

Rybczynski's Theorem in the Heckscher-Ohlin World – Anything Goes*

Marcus M. Opp^a, Hugo F. Sonnenschein^b, and Christis G. Tombazos^c

^a Graduate School of Business,
University of Chicago,
5807 South Woodlawn Avenue,
Chicago, IL 60637
mopp@ChicagoGSB.edu
Phone: (773) 752-4681
Fax: (773) 752-4681

^b Corresponding Author:
Department of Economics,
University of Chicago,
1126 E. 59th Street, Chicago, IL
60637
h-sonnenschein@uchicago.edu
Phone: (773) 834-5960
Fax: (773) 702-8490

^c Department of Economics,
Monash University
Clayton, Victoria, 3800, Australia
[christis.tombazos@
buseco.monash.edu.au](mailto:christis.tombazos@buseco.monash.edu.au)
Phone: (613) 9905-5166
Fax: (613) 9905-5476

Abstract: We demonstrate that Rybczynski's classic comparative statics can be reversed in a Heckscher-Ohlin world when preferences in each country favor the exported commodity. This taste bias has empirical support. An increase in the endowment of a factor of production can lead to an absolute curtailment in the production of the commodity using that factor intensively, and an absolute expansion of the commodity using relatively little of the same factor. This outcome – which we call “Reverse Rybczynski” – implies immiserizing factor growth. We present a simple analytical example that delivers this result with unique pre- and post-growth equilibria. In this example, production occurs within the cone of diversification, such that factor price equalization holds. We also provide general conditions that determine the sign of Rybczynski's comparative statics.

Keywords: Rybczynski Theorem; Heckscher-Ohlin; Factor Endowments; Immiserizing Growth; Transfer Paradox

JEL classification: F11; D51; D33

* A previous version of this paper was presented in Melbourne as the first Xiaokai Yang Memorial Lecture. It is dedicated to the memory of Professor Yang. The paper was also presented in Delhi as a Sukhamoy Chakravarty Memorial Lecture, and in seminars at the University of Chicago, the University of Rochester, Princeton University, and the College of William and Mary. It is a pleasure to acknowledge helpful discussions and communications with Avinash K. Dixit, Peter Dixon, Gene M. Grossman, Matthew Jackson, Ronald W. Jones, Murray Kemp, Samuel S. Kortum, Andreu Mas-Colell, and Philip Reny. We also thank the *Journal of International Economics*' editor Jonathan Eaton, and two anonymous referees for helpful comments and suggestions on an earlier draft. A previous version of this paper by Sonnenschein and Opp was entitled “A Reversal of Rybczynski's Comparative Statics via ‘Anything Goes’ ” and was first submitted to this journal in March of 2007.

1. Introduction

Fifty-three years ago T. M. Rybczynski (1955) published a frequently referenced note in which he modeled the comparative statics associated with a change in the endowment of a factor of production. The questions that he considered are fundamental: How do the prices of final goods, and the production and consumption of these goods, depend on factor endowments? How do factor prices and the wealth of consumers vary with changes in factor endowments? What are the welfare implications of changes in factor endowments? Of similar importance to the Rybczynski contribution are the various derivatives of the Heckscher-Ohlin model in which factor endowments determine the pattern of trade. Both of these models have become cornerstones for teaching the pure theory of trade.

In this paper we reconsider Rybczynski's theoretical analysis within the framework of the Heckscher-Ohlin model. Thus, technology exhibits constant returns to scale, preferences are homothetic, and there are no factor intensity reversals. Similar to Jones (1956), and in accordance with empirical evidence (Linder 1961, and Weder 2003), we consider a taste bias in favor of the exportable good.¹ In the context of this model we demonstrate the existence of economies in which Rybczynski's primary comparative statics' conclusions are reversed in sign. In these economies production prevails within the cone of diversification so that factor price equalization holds, and equilibrium is unique. From a theoretical perspective nothing is unusual. However, since the

¹ It is important to note that the original articulation of the Heckscher-Ohlin theorem by Ohlin (1933) did not rely on the assumption of identical preferences but instead on an economic definition of factor abundance. Such a definition uses (autarky) factor prices rather than physical measures to determine relative factor abundance and renders the Heckscher-Ohlin theorem valid independently of the structure of demand. For the purpose of this article, the distinction between the economic and the physical definition of relative factor abundance does not turn out to play a role (both definitions apply). See Gandolfo (1998) for a discussion of this issue.

comparative statics of the Heckscher-Ohlin model must allow for endogenous changes in the distribution of income across countries it is somewhat richer than the comparative statics in Rybczynski's closed economy model.

