Theoretical developments of the comprehensive (or "green") national accounting literature

Geir B. Asheim

Department of Econonomics
University of Oslo

Expert meeting on Ecosystem Valuation
in the context of Natural Capital Accounting
German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation – BfN
Bonn 24–26 April 2018

Introduction

Introduction

- Many practical applications use wealth-based measures

Introduction

- Many practical applications use wealth-based measures
  - Income: Interest on wealth

Introduction

- Many practical applications use wealth-based measures
  - Income: Interest on wealth
  - Savings: Change in wealth

Introduction

- Many practical applications use wealth-based measures
  - Income: Interest on wealth
  - Savings: Change in wealth

- Theoretical developments from Hicks (1946, Ch. 14), via Samuelson (1961) og Weitzman (1976), to Sefton & Weale (2006) support . . .

Introduction

- Many practical applications use wealth-based measures
  - Income: Interest on wealth
  - Savings: Change in wealth

- Theoretical developments from Hicks (1946, Ch. 14), via Samuelson (1961) og Weitzman (1976), to Sefton & Weale (2006) support . . .
  - Income: PV of future interest on consumption

Introduction

- Many practical applications use wealth-based measures
  - Income: Interest on wealth
  - Savings: Change in wealth

- Theoretical developments from Hicks (1946, Ch. 14), via Samuelson (1961) og Weitzman (1976), to Sefton & Weale (2006) support . . .
  - Income: PV of future interest on consumption
  - Savings: PV of future changes in consumption

Income as interest on wealth

Income as interest on wealth

Income in the tradition of

Fisher (1906) and Lindahl (1933, Sect. II)
is associated with interest on wealth,
where wealth is PV of future consumption

Income as interest on wealth

Income in the tradition of
Fisher (1906) and Lindahl (1933, Sect. II)
is associated with interest on wealth,
where wealth is PV of future consumption

Problems:

Income as interest on wealth

Income in the tradition of
Fisher (1906) and Lindahl (1933, Sect. II)
is associated with interest on wealth,
where wealth is PV of future consumption

Problems:

- Non-constant interest rates

Income as interest on wealth

Income in the tradition of
Fisher (1906) and Lindahl (1933, Sect. II)
is associated with interest on wealth,
where wealth is PV of future consumption

Problems:

- Non-constant interest rates
- Capital gains

Income as interest on wealth

Income in the tradition of
Fisher (1906) and Lindahl (1933, Sect. II)
is associated with interest on wealth,
where wealth is PV of future consumption

Problems:

- Non-constant interest rates
- Capital gains

Illustration:
Models of capital accumulation and resource depletion
where the interest rate decreases & the resource appreciates

Income: "The amount which [one] can consume without impoverish [oneself]" (Hick, 1946), v. 1

Income: "The amount which [one] can consume without impoverish [oneself]" (Hick, 1946), v. 1

Indicator of impoverishment:

Stationary equivalent of future consumption

Income: "The amount which [one] can consume without impoverish [oneself]" (Hick, 1946), v. 1

Indicator of impoverishment:

Stationary equivalent of future consumption

Income (Hicks, 1946, "income no. 3")

is associated with the stationary equivalent

Income: "The amount which [one] can consume without impoverish [oneself]" (Hick, 1946), v. 1

Indicator of impoverishment:

Stationary equivalent of future consumption

Income (Hicks, 1946, "income no. 3")

is associated with the stationary equivalent

Problems:

Income: "The amount which [one] can consume without impoverish [oneself]" (Hick, 1946), v. 1

Indicator of impoverishment:
Stationary equivalent of future consumption

Income (Hicks, 1946, "income no. 3")
is associated with the stationary equivalent

Problems:

- Income does not equal net product,
  even in a closed economy with stationary technology

Income: "The amount which [one] can consume without impoverish [oneself]" (Hick, 1946), v. 1

Indicator of impoverishment:
Stationary equivalent of future consumption

Income (Hicks, 1946, "income no. 3")
is associated with the stationary equivalent

Problems:

- Income does not equal net product,
  even in a closed economy with stationary technology
- Hard to define in the case of multiple consumption goods

Income: "The amount which [one] can consume without impoverish [oneself]" (Hick, 1946), v. 2

Income: “The amount which [one] can consume without impoverish [oneself]” (Hick, 1946), v. 2

Hicks (1946, p. 172): “It seems that we ought to define a man's income as the maximum value which he can consume during a week, and still expect to be as well off at the end of the week as he was at the beginning.”

