will always be binding, but it does not play an essential role in our analysis.

and the transversality condition

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\left[\left(\prod_{j=0}^{t}\frac{1}{1+\hat{R}_j}\right)(\hat{B}_t+B_t-\underline{A}_{t+1})\right]=0. \tag{16}$$

Substituting (10) and (12) into (13), we obtain

$$-\frac{u_y(C_t,C_t+\overline{G})}{u_c(C_t,C_t+\overline{G})}=\frac{1}{1+R_t}. \tag{17}$$

We now turn to constructing equilibria. The initial price level, P_0, is not determined. For each initial price P_0, one can use the interest rate rule R_t and equations (1), (2), (10), (14), (15), and (17) to sequentially solve for a *unique* candidate equilibrium allocation and price system.[6] That is, given R_0, the fiscal policy rule determines T_0, equation (17) solves for C_0 and equation (10) then implies Y_0 and equation (15) implies M_0. Finally, equation (2) determines B_0. With all time-0 variables now determined, the monetary policy rule determines R_1, which by no arbitrage is equal to $\hat{R}_1$ when $\mathcal{B}=\mathbb{R}$. As in period 0, equation (17) solves then for C_1 and equation (10) for Y_1. Knowing C_1 and Y_1, equation (14) can be solved for P_1, and equation (15) for M_1. Equation (1) then yields B_1, and from there the process continues to period 2 and on.

To verify whether the candidate equilibrium allocation and price system we derived above is an equilibrium, we need only to check that the household transversality and no-Ponzi conditions (6) and (16) hold. To this end, we first restrict fiscal policy to a (broad) class which ensures the policy is Ricardian, and second, we make the following assumption:

Assumption 1 $\exists\ \overline{R} : R_t \leq \overline{R}$.

Assumption 1 imposes an upper bound on nominal interest rates. The appendix studies more general cases where Assumption 1 is not necessary; in those cases, it may not be possible to find equilibria with a perfectly anticipated run on the central bank's interest rate peg, such as the one we will study in section 4, but there will instead be equilibria where runs occur with positive probability.

[6] The Inada condition and the assumptions of normal goods ensure that an interior solution can be found and that (17) is strictly monotone in C_t. In our analysis, we do not rule out explosive paths, for the reasons highlighted in Cochrane [3].

The role of Assumption 1 is to ensure that the amount of seigniorage revenues that the government can raise remains bounded, which (together with the path of fiscal policy specified below) ensures that the household budget constraint is well specified.

As a specific example of Ricardian fiscal policy, we assume T_t satisfies

Assumption 2 *There exist finite* $\overline{B} > 0$ *and* $\overline{T}$ *such that*

- *if* $B_{t-1} \in [-\overline{B}P_{t-1}, \overline{B}P_{t-1}]$, T_t *is unrestricted except* $|T_t|P_{t-1} \leq \overline{T}$,
- *if* $B_{t-1} > \overline{B}P_{t-1}$, $T_t \in [\alpha B_{t-1}, B_{t-1}]$, *and*
- *if* $B_{t-1} < -\overline{B}P_{t-1}$, $T_t \in [-B_{t-1}, -\alpha B_{t-1}]$.

Essentially, we require that if real debt is neither too high nor too low, taxes may be any function of past information subject only to a uniform bound in real terms. But when real debt exceeds a threshold (in absolute value), taxes cover at least a fraction α of debt, putting the brakes to a debt spiral.

We relegate the proof that (6) and (16) hold (and thus the candidate equilibrium is an equilibrium) to the appendix.

In the construction we just completed, P_0 is indeterminate, but once a value of P_0 is specified, there exists a unique equilibrium allocation and price system. Moreover, whenever the nominal rate set by the central bank is low, so is inflation. In particular, if $R_t = \frac{1}{\beta} - 1$ for all $t \geq 0$, then inflation is exactly zero in all periods.

The appendix considers a more general case, in which uncertainty is present and sunspot equilibria may arise (particularly if assumption 1 is retained). But, even in that case, a low official interest rate translates into a limit on expected inflation. Moreover, if a bound on deflation is imposed, a law of large numbers implies that average inflation in the limit will be low as long as the central bank keeps a commitment to low interest rates. (And again, if $R_t = \frac{1}{\beta} - 1$ for all $t \geq 0$, then average inflation in the limit is exactly zero with probability one.)

In the next section, we show that a very different type of equilibrium emerges when households are not allowed to borrow unlimited funds from the central bank. In these equilibria, a low interest rate set by the central bank may well lead to high inflation instead.

4 Limits to Central Bank Lending

Suppose now we impose the additional constraint on the households that $B_t \geq 0$, $t \geq 0$: households are not allowed to borrow from the government/central bank (or, equivalently, they are allowed to borrow from the central bank only by posting government bonds as collateral). That the borrowing limit be precisely zero is not central to our analysis, but simplifies exposition somewhat. In this section, we construct additional deterministic equilibria which do not exist when $\mathcal{B}_t = \mathbb{R}$.

With the no-borrowing limit we just imposed, the official rate R_t only becomes a lower bound for the private-sector rate $\hat{R}_t$. When households are at the borrowing limit with the central bank, private nominal interest rates may exceed the official rate. The no-arbitrage condition (12) becomes

$$\hat{R}_t \geq R_t, \quad B_t > 0 \Longrightarrow \hat{R}_t = R_t. \tag{18}$$

All other equilibrium conditions remain the same, except that the private rate $\hat{R}_t$ replaces the government rate R_t in equation (17):

$$-\frac{u_y(C_t, C_t + \overline{G})}{u_c(C_t, C_t + \overline{G})} = \frac{1}{1 + \hat{R}_t}. \tag{19}$$

The allocation of section 3 remains part of an equilibrium even when the central bank limits its lending, provided that households have nonnegative bond holdings in all periods. For a given sequence of prices, interest rates, consumption and work levels, household holdings of government debt in this equilibrium depend on the sequence of taxes. Government debt will be strictly positive in each period $t > 0$ if and only if the following condition is satisfied:

$$\frac{T_t}{P_{t-1}} < \overline{G} + \frac{B_{t-1}}{P_{t-1}} + \frac{M_{t-1}}{P_{t-1}} - \frac{\beta \hat{c}(R_t)(1 + R_t)\hat{u}_y(R_t)}{\hat{u}_y(R_{t-1})}, \tag{20}$$

where $\hat{c}(R)$ is the consumption implied by equation (19) when $\hat{R}_t = R$ and $\hat{u}_y(R) := u_y(\hat{c}(R), \overline{G} + \hat{c}(R))$. It is straightforward to see that there are fiscal rules that satisfy (20) and Assumption 2.[7] We assume that fiscal policy is run by one such rule.

