

American Economic Association

On the Shape of the Trade Indifference Curve: Rejoinder to Batra

Author(s): Murray C. Kemp and Edward Tower

Source: *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 66, No. 4 (Sep., 1976), p. 709

Published by: American Economic Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1806716>

Accessed: 22/07/2009 21:52

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=aea>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Economic Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Economic Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

On the Shape of the Trade Indifference Curve: Rejoinder to Batra

By MURRAY C. KEMP AND EDWARD TOWER*

Raveendra Batra argues in his reply that our comment on his article is substantially incorrect because "the curvature of the trade indifference curve in the presence of the nontraded good is indeterminate" (p. 252). In this note we demonstrate the correctness of our earlier assertion that, even when there are nontraded goods, the trade indifference curve has the usual curvature.

Let $C = \{c = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \mid U(c) \geq U_0\}$ be the production possibility set, where T denotes the set of input-output combinations let $Y = \{y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \mid (y, \bar{x}) \in T\}$ be the production possibility set, where T denotes the set of input-output combinations that are feasible and \bar{x} denotes the given factor endowments. Both Y and C are assumed to be convex. The set of trades which generate levels of utility not less than U_0 is simply $E = Y - C$, where $E = \{e = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ and the i th good is exported or imported according as e_i is greater than or less than zero. It is well known that any linear combination of two convex sets must also be convex.¹ Thus E also is convex, and the

surface which bounds it, a trade indifference surface when all goods are traded, must have the normal curvature.

Now in restricting our attention to the case in which m goods are not traded, so that $c_i = y_i, i = n - m + 1, \dots, n$, we are considering that linear cross section of E determined by $E \cap \Gamma$, where $\Gamma = \{e = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid e_i = 0, i = n - m + 1, \dots, n\}$. Since Γ is convex (Γ is a linear subspace), $E \cap \Gamma$ must also be convex. Since this is simply the set circumscribed by the trade indifference surface when the last m goods are nontradeables, we have proved that the trade indifference surface for an economy which consumes n goods, m of which are nontradeables ($m < n$), has the normal curvature.

REFERENCES

- R. N. Batra, "Nontraded Goods, Factor Market Distortions, and the Gains from Trade: Reply," *Amer. Econ. Rev.*, Mar. 1975, 65, 251-52.
- M. C. Kemp and E. Tower, "Nontraded Goods, Factor Market Distortions, and the Gains from Trade: Comment," *Amer. Econ. Rev.*, Mar. 1975, 65, 249-50.
- H. Nikaido, *Convex Structures and Economic Theory*, New York and London 1968.

* Research professor of economics, University of New South Wales, and associate professor of economics, Duke University, respectively. We are grateful to Daniel Graham for helpful suggestions.

¹ See, for example, theorem 2.10 of H. Nikaido.