Macroeconomic Dynamics, **15**, 2011, 1–30. Printed in the United States of America.
doi:10.1017/S1365100509090415

ARTICLES

NONRENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES AS INPUT FOR PHYSICAL CAPITAL ACCUMULATION: A NEW APPROACH

AGUSTÍN PÉREZ-BARAHONA
INRA-AgroParisTech
and
École Polytechnique

In contrast to the standard approach in energy economics, this paper assumes that physical capital accumulation is relatively more energy-intensive than consumption. By means of Gaussian hypergeometric functions, we provide a closed-form representation of the optimal solution paths of our variables in levels, whatever the initial conditions (*i.e.*, global dynamics). We find that, in general, the optimal trajectories are nonmonotonic. P.S. Dasgupta and G.M. Heal [*Review of Economic Studies* (special number), 3–28 (1974)] pointed out this result (local dynamics) for the optimal consumption in a model with identical technology for both physical capital accumulation and consumption. However, our paper introduces five novelties with respect to their study, namely, global dynamics, the importance of the proportion of nonrenewable energy resources to endowment of physical capital $[S(0)/K(0)]$, the role of technical progress, U-shaped behavior of consumption, and nonmonotonicity of resource extraction.

Keywords: Nonrenewable Resources, Energy-Saving Technical Progress, Special Functions, Global Dynamics

1. INTRODUCTION

Energy economics widely admits that physical capital accumulation is a key component in offsetting the constraint on production possibilities due to the usage of nonrenewable energy resources. The standard approach [see, for

I would like to thank Raouf Boucekkine, Thierry Brechet, Catarina Goulão, Juan de Dios Moreno-Ternero, Ingmar Schumacher, Katheline Schubert, Sjak Smulders, Eric Strobl and Alfonso Valdesogo-Robles, for their useful comments. I am grateful for the financial support of Marie Curie Intra-european Fellowship (FP6), Chaire Lhoist Berghmans in Environmental Economics and Management [CORE, Université catholique de Louvain (Belgium)] and Chaire Développement Durable [École Polytechnique–EDF (France)]. Any remaining errors are mine. Address correspondence to: Agustín Pérez-Barahona, INRA-Économie publique, Avenue Lucien Brétignières, 78850 Thiverval Grignon, France; e-mail: agperez@grignon.inra.fr.

© 2010 Cambridge University Press 1365-1005/10

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

instance, Dasgupta and Heal (1974, 1979), Solow (1974a, 1974b), Stiglitz (1974), Hartwick (1989), and Pezzey and Withagen (1998)] assumes the same technology for both physical capital accumulation and consumption, which implies (among other things) that the energy intensity of both sectors is the same. However, data do not support this simplification. In fact, taking the Structural Analysis Database of the OECD and the Energy Balances and Energy Prices and Taxes of the IEA, Azomahou et al. (2006) build an energy intensity measurement (ratio between energy consumption and value added) of fourteen sectors of the economy.[1] One observes that this ratio is particularly high for activities closely related to physical capital accumulation [e.g., iron and steel sector (0.809), transport and storage (0.85), nonferrous metals (0.599), and nonmetallic minerals (0.507)]. However, for consumption goods energy intensity is clearly lower [e.g., food and tobacco (0.134), textiles and leather (0.082), and construction (0.018)]. Therefore, contrary to the standard assumption, data seem to support the conclusion that physical capital accumulation is more energy-intensive than consumption.

In this paper, we study the implications for economic growth of assuming a different technology for each sector, physical capital accumulation and consumption. More precisely, in an economy where energy is directly produced by extracting nonrenewable resources, we assume that physical capital accumulation is relatively more energy-intensive than consumption. We use a general equilibrium model with three sectors: consumption, physical capital, and extraction. In addition, this paper pays special attention to energy-saving technologies, defined as technologies that reduce energy intensity. Indeed, the importance of these kinds of technologies was pointed out in numerous studies [see, for instance, Boucekkine and Pommeret (2004), COM (2005), and Pérez-Barahona and Zou (2006a, 2006b)].

Our primary focus is on analysis of the balanced growth path equilibrium (BGP). By means of Gaussian hypergeometric functions, we provide a closed-form representation of the optimal solution paths of our variables in levels. In contrast to the standard approach, this method of special functions allows a global description of the dynamics of the economy[2] and does not rely on dimension reduction [see Abramowitz and Stegun (1970) and Boucekkine and Ruiz-Tamarit (2008) for further details]. Therefore, we present a closed-form representation of the optimal trajectories whatever the initial conditions; that is, we do not limit our study to the values of initial conditions in the neighborhood of an equilibrium point. We also prove that there is asymptotic convergence to the BGP. Moreover, we explicitly study the monotonicity of the optimal trajectories of the variables in levels, which is typically unfeasible in the standard approach. We get that, in general, the optimal trajectories are nonmonotonic. Dasgupta and Heal (1974) previously observed this result (local dynamics) for optimal consumption in a model with the same technology for both physical capital accumulation and consumption. However, our paper raises several novelties with respect to their study, where these new results are a direct consequence of assuming both that the physical capital accumulation sector is relatively more energy intensive than the consumption sector, and that there is growing technical progress (in particular,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

energy-saving). Actually, Dasgupta and Heal (1974) showed that an economy with large endowments of both nonrenewable energy resources and physical capital initially increases consumption but, after some time, it will decrease. However, our model points out the possibility of an opposite behavior of consumption. Indeed, under both relative scarcity of nonrenewable energy resources with respect to the endowment of physical capital and low growth rates of technical progress, consumption depicts a U shape. Moreover, we prove that the more impatient the household, the greater is the number of periods where consumption decreases. Finally, in contrast with the same authors, we show that resource extraction is not necessarily monotonic.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes our economy, providing the dynamical system corresponding to the optimal solution. In Section 3 we study the BGP equilibrium. Section 4 solves the dynamical system presented in Section 2 using Gaussian hypergeometric functions. In Section 5 we provide the analytical expressions of the optimal solution paths. Section 6 studies the monotonicity properties of the optimal trajectories in levels. Finally, we offer some concluding remarks in Section 7.

2. THE MODEL

On the basis of Dasgupta and Heal (1974) and Hartwick (1989), let us consider a three-sector economy with nonrenewable energy resources, where the population is constant.[3] The final good sector produces a nondurable good, which can be assigned to consumption or investment. This final good is produced by means of a linear technology, where the physical capital (durable good) is the sole input. The durable good sector accumulates physical capital by means of a technology defined over two inputs: investment and energy. Finally, the extraction sector directly produces energy by extracting nonrenewable energy resources from a given stock.

2.1. Final Good Sector

The final good sector produces a nondurable good $Y(t)$ by means of the linear technology

$$Y(t) = A(t)K(t), \tag{1}$$

where $A(t)$ is the disembodied technical progress,[4] and $K(t)$ represents the physical capital that is the sole input to produce the final good. Notice that our model assumes an AK function for final good production. We consider this linear technology for the sake of simplicity. However, following Barro and Sala-i-Martin (2003) and Groth and Schou (2007), this assumption is reasonable if we consider a broad concept of physical capital, which includes human capital, knowledge, public infrastructure, etc.[5] Final good is used either to consume, $C(t)$, or to invest

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in physical capital, $I(t)$, verifying the budget constraint of the economy:

$$Y(t) = C(t) + I(t). \tag{2}$$

2.2. Durable Good Sector

The durable good sector accumulates physical capital, $\dot{K}(t)$, using two inputs. On one hand, the durable good sector takes the fraction of the final good devoted to investment, whereas on the other hand, this sector uses the energy, $R(t)$, produced by the extraction sector. The technology for physical capital accumulation is represented by the Cobb–Douglas function

$$\dot{K}(t) = [\theta(t)R(t)]^{\alpha} I(t)^{1-\alpha}, \qquad \text{with } 0 < \alpha < 0, \tag{3}$$

where $\theta(t)$ denotes the embodied energy-saving technical progress, and $K(0)$ is the initial stock of physical capital, which is considered as given.[6]

At this moment it is worthwhile to consider two observations. First, following the neoclassical growth framework introduced by Ramsey (1928), Cass (1965), and Koopmans (1965), the standard literature on nonrenewable energy resources [see, for instance, Dasgupta and Heal (1974, 1979), Stiglitz (1974), Solow (1974a, 1974b), Hartwick (1989), and Smulders and Nooij (2003)] considers energy resources as an input for the production of the final good. Moreover, because they also assume a single production process (final good), the technology for physical capital accumulation, $\dot{K}(t)$, and for consumption is the same.[7] As we pointed out in the Introduction, an important implication of this assumption is that the energy intensity of both sectors is the same too. However, there is neither conceptual nor empirical support for this hypothesis. Indeed, data go in the direction of considering that physical capital accumulation is more energy-intensive than consumption [Azomahou et al. (2006)]. Therefore, in contrast to the standard approach, our paper proposes a setup with two separate production processes, namely, production of final good and production of equipment, where physical capital accumulation is an activity more energy-intensive than consumption. Indeed, we consider that the nondurable good is produced by means of an AK production function [equation (1)], whereas the technology for physical capital accumulation is a function of two inputs, namely, investment and nonrenewable energy resources [equation (3)]. Therefore, our model assumes that $\dot{K}(t) = g[I(t), R(t)]$, which contrasts with the standard law of motion of physical capital, $\dot{K}(t) = I(t)$. Finally, as a second observation, we should notice that, in order to get analytical expressions, our model assumes a Cobb–Douglas functional form for the production of equipment [equation (3)]. As is clear, this functional form assumes substitutability between energy and investment. However, this hypothesis can be justified by following an argument similar to that in Dasgupta and Heal (1979), where one can assume substitutability if $I(t)$ is interpreted as final good service. Therefore, we assume that the provision of a flow of final good $I(t)$ implies the provision of a certain energy flow.[8]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2.3. Extraction Sector

