CONCEPTS OF OPTIMALITY AND THEIR USES

Nobel Memorial Lecture, December 11, 1975
by
TJALLING C. KOOPMANS
Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, USA

According to a frequently cited definition, economics is the study of "best use of scarce resources." The definition is incomplete. "Second best" use of resources, and outright wasteful uses, have equal claim to attention. They are the other side of the coin.

For our present purpose the phrase "best use of scarce resources" will suffice. However, each of the two nouns and two adjectives in this phrase needs further definition. These definitions in turn need to be varied and adjusted to fit the specific circumstances in which the various kinds of optimizing economic decisions are to be taken.

I will assume that the main interest of this gathering is in the range of applications of the idea of best use of scarce resources, and in the ways in which the main categories of applications differ from each other. I shall therefore describe mathematical ideas and techniques only to an extent helpful for the exploration of that range of applications.

A good place to start is with the *production programs of the individual plant or enterprise* for a short period ahead. The "resources" then include the capacities of the various available pieces of equipment. In a centrally directed economy they may also include the allotments of nationally allocated primary inputs such as fuels, raw materials, labor services. In a market economy with some capital rationing one single allotment of working capital available for the purchase of primary inputs at given market prices would take the place of most of the primary input allotments.

In either institutional framework, an especially simple prototype problem is obtained if one fixes the quantity of required output of the product or products made by the enterprise, while prices for the primary products are given. Then the term "use" of resources stands for a choice of a technical process or a combination of processes that meets that requirement within the given constraints. "Best" use is a, or if unique, that choice that meets the requirement at minimum cost of primary inputs.

Economists have differed as to whether this problem belongs in economics. In the twenties the British economist A. C. Pigou stated

> . . . it is not the business of economists to teach woolen manufacturers how to make and sell wool, or brewers how to make and sell beer . . .

This was not the attitude of economists in several other European countries. In particular, there was in the thirties a lively discussion among Scandinavian and German economists concerning models of production possibilities and their use in achieving efficiency within the enterprise. The Nordisk Tidsskrift for Teknisk Ökonomi provided an important medium for these discussions.

Significant contributions[1] were made by Carlson, Frisch, Gloerfelt Tarp, Schmidt, Schneider, Stackelberg, and Zeuthen.

Thus the situation at the end of the thirties was one in which important practical problems in the best use of resources within the enterprise had been neglected by economists in several countries, and had been taken up by only a handful of economists in a few other countries. In addition, the problems were of a kind in which special knowledge possessed by other professions, mathematicians, engineers, managers, was pertinent. One could therefore have expected important new contributions to come from these neighboring professions.

This is precisely what happened, and several times over. Chronologically first was the publication by the mathematician Leonid V. Kantorovich (1939, in Russia) of a 68-page booklet entitled, in translation (1960), "Mathematical Methods of Organizing and Planning of Production." The importance of this publication is due to the simultaneous presence of several ideas or elements, some of which had also been present in earlier writings in different parts of economics or mathematics. I enumerate the elements.

(1) *A model of production* in terms of a finite number of distinct production processes, each characterized by constant ratios between the inputs and outputs specific to the process.

This element has a long history in economics. It is found in Walras (1874, Leçon 41; 1954, Lesson 20), Cassel (1919, Ch. IV), the mathematician von Neumann (1936), Leontief (1936, 1941), all dealing with models of the productive system as a whole. However, the feature most important for our purpose was present only in the classical writers in the theory of international trade[2] and in the models of von Neumann and of Kantorovich. This feature is that the output of one-and-the-same required commodity can in general be achieved by more than one process. The same specified vector of outputs of all required commodities can therefore in general be obtained as the outcome of many different combinations of processes. Two such combinations may differ in the list of processes included - and in the levels of activity assigned to the processes they both use. It is due to this element of choice between alternative ways of achieving the same end result that a genuine optimization problem arises. It is true that Walras also optimized (1954, Lesson 36) on the choice of processes, but from an infinite collection defined by a differentiable production function. It is precisely this choice of a more general collection of processes that delayed the recognition by economists of the applications that are our present topic:

(2) The perception of a wide range of *practical applications* of the model to industries that themselves are sources for the data required by these applications.

---

[1] For references to these authors and to the Pigou quotation, see Koopmans (1957), p. 185.
[2] See the references to Torrens (1815), Ricardo (1817), Mill (1852), Graham (1923), and others in the survey article by Chipman (1965).

These included the transportation problem to be discussed below, an agricultural problem, and various industrial applications. The definition and collection of available data of a different, more aggregative, kind was also an important element in Leontief's input-output analysis.

(3) The demonstration that with an optimal solution of the given problem, whether of cost minimization or output maximization, one can associate what in Western literature has been called *shadow prices,* one for each resource, intermediate commodity or end-product.

Kantorovich's term in 1939 was "resolving multipliers", which he changed to "objectively determined valuations"[3] in his book of 1959. In general, these valuations are equal to the first derivatives, of the negative of the cost minimum, with respect to the specified availabilities of the goods in question. In mathematical terminology these valuations have also been called "dual variables", in contrast with the activity levels assigned to the processes, which are then called "primal variables". Analogous dual variables occur also in von Neumann's model of proportional growth, with an interpretation as prices in competitive markets.

(4) The identification of a **separation theorem** for convex sets due to Minkowski as a mathematical basis for the existence of the dual variables[4].

(5) The **computation** of optimal values of the primal and associated dual variables for illustrative examples, and some indications toward calculating such solutions in more complex cases.

