



# Housing Buoy the Economy, Which Is No Surprise to Greenspan

*Continued From First Page*  
 would be sold in ... 2004 are being sold now," said Edward Leamer, an economist at the University of California, Los Angeles, at a panel discussion last fall. Some Fed officials worry that, even without a big pullback, housing activity can't expand much from such robust levels, so its contribution to economic growth will ebb.

Mr. Greenspan's analytic interest in housing dates to his days as a consultant at Townsend-Greenspan & Co. He noticed that total mortgage debt was increasing each year by more than could be explained by mortgages taken out on newly built homes, after he subtracted scheduled repayment of existing loans. The difference, he concluded, had to be mortgage borrowing secured by the equity in existing homes—borrowing that consumers used for other purposes, from buying cars to investing in stocks.

Mr. Greenspan called this the "monetization," "liquefaction" or "extraction" of home equity. He believed it could explain a lot of things—stock prices, home prices and consumer spending—better than other economic models did. "Capital gains from home sales are a potent force in consumer

markets, far greater than ... stock-market gains," he told the National Association for Business Economics in Philadelphia in 1977.

In the audience was Sung Won Sohn, chief economist at what is now Wells Fargo & Co. "After lunch, we came out of the hall saying, 'Is housing really that important?'" he recalls. Although Mr. Sohn found at the time that he couldn't reproduce Mr. Greenspan's findings with a then-popular mathematical model of the economy, he says that "in hindsight, I think Greenspan was right."

When he became Fed chairman in 1987, Mr. Greenspan asked a Fed housing expert to refine the Townsend-Greenspan models. The first challenge was getting good data. Tackling the problem in meetings with Fed economist Jack Goodman, the chairman was in his element. "He'd say, 'Is the American Housing Survey a better source or the Current Population Survey or the decennial census?'" Mr. Goodman recalls.

Despite Mr. Greenspan's fascination with houses, he has never owned one, although he has owned condos in New York and Washington. The home he lives in now belongs to his wife, NBC corre-

spondent Andrea Mitchell, whom he married in 1997.

In 1999, at Mr. Greenspan's urging, Fed colleague Jim Kennedy began working full time on a database of housing wealth, prices and turnover. He used house prices from the 1800s from Mr. Greenspan's well-thumbed two-volume compendium of historical statistics. Another group of staff economists built a large database of mortgage originations and repayments, using records the Fed collects from banks for enforcing fair-lending laws.

It was increasingly apparent that homeowners could spend some of their housing wealth without selling the house. Mr. Kennedy told his boss that growing numbers of people who refinanced mortgages were raising the size of the loans, using the extra cash to pay down other debt, renovate or shop. Such "cash out" refinancings had long been possible. But by 1999 they were surging, a survey done for the Fed by the University of Michigan that year showed.

By 2001, Mr. Greenspan had enough data to test some of the theories he had espoused in that 1977 speech. Addressing a Fed symposium in Jackson Hole, Wyo., he didn't talk about the tech-stock melt-

down or productivity, as many expected, but delivered a technical discussion about the differing effects of stock and housing wealth on spending.

His key finding was that a rise in the value of a home had a bigger impact on household spending than a similar-size gain in the household's stock portfolio. The impact was especially pronounced when a home was actually sold; the seller spent 10 to 15 cents of each dollar of the capital gain on such a sale, Mr. Greenspan said. Fed researchers did not have an equivalent figure for realized capital gains on stocks.

The importance of this finding became clear over the following months. As the post-bubble bear market in stocks deepened, housing prices continued to rise. Between stocks' March 2000 peak and the end of 2002, U.S. households' stock wealth sank by almost \$6 trillion. But their real-estate wealth rose \$3 trillion, cushioning that hit significantly and helping support consumer spending.

Why housing wealth should have a bigger bang for the buck than stock wealth isn't entirely clear. It might be that many stocks are held in tax-sheltered plans, so it's hard for an investor

to spend a capital gain—or even be aware of one—Mr. Greenspan suggested. Or perhaps it's that many more households own homes than stocks. In 2001, 68% of families owned homes, which had a \$122,000 median value; 52% had stock portfolios, with a median value \$34,000. Many of these were tied up in retirement plans.