[7] As an example, choose $T_t = (1-\alpha)(B_{t-1}/P_{t-1}) + \hat{T}_t$, with $\hat{T}_t < P_{t-1}\overline{G} - M_{t-1} - \frac{P_{t-1}\beta\hat{c}(0)(1+\overline{R})\hat{u}_y(\overline{R})}{\hat{u}_y(0)}$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

In period 0, government debt will be nonnegative if

$$T_0 \leq W_{-1} - \hat{c}(R_0)P_0. \tag{21}$$

An interior equilibrium will only exist if

$$T_0 < W_{-1}, \tag{22}$$

which we will assume. While P_0 can take any positive value in section 3, now equation (21) imposes a ceiling.

4.1 Additional Equilbria: A Single Run

The simplest equilibrium that may arise when a limit to private indebtedness is introduced is a run on government debt where $B_s = 0$ for a single date $s > 0$. We now provide conditions under which such an equilibrium exists.

Assumption 3 *Define*

$$\overline{u}_y := \max_{R \in [0, \overline{R}]} \hat{c}(R)(1+R)|\hat{u}_y(R)|.$$

We assume that fiscal policy satisfies the following stronger version of (20):[8]

$$\frac{T_t}{P_{t-1}} < \overline{G} + \frac{B_{t-1}}{P_{t-1}} + \frac{M_{t-1}}{P_{t-1}} - \frac{\beta \overline{u}_y}{\underline{u}_y(\overline{G})}. \tag{23}$$

Equation (20) guarantees that in each period there are positive bonds that can be converted into money and initiate a speculative run. The stronger condition (23) ensures that, *after* a period in which a run occurred and thus previous government debt was monetized, there are enough new bonds for the economy to return to a path where households hold positive amounts of government debt and equation (14) holds.

Proposition 1 *Let* $\{P_t, \hat{R}_t, R_t, T_t, C_t, Y_t, \hat{B}_t, B_t, M_t\}_{t=0}^{s-1}$ *be determined as in the equilibrium of section 3, with* P_0 *satisfying (21), and let fiscal policy satisfy Assumption 2. A necessary and*

[8]Once again, existence of such a rule is shown by the following example: choose $T_t = (1-\alpha)(B_{t-1}/P_{t-1}) + \hat{T}_t$, with $\hat{T}_t < P_{t-1}\overline{G} - M_{t-1} - \frac{\beta P_{t-1}\hat{c}(0)(1+\overline{R})\hat{u}_y(\overline{R})}{\hat{u}_y(0)-\epsilon}$, $\epsilon < \hat{u}_y(0)$ and $\alpha \in (0,1)$.

sufficient condition for the existence of a different (deterministic) equilibrium in which $B_s = 0$ is that the following equation admits a solution for $\hat{R}_s > R_s$:

$$\beta \hat{u}_y(\hat{R}_s)(1+\hat{R}_s)\hat{c}(\hat{R}_s)\left(\frac{P_{s-1}}{M_{s-1}+B_{s-1}+P_{s-1}\overline{G}-T_s}\right) = \hat{u}_y(R_{s-1}). \tag{24}$$

A sufficient condition (based on preferences alone) for (24) to have a solution with $\hat{R}_s > R_s$ is

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} |\hat{u}_y(R)|(1+R)\hat{c}(R) \to \infty. \tag{25}$$

Proof: The proof works by construction. Starting from an arbitrary price level P_0 that satisfies (21), the equilibrium allocation, price system, and government policy are solved as in section 3 up to period $s-1$. Specifically, we use the interest rate rule R_t and the fiscal policy rule with equations (10), (14), (15), and (17) to sequentially solve for the unique candidate equilibrium allocation and price system.

In period s, in order for $\hat{R}_s > R_s$ to be an equilibrium, the constraint $B_s \geq 0$ must be binding, which implies

$$\frac{M_{s-1}+B_{s-1}}{P_{s-1}} + \overline{G} = \frac{T_s}{P_{s-1}} + \hat{c}(\hat{R}_s)\frac{P_s}{P_{s-1}}. \tag{26}$$

Furthermore, equations (14) and (19) require

$$\beta(1+\hat{R}_s)\hat{u}_y(\hat{R}_s)\frac{P_{s-1}}{P_s} = \hat{u}_y(R_{s-1}). \tag{27}$$

Substituting (26) into (27), we obtain (24), which is a single equation to be solved for $\hat{R}_s$. If this equation does not admit a solution for $\hat{R}_s > R_s$, then it is impossible to satisfy all of the necessary conditions for an equilibrium with $B_s = 0$. If a solution exists, then we can retrieve consumption in period s as $C_s = \hat{c}(\hat{R}_s)$ (the unique solution that satisfies equation (19)), and hence (by market clearing) $Y_s = C_s + \overline{G}$. We can then solve equation (26) for the candidate equilibrium level of P_s. Equation (20) ensures that the solution for P_s is strictly positive.

From period $s+1$ onwards, the allocation and price system is once again uniquely determined (sequentially) by the interest rate rule R_t, the fiscal policy rule, and equations (10), (14), (15), and (17). Equation (23) ensures that the resulting sequence for government debt is strictly positive. Once again, the proof that (6) and (16) hold is relegated to the general proof in the appendix.

Finally, to verify the sufficient condition (25), set $\hat{R}_s = R_s$. Equations (14) and (20) imply

$$\beta|\hat{u}_y(R_s)|(1+R_s)\hat{c}(R_s)\left(\frac{P_{s-1}}{M_{s-1}+B_{s-1}+P_{s-1}\overline{G}-T_s}\right) < |\hat{u}_y(R_{s-1})|. \tag{28}$$

Since $|\hat{u}_y(R)|(1+R)\hat{c}(R)$ is a continuous function of R, when equation (25) holds, equation (28) ensures the existence of a solution of (24) with $\hat{R}_s > R_s$. QED.

To be concrete, consider the following numerical example. Let the monetary authority set $R_t = \frac{1}{\beta} - 1$, where $\beta = 1/1.01$, for all t and all histories (and thus we can set $\overline{R} = \frac{1}{\beta} - 1$ as well.) Next, let $u(c_t, y_t) = \frac{c^{1-\sigma}}{1-\sigma} - y^{\psi}$, with $\sigma = 3$ and $\psi = 1.1$, and let $\overline{G} = .1$. Given these, equation (23) becomes

$$T_t < B_{t-1} + M_{t-1} - 1.12P_{t-1}. \tag{29}$$

Thus we assume $T_t = .5(B_{t-1} + M_{t-1}) - 1.12P_{t-1}$ which satisfies (29) whenever $B_{t-1} + M_{t-1} > 0$ (which holds throughout the example). Finally, assume $P_0 = 1$ and $W_{-1} = 2.57$.

Given these assumptions, one equilibrium of this economy is a steady state: In each period $t \geq 0$, $P_t = 1$, $C_t = M_t = .96$, $Y_t = 1.06$ and $B_t = 1.5$. And for the given P_0, when households have an unlimited ability to borrow from the government, this is the unique deterministic equilibrium.

