ECON 6100	03/19/2021
Section 5	
Lecturer: Larry Blume	TA: Abhi Ananth

Developed from Fikri Pitsuwan's notes.

1 Review

The *General Leontief Model (GLM)* extends the Simple Leontief Model (SLM) to capture the notion of multiple productive technology.

The main ingredients of the model are the $n \times m$ input matrix A and the $n \times m$ output matrix B, all with non-negative entries.

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12} & \cdots & b_{1m} \\ \vdots & b_{22} & \cdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & b_{nm} \end{bmatrix} \text{goods} \quad A = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1m} \\ \vdots & a_{22} & \cdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ a_{n1} & \cdots & \cdots & a_{nm} \end{bmatrix}$$

Definition 1. (A, B) is productive if there exists an $x \ge 0$ such that $(B - A) \cdot x >> 0$.

Assumptions maintained.
$$h < m$$
 $[Z] = n \subseteq [1, ..., m]$
1. (A, B) is productive
2. No joint production \rightarrow Any column lactivity in B has at most 1 element > 0
3. Every good is produced \rightarrow Any soci/good in B has at least 1 element > 0

Definition 2. A technology *t* is a set of *n* activities such that each good is produced by only one activity.

Lemma 1. *If a GLM* (*A*, *B*) *is productive and produces* $y \gg 0$ *, then there is a technology that produces y*.

Consider the example:

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \qquad A = \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 & 1/2 & 0 \\ 1/2 & 0 & 1/2 \end{bmatrix} \qquad B - A = \begin{bmatrix} -1/2 & 1/2 & 0 \\ 1/2 & 0 & 1/2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Take $y' = (1/2, 3/2)^T$, verify that both technologies $t = \{1, 2\}$ and $s = \{2, 3\}$ can produce y since

$$\begin{bmatrix} -1/2 & 1/2 & 0 \\ 1/2 & 0 & 1/2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 4 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 \\ 3/2 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \begin{bmatrix} -1/2 & 1/2 & 0 \\ 1/2 & 0 & 1/2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 \\ 3/2 \end{bmatrix}$$

A natural question now is to ask which technology should we use? To compare technologies, we need some notion of efficiency of a technology. To that end, we introduce a finite resource, labor. For the GLM, the labor requirement vector is given by $a_0 = (a_{01}, \ldots a_{0m})$, where a_{0j} is the amount of labor needed to run

1

 $\begin{array}{ccc} Q_0 & \overrightarrow{\chi} & \longrightarrow \text{scalor} \\ \underline{Q_0} & \overrightarrow{\chi} & \longrightarrow \text{vector}. \end{array} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{vs} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{array}$

one unit of activity *j*. Let L be the supply of labor. The set of *feasible net output (PPS)* for the GLM is $Y = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n, y \ge 0 : y \le (B - A)x, a_0 \cdot x \le L, x \ge 0\}.$

The best way to produce y' is now the most efficient way to produce y'. Here, that will correspond to using the least amount of the finite resource, labor.

Example 1. Let $a_0 = (1, 1/2, 1/2)$, then to produce y', technology t needs $a_0 \cdot (3, 4, 0)^T = 5$, while s needs $a_0 \cdot (0, 1, 3)^T = 2$. Thus, we should use technology s to produce y'.

Our analysis shows that some technologies are better than others, but what if we allow all activities to be used. Can we do any better? The answer is no.

For a given *y*, the following linear program gives the activity vector *x* that minimizes labor used.

$$\lambda(y) = \min a_0 \cdot x$$

s. t. $(B - A)x \ge y$
 $x \ge 0$
 $(\mathcal{L}(y))$

For a given *y* and a technology *t*, the following linear program gives the activity vector using technology *t* that minimizes labor used.

$$\lambda^{t}(y) = \min a_{0} \cdot x$$

s.t. $(B - A)x \ge y$
 $x \ge 0$
 $x_{i} = 0$ if $i \notin t$
 $(\mathcal{L}^{t}(y))$

First note that for a given y', if x is an optimal solution to \mathcal{L} , then there is a basic optimal solution which is an optimal solution to \mathcal{L}^t for some t. That is, $\lambda(y') = \lambda^t(y')$ for some t. With the same reasoning, for a given y'', there is a technology s such that $\lambda(y'') = \lambda^s(y'')$. There is no reason for s and t to be the same in our reasoning, but the next theorem says that they are.

