

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Coyote Economist

Economics

Fall 2016

CE Fall 2016

Coyote Economist

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/coyote-economist>

 Part of the [Economics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Coyote Economist, "CE Fall 2016" (2016). *Coyote Economist*. 18.
<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/coyote-economist/18>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Economics at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Coyote Economist by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

Coyote Economist

News from the Department of Economics, CSUSB

Volume 23, Issue 1

Fall 2016



Clinton and Trump's Economic Proposals: An Assessment

by Mayo Toruño

How do the economic proposals of the top two presidential candidates stack up? What policies are Hillary Clinton (Democrat) and Donald Trump (Republican) proposing, and how do they differ from one another?

Reviewing their proposals provides insights into the kind of economic policies they are likely to favor, even though the specifics of their plans will likely change upon taking office. Nevertheless, such an exercise provides us with a better understanding of how they see the economy, the role they believe government should play in the economy, the relative weight they attach to business and labor, and the kind of policies they believe are most likely to move the economy closer to an equitable, full-employment, growth path.

The first thing to note about their economic proposals is that they follow the vision that's common to their corresponding political parties. Both political parties embrace capitalism as an organizing principle, are generally suspicious of socialism, and accept the notion that the United States has an obligation to govern world affairs. But they differ on how they see the free market and, consequently, the economic role they assign to government and labor. Democrats are more likely to accept the claim that markets can fail and, as a result, need public oversight and stimulative policies, while

continued on page 2

Inside this Issue:

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Commencement..... | 2 |
| Staying Informed..... | 3 |
| Class Schedule | 5 |

Economics Department Scholarship Winners

At the end of last year, the Economics Department awarded scholarships to three students. **Justin White** and **Erik Gustafsson** received a John and June Kennedy Economics Scholarship while **Dusty Wilson** was awarded the Sean Brunske Economics scholarship. Each scholarship gave the winner approximately \$1,500 which could be used toward University registration fees.

The Economics Department has been award scholarships to our students since the 1980s and many dozens of students have received them. The scholarships are funded by the generous contributions of our alumni. The Economics Department is very thankful for the generosity of our alumni.

This coming Spring the Economics Department will be awarding yet more scholarships. Next quarter information about the application process will appear in the *Coyote Economist*. The application process is simple and every good student should apply. What have you got to lose!

Department of Economics
CSUSB
909-537-5511
<http://economics.csusb.edu>
Facebook: CSUSB Department of Economics

Fall Commencement

This year's Fall Commencement will be held on December 10, 2016, at the **Coussoulis Arena** on the campus of CSUSB. (The Spring Commencement is held at the Citizens Business Bank Arena in Ontario but this is not Spring! Do not go to Ontario.)

Students majoring in **Economics, Political Economy, Mathematical Economics, or Applied Economics** will participate in the **9 a.m.** commencement along with others in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and the College of Natural Sciences.

Students in the **Business Economics major** will participate in the **1 p.m.** commencement with the College of Business and Public Administration and the College of Arts and Letters.

So...where is Fall commencement?

Coussoulis Arena at CSUSB

We're Still on Facebook!

Joining us on Facebook is an important way of keeping up with Departmental news and events, as well as getting information on political economy.

Simply search for The CSUSB Department of Economics on Facebook and you'll find us. We're easy to find. If you've not already done this, do it today!

Economic Proposals

Continued from page 1

Republicans tend to view government as a parasitical institution that prevents markets from achieving their full potential. And while the Democratic Party is more accommodating to labor than is the Republican Party, it would be a mistake to view it as a labor party. Business interests dominate both parties, but labor has traditionally been better received by Democrats than Republicans.

Since the mid-1970s both political parties have shifted toward the right and embraced policies that are now referred to as "neoliberal." The Democrats began to move in that direction in the late 1970s when the Carter Administration deregulated the transportation, oil, and gas industries. But it wasn't until 1985 that their pivot toward the right took hold with the founding of the Democratic Leadership Council (DLC).


...Since the mid-1970s both political parties have shifted toward the right...

This organization, which eventually disbanded in 2011, pushed the Democratic Party to distance itself from the kind of activist government programs, such as the New Deal and the Great Society, which had defined it since the 1930s. Instead, the DLC began to push for policies that favored free trade, market solutions to public problems, privatization of public assets, market deregulation, welfare reform, and labor market flexibility (On the role of the DLC in moving the Democratic Party to the right, see <https://goo.gl/c0kCH0>). While government was still

seen as an institution that should be used to rectify the vagaries of the free market, these "New Democrats" placed more emphasis on market solutions and privatization than the "old Democrats" of the New Deal and the Great Society. The 42nd President of the United States, William (Bill) Clinton, was the first New Democrat to push for this vision of public policy.