Next suppose households face a restriction that $B_t \geq 0$ for all $t \geq 0$. Then, the following is a deterministic equilibrium for any date $s > 0$. In the first $s-1$ periods, all variables are equal to their values under the steady state equilibrium just defined. At date s, the run occurs. For the chosen parameters, if $B_s = 0$, then $P_s = 4.07$, $M_s = 2.46$, $C_s = .6$, $Y_s = .7$, and $\hat{R}_s = 3.28$. In all subsequent periods $t > s$, $\hat{R}_t = R_t$, $P_t = 4.24$, $M_t = 4.09$, and real variables C_t and Y_t return to their pre-run steady-state values. Government debt B_t then gradually approaches a new steady state from below, where B_t/P_t returns to its previous steady state value.

To see why this is an equilibrium, notice first that, when the run occurs, all government debt is converted into money; this largely increases the money supply. Furthermore, if a run occurs, then the private-sector interest rate $\hat{R}_t$ must be greater than the interest rate set by the central bank, which is constant at $1/\beta - 1$. The intratemporal optimality condition (19) implies that consumption decreases in period s when the run occurs. With consumption down and the money supply up, the price level must jump up so that the (binding) cash-in-advance constraint holds. Whether such a candidate allocation can be supported as an equilibrium depends on whether these changes can be made consistent with the household Euler equations for leisure and consumption, which are respectively (14) and

$$\frac{u_c(C_{t+1}, Y_{t+1})}{u_c(C_t, Y_t)} = \frac{1}{\beta(1+\hat{R}_t)} \frac{P_{t+1}}{P_t}. \tag{30}$$

Specifically, in order to have a perfectly anticipated run in period s (and not before), it must be the case that households are willing to lend to the government in period $s-1$ (i.e., $\hat{R}_{s-1} = R_{s-1}$) even though the nominal interest rate by the central bank is constant and expected inflation between period $s-1$ and period s is high. Since households expect a consumption drop between periods $s-1$ and s, this can be the case, but only if either the drop in consumption (and, by market clearing, in the labor supply) is very steep or the intertemporal elasticity of substitution of consumption is sufficiently low. Equation (19) implies that the consumption drop is steeper, the less curvature there is in the marginal disutility of labor and in the marginal utility of consumption. So, less curvature in $u_y(c, c+\overline{G})$ unambiguously helps in satisfying equation (30). Less curvature in $u_c(c, c+\overline{G})$ has an ambiguous effect, since (for given $\hat{R}_s$) it creates a bigger drop in consumption, but it also implies a greater intertemporal elasticity of consumption. The second effect turns out to be the relevant one, so that a perfectly anticipated run can happen when the curvature is low and hence the function $\hat{c}$ is not very responsive to R. From these observations, we can thus understand the role of assumption A2. We can also understand why a run can happen under much weaker assumptions if it occurs with probability smaller than one, as described in the appendix: in this case, the potentially negative effect of a run on the households' willingness to save between periods $s-1$ and s is tempered by the lower probability of the occurrence. In the limit, as the probability of a run goes to 0, households are content to save at the rate $1/\beta - 1$ between periods $s-1$ and s when the no-run allocation remains at the steady state throughout.

Next, we consider the other intertemporal choice that households face in their decision to save between periods $s-1$ and s, i.e., their labor supply. Because of the cash-in-advance timing, this decision is related to the household labor supply in periods $s-2$ and $s-1$, as shown by equation (14). Since the allocation and inflation are at the no-run steady state values in these two periods, the relevant Euler equation for leisure is automatically satisfied. For this reason, the intertemporal elasticity of substitution of leisure does not play the same role as the one of consumption in determining whether a perfectly anticipated run can occur.

Having discussed the economic forces that lead households to save between periods $s-1$ and s, we next consider the elements that pertain to the private-market interest rate between periods s and $s+1$, in the period of the run. This time, it is simpler to start from the Euler equation for labor, equation (14). The relevant margin of choice for households is their labor supply in period $s-1$ (paid in period s) vs. period s. Here, it is straightforward to see why households optimally choose not to invest in government bonds in period s at the nominal rate $1/\beta-1$. First, the nominal wage (which is equal to the price level) increases from period $s-1$ to period s, which yields an incentive to postpone labor when the nominal interest rate does not adjust correspondingly. Second, the equilibrium features actually a lower labor supply in period s than in period $s-1$, providing a further incentive not to save in period $s-1$ and to postpone work. Both of these channels imply that the interest rate offered by the government within the equilibrium allocation is too low for households to be willing to lend to the government, and that the private-market interest rate that justifies the labor decision is instead higher. Similarly, on the consumption side (where the relevant margin is once again shifted one period forward), households look forward to an increase in consumption between periods s and $s+1$, and hence they require a higher real interest rate to be willing to save than the one offered by the government. This is particularly true because further inflation occurs between periods s and $s+1$, as we establish next, in our discussion of how the run ends.

After the run ends, households resume lending to the government at the rate $R_{s+1}=1/\beta-1$ in period $s+1$. With a fixed nominal interest rate, inflation between period s and $s+1$ must adjust so that households find it optimal to increase their labor supply between the crisis period s and the return to normalcy in period $s+1$. By equation (14), this requires further inflation between periods s and $s+1$. The increase in both prices and production (and consumption) between periods s and $s+1$ implies that money supply must also grow. Since the crisis wiped out government debt, households cannot acquire this additional money by selling government debt. While part of the money can be acquired through the sales of output to the government in period s, a crisis will also require that fiscal policy generates new nominal liabilities through a tax cut at the beginning of period $s+1$, as implied by Assumption 3.

From that point onward, output and consumption return to their pre-run steady state, while government debt (in real terms) converges back to the steady state gradually.

4.1.1 The importance of fiscal policy

Note that, when we restrict discussion to Ricardian fiscal policies and equilibria without borrowing limits, fiscal policy is irrelevant in determining equilibrium consumption and labor levels. (In fact, this is the entire point of Ricardian equivalence.) For run equilibria, this is no longer the case. To see this, consider the run equilibria of the previous section, but with a different tax policy. In particular, instead of $T_t = .5(B_{t-1} + M_{t-1}) - 1.12P_{t-1}$, let $T_t = .6(B_{t-1} + M_{t-1}) - 1.12P_{t-1}$. This leaves consumption and output unchanged in the no-run equilibrium, but decreases the steady state level of debt from 1.5 to 1.09. Now, at date s (when the run occurs), $B_s = 0$ (as before), but since B_{s-1} is now lower, there is less debt to convert into money, and thus the money rises less from period $s-1$ to period s. In this new example, P_s rises from 1 to 3.08 (instead of rising to 4.08), M_s rises from .96 to 2.04 (instead of rising to 2.46), C_s falls from .96 to .66 (instead of falling to $C_s = .6$), and $\hat{R}_s$ rises to 2.22 instead of rising to 3.28. Overall, that the increase in the money supply is smaller due to the smaller date $s-1$ debt causes smaller **real** effects (on consumption and output) from the run.