Income: "The amount which [one] can consume without impoverish [oneself]" (Hick, 1946), v. 2

Hicks (1946, p. 172): "It seems that we ought to define a man's income as the maximum value which he can consume during a week, and still expect to be as well off at the end of the week as he was at the beginning."

Indicator of impoverishment: Dynamic welfare

Income: "The amount which [one] can consume without impoverish [oneself]" (Hick, 1946), v. 2

Hicks (1946, p. 172): "It seems that we ought to define a
man's income as the maximum value which he can consume during a week, and still expect to be as well off at the end of the week as he was at the beginning."

Indicator of impoverishment: Dynamic welfare

Measurement of change in dynamic welfare (Samuelson, 1961):
PV of future changes in consumption

Income: "The amount which [one] can consume without impoverish [oneself]" (Hick, 1946), v. 2

Hicks (1946, p. 172): "It seems that we ought to define a man's income as the maximum value which he can consume during a week, and still expect to be as well off at the end of the week as he was at the beginning."

Indicator of impoverishment: Dynamic welfare

Measurement of change in dynamic welfare (Samuelson, 1961):
PV of future changes in consumption = savings

Income: "The amount which [one] can consume without impoverish [oneself]" (Hick, 1946), v. 2

Hicks (1946, p. 172): "It seems that we ought to define a man's income as the maximum value which he can consume during a week, and still expect to be as well off at the end of the week as he was at the beginning."

Indicator of impoverishment: Dynamic welfare

Measurement of change in dynamic welfare (Samuelson, 1961):
PV of future changes in consumption = savings

Income = value of consumption + savings

Income: "The amount which [one] can consume without impoverish [oneself]" (Hick, 1946), v. 2

Hicks (1946, p. 172): "It seems that we ought to define a
man's income as the maximum value which he can consume
during a week, and still expect to be as well off
at the end of the week as he was at the beginning."

Indicator of impoverishment: Dynamic welfare

Measurement of change in dynamic welfare (Samuelson, 1961):
PV of future changes in consumption = savings

Income = value of consumption + savings
= value of consumpt. + PV of future changes in consumpt.

Income: "The amount which [one] can consume without impoverish [oneself]" (Hick, 1946), v. 2

Hicks (1946, p. 172): "It seems that we ought to define a
man's income as the maximum value which he can consume
during a week, and still expect to be as well off
at the end of the week as he was at the beginning."

Indicator of impoverishment: Dynamic welfare

Measurement of change in dynamic welfare (Samuelson, 1961):
PV of future changes in consumption = savings

Income = value of consumption + savings
= value of consumpt. + PV of future changes in consumpt.

Present & future consumpt. (changes) are valued in welfare terms

Income: "The amount which [one] can consume without impoverish [oneself]" (Hick, 1946), v. 2

Hicks (1946, p. 172): "It seems that we ought to define a man's income as the maximum value which he can consume during a week, and still expect to be as well off at the end of the week as he was at the beginning."

Indicator of impoverishment: Dynamic welfare

Measurement of change in dynamic welfare (Samuelson, 1961):
PV of future changes in consumption = savings

Income = value of consumption + savings
= value of consumpt. + PV of future changes in consumpt.

Present & future consumpt. (changes) are valued in welfare terms

In an optimum: Observable prices; otherwise: calculated prices

Definition of income (Sefton & Weale, 2006)

Definition of income (Sefton & Weale, 2006)

$$\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t)$$

Definition of income (Sefton & Weale, 2006)

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t)\right)$$

Definition of income (Sefton & Weale, 2006)

$$\frac{d}{dt}\big(\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t)\big) = \dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \mathbf{p}_c(t)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(t)$$

Definition of income (Sefton & Weale, 2006)

$$\frac{d}{dt}\big(\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t)\big) = \dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \mathbf{p}_c(t)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(t)$$

$$-\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) = \int_t^\infty \dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(\tau)\mathbf{c}(\tau)d\tau + \int_t^\infty \mathbf{p}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau$$

