

# Consumer Metrics Institute News

## December 23, 2014: BEA Revises 3rd Quarter 2014 GDP Growth Upwards Again to 4.96% Annualized Rate

(Web page version is [here](#))

In their third estimate of the US GDP for the third quarter of 2014, the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) reported an astounding +4.96% annualized rate, up an additional +1.07% from their prior estimate for the 3rd quarter and now a healthy 4.59% annualized growth rate registered during the second quarter.

This revision contained improved numbers for nearly every segment of the economy. The largest gains from the previous quarter came from consumer expenditures for services (+0.61%, mostly in healthcare) and corporate non-residential investment (+0.24%, mostly in intellectual property). Consumer expenditures for goods and inventories each added another +0.09% to the headline number, while government spending and imports added +0.04% each. Only exports weakened, softening their contribution to the headline number (due to a negative contribution from imports).

Despite the increased consumer spending, households actually lost disposable income in this revision -- losing yet another \$373 per year from the 4th quarter (now reported to be \$37,496 per annum). This is now down a full \$373 per year from the 4th quarter (now reported to be \$37,869 per annum). The spending growth reported above came exclusively from reduced household savings, which dropped yet another -0.3%.

As mentioned last month, softening energy prices play a major role in this report, since during the 3rd quarter dollar-denominated energy prices fell 9.8% (and have even accelerated their dive since). US "at the pump" gasoline prices fell 9.8% quarter-to-quarter (a -33.8% decline from the 2nd quarter). Consumer oriented inflation indexes into negative territory. During the third quarter (i.e., from July through September), the Consumer Price Index (CPI-U) published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) was actually mildly dis-inflationary at a -0.10% (annualized) rate. The Billion Prices Project (BPP -- which arguably reflected the real experiences of American households) was slightly more deflationary at a -0.15% (annualized).

Yet for this report the BEA still assumed an effective positive annualized quarterly inflation of 1.39%. Over reported pessimistic growth data, and if the BEA's numbers were corrected for inflation using the appropriate BLS CPI-U and adjusted for inflation, the headline number would have been growing at an astronomical 6.52% annualized rate. If we were to use just the BPP data to adjust for inflation, the headline number would have been growing even faster, at a 6.60% annualized rate.

Among the notable items in the report :

-- The headline contribution from consumer expenditures for goods was +1.06% (up +0.09% from the previous estimate and +0.09% from the prior quarter).

-- The contribution made by consumer services spending to the headline surged to +1.15% (up +0.61% from the previous quarter and +0.42% reported last quarter). The combined consumer contribution to the headline number by consumers was 2.21%, up from 1.55% reported last quarter.

-- Commercial private fixed investments provided +1.21% of the headline number (down -0.24% from the 1.45% in the previous quarter). The positive growth is nearly all non-residential. The increases shown in this report came almost equally from spending on non-residential building and intellectual property category.

-- Inventories subtracted only -0.03% from the headline number (and down a full -1.45% from the prior quarter).

-- Governmental spending added +0.80% to the headline. The growth in Federal spending was probably spending pulled up by the increase in defense spending.



split the "I" component into fixed investment and inventories, separated exports from imports, added a line for the BEA "Product" and listed the quarters in columns with the most current to the left :

### Quarterly Changes in % Contributions to GDP

	3Q-2014	2Q-2014	1Q-2014	4Q-2013	3Q-2013	2Q-2013	1Q-2013	4Q-2012	3Q-2012	2Q-2012	1Q-2012
<b>Total GDP Growth</b>	4.96%	4.59%	-2.11%	3.50%	4.51%	1.77%	2.75%	0.06%	2.48%	1.62%	2.25%
<b>Consumer Goods</b>	1.06%	1.33%	0.23%	0.83%	0.80%	0.30%	1.35%	0.67%	0.74%	0.29%	1.06%
<b>Consumer Services</b>	1.15%	0.42%	0.60%	1.69%	0.59%	0.93%	1.11%	0.65%	0.58%	0.57%	0.81%
<b>Fixed Investment</b>	1.21%	1.45%	0.03%	0.95%	1.01%	0.74%	0.42%	0.96%	0.45%	0.61%	1.24%
<b>Inventories</b>	-0.03%	1.42%	-1.16%	-0.34%	1.49%	0.30%	0.70%	-1.80%	-0.19%	0.27%	-0.20%
<b>Government</b>	0.80%	0.31%	-0.15%	-0.71%	0.04%	0.04%	-0.75%	-1.20%	0.52%	-0.08%	-0.56%
<b>Exports</b>	0.61%	1.43%	-1.30%	1.30%	0.67%	0.82%	-0.12%	0.19%	0.28%	0.64%	0.19%
<b>Imports</b>	0.16%	-1.77%	-0.36%	-0.22%	-0.09%	-1.36%	0.04%	0.59%	0.10%	-0.68%	-0.29%
<b>Real Final Sales</b>	4.99%	3.17%	-0.95%	3.84%	3.02%	1.47%	2.05%	1.86%	2.67%	1.35%	2.45%

### Summary and Commentary

The puzzle in these numbers lies in the huge discrepancy between the reported face value of the economy's growth (nearly 5% at least two quarters) and the continued public proclamations from the central bankers that the economy requires further stimulus in the form of extraordinarily low interest rates.

There are several points to ponder:

- What does the Federal Reserve know that is either missed by (or not yet captured in) these numbers?
- Is increased consumer spending on non-discretionary healthcare (at the cost of raiding household savings) really growing, or is real household disposable income continues to shrink, who exactly is benefiting from the reported growth?
- Since no other major developed country has credible growth data anywhere near the 5% ball park, how can US economic growth be an outlier over an extended period of time?

There are at least a few obvious and plausible answers to the above questions:

- The Fed knows that these numbers misrepresent the true health of the economy -- either now or in the near future.
- US households (especially at the median) are not participating meaningfully in the reported growth -- which is probably why...

on the far side of the "wealth divide."

-- The US is benefiting globally (in an almost predatory fashion) from having the strongest of currencies and the safe

Unfortunately, the latter two answers carry with them destabilizing social consequences that are far worse (internally possibility of yet another economic slowdown -- currently utterly unforeseen by the BEA.

From our perspective we actually hope that the Fed knows far more than is evident in this latest happy BEA report.

---

*Copyright ©2015 The Consumer Metrics Institute*