arXiv:2108.03110v2 [econ.GN] 25 Jun 2022

A Pomeranzian Growth Theory of the Great Divergence

Shuhei Aoki*
Department of Economics, Shinshu University

June 28, 2022

Abstract

In this study, I construct a growth model of the Great Divergence, which formalizes Pomeranz's (2000) hypothesis that the relief of land constraints in Europe caused divergence in economic growth between Europe and China since the 19th century. The model includes the agricultural and manufacturing sectors. The agricultural sector produces subsistence goods from land, intermediate goods made in the manufacturing sector, and labor. The manufacturing sector produces goods from labor and its productivity grows through learning-by-doing. Households make fertility decisions. In the model, a large exogenous positive shock in land supply causes the transition of the economy from the Malthusian state, in which all workers are engaged in agricultural production and per capita income is constant, to the non-Malthusian state, in which the share of workers engaging in agricultural production gradually decreases and per capita income grows at a roughly constant growth rate. Quantitative predictions of the model provide several insights into the causes of the Great Divergence.

Keywords: Industrial Revolution; Great Divergence; Malthusian economy; economic growth
JEL classification codes: J13, O11, O33, O41

1 Introduction


The Industrial Revolution is one of the major events in economic history that brought about irreversible economic change. Since the Industrial Revolution, the world economy has been

*Email: shuhei.aoki@gmail.com. I would like to thank the seminar participants at Tohoku University and Osaka University. I am particularly grateful to Tomoaki Kotera, Akira Momota, and Daishin Yasui for their comments and suggestions. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP18H00831 and JP19K01671.

transformed from stagnancy, in which per capita income was roughly constant, to growth, in which per capita income has been growing steadily.[1] Many studies have investigated why the Industrial Revolution occurred.

Pomeranz (2000) brings comparative historical aspects into the problem. He argues that, in the 18th century, China was at a similar development level to that of Europe. Science and technology, institutions, and market efficiency in China were not far behind those in Europe. Per capita GDP in the Yangzi Delta, the most developed region in China, was roughly at par with that of the Netherlands, the most developed region in Europe. His claim is supported by recent estimates of GDP per capita, as plotted in Figure 1. The figure shows that the GDP per capita of Britain was similar to that of China before 1750. To understand why the Industrial Revolution occurred in Britain in the 18th century, researchers need to identify factors that caused the Great Divergence, the divergence in economic growth between Europe and China since the 19th century. These factors should have been present in Britain but absent in China.

Figure 1: GDP per capita in the pre-modern era



Notes: Data are obtained from Table 10.02 in Broadberry et al. (2015).

According to Pomeranz (2000), key factors are coal and imports from the New World. In the pre-modern era, all necessities were produced using land. Food and clothing were produced through farmland and ranching. Building materials and fuel were collected from forests. The expansion of farmland, ranching, and timber extraction caused deforestation, resulting in soil erosion, floods, and water shortages. Under these ecological pressures, pre-modern societies faced limits to their growth. In Britain, coal and imports of agricultural goods, such as cotton, sugar, cereals, and timber

[1]There is some debate on whether per capita income rose before the Industrial Revolution. For example, in the Maddison database (e.g., see Maddison, 2001), the per capita income of the world grew even before the Industrial Revolution. Following Clark (2007) and Clark (2008), this study assumes that per capita GDP was roughly constant before the Industrial Revolution (see also Broadberry et al., 2015).

from the New World, relieved land constraints. Pomeranz (2000), extending Wrigley's (1988) idea, argues that relief of the land constraint is the reason why the Industrial Revolution did not occur in China, but in Britain. Pomeranz (2000) arouses interest and motivates the debate on the cause of the divergence. However, the specific economic mechanisms behind Pomeranz's thesis are unclear. For example, why did the pre-modern economy stagnate, and why did the relief of land constraints generate sustained economic growth?

The purpose of the paper is to clarify the economic mechanism by embedding Pomeranz's hypothesis into a formal two-sector growth model with agricultural and manufacturing sectors. Our model has the following four characteristics, each of which is fairly standard in the literature. First, as in Eswaran and Kotwal (1993), Laitner (2000), Gollin et al. (2002), and Gollin et al. (2007), I assume a hierarchical preference structure that follows Engel's law. It assumes that households require consuming a subsistence level of agricultural goods (i.e., food, clothing, and housing) before spending on other "goods" (i.e., raising children and consuming manufacturing goods in our model).[2] The preference structure is supported empirically, and models incorporating this structure can predict several facts, including the declining share of agricultural employment (refer to the papers cited above). Second, as in Restuccia et al. (2008), the agricultural sector produces subsistence goods from land, intermediate goods made in the manufacturing sector, and labor, and its productivity grows at a constant rate. In the model, the limited supply of land input traps labor force in the agricultural production to feed themselves. An increasing supply of intermediate inputs from the manufacturing sector shifts the labor force from the agricultural sector to the manufacturing sector. In history, organic fertilizers, hoes, and plows have been replaced by chemical fertilizers and tractors, which greatly reduce manpower. The existence of intermediate inputs captures these observations. Third, the manufacturing sector produces goods from labor, and its productivity grows through learning-by-doing. I assume that manufacturing productivity grows only if the manufacturing sector employs full-time workers. In this model, farmers who produce agricultural goods also produce manufacturing goods as part-time workers. This reflects the fact that, in the pre-modern era, farmers produced all necessities, including manufacturing goods through home production. I assume that such home production does not increase manufacturing productivity as farmers are not eager to share or extensively employ their production expertise, especially compared to entrepreneurs who led the Industrial Revolution. Finally, as in Barro and Becker (1989), Galor and Weil (2000), and Greenwood et al. (2005), among others, endogenous fertility choices are incorporated into the model. I follow Greenwood et al. (2005) on the preference specification of fertility choice: when income is low, households spend only on subsistence consumption of agricultural goods and raise no children. As income exceeds the subsistence level, they allocate

[2]Hierarchical preference is an extreme limit case of the Stone-Geary preference.

resources to raising children, resulting in population growth. When the income level is sufficiently high, households start spending on manufacturing goods rather than raising children. Consequently, after per capita income exceeds a certain level, population growth declines.