Energy is directly produced by extracting nonrenewable energy resources, $R(t)$, from a homogeneous stock $S(t)$. Like Dasgupta and Heal (1974) and Hartwick (1989), we assume costless extraction.[9] The law of motion of the stock of nonrenewable energy resources is described by the expression

$$R(t) = -\dot{S}(t), \tag{4}$$

where $S(0)$ is the endowment of nonrenewable energy resources of the economy and is considered as given. Since we cannot extract more than the available stock, the following restriction should be included:

$$S(t) \geq 0. \tag{5}$$

2.4. Optimal Solution

The central planner (optimal solution) maximizes the instantaneous utility function of the representative household,

$$\max \int_0^\infty \ln[C(t)] \exp(-\rho t)\, dt, \text{ with } \rho > 0,$$

subject to equations (1)–(5), where ρ is the time preference parameter (it is assumed to be a positive discount factor).[10]

We can rewrite the previous problem as the optimal control problem with mixed constraints

$$\max \int_0^\infty \ln[A(t)K(t) - I(t)] \exp(-\rho t) dt, \quad \text{with } \rho > 0$$

subject to

$$\dot{K}(t) = [\theta(t)R(t)]^\alpha I(t)^{1-\alpha}, \quad \text{with } 0 < \alpha < 0,$$

$$R(t) = -\dot{S}(t),$$

$$S(t) \geq 0,$$

with $K(0)$ and $S(0)$ given, where $K(t)$ and $S(t)$ are the state variables, and $I(t)$ and $R(t)$ are the control variables. Following Sydster et al. (1999):

PROPOSITION 1. *Given the initial conditions $K(0)$ and $S(0)$, the solution of our optimal control problem is a path $\{C(t), R(t), I(t), S(t), K(t)\}$ that satisfies the following conditions:*

$$\dot{K}(t) = \theta(t)^\alpha R(t)^\alpha I(t)^{1-\alpha}, \tag{6}$$

$$\frac{\dot{C}(t)}{C(t)} = (1-\alpha)A(t)\theta(t)^\alpha \left(\frac{R(t)}{I(t)}\right)^\alpha - \alpha\left(\frac{\dot{\theta}(t)}{\theta(t)} - \frac{\dot{I}(t)}{I(t)} + \frac{\dot{R}(t)}{R(t)}\right) - \rho, \tag{7}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$$(1-\alpha)A(t)\theta(t)^{\alpha}\left(\frac{R(t)}{I(t)}\right)^{\alpha}=\alpha\frac{\dot{\theta}(t)}{\theta(t)}+(1-\alpha)\left(\frac{\dot{I}(t)}{I(t)}-\frac{\dot{R}(t)}{R(t)}\right), \tag{8}$$

$$A(t)K(t)=C(t)+I(t), \tag{9}$$

$$\dot{S}(t)=-R(t). \tag{10}$$

This system has five equations and five unknowns.[11] Equation (6) is the accumulation law of physical capital. Notice that, in this model, energy is an input to accumulate physical capital. If we denote $\dot{K}(t)=g[\theta(t),I(t),R(t)]$, then for a general utility function $U[C(t)]$, equation (7) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{U_{cc}\dot{C}}{U_c}-\rho=\frac{\dot{g}_I}{g_I}-Ag_I.$$

This is the Ramsey optimal savings relation. Similarly, equation (8) is equivalent to the expression

$$A(t)g_I=\frac{\dot{g}_R}{g_R},$$

which is the efficient condition for using up the nonrenewable resource, that is, the Hotelling rule. Finally, equation (9) is the budget constraint of the economy, whereas equation (10) is the law of motion of the stock of nonrenewable energy resources.

3. BALANCED GROWTH PATH EQUILIBRIUM

Let us define BGP as the situation where all the endogenous variables grow at a constant rate, $x(t)=\overline{x}\exp(\gamma_x t)$, where γ_x is the growth rate of $x(t)$ and $\overline{x}$ the corresponding level. Following Solow (1974a), we assume that $A(t)=\overline{A}\exp(\gamma_A t)$ and $\theta(t)=\overline{\theta}\exp(\gamma_\theta t)$ for all t, where $\overline{A},\overline{\theta},\gamma_A,\gamma_\theta$ are considered as strictly positive and exogenous parameters. Thus, from the dynamical system (6)–(10), it is easy to get the growth rates of the endogenous variables of our model along the BGP (necessary condition):[12]

PROPOSITION 2. *Along the BGP, $Y(t)$, $C(t)$, and $I(t)$ grow at rate*

$$\gamma_Y=\gamma_C=\gamma_I=\gamma_\theta+\frac{1}{\alpha}\gamma_A-\rho,$$

the growth rate of the stock of physical capital is

$$\gamma_K=\gamma_\theta+\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\gamma_A-\rho,$$

and extraction, $R(t)$, and stock of nonrenewable energy resources, $S(t)$, grow at a rate

$$\gamma_R=\gamma_S=-\rho.$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

As we observed in Section 2.4, the parameter ρ is the (positive) discount rate that represents the degree of impatience of the household. Indeed, the greater ρ, the more impatient the household is. Therefore, households prefer a higher level of present consumption over postponing it. Indeed, from Proposition 2, we can observe that the greater ρ, the greater is the rate of decrease of the stock of nonrenewable energy resources. The reason is the following. Because the household does not want to postpone consumption, it prefers to extract a greater amount of energy resource in order to get higher present consumption.

Furthermore, since greater ρ induces greater extraction, this reduces the growth rates of the economy along the BGP for a given growth rate of technical progress. However, this negative effect of the degree of impatience can be compensated for by greater growth rates of both disembodied (γ_A) and energy saving technical progress (γ_θ). More precisely, Proposition 2 establishes that if the growth rate of technical progress is high enough ($\gamma_\theta + \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\gamma_A > \rho$), then $\gamma_Y (= \gamma_C = \gamma_I) > 0$ and $\gamma_K > 0$ (if BGP exists). The reason is that technical progress (in particular, energy saving) reduces the energy intensity of the economy (i.e., increases energy efficiency). Indeed, if we define energy intensity as the ratio $R(t)/Y(t)$, it is easy to prove that, in our model, the growth rate of energy intensity along the BGP is

$$\gamma_{R/Y} = -\left(\gamma_\theta + \frac{1}{\alpha}\gamma_A\right),$$

which is negative for $\gamma_A > 0$ and $\gamma_\theta > 0$. Moreover, this is consistent with empirical works such as COM (2005) and Azomahou et al. (2006).

4. ANALYTICAL SOLUTION: GAUSSIAN HYPERGEOMETRIC REPRESENTATION

The aim of this section is to provide an analytical characterization of the dynamics of the model. As we explained in Section 1, the equilibrium of our economy is described by the dynamical system (6)–(10). By means of a family of special functions called Gaussian hypergeometric, we obtain closed-form solutions of the optimal paths. Special functions are frequently used in mathematical physics and computational mathematics [see Luke (1969), Abramowitz and Stegun (1972), Temme (1996), and Andrews et al. (1999) for a review of the properties and applications of these functions]. In this paper, we have to deal with a calculus problem similar to that in Boucekkine and Ruiz-Tamarit (2008, p. 40, Proposition 1), where Gaussian hypergeometric functions are applied to solve the problem. Therefore, in this paper we follow their resolution method.[13]

Let us start with a brief description of how to solve recursively the dynamical system (6)–(10).[14] By defining the ratio $X(t) = R(t)/I(t)$, it is easy to verify that equation (8) is a Bernoulli equation (see Appendix A). Therefore, following Sydsæter et al. (1999), we get the analytical solution for the ratio $X(t)$. Taking the solution of $X(t)$ into equation (7), we get $C(t)$ as solution of the corresponding linear first-order differential equation. Similarly, by rewriting equation (6)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as $\dot{K}(t) = \theta(t)^{\alpha} X(t)^{\alpha}[A(t)K(t) - C(t)]$, and taking the previously obtained formulas for $X(t)$ and $C(t)$, $K(t)$ is calculated as the solution of a linear first-order differential equation. Knowing $C(t)$ and $K(t)$, the analytical expression for $I(t)$ is straightforward from equation (9). Moreover, by retrieving the ratio $X(t)$, we get the formula for $R(t)$. Finally, from equation (10), $S(t)$ is obtained by solving another linear first-order differential equation.

4.1. Optimal Solution Paths

By recursively solving the dynamical system, together with the parameter constraints involved in both the transversality conditions and the Gaussian hypergeometric representation (see Appendix A for details), we establish the optimal solution paths of our economy.

As we will see in this section, in general, the optimal solution paths [$x(t) = C(t), K(t), I(t), Y(t), R(t)$ or $S(t)$] are functions in the form of

$$x(t) = f(\text{parameters}, K(0), S(0), \varphi, t),$$

where φ is the solution of a nonlinear equation [see Appendix A, equation (A.25)]:[15]

$$h(\text{parameters}, K(0), S(0), \varphi) = 0.$$

Optimal solution paths for consumption $C(t)$. From equation (A.10) (see Appendix A), we get $C(t)$. Then, by rearranging terms, we establish the following proposition:

PROPOSITION 3. *Under conditions (A.22) and (A.26), if equation (A.25) admits a unique solution, then*

(i) *there exists a unique path for $C(t)$, starting from*

$$C(0) = \frac{\alpha\overline{A}}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)}\frac{Z+\rho}{Z}K(0),$$

such that

$$C(t) = C(0)\left[\left(\frac{\varphi Z}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)\exp(-Zt) + \frac{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right]^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \cdot \exp\left\{\left(\gamma_{\theta} + \frac{1}{\alpha}\gamma_A - \rho\right)t\right\}; \quad (11)$$

(ii) *this equilibrium path shows transitional dynamics, approaching the unique BGP asymptotically*

$$C_{BGP}(t) = C(0)\left(\frac{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\exp\left\{\left(\gamma_{\theta} + \frac{1}{\alpha}\gamma_A - \rho\right)t\right\};$$

where $K(0)$ is given.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Regarding the sign of the optimal solution path, for $C(0) > 0$, condition (A.26) implies that both the transitional dynamics and BGP are positive. From Proposition 3, the condition for $C(0) > 0$ is that ${}_2F_1(-\varphi Z/\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}) > 0$. Then, we establish the following corollary:

COROLLARY 1. *Under conditions (A.22), (A.26), and* ${}_2F_1(-\varphi Z/\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}) > 0$, *the optimal solution path for* $C(t)$ *is strictly positive for all* $t \geq 0$.