Before turning to the Heckscher-Ohlin world we begin with a careful statement of Rybczynski's contribution. Consider a closed economy with two factors of production, Capital (K) and Labor (L), and two consumption goods, x and y , each produced according to constant returns to scale (CRS) and perfect competition. Let p denote the ratio of the price of x to the price of y . The Rybczynski theorem states that if x is labor intensive and y is capital intensive, *then for each p an increase in L leads to an increase in the equilibrium supply of x and a decrease in the equilibrium supply of y at prices p .* Another way to state this conclusion is to say that if one holds the marginal rate of transformation in the production between x and y , $MRT(x, y)$, constant then an increase in L which allows for an increase in the production of both outputs, leads to an increase in x and a decrease in y . This is illustrated in Figure 1 by the movement from “ a ” to “ b ”, where T is the original production possibilities frontier and $T(\Delta L)$ represents the new production possibilities when L is augmented by an increment ΔL .

Rybczynski understood that in a closed economy the relative price p that prevails at equilibrium depends on the demand side of the economy, and varies with factor endowments (this is a general equilibrium effect), and he provided an analysis of how outputs (which are equal to consumptions in a closed economy) and prices will change

following an increase in labor.² In particular, Rybczynski argued that in the absence of inferior goods, and with demand generated by the smooth indifference curves of a single consumer whose income is derived from her ownership of K and L , an increase in the amount of factor L leads to an increase in the equilibrium supply (=demand) of x , but that the effect on the equilibrium value of y is ambiguous and could take the economy of Figure 1 to any point on $T(\Delta L)$ between “ b ” and “ c^* ”, such as “ c ”. Furthermore, it is apparent that he understood that with x inferior, an increase in L can lead to an absolute decrease in x and an increase in y , as in the movement from “ a ” to “ d ” in Figure 1. We call this outcome “Reverse Rybczynski”.

Although Rybczynski's own analysis took place in the context of a closed economy, it has prominently been recast in trade theory in the context of a home economy that is small (more properly, infinitesimal) relative to the rest of the world so that p is determined by the rest of the world. In Figure 2 the equilibrium supply in the home country is initially “ a ” (on T) and is determined by profit maximization at p . When home labor increases by ΔL the equilibrium supply moves to “ b ” on $T(\Delta L)$. If the home country acts as a single consumer with homothetic preferences, the equilibrium demand moves from “ \bar{a} ” to “ \bar{b} ” of Figure 2. The increment ΔL will increase the supply of x more than demand at p (in fact, the assumption that y is not inferior is enough for this conclusion). In the Heckscher-Ohlin world that we will consider the home country is not taken to be infinitesimal. Still, at each p the increment ΔL will increase the supply

² Rybczynski also understood that an increase in L leads to an improvement in welfare and, with y normal, to a fall in p .

of x more than demand. This powerful implication of Rybczynski's theorem is evident from Figure 1. It will play a major role in our analysis.

We now turn explicitly to the Heckscher-Ohlin world: there are two countries, neither of which is infinitesimal, and production functions are CRS and identical across countries. Relative factor endowments are different in the two countries and demand in each country is generated by a single consumer whose income is generated by her ownership of capital and labor and who has homothetic preferences; in particular, no goods are inferior in either country. (It is the latter assumption that gives our example of "Reverse Rybczynski" weight.) Despite this rather standard form, we show that an increase in the amount of factor L in the home country may lead to a decrease in the relative price of x that is sufficiently large so that the equilibrium supply of x in that country decreases while the production of y increases, as in the movement from "a" to "d" in Figure 1. World production of x also declines. In other words, in general equilibrium, and without the small country assumption, the output implications of an increase in a factor endowment can be the reverse of what is established in the Rybczynski analysis; that is, "Reverse Rybczynski", even with no inferior goods in either country. Furthermore, equilibrium is unique both before and after the increase in L and equilibria are interior³.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. A brief overview of related literature is provided in the next section, and an example of "Reverse Rybczynski" in the case of a simple Heckscher-Ohlin model appears in Section 3. We emphasize that we do not assert that "Reverse Rybczynski" is normally the case. Despite the rather innocuous