Definition of income (Sefton & Weale, 2006)

$$\frac{d}{dt}\big(\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t)\big) = \dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \mathbf{p}_c(t)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(t)$$

$$-\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) = \int_t^\infty \dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(\tau)\mathbf{c}(\tau)d\tau + \int_t^\infty \mathbf{p}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau$$

$$\underbrace{\int_t^\infty \mathbf{p}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau}_{\text{Savings}}$$

Definition of income (Sefton & Weale, 2006)

$$\frac{d}{dt}\big(\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t)\big) = \dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \mathbf{p}_c(t)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(t)$$

$$-\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) = \int_t^\infty \dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(\tau)\mathbf{c}(\tau)d\tau + \int_t^\infty \mathbf{p}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau$$

$$\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) \; + \; \underbrace{\int_t^\infty \mathbf{p}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau}_{\text{Savings}}$$

Definition of income (Sefton & Weale, 2006)

$$\tfrac{d}{dt}\big(\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t)\big) = \dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \mathbf{p}_c(t)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(t)$$

$$-\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) = \int_t^{\infty} \dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(\tau)\mathbf{c}(\tau)d\tau + \int_t^{\infty} \mathbf{p}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau$$

$$\underbrace{\qquad\qquad\qquad}_{\text{Income}} = \mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \underbrace{\int_t^{\infty} \mathbf{p}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau}_{\text{Savings}}$$

Definition of income (Sefton & Weale, 2006)

$$\frac{d}{dt}\big(\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t)\big) = \dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \mathbf{p}_c(t)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(t)$$

$$-\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) = \int_t^{\infty} \dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(\tau)\mathbf{c}(\tau)d\tau + \int_t^{\infty} \mathbf{p}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau$$

$$\underbrace{\int_t^{\infty} \big(-\dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(\tau)\big)\mathbf{c}(\tau)d\tau}_{\text{Income}} = \mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \underbrace{\int_t^{\infty} \mathbf{p}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau}_{\text{Savings}}$$

Definition of income (Sefton & Weale, 2006)

$$\frac{d}{dt}\big(\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t)\big) = \dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \mathbf{p}_c(t)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(t)$$

$$-\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) = \int_t^\infty \dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(\tau)\mathbf{c}(\tau)d\tau + \int_t^\infty \mathbf{p}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau$$

$$\underbrace{\int_t^\infty \big(-\dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(\tau)\big)\mathbf{c}(\tau)d\tau}_{\text{Income}} = \mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \underbrace{\int_t^\infty \mathbf{p}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau}_{\text{Savings}}$$

$$\mathbf{P}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t)$$

Definition of income (Sefton & Weale, 2006)

$$\tfrac{d}{dt}\big(\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t)\big) = \dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \mathbf{p}_c(t)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(t)$$

$$-\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) = \int_t^\infty \dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(\tau)\mathbf{c}(\tau)d\tau + \int_t^\infty \mathbf{p}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau$$

$$\underbrace{\int_t^\infty \big(-\dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(\tau)\big)\mathbf{c}(\tau)d\tau}_{\text{Income}} = \mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \underbrace{\int_t^\infty \mathbf{p}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau}_{\text{Savings}}$$

$$\mathbf{P}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \int_t^\infty \frac{\pi(\tau)}{\pi(t)}\mathbf{P}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau$$

Definition of income (Sefton & Weale, 2006)

$$\frac{d}{dt}\big(\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t)\big) = \dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \mathbf{p}_c(t)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(t)$$

$$-\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) = \int_t^\infty \dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(\tau)\mathbf{c}(\tau)d\tau + \int_t^\infty \mathbf{p}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau$$

$$\underbrace{\int_t^\infty \big(-\dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(\tau)\big)\mathbf{c}(\tau)d\tau}_{\text{Income}} = \mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \underbrace{\int_t^\infty \mathbf{p}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau}_{\text{Savings}}$$

$$\int_t^\infty \frac{\pi(\tau)}{\pi(t)}R(\tau)\mathbf{P}_c(\tau)\mathbf{c}(\tau)d\tau = \mathbf{P}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \int_t^\infty \frac{\pi(\tau)}{\pi(t)}\mathbf{P}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau$$