Finally, brief but precise explanations of

(6) The interpretation of the dual variables as defining equivalence ratios *(rates of substitution)* between different primary inputs and/or different required outputs, and

(7) the additional interpretation of the dual variables as **guides for** the coordination of **allocative decisions** made in different departments or organizations.

I shall return to (7) below.

Kantorovich's work of 1939 did not become known in the West until the late fifties or early sixties. Meanwhile the transportation model was redeveloped in the West without knowledge of the work on this topic by Kantorovich (1942, reprinted 1958) and Kantorovich and Gavurin (1940, 1949). The Western contributions were made by Hitchcock (1941), Koopmans (memo dated 1942, published 1970; articles of 1949 and 1951 (with Reiter), Dantzig (Ch. XXIII in Koopmans, ed., 1951).

The general linear model was rediscovered and developed by George B. Dantzig and others associated with him, under the initial stimulus of the scheduling problems of the United States Air Force. The term "linear programming" came into use for the mathematical analysis and computational procedures associated with this model. A compact early publication of this

---

[3] Ob'ektivno obuslovlennye otsenki.

[4] For this purpose von Neumann had used the heavier tool of a topological fixed-point theorem. The dispensibility of this for his purpose was shown later by Gale (1956) and by Koopmans and Bausch (1959, Topic 5).

work can be found in a volume entitled "Activity Analysis of Production and Allocation", edited by Koopmans (195 1). Substantial further developments appeared in such Journals as Econometrica, Management Science, Operations Research, and were brought together in Dantzig's "Linear Programming and Extensions" (1963), a book that was many years in the making. These developments, in which many mathematicians and economists took part, went substantially beyond the earlier work of Kantorovich, in several directions. I note only a few of the extensions to the elements listed above.

(2') Extension of the range of applications to animal feeding problems, inventory and warehousing problems, oil refinery operations, electric power investments[5] and many other problems.

(3', 4') Further clarification of the **mathematical relations between primal and dual variables** and their extension to **nonlinear programming** by[6] Tucker, Gale, Kuhn and others.

This work also traced additional mathematical origins or precursors for the duality theory of linear programming in the work on game theory by von Neumann (1928 and, with Morgenstern, 1944) and by Ville (1938), and in work on linear inequalities by Gordan (1873), Farkas (1902), Stiemke (1915), Motzkin (1936) and others.[7]

(5') The development by Dantzig of the **simplex method** for maximizing a linear function under linear constraints (including inequalities) and the further improvements to this method by Dantzig and others.

The simplex method has become the principal starting point for a family of algorithms dealing with linear and convex nonlinear allocation problems. These methods can be set up so as to compute optimal values of both primal and dual variables.

Most important to economic theory as well as application was a further extension of (7) into

(7') analysis of the *role or use of prices* toward best allocation of resources, either through the operation of competitive markets, or as an instrument of national planning.

These ideas, again, have a long history in economics. In regard to competitive markets, they go back at least as far as Adam Smith (1776), and were eloquently restated and developed by Hayek (1945). Important writers on the use of prices in socialist planning were Barone (1908), Lange (1936), and Lerner (1937, 1938). The new element in the work by Koopmans (1949, 1951) and Samuelson (1949, 1966) was the use of the linear model and, in my own case, the attempt to develop what may be called a *pre-*institutional theory of allocation of resources. It was already foreshadowed in the work of Lange and Lerner that hypothetical perfect competition and hypothetical perfect planning both imply efficient allocation of resources - although neither occurs in reality.

---

[*] See, for instance, Massé and Gibrat (1957).

[6] See Gale, Kuhn and Tucker (1951), Kuhn and Tucker (1950), and, for a summary, Tucker (1957).

[7] For references see Dantzig (1963), Ch. 2-3.

It therefore seemed useful to turn the problem around, and just postulate allocative efficiency as a model for abstract, pre-institutional study. Thereafter, one can go on to explore alternative institutional arrangements for approximating that model.

I believe that the linear model offers a good foothold for this purpose. First, it makes a rigorous discussion easier. Secondly, the most challenging **non**-linearity - that connected with increasing returns to scale - in fact undermines competition. It also greatly escalates the mathematical and computational requirements for good planning. The linear model, therefore, makes a natural first chapter in the theory of best allocation of resources. In its simplest form it leads to the following symmetric relationships between activity levels of the processes and the (shadow) prices of the resources and goods produced:

(7") (a) Every process in use makes a zero profit,
(b) No process in the technology makes a positive profit,
(c) Every good used below the limit of its availability has a zero price,
(d) No good has a negative price.

These same relationships are a recurrent theme in the first two chapters of Kantorovich's (1959) book, which also was many years in the making prior to publication. It was subsequently translated into French and English, the latter under the title "The Best Use of Economic Resources." The gist of the book's recommendations is that socialist planning can achieve best attainment of the goal set by the planning body through calculations that ensure the fulfillment of these or similar conditions for optimality.

Kantorovich did not go much beyond his earlier remarks on the questions concerning possible use of a price system for decentralization of decisions. This became a major theme, however, in the abstract work of Koopmans (1951, Sec. 5.12), in the work on two-level planning by Kornai and Lipták (1962, 1963, 1965) in relation to planning in Hungary, and in that by Malinvaud (1967) stimulated by experiences with planning in France. The principal computational counterpart of this work was developed by Dantzig and Wolfe (1960, 1961) under the name "the decomposition principle."