Optimal solution paths for physical capital $K(t)$. Plugging equation (A.19) into equation (A.12) and rearranging terms (see Appendix A), we obtain the optimal solution path for physical capital:

PROPOSITION 4. *Under conditions (A.22) and (A.26), if equation (A.25) admits a unique solution, then*

(i) *there exists a unique path for* $K(t)$, *starting from* $K(0)$, *such that*

$$K(t) = K(0)(\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha})^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \frac{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\exp(Zt)\right)}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)} \left(\frac{\varphi Z}{\exp(Zt)} + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$$

$$\cdot \exp\left\{\left(\gamma_\theta + \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\gamma_A - \rho\right)t\right\}; \tag{12}$$

(ii) *this equilibrium path shows transitional dynamics, approaching the unique BGP asymptotically:*

$$K_{BGP}(t) = K(0)\left(\frac{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \frac{1}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)} \exp\left\{\left(\gamma_\theta + \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\gamma_A - \rho\right)t\right\},$$

where $K(0)$ *is given.*

Furthermore, as in the previous case, we establish the following corollary to ensure a positive optimal solution path:

COROLLARY 2. *For a given* $K(0) > 0$, *under conditions (A.22), (A.26), and* ${}_2F_1(-\varphi Z/\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}) > 0$, *the optimal solution path for* $K(t)$ *is strictly positive for all* $t \geq 0$.

The proof will be provided upon request.

Optimal solution paths for investment $I(t)$. Substituting equation (A.19) into equation (A.13) (see Appendix A) and rearranging terms, we find the following proposition:

PROPOSITION 5. *Under conditions (A.22) and (A.26), if equation (A.25) admits a unique solution, then*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(i) *there exists a unique path for* $I(t)$*, starting from*

$$I(0) = \overline{A}K(0)\left(1 - \alpha\frac{Z+\rho}{Z}\frac{1}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)}\right),$$

such that

$$I(t) = \frac{\overline{A}K(0)}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)}\left(\frac{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\exp(Zt)}{(\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha})\exp(Zt)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$$
$$\cdot\left[{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\exp(Zt)}\right) - \alpha\frac{Z+\rho}{Z}\right]\exp\left\{\left(\gamma_\theta + \frac{1}{\alpha}\gamma_A - \rho\right)t\right\}; \quad \textbf{(13)}$$

(ii) *this equilibrium path shows transitional dynamics, approaching the unique BGP asymptotically:*

$$I_{BGP}(t) = \frac{\overline{A}K(0)}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)}\left(\frac{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\left(1 - \frac{Z+\rho}{Z}\alpha\right)$$
$$\cdot\exp\left\{\left(\gamma_\theta + \frac{1}{\alpha}\gamma_A - \rho\right)t\right\},$$

where $K(0)$ *is given.*

It is easy to prove that condition (A.22) implies that $\alpha\frac{Z+\rho}{Z} < 1$. If ${}_2F_1(-\varphi Z/\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}) > 1$, then $I(0) > 0$. Moreover, as in Corollary 2, we prove that ${}_2F_1(-\varphi Z/\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\exp(Zt)) > {}_2F_1(-\varphi Z/\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha})$. Therefore, equation (13) will also be positive. Hence, we establish the following corollary:

COROLLARY 3. *For a given* $K(0) > 0$*, under conditions (A.22), (A.26), and* ${}_2F_1(-\varphi Z/\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}) > 1$*, the optimal solution path for* $I(t)$ *is strictly positive for all* $t \geq 0$*.*

Optimal solution paths for output $Y(t)$*.* Because $Y(t) = C(t) + I(t)$, Propositions 3 and 5 provide the optimal solution path for output:

PROPOSITION 6. *Under conditions (A.22) and (A.26), if equation (A.25) admits a unique solution, then*

(i) *there exists a unique path for* $Y(t)$*, starting from* $Y(0) = \overline{A}K(0)$*, such that*

$$Y(t) = \overline{A}K(0)\left(\frac{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\exp(Zt)}{(\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha})\exp(Zt)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\frac{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\exp(Zt)}\right)}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)}$$
$$\cdot\exp\left\{\left(\gamma_\theta + \frac{1}{\alpha}\gamma_A - \rho\right)t\right\}; \quad \textbf{(14)}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(ii) *this equilibrium path shows transitional dynamics, approaching the unique BGP asymptotically:*

$$Y_{BGP}(t) = Y(t) = \overline{A}K(0)\left(\frac{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \frac{1}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)}$$

$$\cdot \exp\left\{\left(\gamma_\theta + \frac{1}{\alpha}\gamma_A - \rho\right)t\right\},$$

where $K(0)$ is given.

Concerning the sign of the optimal solution path, we proceed as in Corollary 2:

COROLLARY 4. *For a given $K(0) > 0$, under conditions (A.22), (A.26), and ${}_2F_1(-\varphi Z/\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}) > 0$, the optimal solution path for $Y(t)$ is strictly positive for all $t \geq 0$.*

Optimal solution paths for extraction of nonrenewable resources $R(t)$. Since $R(t) = X(t)I(t)$, from equations (A.13) and (A.19) (see Appendix A), and (B.1) (see Appendix B) we get the optimal solution path for the extraction of nonrenewable resources:

PROPOSITION 7. *Under conditions (A.22) and (A.26), if equation (A.25) admits a unique solution, then*

(i) *there exists a unique path for $R(t)$, starting from*

$$R(0) = \overline{A}K(0)\left(\frac{Z}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\left(1 - \alpha\frac{Z+\rho}{Z}\frac{1}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)}\right),$$

such that

$$R(t) = \left(\frac{Z}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \frac{\overline{A}K(0)}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)}\left[{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\exp(Zt)\right) - \alpha\frac{Z+\rho}{Z}\right]$$

$$\cdot \exp(-\rho t); \tag{15}$$

(ii) *this equilibrium path shows transitional dynamics, approaching the unique BGP asymptotically:*

$$R_{BGP}(t) = \left(\frac{Z}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \frac{\overline{A}K(0)}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)}\left[1 - \alpha\frac{Z+\rho}{Z}\right] \cdot \exp(-\rho t),$$

where $K(0)$ is given.

Following the same reasoning as in Corollary 3, we can establish the following condition for a positive optimal solution path for $R(t)$:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

COROLLARY 5. *For a given $K(0) > 0$, under conditions (A.22), (A.26), and ${}_2F_1(-\varphi Z/\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}) > 1$, the optimal solution path for $R(t)$ is strictly positive for all $t \geq 0$.*

Optimal solution paths for the stock of nonrenewable resources $S(t)$. From Appendix A, substituting equation (A.21) into equation (A.15) and rearranging terms, we get the optimal solution path for the stock of nonrenewable energy resources:

PROPOSITION 8. *Under conditions (A.22) and (A.26), if equation (A.25) admits a unique solution, then*

(i) *there exists a unique path for $S(t)$, starting from $S(0)$, such that*

$$S(t) = C(0)\left(\frac{Z}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \cdot \left\{\frac{\left(\frac{Z}{Z+\rho}\right)^2 \frac{1}{\alpha}\frac{1}{Z+\Omega}}{\exp\left((Z+\Omega)\frac{Z+\rho}{Z}t\right)}\,{}_3F_2\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\exp(Zt)}\right) - \frac{1}{\rho}\frac{1}{\exp(\rho t)}\right\} \cdot \exp(-\rho t); \quad (16)$$

(ii) *this equilibrium path shows transitional dynamics, approaching asymptotically to zero,*

where $K(0)$ and $S(0)$ are given.

Regarding the sign of the optimal solution path for the stock of nonrenewable resources, for $C(0) > 0$, it is enough to require that $\exp(\rho t)$ increases faster than $\exp((Z+\Omega)\frac{Z+\rho}{Z}t)$:

COROLLARY 6. *For $K(0) > 0$ and $S(0) > 0$ given, under conditions (A.22), (A.26), ${}_2F_1(-\varphi Z/\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}) > 0$, and $\rho > (Z+\Omega)\frac{Z+\rho}{Z}$, the optimal solution path for $S(t)$ is strictly positive for all $t \geq 0$.*[16]

Finally, we conclude this section by summarizing all the conditions to guarantee strictly positive optimal solution paths:

COROLLARY 7. *For $K(0) > 0$ and $S(0) > 0$ given, under conditions (A.22), (A.26), ${}_2F_1(-\varphi Z/\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}) > 1$, and $\rho > (Z+\Omega)\frac{Z+\rho}{Z}$, the optimal solution paths for $X(t)$, $C(t)$, $K(t)$, $I(t)$, $Y(t)$, $R(t)$, and $S(t)$ are strictly positive for all $t \geq 0$.*

5. ON THE MONOTONICITY OF THE OPTIMAL SOLUTION PATHS

An important outcome of having closed-form solutions is that we can explicitly study the monotonicity of the optimal trajectories of the variables in levels, whatever the initial conditions. Indeed, this study is typically unfeasible

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in the standard approach. This section will show that, in general, the optimal trajectories are nonmonotonic. Dasgupta and Heal (1974) already pointed out this result (local dynamics) for the optimal consumption in a model with the same technology for both physical capital accumulation and consumption. However, our paper raises several novelties with respect to their study. Also note that, because Dasgupta and Heal (1974)'s result focused on $C(t)$ and $R(t)$, this section will similarly concentrate on the monotonicity properties of these two variables.[17]

As we will see in Sections 5.2 and 5.3, the sign of φ is a key element in determining the monotonicity properties of our optimal solutions paths. Therefore, we have to study this sign before dealing with the monotonicity of the optimal trajectories.

