Consumer Goods, Capital Goods, and the Soviet Choice after World War II

A Textbook Case Study for the Production Possibilities Curve (DKent)

One of the most useful ways to explain the production possibilities curve is to show that nations, not just individuals, must choose among competing uses of scarce resources. In the years after World War II, the Soviet Union made a striking macroeconomic choice. Soviet planners gave priority to capital goods, heavy industry, reconstruction, and defense-related capacity, while consumer goods remained secondary. In production-possibilities-curve terms, the Soviet system repeatedly chose points closer to the capital-goods and military-goods side of the frontier than to the consumer-goods side.[1] That choice was not irrational in the narrow sense. After the destruction of the war, Soviet leaders wanted rapid industrial reconstruction, strategic security, and long-run growth in productive capacity. Yet the same choice carried long-run costs. Chronic shortages, poor quality consumer goods, weak incentives, and growing dependence on imports of food and processed goods undermined living standards and reduced confidence in the system. These problems did not by themselves cause the Soviet collapse, but they became one of the important economic weaknesses that made the Soviet model increasingly fragile by the 1980s.[2]

The postwar strategy was rooted in the Soviet planning tradition that had already emerged in the 1930s. Alexander Erlich explained that the Soviet development model placed overriding priority on the capital-goods sector and treated rapid industrialization as the foundation of national power.[3] After 1945, that logic returned with new urgency. Abram Bergson observed that the Fourth Five-Year Plan, published in 1946, again favored heavy industry over consumer industries.[4] The Soviet leadership believed that steel, machinery, energy, transport, and defense production would rebuild the economy faster than a broad immediate improvement in household consumption. On a PPC graph, this is the classic

---

[1] Abram Bergson, "The Fourth Five-Year Plan: Heavy versus Consumers' Goods Industries," *Political Science Quarterly* 62, no. 2 (1947): 195–227; Alexander Erlich, "Development Strategy and Planning: The Soviet Experience," in *National Economic Planning*, ed. Max F. Millikan (New York: Columbia University Press for the National Bureau of Economic Research, 1967), 233–278. See also the user's PPC chapter materials for the consumer-goods versus capital-goods framework.

[2] Stanley Fischer, "Russia and the Soviet Union Then and Now," in *NBER Macroeconomics Annual 1994*, ed. Stanley Fischer and Julio J. Rotemberg (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994), 221–258.

[3] Erlich, "Development Strategy and Planning," 233–278.

[4] Bergson, "The Fourth Five-Year Plan," 195–227.

tradeoff: if a country devotes more resources to machine tools, industrial plant, and military hardware, it must usually sacrifice some combination of housing, clothing, food variety, and durable household goods in the present.

In the short run, the Soviet choice produced some real achievements. Reconstruction after the war was rapid, and industrial output recovered strongly. Jukka Gronow and Sergei Zhuravlev note that heavy industry again received the highest investment priority after the war and that, by the end of the Fourth Five-Year Plan, industrial production had moved well beyond prewar levels.[5] From the standpoint of a PPC lesson, this is the strongest argument for choosing capital goods: sacrificing current consumption can enlarge future productive capacity. Soviet planners hoped that today's lower consumption would buy tomorrow's higher frontier.

The problem was that the Soviet economy never managed the second half of that promise very well. The system was better at mobilizing labor and investment into large industrial projects than at producing varied, high-quality consumer goods in quantities and locations people actually wanted. Gronow and Zhuravlev show that even when output of consumer durables rose, shortages and queues often persisted, and the more the economy produced, the more the discrepancy between supply and demand appeared to widen.[6] Part of the problem was administrative pricing: official prices were often kept artificially low, which sustained excess demand. Another part was structural: planners allocated resources more readily to large-scale heavy industry than to the decentralized, flexible, and quality-sensitive production required in light industry and services.[7]

This helps explain why the Soviet Union could produce impressive gross industrial totals while ordinary citizens still struggled to buy shoes, clothing, appliances, and better food. Gronow and Zhuravlev report that in the late Soviet period consumer-goods shortages remained widespread; simple low-tech goods could be hard to find, many foreign goods carried prestige because they were scarce, and a significant share of domestic goods was criticized for poor quality.[8] They also note that, according to one 1986 household-budget study, complaints about quality were substantial across categories such as knitwear, clothing, and shoes.[9] In macroeconomic terms, the Soviet leadership repeatedly chose a

---

[5] Jukka Gronow and Sergei Zhuravlev, "Economic Development and Standard of Living in the USSR after the Second World War: A Consumer's Perspective," in *Fashion Meets Socialism: Fashion Industry in the Soviet Union after the Second World War* (Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society, 2015), 57–77.

[6] Gronow and Zhuravlev, "Economic Development and Standard of Living," 57–77.