The third chapter of Kantorovich's book deals with the problem of investment planning to enlarge the production base. The principal emphasis is on the concept of the **normal effectiveness of capital investment.** This is a discount rate applied to future returns and to contemplated investments and other future costs, in the evaluation and selection of investment projects. This idea had been proposed earlier by Novozhilov (1939). The point emphasized by Kantorovich is that the prices to be used in calculating returns and costs should be the objectively determined valuations determined by his methods, for the selection to have an optimal result. These proposals were at the time new to the practice of Soviet economic planning. I believe that the principle of the normal effectiveness of capital investment has gained increasing acceptance in Soviet theory and practice since that time. There is an obvious formal analogy with the profitability criterion for investment planning used by the firm in a market economy, using anticipated market prices and the appropriate market rate of interest. The institutional framework contemplated is, of course, fundamentally

different. I believe that the underlying pre-institutional optimizing theory is the same.

Summing up, I see two principal merits in the developments I have reviewed so far. One is their initially pre-institutional character. Technology and human needs are universal. To start with just these elements has facilitated and intensified professional contacts and interactions between economists from market and socialist countries. The other merit is the combination and merging of economic theory, mathematical modeling, data collection, and computational methods and algorithms made possible by the modern computer. A genuine amalgam of different professional contributions!

The linear model, followed by the convex nonlinear model, have provided the proving ground for these developments - and - their most conspicuous limitation: The nonconvex nonlinearities associated with increasing returns to scale - i.e., with the greater productivity of large-scale production in many industries - require quite different methods of analysis, and also raise different problems of institutional frameworks conducive to best allocation.

I now proceed to a rather different class of applications of the idea of best allocation of scarce resources. This field is usually referred to as the ***theory of optimal economic growth.*** In most studies of this kind made in the countries with market economies there is not an identifiable client to whom the findings are submitted as policy recommendations. Nor is there an obvious choice of objective function, such as cost minimization or profit maximization in the studies addressed to individual enterprises. The field has more of a speculative character. The models studied usually contain only a few highly aggregated variables. One considers alternative objective functions that incorporate or emphasize various strands of ethical, political, or social thought. These objectives are then tried out to see what future paths of the economy they imply under equally simplified assumptions of technology or resource availability. The principal customers aimed for are other economists or members of other professions, who are somewhat closer to the making of policy recommendations. These may be those engaged in making more disaggregated optimizing models of growth that incorporate numerical estimates of technological or behavioral parameters. (I shall return to this field of "development programming" below.) Or the hoped-for customers may be policy economists who may find it useful to have the more abstract ideas of this field in the back of their mind when coping with the day-to-day pressures for outcomes rather than criteria.

The question of the clientèle is even more baffling when the problem concerns growth paths for time spans covering several generations. What can at best be recommended in that case is the signal the present generation gives, the tradition it seeks to strengthen or establish, for succeeding generations to take off from.

The classic in the optimal growth field is a paper published in 1928 by Frank Ramsey, known also as the author of equally fundamental papers on the foundations of mathematics and on subjective probability. His definition of "best" involves the maximization of a sum (or integral) of utility flows to be

derived from future consumption. Using a continuous time variable, Ramsey's choice of objective function is a limiting case of a broader class of functions which I shall consider first,

$$U = \int_0^\infty e^{-\varrho t} u(c_t)\,dt, \ 0 < \varrho, \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{the objective function} \\ \text{representing generations,} \end{array} \right.$$

Here c_t denotes the aggregate consumption flow as of time t, and $u(c)$ is a utility flow serving as an evaluating score for the consumption flow c. One chooses the function $u(c)$ so as to increase with c but at a decreasing rate $\dfrac{du}{dc}$ as c increases. This expresses that at all times "more is better", but less so if much is already being enjoyed (see Figure 1). The effect on the allocation of consumption goods between generations is similar to the effect of a progressive income tax on spendable incomes among contemporaries.


Fig. 1

We shall call the exponentially decaying factor $e^{-\varrho t}, \varrho > 0$, **the discount factor** for utility. It diminishes the weight given to future utility flows in the summation of the entire utility flow over all the future to form a total score U. The weight is smaller the larger the **discount rate** for **utility,** ϱ, and the further one looks into the future. On ethical grounds Ramsey would have none of this. I shall take the view that the important question of discounting utility - or for that matter any other aspect of the choice of the objective function - should not be settled entirely on a priori grounds. Most decision makers will first want to know what a given objective function will make them do in given circumstances. I shall therefore hold $\varrho > 0$ for this first exploration,[8] and turn to the mathematical modeling of the "circumstances" in terms of technological and resource constraints on the consumption and capital variables.

One "resource" is the labor force. It need not enter the formulae because it will be assumed to remain inexorably constant over time. The only other resource is an initial capital stock denoted k_0, historically given as of time $t = 0$. The "use" at any time t of labor and of the then capital stock k_t consists

---

[8]For an objective function implying a variable discount rate that depends on the path contemplated see Koopmans (1960), Koopmans. Diamond and Williamson (1964) and Beals and Koopmans (1969).

of two steps. The first and obvious step is to achieve at. all times the highest net output flow $f(k)$ that can be produced by the labor force, using the capital stock fully and to best effect. The form given to the function *f(k)* summarizes and simplifies broad technological experience. It specifies *f(0)* = 0 ("without capital no output"), *f(k)* initially increasing with k but at a diminishing rate $\frac{df}{dk}$, in such a way that from some point $\hat{k}$ of capital saturation on, *f(k)* decreases because depreciation rises more steeply than gross output. (See Figure 2.)