4.2 Other Equilibria

By repeating the steps outlined in section 4.1, it is easy to construct equilibria in which runs occur repeatedly, and it is also possible to construct equilibria in which runs last for more than one period. The conditions under which such equilibria exist are similar to those for a single run (in particular, Assumptions 1, 2, and 3 are sufficient conditions). In more general cases, the appendix considers stochastic equilibria, where runs can emerge with probability less than 1.

In the simple setup that we described, a run on an interest peg triggers immediate monetization of all of the government debt. This may be a good description of the experience of the Reichsbank during the German hyperinflation, but it is unlikely that a run would suddenly appear in this form in an economy that has previously experienced stable inflation and macroeconomic conditions. In practice, the unfolding of a run would be slowed by a number of frictions that may prevent households from immediately demanding cash for all of their government bond holdings; these frictions may take the form of limited participation in bond markets (see e.g. Grossman and Weiss [5], Alvarez and Atkeson [1], and Alvarez, Atkeson, and Edmond [2]), noisy information about other households' behavior, or the presence of long-term bonds whose price is not pegged by the central bank.

5 Discussion

In this paper, we have shown that considering *bounds* on open market operations may be crucial in determining the size of the set of monetary equilibria under interest rate rules. Policies which have unique equilibria in environments with no bounds may instead have many new equilibria when bounds are introduced. The particular bound we studied was on the size of privately held government debt – we assumed it must not be negative.

Suppose instead we had assumed that if a run is seen as occurring, the monetary authority stops it by not letting, say, government debt fall below 90% of its previous value. That is, the central bank abandons the interest rate peg at that point. Then, of course, it is impossible for debt to go to zero in one period as in our examples. On the other hand, the same logic as our examples still holds, except that the lower bound on debt is no longer zero, but 90% of its previous value. What causes these additional equilibria is the existence of the bounds themselves, not their particular values.

These questions are particularly important in the wake of quantitative easing. In our model, we do not distinguish between the monetary authority and the fiscal authority. In our run equilibrium, in essence, the monetary authority monetizes the debt. If that monetary authority proposed to limit such a run by not letting debt fall below 90% of its previous value, it could do this by simply not buying government debt at some point. With quantitative easing, however, central banks *themselves* now owe large debts to private institutions in the form of excess bank reserves. We interpret excess reserves in our model to be part of B_t, not M_t, since in equilibrium they must pay the market rate of interest. While a central bank can refuse to turn government debt into cash by simply not purchasing it, it is unclear to us how a central bank can refuse to turn excess reserves into cash without explicitly or implicitly defaulting. Thus the dangers we outline in this paper may be more relevant now than ever.

A Analysis of the General Stochastic Case

A.1 The Environment with Sunspots

We modify the environment described in section 2 by introducing a sunspot variable s_t in each period. Without loss of generality, s_t is i.i.d. with a uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$. Its realization at time t is observed before any action takes place. All variables with a time-t subscript are allowed to be conditional on the history of sunspot realizations $\{s_j\}_{j=1}^t$.

We assume that the government only trades in one-period risk-free debt, but we allow the households to trade state-contingent assets, and we denote by a_{t+1} the amount of nominal claims that a household purchases in period t maturing in period $t + 1$ (conditional on the sunspot realization s_{t+1}). Without uncertainty, $a_{t+1} \equiv \hat{b}_t$. Equation (3) is thus replaced by

$$E_t[a_{t+1}Q_{t+1}] + \frac{b_t}{1 + R_t} = P_{t-1}(y_{t-1} - c_{t-1}) - T_t - m_t + m_{t-1} + a_t + b_{t-1}, \tag{31}$$

where Q_{t+1} is the stochastic discount factor of the economy. For the later analysis, it is convenient to define $\hat{R}_t := 1/E_tQ_{t+1} - 1$. This definition is consistent with the notation that we used in the main text for the deterministic case: $\hat{R}_t$ is the one-period nominal risk-free rate in the market for private credit.

In period 0, the household budget constraint becomes

$$E_0[a_1Q_1] + \frac{b_0}{1 + R_0} = W_{-1} - m_0 - T_0. \tag{32}$$

The no-Ponzi condition (6) generalizes to

$$a_{t+1} + b_t \geq \underline{A}_{t+1} := -P_t - m_t + T_{t+1} +$$
$$E_{t+1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \left(\prod_{v=1}^{j} Q_{t+v+1} \right) \left[T_{t+j+1} - P_{t+j} - \max_{\hat{b} \in \mathcal{B}_t} [\hat{b} \left(E_{t+j} Q_{t+j+1} - \frac{1}{1 + R_{t+j}} \right)] \right] \right\}. \tag{33}$$

With these changes, an equilibrium is defined as in section 3; the market-clearing condition (11) becomes

$$A_{t+1} = 0. \tag{34}$$

The conditions characterizing an equilibrium are given by (10), (15), (19), (34), the stochastic Euler equation

$$\frac{u_y(C_{t+1}, Y_{t+1})}{u_y(C_t, Y_t)} = \frac{Q_{t+1}(1 + \hat{R}_t)}{\beta(1 + \hat{R}_{t+1})} \frac{P_{t+1}}{P_t}, \tag{35}$$

the transversality condition, which in the stochastic case becomes[9]

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} E_0 \left[\left(\prod_{j=1}^{t+1} Q_j \right) (A_{t+1} + B_t - \underline{A}_{t+1}) \right] = 0, \tag{36}$$

and finally the no-arbitrage condition for interest rates. This last condition states $\hat{R}_t = R_t$ when $\mathcal{B} = \mathbb{R}$ and (18) when $B_t \geq 0$ is imposed.

In the main text, we adopted Assumption 1 to ensure that seigniorage revenues remain bounded and hence that the present-value budget constraint of the households is well defined. When Assumption 1 is violated, such as in the case of Taylor rules that have no upper bound on the interest rate, an alternative (sufficient) condition that we can adopt is given by

Assumption 4

$$\lim_{R \to \infty} \hat{c}(R)(1 + R) = 0. \tag{37}$$

Notice that Assumption 4 is incompatible with the sufficient condition (25) in Proposition 1. When Assumption 4 is adopted, often perfectly anticipated runs will fail to exist (but probabilistic runs will continue to occur).

[9]See [4].

