General Equilibrium for the Exchange Economy

Joseph Tao-yi Wang

2013/10/9

(Lecture 9, Micro Theory I)

What's in between the lines?

- And God said,
  - Let there be light...
- and there was light.... (Genesis 1:3, KJV)

What's in between the lines?



What's in



xchange

What We Learned from the 2x2 Economy?

- **Pareto Efficient Allocation (PEA)**
  - **Cannot** make one better off without hurting others
- **Walrasian Equilibrium (WE)**
  - When Supply Meets Demand
  - Focus on Exchange Economy First
- 1^{st} Welfare Theorem: WE is Efficient
- 2^{nd} Welfare Theorem: Any PEA can be supported as a WE
- These also apply to the general case as well!

General Exchange Economy

- n Commodities: *1, 2, ..., n*
- H Consumers: $h = 1, 2, \cdots, H$
  - Consumption Set: $X^h \subset \mathbb{R}^n_+$
  - Endowment: $\omega^h = (\omega_1^h, \cdots, \omega_n^h) \in X^h$
  - Consumption Vector: $x^h = (x_1^h, \cdots, x_n^h) \in X^h$
  - Utility Function: $U^h(x^h) = U^h(x_1^h, \cdots, x_n^h)$
  - Aggregate Consumption and Endowment:

$$x = \sum_{h=1}^{H} x^h \text{ and } \omega = \sum_{h=1}^{H} \omega^h$$

- Edgeworth Cube (Hyperbox)

Feasible Allocation

- A allocation is feasible if
- The sum of all consumers' demand doesn't exceed aggregate endowment: $x - \omega \leq 0$
- A feasible allocation $\overline{x}$ is Pareto efficient if
- there is no other feasible allocation x that is
- strictly preferred by at least one: $U^i(x^i) > U^i(\overline{x}^i)$
- and is weakly preferred by all: $U^h(x^h) \geq U^h(\overline{x}^h)$

Walrasian Equilibrium

- Price-taking: Price vector $p \geq 0$
- Consumers: $h=1, 2, \ldots, H$
- Endowment: $\omega^h = (\omega_1^h, \cdots, \omega_n^h) \quad \omega = \sum_h \omega^h$
- Wealth: $W^h = p \cdot \omega^h$
- Budget Set: $\{x^h \in X^h | p \cdot x^h \leq W^h\}$
- Consumption Set: $\overline{x}^h = (\overline{x}_1^h, \cdots, \overline{x}_n^h) \in X^h$
- Most Preferred Consumption:

$U^h(\overline{x}^h) \geq U^h(x^h)$ for all x^h such that $p \cdot x^h \leq W^h$

- Vector of Excess Demand: $\overline{e} = \overline{x} - \omega$

Definition: Walrasian Equilibrium Prices

- The price vector $p \geq 0$ is a Walrasian Equilibrium price vector if
- there is no market in excess demand ($\overline{e} \leq 0$),
- and $p_j = 0$ for any market that is in excess supply ($\overline{e}_j < 0$).

- We are now ready to state and prove the "Adam Smith Theorem" (WE $\Rightarrow$ PEA)...

Proposition 3.2-0: First Welfare Theorem

- If preferences of each consumer satisfies LNS, then the Walrasian Equilibrium allocation is Pareto efficient.

- Proof:
  - (Same as 2-consumer case. Homework.)

SWT without differentiability

- In Section 3.1, we assumed differentiability to use Kuhn-Tucker conditions to prove SWT
- Now we drop differentiability and appeal directly to Supporting Hyperplane Theorem
- To do that, we first need a lemma...

Lemma 3.2-1: Quasi-concavity of V

- If $U^h, h = 1, \cdots, H$ is quasi-concave,
- Then so is the indirect utility function

$$V^1(x) = \max_{x^h} \left\{ U^1(x^1) \middle| \sum_{h=1}^{H} x^h \leq x, \right.$$

$$\left. U^h(x^h) \geq U^h(\hat{x}^h), h \neq 1 \right\}$$

Lemma 3.2-1: Quasi-concavity of V

- Proof: For aggregate endowment a, b, Claim for $c=(1-\lambda)a+\lambda b, V^1(c)\geq \min\{V^1(a),V^1(b)\}$

Assume $\{a^h\}_{h=1}^H$ solves $V^1(a)=U^1(a^1)$

$\{b^h\}_{h=1}^H$ solves $V^1(b)=U^1(b^1)$

$\{c^h\}_{h=1}^H$ is feasible since $c^h=(1-\lambda)a^h+\lambda b^h$

$\Rightarrow V^1(c)\geq U^1(c^1)$

Now only need to prove $U^1(c^1)\geq \min\{V^1(a),V^1(b)\}$.