The nature of the developed model differs depending on whether the economy is in the Malthusian or in the non-Malthusian state. The economy is in the Malthusian state if the agricultural sector employs all labor and in the non-Malthusian state if the manufacturing sector employs some full-time workers. In the Malthusian state, per capita income stagnates and per capita consumption is maintained at the subsistence level. The surplus in income is absorbed by population growth. I show analytically that, if the manufacturing productivity level is low, the agricultural productivity growth rate is not too high, and the initial population size is neither too small nor too large, then the economy is in the Malthusian state and converges to the Malthusian steady state.

Then, following Pomeranz (2000), I examine the case in which the economy, which is initially trapped in the Malthusian state, experiences a sudden increase in the supply of land used for agricultural production.[3] With a sufficiently large land supply increase, the economy no longer needs to allocate all labor to the agricultural sector to feed households and their children and switches into the non-Malthusian state. Manufacturing productivity and per capita income grow in the non-Malthusian state. The non-Malthusian state is sustained if population growth is sufficiently slow relative to the growth in agricultural and manufacturing productivities.

To further investigate the dynamics of the economy and quantify the magnitude of the relief of land constraints, I calibrate parameters and conduct numerical exercises. I find that the economy, initially trapped in the Malthusian state, where the population grows but per capita income is constant, experiences sustained per capita income growth and a decline in the share of agricultural employment after the sudden increase in land supply. These results are consistent with the historical facts.

The model developed in this study has several implications. First, according to Pomeranz (2000), in the pre-modern era, land productivity in China was higher than that in Europe, while labor productivity was similar in both regions. Our model can account for this fact by assuming that China had a higher agricultural productivity level than Europe and that both economies were in the Malthusian state. Second, in the model, a sudden decline in population size, which occurs due to epidemics and wars, has an effect similar to that of increased land supply. However, I show that their effects were quantitatively smaller than the relief of land constraints caused by coal and imports from the New World. Third, our model offers another interpretation of why per capita income

[3]Following Pomeranz (2000), this study considers coal as a substitute for timber and assumes that the use of coal affects only the supply of agricultural goods. Although coal also affects the supply of manufacturing goods, the analysis for this case is left for future research.

did not grow, whereas the population grew in the pre-modern era. This fact might be inconsistent with the prediction of endogenous growth models in which population growth is the engine of per capita income growth. Our model offers an interpretation that per capita income stagnated in the pre-modern era because labor was allocated to the agricultural sector that engaged in subsistence production and not to R&D activities in the manufacturing sector that generated sustained per capita growth.

Several studies propose formal economic models that account for why and how the Industrial Revolution occurred (for a survey of these theories, see Clark, 2014 and Mokyr, 2005). These models can be divided into two categories based on whether the Industrial Revolution is inevitable.[4] Most models, including Acemoglu and Zilibotti (1997), Galor and Weil (2000), and Jones (2001), Hansen and Prescott (2002), and Roys and Seshadri (2017), assume that an Industrial Revolution is inevitable and eventually occurs. For example, in Galor and Weil (2000), population size affects the productivity growth rate. In their Malthusian state, the population size and productivity growth rate gradually increase. When population size increases to a certain level, the economy automatically switches from the Malthusian regime to the modern growth regime. By contrast, in a model in Lucas (2002), the Industrial Revolution is not inevitable. He considers a situation wherein a positive exogenous shock to the rate of human capital accumulation allows the economy to transition from a stagnant to a sustained growth path. This study belongs to the latter category of research. This study identifies the exogenous shocks that transform the economy from stagnation to growth based on studies in economic history and quantitatively examines the magnitude of the shocks.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the model. Section 3 discusses the analytical properties of the proposed model. Section 4 presents numerical exercises to quantitatively evaluate the Pomeranzian hypothesis of the Great Divergence. Section 5 discusses the implications of the model. Finally, Section 6 concludes the paper.

2 Model

This section presents a two-sector growth model in which the fertility choice is endogenous. Time is discrete, ranging from zero to infinity. As in Lagerlöf (2003), one period corresponds to 25 years.

2.1 Production

The economy produces two final goods: agricultural and manufacturing. As in Restuccia et al. (2008), agricultural goods Y_{at} at time t are produced from land Z, intermediate inputs produced in

[4]This classification is based on Jones (2001).

the manufacturing sector X_t, and labor inputs by farmers L_{at}:

$$Y_{at} = Z^{\theta_Z} X_t^{\theta_X} (A_{at} L_{at})^{\theta_L}, \tag{1}$$

where A_{at} is agricultural productivity, $\theta_Z, \theta_X, \theta_L > 0$, and $\theta_Z + \theta_X + \theta_L = 1$. The time subscript is dropped from land Z because land supply is constant. Agricultural productivity A_a grows at a constant rate G_a:

$$\frac{A_{at+1}}{A_{at}} = G_a \geq 1.$$

The manufacturing goods Y_{mt} are produced both using full-time labor by manufacturing workers L_{mt} and part-time labor by farmers $\mu \cdot L_{at}$, where $0 < \mu < 1$:

$$Y_{mt} = A_{mt} L_{mt} + A_{mt} \mu L_{at}, \tag{2}$$

where A_{mt} is manufacturing productivity. The part-time labor by farmers captures the fact that, in the pre-modern period, many manufacturing goods were produced through home production by farmers.[5] Moreover, even in the modern period, for example, in Japan, many farmers have worked part-time in factories.