5.1. The Relationship between φ and $S(0)/K(0)$

From condition (A.25), taking all parameters as given, we observe that the ratio $S(0)/K(0)$ determines φ (and, in particular, the sign of φ).[18] Let us define $(S(0)/K(0))^*$ as the ratio corresponding to $\varphi = 0$. Then

$$\left(\frac{S(0)}{K(0)}\right)^* = \alpha\overline{A}\left(\frac{Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\left(\frac{Z}{Z+\rho}\frac{1}{\alpha}\frac{1}{Z+\Omega} - \frac{Z+\rho}{Z}\frac{1}{\rho}\right). \tag{17}$$

From (A.25), by applying the implicit function theorem, we get that

$$\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial(S(0)/K(0))} < 0.$$

The proof is provided in Appendix C.

Hence, for $S(0)/K(0) > (<)(S(0)/K(0))^*$, φ is negative (positive).

5.2. Monotonicity of Consumption

Equation (11) provides the optimal solution path for consumption. First, let us study detrended consumption $[\tilde{C}(t)]$; that is,

$$\tilde{C}(t) = C(0)\left[\left(\frac{\varphi Z}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)\exp(-Zt) + \frac{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right]^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}. \tag{18}$$

From equation (18), we get

$$\frac{d\tilde{C}(t)}{dt} = -\varphi\left\{\tilde{C}(t)\frac{Z\exp(-Zt)}{\alpha}\left(\frac{\varphi Z\exp(-Zt) + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)^{-1}\frac{1}{\varphi + \frac{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}{Z}}\right\}. \tag{19}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

From Corollary 7, the expression between braces is positive. Thus, the sign of φ determines the sign of the derivative. Hence, we can establish the following proposition:

PROPOSITION 9.

(1) *If* $S(0)/K(0) > (<)(S(0)/K(0))^*$, *then* $\tilde{C}(t)$ *increases (decreases) monotonically for all* t.

(2) *If* $S(0)/K(0) = (S(0)/K(0))^*$, *then*

$$\tilde{C}(t) = \alpha \overline{A} \frac{Z+\rho}{Z} K(0)$$

for all t.

Knowing the monotonicity properties of $\tilde{C}(t)$ allows us to study $C(t)$. Because $C(t) = \tilde{C}(t)\exp(\gamma_C t)$, where $\gamma_C = \gamma_\theta + \frac{1}{\alpha}\gamma_A - \rho$, it is easy to prove that

$$\frac{dC(t)}{dt} = \exp(\gamma_C t)\left(\frac{d\tilde{C}(t)}{dt} + \tilde{C}(t)\gamma_C\right). \tag{20}$$

From Corollary 7, we observe that all terms in equation (20) are positive except $d\tilde{C}(t)/dt$. Therefore, we can study this derivative from the monotonicity properties of $\tilde{C}(t)$. If $S(0)/K(0) > (S(0)/K(0))^*$, then $d\tilde{C}(t)/dt > 0$ for all t. Consequently, from equation (20), $dC(t)/dt > 0$ for all t. If $S(0)/K(0) = (S(0)/K(0))^*$, then $d\tilde{C}(t)/dt = 0$ for all t. So, from equation (20), we conclude that $dC(t)/dt > 0$ for all t. However, the difficult case emerges for $S(0)/K(0) < (S(0)/K(0))^*$ because $d\tilde{C}(t)/dt < 0$ for all t. Substituting equation (19) into equation (20) and rearranging terms yields

$$\frac{dC(t)}{dt} = \exp(\gamma_C t)\tilde{C}(t)\left[\gamma_C - \left(\frac{Z}{\alpha}\frac{\varphi Z}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\exp(Zt)}\right)\right]. \tag{21}$$

As before, all terms of equation (21) are positive. Because $\exp(Zt)$ increases with time, the term between brackets achieves its maximum value when $t = 0$. Thus, if

$$\gamma_C \geq \frac{Z}{\alpha}\frac{\varphi Z}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}} (\equiv \gamma^*),$$

then $dC(t)/dt > 0$ for all $t > 0$. However, if $\gamma_C < \gamma^*$, there exist a strictly positive t^* such that $dC(t)/dt < 0$ for all $0 < t < t^*$, $dC(t)/dt = 0$ for $t = t^*$, and $dC(t)/dt > 0$ for all $t > t^*$. Indeed, we can easily get the expression for t^*:

$$t^* = \frac{\ln\left[\dfrac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\left(\dfrac{Z-\alpha\gamma_C}{\alpha\gamma_C}\right)\right]}{Z}.$$

The proof is provided in Appendix D.

We summarize the monotonicity properties of $C(t)$ in the following proposition:

PROPOSITION 10.

(1) *If* $S(0)/K(0) \geq (S(0)/K(0))^*$, *then* $C(t)$ *increases monotonically for all* t.

(2) *If* $S(0)/K(0) < (S(0)/K(0))^*$, *then*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(2.1) *if* $\gamma_\theta + \frac{1}{\alpha}\gamma_A \geq \gamma^*$ *then* $C(t)$ *increases monotonically for all* $t > 0$*;*
(2.2) *if* $\gamma_\theta + \frac{1}{\alpha}\gamma_A < \gamma^*$ *then* $C(t)$ *then* $C(t)$ *decreases monotonically for all* $0 < t < t^*$*, and increases monotonically for all* $t > t^*$.

The economic interpretation of Propositions 9 and 10 is the following. Let us consider an economy where the proportion of nonrenewable energy resources to endowment of physical capital is high enough, that is, $S(0)/K(0) > (S(0)/K(0))^*$ (see Boucekkine et al. (2008) for the importance of imbalance effects in global dynamics). Then, due to the relative abundance of energy resources, detrended consumption $[\tilde{C}(t)]$ increases monotonically until its BGP level. However, if the endowment of nonrenewable energy resources is relatively low [i.e., $S(0)/K(0) < (S(0)/K(0))^*$], the economy cannot keep its initial level of consumption, because energy resources are required to build new equipment. Therefore, detrended consumption declines monotonically to the corresponding BGP level (see Proposition 9).[19] Let us study $C(t)$ (see Proposition 10). If the economy is relatively abundant in nonrenewable energy resources [i.e., $S(0)/K(0) \geq (S(0)/K(0))^*$], then $C(t)$ increases monotonically. However, under relative scarcity of nonrenewable energy resources, $C(t)$ does not necessarily increase for all $t > 0$. Indeed, an economy relatively poor in energy resources increases $C(t)$ (monotonically) if technical progress (in particular, energy saving) grows at a high enough rate (i.e., $\gamma_\theta + \frac{1}{\alpha}\gamma_A \geq \gamma^*$). Nevertheless, if despite its lack of energy resources the economy keeps technical progress at a sufficiently low growth rate (i.e., $\gamma_\theta + \frac{1}{\alpha}\gamma_A < \gamma^*$), then consumption declines monotonically during t^* periods. After that, the "accumulated" technical progress (notice that (exogenous) technical progress increases with time) overcomes the scarcity of nonrenewable energy resources and consumption increases monotonically for all $t > t^*$. Moreover, it is easy to prove that

$$\frac{dt^*}{d\rho} = \frac{1}{\gamma_C(Z - \alpha\gamma_C)}.$$

Thus, from Proposition 2 and taking the definition of Z [see Appendix A, equation (A.8)], we conclude that $dt^*/d\rho > 0$. This result implies that the more impatient the household is (i.e., the greater is ρ), the greater is the number of periods where consumption decreases (t^*).[20] Consequently, Proposition 10 predicts that economies relatively poor in energy resources will face a transition with declining consumption during some periods if the growth rate of technical progress (in particular, energy saving) is not high enough. This kind of transitional dynamics of consumption was previously observed in several studies on nonrenewable energy resources and technical progress [see, for instance, Jorgenson and Wilcoxen (1993) and Growiec and Schumacher (2008)]. Nevertheless, due to the analytical complexity of the problem, their results were based on numerical simulations. However, our paper provides an analytical setup for this outcome, where the relative scarcity of resources and the technical progress are involved. Moreover, we should notice this is a global dynamics result and, consistent with Krautkraemer

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(1998), is also related with the impatient degree of the economy. As it is clear, this nonmonotonicity result is particularly relevant for developed economies such as the European Union (EU), where the relative endowment of nonrenewable energy resources is low. Indeed, as the IEA (2006) shows, the oil supply of the EU in 2005 was 4.8 billion barrels per day (5.74% of total world supply), with an estimated average annual growth rate of −4.5% for the period 2005–2030. However, the primary oil demand of the EU in 2005 [13.5 billion barrels per day (16.15% of total world demand), with an estimated average annual growth rate of 0.2% for the period 2005–2030] was almost three times the oil supply of the EU in 2005.[21] Actually, this shortage of energy resources has recently driven the EU to show explicit interest in improving energy efficiency by means of energy-saving technologies. Indeed, the European Commission [COM (2005)] estimated that the EU could have saved at least 20% of its energy consumption in 2005 by adopting energy-saving technologies. Moreover, as Boucekkine and Pommeret (2004) pointed out, energy-saving technological progress has been significant in the last two decades [see for instance Newell et al. (1999) and Kuper and Soest (2003)]. Indeed, the energy intensity of OCDE countries for the period 1990–2004 has been reduced by 1.6% per year [IEA (2006)]. Therefore, our theoretical result goes in the same direction of promoting energy-efficiency policies such as the adoption of energy-saving technologies.

