

Trade Policy in the Shadow of Power

Quantifying Military Coercion in the International System

Brendan Cooley

5 December 2019

Model (Overview)

- Governments indexed $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$

Sequence

1. (Γ^m) Governments set military strategies
 - allocations of effort over potential wars
2. (Γ^τ) Governments make trade policy announcements
3. (Γ^a) Wars
 - Winners choose trade policies for vanquished governments
4. $(h(\tau))$ Economic (general equilibrium) consequences of trade policies

Payoffs

$$G_i(h(\tau), \mathbf{a})$$

Preferences

$$h(\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ \vdots \\ w_N \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{w}$$

- $V_i(\mathbf{w})$: welfare of representative consumer in i
- $X_{ij}(\mathbf{w})$: i 's imports of goods from j
- Rents (tariff revenue):

$$r_i(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_j (\tau_{ij} - 1) X_{ij}(\mathbf{w})$$

Government Objective

$$G_i(\mathbf{w}) = V_i(\mathbf{w})^{1-b_i} r_i(\mathbf{w})^{b_i}$$

Wars (I)

Optimal Post-Conquest Policies

$$\hat{\tau}_i^{j*}(b_j) = \arg \max_{\tau_i} G_j(\tau_i; \tilde{\tau}_{-i})$$

- τ_i^{j*} : trade policies in j imposed by government i post-conquest

Conquest Values

$$G_j(\tau_i^{j*}; \tilde{\tau}_{-i})$$

Contest Function (Dyadic)

$$\chi_{ji}(\mathbf{m}) = \frac{\rho_{ji}(\mathbf{W}_{ji}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{ji}, \epsilon_{ji}) m_{ji}}{\rho_{ji}(\mathbf{W}_{ji}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{ji}, \epsilon_{ji}) m_{ji} + m_{ii}}$$

Loss of Strength Gradient

$$\rho_{ji}(\mathbf{W}_{ji}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{ji}, \epsilon_{ji}) = e^{-\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{ji}^T \mathbf{W}_{ji} + \epsilon_{ji}}$$

$$\epsilon_{ji} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$$

Wars (II)

Reservation Values

$$\underline{G}_{ji}(\mathbf{m}) = \chi_{ji}(\mathbf{m}) G_j(\tau_i^{j*}; \tilde{\tau}_{-j}) + (1 - \chi_{ji}(\mathbf{m})) G_j(\tilde{\tau}) - c_j$$

Constrained Policy Setting Problem (I)

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\tau}_i^*(\mathbf{m}) = \arg \max_{\tilde{\tau}_i} \quad & G_i(\tilde{\tau}_i; \tilde{\tau}_{-i}) + \sum_j \xi_{ij} G_j(\tilde{\tau}_i; \tilde{\tau}_{-i}) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & G_j(\tilde{\tau}_i; \tilde{\tau}_{-i}) \geq \underline{G}_{ji}(\mathbf{m}) \text{ for all } j \neq i \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

In Differences (Hats)

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\hat{\tau}_i} \quad & \hat{G}_i(\hat{\tau}_i; \hat{\tau}_{-i}) + \sum_j \xi_{ij} \frac{G_j(\tau)}{G_i(\tau)} \hat{G}_j(\hat{\tau}_i; \hat{\tau}_{-i}) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \hat{G}_j(\hat{\tau}) - \hat{G}_j(\hat{\tau}_i^*) + \hat{c}(\chi_{ji}(\mathbf{m}))^{-1} \geq 0 \text{ for all } j \neq i \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Assumptions

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{c} &= \frac{c_i}{G_i(\tau)} \\ \mathbb{E} \left[\xi_{ij} \frac{G_j(\tau)}{G_i(\tau)} \right] &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Constrained Policy Setting Problem (II)

MPEC

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\hat{\tau}, \mathbf{w}} \quad & \hat{G}_i(\hat{\tau}_i; \hat{\tau}_{-i}) + \sum_j \xi_{ij} \frac{G_j(\tau)}{G_i(\tau)} \hat{G}_j(\hat{\tau}_i; \hat{\tau}_{-i}) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \hat{G}_j(\hat{\tau}) - \hat{G}_j(\hat{\tau}_i^{j*}) + \hat{c}(\chi_{ji}(\mathbf{m}))^{-1} \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } j \neq i \quad (3) \\ & \hat{\tau}_{j \neq i} = \mathbf{1} \\ & \mathbf{w} = h(\hat{\tau}) \end{aligned}$$