Theorem 2 (Non-substitution). If a GLM (A, B) satisfies the maintained assumptions, there is a technology t such that for all $y \ge 0$, $\lambda^t(y) = \lambda(y)$.

Example 2. Let
$$y' = \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 \\ 3/2 \end{bmatrix}$$
 and $y'' = \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$. The problems are

$$\lambda(y') = \min x_1 + \frac{1}{2}x_2 + \frac{1}{2}x_3$$
s. t. $-x_1 + x_2 \ge 1$

$$x_1 + x_3 \ge 3$$

$$x \ge 0$$

$$\lambda(y'') = \min x_1 + \frac{1}{2}x_2 + \frac{1}{2}x_3$$
s. t. $-x_1 + x_2 \ge 1$

$$x_1 + x_3 \ge 4$$

$$x \ge 0$$

$$(\mathcal{L}(y''))$$

The solutions are $x' = (0, 1, 3)^T$ and $x'' = (0, 1, 4)^T$, respectively. We see that technology $s = \{2, 3\}$ gives $\lambda^s(y') = \lambda(y')$ and also that $\lambda^s(y'') = \lambda(y'')$.



The non-substitution theorem says that technologies can be ranked by how efficient they are, where efficiency of a technology is measured by how much labor is used. Another interpretation of the non-substitution theorem is that when a GLM is productive, has one primary factor, and satisfies all our assumptions, restricting our usage to technology t with n activities does not alter the production possibility.

2 Problems

Problem 1 (Q7 of Linear Economic Models).Problem 2. Consider a GLM given by

 $B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \qquad A = \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 & 1/4 \end{bmatrix}$ and suppose that there are two primary factors $a_P = (1,0)$ and $a_E = (0,1/2)$ with labor supply $L_P = 4$ and $L_E = 2$, respectively. Is there a technology that does not alter the production possibility? Compare this to the case with one primary factor $a_0 = (1,1/2)$ and L = 6.

-> No joint prod -> All goods produced.

lips: 1- PPS of all activities? 2- PPS of all technologies?

7 Countries : A, B Goods : $z \in [0,1]$ Labor regt : $(a(z), b(z))_{z \in [0,1]}$ - only 1 input. z is ordered so that d(z) = a(z)/b(z) strictly to Ŵ Output prices: $(p(z))_{z \in [0,1]}$ Input prices: w_a , w_b Input endowments : LA, LB a Convex support function of world PPS: $v(L_A, L_B) = \max_{\chi_a(\cdot), \chi_b(\cdot)} \int_0^1 p(z) \cdot [\chi_a(z) + \chi_b(z)] dz$ s.t. $\int a(z) x_a(z) dz \leq L_A$ $--(\omega_a)$ $\int^{1} b(z) \chi_{b}(z) dz \leq L_{B}$ $-\left(\omega_{\mathbf{b}}\right)$ $\chi_a(\cdot), \chi_b(\cdot) \ge 0$ Complementary slackness: $\omega_{a} \int a(z) x_{a}(z) dz - L_{A} = 0$ $W_{b} \left[\int_{0}^{1} b(z) \chi_{b}(z) dz - L_{b} \right] = 0$

= min Wa La + Wb LB Wa, Wb Dual 8.t. $\begin{cases} w_a \quad a(z) \geq p(z) \quad \dots \quad (\chi_a(z)) \\ w_b \quad b(z) \geq p(z) \quad \dots \quad (\chi_b(z)) \\ \forall z \end{cases}$ $\omega_a, \omega_b \ge 0$ Refit maximization condition: $\forall z \in [0, 1]$, $Xa(z)\left[p(z) - Waa(z)\right] = 0, \quad p(z) \leq waa(z)$ $\chi_{b}(z) \left[p(z) - \omega_{b} b(z) \right] = 0, \quad p(z) \leq \omega_{b} b(z)$ [b] If $\chi_a(\tilde{z}) > 0$, $\chi_b(\tilde{z}) > 0$ for some $\tilde{z} \in [0, 1]$ then: $p(\tilde{z}) = \omega_a a(\tilde{z})$ $p(\tilde{z}) = w_b b(\tilde{z})$ $\Rightarrow \frac{\mathfrak{a}(\widetilde{z})}{\mathfrak{b}(\widetilde{z})} \equiv \mathfrak{a}(\widetilde{z}) = \frac{\omega_{\mathfrak{b}}}{\omega_{\mathfrak{a}}}$ Statement: $\exists z^* : A produced all <math>z < z^* \notin B$ all $z > z^*$. C Altered proposition: $\exists z^* \in [0, 1]$ such that any $\chi_A^*(z) > 0$ has $z > z^* fany \chi_B^*(z) > 0$ has $z \leq z^*$. not all $z < z^*$ has $\chi_B^*(z) > 0$