³ Uniqueness is key here, since with multiple equilibria both before and after the increase in L , there will generally be a selection from the equilibrium set that trivially yields "Reverse Rybczynski".

form of the example that demonstrates the above possibility, we are able to provide general conditions on preferences in the Heckscher-Ohlin model under which the comparative statics in the home and world economies are more or less as they are in Rybczynski's closed economy with no inferior goods. Namely, we are able to provide conditions under which an increase in the home endowment of the factor in which x is intensive leads necessarily to an increase in the supply of x in the home country and in the world. In this case the world production of y will also increase. Finally, we will prove general propositions concerning the link between the terms of trade and factor growth, and also show that "Reverse Rybczynski" implies immiserizing factor growth. The preceding propositions are the work of Section 4. Concluding remarks are presented in Section 5.

2. Related Literature

The possibility of "Reverse Rybczynski" was of great interest to Professor Xiaokai Yang, and his interest in that possibility led to this paper. Professor Yang conjectured that "Reverse Rybczynski" could be established using the Sonnenschein-Mantel-Debreu (SMD) theorem (Sonnenschein 1972, 1973; Mantel 1974; Debreu 1974). On this premise some attempts were made to prove this possibility using the idea that derivatives in an equilibrium model could be given quite arbitrary signs (Cheng, Sachs, and Yang 2004). However, the Cobb-Douglas utility specification used by the authors means that this approach cannot succeed⁴.

"Reverse Rybczynski" was first established by Hugo Sonnenschein using an elementary version of the Sonnenschein-Mantel-Debreu theorem and it was improved by

⁴ This is a corollary to Proposition 3 of Section 4.

Marcus Opp and Hugo Sonnenschein in the first submitted version of this paper. The couplet "Anything Goes" at the end of this paper's title captures the idea that in a Heckscher-Ohlin world an increase in L in the home country can result in a change in equilibrium supply to any one of d , c , or b in Figures 1 and 2. The example of "Reverse Rybczynski" in Section 2, using Leontief preferences, is due to Christis Tombazos, and this led the way to an understanding by the present authors of the conditions under which "Reverse Rybczynski" is not possible, as well as to the rather complete list of comparative statics that are presented here.

It is not difficult to demonstrate that "Reverse Rybczynski" is possible when demand in a country is generated by two consumers who own different shares of the endowment commodities and have different homothetic preferences. Such a demonstration would be very much in the spirit of Kemp and Shimomura (2002). By contrast, here we make the usual assumption that demand in a country is generated by a single consumer with homothetic preferences. Nonetheless, we generate the possibility of "Reverse Rybczynski" when the analysis is taken to general equilibrium in the most standard manner.

Finally, the well informed reader will note a relationship between immiserizing factor growth (Bhagwati 1958), that is necessary for "Reverse Rybczynski" in our setup, and the transfer paradox (Samuelson 1952a, 1952b). It is well known that in the Edgeworth Box framework a gift of endowments can be harmful to the recipient, but that this requires that there be multiple equilibria. It is thus somewhat surprising that in the Heckscher-Ohlin world an increase in endowment can hurt a country, even when equilibrium is unique.

3. An Example of “Reverse Rybczynski”

One might conjecture that “Reverse Rybczynski” requires exotic preferences and technologies, but as the following example shows this is in fact not the case. Following the conventions of the previous section, the two goods are given by x and y , the two countries are home (h) and foreign (f), and the two factors are capital (K) and labor (L). Commodity x is assumed to be the labor intensive good. As in the previous section, y is the numeraire and p is the normalized price of good x . Factor endowments are $K_h = 0.2$ and $L_h = 1$ in the home country, and $K_f = 1$ and $L_f = 0.2$, in the foreign country.