The productivity of the manufacturing sector grows through learning-by-doing if the manufacturing sector employs full-time manufacturing workers. I simply assume that it grows at a constant rate G_m if $L_{mt} > 0$. However, the productivity does not grow if the entire labor force works in the agricultural sector. This assumption captures the observation that, if farmers produce manufacturing goods by home production, as they did in the pre-modern period, expertise for the production would be easily lost as it is not exchanged efficiently between farmers. In sum,

$$\frac{A_{mt+1}}{A_{mt}} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } L_{mt} = 0, \\ G_m > 0 & \text{if } L_{mt} > 0. \end{cases}$$

I hereafter denote the case where $L_{mt} = 0$ as the Malthusian state and the other case where $L_{mt} > 0$ as the non-Malthusian state. We can incorporate into the model the elements of endogenous growth models wherein scientists engage in the R&D of manufacturing goods in the non-Malthusian state, and the basic properties of the model would not change.

[5] Pomeranz (2000) refers to the "man plows, woman weaves" culture in the Chinese Qing dynasty.

Both sectors are competitive, and the first-order conditions for firm maximization problems are

$$\frac{\theta_X p_{at} Y_{at}}{X_t} = 1, \tag{3}$$

$$\frac{\theta_L p_{at} Y_{at}}{L_{at}} + \mu A_{mt} = w_t, \tag{4}$$

and if $L_{mt} > 0$, then

$$A_{mt} = w_t, \tag{5}$$

where p_{at} is the price of agricultural goods and w_t is the wage for a unit of labor provided by a household. I normalize the price of manufacturing goods to unity. From these equations, in the non-Malthusian state where $L_{mt} > 0$,

$$X_t = \frac{\theta_X}{\theta_L}(1-\mu) A_{mt} L_{at} \tag{6}$$

In the Malthusian state, even when households do not demand manufacturing goods because their income level is low, L_{mt} can be positive because of the demand for intermediate inputs in the agricultural sector. This possibility is excluded if $\mu \geq \theta_X/(\theta_X + \theta_L)$, which is obtained from $X_t \leq A_{mt}\mu L_{at}$ and (6). For simplicity of calculation, I hereafter assume

$$\mu = \frac{\theta_X}{\theta_X + \theta_L}, \text{ or equivalently, } \frac{\theta_X}{\theta_L}(1-\mu) = \mu. \tag{7}$$

Then, (5) and (6) are satisfied in both Malthusian and non-Malthusian states.[6]

2.2 Households

The utility function of a household is

$$U_t = \begin{cases} \ln c_{at} & \text{if } c_{at} \leq \overline{c}_a, \\ \ln \overline{c}_a + (1-\gamma)\ln(c_{mt} + \overline{c}_m) + \gamma \ln n_t & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where c_{at} and c_{mt} are the consumption of agricultural and manufacturing goods, respectively, and n_t is the number of children. Two features are incorporated into the preference structure. First, I

[6]If (5) does not hold (i.e., $w_t > A_{mt}$) in the Malthusian state, then, from (4), $\theta_L p_{at} Y_{at}/L_{at} + \mu A_{mt} > A_{mt}$. From this equation and (3), $X_t > \theta_X/\theta_L(1-\mu)A_{mt}L_{at} = A_{mt}\mu L_{at}$, contradicting the assumption that X_t is supplied by home production in the agricultural sector.

assume a hierarchical preference for agricultural goods. As in Eswaran and Kotwal (1993), Gollin et al. (2002), and Gollin et al. (2007), households strongly prefer consuming agricultural goods, such as food, to consuming manufacturing goods or raising children when the agricultural good consumption is below a threshold level $\overline{c}_a$, but do not prefer agricultural goods any more than $\overline{c}_a$. Second, a constant parameter $\overline{c}_m > 0$ is added in the utility from manufacturing goods. As in Greenwood and Seshadri (2002) and Greenwood et al. (2005), due to $\overline{c}_m$, households prefer raising children to consuming manufacturing goods when household income is not too low but not high enough. As the income level exceeds a certain level, the household starts its consumption of manufacturing goods, and gradually decreases the number of children. These settings play an important role in the Great Divergence, mainly by preventing the production of manufacturing goods in the Malthusian state.

Let y_t be the household income and N_t be the (adult) population of the economy, which is equal to the number of households. Then, $y_t \equiv w_t + \pi_t$, where π_t is the rent from land in the agricultural sector that is evenly distributed. The budget constraint of a household is

$$p_{at}c_{at} + c_{mt} + \eta n_t w_t \leq y_t. \tag{8}$$

Here, I assume that it takes a fixed time cost η to raise a child, where $0 < \eta < 1$.

The solution to the household maximization problem is expressed as follows:

$$c_{mt} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } y_t \leq p_{at}\overline{c}_a + \dfrac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}\overline{c}_m, \\ (1-\gamma)(y_t - p_{at}\overline{c}_a) - \gamma\overline{c}_m & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$n_t = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } y_t \leq p_{at}\overline{c}_a, \\ \dfrac{1}{\eta w_t}(y_t - p_{at}\overline{c}_a) & \text{if } p_{at}\overline{c}_a < y_t \leq p_{at}\overline{c}_a + \dfrac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}\overline{c}_m, \\ \dfrac{\gamma}{\eta w_t}(y_t - p_{at}\overline{c}_a + \overline{c}_m) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

2.3 Equilibrium

The market-clearing conditions are given by the following equations:

$$\overline{c}_a N_t = Y_{at}, \tag{10}$$

$$c_{mt}N_t + X_t = Y_{mt}, \tag{11}$$

$$L_{at} + L_{mt} = (1 - \eta n_t)N_t. \tag{12}$$

Note that the labor supply decreases in (12) by ηn_t per adult because of childcare.

The endogenous variables of the model are determined once the employment shares of the agricultural and manufacturing sectors are obtained by market-clearing conditions. From (1), (3), (6), and (7), the relative price of agricultural goods becomes

$$p_{at} = \frac{\mu^{1-\theta_X}}{\theta_X} \frac{A_{mt}^{1-\theta_X} [\ell_{at}(1-\eta n_t) N_t / Z]^{\theta_Z}}{A_{at}^{\theta_L}}, \tag{13}$$

where $\ell_{at} \equiv L_{at}/[(1-\eta n_t)N_t]$ is the employment share of the agricultural sector.

Finally, the population dynamics are given by

$$N_{t+1} = n_t N_t.$$

In the model, because endogenous variables are determined in a static manner, the dynamics of these variables can be sequentially computed.