Lemma 3.2-1: Quasi-concavity of V

- Since $\{a^h\}_{h=1}^H$ solves $V^1(a)$,
  $\{b^h\}_{h=1}^H$ solves $V^1(b)$,

  $U^1(a^1) = V^1(a)$ and $U^1(b^1) = V^1(b)$

  by quasi-concavity of U^1

$$\Rightarrow U^1(c^1) \geq \min\{U^1(a^1), U^1(b^1)\}$$
$$= \min\{V^1(a), V^1(b)\}$$

$$\Rightarrow V^1(c) \geq U^1(c^1) \geq \min\{V^1(a), V^1(b)\}$$

Proposition 3.2-2: Second Welfare Theorem

- Consumer $h \in \mathcal{H}$ has endowment $\omega^h \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$
- Suppose $X^h = \mathbb{R}_+^n$, and utility functions $U^h(\cdot)$
- continuous, quasi-concave, strictly monotonic.
- If $\{\hat{x}^h\}_{h=1}^H$ where $\hat{x}^h \neq 0$ is Pareto efficient,
- then there exist a price vector $p > 0$ such that

$$U^h(x^h) > U^h(\hat{x}^h) \Rightarrow p \cdot x^h > p \cdot \hat{x}^h$$

- Proof:

Proposition 3.2-2: Second Welfare Theorem

- Proof: Want to apply Supporting Hyperplane Theorem to the set $\{x | V^1(x) \geq V^1(\omega)\}$ where

$$V^1(x) = \max_{x^h} \left\{ U^1(x^1) \middle| \sum_{h=1}^{H} x^h \leq x, \right.$$

$$\left. U^h(x^h) \geq U^h(\hat{x}^h), h \neq 1 \right\}$$

(2D example)



Need to show that:

1. ω on boundary
2. Set is convex

Proposition 3.2-2: Second Welfare Theorem

- Proof: Assume nobody has zero allocation
  - Relaxing this is easily done…
- By Lemma 3.2-1, $V^1(x)$ is quasi-concave
  - Convex upper contour set $\{x|V^1(x) \geq V^1(\omega)\}$
- $V^1(x)$ is strictly increasing since $U^1(\cdot)$ is also
  - and any increment could be given to consumer *1*
- Since $\{\hat{x}^h\}_{h=1}^H$ is Pareto efficient, $V^1(\omega) = U^1(\hat{x}^1)$
- Since $U^1(\cdot)$ is strictly increasing, $\sum_{h=1}^{H} \hat{x}^h = \omega$

Proposition 3.2-2: Second Welfare Theorem

- Proof (Continued):
- Since ω is on the boundary of $\{x|V^1(x) \geq V^1(\omega)\}$
- By the Supporting Hyperplane Theorem, there exists a vector $p \neq 0$ such that

$$V^1(x) > V^1(\omega) \Rightarrow p \cdot x > p \cdot \omega$$
$$\text{and } V^1(x) \geq V^1(\omega) \Rightarrow p \cdot x \geq p \cdot \omega$$

- Claim: $p > 0$, then we can show that

$$U^h(x^h) > U^h(\hat{x}^h) \Rightarrow p \cdot x^h > p \cdot \hat{x}^h$$

Proposition 3.2-2: Second Welfare Theorem

- Proof (Continued):
- Why $p > 0$? If not, define $\delta = (\delta_1, \cdots, \delta_n) > 0$
- such that $\delta_j > 0$ iff $p_j < 0$ (others = 0)
- Then, $V^1(\omega + \delta) > V^1(\omega)$ and $p \cdot (\omega + \delta) < p \cdot \omega$
- Contradicting (Supporting Hyperplane Thm)

$$U^h(x^h) \geq U^h(\hat{x}^h) \Rightarrow p \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{H} x^h \geq p \cdot \omega$$

$$V^1(x) > V^1(\omega) \Rightarrow p \cdot \sum_{h=1} x^h > p \cdot \omega$$

Proposition 3.2-2: Second Welfare Theorem

- Since $U^h(x^h) \geq U^h(\hat{x}^h) \Rightarrow p \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{H} x^h \geq p \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{H} \hat{x}^h$
- Set $x^k = \hat{x}^k$ for all $k \neq h$, then for consumer h

$$U^h(x^h) \geq U^h(\hat{x}^h) \Rightarrow p \cdot x^h \geq p \cdot \hat{x}^h$$

- Need to show strict inequality implies strict…
- If not, then $U^h(x^h) > U^h(\hat{x}^h) \Rightarrow p \cdot x^h = p \cdot \hat{x}^h$
- Hence, $p \cdot \lambda x^h < p \cdot \hat{x}^h$ for all $\lambda \in (0,1)$

$$U^h \text{ continuous } \Rightarrow U^h(\lambda x^h) > U^h(\hat{x}^h) \text{ for } \lambda \text{ near } 1$$

- Contradiction!

Why should I care about this (or the math)?

- In Ch.3 we saw three different versions of the SWT, each with different assumptions...



- Need to know when can you use which...

Summary of 3.2

- Pareto Efficiency:
  - Cannot make one better off without hurting others
- Walrasian Equilibrium: market clearing prices
- Welfare Theorems:
  - First: Walrasian Equilibrium is Pareto Efficient
  - Second: Pareto Efficient allocations can be supported as Walrasian Equilibria (with transfer)
- Homework: Prove FWT for n-consumers
  - (Optional: 2009 final-Part B)