Fig. 2

In all this the product flow *f(k)* is regarded as consisting of a single good, which can be used as desired for consumption or for adding to the capital stock,

$$f(k_t) = c_t + \frac{dk_t}{dt}, \quad \text{the allocation constraint.}$$

To determine this allocation for all *t* is the second step. This is done "best" at all future points of time if the total score *U* is thereby maximized.

It might seem as if this constrained maximization problem is quite different in mathematical structure from those discussed before. This is not the case. The main difference is that the discussion has shifted from a vector space to a function space, using conventional notations not designed to reveal the common structure of the two problems. In particular, as long as the crucial convexity assumptions are maintained, interpretations in terms of shadow prices remain valid.

The problem for $\varrho > 0$ was solved independently by Cass (1966), Koopmans (1965, 1967), Malinvaud (1965, 1967), thirty-five years after Ramsey. Without proof I indicate the nature of the solution in Figure 3. In the diagram on the left, the **abscissa k** is set out along the **vertical** half-axis the **odinate** $y = f(k)$ along the **horizontal** half-axis pointing left. For given ρ > 0, find the unique point $\hat{k}(\varrho)$ on the curve y $= f(k)$ in which the slope $\frac{df}{dk}$ equals ρ. Then, if the initial capital stock k_0 should happen to equal $\hat{k}(\varrho)$, the optimal capital path remains constant, $k_t = \hat{k}(\varrho)$, over all the future. For any initial stock k_0 less than or larger than $\hat{k}(\varrho)$, the optimal path shows a monotonic and asymptotic approach to $\hat{k}(\varrho)$. All this is illustrated in solid lines in the top right diagram in Figure 3. The lower right diagram shows the corresponding optimal consumption path c_t, which approaches the asymptotic level $c(\varrho) = f(k(\varrho))$.

Fig. 3

The differential equation which, together with the allocation constraint given above, governs the approaches of k_t and c_t to their asymptotes is subject to an interesting interpretation in terms of shadow prices. Define such prices, p_t for the consumption good and q_t for the use of a unit of the capital stock, by

$$p_t = e^{-\varrho t} \left(\frac{du}{dc}\right)_{c=c_t}, \quad q_t = p_t \left(\frac{df}{dk}\right)_{k=k_t}.$$

Then p_t is the marginal utility of consumption, $\frac{du}{dc}$, at the level c_t of consumption flow reached at time t, discounted back to time zero. In turn, q_t is the marginal productivity of capital, $\frac{df}{dk}$, at the level k_t reached at time t, multiplied by the shadow price p_t of the product, already defined. This makes q_t the marginal productivity of capital in terms of discounted utility.

In these terms the differential equation is

$$q_t = -\frac{dp_t}{dt}, \quad \text{the allocation principle.}$$

If p_t and q_t were to be market prices for the capital good and for its use in production, this equality would state that the returns on two alternative dispositions for the capital good would be equal: One is to sell the good now, the other is to sell first only its use for a short period, and thereafter to sell the good itself. That this principle is necessary for optimality is intuitively plausible. Its sufficiency can be proved from the convexity assumptions about the functions $-u(\cdot)$ and $-f(\cdot)$, plus the boundary condition that $\lim_{t \to \infty} k_t = \hat{k}(\varrho)$.

What is the effect of choosing different values of the discount rate ϱ? Figure 3 suggests the answer for the realistic case that the initial capital stock k_0 is well below its ultimate level $\hat{k}(\varrho)$. In that case, as ϱ is decreased, that is, as the present valuation of consumption in a distant future is increased, then the asymptotic levels of the capital stock and of consumption are both increased. However, to accumulate the additional capital that makes this feasible, consumption in the present and the near future is further decreased. Thus, the impatience expressed by a positive discount rate merely denies to uncounted distant generations a permanently higher level of consumption because that would necessitate a substantially smaller present consumption. Perhaps a pity, but not a sin.

Ramsey showed that the effect of a decrease in ϱ goes right down to but not beyond the limiting case of no discounting, $\varrho = 0$. The optimal paths for that case are shown by dashed lines in Figure 3. Ramsey used an ingenious mathematical device that gets around the nonconvergence of the utility integral for $\varrho = 0$, and also leads to a proof simpler than the one for positive ϱ.

This narrow escape for virtue is blocked off by some quite plausible modifications of the model toward greater realism. For instance, one may introduce a population (= labor force) L_t that changes with time and, for interpersonal equity, modify the objective function to read

$$V = \int_0^\infty e^{\varrho - t} L_t u(c_t)\,dt, \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{the objective function} \\ \text{representing individuals,} \end{array} \right.$$

where c_t is now interpreted as *per capita* consumption, k_t as ditto capital. The thought here is to give equal weight (apart from discounting) to all future individuals rather than generations. Assume further that L_t cannot be influenced but is subject to an exogenous exponential growth

$$L_t = L_0 e^{\lambda t}, \quad \lambda > 0,$$

over time. By way of example, let λ correspond to a growth by 3% per year. Then, for mathematical reasons alone, the discount rate ϱ has to correspond to at least 3% per year for an optimal path to exist. If one tries to keep ϱ at zero and force existence by imposing a *finite* time horizon of one century, say, then the "optimization" produces an irrational and arbitrary pile-up of consumption toward the end of that century while the capital stock runs down to zero - or to any other prescribed level that still leaves room for a terminal splurge.

The model discussed so far leaves out important aspects of the modern economy. I shall comment briefly on the incorporation into the model of

  (1) exhaustible resources,
  (2) technological change,
  (3) population as a policy variable.