Definition of income (Sefton & Weale, 2006)

$$\frac{d}{dt}\big(\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t)\big) = \dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \mathbf{p}_c(t)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(t)$$

$$-\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) = \int_t^{\infty} \dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(\tau)\mathbf{c}(\tau)d\tau + \int_t^{\infty} \mathbf{p}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau$$

$$\underbrace{\int_t^{\infty} \big(-\dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(\tau)\big)\mathbf{c}(\tau)d\tau}_{\text{Income}} = \mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \underbrace{\int_t^{\infty} \mathbf{p}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau}_{\text{Savings}}$$

$$Y(t) = \int_t^{\infty} \frac{\pi(\tau)}{\pi(t)} R(\tau)\mathbf{P}_c(\tau)\mathbf{c}(\tau)d\tau = \mathbf{P}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \int_t^{\infty} \frac{\pi(\tau)}{\pi(t)} \mathbf{P}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau$$

- Real income: PV of future real interest on consumption

$$\frac{d}{dt}\big(\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t)\big) = \dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \mathbf{p}_c(t)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(t)$$

$$-\mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) = \int_t^\infty \dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(\tau)\mathbf{c}(\tau)d\tau + \int_t^\infty \mathbf{p}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau$$

$$\underbrace{\int_t^\infty \big(-\dot{\mathbf{p}}_c(\tau)\big)\mathbf{c}(\tau)d\tau}_{\text{Income}} = \mathbf{p}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \underbrace{\int_t^\infty \mathbf{p}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau}_{\text{Savings}}$$

$$Y(t) = \int_t^\infty \frac{\pi(\tau)}{\pi(t)} R(\tau)\mathbf{P}_c(\tau)\mathbf{c}(\tau)d\tau = \mathbf{P}_c(t)\mathbf{c}(t) + \int_t^\infty \frac{\pi(\tau)}{\pi(t)}\mathbf{P}_c(\tau)\dot{\mathbf{c}}(\tau)d\tau$$

Results (including Asheim & Weitzman, 2001)

Results (including Asheim & Weitzman, 2001)

If a Divisia CPI is used

Results (including Asheim & Weitzman, 2001)

If a Divisia CPI is used

- Change in the real value of consumption
  $=$ real value of consumption changes

Results (including Asheim & Weitzman, 2001)

If a Divisia CPI is used and the real interest rate is positive:

- Change in the real value of consumption
  = real value of consumption changes

Results (including Asheim & Weitzman, 2001)

If a Divisia CPI is used and the real interest rate is positive:

- Change in the real value of consumption
  $=$ real value of consumption changes
- Real income grows if and only if savings are positive

Results (including Asheim & Weitzman, 2001)

If a Divisia CPI is used and the real interest rate is positive:

- Change in the real value of consumption
  $=$ real value of consumption changes
- Real income grows if and only if savings are positive

In a closed economy with stationary technology:

Results (including Asheim & Weitzman, 2001)

If a Divisia CPI is used and the real interest rate is positive:

- Change in the real value of consumption
  = real value of consumption changes
- Real income grows if and only if savings are positive

In a closed economy with stationary technology:

- Savings = value of net investments

Results (including Asheim & Weitzman, 2001)

If a Divisia CPI is used and the real interest rate is positive:

- Change in the real value of consumption
  $=$ real value of consumption changes
- Real income grows if and only if savings are positive

In a closed economy with stationary technology:

- Savings $=$ value of net investments
- Income $=$ consumpt. $+$ value of net investm. $=$ net product

Results (including Asheim & Weitzman, 2001)

If a Divisia CPI is used and the real interest rate is positive:

- Change in the real value of consumption
  = real value of consumption changes
- Real income grows if and only if savings are positive

In a closed economy with stationary technology:

- Savings = value of net investments
- Income = consumpt. + value of net investm. = net product

If a Divisia CPI is used and the real interest rate is positive
in a closed economy with stationary technology:

Results (including Asheim & Weitzman, 2001)

If a Divisia CPI is used and the real interest rate is positive:

- Change in the real value of consumption
  $=$ real value of consumption changes
- Real income grows if and only if savings are positive

In a closed economy with stationary technology:

- Savings $=$ value of net investments
- Income $=$ consumpt. $+$ value of net investm. $=$ net product