Preferences across the two countries are Leontief and are given by:

$$U_h = \min\left((1 - \varepsilon)x_h^d, \varepsilon y_h^d\right), \quad U_f = \min\left((1 - \delta)x_f^d, \delta y_f^d\right) \quad (1)$$

where x_i^d, y_i^d represent the consumption of x and y in economy $i \in (h, f)$, respectively.

We assume that $\varepsilon = 0.750$ and $\delta = 0.248$, thus there is a consumption bias in favor of the exportable. We will show later that such a bias, which is not standard in many textbook editions of the Heckscher-Ohlin model but which is consistent with the original articulation of this model (Ohlin 1933) and which finds empirical support (Linder 1961, and Weder 2003), is required for the result.

Technology across the two countries is common and is given by the following Constant Elasticity of Substitution (CES) production functions:

$$x_i^s = \left(\alpha K_{i,x}^\rho + (1 - \alpha)L_{i,x}^\rho\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho}}, \quad y_i^s = \left(\beta K_{i,y}^\rho + (1 - \beta)L_{i,y}^\rho\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho}} \quad (2)$$

where $\alpha = 0.001$, $\beta = 0.999$, and $\rho = -2$, x_i^s and y_i^s represent the production of x and y in economy $i \in (h, f)$, respectively, and K_{ix} and L_{ix} (K_{iy} and L_{iy}) correspond to the quantities of capital and labor employed in industry x (y) in economy $i \in (h, f)$. The common ρ across the two production functions, rules out factor intensity reversals (Arrow, Minhas, Chenery, and Solow 1961). Using (2) it can be easily shown that:

$$\kappa_y = \xi \kappa_x \quad (3)$$

where κ_y and κ_x correspond to the capital-labor ratios that are employed in the production of y and x , respectively, and $\xi = \left(\frac{(1-\alpha)\beta}{(1-\beta)\alpha} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\rho}} = 99.93$ corresponds to the constant of proportionality.

Using the aggregate resource constraints, equation (3) and $MRT(x, y) = p$, it is possible to determine a closed form expression for the quantity supplied of goods x and y in each country as a function of the final goods price p :

$$x_i^s(p, L_i, K_i) = \left(\alpha \left(\frac{K_i - \xi \kappa_x^*(p) L_i}{1 - \xi} \right)^\rho + (1 - \alpha) \left(\frac{K_i / \kappa_x^*(p) - \xi L_i}{1 - \xi} \right)^\rho \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho}} \quad (4)$$

$$y_i^s(p, L_i, K_i) = \left(\beta \left(K_i - \frac{K_i - \xi \kappa_x^*(p) L_i}{1 - \xi} \right)^\rho + (1 - \beta) \left(L_i - \frac{K_i / \kappa_x^*(p) - \xi L_i}{1 - \xi} \right)^\rho \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho}} \quad (5)$$

where: $\kappa_x^*(p) = \left[\frac{\beta^{1-\rho} (p\alpha)^{\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}} (1-\alpha) - \xi^{-\rho} (1-\beta)}{\beta - \beta^{1-\rho} (p\alpha)^{\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}} \alpha} \right]^{\frac{1}{\rho}}$ denotes the optimal capital-labor

ratio in sector x as a function of p . The equilibrium price ratio p can be determined by the market clearing condition for good x :

$$x_h^s(p, L_i, K_i) + x_f^s(p, L_i, K_i) = \frac{Y_h}{p + \frac{1-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}} + \frac{Y_f}{p + \frac{1-\delta}{\delta}} \quad (6)$$

where $Y_i = px_i^s(p, L_i, K_i) + y_i^s(p, L_i, K_i)$ represents the income of country i .

In the context of the assumed parameter calibrations and endowments the equilibrium price ratio is 0.679 and the capital-labor ratio in sector x is given by $\kappa_x^*(p) = 0.085$.

Given $\frac{k_f}{\xi} (= 0.05) \leq \kappa_x^* < k_h (= 0.2)$ production prevails within the cone of diversification.

T of Figures 1 and 2 is in fact an exact representation of the production possibilities of the home country with the above technology and resource endowments. Point “ a ” on this frontier is the equilibrium of the production vector $(x_h^s[a], y_h^s[a])$ in the home country with values given by $(0.925, 0.112)^5$. The corresponding equilibrium values of the consumption vector, given in Figure 2 by $\bar{a} = (x_h^d[\bar{a}], y_h^d[\bar{a}])$, correspond to $(0.731, 0.244)$.