<u>Pf</u>: Key ingredient: i - Complementary stackness conditions ii - d() is strictly decreasing Part (b) above says that for any good produced in both countries, $\alpha(\tilde{z}) = \frac{\omega_b}{\omega_a}$ Since, $\alpha(\cdot)$ is strictly dureasing \Rightarrow 3 atmost <u>one</u> $\tilde{z} \in [0,1] : \alpha(\tilde{z}) = \frac{w_b}{w_a}$ Towards a contradiction of proposition, suppose: m_1 $\exists z_1, z_2$ such that $z_1 > z_2$. Let A produces Z and B produces Z, $Waa(z_1) \ge p(z_1)$ f $W_bb(z_1) = p(z_1)$ $wa a(z_2) = p(z_2) \qquad \qquad bb b(z_2) \ge p(z_2)$ $\frac{q(z_1)}{q(z_2)} \ge \frac{p(z_1)}{p(z_2)} & 4 \qquad \frac{p(z_1)}{p(z_2)} \ge \frac{b(z_1)}{b(z)}.$ $\Rightarrow \qquad \frac{q(z_1)}{b(z_1)} \ge \frac{q(z_2)}{b(z_2)} \equiv q(z_1) \ge q(z_2).$ By strict decreasing: $q(z_1) < q(z_2) = q(z_2) \Rightarrow Cantradiction$

But suppose $x_a(z_1) > 0$, does this imply $\chi_a(z_2) > 0 \quad \forall z_2 > z_1$ $Wa a(z_1)$ $Xa(z_1) > 0 \implies p(z_1) =$ It is possible that: $p(z_2) < wa a(z_2) \implies \chi_a(z_2) = 0$ $\frac{p(z_2)}{a(z_2)} < \frac{p(z_1)}{a(z_1)} > \frac{\chi_a(z_2) = 0}{\lambda a(z_1)}$ Not the case that $\frac{q(z_2)}{a(z_1)} = \frac{p(z_1)}{a(z_1)} = \frac{\chi_a(z_2)}{\lambda a(z_2)}$ [d] See b. Notice that z* is the only good that both A and B can produce simultaneously. This happens when: $0 \le Z^* = \frac{\omega_b}{\omega_a} \le 1$ 2 Identical consumers with Cobb-Douglas preferences → Use aggregate representation. Consumer problem: max $U_{A}\left[(C_{A}(z))_{z\in[0,1]}\right]$ S(2) = 22) Cilly 8. t. $\int_{p(z)}^{1} G_{A}(z) dz \leq \omega_{A} L_{A}$ selling labors in A.

Un() is Cobb Douglas $\implies LNS \implies \int_{\mathcal{D}} \int_{\mathcal{D}} p(z) G_{k}(z) d_{z} = \omega_{A} L_{A}$ $\int_{0}^{1} p(z) \frac{C_{A}(z)}{W_{A}} dz = 1$ $\equiv S_A(Z)$ If UA = UB, given preferences are C-D: $p(z) G_{A}(z) = p(z) C_{B}(z)$ $W_{A} L_{A} \qquad W_{B} L_{A}$ $S_A(z) = S_B(z) = S(z)$ [f] Fraction spent on country A goods: $\theta(z^*) = \int_{z^*}^1 g(z) dz$ ($\tilde{\theta} = 1 - \theta$ in p.s.) Revenue in $A = \tilde{\Theta}(z^*) \left[w_a L_a + w_b L_b \right]$ Labor expense = Wa La in A Wa La $\left[1 - \theta(z^*)\right]$ Egbm: Õ(z*) Wb Lb