To conclude the monotonicity study of consumption, we compare our results with Dasgupta and Heal (1974). In a model with identical technology for both sectors, physical capital accumulation and consumption, these authors observed that the optimal trajectories of consumption are not necessarily monotonic. However, our paper introduces five novelties with respect to their study. First, as we already pointed out, our study is global (i.e., whatever the initial conditions), whereas Dasgupta and Heal (1974) consider local dynamics. Second, our sufficient condition for nonmonotonicity involves the proportion of initial endowment of nonrenewable resources ($S(0)$) to the initial endowment of physical capital [$K(0)$], i.e., the ratio $S(0)/K(0)$. However, what matters for Dasgupta and Heal (1974)'s nonmonotonicity result is the size of $S(0)$ and $K(0)$, i.e., not necessarily the size of the ratio $S(0)/K(0)$. Third, our sufficient condition entails both the ratio $S(0)/K(0)$ and the growth rate of technical progress. This contrasts with Dasgupta and Heal (1974) because their sufficient condition does not involve technical progress. Fourth, Dasgupta and Heal (1974) show that if the size of both $S(0)$ and $K(0)$ is large enough then consumption initially rises and, after some time, decreases. However, our model raises the possibility of opposite behavior of consumption. Indeed, if both $S(0)/K(0)$ and the growth rate of technical progress are low enough then consumption depicts a U shape. Moreover, we analytically prove that the more impatient the household, the greater is the number of periods where consumption decreases. Finally, as we will see in the next section, the fifth novelty is that our model shows that resource extraction is not necessarily monotonic. This contrasts with Dasgupta and Heal (1974), where extraction decreases monotonically.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

5.3. Monotonicity of Extraction of Nonrenewable Energy Resources

From Equation (15), we get the detrended $R(t)$:

$$\tilde{R}(t) = \left(\frac{Z}{\varphi Z + \alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \frac{\overline{A}K(0)}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)} \cdot \left[{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\exp(Zt)\right) - \alpha\frac{Z+r}{Z}\right]. \tag{22}$$

Taking logs and differentiating with respect to t yields

$$\frac{d\tilde{R}(t)}{dt} = \left[\tilde{R}(t)\frac{Z+\rho}{2Z+\rho}\frac{Z^2}{\alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\exp(Zt)}\frac{{}_2F_1\left(a,b,c;-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\exp(Zt)\right)}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\exp(Zt)\right) - \alpha\frac{Z+\rho}{Z}}\right]\varphi, \tag{23}$$

where

$$a = 2; \quad b = 1 + \frac{Z+\rho}{Z}; \quad c = b + 1.$$

Following Corollary 7, we observe that the terms between square brackets in equation (23) are positive. Thus, the sign of $d\tilde{R}(t)/dt$ is determined by the sign of φ. Hence, we establish the following proposition:

PROPOSITION 11.

(1) *If* $S(0)/K(0) > (S(0)/K(0))^*$, *then* $\tilde{R}(t)$ *decreases monotonically for all* t.

(2) *If* $S(0)/K(0) = (S(0)/K(0))^*$, *then*[22]

$$\tilde{R}(t) = \overline{A}K(0)\left(\frac{Z}{\alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\left(1 - \alpha\frac{Z+\rho}{Z}\right).$$

(3) *If* $S(0)/K(0) < (S(0)/K(0))^*$, *then* $\tilde{R}(t)$ *increases monotonically for all* t.

Because $R(t) = \tilde{R}(t)\exp(-\rho t)$, $dR(t)/dt = \exp(-\rho t)(d\tilde{R}(t)/dt - \rho\tilde{R}(t))$. Therefore, applying equation (23), we obtain

$$\frac{dR(t)}{dt} = \tilde{R}(t)\exp(-\rho t) \cdot \left\{\left[\frac{Z+\rho}{2Z+\rho}\frac{Z^2}{\alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\exp(Zt)}\frac{{}_2F_1\left(a,b,c;-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\exp(Zt)\right)}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\exp(Zt)\right) - \alpha\frac{Z+\rho}{Z}}\right]\varphi - \rho\right\}. \tag{24}$$

As the terms between square brackets are positive, we establish the monotonicity properties of $R(t)$:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PROPOSITION 12.

(1) *If* $S(0)/K(0) \geq (S(0)/K(0))^*$, *then* $R(t)$ *decreases monotonically for all* t.

(2) *If* $S(0)/K(0) < (S(0)/K(0))^*$, *then* $R(t)$ *is not necessarily monotonic.*

As we observed in the preceding section, this result contrasts with Dasgupta and Heal (1974). Indeed, these authors obtained that $R(t)$ decreases monotonically for all t. However, because we assume that the physical capital accumulation sector is relatively more energy intensive than consumption, our model allows for a nonmonotonic behavior of $R(t)$ if the economy is relatively poor in energy resources.[23]

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper we studied the implications of assuming that physical capital accumulation is relatively more energy-intensive than consumption, focusing on the analysis of the BGP. By means of Gaussian hypergeometric functions we provided a closed-form representation of the optimal solution paths of our variables in levels, whatever the initial conditions (i.e., global dynamics). We also proved that there is asymptotic convergence to the BGP. Moreover, we explicitly studied the monotonicity of the optimal trajectories of the variables in levels, which is typically unfeasible in the standard approach. We found that, in general, the optimal trajectories are nonmonotonic. Dasgupta and Heal (1974) already pointed out this result (local dynamics) for the optimal consumption in a model with identical technology for both physical capital accumulation and consumption. However, our paper introduced five novelties with respect to their study (namely, global dynamics, the importance of the size of the ratio $S(0)/K(0)$, the role of the technical progress, U-shaped behavior of consumption, and the nonmonotonicity of resource extraction), which are direct consequences of assuming both a physical capital accumulation sector that is relatively more energy-intensive than consumption, and growing technical progress (in particular, energy saving). Moreover, it is important to note that this new dynamical transition undoubtedly has important welfare implications, in particular with regard to the adoption of energy saving technologies. However, because this is not the scope of the present paper, we leave the welfare analysis for further research.

Our model has several limitations. Among them, we point out the following two. First, as did Solow (1974a), we assumed unlimited (exogenous) technical progress. In regard to our disembodied technical progress ($A(t)$), this assumption captures the idea of unlimited growth of knowledge. However, unlimited energy-saving technical progress ($\theta(t)$) could give rise to physical incompatibility problems related to the thermodynamic laws [see Krautkraemer (1998)]. In the literature of exogenous energy-saving technical progress, the assumption of unlimited growth of energy efficiency is widely applied [see for instance Boucekkine and Pommeret (2004), Azomahou et al. (2006), and Pérez-Barahona and Zou (2006a, 2006b)]. Indeed, these authors assume that the limit of improving energy efficiency is very far away. In our model, we take the same point of view. A second limitation of our analysis is that we assumed exogenous technical progress. The reason of making the assumption is that the aim of this paper is to study the conditions under

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which technical progress can offset the trade-off between economic growth and the usage of nonrenewable energy resources, and not to analyze how the economy can achieve these conditions. However, a very interesting extension to our model is to assume technical progress (in particular, energy saving) as an endogenous variable. Actually, as we observed in Proposition 2, our BGP growth rates are not affected by the stock of nonrenewable energy resources. However, the scarcity of energy resources can induce new investments in energy-saving technologies [see, for instance, Newell et al. (1999), Buonanno et al. (2003), Carraro et al. (2003), and Boucekkine and Pommeret (2004)], establishing an effect of the stock of the nonrenewable energy resource on the BGP growth rates. Indeed, one possibility for endogenizing energy-saving technical progress could be by means of an R&D sector (for energy-saving technologies) following Aghion and Howitt (1992) and Grossman and Helpman (1991a, 1991b).

NOTES

1. They consider the mean of the period 1978–2005.

2. Notice that, in general, the standard approach focuses on local dynamics, that is, around an equilibrium point (e.g., steady state).

3. See Stigliz (1974) for an economy with nonrenewable resources and exponentially growing labor force.

4. If $A(t) = \overline{A}$ for all $t \geq 0$, it can be interpreted as a scale parameter.

5. Further analysis could assume a CES function (in particular, Cobb–Douglas) where more inputs, such as energy (for final good production) or labor, would be included. In this case, there is an extra decision variable: the share of nonrenewable energy resources in each sector. Moreover, due to the CES formulation, we would introduce an additional effect, namely, the substitutability among inputs in the final good production. However, the results concerning the energy-intensity hypothesis will remain qualitatively the same as in our simpler setup. In any case, because the substitutability effect is not the central concern of this paper [see Krautkraemer (1998) for an accurate revision of the substitutability effect], we leave this analysis for future research.

6. As we will see in Section 3, this paper considers technical progress [$A(t)$ and $\theta(t)$] as an exogenous variable.

7. The standard approach assumes that $Y(t) = f[K(t), R(t)]$, where $Y(t) = C(t) + I(t)$ and $\dot{K}(t) = I(t)$.

8. If we consider the idea of a minimum amount of energy being required to use a machine, the assumption of complementarity should be chosen [see for instance Pérez-Barahona and Zou (2006a, 2006b)].

9. Dasgupta and Heal (1974): "Extraction costs do not appear to introduce any great problem, provided that we assume any nonconvexities". Indeed, we can easily introduce extraction cost $EC(t)$ by modifying the budget constraint of the economy:

$$Y(t) = C(t) + I(t) + EC(R, S), \quad \text{where } \partial EC/\partial R > 0 \text{ and } \partial EC/\partial S \leq 0.$$

10. Notice that there is no externality. Therefore, it is easy to prove that, under perfect competition, the decentralized solution is optimal.

11. There are, indeed, two additional equations: a transversality condition (TC) for each state variable,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \psi(t)K(t) = 0 \text{ and } \lim_{t\to\infty} \lambda(t)S(t) = 0,$$

where $\psi(t)$ and $\lambda(t)$ are the corresponding Lagrangian multipliers. We use these two TCs to get the two constants involved in the calculation of the endogenous variables of the dynamical system. Actually,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

we can rewrite the previous system (6)–(10) as a system of seven equations (the five previous equations and the two TCs) and seven unknowns (the former unknowns and the two constants related to each state variables).

12. In Section 4, we will prove that there is asymptotic convergence to the BGP.

13. Boucekkine and Ruiz-Tamarit (2008) also provide a quick overview of Gaussian hypergeometric functions.

14. Recursiveness is a necessary condition for the Gaussian hypergeometric representation.

15. Because our problem is concave, the solution paths are unique. Thus, equation (A.25) has a unique solution for φ. A formal proof of uniqueness of the solution of equation (A.25) could be provided. However, this is beyond the scope of the present paper. The uniqueness can be tested by plotting equation (A.25) for given values of the parameters.

16. Notice that $(Z + \Omega)\frac{Z+\rho}{Z} > 0$ [see equation (A.21)]. Moreover, the condition ${}_2F_1(-\varphi Z/\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}) > 0$ is required to guarantee $C(0) > 0$.

