

Herbert Hoover's Cartelization Policies and the start of the Great Depression

by Lee Ohanian

Discussion by: Fabrizio Perri
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis FED and NBER

Lucas Conference, Chicago April 2007

- What caused the start of the great depression (1929-31)?

Outline

- What caused the start of the great depression (1929-31)?
- Exogenous high real wages (Bordo Erceg Evans, 2000)
- No! (Cole Ohanian, 2001)
- Endogenous high real wages? (Ohanian, 2007)

Early phases of the great depression (1929-31)

Aggregate facts

- GDP: -20%
- Employment: -25%
- Investment: -50%
- Consumption: -15%
- **Little change in TFP**
- **Aggregate real wages: +7%**

Early phases of the great depression (1929-31)

Aggregate facts

- GDP: -20%
- Employment: -25%
- Investment: -50%
- Consumption: -15%
- **Little change in TFP**
- **Aggregate real wages: +7%**

Sectoral Facts

- Manufacturing output and hours: -50%, Farm: stable
- Manufacturing real wages: +10%, Farm wages -10%
- Relative price of manufacturing falls

A one sector sticky wage model

Key assumptions: given k , n is determined by labor demand, real wages exogenous

$$\begin{aligned}y &= n^\gamma k^{1-\gamma} \\w &= \gamma n^{\gamma-1} k^{1-\gamma}\end{aligned}$$

Key result (Assuming $\hat{k} = 0$)

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{n} &= \frac{1}{\gamma-1} \hat{w} \approx -3\hat{w} \\ \hat{y} &= \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1} \hat{w} \approx -2\hat{w}\end{aligned}$$

A 7% increase in wage gives a 14% fall in GDP, and 21% fall in employment, not too far from the observed.

A two sectors sticky price model

Add a farm sector (σ is the elast. of substitution between farm and mfg)

$$\begin{aligned}y_m &= n_m^\gamma k_m^{1-\gamma} \\w &= \gamma p n_m^{\gamma-1} k_m^{1-\gamma} \\p &= y_m^{-\frac{1}{\sigma}}\end{aligned}$$

yielding

$$\hat{y} = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma \frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma} - 1} \hat{w} \approx \begin{array}{ll} -\gamma \approx -\frac{2}{3} \hat{w} & \text{if } \sigma = 1 \\ -\frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma} \approx -\frac{2}{5} \hat{w} & \text{if } \sigma = 1/2 \end{array}$$

So a 10% increase in mfg wages generates a fall in mfg output between 7% and 4% : much less than the observed!

A two sectors sticky price model

Add a farm sector (σ is the elast. of substitution between farm and mfg)

$$\begin{aligned}y_m &= n_m^\gamma k_m^{1-\gamma} \\w &= \gamma p n_m^{\gamma-1} k_m^{1-\gamma} \\p &= y_m^{-\frac{1}{\sigma}}\end{aligned}$$

yielding

$$\hat{y} = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma \frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma} - 1} \hat{w} \approx \begin{array}{ll} -\gamma \approx -\frac{2}{3} \hat{w} & \text{if } \sigma = 1 \\ -\frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma} \approx -\frac{2}{5} \hat{w} & \text{if } \sigma = 1/2 \end{array}$$

So a 10% increase in mfg wages generates a fall in mfg output between 7% and 4% : much less than the observed!

- Price effect dampens reduction in labor demand caused by high wages
- also manufacturing relative prices actually fell!


If high real wages are associated with investment fall, **and investment is intensive in manufacturing** then:

- Increase in manufacturing real price is small or negative
- Large drop in manufacturing output

What makes investment fall?

- If people had expectations about what was going to happen in 1932-1934 (fall in TFP)
- If wage increases are very persistent (very high degree of stickyness)
- If high wages are associated with higher collusion. Firms want to reduce the capital stock from competitive to collusive -> large investment drop (note that it is the interaction between collusion and sticky wages that does it, as each separately has small effect)
- If wages, employment investment in manufacturing are jointly set by Hoover and firms under the threat of a gangster union (Hoover-Ohanian policy)

The Hoover-Ohanian policy




The Hoover-Ohanian policy

- Set the highest possible wage subject to a period by period reservation profit
- Let manufacturing firms collude

Outcomes from policy

- Wages increase
- Big investment decline (Collusion and low returns to capital)
- Fall in employment (Collusion and Gangster union objective)
- Fall in manufacturing relative price
- Wages increase in 1932 but actually fall in 1930

Wages under the Hoover policy



On modeling the policy

- It provides a theory of mfg wages in the depression instead of just assuming them. High wages are the price to pay to keep unions out. But..


On modeling the policy

- It provides a theory of mfg wages in the depression instead of just assuming them. High wages are the price to pay to keep unions out. But..
- Does not fully account for mfg wage patterns in 1929-31
- It also introduces collusion
 - In 1929-31 increasing union pressure but not big change in antitrust enforcement, that was already quite lax.
 - It implies increasing profits in 1929-1931


On modeling the policy

- It provides a theory of mfg wages in the depression instead of just assuming them. High wages are the price to pay to keep unions out. But..
- Does not fully account for mfg wage patterns in 1929-31
- It also introduces collusion
 - In 1929-31 increasing union pressure but not big change in antitrust enforcement, that was already quite lax.
 - It implies increasing profits in 1929-1931
- Suggestion: introduce the Hoover policy in a collusive environment. Consistent with patterns above, implies fall in profits, can get larger wage increases.

Conclusions




Conclusions



IF I ONLY HAD KNOWN...

Conclusions



IF I ONLY HAD KNOWN...



LEE OHANIAN!