A.2 Verification of the Transversality and no-Ponzi conditions

Proposition 2 *Let a sequence* $\{P_t, Q_{t+1}, T_t, R_t, C_t, Y_t, A_{t+1}, B_t, M_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ *satisfy equations (10), (11), (15), (19), (31), (32),and (35), and let fiscal policy satisfy Assumption 2. Assume also that either Assumption 1 or Assumption 4 holds. Then equations (33) and (36) hold.*

We prove this proposition in 3 steps. First, we prove that $\underline{A}_{t+1}$, as defined in (33), is well defined. Second, we prove that (36) holds, and finally that (33) holds.

A.2.1 $\underline{A}_{t+1}$ is well defined.

We work backwards on the individual components of the sum defining $\underline{A}_{t+1}$ in equation (33). From (18) we obtain[10]

$$\max_{\hat{b}\in\mathcal{B}_t}[\hat{b}\left(E_{t+j}Q_{t+j+1} - \frac{1}{1+R_{t+j}}\right)] = 0. \tag{38}$$

Next, use (35) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
&E_{t+1}\left\{\Big(\prod_{v=1}^{j}Q_{t+v+1}\Big)P_{t+j}\right\} \leq \hat{u}_y(0)E_{t+1}\left\{\Big(\prod_{v=1}^{j}Q_{t+v+1}\Big)\frac{P_{t+j}}{\hat{u}_y(\hat{R}_{t+j})}\right\} = \\
&\hat{u}_y(0)E_{t+1}\left\{\Big(\prod_{v=1}^{j-1}Q_{t+v+1}\Big)\frac{P_{t+j}}{\hat{u}_y(\hat{R}_{t+j})}E_{t+j}Q_{t+j+1}\right\} = \\
&\hat{u}_y(0)E_{t+1}\left\{\Big(\prod_{v=1}^{j-1}Q_{t+v+1}\Big)\frac{P_{t+j}}{\hat{u}_y(\hat{R}_{t+j})(1+\hat{R}_{t+j})}\right\} = \\
&\beta\hat{u}_y(0)E_{t+1}\left\{\Big(\prod_{v=1}^{j-2}Q_{t+v+1}\Big)\frac{P_{t+j-1}}{\hat{u}_y(\hat{R}_{t+j-1})(1+\hat{R}_{t+j-1})}\right\} = \\
&\beta^{j-1}\frac{\hat{u}_y(0)P_{t+1}}{\hat{u}_y(\hat{R}_{t+1})(1+\hat{R}_{t+1})}
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Equation (39) implies[11]

$$E_{t+1}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\left\{\Big(\prod_{v=1}^{j}Q_{t+v+1}\Big)P_{t+j}\right\} \leq \frac{\hat{u}_y(0)P_{t+1}}{\hat{u}_y(\hat{R}_{t+1})(1+\hat{R}_{t+1})(1-\beta)}, \tag{40}$$

[10] If the borrowing limit is not 0, the expression in (38) would not be 0, but it can be proven that $\underline{A}_{t+1}$ is nonetheless well defined.

[11] We can interchange the order of the sum and the expectations since all elements of the sum have the same sign.

which proves that the second piece of the infinite sum defining $\underline{A}_{t+1}$ is well defined. From Assumption 2, we have $|T_{t+j+1}| \leq \overline{T} P_{t+j} + |B_{t+j}|$, and so

$$\left| E_{t+1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \Big(\prod_{v=1}^{j} Q_{t+v+1} \Big) T_{t+j+1} \right\} \right| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} E_{t+1} \Big\{ \Big(\prod_{v=1}^{j} Q_{t+v+1} \Big) \Big[P_{t+j} \overline{T} + |B_{t+j}| \Big] \Big\}. \tag{41}$$

We analyze equation (41) in pieces. Using (40), we have

$$\overline{T} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} E_{t+1} \left\{ \Big(\prod_{v=1}^{j} Q_{t+v+1} \Big) P_{t+j} \right\} \leq \frac{\overline{T} \hat{u}_y(0) P_{t+1}}{\hat{u}_y(\hat{R}_{t+1})(1+\hat{R}_{t+1})(1-\beta)}. \tag{42}$$

To work on the sum of debt, notice first that equation (1) continues to hold even if we replace R_t by $\hat{R}_t$. This is because $B_t = 0$ in the periods and states of nature in which $\hat{R}_t > R_t$. If Assumption 1 is retained, define $\overline{S} := \max_{R \in [0, \overline{R}]} [\hat{c}(R)(1+R)]$; alternatively, if Assumption 4 is adopted instead, define $\overline{S} := \max_{R \in [0, \infty]} [\hat{c}(R)(1+R)]$. Finally, notice that Assumption 2 implies

$$|T_{t+j} - B_{t+j-1}| \leq P_{t+j-1}(\overline{T} + \overline{B}) + (1-\alpha)|B_{t+j-1}|. \tag{43}$$

We can then use (1), (15), (35), and (43) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{t+1} \left\{ \Big(\prod_{v=1}^{j} Q_{t+v+1} \Big) |B_{t+j}| \right\} = E_{t+1} \Big\{ \Big(\prod_{v=1}^{j-1} Q_{t+v+1} \Big) \Big| \Big[P_{t+j-1} \overline{G} - \\
& T_{t+j} + B_{t+j-1} + \hat{c}(\hat{R}_{t+j-1}) P_{t+j-1} - \hat{c}(\hat{R}_{t+j}) P_{t+j} \Big] \Big| \Big\} = \\
& E_{t+1} \Big\{ \Big(\prod_{v=1}^{j-1} Q_{t+v+1} \Big) \Big| \Big[P_{t+j-1} \overline{G} - T_{t+j} + B_{t+j-1} + \hat{c}(\hat{R}_{t+j-1}) P_{t+j-1} - \\
& \frac{\beta P_{t+j-1} \hat{c}(\hat{R}_{t+j})(1+\hat{R}_{t+j}) \hat{u}_y(\hat{R}_{t+j})}{\hat{u}_y(\hat{R}_{t+j-1})} \Big] \Big| \Big\} \leq \\
& E_{t+1} \Big\{ \Big(\prod_{v=1}^{j-1} Q_{t+v+1} \Big) \Big[\Big(\overline{G} + \overline{T} + \overline{B} + \frac{\beta \hat{u}_y(0) \overline{S}}{\hat{u}_y(\hat{R}_{t+j-1})} + \hat{c}(0) \Big) P_{t+j-1} + \\
& (1-\alpha) |B_{t+j-1}| \Big] \Big\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Using (39) and (44), we obtain (for $j > 1$)