The Republican shift toward the right began in 1980 with the election of Ronald Reagan. To be sure, they have always been to the right of the Democrats, at least since the early 20th century, but by 1971 they had reluctantly accommodated themselves to a Keynesian view of things as witnessed by President Nixon's use of wage and price controls. But, by 1980 they doubled down on their belief that government stifles free markets and began

continued on page 3



Staying Informed of CSUSB Department of Economics Events and News

If you're receiving the *Coyote Economist*, then you're on our mailing list and everything is as it should be. But, if you know of an Economics Major, or an Econ Fellow Traveler, who is not receiving the *Coyote Economist* through email, then please have him/her inform our Administrative Support Coordinator, Ms. Jacqueline Carrillo, or the Chair of the Economics Department, Professor Eric Nilsson. Our phone number is 909-537-5511.

You can stay informed by consulting:

Our Website - <http://economics.csusb.edu/>

Our Facebook Page - <http://www.facebook.com/pages/CSUSB-Department-of-Economics/109500729082841>

Chair of the Economics Department – enilsson@csusb.edu

Economic Proposals

Continued from page 2
to push, once again, for greater deregulation, privatization of public services, heightened vigilance over possible bureaucratic waste, and attacking social welfare and collective bargaining. President Reagan's famous quip "government is not the solution to our problem; government is the problem", succinctly captures this position (see "Reagan's First Inaugural" in <https://goo.gl/v8fRro>). This perspective was buttressed by a new policy that came to be called Supply Side Economics.

The basic idea was that economic growth had been stifled by government regulation and taxation, so the best way to regenerate economic growth was to encourage greater deregulation while simultaneously reducing

marginal tax rates—particularly on corporations and the wealthy. The belief was that such tax reductions would motivate corporations and capitalists to invest in new productive capacity, which in turn would generate more output and employment.

While the economic proposals of both candidates fall within the traditions of their corresponding parties, Clinton's plan tilts a bit more toward the old Democratic Party, while Trump's plan stays within the current supply side tradition of the Republican Party.

For example, Clinton presents her plan in terms of economic fairness, claiming that her administration will seek an equitable distribution of the

burdens (taxes) and benefits (public services) of government. She proposes a tax system that ensures the wealthy not pay a lower tax rate than their employees (the Buffett Rule), intends

... Trump's proposals stay within the current supply side tradition of the Republican Party...

to close corporate and Wall Street loopholes, simplify and cut small business taxes, and provide tax relief for working families. In

addition, she plans to invest in transportation and energy infrastructure, encourage U.S. manufacturing, make housing affordable to working families, keep the Affordable Care Act (ACT), boost social security benefits, introduce greater oversight of the financial sector, invest in public education and push for debt-free college education.

She claims to fight for the labor movement by supporting collective bargaining and the Employee Free Choice Act. She also has expressed a desire to raise the minimum wage to \$15, protect workers from exploitation, encourage companies to invest in their workers, and reject trade agreements, like the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), that threaten jobs and national security. What's more, she plans to create a defense budget that encourages efficiency while investing in cyber defense and attack capabilities, which she calls "net-centric warfare" (see Hillary Clinton's website <https://goo.gl/9GbE9T> and "10 Ways Hillary

continued on page 4





Economic Proposals

Continued from page 3

Clinton Plans to Grow the Economy”
<https://goo.gl/l02cwt>).

Trump’s proposals fit within the Republican Party’s agenda of supply side policies and reductions to the social welfare component of the budget. The centerpiece of his economic plan involves simplifying the federal income tax code by reducing it from the current seven tax brackets to three. Instead of the current structure that starts at a tax rate of 10% and tops at 39.6%, he intends to compress it into three rates, 12%, 25%, and 33%. The statutory corporate tax rate will be reduced from the current 35% to 15% and he’ll encourage U.S. corporations that currently keep their foreign earnings abroad to bring them back to the U.S. by enticing them with a special 10% tax rate.

He’ll push to eliminate special interest loopholes, repeal the inheritance tax, and allow families with an income of \$500,000 or less (married filing

jointly) to deduct the average cost of childcare from their taxes. He’s proposed a moratorium on new regulations, a “penny plan” that will reduce, on a yearly basis, non-defense and non-safety net spending by one percent of the previous year’s spending, and will encourage bureau chiefs to identify and remove job-killing regulations.

Additionally, he intends to eliminate the Waters of the U.S. Rule and the Clean Power Plan, as well as repeal the Affordable Care Act by replacing it with a Health Savings Accounts. He’s silent on unions, collective bargaining, and the minimum wage.

