

# Contents

|          |   |           |
|----------|---|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Introduction</b>   | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>I</b> | <b>The Intergenerational Perspective</b>                        | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>2</b> | <b>The two faces of the <math>\eta</math></b>                   | <b>7</b>  |
| 2.1      | Introduction . . . . .  | 7         |
| 2.2      | Building blocks of a social welfare function . . . . .          | 10        |
| 2.2.1    | The role of the social planner . . . . .                        | 10        |
| 2.2.2    | Describing people's well-being . . . . .                        | 14        |
| 2.2.3    | Combining the elements . . . . .                                | 16        |
| 2.3      | The debate on the Stern Review: The land of confusion . . . . . | 17        |
| 2.4      | A Matter of Perspective . . . . .                               | 20        |
| 2.4.1    | Two different views on the world . . . . .                      | 20        |
| 2.4.2    | An ethical approach . . . . .                                   | 21        |
| 2.4.3    | An individualistic (or Benthamite) approach . . . . .           | 25        |
| 2.5      | On the link of $\tilde{\eta}$ and $\eta$ . . . . .              | 28        |
| 2.6      | Conclusion . . . . .  | 29        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Finding the right <math>\eta</math></b>                      | <b>31</b> |
| 3.1      | Introduction . . . . .  | 31        |
| 3.2      | Intertemporal choice in a two-period-setting . . . . .          | 34        |
| 3.2.1    | An argument in favor of pure time discount . . . . .            | 34        |

|       |  |    |
|-------|--|----|
| 3.2.2 | The interchangeability between $\rho$ and $\eta$ . . . . .                                       | 37 |
| 3.3   | Empirical studies on the size of $\eta$ . . . . .  | 41 |
| 3.4   | Ethical axioms for determining the size of $\eta$ . . . . .                                      | 44 |
| 3.4.1 | Framework . . . . .  | 44 |
| 3.4.2 | Postulate A: Protecting the interests of earlier generations . . . . .                           | 45 |
| 3.4.3 | Postulate B: Non-envy in the absolute sense . . . . .  | 47 |
| 3.4.4 | Postulate C: Non-envy in the relative sense . . . . .  | 50 |
| 3.5   | The critique of the Stern Review's approach to intergenerational valuation – a comment . . . . . | 51 |
| 3.6   | Conclusion . . . . .   | 58 |

## **II Redistribution and freedom of choice: The role of in-kind transfers and public provision of private goods** **61**

|          |   |           |
|----------|---|-----------|
| <b>4</b> | <b>In-kind transfers and freedom of choice</b>                    | <b>63</b> |
| 4.1      | Introduction . . . . .  | 63        |
| 4.2      | A short primer on in-kind transfers . . . . .                     | 66        |
| 4.2.1    | The choice constraint as a policy objective . . . . .             | 68        |
| 4.2.2    | Efficiency and freedom of choice . . . . .                        | 71        |
| 4.2.3    | Characterizing the restrictions . . . . .                         | 84        |
| 4.3      | In-kind transfers in a democracy . . . . .                        | 86        |
| 4.4      | Implications . . . . .  | 92        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Alternatives to the public provision of private goods</b>      | <b>93</b> |
| 5.1      | Introduction . . . . .  | 93        |
| 5.2      | Can a minimum consumption law replace public provision? . . . . . | 95        |
| 5.3      | Welfare enhancing quality regulation . . . . .                    | 104       |

|          |   |            |
|----------|---|------------|
| 5.3.1    | The setup . . . . .   | 104        |
| 5.3.2    | Individual consumption choice contingent on govern-<br>ment's decisions . . . . . | 106        |
| 5.3.3    | Some restrictions on admissible preferences . . . . .                             | 107        |
| 5.3.4    | The impact of a minimum quality law on individual<br>demand . . . . .             | 109        |
| 5.3.5    | The optimal income tax problem . . . . .  | 110        |
| 5.3.6    | A minimum quality law as a policy alternative . . . . .                           | 112        |
| 5.4      | Empirical relevance . . . . .   | 116        |
| 5.5      | Discussion of the result . . . . .  | 117        |
| 5.6      | Appendix to Chapter 5 . . . . .   | 118        |
| <b>6</b> | <b>Altruism, status, and transfers</b>  | <b>121</b> |
| 6.1      | Introduction . . . . .  | 121        |
| 6.2      | The model . . . . .   | 125        |
| 6.3      | The second stage: the poor's consumption choice . . . . .                         | 127        |
| 6.4      | The first stage: the rich's policy choice . . . . .                               | 131        |
| 6.4.1    | What if status did not matter? . . . . .  | 131        |
| 6.4.2    | The influence of status concerns . . . . .  | 132        |
| 6.5      | Limiting freedom of choice – again . . . . .                                      | 138        |
| 6.6      | Conclusion . . . . .  | 139        |
| 6.7      | Appendix to Chapter 6 . . . . .   | 141        |
| <b>7</b> | <b>Brief summary and outlook</b>  | <b>145</b> |