$$\begin{aligned}
&E_{t+1}\left\{\left(\prod_{v=1}^{j} Q_{t+v+1}\right)|B_{t+j}|\right\} \leq E_{t+1}\Bigg\{\sum_{s=2}^{j}(1-\alpha)^{j-s}\Bigg[\Bigg(\prod_{v=1}^{s-1} Q_{t+v+1}\Bigg)\cdot \\
&\left[\left(\overline{G}+\overline{T}+\overline{B}+\frac{\beta \hat{u}_y(0)\overline{S}}{u_y(\hat{R}_{t+s-1})}+\hat{c}(0)\right)P_{t+s-1}\right]\Bigg]\Bigg\} + (1-\alpha)^{j-1}\frac{|B_{t+1}|}{1+\hat{R}_{t+1}} \leq \\
&\frac{\hat{u}_y(0)P_{t+1}\left(\overline{G}+\overline{T}+\overline{B}+\beta\overline{S}+\hat{c}(0)\right)}{\hat{u}_y(\hat{R}_{t+1})(1+\hat{R}_{t+1})}\sum_{s=2}^{j}\left[\beta^{s-2}(1-\alpha)^{j-s}\right] + (1-\alpha)^{j-1}\frac{|B_{t+1}|}{1+\hat{R}_{t+1}} = \\
&\frac{\hat{u}_y(0)P_{t+1}\left[(1-\alpha)^{j-1}-\beta^{j-1}\right]\left(\overline{G}+\overline{T}+\overline{B}+\beta\overline{S}+\hat{c}(0)\right)}{\hat{u}_y(\hat{R}_{t+1})(1+\hat{R}_{t+1})(1-\alpha-\beta)} + (1-\alpha)^{j-1}\frac{|B_{t+1}|}{1+\hat{R}_{t+1}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

Using (45) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} E_{t+1}\left\{\left(\prod_{v=1}^{j} Q_{t+v+1}\right)|B_{t+j}|\right\} \leq \\
&\frac{\hat{u}_y(0)P_{t+1}\left(\overline{G}+\overline{T}+\overline{B}+\beta\overline{S}+\hat{c}(0)\right)}{\hat{u}_y(\hat{R}_{t+1})(1+\hat{R}_{t+1})\alpha(1-\beta)} + \frac{|B_{t+1}|}{\alpha(1+\hat{R}_{t+1})}
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

Collecting all terms, equations (40), (42), and (46) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\underline{A}_{t+1}| \leq \frac{\hat{u}_y(0)P_{t+1}}{\hat{u}_y(\hat{R}_{t+1})(1+\hat{R}_{t+1})(1-\beta)}\Bigg[1+\overline{T}+ \\
&\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)\left(\overline{G}+\overline{T}+\overline{B}+\beta\overline{S}+\hat{c}(0)\right)\Bigg]+ \\
&\frac{|B_{t+1}|}{\alpha(1+\hat{R}_{t+1})} + P_t\left[1+\hat{c}(0)+\overline{T}\right] + |B_t|.
\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

A.2.2 Equation (36) holds.

Use (45) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{t\to\infty} E_0\left[\left(\prod_{j=1}^{t+1} Q_j\right)|B_t|\right] \leq \\
&\frac{\hat{u}_y(0)P_0\left(\overline{G}+\overline{T}+\overline{B}+\beta\overline{S}+\hat{c}(0)\right)}{\hat{u}_y(\hat{R}_0)(1+\hat{R}_0)(1-\alpha-\beta)}\lim_{t\to\infty}\left[(1-\alpha)^t-\beta^t\right] + \\
&\frac{|B_0|}{1+\hat{R}_0}\lim_{t\to\infty}(1-\alpha)^t = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

We then use (35), (47), and (48) to prove

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{t\to\infty} E_0\left[\left(\prod_{j=1}^{t+1} Q_j\right)|A_{t+1}|\right] \le \frac{\hat{u}_y(0)}{1-\beta}\Bigg[1+\overline{T}+ \\
&\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)\left(\overline{G}+\overline{T}+\overline{B}+\beta\overline{S}+\hat{c}(0)\right)\Bigg]\lim_{t\to\infty} E_0\left[\left(\prod_{j=1}^{t+2} Q_j\right)\frac{P_{t+1}}{\hat{u}_y(\hat{R}_{t+1})}\right]+ \\
&\frac{1}{\alpha}\lim_{t\to\infty} E_0\left[\left(\prod_{j=1}^{t+2} Q_j\right)|B_{t+1}|\right]+\hat{u}_y(0)\left[1+\hat{c}(0)+\overline{T}\right]\lim_{t\to\infty} E_0\left[\left(\prod_{j=1}^{t+1} Q_j\right)\frac{P_t}{\hat{u}_y(\hat{R}_t)}\right]+ \\
&\lim_{t\to\infty} E_0\left[\left(\prod_{j=1}^{t+1} Q_j\right)|B_t|\right] = \frac{\hat{u}_y(0)P_0}{(1+\hat{R}_0)\hat{u}_y(\hat{R}_0)}\Bigg\{\frac{\beta}{1-\beta}\Bigg[1+\overline{T}+ \\
&\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)\left(\overline{G}+\overline{T}+\overline{B}+\beta\overline{S}+\hat{c}(0)\right)\Bigg]+1+\hat{c}(0)+\overline{T}\Bigg\}\lim_{t\to\infty}\beta^t = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

Equations (11), (48), and (49) imply (16).

A.2.3 Equation (33) holds.

The same steps used to prove (48) can also be used to prove

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} E_t\left\{\left(\prod_{v=1}^{j+1} Q_{t+v}\right)|B_{t+j}|\right\} = 0. \tag{50}$$

As previously noted, equation (1) continues to hold even if we replace R_t with $\hat{R}_t$, since the two values only differ when $B_t = 0$. We can then iterate (1) forward, taking expectations conditional on time-$t+1$ information, and use (50) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
B_t = M_{t+1} - M_t - T_{t+1} - P_t\overline{G} + E_{t+1}\Bigg\{\sum_{s=1}^{\infty}\Bigg[\left(\prod_{v=1}^{s} Q_{t+v+1}\right)\cdot \\
\left(M_{t+s+1} - M_{t+s} + T_{t+s+1} - P_{t+s}\overline{G}\right)\Bigg]\Bigg\} > \underline{A}_{t+1},
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

which completes the proof. Equation (51) relies on $\overline{G} < 1$ (government spending must be less than the maximum producible output) and on

$$E_{t+s}\left[M_{t+s}(1-Q_{t+s+1})\right] = \frac{\hat{R}_{t+s}M_{t+s}}{1+\hat{R}_{t+s}} \ge 0.$$

This completes the proof of proposition 2.

B Other Equilibria of the Stochastic Economy

B.1 A Probabilistic Run in Period $s > 0$.

The perfectly anticipated run described in section 4.1 relies on strong assumptions about preferences. As an example, if we assume that preferences are given by $u(c_t, y_t) = \frac{c^{1-\sigma}}{1-\sigma} - y^{\psi}$, such an equilibrium will always fail to exist for $\sigma \leq 1$, since a solution to (24) cannot be found (with $\hat{R} > R$). Nonetheless, even for these preferences other equilibria exist, provided that the occurrence of a run is sufficiently small. Moreover, these equilibria exist even when the central bank sets no upper bound to its interest rate (provided, of course, that preferences are such that the present value of seigniorage remains finite). As was the case in section 4.1, fiscal policy plays an important role in ensuring that households have enough nominal wealth to acquire their desired money balanced, and we assume that (23) holds.