But, he’s against the TPP and plans to revisit trade policies, such as NAFTA, by renegotiating or renegeing on agreements that do not increase GDP, reduce the trade deficit, and strengthen the nation’s manufacturing base. What’s more, China will be labeled a currency manipulator and legal claims will be brought against China in the U.S. and the WTO.

At the same time, he intends to

increase military spending, increase investment in the nation’s missile defense system and build a stronger system of cyber defense and offense. The combined effect of these policies, he claims, will unleash a 3.5% to 4% rate of economic growth over the next ten years (see Donald Trump’s website <https://goo.gl/gCfFhj> and “10 Ways Donald Trump Plans to Grow the Economy” <https://goo.gl/vX6CL7>).

Clinton’s plan emphasizes spending on social infrastructure, or more broadly the social wage, while raising taxes on the wealthy so as to fund, in part, this increased spending, but also to encourage a more equitable distribution of income and the net benefits of government. At the same time, military spending will increase by an amount determined by the cost of her “net-centric warfare” proposal.

Both of these forms of government spending will increase, though it’s unclear whether the social wage component will rise by the same proportion as (or greater or smaller than), the military component. In the meantime, the tax increase will dampen to some

continued on page 5

... Clinton’s plan emphasizes spending on social infrastructure... while raising taxes on the wealthy...

Economic Proposals

Continued from page 4

extent the stimulative impact of the increased government spending, though the extent of this effect will be modest since it's focused on the wealthy (whose relatively low propensity to consume implies a modest decrease in aggregate consumption). Thus, it's reasonable to assume that negative impact of the tax increase will be outweighed by the positive impact of increased government spending, bringing about a net increase in aggregate demand and thus national output.

The growth that would be expected from this combination of proposals will be modest. This is consistent with the prognosis of the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, which claims that Clinton's plan will be "debt neutral," meaning that the deficit, and thus the stimulus, will be modest (see Joel L. Naroff, "Clinton's economic plan", Philly.com <https://goo.gl/5H4y4D>).

In contrast, Trump proposes significant tax reductions, cuts to the non-military component of government spending, and increases to the military. Given the troop and hardware increase he's proposing, it's reasonable to imagine that military spending will rise by a greater proportion than whatever decrease will occur to the non-military component of the budget.

This means that Trump would increase government spending (though mostly on the military) while, at the same time, cutting taxes. Both policies, i.e. increased government spending and reduced taxes, will have a stimulative impact on aggregate demand and thus national output.

Indeed, the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget claims that Trump's plan will increase both the federal deficit and the nation's debt by a far greater proportion than Clinton's impact on the deficit and debt (see Joel L. Naroff, "Why Trump's economic plans are unrealistic and costly", Philly.com <https://goo.gl/nCkQgB>).

In other words, Trump's plan is more stimulative than Clinton's.

But, while his plan may very well bring about a faster rate of growth than Clinton's, it is very doubtful that it will be close to the 4% rate he's proclaiming. The last time the U.S. economy experienced such rates of growth was in the 1950s and 1960s.

And even during the 1980s, when the miracle of supply side economics was supposed to have occurred, the average annual rate of growth was 3.2%; a good rate, to be sure, but short of the 4% he's promising (see Real Gross Domestic Product (A191RL1Q225S-BEA), FRED Economic Data, <https://goo.gl/Suycen>).

What's more, the kind of stimulus he's proposing will heighten wealth and income inequality; not simply because the tax cuts are aimed at the wealthy, but because he's also minimizing, indeed attacking, the social wage, reducing or eliminating regulations, and ignoring—or working against—collective bargaining and increases to the minimum wage. At the same time, because his plan minimizes the

social wage while highlighting military expenditures, the quality of public life will deteriorate as militarism is encouraged at the expense of the social wage.

On the international front, Clinton's proposals are more in line with longstanding U.S. trade relations whereas Trump's proposals have the potential for destabilizing world trade as a result of his threats to renegotiate or renege existing trade agreements, not to mention the economic war he's planning to conduct against China. This could

lead to economic retaliation by other nations and, as a result, have the effect of reducing global trade and conse-

quently economic growth in the U.S.

In short, his trade proposal can counteract to some extent the stimulus his fiscal policy could bring about.