If a Divisia CPI is used and the real interest rate is positive
in a closed economy with stationary technology:

- Increase in real net product indicates welfare improvement

Purpose: Indicating prudent behavior

Purpose: Indicating prudent behavior

by:

Purpose: Indicating prudent behavior

by:

- savings non-negative

Purpose: Indicating prudent behavior

by:

- savings non-negative
- consumption not exceeding income

Purpose: Indicating prudent behavior

by:

- savings non-negative
- consumption not exceeding income
- real income non-decreasing

Purpose: Indicating prudent behavior

by:

- savings non-negative
- consumption not exceeding income
- real income non-decreasing

For local-in-time comparisons within an economy:
Does dynamic welfare increase?

Purpose: Indicating prudent behavior

by:

- savings non-negative
- consumption not exceeding income
- real income non-decreasing

For local-in-time comparisons within an economy:
Does dynamic welfare increase?

Not for global-in-space comparisons between economies:
Are people in one economy better off than in another?

Role of consumers' surplus

Role of consumers' surplus

For local-in-time comparisons within an economy:

Role of consumers' surplus

For local-in-time comparisons within an economy:

No role! Only the value of consumption changes matters

Role of consumers' surplus

For local-in-time comparisons within an economy:

No role! Only the value of consumption changes matters

For global-in-time comparisons within an economy:

Is dynamic welfare higher now than it was n periods ago?

Role of consumers' surplus

For local-in-time comparisons within an economy:

No role! Only the value of consumption changes matters

For global-in-time comparisons within an economy:

Is dynamic welfare higher now than it was n periods ago?

This leads to the problem of path dependence

Role of consumers' surplus

For local-in-time comparisons within an economy:
  No role! Only the value of consumption changes matters

For global-in-time comparisons within an economy:
  Is dynamic welfare higher now than it was n periods ago?
  This leads to the problem of path dependence

Global-in-time comparisons using a Divisia CPI
  hold if preferences are quasi-homothetic

Role of consumers' surplus

For local-in-time comparisons within an economy:
No role! Only the value of consumption changes matters

For global-in-time comparisons within an economy:
Is dynamic welfare higher now than it was n periods ago?
This leads to the problem of path dependence

Global-in-time comparisons using a Divisia CPI
hold if preferences are quasi-homothetic
that is, if Engel curves are linear

Role of consumers' surplus

For local-in-time comparisons within an economy:
No role! Only the value of consumption changes matters

For global-in-time comparisons within an economy:
Is dynamic welfare higher now than it was n periods ago?
This leads to the problem of path dependence

Global-in-time comparisons using a Divisia CPI
hold if preferences are quasi-homothetic
that is, if Engel curves are linear

If some goods are environmental amenities,
then linear Engel curves impose requirements on
the scale used to measure such amenities

Role of consumers' surplus

For local-in-time comparisons within an economy:
No role! Only the value of consumption changes matters

For global-in-time comparisons within an economy:
Is dynamic welfare higher now than it was n periods ago?
This leads to the problem of path dependence

Global-in-time comparisons using a Divisia CPI
hold if preferences are quasi-homothetic
that is, if Engel curves are linear

If some goods are environmental amenities,
then linear Engel curves impose requirements on
the scale used to measure such amenities
For a different scale, consumers' surplus might have a role

References

Asheim GB, Weitzman ML. 2001. Does NNP growth indicate welfare improvement? *Econ Letters* 73:233–239

Fisher I. 1906. *The Nature of Capital and Income*. Macmillan, New York

Hicks J. 1946. *Value and capital*. 2nd ed. Oxford University Press, Oxford

Lindahl E. 1933. The concept of income, in Bagge G (ed.), *Economic Essays in Honor of Gustav Cassel*. George Allen & Unwin, London

Samuelson P. 1961. The evaluation of 'social income': Capital formation and wealth, in Lutz FA, Hague, DC (eds.), *The Theory of Capital*, St. Martin's Press, New York

Sefton JA, Weale MR. 2006. The concept of income in a general equilibrium *Rev Econ Stud* 73:219–249

Weitzman ML. 1976. On the welfare significance of national product in a dynamic economy *Quart J Econ* 90:156–162