The combination of rising home prices and lower mortgage rates made for a powerful economic force. Magnifying it were changes in the mortgage market that made refinancing simpler.

The mortgage market, once dominated by savings and loans that took deposits and lent the money on housing, began shifting in the 1980s toward mortgage bankers. Instead of taking deposits, these firms lent funds borrowed on capital markets and quickly unloaded their mortgages to other institutions, primarily the giant mortgage agencies Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac. Home loans, thus freed from the vagaries of local economic and banking conditions, became cheaper and more readily available.

Meanwhile, software for underwriting and credit-scoring speeded the mortgage-approval process. The result was a fall in the cost and complexity of refinancing a mortgage. A smaller interest-rate drop was sufficient to make refinancing worth a homeowner's while.

"In the old days, housing wealth was relatively illiquid and the only way to realize it was to sell and move to smaller house," said Fed researcher Andreas Lehnert at a recent academic conference in Washington. "Now you can borrow against housing wealth." He calls this increased role of the home as a source of cash the "ATM effect."

Some 35% of homeowners who refinanced after a late-1998 fall in mortgage rates took out extra cash, averaging \$18,000, a University of Michigan survey showed. The share who took out cash jumped to 46% in the 2001-2002 refinancing boom, and the average amount rose to \$31,000, a new survey showed.

Though Fed officials have always watched housing closely, Mr. Greenspan

increased the scrutiny. In 1994, when the National Association of Home Builders complained of high interest rates, he asked the group to help update him on industry conditions. The association's chief economist, David Seiders, now does a special early survey of homebuilders about sales, cancellations and backlogs, and provides the Fed with the results.

The industry doesn't always behave as the Fed staff expects. In early 1997, the Fed's staff began looking for an economic slowdown that would cause the homebuilding industry to cool. Michael Prell, then the Fed's research director, predicted that housing starts, which totaled 1.5 million in 1996, would slip to 1.4 million in 1997 and 1.3 million in 1998. Instead, they stayed level in 1997 and rose to 1.6 million the next year.

For a while, Fed officials figured the demand was a logical response to buoyant growth and fattened stock portfolios. But by 2000, Mr. Greenspan began to fret that demand for homes was overheating. That July, he told Congress new home sales were running at "extraordinarily high levels relative to new household formations," and "a pause" was likely.

There was no pause. By fall, mortgage rates had begun falling as the economy slowed. Housing remained strong right through the 2001 recession, taking a breather after the Sept. 11 terror attacks and then rebounding. It was the first recession in four decades in which housing sales and construction rose. Housing starts hit 1.7 million last year.

Fed officials acknowledge that housing is likely to weaken when interest rates rise, but they expect that to happen only when the economy rebounds.

As for the concerns Mr. Greenspan expressed in 2000 about a saturated housing market, those have abated. New census data suggested there were more potential homeowners than Mr. Prell knew back in 1997, especially among immigrants and low-income families. That's one reason Mr. Greenspan is confident there's no housing bubble waiting to burst, though he has acknowledged housing prices could slip after such a big runup. And as more Americans own their own home, he told Congress last week, the impact of home values on the economy, which he started to follow more than 30 years ago, is going to "increase, rather than decrease."



Alan Greenspan

## Stunning Success.

Deadly cancer at 23. Complete remission at 24.



"Not long ago, my cancer was all I could think about. Now I feel so good, I have to remind myself I'm a cancer patient." — Erin Zammett

If her cancer had happened a few years ago, Erin might be dead now. But she was lucky. Novartis put her deadly cancer into remission quickly and completely. And today, at 25, Erin's very much alive and living life to the fullest. She's enjoying her job as a writer and editor at a leading woman's magazine, and as a tireless fundraiser for cancer causes. Novartis is proud to be the innovative force that's bringing new optimism and hope to patients and their families. No one can promise what the future holds for patients like Erin, but today she's winning the battle against her particular form of cancer, living a life filled with all the excitement and promise a twenty-five year old deserves.