Lastly, there's the crazy proposal to build an impenetrable wall on the southern border of the United States, which, Trump claims, will be paid by Mexico. How Mexico will be made to pay for it, and not expect some kind of economic retaliation while renegotiating NAFTA, is a mystery. There's nothing as extreme on the Clinton side. ∞

*... the kind of stimulus
[Trump's] proposing will
heighten wealth and income
inequality...*



Winter Schedule!

| Title | Subject | Course | Instructor | Start Time | End Time | Daysmet |
|-------------------------------|---------|--------|------------------|------------|----------|---------|
| ECON SOCIAL ISSUES | ECON | 104 | Hayes,Michael | 2:00 PM | 3:50 PM | TR |
| PRIN MICROECONOMICS | ECON | 200 | Asheghian,Parviz | 2:00 PM | 3:50 PM | MW |
| PRIN MICROECONOMICS | ECON | 200 | Hayes,Michael | 10:00 AM | 11:50 AM | TR |
| PRIN MICROECONOMICS | ECON | 200 | Konyar,Kazim | 12:00 PM | 1:50 PM | TR |
| PRIN MICROECONOMICS | ECON | 200 | Aldana,Carolyn | Online | | |
| PRIN MICROECONOMICS | ECON | 200 | Konyar,Kazim | 2:00 PM | 3:50 PM | TR |
| PRIN MACROECONOMICS | ECON | 202 | Dulgeroff,James | 10:00 AM | 11:50 AM | MW |
| PRIN MACROECONOMICS | ECON | 202 | MacDonald,Daniel | 10:00 AM | 11:50 AM | TR |
| PRIN MACROECONOMICS | ECON | 202 | MacDonald,Daniel | 4:00 PM | 5:50 PM | TR |
| PRIN MACROECONOMICS | ECON | 202 | Aldana,Carolyn | Online | | |
| INTER MACROECONOMICS | ECON | 300 | Pierce,Thomas | 4:00 PM | 5:50 PM | MW |
| INTER MICROECONOMICS | ECON | 302 | Toruno,Mayo | 4:00 PM | 5:50 PM | TR |
| ECON IN ELEM & MID SCHOOLS | ECON | 311 | Charkins,Ralph | Online | | |
| MANAGERIAL ECON | ECON | 322 | Konyar,Kazim | 6:00 PM | 7:50 PM | TR |
| POL EC WMN:MONEY,SEX,RACE,PWR | ECON | 333 | Dildar,Yasemin | 10:00 AM | 11:50 AM | MW |
| MONEY & BANKING | ECON | 410 | Pierce,Thomas | 12:00 PM | 1:50 PM | MW |
| INTERNATIONAL ECON | ECON | 430 | Asheghian,Parviz | 6:00 PM | 7:50 PM | MW |
| ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT | ECON | 455 | Dildar,Yasemin | 2:00 PM | 3:50 PM | MW |
| LABOR ECONOMICS | ECON | 460 | MacDonald,Daniel | 2:00 PM | 3:50 PM | TR |
| PUBLIC ECONOMICS | ECON | 475 | Nilsson,Eric | 8:00 AM | 9:50 AM | TR |
| POLITICAL ECON LATIN AMERICA | ECON | 540 | Toruno,Mayo | 12:00 PM | 1:50 PM | TR |

Tentative Spring Schedule

| # | TITLE | DAYS | HOURS | AM/PM | INSTRUCTOR |
|---------|-------------------------------|------|------------|-------|------------|
| 200 | PRIN MICROECON | | ONLINE | | ALDANA |
| 200 | PRIN MICROECON | MW | 1000-1150 | AM | ASHEGHIAN |
| 200 | PRIN MICROECON | MW | 0200-0350 | PM | ASHEGHIAN |
| 200 | PRIN MICROECON | TR | 0200-0350 | PM | HAYES |
| 200 | PRIN MICROECON | TR | 0400-0550 | PM | KONYAR |
| 202 | PRIN MACROECON | | ONLINE | | ALDANA |
| 202 | PRIN MACROECON | MW | 1000-1150 | AM | DULGEROFF |
| 202 | PRIN MACROECON | MW | 0400-0550 | PM | DULGEROFF |
| 202 | PRIN MACROECON | TR | 0600-0750 | PM | KONYAR |
| 202 | PRIN MACROECON | TR | 1000-1150 | AM | STAFF |
| 300 | INTERMEDIATE MACROECON | MW | 0200-0350 | PM | DILDAR |
| 311 | ECON K-8 | ST | 0900-12:50 | AM | GARDNER |
| 335 | TOOLS OF ECON ANALYSIS | TR | 1000-1150 | AM | MACDONALD |
| 360 | ENVIRONMENTAL ECON | MW | 1000-1150 | AM | DILDAR |
| 390 | SELECTED TOPICS: PE OF SO CAL | TR | 0200-0350 | PM | MACDONALD |
| 410 | MONEY & BANKING | MW | 0600-0750 | PM | PIERCE |
| 450 | GLOBAL ECONOMY | MW | 0400-0550 | PM | ASHEGHIAN |
| 490 | ECONOMETRICS | TR | 0600-0750 | PM | HAYES |
| 500 | HIST ECON IDEAS | TR | 0400-0550 | PM | TORUNO |
| SSCI320 | UNDERSTANDING CAPITALISM | TR | 0200-0350 | PM | TORUNO |