[7] Erlich, "Development Strategy and Planning," 233–278; Gronow and Zhuravlev, "Economic Development and Standard of Living," 57–77.

[8] Gronow and Zhuravlev, "Economic Development and Standard of Living," 57–77.

[9] Ibid.

point on the PPC that favored the production of capital goods, but it did not create a market or administrative system capable of translating later growth into steady improvements in consumer welfare.

This weakness also shaped Soviet foreign trade. As the domestic consumer sector lagged, the Soviet Union increasingly relied on imports to supplement shortages and quality gaps. The IMF-led *Study of the Soviet Economy* concluded that Soviet foreign trade was dominated by exports of energy products and raw materials, while imports were concentrated in processed goods and food products.[10] Gronow and Zhuravlev likewise note that the USSR imported sizable quantities of consumer goods in some years and that certain items, including shoes and Western clothing, remained especially desirable because domestic substitutes were limited or inferior.[11] In effect, the Soviet economy proved much more competitive in selling oil, gas, and basic industrial materials than in selling consumer manufactures that could compete in world markets on quality and design.

That trade pattern mattered. An economy that devotes a very large share of resources to capital goods should eventually expect those investments to raise productivity broadly enough to support both stronger exports and better domestic consumption. The Soviet case fell short of that outcome. Stanley Fischer argued that by the 1970s and 1980s the system's declining growth rate, low consumption, growing inventories, unfinished construction, and low quality output had begun to take a cumulative toll.[12] Instead of generating a broad consumer payoff, the older investment-heavy model produced stagnation. In the 1970s, higher oil prices temporarily helped by allowing more imports of machinery, grain, and consumer goods, but this masked rather than solved the underlying problem.[13]

For teaching purposes, the most important lesson is that the PPC does not merely show that every choice has a cost. It also shows that the quality of institutions matters for whether the sacrifice is worthwhile. If a country shifts resources from consumer goods to capital goods, the strategy can succeed when investment is productive, innovation is rewarded, maintenance is adequate, and future output gains are broad enough to improve living standards. The Soviet Union did achieve industrial and military strength, but its planning system often generated bottlenecks, low quality, poor adaptation to consumer preferences, and weak incentives for efficiency. Fischer therefore stresses that the

---

[10] International Monetary Fund, World Bank, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, and European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, *A Study of the Soviet Economy*, 3 vols. (Paris: OECD, 1991).

[11] Gronow and Zhuravlev, "Economic Development and Standard of Living," 57–77.

[12] Fischer, "Russia and the Soviet Union Then and Now," 221–258.

[13] Gronow and Zhuravlev, "Economic Development and Standard of Living," 57–77; International Monetary Fund et al., *A Study of the Soviet Economy*.

slowdown of the 1970s and 1980s increased demand for reform, especially as Soviet citizens could more easily see the higher living standards available elsewhere in Europe.[14]

It would be too simple to say that neglect of consumer goods alone destroyed the Soviet Union. The end of the USSR also involved political liberalization, nationality conflicts, fiscal and monetary disorder, the burden of military competition, and the destabilizing consequences of Gorbachev's reforms.[15] Still, the consumer-goods versus capital-goods tradeoff was one of the central economic weaknesses of the Soviet model. The regime repeatedly justified present sacrifice in the name of future abundance, but too many households experienced the sacrifice without ever feeling that the abundance had truly arrived. In that sense, the Soviet case is an excellent macroeconomic illustration of the PPC: a nation can choose more capital goods today in order to push its frontier outward tomorrow, but if the resulting system cannot convert investment into productivity, quality, and consumer satisfaction, the long-run payoff will be far smaller than promised.

Bibliography

Bergson, Abram. "The Fourth Five-Year Plan: Heavy versus Consumers' Goods Industries." *Political Science Quarterly* 62, no. 2 (1947): 195–227.

Erlich, Alexander. "Development Strategy and Planning: The Soviet Experience." In *National Economic Planning*, edited by Max F. Millikan, 233–278. New York: Columbia University Press for the National Bureau of Economic Research, 1967.

Fischer, Stanley. "Russia and the Soviet Union Then and Now." In *NBER Macroeconomics Annual 1994*, edited by Stanley Fischer and Julio J. Rotemberg, 221–258. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994.

Gronow, Jukka, and Sergei Zhuravlev. "Economic Development and Standard of Living in the USSR after the Second World War: A Consumer's Perspective." In *Fashion Meets Socialism: Fashion Industry in the Soviet Union after the Second World War*, 57–77. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society, 2015.

International Monetary Fund, World Bank, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, and European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. *A Study of the Soviet Economy*. 3 vols. Paris: OECD, 1991.

---

[14] Fischer, "Russia and the Soviet Union Then and Now," 221–258.

[15] Ibid.