

# Re: how to compare living standards

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2006-04/msg00035.html>

---

- *From:* "Jim Blair" <jeb@xxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Mon, 3 Apr 2006 10:58:07 -0500
- 

"William F Hummel" <wfhummel@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:5r9r225n3dbmrt3eme0p9g4unv7e9hv5u3@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:5r9r225n3dbmrt3eme0p9g4unv7e9hv5u3@xxxxxxxxxxxx)

On Fri, 31 Mar 2006 15:30:50 -0600, "Jim Blair" <jeb@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

"William F Hummel" <wfhummel@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:u11r221splsdkkmbocqpal8ov8sntd9503@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:u11r221splsdkkmbocqpal8ov8sntd9503@xxxxxxxxxxxx)

On Fri, 31 Mar 2006 12:13:03 -0600, "Jim Blair" <jeb@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

Do you think poor and low income people  
save and invest more than rich

and

high income people?

Irrelevant. The issue is whether reducing taxes primarily on the wealthy will increase capital formation for real investment. Don't confuse financial investment with real investment. If you increase after-tax income for the wealthy, most of it will end up spent on financial assets and drive up asset prices.

Or do asset prices increase because the assets become more valuable?

Strange question. Obviously when the market bids up asset prices, their monetary value increases.

Re: how to compare living standards

Hi,

But when a company improves/expands/modernizes/markets new products/etc. the value of the company increases. And thus the value of a share of the company (it stock) also increases in value, doesn't it? And the market price of a share of stock is supposed to reflect the value of the stock and thus of the company.

If the money chasing a given number of shares increases, share prices will increase — until that liquidity dries up — and then you have just witnessed a bubble. ....

Which I read to mean that sometimes those buying stocks overestimate the "real value" of a company. But not every increase in stock price is an overestimate of the company's value.

....All of which has nothing whatsoever to do with the real value of the assets behind those shares.

But it is a measure of what those buying and selling THINK the value of the assets is. Sure they are sometimes wrong, but they are the "experts": they study the market, the companies, and they have a financial incentive to make accurate judgements. (and by "they" here I mean the mostly mutual fund and pension fund managers—the general investing public mostly bases their purchases on the history and reputation of the particular fund, not the individual companies in the fund)

The large middle class savings in pension funds, mutual funds, life insurance companies, etc. is far more important in supporting real investment.

jeb:

Your statement above must stem from the idea that money in the stock market, mutual funds, bonds, T-bills and bank CD's does not correspond to money "invested", because you surely don't

Re: how to compare living standards

think

that

people with low incomes have more money in these than people with high incomes.

There is no shortage of funds available for investment. But there is a chronic shortage of funds available among the broad middle and lower middle class. That shows up on the demand side and is what explains the business cycle and the occasional shrinkage in the economy, otherwise known as a recession or depression.

The notion that reducing taxes on the wealthy leads to greater output is simply false.

jeb:

Interesting theory. But how does it explain the fact that recessions in

the

US have become less frequent and less severe since Reagan pushed through his supply side tax cuts?

Recessions have been moderate since 1982 for two reasons: (1) the Fed learned from past mistakes regarding monetary policy, (2) the enormous Reagan/Bush budget deficits primed the pump quite effectively. Borrowing at a record pace for SDI, a 600 ship navy, and all the other goodies did a lot for aggregate demand.

So it took from the creation of the Federal Reserve until Reagan for them to learn how to properly manage fiscal policy?

And the US had a large deficit (relative to GDP) from 1945 to the 1960's but we also had more and deeper recessions

....Reagan is the most Keynesian of all our presidents, although he apparently never understood why.

Re: how to compare living standards

Re: how to compare living standards

I agree, except perhaps with the "never understood" part. I think Reagan (pre-Alzheimer) was smarter than he wanted his enemies to think. The better to out fox them ;-)

<http://www.kc.frb.org/publicat/econrev/PDF/4q98haim.pdf>

What data supports your claim?

Another bad link.

Twice you used the term "bad link". Explain.

As I see it, you and other "demand siders" claim that a more even distribution of incomes would mean a better economy because of "more demand" from the bottom of the income distribution. Supply siders say it is the rich who invest and provide the capital for a better economy, so cuts in tax RATES can supply more capital, expand the GDP and thus in the long run increase tax REVENUE for both the feds and the states.

Since the tax rate reductions of Reagan, the US economy has been more stable than before, and has grown faster than either Europe or Japan. Isn't that fact contrary to the "demand side" predictions?

\*\*\*\*\*

\_\_\_\_\_ooo\_\_(\_O O\_)\_\_ooo\_\_\_\_\_

( )

jim blair (jeblair@xxxxxxxx) Madison Wisconsin USA.

This message was brought to you using biodegradable binary bits, and 100% recycled bandwidth. For a good time call: <http://www.geocities.com/capitolhill/4834>

.

Re: how to compare living standards