Now assume that the endowment of labor in the home country, given by L_h , increases by $\Delta L = 0.05$ to 1.05. The new equilibrium values of κ_x^* and p are given by

⁵ All reported figures are rounded at the three digit level.

0.061 and 0.306, respectively. Since $\frac{k_f}{\xi} (= 0.05) \leq \kappa_x^* < k_h (= 0.19)$ continues to hold equilibrium remains within the cone of diversification. $T(\Delta L)$ of Figure 1 is an exact representation of the new set of production possibilities in the home country when the supply of labor is augmented. Given the new relative endowments the equilibrium production choice in the home country is given by $d = (x_h^s[d], y_h^s[d])$ which corresponds to (0.912, 0.135).

The movement from “ a ” to “ b ” $\{=(x_h^s[b]=0.973, y_h^s[b]=0.108)\}$ is the Rybczynski (fixed price) effect associated with the increase in the labor endowment of the home country. The movement from “ b ” to “ d ” is the price effect that results from the increase in labor endowment. The “net” movement from “ a ” to “ d ” represents a decrease in the home production of the labor intensive good (denoted by x_h^s) and an increase in the production of the capital intensive commodity (denoted by y_h^s); thus “Reverse Rybczynski”.

One should observe that despite the unexceptional aspects of this example, the general equilibrium demand function for x in the home country is increasing in its relative price p . To be precise, if we define $x_h^d(\cdot)$ to represent the demand for x in the home country when prices for the final goods are given by p for x and 1 for y , and where income in the home country is derived from the value of its labor and capital, then $x_h^d(\cdot)$ slopes upward in a neighborhood of the initial equilibrium of value of p (the prices of labor and capital are determined by the zero profit requirement). Exact representations of this upward sloping home demand can be seen in Panel (ii) of Figure 3

where its pre and post-growth manifestations are denoted as “ D ” and “ \bar{D} ”, respectively. Similar exact representation of the foreign and world markets are given in Panels (i) and (iii) of Figure 3, respectively.

Before explaining the intuition behind the previous comparative statics, it is useful to understand why the general equilibrium demand function $x_h^d(\cdot)$ that we generated slopes upward despite the fact that preferences are homothetic. This is an easy consequence of the fact that as price falls the home country must sacrifice more of the x commodity that it has produced in order to purchase y , and when it has a low elasticity of substitution in consumption it is forced to reduce both its consumption of x and y in order to maintain equilibrium. In the example under consideration the elasticity of substitution in consumption is zero; however, a more moderate assumption would suffice in order to generate a positive slope for $x_h^d(\cdot)$. If there is a low elasticity of substitution in consumption in the two countries, and if in addition both countries favor the commodity that they export, then in a neighborhood of equilibrium a small decrease in price reduces the home country's demand for x more than it increases the foreign country's demand for that commodity. This is the case under consideration and it results in an upward slope for the world's general equilibrium demand for x , given by $x_{world}^d(\cdot) = x_h^d(\cdot) + x_f^d(\cdot)$, in a neighborhood of the equilibrium price⁶.

We are now able to explain the intuition behind the possibility of “Reverse Rybczynski” comparative statics, and we trace this through in Figure 3. Begin with an equilibrium that is associated with the original global demand and supply curves for commodity x , given by D and S of Panel (iii), respectively. Observe that the global

⁶ In Rybczynski's closed economy demand slopes down in a neighborhood of equilibrium.

demand function is upward sloping at p , but that the aggregate supply function for x is flatter than demand function at this price. (For the aggregate supply function to be flatter than the demand function it is required that there be sufficient output substitution between x and y in production). When the home country's initial labor resource is augmented by ΔL , the demand function $x_h^d(\cdot)$ will shift right at each price less than the supply function shifts right. This is the implication of Rybczynski's Theorem that was discussed earlier, and it is displayed in Panel (ii) of Figure 3. Observe that the demand and supply functions in the foreign country, given in Panel (i), are not affected by the change in endowment in the home country. Thus, world demand changes from D to \bar{D} in Panel (iii) of Figure 3. As a consequence of the increase in labor in the home country there is now an excess supply for x at the initial equilibrium p and so the price of x must fall relative to the price of y . The reduction in price that is necessary in order to restore equilibrium is sufficiently large that it leads to a reduction in the equilibrium production of x in the home country, despite the fact that the supply of x is now larger at every price as a result of the increase in labor.⁷ This is "Reverse Rybczynski".