With regard to **exhaustible resources,** I shall only consider the extreme case of an **essential** resource. By this I mean a resource that is essential to sustaining life, is not capable of complete recycling, and has no substitute either now or later within the remaining period of its availability.

I have constructed a highly simplified model (Koopmans, 1973) of an essen-

tial resource which leads to conclusions quite different from those reached for
the preceding **capital model.** The only process in the technology consists of cost-
less extraction of the resource combined with its immediate and direct con-
sumption. This process is available at all times until the time T at which the
resource is exhausted. Population is assumed given and constant for the
.survival period 0 t T. At time T it falls to zero. In these circumstances,
higher per capita consumption by those living early enough to share in the
available resource shortens the survival period, hence reduces the total number
sharing. Thus the survival period is now a policy variable, and thereby so is
population in some part of the future.

We now adopt again the objective function of the Ramsey model with
discounting, except that the integration extends only over the period of survival.
Then, unlike in the capital model, the optimal path now depends on where
one places the zero point in the utility scale in which the function $u(\cdot)$ is
expressed. Let us set this zero point somewhat arbitrarily at the utility flow
level, $u(r) = 0$, of the resource consumption level **r** below which life cannot
be sustained. The resulting function **u(r)** is shown (again sideways) on the left
in Figure 4.

Fig. 4

In the absence of discounting ($\varrho = 0$), time now enters only as a scale on
which the fatal cut-off point T is determined. Among those so admitted equal
sharing is clearly optimal, hence optimal consumption stays at a constant
level over time. Figure 4 shows (dashed lines) how this level, and therewith
the survival period, are determined: All included claimants consume optimally
at that unique per capita level $\hat{r}$ that maximizes the utility flow per unit of
resource flow consumed. Note that this consumption level is well above the
subsistence minimum **r.** This result is to be expected from an objective function
that places value not on the number of included people as such, but only on
the "number of utils" enjoyed by all alive taken together.

Discounting ($\varrho > 0$) now introduces unequal weights, decreasing as time
goes on, between people with equal technological opportunities. The result
is (solid line) that the consumption of earlier claimants is raised over that of
later ones, with the last claimants no better off than before. Of necessity, the

cut-off point arrives sooner, and some of those included for $\varrho = 0$ will not be there to press their claim if $\varrho > 0$.

I hold no brief for the realism of this model. I have brought it up only as a stark demonstration of the point that the problem of whether and how much to discount future utilities cannot be equitably resolved a priori and in the abstract. One needs to take into account the opportunities expected to be available to the various consumers now and later, for the given technology and resource base.

Does there exist an essential resource, as defined above, exhaustible in less than astronomical or even geological time? I have argued elsewhere (Koopmans, 1973) that the best available answer to this question must come from those natural scientists and engineers most able to assess what future technology may do, or be made to do, to find substitute materials or fuels for those now within sight of exhaustion. I should add that geologists may well develop ways to pin down further the best estimates of ultimate availability. Economists could bring up the rear with methods for integrating the diverse pieces of information so obtained.

This leads to a few remarks on models that recognize **technological change,** and the uncertainty by which it is inevitably surrounded. A conceptual step forward in this direction has been made recently by Dasgupta and Heal (1974). Their model postulates an exhaustible resource for which a substitute will or may become available at an uncertain future date. The uncertainty is described by a subjectively estimated probability distribution. Capital accumulation is also represented in the model. The objective function is the mean value of the distribution of the sum of discounted utilities over an infinite future period. The optimal path to be found consists of two successive segments. One is the path to be followed from $t = 0$ up to the as yet unknown time $t = T$ of the availability of the substitute. The other is the path to be followed from time T on, which of course depends on the situation in which the advent of the substitute finds the economy.

In one interesting sub-case, the effect of uncertainty can be represented by an equivalent addition to the discount rate - until the substitute is available. This is the case in which the technological change is expected to be so incisive that the old capital stock will lose all its value as a result of the availability of the new technology.

Deep problems of choice of optimality criterion arise in models in which **population size is a decision variable, or** is affected by decision variables. I shall contrast only two distinct alternative criteria. One, used in a population context by Meade (1955), Dasgupta (1969) and others, is given by the "objective function representing individuals" already discussed. This function multiplies the utility of per capita consumption by the number of consumers before forming the discounted sum. The other criterion, the "function representing generations", sums just the per capita utilities.

The argument by Arrow and Kurz (1970, I. 4) in favor of the former criterion uses the analogy of two contemporaneous island populations under one government. It shows convincingly that per capita utilities for the two islands

must before their addition be multiplied by the respective populations if one wants to avoid discrimination between people of the two groups.

Does this argument carry over to generations that succeed each other in time? One might well argue this on the same grounds if population increase is a truly exogenous function of time, unalterable by any policy, but fortunately one that permits a feasible path. One such case was already considered above. But in fact population can be influenced, directly by persuasion and provision of information, or indirectly through other economic variables. I submit that this makes a difference.

A distinction should be made here between concern for the welfare of those already alive and of those as yet unborn whose numbers are still undecided. Current social ethic urges recognition of the needs and desires of living persons, within nations, and between nations-even though practice differs from norm. But there is something open-ended about the same concern for our descendants. How many descendants?

The answer to that question is different for the two criteria we are now comparing. On the basis of indications in a recent paper of Pitchford (1975, p, 21) I conjecture:[9] that the criterion representing individuals will, under constraints like those considered above, recommend a smaller per capita utility for all generations, present and future, than does the criterion representing generations. This is to be expected because the criterion representing individuals attaches value to numbers as such. Specifically it would rate the combination of a given per capita utility level and population size below another combination with a 5% lower utility, say, and a more than 5% larger population.