17. The monotonicity properties of the other variables are available upon request.

18. Notice that Corollary 7 implies that both the left- and right-hand sides of (A.25) are positive.

19. If $S(0)/K(0) = (S(0)/K(0))^*$ then detrended consumption stays constant for all $t \geq 0$ at the corresponding BGP level, which equals $C(0)$.

20. Unfortunately, we cannot provide a general analytical conclusion for the effect of technical progress on t^*.

21. Notice that 40.33% of the primary energy production (energy mix) of the EU in 2005 came from oil, whereas natural gas accounted for 21% [Eurostat (2008)]. Therefore, oil and natural gas can be considered as the main primary energy resources in the EU (61.33% in 2005). We should also observe that the behavior of supply and demand of natural gas in the EU is similar to oil [see IEA (2006) for further details].

22. Notice that condition (A.22) implies that $1 > \alpha\frac{Z+\rho}{Z}$.

23. Unfortunately, due to the complexity of equation (24), we cannot provide further analytical results and interpretations on the monotonicity of $R(t)$.

24. Notice that this is not a compulsory step. However, it provides simpler expressions by eliminating the long-run trends.

25. This paper also provides a quick overview of Gaussian hypergeometric functions.

26. Notice that $K(t) = \tilde{K}(t)\exp[(\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}Z - \rho)t]$.

27. This is because, on one hand, nonrenewable energy resources are necessary inputs to accumulate physical capital. On the other hand, energy-saving technical progress is incorporated into the economy through the production of new equipment. Therefore, because energy-saving technical progress grows with t, it is not optimal to deplete the stock of nonrenewable energy resources in finite time.

28. ${}_3F_2(a; b; 0) = 1$ for a and b different than zero.

29. Notice that, from Proposition 2 and the definition of Ω [see equation (A.15)], Ω should be less than or equal to 0 to get BGP.

30. If some particular parameterization generates a solution for equation (A.25) out of the interval (A.26), one should study the so-called continuation formulas of the Gaussian hypergeometric representation [see Abramowitz and Stegun (1970)] for $S(t)$. However, this is beyond the scope of the current paper.

REFERENCES

Abramowitz, M. and A. Stegun (1972) *Handbook of Mathematical Functions*. New York: Dover.

Aghion, P. and P. Howitt (1992) A model of growth through creative destruction. *Econometrica* 60(2), 323–351.

Andrews, G., R. Askey, and R. Roy (1999). *Special Functions*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Azomahou, T., R. Boucekkine, and Van P. Nguyen (2006) Energy Consumption and Vintage Effect: A Sectoral Analysis. Mimeo, CORE, Université catholique de Louvain (Belgium).

Barro, R. and X. Sala-i-Martin (2003) *Economic Growth* 2nd edition. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Boucekkine, R., B. Martínez, and J.R. Ruiz-Tamarit (2008) Note on global dynamics and imbalance effects in the Lucas–Uzawa model. *International Journal of Economic Theory* 4(4), 503–518.

Boucekkine, R. and A. Pommeret (2004) Energy saving technical progress and optimal capital stock: The role of embodiment. *Economic Modelling* 21, 429–444.

Boucekkine, R. and J.R. Ruiz-Tamarit (2008) Special functions for the study of economic dynamics: The case of the Lucas–Uzawa model. *Journal of Mathematical Economics* 44(1), 34–54.

Buonanno, P., C. Carraro, and M. Galeotti (2003) Endogenous induced technical change and the costs of Kyoto. *Resource and Energy Economics* 25(1), 11–34.

Carraro, C., R. Gerlagh, and B. van der Zwaan (2003) Endogenous technical change in environmental macroeconomics. *Resource and Energy Economics* 25, 1–10.

Cass, D. (1965) Optimum growth in an aggregative model of capital accumulation. *Review of Economic Studies* 32(July), 233–240.

COM (2005) Doing More with Less. Green Papers. Official Documents. European Union, 265, June.

Dasgupta, P.S. and G.M. Heal (1974) The optimal depletion of exhaustible resources. *Review of Economic Studies* (special number), 3–28.

Dasgupta, P.S. and G.M. Heal (1979) *Economic Theory and Exhaustible Resources*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Eurostat (2008) *Eurostat Data*. European Commission. Available at http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/.

Grossman, G.H. and E. Helpman (1991a) Quality ladders and product cycles. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 106(425), 557–586.

Grossman, G.H. and E. Helpman (1991b) Quality ladders in the theory of growth. *Review of Economic Studies* 58(1), 43–61.

Groth, C. and P. Schou (2007) Growth and non-renewable resources: The different roles of capital and resource taxes. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 53(1) (January), 80–98.

Growiec, J. and I. Schumacher (2008) On technical change in the elasticities of resource inputs. *Resources Policy* 33(4), 210–221.

Hartwick, J.M. (1989) *Non- renewable Resources: Extraction Programs and Markets*. London: Harwood Academic.

IEA (2006) *World Energy Outlook 2006*. Paris: OECD/International Energy Agency.

Jorgenson, D.W. and P.J. Wilcoxen (1993) Energy, the environment, and economic growth. In A.V. Kneese and J.L. Sweeney (eds.), *Handbook of Natural Resource and Energy Economics*, vol. 3, pp. 1267–1349. Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science Publishers B.V.

Koopmans, T.C. (1965) On the concept of optimal economic growth. In *the Econometric Approach to Development Planning*. Amsterdam: North Holland.

Krautkraemer, J.A. (1998) Nonrenewable resource scarcity. *Journal of Economic Literature* 36(4) (December), 2065–2107.

Kuper, Gerard H. and Daan P. van Soest (2003). Path-dependency and input substitution: Implications for energy policy modelling. *Energy Economics* 25(4)(July), 397–407.

Luke, L.Y. (1969) *The Special Functions and Their Approximations*, vols. 1–2. New York: Academic Press.

Newell, R., A. Jaffe, and R. Stavins (1999) The induced innovation hypothesis and energy-saving technological change. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 114, 941–975.

Pérez-Barahona, A. and B. Zou (2006a) A comparative study of energy saving technical progress in a vintage capital model. *Resource and Energy Economics* 28(2), 181–191.

Pérez-Barahona, A. and B. Zou (2006b) Energy saving technological progress in a vintage capital model. In C. de Miguel, X. Labandeira, and B. Manzano (eds.), *Economic Modelling of Climate Change and Energy Policies*, pp. 166–179. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Pezzey, J. and C.A. Withagen (1998) The rise, fall and sustainability of capital-resource economics. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 100(2), 513–527.
Ramsey, F. (1928) A mathematical theory of saving. *Economic Journal* 38(December), 543–559.
Smulders, S. and Michiel de Nooij (2003) The impact of energy conservation on technology and economic growth. *Resource and Energy Economics* 25, 59–79.
Solow, Robert M. (1974a) The economics of resources or the resources of economics. *American Economic Review* 64(2), 1–14.
Solow, Robert M. (1974b) Intergenerational equity and exhaustible resource. *Review of Economic Studies* (special number), 29–46.
Stiglitz, J. (1974) Growth with exhaustible natural resources: Efficient and optimal growth paths. *Review of Economic Studies* (special number), 123–137.
Sydsæter, K., A. Strøm, and P. Berck (2000) *Economists' Mathematical Manual*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
Temme, N.M. (1996) *Special Functions. An Introduction to the Classical Functions of Mathematical Physics*. New York: Wiley.

APPENDIX A

Following the enumerate presented in Section 4, this appendix solves the dynamical system (6)–(10) recursively. Since our paper focuses on the BGP, it is useful to detrend the dynamical system.[24] Therefore, let us define the following change of variable $\tilde{x}(t) = x(t)/\exp(\gamma_x t)$. Then, the transformed (detrended) variables will be constant along the BGP (if it exists). Applying the previous change of variable, we get the following detrended dynamical system with five equations and five unknowns ($\tilde{K}$, $\tilde{C}$, $\tilde{R}$, $\tilde{I}$, S):

$$\dot{\tilde{K}}(t) + \left(\gamma_\theta + \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\gamma_A - \rho\right)\tilde{K}(t) = \overline{\theta}^{\alpha}\tilde{R}(t)^{\alpha}\tilde{I}(t)^{1-\alpha}, \tag{A.1}$$

$$\frac{\dot{\tilde{C}}(t)}{\tilde{C}(t)} = (1-\alpha)\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}(t)}{\tilde{I}(t)}\right)^{\alpha} - \alpha\left(\frac{\dot{\tilde{R}}(t)}{\tilde{R}(t)} - \frac{\dot{\tilde{I}}(t)}{\tilde{I}(t)}\right) - \gamma_\theta - \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\gamma_A, \tag{A.2}$$

$$(1-\alpha)\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\left(\frac{\tilde{R}(t)}{\tilde{I}(t)}\right)^{\alpha} = (1-\alpha)\left(\frac{\dot{\tilde{I}}(t)}{\tilde{I}(t)} - \frac{\dot{\tilde{R}}(t)}{\tilde{R}(t)}\right) + \gamma_\theta + \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\gamma_A, \tag{A.3}$$

$$\tilde{C}(t) + \tilde{I}(t) = \overline{A}\tilde{K}(t), \tag{A.4}$$

$$\dot{S}(t) = \tilde{R}(t)\exp(-\rho t). \tag{A.5}$$

RATIO $X(t)$

Let us define the ratio $X(t) = \tilde{R}(t)/\tilde{I}(t)$. Taking logs and differentiating with respect to t, we get

$$\frac{\dot{X}(t)}{X(t)} = \frac{\dot{\tilde{R}}(t)}{\tilde{R}(t)} - \frac{\dot{\tilde{I}}(t)}{\tilde{I}(t)}. \tag{A.6}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

BERNOULLI'S EQUATION

Applying equation (A.6) to equation (A.3) yields

$$\dot{X}(t) = \frac{\gamma_\theta + \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\gamma_A}{1-\alpha} X(t) + \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha} X(t)^{1+\alpha}. \tag{A.7}$$

Notice that equation (A.7) is a Bernoulli equation. Indeed, following Sydster et al. (1999), a Bernoulli equation is defined as

$$\dot{x}(t) = q(t)x(t) + r(t)x(t)^n,$$

which has the solution

$$x(t) = \exp\left(\frac{p(t)}{1-n}\right)\left(\varphi + (1-n)\int r(t)\exp(-p(t))dt\right)^{\frac{1}{1-n}},$$

where $p(t) = (1-n)\int q(t)dt$, φ is a constant, and $n \neq 1$.