3 Properties of the Model

This section analytically investigates the properties of the model, particularly the population dynamics of the Malthusian state, and the effect of a sudden increase in land supply. Because it is difficult to completely evaluate the dynamics of the non-Malthusian state analytically, in the next section, I resort to a numerical analysis.

3.1 Malthusian state

I first analyze the equilibrium in which the economy is in the Malthusian state, where manufacturing productivity is constant at $A_{mt} = A_m$. I further restrict the case wherein households can raise children and $n_t > 0$. The condition for this case is

$$p_{at}\overline{c}_a < y_t \leq p_{at}\overline{c}_a + \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}\overline{c}_m.$$

Let $N_{t,\text{escape}}$ be the population size where $y_t = p_{at}\overline{c}_a + \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}\overline{c}_m$ and $N_{t,\text{starve}}$ be the population size where $y_t = p_{at}\overline{c}_a$. Then, the above inequalities can be rewritten as

$$N_{t,\text{escape}} \leq N_t < N_{t,\text{starve}}.$$

Here, $N_{t,\text{escape}}$ is the population size that divides the Malthusian state from the non-Malthusian state. To make the analysis interesting, I assume that $N_{t,\text{escape}}$ is strictly greater than zero so that the non-Malthusian state exists. If the population is less than $N_{t,\text{escape}}$, household income becomes sufficiently high for households to demand manufacturing goods for consumption; hence, the economy escapes into the non-Malthusian state. By contrast, $N_{t,\text{starve}}$ is the population size, where households can only feed themselves, but cannot afford to raise their children. If the population size exceeds $N_{t,\text{starve}}$, the population size in the next generation N_{t+1} becomes zero.

Then, I analyze the dynamics of the economy in the Malthusian state. Let A_{a0} be the initial level of agricultural productivity. Let n_{ss} be the steady-state population growth rate in the Malthusian state, which is equal to

$$n_{\text{ss}} \equiv G_a^{\frac{\theta_L}{\theta_Z}}. \tag{14}$$

I define the detrended population as $\widetilde{N}_t \equiv N_t/n_{\text{ss}}^t$. From (9), the dynamics of the detrended population between times t and $t+1$ is derived as follows:

$$\widetilde{N}_{t+1} = \frac{n_t}{n_{\text{ss}}}\widetilde{N}_t, \tag{15}$$

where, given $\widetilde{N}_t$, n_t is determined by the following equation:

$$n_t = \frac{1}{\eta}\left[1 - \frac{\overline{c}_a}{\mu^{\theta_X}} \frac{\left((1-\eta n_t)\widetilde{N}_t/Z\right)^{\theta_Z}}{A_m^{\theta_X} A_{a0}^{\theta_L}}\right]. \tag{16}$$

The locus of (15) is depicted in Figure 2 (see the "next $\widetilde{N}$" locus in the figure). The intersection of the locus of (15) and the 45-degree line is defined as $\widetilde{N}_{\text{ss}}$:

$$\widetilde{N}_{\text{ss}} = \left[\frac{\mu^{\theta_X}}{\overline{c}_a}(1-\eta n_{\text{ss}})^{1-\theta_Z} Z^{\theta_Z} A_m^{\theta_X} A_{a0}^{\theta_L}\right]^{\frac{1}{\theta_Z}}. \tag{17}$$

Note that the population growth rate when the detrended population level is $\widetilde{N}_{\text{ss}}$ becomes n_{ss} given in (14). I also add to Figure 2 the line for the detrended version of $N_{t,\text{escape}}$:


$$\widetilde{N}_{\text{escape}} = \left[\left(\left(1-\theta_Z \eta n_{\text{escape}}\right) - \frac{\theta_X}{\mu}\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}\frac{\overline{c}_m}{A_m}\right)\frac{\mu^{\theta_X}}{\overline{c}_a}\frac{Z^{\theta_Z} A_m^{\theta_X} A_{a0}^{\theta_L}}{\left(1-\eta n_{\text{escape}}\right)^{\theta_Z}}\right]^{\frac{1}{\theta_Z}}. \tag{18}$$

n_{escape} is jointly determined with $\widetilde{N}_{\text{escape}}$ in equations (16) and (18). Note that $\widetilde{N}_{\text{ss}}$ and $\widetilde{N}_{\text{escape}}$ do not depend on time t variables. In this study, I assume that the following inequalities hold in the Malthusian state:

$$\frac{\widetilde{N}_{\text{escape}}}{\widetilde{N}_{\text{ss}}} = \left(\left(1 - \theta_Z \eta n_{\text{escape}}\right) - \frac{\theta_X}{\mu} \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \frac{\overline{c}_m}{A_m} \right) \frac{1}{\left(1 - \eta n_{\text{ss}}\right)^{1-\theta_Z} \left(1 - \eta n_{\text{escape}}\right)^{\theta_Z}} < 1, \tag{19}$$

I do not add to Figure 2 the line for the detrended version of $N_{t,\text{starve}}$, $\widetilde{N}_{\text{starve}}$, because $\widetilde{N}_{\text{starve}}$ is quantitatively significantly larger than $\widetilde{N}_{\text{escape}}$ and $\widetilde{N}_{\text{ss}}$.[7]

Figure 2: Dynamics of detrended population $\widetilde{N}_t$ in the Malthusian state



The Malthusian dynamics of the model under assumption (19) can be analyzed from Figure 2. Suppose the economy starts from $\widetilde{N}_0 > \widetilde{N}_{\text{escape}}$. Then, if $\widetilde{N}_0$ is not too large, then the next $\widetilde{N}$ given by the right-hand side of (15) is greater than $\widetilde{N}_{\text{escape}}$, the detrended population converges to $\widetilde{N}_{\text{ss}}$, and the economy is permanently trapped in the Malthusian state.