So the issue appears to be one of quantity versus quality. Again, one would want to try out the two criteria, and other ones, under a variety of constraints before a fully considered judgment can be made. But the simple idea of adding up individual utilities does not seem to me compelling in itself. Those already born are committed to their existence by the instinct of selfpreservation. Choosing a criterion that limits births so as to allow a good existence to an indefinitely continuing sequence of generations appears sufficient as an end in itself. Why more people at the expense of each of them?

The foregoing discussion tacitly assumes that net population increase can be controlled without much delay, within the range recommended by optimization. In reality, neither the techniques nor the acceptance of birth control are such as to support that assumption. On the other hand it is not so that population increase can be regarded as entirely exogenous. This suggests refinement of the models in two directions.

---

[9] For this conjecture to he well defined, the criterion must again specify the zero point in the utility scale. I set it again at the subsistence minimum, because associating a zero utility with any higher consumption level would imply a preference for the phasing out of human life in some adverse circumstances in which a very low consumption level permitting survival remains feasible.

First, a more realistic model should incorporate estimates of the relations describing the response of reproductive behavior to levels income, education, housing, medical care, and other causative variables. In circumstances where the resulting path of population does not seriously reduce per capita income below what could be achieved by a more direct population policy, no further action would be required. Where this is not the case, the processes whereby reproductive behavior can be influenced, and in particular the relation between resource inputs into these processes and the responses to them (prompt and delayed) need to be incorporated in the model. Considerations of this kind have been introduced into optimal population models by Pitchford (1974).

The second refinement concerns the optimality criterion. Situations occur in which what can be achieved by population policies can only diminish but not prevent a lowering of the per capita consumption sustained by domestic resources, for an extended period ahead. In such cases a realistic view will recognize a degree of exogeneity in the future path of population for some time to come. One may then want to explore optimality criteria that extend to those as yet unborn children whose birth had better, but cannot, be prevented the same consideration as to those already born.

We have considered two broad fields of application for optimization models. One comprises the detailed and data-oriented optimization of the decisions of the enterprise or public agency- and also the coordination of such decisions through a price system, through centralized planning and management, or both. The other is the more speculative study of alternative aggregate future growth paths for an entire economy.

In conclusion I want to make some remarks about the growing field of **development programming,** in which the two strands of thought are being combined and merged. One early step in this development was the construction of a mathematical programming model for an economy as of some future year, including investments and the flow of aid in the intervening period as decision variables. An example is the study of the economy of Southern Italy by Chenery, writing with Kretschmer (1956) and with Uzawa (1958). An evaluative description of experiences with Hungarian economic planning along these lines was written by Kornai (1967). Later studies, such as that of the Mexican economy by Goreux, Manne and coauthors (1973), envisaged a sequence of future years. In most of these studies data availabilities determined the use of Leontief's input-output framework for representing the production possibilities of the economy as a whole. Policy choices and optimization were introduced where data so permitted. One example is the choice between domestic production versus imports paid for by exports in the Southern Italy study. Others are the sectoral detail in the Hungarian studies, and concentration on the energy and especially electric energy sectors in the Mexican one.

A weakness in the treatment of consumption in optimal growth models, noted by Chakravarty (1969), is the lack of continuity between consumption levels in the past and those recommended by otherwise reasonable looking optimality criteria for the near future. One remedy proposed by Manne

(1970) has been to constrain future consumption paths to a family of smooth paths all anchored on the most recent observed level of consumption.

Econometric studies have been used to estimate consumption, production and investment relations describing decisions not or only partly controlled by the policy maker. In some cases the studies have gone beyond the convexity assumptions of most optimal growth models to recognize economies of scale in production. Examples are studies by Chenery (1952) of investment in pipelines in the United States, and by Manne (1967) and coauthors of plant size, location and timing of availability in four industries in India.

A substantial part of the work in this field may have escaped the general reader of economic journals, because much of the work has been published in collective volumes. Examples of these, not already mentioned, are Manne and Markowitz (1963), Adelman and Thorbecke (1966), Chenery (1971), Blitzer, Clark and Taylor (1975).

One final remark. The economist as such does not advocate criteria of optimality. He may invent them. He will discuss their pros and cons, sometimes before but preferably after trying out their implications. He may also draw attention to situations where allover objectives, such as productive efficiency, can be served in a decentralized manner by particularized criteria, such as profit maximization. But the ultimate choice is made, usually only implicitly and not always consistently, by the procedures of decision making inherent in the institutions, laws and customs of society. A wide range of professional competences enters into the preparation and deliberation of these decisions. To the extent that the economist takes part in this decisive phase, he does so in a double role, as economist, and as a citizen of his polity: local polity, national polity, or world polity.

REFERENCES:

Adelman, I. and E. Thorbecke, eds. (1966), *The Theory and Design of Economic Development.* Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press.

Arrow, K. J. and M. Kurz (1970), ***Public Investment, the Rate of Return and Optimal Fiscal Policy.*** Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press.

Barone, E. (1908), "Il Ministro della Produzione nello Stato Collettivista," ***Giorn. degli Econ.;*** English Translation in F. A. Hayek, ed., ***Collectivist Economic Planning,*** London, 1935.

Beals, R. and T. C. Koopmans (1969), "Maximizing Stationary Utility in a Constant Technology," ***SIAM Journal of Applied Mathematics*** 17, 5, pp. 1001-1015.

