


Misconceptions about the Real-Bills Doctrine: A Comment on Sargent and Wallace

David Laidler

 More

Comments

Misconceptions about the Real-Bills Doctrine: A Comment on Sargent and Wallace

David Laidler

University of Western Ontario

I

In their (1982) paper “The Real-Bills Doctrine versus the Quantity Theory: A Reconsideration,” Sargent and Wallace develop certain properties of Samuelson’s (1958) overlapping-generations-consumption-loan model under alternative monetary policy regimes. They argue that their analysis casts new light on the well-known debate to which they refer in their title, claiming that their results call for “a re-examination of the real-bills doctrine” (p. 1914).

for “something of a rehabilitation of the real-bills doctrine” (p. 1214). Their analysis per se has all the characteristics we have come to expect from these authors: it is elegant and rigorous, yielding conclusions provocatively strong to the point of being paradoxical. However, Sargent and Wallace’s attempted rehabilitation of the real-bills doctrine suffers from the following deficiencies: (1) the conclusions on whose basis they seek to rehabilitate the real-bills doctrine would have been anathema to its proponents; (2) what they refer to as the real-bills doctrine is not the real-bills doctrine; and (3) their interpretation of Adam Smith’s analysis of the social productivity of banking is quite misconceived. I shall take up these points in turn.

II

Sargent and Wallace show that what they call a “free-banking or real-bills regime” (p. 1214) will lead to a fluctuating and perhaps indeter-

I am grateful to Robert Barro, Peter Howitt, Michael Parkin, George Stigler, Lawrence H. White, and two anonymous referees for helpful comments on earlier versions of this essay.

[*Journal of Political Economy*, 1984, vol. 92, no. 1]

© 1984 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved. 0022-3808/84/9201-0003\$01.50