There are several notable features of the model in the Malthusian state. First, if $\widetilde{N}_0$ is too large, the economy escapes from the Malthusian state in the next period. In this case, the land supply

[7]Under the parameter values used in Section 4, $\widetilde{N}_{\text{starve}} \approx 3.54 \times \widetilde{N}_{\text{ss}}$.

relative to the population size is limited, and enough food is not produced. This reduces the fertility rate, resulting in a detrended population size of less than $\widetilde{N}_{\text{escape}}$ that escapes the Malthus state in the next period. Second, if $G_a^{\theta_L/\theta_Z}$ or A_m is too large, then (19) is violated and the Malthusian state does not exist. Household behavior then shifts from raising more children to consuming manufacturing goods, causing an escape from the Malthusian state.

3.2 Great Divergence

Pomeranz (2000) argues that coal and imports from the New World relieved land constraints and further led to the Industrial Revolution in Britain. In this study, I model the relief of land constraints as a sudden increase in Z. The sudden jump in Z increases $N_{t,\text{escape}}$. If the population N_t in the economy becomes less than the new $N_{t,\text{escape}}$, the economy can escape into the non-Malthusian state wherein manufacturing productivity grows.

An increase in Z must suddenly occur. Suppose otherwise that Z increases gradually. It is accompanied by a population increase, which can necessitate all the labor force to be allocated to the agricultural sector to supply food to the growing population. Consequently, the economy can become trapped in the Malthusian state. This mechanism is what Malthus (2018) "compared the relative speed of the growth of productive capacity and of population to a contest between a tortoise and a hare" (Wrigley, 2018).

3.3 Non-Malthusian state

The economy moves into the non-Malthusian state if the population N_t is strictly less than $N_{t,\text{escape}}$. By rewriting (10), we obtain the following equation that offers an interpretation of the sustainability of the non-Malthusian state:

$$\ell_{at} \equiv \frac{L_{at}}{N_t} = \left[\frac{\overline{c}_a}{\mu^{\theta_X}} \frac{N_t^{\theta_Z}}{Z_Z^{\theta} A_{mt}^{\theta_X} A_{at}^{\theta_L}} \frac{1}{(1-\eta n_t)^{1-\theta_Z}} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\theta_Z}}.$$

Suppose that the population growth rate n_t either decreases or does not change significantly and satisfies the following conditions:

$$n_t < \left[G_m^{\theta_X} G_a^{\theta_L} \right]^{\frac{1}{\theta_Z}}.$$

Then, agricultural share ℓ_{at} continues to decrease. That is, if productivity growth rates are sufficiently higher than the population growth rate, the economy remains in a non-Malthusian

state, and per capita income continues to grow. The results also show that Malthus' tale of a tortoise and a hare applies.

The above results crucially depend on the population growth rate n_t. Because it is difficult to analytically investigate the dynamics of the population growth rate n_t, I employ numerical techniques in the subsequent section to analyze the economy in the non-Malthusian state.

4 Numerical Exercises

This section describes the numerical simulation of the model. The purpose of this section is twofold. The first is to quantitatively examine the Pomeranzian hypothesis that the relief of land constraints caused by the use of coal and imports from the New World brought about the Great Divergence. Another purpose is to numerically analyze the dynamics of the economy in the non-Malthusian state, which is difficult to explore analytically.

4.1 Calibration

The calibration procedure for the parameter values is divided into three parts. The first part focuses on the parameters of the agricultural production function θ_Z, θ_X, and $\theta_L = 1 - \theta_Z - \theta_X$. For this, I use cost-share data for the agriculture sector in the U.S. in 1960 (Capalbo and Vo, 1988, p. 106). For the agricultural production function, Mundlak (2001) argues, "...the elasticity of labor never exceeds 0.5, and in most cases it varies in the range of 0.25 to 0.45. The value is well below the elasticity of labor in non-agriculture." Mundlak also writes, "...it is meaningful to look at the sum of labor and land elasticities, and this sum is fluctuating around 0.5." Our θ_L is his lower bound, and θ_X is his upper bound. This study uses these values, particularly an upper bound for θ_X, to ensure that the population growth rate in the non-Malthusian state is not inconsistent with the facts on population growth.[8]

The second part deals with the agricultural and manufacturing productivity growth rates. The agricultural productivity growth rate G_a is chosen such that the steady-state population growth rate in the Malthusian state given by (14) is close to the actual population growth rate in the pre-modern era in Britain and China. The average annual population growth rate in Britain between 1500 and 1700 is 0.43% (see Appendix 5.3 in Broadberry et al., 2015), whereas that in China between 1480 and 1740 is 0.27% (see Figure 2. A in Broadberry et al., 2018). I set G_a such that the annual population growth rate is 0.35% in the Malthusian steady state. Here, as in Lagerlöf (2003), I

[8]If otherwise, a lower θ_X is adopted, as A_{mt} increases in the non-Malthusian state, p_{at} rapidly increases (see (13)). Subsequently, the population growth rate n_t fluctuates (see (9)). See also footnote 13.

assume that one period corresponds to 25 years.[9] The manufacturing productivity growth rate in the non-Malthusian state is attested from the fact that the growth rate of output in the U.S. during the 20th century was about 2% on average.

The third part relates to fertility choices. In Greenwood et al. (2005), they choose 0.17 for the utility parameter for the number of children, which is in our model γ.[10] Lagerlöf (2006) chooses 0.225 for the same parameter. I set $\gamma = 0.20$ to obtain the middle value. I set $\eta = \gamma/1.02$, resulting in the long-term annual net population growth rate in the non-Malthusian state of 0.08%. I set η to a value greater than γ such that n_t during the transition process in the non-Malthusian state does not fluctuate (see footnote 8). To simulate the dynamics, the initial population size N_0 must be determined. I assume that the economy begins in the Malthusian steady state and set N_0 to the value of $\widetilde{N}_{\text{ss}}$ calculated by (17) using other parameters.