Blitzer, C. R., P. C. Clark and L. Taylor, eds. (1975), ***Economy-Wide Models and Development Planning.*** Oxford U. Press.

Cass, D. (1966), "Optimum Growth in an Aggregate Model of Capital Accumulation: A Turnpike Theorem," ***Econometrica 34, 4,*** pp. 833-850.

Cassel, Gustav (1918), ***The Theory of Social Economy.*** London, 1923. Originally published in German, 1918.

Chakravarty, *S.* (1969), ***Capital and Development Planning.*** Cambridge, Mass., M.I.T. Press.

Chenery, H. B. (1952), "Overcapacity and the Acceleration Principle," ***Econometrica 20,*** 1. pp. l-28.

Chenery, H. B. and K. Kretschmer (1956), "Resource Allocation for Economic Development," ***Econometrica 24, 4,*** pp. 365-399.

Chenery, H. B. and H. Uzawa (1958), "Non-Linear Programming in Economic Development" in Arrow, K. J., L. Hurwicz and H. Uzawa, eds., ***Studies in Linear and Non-Linear Programming.*** Stanford. U. Press.

Chenery, H. B., ed. (1971), ***Studies in Development*** Planning. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard U. Press.

Chipman, J. S. (1965), "A Survey of the Theory of International Trade: Part I, The Classical Theory," ***Econometrica, 33, 3*** pp. 477-519.

Dantzig, G. B. (1951), "Application of the Simplex Method to a Transportation problem" in Koopmans, T. C., ed., ***Activity Analysis . . . (***see below), pp. 359-373.

Dantzig, G. B. and P. Wolfe (1960), "The Decomposition Principle for Linear Programming," ***Operations Research*** 8, 1, pp. 101-111.

Dantzig, G. B. and P. Wolfe (1961), "The Decomposition Algorithm for Linear Programs," ***Econometrica 29, 4,*** pp. 767-778.

Dantzig, ***G.*** B. (1963), ***Linear Programming and Extensions.*** Princeton U. Press.

Dasgupta, P. S. (1969), "On the Concept of Optimum Population," ***Review of Econ. Studies, 36,*** 1, pp. 295-318.

Dasgupta, P. S. and G. Heal (1974), "The Optimal Depletion of Exhaustible Resources," ***Review of Econ. Studies, Symposium,*** pp. 3-28.

Gale, D. (1956), "The Closed Linear Model of Production," Paper 18, Kuhn, H., and A. W. Tucker, eds., ***Linear Inequalities and Related Systems.*** Princeton U. Press.

Gale, D., H. W. Kuhn and A. W. Tucker (1951), "Linear Programming and the Theory of Games," Ch. XIX of Koopmans, T.C., ed., ***Activity Analysis. . . (***see below), pp. 317-329.

Goreux, L. M., A. S. Manne and coauthors (1973), ***Multi-Level Planning: Case Studies*** in ***Mexico.*** Amsterdam, North-Holland Publ.

Hayek, F. A. (1945), "The Use of Knowledge in Society," ***Am. Econ. Rev., 35, 4,*** pp. 519-30.

Hitchcock, F. L. (1941), "The Distribution of a Product from Several Sources to Numerous Localities," ***Journal of Mathematics and Physics, 20,*** pp. 224-230.

Kantorovich, L. V. (1939), ***Mathematicheskie Metody Organizatsii i Planirovania Proizvodstva,*** Leningrad State University Publishers, translated as "Mathematical Methods in the Organization and Planning of Production" (1960) in ***Management Science 6, 4,*** pp, 366-422.

Kantorovich, L. V. and M. K. Gavurin (first version 1940, publ. 1949), "Primenenie matematicheskikh metodov v voprosakh analiza gruzopotokov," in ***Problemy povysheniia effektivnosti raboty transporta*** (The Use of Mathematical Methods in Analyzing Problems of Goods Transport, in ***Problems of Increasing the Efficiency in the Transport Industry,*** pp. 110-138). Academy of Sciences, U.S.S.R.

Kantorovich, L. V. (1942), "On the Translocation of Masses," *Comptes Rendus (Doklady) de l'Académie des Sciences de l'URSS,* 37, nos. 7-8. Reprinted (1958) in ***Management Science, 5,*** 1, pp. l-4.

Kantorovich, L. V. (1959), Ekonomicheskii raschst nailichshego ispolzovania resursov, Acad. of Sc., USSR (translated (1965), ***The Best Use of Economic Resources.*** Cambridge, Mass., Harvard U. Press.)

Koopmans, T. C. (memo dated 1942, publ. 1970), "Exchange Ratios between Cargoes on Various Routes," in ***Scientific Papers of Tjalling C. Koopmans.*** Berlin, Springer Verlag.

Koopmans, T. C. (1949) (conference paper, publ. 1951), "Optimum Utilization of the Transportation System," in ***Proceedings of the International Statistical Conferences,*** 5, pp. 136-145.

Koopmans, T. ***C.,*** ed., ***(1951), Activity Analysis of Production and Allocation. New*** York, Wiley.

Koopmans, T. C. (1951), "Analysis of Production as an Efficient Combination of Activities," in Koopmans, T. ***C.,*** ed., ***Activity Analysis . . ., op. cit.***

Koopmans, T. C. and S. Reiter (1951) , "A Model of Transportation," in Koopmans, T. *C.,* ed., ***Activity Analysis . . . , op. cit.,*** pp. 222-259.