Therefore, the solution of the Bernouilli's equation (A.7) is

$$X(t) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}Zt\right)\left(\varphi + \frac{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}{Z}\exp(Zt)\right)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \tag{A.8}$$

where $Z = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}\left(\gamma_\theta + \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\gamma_A\right)$, and φ is a constant that must be calculated.

CONSUMPTION

Applying equations (A.6) and (A.8) to equation (A.2), we find that

$$\frac{\dot{\tilde{C}}(t)}{\tilde{C}(t)} = \frac{\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\exp(Zt)}{\varphi + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\exp(Zt)} - \frac{Z}{\alpha}, \tag{A.9}$$

which is a linear first-order differential equation.

A linear first-order differential equation is defined as

$$\dot{x}(t) + a(t)x(t) = b(t),$$

where the corresponding solution is given by the expression [Sydster et al. (1999)]

$$x(t) = x(0)\exp\left(-\int_0^t a(\xi)d\xi\right) + \int_0^t b(\tau)\exp\left(-\int_\tau^t a(\xi)d\xi\right)d\tau.$$

Applying this result to equation (A.9) yields

$$\tilde{C}(t) = \tilde{C}(0)\exp\left[\frac{1}{\alpha}\left(\ln(\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\exp(Zt)) - \ln(\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}) - Zt\right)\right], \tag{A.10}$$

where $\tilde{C}(0)(= C(0))$ is the initial condition for consumption, which should be determined.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PHYSICAL CAPITAL

Rewriting equation (A.1), we get

$$\dot{\tilde{K}}(t) + \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}Z - \rho - \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha} X(t)^{\alpha}\right)\tilde{K}(t) = -\overline{\theta}^{\alpha} X(t)^{\alpha}\tilde{C}(t). \tag{A.11}$$

Because we know the analytical solution for $X(t)$ [equation (A.8)] and $\tilde{C}(t)$ [equation (A.10)], $\tilde{K}(t)$ is the solution of the linear first-order differential equation (A.11). Therefore, by applying the previous result of the solution of a linear first-order differential equation, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{K}(t) &= \exp\left[-\frac{1}{\alpha}\ln(\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha})\right] \\ &\cdot \exp\left\{\frac{1}{\alpha}\left[\ln(\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\exp(Zt)) - ((1-\alpha)Z - \alpha\rho)t\right]\right\} \\ &\cdot \left\{K(0) + \frac{Z}{Z+\rho}\frac{\tilde{C}(0)}{\alpha\overline{A}}\left[\frac{{}_2F_1\left(-\dfrac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\exp(Zt)}\right)}{\exp((Z+\rho)t)} - {}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)\right]\right\},\end{aligned} \tag{A.12}$$

where

$${}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\exp(Zt)}\right) = {}_2F_1\left(1, \frac{Z+\rho}{Z}, 1+\frac{Z+\rho}{Z}; -\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\exp(Zt)}\right),$$

$${}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right) = {}_2F_1\left(1, \frac{Z+\rho}{Z}, 1+\frac{Z+\rho}{Z}; -\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right),$$

and $K(0)(=\tilde{K}(0))$ is the (given) initial condition for capital.

Notice that equation (A.12) involves special functions (${}_2F_1$). More precisely, we use a family of special functions called Gaussian hypergeometric functions, which are defined as

$${}_pF_q(a; b; z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{(a_1)_n \times (a_2)_n \times \ldots (a_p)_n}{(b_1)_n \times (b_2)_n \times \ldots (b_q)_n}\frac{z^n}{n!},$$

where $a = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_p)$, $b = (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_q)$, and $(x)_n$ is the Pochhammer symbol, defined by

$$(x)_n = \frac{\Gamma(x+n)}{\Gamma(x)},$$

where $\Gamma(x)$ is the *Gamma function*.

To prove equation (12), we follow Abramowitz and Stegun (1970) and Boucekkine and Ruiz-Tamarit (2008).[25] The proof is available upon request.

INVESTMENT

Because we have the solution for $\tilde{C}(t)$ [equation (A.10)] and $\tilde{K}(t)$ [equation (A.12)], equation (A.4) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{I}(t) &= \exp\left\{\frac{1}{\alpha}\left[\ln(\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\exp(zt)) - \ln(\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}) - Zt\right]\right\} \\ &\cdot \left\{\overline{A}\exp((Z+\rho)t)\zeta(t) - \tilde{C}(0)\right\},\end{aligned} \tag{A.13}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

where

$$\zeta(t) = \left\{ K(0) + \frac{Z}{Z+\rho}\frac{\tilde{C}(0)}{\alpha\overline{A}} \cdot \left[\frac{1}{\exp((Z+\rho)t)}\,{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\exp(Zt)}\right) - {}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)\right]\right\}.$$

RESOURCES EXTRACTION

Because $X(t)$ is defined as $X(t) = \tilde{R}(t)/\tilde{I}(t)$, taking the solution for $X(t)$ [equation (A.8)] and $\tilde{I}(t)$ [equation (A.13)], we find the solution for the energy flow $\tilde{R}(t)$:

$$\tilde{R}(t) = \exp\left[-\frac{1}{\alpha}\ln(\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha})\right] Z^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \exp\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}Zt\right) \cdot \left\{\overline{A}\exp\left\{\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}Z - \rho\right)t\right\}\zeta(t) - \tilde{C}(0)\exp\left(-\frac{1}{\alpha}Zt\right)\right\}. \quad \textbf{(A.14)}$$

RESOURCES STOCK

Because we have the solution for $\tilde{R}(t)$ [equation (A.14)], we find the solution for the stock of nonrenewable energy resources, $S(t)$, by solving equation (A.5), which is a linear first-order differential equation. The solution of this equation is

$$S(t) = S(0) + \int_0^t \tilde{R}(\tau)\exp(-\rho\tau)d\tau, \quad \textbf{(A.15)}$$

where $S(0)$ is given. The corresponding integral is equal to

$$\int_0^t \tilde{R}(\tau)\exp(-\rho\tau)d\tau = [1] + [2] + [3] + [4],$$

where

$$[1] = \frac{(\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha})^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} Z^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\overline{A}K(0)}{2(\frac{1}{\alpha}Z - \rho) - Z}\left\{\exp\left[\left(2\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}Z - \rho\right) - Z\right)t\right] - 1\right\},$$

$$[2] = A_2\frac{1}{Z+\Omega}\frac{Z}{Z+\rho} \cdot \left[{}_3F_2\left(a; b; -\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right) - \exp\left(-(Z+\Omega)\frac{Z+\rho}{Z}t\right){}_3F_2\left(a; b; -\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\exp(Zt)}\right)\right],$$

$$[3] = -A_2\frac{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)}{2(\frac{1}{\alpha}Z - \rho) - Z}\left\{\exp\left[\left(2\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}Z - \rho\right) - Z\right)t\right] - 1\right\},$$

$$[4] = \frac{(\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha})^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} Z^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} C(0)}{\rho}(\exp(-\rho t) - 1),$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with

$$A_2 = (\varphi Z + \alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha})^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \frac{Z^{\frac{1+\alpha}{\alpha}}}{Z+\rho} \frac{C(0)}{\alpha},$$

$$\Omega = \left(2\rho - \frac{2-\alpha}{\alpha} Z\right)\left(\frac{Z}{Z+\rho}\right),$$

$$a = \left(1, \frac{Z+\rho}{Z}, \frac{Z+\rho}{Z}\frac{Z+\Omega}{Z}\right),$$

$$b = \left(1 + \frac{Z+\rho}{Z}, 1 + \frac{Z+\rho}{Z}\frac{Z+\Omega}{Z}\right),$$

and

$$\left| -\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}} \right| < 1.$$

The proof is available upon request.

COMPUTATION OF THE CONSTANTS φ AND $C(0)$

Equations (A.10) and (A.12)–(A.15) are the analytical solutions for, respectively, $\tilde{C}(t)$, $\tilde{K}(t)$, $\tilde{I}(t)$, $\tilde{R}(t)$, and $S(t)$. Moreover, by retrieving the change of variable (notice that γ_A and γ_θ are exogenous parameters), we recover the original variables involved in the dynamical system (6)–(10). However, we still need to determine the constants φ and $C(0)$ to conclude our calculations. To do this, we use the two following transversality conditions (TC) corresponding to each state variable of our model:

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \psi(t) K(t) = 0, \tag{A.16}$$

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \lambda(t) S(t) = 0, \tag{A.17}$$

where $\psi(t)$ and $\lambda(t)$ are the Lagrangian multipliers. In addition, the TC also imply restrictions on the parameters, which allow us to complete the characterization of the optimal trajectories.

TRANSVERSALITY CONDITION FOR THE STOCK OF PHYSICAL CAPITAL ($K(t)$)

By solving the optimal control problem presented in Section 2.4, it is easy to obtain the shadow price of physical capital, $\psi(t)$:

$$\psi(t) = \frac{(\varphi Z + \alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha})^{\alpha}}{(1-\alpha)\overline{\theta}^{\alpha} C(0)} [\varphi Z + \alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha} \exp(Zt)]^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}. \tag{A.18}$$

Taking equation (A.12), we get[26]

$$\psi(t)K(t) = \frac{\varphi Z + \alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha} \exp(Zt)}{(1-\alpha)\overline{\theta}^{\alpha} C(0)}$$
$$\cdot \left\{ K(0) + \frac{Z}{Z+\rho} \frac{C(0)}{\alpha \overline{A}} \left[\exp(-(Z+\rho)t) {}_2F_1\left(\frac{-\varphi Z}{\alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha} \exp(Zt)} \right) - {}_2F_1\left(\frac{-\varphi Z}{\alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}} \right) \right] \right\}.$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Thus the TC for $K(t)$ [equation (A.16)] implies that

$$C(0) = \frac{\alpha \overline{A}}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)} \frac{Z+\rho}{Z} K(0), \tag{A.19}$$

where $K(0)$ is given.