Think what's possible.



www.us.novartis.com

## Chinese Market Eludes Crackdown

*Continued From First Page*  
 steamed with ginger and garnished with coriander.

A survey conducted by a Chinese newspaper three years ago found that 95% of people in Shenzhen had eaten wild animals. In nearby Guangzhou, a city of about 10 million, people eat nearly eight million pounds of snake each year, says Jiang Zhigang, a fellow at the Animal Institute of the Chinese Academy of Science. The taste for exotic animals has been spreading along with the general economic liberalization that began a quarter century ago.

While still inconclusive, the scientific case linking SARS and wild animals has strengthened somewhat over the past several days. First, researchers from the University of Hong Kong microbiology department and the Shenzhen Center for Disease Control announced on Friday that they had discovered live coronaviruses in masked palm civets at the Dongmen market, and in a raccoon dog, a wild creature related to domestic dogs. New research by a Chinese government interagency task force this week found that 13% of 508 people working in three Guangdong wild-animal markets had antibodies to the SARS coronavirus, suggesting that at some time they had been exposed to it, though most apparently never developed pneumonia.

Chinese researchers also found that all six SARS patients linked to outbreaks of the disease in four Guangdong cities had eaten or handled wild animals within 20 days of falling ill. Many of the initial cases involved chefs. The research was muddled by the large range of animals that the people who tested positive work with. Masked palm civets, wild pigs, rabbits and snakes were the most common.

Even before the latest findings, Chinese authorities, acting on a hunch, last month banned the capture, transport, sale and purchase of almost all wild animals—dead or alive.

But the scene at the Dongmen market shows how wide the gap remains between rules and enforcement. Bedraggled domesticated cats, confined to small chickenwire cages and panting in the heat as they await a buyer, are stained with droppings from pigeons en-

closed above. Green-shirted market supervisors periodically hose down the floors, washing the effluence into an open gutter.

The wildlife trade is so lucrative, it "is just like drug trafficking," says Mr. Jiang Haisheng, professor of the South China Research Institute for Endangered Animals. "So long as profits exist, there will be people willing to take risks."

There are signs Chinese officials plan to move more forcefully in cracking down on the wild-animal trade. Yesterday, newspapers in Guangdong province published new rules designed to

In Guangzhou, people eat nearly eight million pounds of snake each year.

give teeth to the new ban on wildlife trade. Officials announced they would conduct "comprehensive" inspections of markets, restaurants and ports. Even roving circuses and animal shows are being required to stop performances and go into quarantine. The provincial legislature is also considering a campaign declaring that citizens must "cultivate enlightened and hygienic eating habits, and not eat wild animals" in order to halt the spread of SARS.

Vendors at the Dongmen market say they believe the crackdown will follow the pattern of periodic campaigns against the sex industry: aggressive enforcement for a time, and then an eventual drift back to business as usual.

Others in the food business are preparing for permanent change. The proprietor of Zhiqing No. 1 Village restaurant, Liu Zhenhua, says he is gradually shifting away from providing reptiles and wild mammals in favor of seafood.

Some diners say they are willing to kick the habit. Wild animal "isn't a must-have item," says another Zhiqing patron, Zhuang Ge, "it wouldn't be like giving up rice."

Call 800-WSJ-2206 ext. 176

### Early A.M. Delivery At 50% Off

Get The Journal when you need it. And save 50% on your first two months when you charge your subscription to your credit card. Pay just \$7.99 a month for your first two months—only 38¢ a day.

Charge my:  AMEX  V/MC  DISCOVER  Diners

Card Number \_\_\_\_\_ Expiration Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
 Name \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address \_\_\_\_\_  
 City \_\_\_\_\_  
 State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Or mail this coupon to: The Wall Street Journal, 200 Burnett Road, Chicopee, MA 01020

Early A.M. delivery available in most areas. Offer good for new subscribers in the continental U.S. Customer agrees to automatic subscription renewal at standard Journal rates charged to their credit card each month. The current monthly rate is \$15.98. Sales tax may apply. 20348 82LEDT