Koopmans, T. C. (1957), *Three Essays on the State of Economic Science.* New York, McGraw-Hill.

Koopmans, T. C. and A. F. Bausch (1959), "Selected Topics in Economics Involving Mathematical Reasoning," ***SIAM Review, 1, 2,*** pp. 79-148.

Koopmans, T. C. (1960), "Stationary Ordinal Utility and Impatience," ***Econometrica*** 28, 2, pp. 287-309.

Koopmans, T. C., P. A. Diamond, and R. E. Williamson (1964), "Stationary Utility and Time Perspective," ***Econometrica, 32,*** 1-2, pp. 82-100.

Koopmans, T. C. (1965), "On the Concept of Optimal Economic Growth," in ***The Econometric Approach to Development Planning,*** Pontif. Acad. Sc. Scripta Varia 28, pp. 225-300; reissued North-Holland Publ. (1966).

Koopmans, T. C. (1967), "Intertemporal Distribution and 'Optimal' Aggregate Economic Growth," in Fellner *et al., Ten Economic Studies in the Tradition of Irving Fisher,* pp. 95-126. New York, Wiley.

Koopmans, T. C. (1973), "Economic Growth and Exhaustible Resources," in Bos, H. C., H. Linneman, and P. de Wolff, eds., *Economic Structure and Development,* Essays in Honour of Jan Tinbergen, pp. 239-255. Amsterdam, North Holland Publ.

Kornai, J. and Th. Liptak (1962, 1965), "Two-Level Planning," 'duplicated', in Hungarian; ***Econometrica, 33,*** 1, pp. 141-169.

Kornai, J. (1967), *Mathematical Planning of Structural Decisions.* Budapest, Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

Kuhn, H. W. and A. W. Tucker (1959), "Nonlinear Programming," in Neyman, J., ed., *Proc. Second Berkely Symposium on Math. Stat. and Probability,* Berkeley, pp. 481-492.

Lange, O. (1936), "On the Economic Theory of Socialism," ***Review of Econ. Studies, 4,*** 1 and 2, pp. 53-71, 123-142. Repr. in Lippincott, B., ed., *On the Economic Theory of Socialism* (1938). Minneapolis, U. of Minnesota Press.

Leontief, W. W. (1936), "Quantitative Input and Output Relations in the Economic System of the United States," ***Review of Econ. Statistics, 18, 3,*** pp. 105-125.

Leontief, W.W. (1941), *The Structure of American Economy*, ***1919-1939.*** Oxford U. Press.

Lerner, A. P. (1937), "Statics and Dynamics in Socialist Economics," ***Economic Journal,*** 47, 2, pp. 253-270.

Lerner, A. P. (1938), "Theory and Practice in Socialist Economics," ***Review of Econ. Studies, 6,*** 1, pp. 71-75.

Malinvaud, E. (1965), "Croissances optimales dans un modéle macroéconomique," in ***The Econometric Approach*** , see Koopmans (1965).

Malinvaud, E. (1967), "Decentralized Procedures for Planning," in Malinvaud, E. and M. O. L. Bacharach, eds., ***Activity Analysis in the Theory of Growth and Planning.*** London, Macmillan; New York, St. Martin's Press.

Manne, A. S. and H. Markowitz, eds. (1963), ***Studies in Process Analysis, New*** York, Wiley.

Manne, A. S. and coauthors (1967), *Investments for Capacity Expansion: Size, Location, and Time-Phasing.* Cambridge, Mass., M.I.T. Press.

Manne, A. S. (1970), "Sufficient Conditions for Optimality in an Infinite Hirozon Development Plan," Econometrica 38, 1, pp. 18-38.

Massé, P. and R. Gibrat (1957), "Application of Linear Programming to Investments in the Electric Power Industry," *Management Science* 3, 2, pp. 149-166.

Meade, J. E. (1955), *Trade and Welfare,* Oxford U. Press.

von Neumann, J. (1936), "Uber ein Gkonomisches Gleichungsystem und eine Verallgemeinerung des Brouwerschen Fixpunktsatzes," in Menger, K., ed., ***Ergebnisse eines mathematischen Kolloquiums,*** no 8. Translated as "A Model of General Equilibrium," ***Review of Econ. Studies*** 13, 1. pp. l-9 (1945).

Novozhilov, V. V. (1939), "Metody soizmerenia narodnokhaziaistvennoi effektivnosti planovikh i proiektnikh variantov" ("Methods of Comparison of the National Economic Efficiency of Plan- and Project-Variants"). ***Transactions of the Leningrad Industrial Institute, 4.***

Pitchford, J. D. (1974), *Population in Economic Growth.* Amsterdam, North-Holland Publ.

Pitchford, J. D. (1975), "Population and Economic Growth: Macroeconomics," paper presented at the Econometric Society, Third World Congress, Toronto, Canada.

Ramsey, F. P. (1928), "A Mathematical Theory of Saving," *Economic Journal,* 38, 4, pp. 543-559.

Samuelson, P. A. (1949, 1966), "Market Mechanisms and Maximization," Rand Corporation, 1949. Reprinted in ***The Collected Scientific Papers of Paul A. Samuelson*** Cambridge, Mass. M.I.T. Press, pp. 425-493.

Smith, Adam (1776), ***The Wealth of Nations.***

Tucker, A. W. (1957), "Linear and Nonlinear Programming," ***Operations Research, 5, 2,*** pp. 244-257.

Walras, L. (1874), *Elements d'économie politique pure* , Lausanne; translated (1954) by W. Jaffé as ***Elements of Pure Economics,*** London.