Table 1: Calibration of the model

θ_Z	Share of rents from land in the agr. sector	0.16
θ_X	Share of intermediate inputs in the agr. sector	0.60
θ_L	Share of labor inputs in the agr. sector	0.24
G_a	Agricultural growth rate	$(1 + 0.35\%)^{\frac{\theta_Z}{\theta_L} \cdot 25}$
G_m	Manufacturing growth rate	$(1 + 2.0\%)^{25}$
γ	Utility parameter on the number of children	0.20
η	Child care cost	0.20/1.02
N_0	Initial population size	$\widetilde{N}_{\text{ss}}$
A_{a0}	Initial agr. productivity	1.0
A_{m0}	Initial man. productivity	1.0
$\overline{c}_a$	Subsistence consumption for agr. goods	0.25
$\overline{c}_m$	Taste parameter on man. goods	1.35

The remaining parameters are either normalized to unity or pinned down by restrictions in the following ways. First, A_{a0} and A_{m0} (and Z, which is explained in detail in the next section) are normalized to unity. Second, the ratio of $\overline{c}_m$ to A_{m0} determines $\widetilde{N}_{\text{escape}}/\widetilde{N}_{\text{ss}}$, given in (19). The lower the $\overline{c}_m$ compared to A_{m0}, the higher the $\widetilde{N}_{\text{escape}}/\widetilde{N}_{\text{ss}}$. If $\widetilde{N}_{\text{escape}} \geq \widetilde{N}_{\text{ss}}$, which is rewritten as $\overline{c}_m/A_{m0} \lesssim 0.86$, in the long run, the economy necessarily escapes into the non-Malthusian state. By contrast, if $\overline{c}_m/A_{m0}$ is large, it becomes more difficult for the economy to escape the Malthusian state by the sudden increase in land supply. Because $\overline{c}_m/A_{m0}$ is difficult to measure from data, I set $\overline{c}_m/A_{m0} = 1.35$, resulting in $\widetilde{N}_{\text{escape}}/\widetilde{N}_{\text{ss}} \approx 0.41$. Second, the ratio $\overline{c}_m/\overline{c}_a$ affects the change in

[9]There are some variations on the number of years for one period in quantitative models with fertility. One period corresponds to 20 years in Lagerlöf (2006), while it corresponds to 35 years in Hansen and Prescott (2002).

[10]Indeed, 0.17 is the number allocated to $1 - \phi$ in Greenwood et al. (2005).

fertility through (9). $\overline{c}_m/\overline{c}_a$ needs to be set so that the dynamics of fertility depict the well-known inverted U-shaped curve in the non-Malthusian state. In Greenwood and Seshadri (2002), who adopt a similar preference structure, $\overline{c}_m/\overline{c}_a = 1.35/0.25 = 5.4$.[11] Following Greenwood and Seshadri (2002), I choose $\overline{c}_a = \overline{c}_m/5.4 = 0.25$ (therefore, I coincidentally set the same numbers for $\overline{c}_a$ and $\overline{c}_m$).

4.2 Magnitude of abolishing the land constraint

Table 2: Land supply Z

	Before the Great Divergence	After the Great Divergence
Economy 1	1.0	2.74
Economy 2	1.0	1.0

As explained in Section 3.2, I model the relief of land constraints, which Pomeranz argues as the cause of the Great Divergence and the Industrial Revolution in Britain, as a sudden increase in Z. I normalize the land supply Z before the Great Divergence to unity. I consider two cases for the periods after the Great Divergence, which I assume to occur at $t = 10$: in the first case, after the Great Divergence, the land supply increases, and the land supply in the second case is kept constant as before. I refer to the economy in the first case as Economy 1 and that in the second case as Economy 2. Economy 1 corresponds to both Britain and Europe, whereas Economy 2 corresponds with China.

Subsequently, we quantify the extent to which the land supply increased after the Great Divergence in Economy 1. According to Pomeranz (2000),

> . . . [R]aising enough sheep to replace the yarn made with Britain's New World cotton imports by would have required staggering quantities of land: almost 9,000,000 acres in 1815, using ratios from model farms, and over 23,000,000 acres in 1830. This final figure surpasses Britain's total crop and pasture land combined. It also surpasses Anthony Wrigley's estimate that matching the annual energy output of Britain's coal industry circa 1815 would have required that the country magically receive 15,000,000 additional acres of forest. If we add cotton, sugar, and timber circa 1830, we have somewhere between 25,000,000 and 30,000,000 ghost acres, exceeding even the contribution of coal by a healthy margin. (p. 276)

[11] In Greenwood and Seshadri (2002), their a corresponds to $\overline{c}_a$ in my model, and their c corresponds to $\overline{c}_m$. Coincidentally, their value for c is similar to that of $\overline{c}_m$ in this model.


Based on this calculation, I set the land supply Z after the relief of land constraints to

$$1 + \frac{15,000,000 \text{ acres} + 25,000,000 \text{ acres}}{23,000,000 \text{ acres}} \approx 2.74.$$

These values are summarized in Table 2.

4.3 Quantitative results

Figure 3: Dynamics of the economy



(a) Per capita income

(b) Share of agricultural employment

(c) Per capita intermediate inputs for agriculture

(d) Population

Notes: The solid lines in the figures are those of the economy wherein the land supply suddenly increases from $Z = 1.0$ to $Z = 2.74$ at $t = 10$ (Economy 1). The dashed lines are those of the economy that does not experience the increase in land supply (Economy 2). One period is equivalent to 25 years; that is, four periods are equivalent to one century. I normalize the initial values of per capita income, per capita intermediate inputs for agriculture, and population to be unity.

This section describes the dynamics of the model. In Economy 1, land supply suddenly increases from $Z = 1.0$ to $Z = 2.74$ at $t = 10$. In Economy 2, the land supply is kept constant. $t = 10$ corresponds to 1725 or 1750 in the real world, $t = 12$ corresponds to 1775 or 1800, and $t = 20$ corresponds to 1975 or 2000.

The results of the numerical exercises are shown in Figure 3. In the figures, the solid lines are the paths of Economy 1, and the dashed lines are the paths of Economy 2. Figure 3(a) shows that per capita income in Economy 1 grows at a roughly constant rate after $t = 10$ (the annual growth rate after $t = 10$ is approximately 1.97%). This is because Economy 1 switches from a Malthusian state to a non-Malthusian state at $t = 10$. Conversely, Economy 2 remains in the Malthusian state, and consequently per capita income in Economy 2 is constant.