Equation (A.19) establishes a first relationship between φ and $C(0)$. However, we need an additional expression between these two constants to complete the job. In the following, we will obtain this second relationship from the TC for the nonrenewable energy resources [equation (A.17)].

TRANSVERSALITY CONDITION FOR THE STOCK OF NONRENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCE ($S(t)$)

Because it is not optimal to completely deplete the stock of nonrenewable energy resource in a finite t,[27] we can prove that $\lambda(t) = \lambda$ for all t. Therefore, equation (A.17) implies that the stock of nonrenewable energy resources should be depleted in infinite time, that is,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} S(t) = 0. \tag{A.20}$$

Taking equation (A.19) in equation (A.15), we get that

$$S(t) = S(0) - \frac{(\varphi Z + \alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha})^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} Z^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} C(0)}{\rho} (\exp(-\rho t) - 1) - A_2 \frac{1}{Z+\Omega} \frac{Z}{Z+\rho}$$
$$\cdot \left[{}_3F_2\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right) - \exp\left(-(Z+\Omega)\frac{Z+\rho}{Z} t\right) {}_3F_2\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha} \exp(Zt)}\right)\right], \tag{A.21}$$

where

$${}_3F_2\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right) = {}_3F_2\left(a; b; -\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right),$$

$${}_3F_2\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha} \exp(Zt)}\right) = {}_3F_2\left(a; b; -\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha \overline{A\theta}^{\alpha} \exp(Zt)}\right).$$

From equation (A.21), if the term $(\Omega + Z)\frac{Z+\rho}{Z}$ is negative,[28] then $S(t)$ will increase infinitely. Hence, $(\Omega + Z)\frac{Z+\rho}{Z}$ should be greater than zero in order to avoid explosive solutions. Because ρ and Z are positive, we have to ensure that $\Omega + Z$ is positive too.[29] Then, from the definition of Ω, we can establish that any particular solution to the dynamical system (6)–(10) has to satisfy the condition $\rho > \frac{2}{3}(\gamma_\theta + \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\gamma_A)$. Moreover, as we showed in Section 2, the growth rate of technical progress should be high enough if BGP exists. Therefore, we can consider both conditions in the following proposition:

PROPOSITION A.1. *Any particular BGP solution to the dynamical system (6)–(10) has to satisfy the following condition:*

$$\frac{2}{3}\left(\gamma_\theta + \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\gamma_A\right) < \rho < \left(\gamma_\theta + \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\gamma_A\right). \tag{A.22}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Finally, we can establish a condition on the parameters to deplete the stock of nonrenewable energy resources in the infinite. From equation (A.21) and condition (A.22), it is clear that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} S(t) = S(0) + \frac{C(0)}{\rho}\left(\frac{Z}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} - A_2\frac{1}{Z+\Omega}\frac{Z}{\Omega+\rho}{}_3F_2\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right). \quad \textbf{(A.23)}$$

From equation (A.20), $\lim_{t\to\infty} S(t) = 0$. Then, we obtain the following condition by substituting A_2 [see equation (A.15)] into equation (A.23) and equalizing to zero:

$$S(0) = C(0)\left(\frac{Z}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\left[\left(\frac{Z}{Z+\rho}\right)^2\frac{1}{\alpha}\frac{1}{Z+\Omega}{}_3F_2\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right) - \frac{1}{\rho}\right], \quad \textbf{(A.24)}$$

where $S(0)$ is given.

Equation (A.24) is the second relationship between φ and $C(0)$. Thus, equations (A.19) and (A.24) constitute a nonlinear system of two equations and two unknowns. Taking equation (A.19) into equation (A.24), we reduce the previous nonlinear system of two equations [(A.19) and (A.24)] and two unknowns (φ and $C(0)$) to the following single equation for φ, where $C(0)$ is directly found [equation (A.19)] once φ is determined:

$$\frac{S(0)}{K(0)} = \alpha\overline{A}\left(\frac{Z}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \cdot\left[\frac{Z}{Z+\rho}\frac{1}{\alpha}\frac{1}{Z+R}\frac{{}_3F_2\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)} - \frac{Z+\rho}{Z}\frac{1}{\rho}\frac{1}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)}\right], \quad \textbf{(A.25)}$$

where $K(0)$ and $S(0)$ are given.

Since equation (A.15) requires $|-\varphi Z/\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}| < 1$, we only consider parameterizations with a solution for equation (A.25) such that[30]

$$\varphi \in \left(-\frac{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}{Z}, \frac{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}{Z}\right). \quad \textbf{(A.26)}$$

APPENDIX B

OPTIMAL SOLUTION PATHS FOR THE RATIO $X(t)$

From equation (A.8), rearranging terms, we get the following proposition for the optimal solution path for $X(t)$:

PROPOSITION B.1. *Under conditions (A.22) and (A.26), if equation (A.25) admits a unique solution, then*

(i) *there exists a unique path for $X(t)$, starting from $X(0) = (Z/[\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}])^{1/\alpha}$, such that*

$$X(t) = \left(\frac{Z}{\varphi Z\exp(-Zt) + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}; \quad \textbf{(B.1)}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(ii) *this equilibrium path shows transitional dynamics, approaching asymptotically to the constant*

$$X_{BGP} = \left(\frac{Z}{\alpha\overline{A}\overline{\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}.$$

Moreover, it is easy to see that condition (A.26) implies that the starting point, the transitional dynamics, and the BGP of $X(t)$ are always strictly positive:

COROLLARY B.1. *Under conditions (A.22) and (A.26), the optimal solution path for $X(t)$ is strictly positive.*

APPENDIX C

Let us define

$$F\left(\frac{S(0)}{K(0)}\right) = \frac{S(0)}{K(0)} - \alpha\overline{A}\left(\frac{Z}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A}\overline{\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \cdot \left[\frac{Z}{Z+\rho}\frac{1}{\alpha}\frac{1}{Z+R}\frac{{}_3F_2\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A}\overline{\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A}\overline{\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)} - \frac{Z+\rho}{Z}\frac{1}{\rho}\frac{1}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A}\overline{\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)}\right]. \quad \textbf{(C.1)}$$

Condition (A.25) implies

$$F\left(\frac{S(0)}{K(0)}\right) = 0.$$

Then, applying the implicit function theorem, we get

$$\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial(S(0)/K(0))} = -\frac{\partial F/\partial(S(0)/K(0))}{\partial F/\partial\varphi}. \quad \textbf{(C.2)}$$

From (C.1), $\partial F/\partial(S(0)/K(0)) = 1$. Moreover, $\partial F/\partial\varphi = -\partial g(\varphi)/\partial\varphi$, where

$$g(\varphi) = \alpha\overline{A}\left(\frac{Z}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A}\overline{\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \cdot \left[\frac{Z}{Z+\rho}\frac{1}{\alpha}\frac{1}{Z+R}\frac{{}_3F_2\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A}\overline{\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A}\overline{\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)} - \frac{Z+\rho}{Z}\frac{1}{\rho}\frac{1}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A}\overline{\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)}\right]. \quad \textbf{(C.3)}$$

Applying the property [Luke (1975), Vol. 1, page 111, Property 38)]

$${}_3F_2\{(a,b,c);(d+1,c+1);Z\} = \frac{c}{c-d}{}_2F_1(a,b,d+1;Z) - \frac{d}{c-d}{}_3F_2\{(a,b,c);(d,c+1);Z\},$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

we obtain that

$$\frac{{}_3F_2\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)} = \frac{Z+\Omega}{\Omega} - \frac{Z}{\Omega}\frac{{}_2F_1\left(a', b', c', -\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)}{{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\right)},$$

where

$$a' = 1; b' = \frac{Z+\rho}{Z}\frac{Z+\Omega}{Z}; c' = 1 + b'.$$

Thus, we can rewrite $g(\varphi)$ with ${}_2F_1$ functions. Applying the formula for the derivative of ${}_2F_1$ [see Abramowitz and Stegun, (1970, 15.2.1, p. 557)], we get $\partial g(\varphi)/\partial\varphi$. Rearranging terms and taking Corollary 7, we obtain that $\partial g(\varphi)/\partial\varphi < 0$. Therefore, from (C.2), we conclude that

$$\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial(S(0)/K(0))} < 0.$$

■

APPENDIX D

Let us consider the case

$$\gamma_C < \frac{Z}{\alpha}\frac{\varphi Z}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}.$$

Taking

$$\gamma_C = \frac{Z}{\alpha}\frac{\varphi Z}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}\exp(Zt^*)}, \tag{D.1}$$

we obtain t^*. Therefore, from equation (D.1), we get that

$$\exp(Zt^*) = \frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\left(\frac{Z-\alpha\gamma_C}{\alpha\gamma_C}\right). \tag{D.2}$$

Because, under Corollary 7, the term $Z - \alpha\gamma_C$ is strictly positive, we can apply logs in equation (D.2). Thus,

$$t^* = \frac{\ln\left[\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\left(\frac{Z-\alpha\gamma_C}{\alpha\gamma_C}\right)\right]}{Z}.$$

If the term between square brackets is >1, then $t^* > 0$. We can prove this by contradiction. Let us assume that

$$\frac{\varphi Z}{\alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}}\left(\frac{Z-\alpha\gamma_C}{\alpha\gamma_C}\right) \leq 1.$$

Then it is easy to prove that

$$\gamma_C \geq \frac{Z}{\alpha}\frac{\varphi Z}{\varphi Z + \alpha\overline{A\theta}^{\alpha}},$$

which contradicts our initial statement. Then $t^* > 0$. ■

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100509090415 Published online by Cambridge University Press