 $= (1 - \tilde{\Theta}(z^*)) \left[wala + w_b L_b \right]$ Revenue in B Labor expense in B WbLb Eq. $\tilde{\Theta}(z^*) w_b L_b = (1 - \tilde{\Theta}(z^*)) w_a L_a$ $\frac{La}{Lb} = \int_{z^*}^{z} g(z) dz$ $\equiv \beta(z^*)$ $\equiv \beta(z^*)$ Wb Wa 9 $\frac{W_{b}}{W_{a}} = \chi(Z^{*}).$ $\beta(z^*)$ h Diff. w.r.t. La $\left(\frac{d\alpha(z^*)}{dz^*}\right) = \frac{d\beta(z^*)}{dz^*}$ $\alpha'(z^*) \cdot \frac{dz^*}{dl_a} = \frac{d}{dl_a} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} L_a \\ L_b \end{array} \left(\begin{array}{c} (1 - \tilde{\Theta}(z^*)) \\ \tilde{\Theta}(z^*) \end{array} \right) \right\}$ $\frac{du}{1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \tilde{\Theta}(z^*) \\ \tilde{\Theta}(z^*) \end{bmatrix} + \frac{L_a}{4} \begin{bmatrix} -\tilde{\Theta}(z^*) - (1 - \tilde{\Theta}(z^*)) \\ \tilde{\Theta}(z^*) \end{bmatrix} \frac{d\tilde{\Theta}(z^*)}{dL_a}$ Jon whi $\frac{1}{L_{b}} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1 - \tilde{\Theta}(z^{*})}{\tilde{\Theta}(z^{*})} \end{bmatrix} - \frac{L_{a}}{L_{b}} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{d \tilde{\Theta}(z^{*})}{dz^{*}} \cdot \frac{dz^{*}}{dz^{*}} \\ \tilde{\Theta}(z^{*})^{2} \end{pmatrix}$

 $\tilde{\Theta}(z^*) = \int g(z) dz$ $\int p(z) C(z) dz$ wala+wele Using Leibniz Rule: $\frac{d\theta(z^*)}{dz^*} = -1 \cdot 8(z^*)$ $\frac{1}{L_{b}} \left[\frac{1 - \tilde{\Theta}(z^{*})}{\tilde{\Theta}(z^{*})} \right] + \frac{L_{a}}{L_{b}} \left[\frac{g(z^{*})}{\tilde{\Theta}(z^{*})^{2}} \right] \frac{dz^{*}}{dl_{a}}$ $\therefore \alpha'(z^*) \frac{dz^*}{dla}$ $\alpha'(z^*) \mathcal{L}_b \tilde{\Theta}(z^*)^2 \frac{dz^*}{dLa}$ $\tilde{\Theta}(z^*)(I-\tilde{\Theta}(z^*))$ + La $8(z^*) \frac{dz^*}{dla}$ $\tilde{\Theta}(z^*) \left[1 - \tilde{\Theta}(z^*) \right] > 0$ $\frac{dz^{*}}{dLa}$ $\alpha'(z^*) \downarrow_b \Theta(z^*)^2 - \lfloor_a B(z^*)$ $\frac{dz^*}{dLa} < 0$ ⇒ z*√

 $\frac{q_0}{q_0} = \begin{bmatrix} \overline{a_p} \\ \overline{a_E} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix}; \quad \overline{L} = \begin{bmatrix} L_p \\ L_E \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 4 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$ B = [1, 1] $Y = \{ y \ge 0 : y \le \left(\frac{\chi_1}{2} + \frac{3\chi_2}{4} \right), 0 \le \chi_1 \le 4$ $0 \leq \frac{\chi_2}{2} \leq 2$ β α : 1×m $2L_{E}$ Set $X_1 = X_2 = 4$. $Y = \frac{4}{2} + \frac{3x4}{1} =$ = 2+3 = 5 Suppose we only use technology 1, $\chi_1 = 4$, $\chi_2 = 0$ $\Rightarrow \gamma = 2$. Suppose we only use technology 2, $\chi_1 = 0, \quad \chi_2 = 4 \implies \gamma = \underline{3}$