Unconstrained, Affinity-Less Policies

$$\hat{\tau}'_i(b_i) = \arg \max_{\hat{\tau}_i} \hat{G}_i(h(\hat{\tau}); b_i) \quad (4)$$

Constraint binds in expectation if

$$\underbrace{\hat{G}_j(\hat{\tau}'_i(b_i)) - \hat{G}_j(\hat{\tau}_i^{j*}(b_j))}_{W_{ji}(b_i, b_j)} + \hat{c}\chi_{ji}(\mathbf{m})^{-1} \geq 0$$

Military Strategies (I)

- Affinity shocks (ξ_{ji}) and power projection shocks (ϵ_{ji}) realized *after* military allocations set

$$\epsilon_{ji}^*(\mathbf{m}) = -\ln\left(\frac{m_{ji}}{m_{ii}}\right) + \ln\left(\frac{W_{ji}(b_i, b_j)}{\hat{c} - W_{ji}(b_i, b_j)}\right) + \alpha_{ji}^T \mathbf{w}_{ji}$$

$$\varphi_{ji}(\mathbf{m}) = \Pr(\epsilon_{ji} > \epsilon_{ji}^*(\mathbf{m}))$$

Optimal Military Strategies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}_j^* &= \arg \max_{\mathbf{m}_j} \mathbb{E} \left[\hat{G}_j \left(\hat{\tau}^*(\mathbf{m}_i; \mathbf{m}_{-j}) \right) \right] \\ &\text{subject to} \quad \sum_i m_{ji} \leq M_j \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Military Strategies (II)

First Order Conditions

$$\frac{\partial \varphi_{ji}(\mathbf{m})}{\partial m_{ji}} \hat{c}_{\chi_{ji}(\mathbf{m})}^{-1} - \varphi_{ji}(\mathbf{m}) \hat{c}_{\chi_{ji}(\mathbf{m})}^{-1} \frac{\partial \chi_{ji}(\mathbf{m})}{\partial m_{ji}} = \lambda_j^m \quad \text{for all } i \neq j$$

$$\sum_i \varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{m}) \mathbb{E} [\lambda_{ij}^x | \epsilon_{ji} > \epsilon_{ji}^*(\mathbf{m})] = \lambda_j^m$$

$$\sum_i m_{ji} = M_j$$

Observables, Unobservables

Data

- τ : policy barriers to trade
- M : military expenditure

Structural Parameters

$$\theta = \{\mathbf{b}, \alpha, \hat{c}, \sigma_{\epsilon}^2\}$$

Unobservables

$$m^*(\theta, M)$$

Estimation Problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{m}} \quad & \sum_i \sum_j \ell_{\xi}(\xi_{ij}) + \sum_i \sum_j \ell_{\epsilon}(\epsilon_{ij}) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \boldsymbol{m} = \boldsymbol{m}^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ & \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}^*(\boldsymbol{m}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{1}_{N \times N} \\ & \hat{h}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}^*(\boldsymbol{m})) = \mathbf{1}_{N \times 1} \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Estimation Algorithm

1. Initialize $\theta = \tilde{\theta}_0$ and $m_i = \frac{M_i}{N}$ for all i

Loop (indexed r)

1. Draw ϵ_r war shocks
 - Large sample as we get closer to convergence?
2. Recover \tilde{b}_r through grid search and update $\tilde{\theta}_r$
 - Minimize deviations from FOCs
3. Calculate $\varphi_{ji}(\mathbf{m}; \tilde{\theta}_r)$
4. Weighted least squares on constraints with $\varphi_{ji}(\mathbf{m}; \tilde{\theta}_r)$ as weights to recover $\tilde{\alpha}_r, \tilde{c}_r, \tilde{\sigma}_{\epsilon,r}^2$ and update $\tilde{\theta}_r$
5. Calculate $E[\lambda_{ij}^X | \epsilon_{ji} > \epsilon_{ji}^*(\mathbf{m})]$
 - Simulation to calculate $E[\chi_{ij}(\mathbf{m}; \tilde{\theta}_r)]$, then solve constrained policy problem
6. Calculate $m^*(\tilde{\theta}_r)$

Repeat 1-6 until convergence

Questions and Notes

Questions

- $E[\lambda_{ij}^x | \epsilon_{ji} > \epsilon_{ji}^*(\mathbf{m})]$ is actually constraint evaluated at expected value of contest function. Equivalent? Alternatives?
- Are ϵ_r draws going to throw off consistency/convergence?

Notes

- Measurement error model implies constraints bind exactly at $\hat{\tau}^*(\mathbf{m}; \tilde{\theta}_0)$
- Think Bayesian?