

Table 1 Microeconomic Model Calibration

Calibrated Parameters			
Description	Parameter	Value	Source
Permanent Income Growth Factor	Φ	1.03	PSID: Carroll (1992)
Interest Factor	R	1.04	Conventional
Time Preference Factor	β	0.96	Conventional
Coefficient of Relative Risk Aversion	ρ	2	Conventional
Probability of Zero Income	\wp	0.005	PSID: Carroll (1992)
Std Dev of Log Permanent Shock	σ_ψ	0.1	PSID: Carroll (1992)
Std Dev of Log Transitory Shock	σ_θ	0.1	PSID: Carroll (1992)

Table 2 Model Characteristics Calculated from Parameters

Description	Symbol and Formula	Approximate Calculated Value
Finite Human Wealth Factor	$\mathcal{R}^{-1} \equiv \Phi/R$	0.990
PF Value of Autarky Factor	$\sqsupset \equiv \beta\Phi^{1-\rho}$	0.932
Growth Compensated Permanent Shock	$\underline{\psi} \equiv (\mathbb{E}[\psi^{-1}])^{-1}$	0.990
Uncertainty-Adjusted Growth	$\underline{\Phi} \equiv \Phi\underline{\psi}$	1.020
Utility Compensated Permanent Shock	$\underline{\underline{\psi}} \equiv (\mathbb{E}[\Psi^{1-\rho}])^{1/(1-\rho)}$	0.990
Utility Compensated Growth	$\underline{\underline{\Phi}} \equiv \Phi\underline{\underline{\psi}}$	1.020
Absolute Patience Factor	$\mathfrak{P} \equiv (R\beta)^{1/\rho}$	0.999
Return Patience Factor	$\mathfrak{P}_R \equiv \mathfrak{P}/R$	0.961
Growth Patience Factor	$\mathfrak{P}_\Phi \equiv \mathfrak{P}/\Phi$	0.970
Normalized Growth Patience Factor	$\mathfrak{P}_{\underline{\Phi}} \equiv \mathfrak{P}/\underline{\Phi}$	0.980
Value of Autarky Factor	$\sqsubseteq \equiv \beta\Phi^{1-\rho}\underline{\underline{\psi}}^{1-\rho}$	0.941
Weak Return Impatience Factor	$\wp^{1/\rho}\mathfrak{P} \equiv (\wp\beta R)^{1/\rho}$	0.071

Table 3 Definitions and Comparisons of Conditions

Perfect Foresight Versions	Uncertainty Versions
Finite Human Wealth Condition (FHWC)	
$\Phi/R < 1$ The growth factor for permanent income Φ must be smaller than the discounting factor R for human wealth to be finite.	$\Phi/R < 1$ The model's risks are mean-preserving spreads, so the PDV of future income is unchanged by their introduction.
Absolute Impatience Condition (AIC)	
$\mathbf{P} < 1$ The unconstrained consumer is sufficiently impatient that the level of consumption will be declining over time: $\mathbf{c}_{t+1} < \mathbf{c}_t$	$\mathbf{P} < 1$ <i>If wealth is large enough, the expectation of consumption next period will be smaller than this period's consumption:</i> $\lim_{m_t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_t[\mathbf{c}_{t+1}] < \mathbf{c}_t$
Return Impatience Conditions	
Return Impatience Condition (RIC)	Weak RIC (WRIC)
$\mathbf{P}/R < 1$ The growth factor for consumption \mathbf{P} must be smaller than the discounting factor R , so that the PDV of current and future consumption will be finite: $c'(m) = 1 - \mathbf{P}/R < 1$	$\wp^{1/\rho} \mathbf{P}/R < 1$ If the probability of the zero-income event is $\wp = 1$ then income is always zero and the condition becomes identical to the RIC . Otherwise, weaker. $c'(m) < 1 - \wp^{1/\rho} \mathbf{P}/R < 1$
Growth Impatience Conditions	
GIC	GIC-Nrm
$\mathbf{P}/\Phi < 1$ For an unconstrained PF consumer, the ratio of \mathbf{c} to \mathbf{p} will fall over time. For constrained, guarantees the constraint eventually binds. Guarantees $\lim_{m_t \uparrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_t[\Psi_{t+1} m_{t+1}/m_t] = \mathbf{P}\Phi$	$\mathbf{P} \mathbb{E}[\Psi^{-1}]/\Phi < 1$ By Jensen's inequality stronger than GIC . Ensures consumers will not expect to accumulate m unboundedly. $\lim_{m_t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}/m_t] = \mathbf{P}\Phi$
Finite Value of Autarky Conditions	
PF-FVAC	FVAC
$\beta \Phi^{1-\rho} < 1$ equivalently $\mathbf{P} < R^{1/\rho} \Phi^{1-1/\rho}$ The discounted utility of constrained consumers who spend their permanent income each period should be finite.	$\beta \Phi^{1-\rho} \mathbb{E}[\psi^{1-\rho}] < 1$ By Jensen's inequality, stronger than the PF-FVAC because for $\rho > 1$ and nondegenerate Ψ , $\mathbb{E}[\Psi^{1-\rho}] > 1$.