Thus, $\exists Z \in \{\{1\}, \{2\}\}\$ such that the PPS is unchanged If $\vec{a}_0 = (1, \frac{1}{2})$; L = 6 $Y = \{ y \ge 0 : y \le \frac{\chi_1}{2} + \frac{3\chi_2}{4}, \chi_1 + \frac{\chi_2}{2} \le 6, \chi \ge 0 \}$ N2 12 $\chi_1^* = 0, \quad \chi_2^* = 12$ $\frac{1}{2} = 9$ 7={2} produces same PPS κı

•	•	•		•		•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	٠	•	•	•		•		•					٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	,	•
	*	•	٠	٠	*	•	•	*	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	• •		•	٠	٠	٠	•	٠	•	•	•	а — -	•
•	٠	•	٠	٠		٠	•		٠	•	•	*	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	• •	•	٠	۰	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•
•	•	•	•	٠	٠	•	•	٠	•	•	•	٠	•		٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	• •			٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•
•	•	•	•	•	*	•	•	*	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	• •			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	*		•
•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•			•		•		•			•	•	•	•		•			•		•
	•		•																	•														•	
						•																											•		
				•				•				•			•			•												•			•	•	
				•											•	•		•	•		•										•		•	0	
٠	٠		٠			٠			•	•			•					•		•		•	• •		•			•			•	•		•	
•				•	•	•		•		٠		•	٠	•	•	•		٠	•	•	•	٠				٠		•	٠	٠	•	•	•	,	
٠	٠		٠			•			•			•				•		٠	•	·	•	•	• •			٠	•		٠	•	•	•		,	•
٠	•			•	•	•		•	•			•		•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•					•	•	•	•	•	•	•	,	•
٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	• •					•	٠	•	•	•		,	•
٠	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	٠	•	•		•	•		٠	٠	•	•	•	•	•		•
٠	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	٠	٠	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	*	• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•
٠	٠	•	٠	•	•	٠	•	•	٠		•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	٠	• •	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	•	•	•		•
•	٠	•	۰	•	•	٠	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	• •	•	•	۰	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•
•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•			•		•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•				•	•	•	•	•	•				•
																				•															
				•	*			•							•			•															•	•	
				•							•				•		•	•			•										•		•	•	
				٠	*	•		•	•	•		•		•	٠			•		•							٠	•		٠	•		•	•	
							•	٠		•			•			•		•	•		•										•		*	,	•
٠	•			•		•	•		•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	• •					•	•	•	•		•	,	•
•	•	•	•	٠	*		•	٠	•		•	•		٠	٠	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•				•	•		٠	٠	٠	•	•		•
٠	•	•	•	٠	٠	•	•	٠	•	•	•	٠	•	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	•	٠	•	• •			•		•	٠	٠	٠	•	•		•
٠	•	•	•	٠	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	٠	٠	•	٠	٠	•	٠	•					٠	•	٠	٠	٠	•	•		•
•	•	•	•	*	*	•	•	*	•	•	•	•	•	•	*	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	• •			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	*		•
				•					•						•							•					•								•
												•						•													•			•	
				•											•																		•		
				٠								•			٠			•		•										•			•	•	
				٠				*		•					٠			•		•													•	•	
						•	•											•										•		•			•	,	
٠			•	•	•			•	•		•	•		•	•	•		٠	•	•	•	•				•	•		•	•	•	•		,	•
	٠		٠			•	•	٠	٠		•			•		•	•	•	•	*	•	•	• •		٠	٠	*	٠	•	٠	•	•	•		•
٠	٠	٠		٠		٠	•	٠		٠	•	٠	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	• •	٠	•		٠	٠	•	•	•	•	•		•
٠	•	•	٠	٠	*	*	•	*	•	•	•	٠	•	•	٠	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•		•		٠	٠	0	•	٠	•	•	•		•
	•	٠	٠	٠		٠	•	٠	٠	•	٠	٠	•	٠	٠	•	٠		٠	٠	•	•	• •	•		٠	٠	0	٠	٠	•	•	٠		•
•	٠	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	• •	•	٠	٠	٠	•	٠	٠	•	•	•		•
•	•	•	•	•					•			•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•				*	•	•	•		•	•				•	
			٠	•											•			•						•							•	•	•	•	