Figure 3(b) illustrates that in Economy 1, the share of agricultural employment decreases significantly after $t = 10$. Quantitatively, the agricultural employment share ℓ_{at} in Economy 1 is 47% at $t = 12$ and 2.5% at $t = 20$. The employment share of the primary sector in Britain, which excludes mining, was 48.0% in 1759 and 41.7% in 1801-1803 (Crafts, 1985, pp. 11-15; Shaw-Taylor and Wrigley, 2014, p. 56). The employment share of the agricultural sector around year 2000 was less than 5% in most developed countries. Although our model and assumptions are simple, the change in the agricultural employment share roughly matches the facts experienced in many developed countries. Alongside the structural transformation, in Economy 1, the per capita intermediate inputs used for agricultural production x_t constantly grow (see Figure 3(c)).[12]

Finally, Figure 3(d) plots the economies' populations. Note that, because the growth rate of agricultural productivity is positive, the population grows in both economies before $t = 10$. In Economy 1, the population increases rapidly after $t = 10$ because the constraint on the food supply is relieved. After this steep increase, the growth rate declines and almost stops because households prefer manufacturing goods to raising children.[13] In contrast, the population of Economy 2 grows steadily. As a result, the population in Economy 2 exceeds that in Economy 1 at $t = 24$.

5 Implications of the Model

This section interprets several historical facts that have been addressed in previous studies through the lens of the model.

[12] x_t in Economy 1 decreases at $t = 10$, because enough level of the agricultural good to feed the population is produced with a smaller amount of x_t by the sudden land supply increase.

[13] The population subtly increases again after $t = 19$ in Economy 1 because the absolute value of the second term on the right-hand side of (9) in the non-Malthusian state, $p_{at}\overline{c}_a/w_t$, decreases at a slower rate than that of the third term, $\overline{c}_m/w_t$ as the manufacturing productivity A_{mt} grows.

5.1 Higher agricultural productivity in China

Pomeranz (2000) summarizes several historical studies and concludes, "agricultural labor productivity in the Yangzi Delta was still within 10 percent of English levels even near 1820, while its land productivity was several times higher—so that its total factor productivity in agriculture far exceeded that of any European locale" (p. xvi). Our model is consistent with these findings.

To demonstrate this property, suppose that both Britain and China are in a Malthusian steady state, whose populations are given by (17). All exogenous variables are equal in both countries, except that the agricultural productivity level in China A^C_{a0} is higher than that in Britain A^B_{a0} (we denote variables with superscript B or C as those in Britain or China). Using (1), (17), and $L_{at} = (1 - \eta n_{\rm ss})N_t$ in the Malthusian state, we can easily show that, in the steady state, labor productivities are the same, while land productivity in Britain is lower than that in China:

$$\frac{Y^B_{at}}{L^B_{at}} = \frac{Y^C_{at}}{L^C_{at}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{Y^B_{at}}{Z^B} < \frac{Y^C_{at}}{Z^C}.$$

Interestingly, even if the agricultural productivity level in China is higher than that in Britain, this does not contribute to escape from the stagnant Malthusian state in our model.

5.2 Epidemics and wars

In this model, if the population of the economy suddenly declines in the Malthusian state and becomes less than $N_{t,\text{escape}}$, the economy moves into the non-Malthusian state. In the pre-modern era, sudden declines in population occurred by epidemics and wars. A representative of such epidemics is the Black Death of the 14th Century. According to Griffin (2018): "[I]n England, somewhere between a third and a half of the population are estimated to have died" from the black death in the fourteenth century (Griffin, 2018, p. 30; see also Hinde, 2003, pp. 44-47). For wars, Pinker (2011) collects data on "100 worst wars and atrocities in human history" from several studies (see Pinker, 2011, Figure 5-3). In his data, the worst in terms of the death toll relative to the world population is the Mongol Conquest of the 13th century. One of the countries most damaged by the invasion is Hungary, which lost at most 50% of its population due to the invasion (Berend, 2001, pp. 36-37).

Compared to these numbers, the relief of land constraints by coal and New World imports is quantitatively large. In the model, a 2.74-time increase in land supply, calculated in Section 4.2 from the estimates in Pomeranz (2000), increases $\widetilde{N}_{\text{escape}}$ by 2.74 times. This increase in land supply has the same effect as when two-thirds of the population suddenly disappears, which is the upper bound of epidemic and war estimates. Considering that, in the chaos of epidemics and wars,

production expertise could easily be lost, the increased supply of land by coal and New World imports is quantitatively appealing as a hypothesis of the Great Divergence.

5.3 Prediction of endogenous growth models in the pre-modern era

In the pre-modern era, while the population grew, per capita income was constant. This fact is seemingly inconsistent with the prediction of the endogenous growth theory that population growth is the engine of economic growth. One justification is that, in the pre-modern era, human capital accumulation was too slow because the population size was small, resulting in negligible per capita income growth, as explained by the unified growth model of Galor and Weil (2000). Our model provides an alternative interpretation of this inconsistency. Suppose that R&D activities in the manufacturing sector are engines of modern economic growth. In my model, even if the population grows, per capita income stagnates in the pre-modern era because all the labor forces are allocated to agricultural production or raising children rather than manufacturing production.

6 Conclusion

In this study, constructs a growth model that formalizes the idea of Pomeranz (2000) and other predecessor economic historians that the relief of land constraints by coal and imports from the New World brought about the Industrial Revolution. In the model, all workers initially engage in agricultural production to produce the goods necessary for their subsistence. In such an economy, per capita income is maintained at a subsistence level. An exogenous positive shock in land supply allows the production of adequate subsistence goods with limited labor and lifts some workers from subsistence production to manufacturing mass production. Owing to the learning-by-doing of these workers in the manufacturing sector, the manufacturing productivity grows. This results in a sustained growth in per capita income. I quantify the magnitude of the increase in land supply and conduct quantitative exercises. The predictions of the model are consistent with facts. The model presented in this study seems to be a plausible candidate for the theory of the Great Divergence.