We now construct an equilibrium where a run occurs in period s with probability $\phi \in (0, 1)$. Starting from an arbitrary initial price level P_0, we construct recursively a deterministic allocation and price system up to period $t - 1$ as we did in section 4.1. For period s, we consider an equilibrium with just two realizations of the allocation and price level: with probability ϕ, the price level is P_s^H and a run occurs ($\hat{R}_s^H > R_s$), and with probability $1-\phi$ the price level is P_s^L and the private nominal interest rate coincides with the public one: $\hat{R}_s^H = R_s$. In order for $\hat{R}_s^H > R_s$ to be an equilibrium, the constraint $B_s \geq 0$ must be binding, which implies

$$\frac{M_{s-1} + B_{s-1}}{P_{s-1}} + \overline{G} = \frac{T_s}{P_{s-1}} + \hat{c}(\hat{R}_s^H)\frac{P_s^H}{P_{s-1}}. \tag{52}$$

Given any arbitrary value $\hat{R}_s^H > R_s$, and given the predetermined time-$s-1$ variables and the fiscal policy rule for T_s, equation (52) can be solved for P_s^H/P_{s-1}, the level of inflation that will occur if a run on the interest rate peg materializes in period s. As was the case in section 4.1, since $\hat{c}$ is a decreasing function and taxes satisfy (20), inflation in the event of a run will necessarily be strictly greater than inflation in the equilibrium in which no run can take place.

To determine P_s^L/P_{s-1}, we rely on the household Euler equation (35). Rearranging terms and taking the expected value as of period $s-1$, we obtain

$$\beta\left[\phi\hat{u}_y(\hat{R}_s^H)(1+\hat{R}_s^H)\frac{P_{s-1}}{P_s^H}+(1-\phi)\hat{u}_y(R_s)(1+R_s)\frac{P_{s-1}}{P_s^L}\right]=\hat{u}_y(R_{s-1}). \tag{53}$$

Generically, this equation can be solved for P_s^L/P_{s-1}. However, we need to ensure that the solution is nonnegative, and that it entails nonnegative bond holdings, i.e., that

$$M_{s-1}+B_{s-1}+P_{s-1}\overline{G}\geq\frac{T_s}{P_{s-1}}+\hat{c}(R_s)\frac{P_s^L}{P_{s-1}} \tag{54}$$

A sufficient condition for both is that ϕ be sufficiently small.[12]

If $\hat{u}_y$ does not decline too fast with R, then equation (53) will imply that P_s^L/P_{s-1} is lower than in the deterministic equilibrium with no runs. Because of this, the possibility of a run may cause the central bank to *under*shoot inflation while the run is not occurring, further undermining inflation stability.

From period s onwards, the characterization of the equilibrium proceeds again deterministically and recursively, separately for the branch that follows P_s^H and P_s^L; this follows the same steps as in section 4.1. The construction of the equilibrium is completed by Proposition 2 that ensures that the transversality and no-Ponzi conditions are satisfied for the sequences that we constructed.

B.2 Recurrent Runs

We can generalize the example of subsection B.1 to construct equilibria in which runs can occur in any number of periods. As an example, there are equilibria in which runs occur with i.i.d. probability ϕ in each period. Once again, we construct the allocation and price system recursively, as we did in section B.1. In each period t, the history of runs up to period $t-1$ is taken as given, and (52) and (53) are used to solve for P_t^H/P_{t-1} and P_t^L/P_{t-1}.

[12] Note that, as $\phi\to 0$, P_s^L/P_{s-1} converges to the inflation in the deterministic equilibrium with no runs, where (20) guarantees that (54) holds.

References

[1] Fernando Alvarez and Andrew Atkeson. Money and Exchange Rates in the Grossman-Weiss and Rotemberg Model. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 40(3):619–640, 1997.

[2] Fernando Alvarez, Andrew Atkeson, and Chris Edmond. On the Sluggish Response of Prices to Money in an Inventory Theoretic Model of Money Demand. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124(3):911–967, 2009.

[3] John H. Cochrane. Determinacy and Identification with Taylor Rules. *Journal of Political Economy*, 119(3):565–615, 2011.

[4] A. Kerem Coşar and Edward Green. Necessary and Sufficient Conditions of Dynamic Optimization. `http://faculty.chicagobooth.edu/kerem.cosar/research/CosarGreen_NecSufConditionsDynOpt.pdf`, 2008. Mimeo, University of Chicago.

[5] Sanford Grossman and Laurence Weiss. A Transactions-Based Model of the Monetary Transmission Mechanism. *American Economic Review*, 73(5):871–880, 1983.

[6] Eric Leeper. Equilibria under 'Active' and 'Passive' Monetary Policies. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 27(1):129–147, 1991.

[7] Robert E. Lucas, Jr. Panel Discussion: Central Banking: Is Science Replacing Art? In *Monetary Policy. A Journey from Theory to Practice. An ECB Colloquium held in honour of Otmas Issing 16-17 March 2006*, pages 168–171. European Central Bank, 2007.

[8] Thomas J. Sargent. The Ends of Four Big Inflations. In Robert E. Hall, editor, *Inflation: Causes and Effects*, pages 41–97. The University of Chicago Press, 1983.

[9] Thomas J. Sargent and Neil Wallace. Some Unpleasant Monetarist Arithmetic. *Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis Quarterly Review*, 5(1):1–17, 1981.

[10] Christopher A. Sims. A Simple Model for Study of the Determination of the Price Level and the Interaction of Monetary and Fiscal Policy. *Economic Theory*, 4(3):381–399, 1994.

[11] Michael Woodford. Monetary Policy and Price Level Determinacy in a Cash-in-Advance Economy. *Economic Theory*, 4(3):345–380, 1994.

Working Paper Series

A series of research studies on regional economic issues relating to the Seventh Federal Reserve District, and on financial and economic topics.

