

It used to be that if you owned shares of a public company, you actually felt like you owned shares of that company. The concept of actual ownership by individuals is long gone. Shareholders as owners are nothing but a concept, and echo from days gone by.

That shouldn't be a surprise. It's just as rare for individuals with less than 10 figures in their networth to even consider actually buying shares as a path to ownership.

But what if this were not the case any longer? For those of you that own shares of stocks in companies, either directly or indirectly, would you be willing to take a lower earnings per share, or on the flip side, hold your stock at a higher P/E Ratio if in exchange the company moved their manufacturing to the USA?

Would Apple shareholders be willing to accept Apple moving jobs back and not sell when the announcement was made? Name a company that you as a shareholder would be willing to hold, knowing that earnings would be lower, but jobs would come back to the USA?

I don't directly own shares of any companies that do manufacturing overseas (at least that I know of), so I haven't had to consider this. I know in my own personal businesses I try not to squeeze every penny out. I just want to be profitable and earn a decent return, but I recognize that a good or decent return is not the maximum return.

I feel the same way about tax-free accounts overseas. I don't have any personal bank accounts in Switzerland. I own a house in the Cayman Islands, but I don't have a bank account there and I won't put a bank account there. I'm pretty sure that one of the hedge funds I invested in has accounts there, but I'm not involved in its operations. So I don't have a say.

What do you think? Would you cut a public company slack if they brought back jobs to the USA?