References

Acemoglu, Daron and Fabrizio Zilibotti (1997) "Was Prometheus Unbound by Chance? Risk, Diversification, and Growth," *Journal of Political Economy*, 105 (4), 709–751.

Barro, Robert J. and Gary S. Becker (1989) "Fertility Choice in a Model of Economic Growth," *Econometrica*, 57 (2), 481–501.

Berend, Nora (2001) *At the Gate of Christendom: Jews, Muslims and 'Pagans' in Medieval Hungary, c.1000 – c.1300*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought: Fourth Series: Cambridge University Press.

Broadberry, Stephen, Bruce M. S. Campbell, Alexander Klein, Mark Overton, and Bas van Leeuwen (2015) *British Economic Growth 1270–1870*: Cambridge University Press.

Broadberry, Stephen, Hanhui Guan, and David Daokui Li (2018) "China, Europe, and the Great Divergence: A Study in Historical National Accounting, 980–1850," *Journal of Economic History*, 78 (4), 955–1000.

Capalbo, Susan M. and Trang T. Vo (1988) "A Review of Evidence on Agricultural Productivity and Aggregate Technology," in Capalbo, Susan M. and John M. Antle eds. *Agricultural Productivity: Measurement and Explanation*: Resources for the Future, Inc.

Clark, Gregory (2007) *A Farewell to Alms: A Brief Economic History of the World*: Princeton University Press.

——— (2008) "In Defense of the Malthusian Interpretation of History," *European Review of Economic History*, 12 (2), 175–199.

——— (2014) "The Industrial Revolution," in Aghion, Philippe and Steven N. Durlauf eds. *Handbook of Economic Growth*, 2, 217–262: Elsevier.

Crafts, Nicholas F. R. (1985) *British Economic Growth During the Industrial Revolution*: Clarendon Press.

Eswaran, Mukesh and Ashok Kotwal (1993) "A Theory of Real Wage Growth in LDCs," *Journal of Development Economics*, 42 (2), 243–269.

Galor, Oded and David N. Weil (2000) "Population, Technology, and Growth: From Malthusian Stagnation to the Demographic Transition and Beyond," *American Economic Review*, 90 (4), 806–828.

Gollin, Douglas, Stephen L. Parente, and Richard Rogerson (2002) "The Role of Agriculture in Development," *American Economic Review*, 92 (2), 160–164.

——— (2007) "The Food Problem and the Evolution of International Income Levels," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 54 (4), 1230–1255.

Greenwood, Jeremy and Ananth Seshadri (2002) "The U.S. Demographic Transition," *American Economic Review*, 92 (2), 153–159.

Greenwood, Jeremy, Ananth Seshadri, and Guillaume Vandenbroucke (2005) "The Baby Boom and Baby Bust," *American Economic Review*, 95 (1), 183–207.

Griffin, Emma (2018) *A Short History of the British Industrial Revolution 2nd Edition*: Palgrave.

Hansen, Gary D. and Edward C. Prescott (2002) "Malthus to Solow," *American Economic Review*, 92 (4), 1205–1217.

Hinde, Andrew (2003) *England's Population: A History since the Domesday Survey*: Hodder Arnold.

Jones, Charles I. (2001) "Was an Industrial Revolution Inevitable? Economic Growth Over the Very Long Run," *The B.E. Journal of Macroeconomics*, 1 (2), 1–45.

Lagerlöf, Nils-Petter (2003) "From Malthus to Modern Growth: Can Epidemics Explain the Three Regimes?" *International Economic Review*, 44 (2), 755–777.

——— (2006) "The Galor-Weil Model Revisited: A Quantitative Exercise," *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 9 (1), 116–142.

Laitner, John (2000) "Structural Change and Economic Growth," *Review of Economic Studies*, 67 (3), 545–561.

Lucas, Robert E. (2002) "The Industrial Revolution: Past and Future," in *Lectures on Economic Growth*, 109–190: Harvard University Press.

Maddison, Angus (2001) *The World Economy: A Millenial Perspective*, Development Centre studies, Paris: OECD.

Malthus, Thomas Robert (2018) *Essay on the Principle of Population The 1803 Edition*: Yale University Press.

Mokyr, Joel (2005) "Long-Term Economic Growth and the History of Technology," in Aghion, Philippe and Steven N. Durlauf eds. *Handbook of Economic Growth*, 1, 1113–1180: Elsevier.

Mundlak, Yair (2001) "Production and Supply," in Gardner, B. L. and G. C. Rausser eds. *Handbook of Agricultural Economics*, 1, Part 1, 1st edition, 3–85: Elsevier.

Pinker, Steven (2011) *The Better Angels of our Nature*: New York, NY: Viking.

Pomeranz, Kenneth (2000) *The Great Divergence: China, Europe, and the Making of the Modern World Economy*: Princeton University Press.

Restuccia, Diego, Dennis Tao Yang, and Xiaodong Zhu (2008) "Agriculture and Aggregate Productivity: A Quantitative Cross-Country Analysis," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 55 (2), 234–250.

Roys, Nocolas and Ananth Seshadri (2017) "On the Origin and Causes of Economic Growth," working paper.

Shaw-Taylor, Leigh and Edward Anthony Wrigley (2014) "Occupational Structure and Population Change," in Flowd, Roderick, Jane Humphries, and Paul Johnson eds. *The Cambridge Economic History of Modern Britain, Volume I: 1700–1870*: Cambridge University Press.

Wrigley, Edward Anthony (1988) *Continuity, Chance and Change: The Character of the Industrial Revolution in England*: Cambridge University Press.

——— (2018) "The Preventive Check and the Poor Law: the Malthusian Model and Its Implications," in Stimson, Shannon C. ed. *Essay on the Principle of Population The 1803 Edition*: Yale University Press.