Working Paper Series *(continued)*

Working Paper Series *(continued)*

Robustness and Macroeconomic Policy *Gadi Barlevy*	**WP-10-04**
Benefits of Relationship Banking: Evidence from Consumer Credit Markets *Sumit Agarwal, Souphala Chomsisengphet, Chunlin Liu, and Nicholas S. Souleles*	**WP-10-05**
The Effect of Sales Tax Holidays on Household Consumption Patterns *Nathan Marwell and Leslie McGranahan*	**WP-10-06**
Gathering Insights on the Forest from the Trees: A New Metric for Financial Conditions *Scott Brave and R. Andrew Butters*	**WP-10-07**
Identification of Models of the Labor Market *Eric French and Christopher Taber*	**WP-10-08**
Public Pensions and Labor Supply Over the Life Cycle *Eric French and John Jones*	**WP-10-09**
Explaining Asset Pricing Puzzles Associated with the 1987 Market Crash *Luca Benzoni, Pierre Collin-Dufresne, and Robert S. Goldstein*	**WP-10-10**
Prenatal Sex Selection and Girls' Well‐Being: Evidence from India *Luojia Hu and Analía Schlosser*	**WP-10-11**
Mortgage Choices and Housing Speculation *Gadi Barlevy and Jonas D.M. Fisher*	**WP-10-12**
Did Adhering to the Gold Standard Reduce the Cost of Capital? *Ron Alquist and Benjamin Chabot*	**WP-10-13**
Introduction to the *Macroeconomic Dynamics*: Special issues on money, credit, and liquidity *Ed Nosal, Christopher Waller, and Randall Wright*	**WP-10-14**
Summer Workshop on Money, Banking, Payments and Finance: An Overview *Ed Nosal and Randall Wright*	**WP-10-15**
Cognitive Abilities and Household Financial Decision Making *Sumit Agarwal and Bhashkar Mazumder*	**WP-10-16**
Complex Mortgages *Gene Amromin, Jennifer Huang, Clemens Sialm, and Edward Zhong*	**WP-10-17**
The Role of Housing in Labor Reallocation *Morris Davis, Jonas Fisher, and Marcelo Veracierto*	**WP-10-18**
Why Do Banks Reward their Customers to Use their Credit Cards? *Sumit Agarwal, Sujit Chakravorti, and Anna Lunn*	**WP-10-19**

Working Paper Series *(continued)*

The impact of the originate-to-distribute model on banks before and during the financial crisis *Richard J. Rosen*	**WP-10-20**
Simple Markov-Perfect Industry Dynamics *Jaap H. Abbring, Jeffrey R. Campbell, and Nan Yang*	**WP-10-21**
Commodity Money with Frequent Search *Ezra Oberfield and Nicholas Trachter*	**WP-10-22**
Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards and the Market for New Vehicles *Thomas Klier and Joshua Linn*	**WP-11-01**
The Role of Securitization in Mortgage Renegotiation *Sumit Agarwal, Gene Amromin, Itzhak Ben-David, Souphala Chomsisengphet, and Douglas D. Evanoff*	**WP-11-02**
Market-Based Loss Mitigation Practices for Troubled Mortgages Following the Financial Crisis *Sumit Agarwal, Gene Amromin, Itzhak Ben-David, Souphala Chomsisengphet, and Douglas D. Evanoff*	**WP-11-03**
Federal Reserve Policies and Financial Market Conditions During the Crisis *Scott A. Brave and Hesna Genay*	**WP-11-04**
The Financial Labor Supply Accelerator *Jeffrey R. Campbell and Zvi Hercowitz*	**WP-11-05**
Survival and long-run dynamics with heterogeneous beliefs under recursive preferences *Jaroslav Borovička*	**WP-11-06**
A Leverage-based Model of Speculative Bubbles (Revised) *Gadi Barlevy*	**WP-11-07**
Estimation of Panel Data Regression Models with Two-Sided Censoring or Truncation *Sule Alan, Bo E. Honoré, Luojia Hu, and Søren Leth–Petersen*	**WP-11-08**
Fertility Transitions Along the Extensive and Intensive Margins *Daniel Aaronson, Fabian Lange, and Bhashkar Mazumder*	**WP-11-09**
Black-White Differences in Intergenerational Economic Mobility in the US *Bhashkar Mazumder*	**WP-11-10**
Can Standard Preferences Explain the Prices of Out-of-the-Money S&P 500 Put Options? *Luca Benzoni, Pierre Collin-Dufresne, and Robert S. Goldstein*	**WP-11-11**
Business Networks, Production Chains, and Productivity: A Theory of Input-Output Architecture *Ezra Oberfield*	**WP-11-12**
Equilibrium Bank Runs Revisited *Ed Nosal*	**WP-11-13**

Working Paper Series *(continued)*

Are Covered Bonds a Substitute for Mortgage-Backed Securities? *Santiago Carbó-Valverde, Richard J. Rosen, and Francisco Rodríguez-Fernández*	**WP-11-14**
The Cost of Banking Panics in an Age before "Too Big to Fail" *Benjamin Chabot*	**WP-11-15**
Import Protection, Business Cycles, and Exchange Rates: Evidence from the Great Recession *Chad P. Bown and Meredith A. Crowley*	**WP-11-16**
Examining Macroeconomic Models through the Lens of Asset Pricing *Jaroslav Borovička and Lars Peter Hansen*	**WP-12-01**
The Chicago Fed DSGE Model *Scott A. Brave, Jeffrey R. Campbell, Jonas D.M. Fisher, and Alejandro Justiniano*	**WP-12-02**
Macroeconomic Effects of Federal Reserve Forward Guidance *Jeffrey R. Campbell, Charles L. Evans, Jonas D.M. Fisher, and Alejandro Justiniano*	**WP-12-03**
Modeling Credit Contagion via the Updating of Fragile Beliefs *Luca Benzoni, Pierre Collin-Dufresne, Robert S. Goldstein, and Jean Helwege*	**WP-12-04**
Signaling Effects of Monetary Policy *Leonardo Melosi*	**WP-12-05**
Empirical Research on Sovereign Debt and Default *Michael Tomz and Mark L. J. Wright*	**WP-12-06**
Credit Risk and Disaster Risk *François Gourio*	**WP-12-07**
From the Horse's Mouth: How do Investor Expectations of Risk and Return Vary with Economic Conditions? *Gene Amromin and Steven A. Sharpe*	**WP-12-08**
Using Vehicle Taxes To Reduce Carbon Dioxide Emissions Rates of New Passenger Vehicles: Evidence from France, Germany, and Sweden *Thomas Klier and Joshua Linn*	**WP-12-09**
Spending Responses to State Sales Tax Holidays *Sumit Agarwal and Leslie McGranahan*	**WP-12-10**
Micro Data and Macro Technology *Ezra Oberfield and Devesh Raval*	**WP-12-11**
The Effect of Disability Insurance Receipt on Labor Supply: A Dynamic Analysis *Eric French and Jae Song*	**WP-12-12**

Working Paper Series *(continued)*

Medicaid Insurance in Old Age — **WP-12-13**
Mariacristina De Nardi, Eric French, and John Bailey Jones

Fetal Origins and Parental Responses — **WP-12-14**
Douglas Almond and Bhashkar Mazumder

Repos, Fire Sales, and Bankruptcy Policy — **WP-12-15**
Gaetano Antinolfi, Francesca Carapella, Charles Kahn, Antoine Martin, David Mills, and Ed Nosal

Speculative Runs on Interest Rate Pegs
The Frictionless Case — **WP-12-16**
Marco Bassetto and Christopher Phelan