Table 4 Sufficient Conditions for Nondegenerate[‡] Solution

Consumption Model(s)	Conditions	Comments
$\bar{c}(m)$: PF Unconstrained $\underline{c}(m) = \underline{\kappa}m$ Section 2.5.3: Section 2.5.3: Eq (23): Eq (24):	RIC, FHWC [°]	RIC $\Rightarrow v(m) < \infty$; FHWC $\Rightarrow 0 < v(m) $ PF model with no human wealth ($h = 0$) RIC prevents $\bar{c}(m) = \underline{c}(m) = 0$ FHWC prevents $\bar{c}(m) = \infty$ PF-FVAC+FHWC \Rightarrow RIC GIC+FHWC \Rightarrow PF-FVAC
$\dot{c}(m)$: PF Constrained Section 2.5.6: Appendix A: Appendix A:	GIC , RIC GIC, RIC GIC, RIC	FHWC holds ($\Phi < \mathbf{P} < R \Rightarrow \Phi < R$) $\dot{c}(m) = \bar{c}(m)$ for $m > m_{\#} < 1$ (RIC would yield $m_{\#} = 0$ so $\dot{c}(m) = 0$) $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \dot{c}(m) = \bar{c}(m)$, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \dot{\kappa}(m) = \underline{\kappa}$ kinks where horizon to $b = 0$ changes* $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \dot{\kappa}(m) = 0$ kinks where horizon to $b = 0$ changes*
$c(m)$: Friedman/Muth Section 2.10: Section 2.12: Figure 3: Section 2.12.2: Section 2.12.1: Section 3.3: Section 3.3.2: Section 3.3.1:	Section 3.1, Section 3.2 FVAC, WRIC	$\underline{c}(m) < c(m) < \bar{c}(m)$ $\underline{v}(m) < v(m) < \bar{v}(m)$ Sufficient for Contraction WRIC is weaker than RIC FVAC is stronger than PF-FVAC FHWC +RIC \Rightarrow GIC, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \kappa(m) = \underline{\kappa}$ RIC \Rightarrow FHWC , $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \kappa(m) = 0$ “Buffer Stock Saving” Conditions GIC $\Rightarrow \exists 0 < \check{m} < \infty$ GIC-Nrm $\Rightarrow \exists 0 < \hat{m} < \infty$

[‡]For feasible m satisfying $0 < m < \infty$, a nondegenerate limiting consumption function defines a unique optimal value of c satisfying $0 < c(m) < \infty$; a nondegenerate limiting value function defines a corresponding unique value of $-\infty < v(m) < 0$.

[°]RIC, FHWC are necessary as well as sufficient for the perfect foresight case. *That is, the first kink point in $c(m)$ is $m_{\#}$ s.t. for $m < m_{\#}$ the constraint will bind now, while for $m > m_{\#}$ the constraint will bind one period in the future. The second kink point corresponds to the m where the constraint will bind two periods in the future, etc.

**In the Friedman/Muth model, the RIC+FHWC are sufficient, but *not* necessary for nondegeneracy

Table 5 Taxonomy of Perfect Foresight Liquidity Constrained Outcomes

For constrained \bar{c} and unconstrained \bar{c} consumption functions

Main Condition Subcondition	Math	Outcome, Comments or Results
GIC	$1 < \mathbf{P}/\Phi$	Constraint never binds for $m \geq 1$
and RIC	$\mathbf{P}/R < 1$	FHWC holds ($R > \Phi$); $\dot{c}(m) = \bar{c}(m)$ for $m \geq 1$
and RIC	$1 < \mathbf{P}/R$	$\dot{c}(m)$ is degenerate: $\dot{c}(m) = 0$
GIC	$\mathbf{P}/\Phi < 1$	Constraint binds in finite time for any m
and RIC	$\mathbf{P}/R < 1$	FHWC may or may not hold
		$\lim_{m \uparrow \infty} \bar{c}(m) - \dot{c}(m) = 0$
		$\lim_{m \uparrow \infty} \dot{\kappa}(m) = \underline{\kappa}$
and RIC	$1 < \mathbf{P}/R$	FHWC $\lim_{m \uparrow \infty} \dot{\kappa}(m) = 0$

Conditions are applied from left to right; for example, the second row indicates conclusions in the case where ~~GIC~~ and **RIC** both hold, while the third row indicates that when the **GIC** and the ~~RIC~~ both fail, the consumption function is degenerate; the next row indicates that whenever the **GIC** holds, the constraint will bind in finite time.