4. General Analysis

The next order of business is to provide conditions on the Heckscher-Ohlin model under which an increase in labor endowment in the home country leads to adjustments in the home and world economies that are similar to what is found in Rybczynski's closed economy. In particular, we provide conditions under which an increase in labor

⁷ The rate of reduction in the production of x in the home country, which is given by the elasticity of supply in that country, is determined by the specified CES technologies. These technologies generate sufficient substitution in production between x and y to make "Reverse Rybczynski" possible. It is quite clear that "Reverse Rybczynski" depends on the availability of such substitution.

endowment in the home country leads to an increase in the production of the labor intensive good x in the home country and in the world.

As in previous sections, we rely on the assumption that production is constant returns to scale and common across the two countries, and that the home country is labor abundant. In addition, for reasons that we have previously discussed, we assume that there is a unique equilibrium. Alternatively, we could make the weaker assumption that all changes take place in a neighborhood of a Walrasian stable equilibrium. In either case, the slope of world demand for x does not exceed the slope of world supply in a neighborhood of the equilibrium under consideration. As before, the home country exports x in a neighborhood of equilibrium.⁸ The fact that in a neighborhood of equilibrium the slope of world demand for x does not exceed the slope of world supply, coupled with the fact that an increase in home labor endowment increases supply more than demand at each price, means that the relative price of x must decrease with an increase in home labor endowment. This unambiguous result concerning the terms of trade mirrors what must occur in Rybczynski's closed economy and it is summarized in the following proposition.

Proposition 1. *An increase in labor endowment in the home country hurts the terms of trade of the home country.*

As a consequence of this proposition, an increase in labor endowment in the home country must decrease the price of labor and increase the price of capital. It can also be

⁸ Some results of this section (such as Proposition 2) are valid even if we replace the assumption that preferences are homothetic by the weaker assumption that y is not inferior in the preferences that generate home demand and neither commodity is inferior in the preferences that generate foreign demand.

shown that the decrease in the price of labor is proportionally larger than the decrease in the price of x (Mas-Colell *et al.* 1995, p. 543).

In the Heckscher-Ohlin model the occurrence of “Reverse Rybczynski” requires that world demand for x , shown in Panel (iii) of Figure 3, has a positive slope in a neighborhood of equilibrium. This follows from the fact that if world demand for x has a negative slope at equilibrium, then an increase in labor endowment in the home country means that both $x_h^d(\cdot)$ and $x_h^s(\cdot)$ shift right, and so the equilibrium value of world supply of x must increase. However, since p falls (Proposition 1) the foreign production of x cannot increase. Thus, the home production of x must increase, and so Reverse Rybczynski is not possible. This is Proposition 2.

Proposition 2. *If demand in the home country slopes downward in a neighborhood of equilibrium, then an increase in labor endowment in the home country leads the home country to increase the quantity supplied of good x .*

The next proposition gives conditions under which world demand for x has a negative slope in a neighborhood of equilibrium, and as a result the production of x in the home country must increase as the endowment of labor in the home country increases. All of these conditions allow for the possibility that the production of y in the home economy may either increase or decrease.

Proposition 3. *World demand for x slopes downward in a neighborhood of equilibrium if any of the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (i) *Preferences in the two countries are identical;*
- (ii) *Endowments in the two countries are proportional;*
- (iii) *The home country prefers the importable commodity when compared to the foreign country in the sense that at each p , $y_h^d(p)/x_h^d(p) > y_f^d(p)/x_f^d(p)$;*
- (iv) *The elasticity of substitution in consumption in the home country is greater than, or equal to, one.*

Before providing the proof of Proposition 3 we comment on the four conditions. The first condition, identical preferences, is commonly made in implementations of the Heckscher-Ohlin model; however, as pointed out in footnote 1 it is not a requirement for the result of the theory. There is, in fact, empirical support for differences in taste that are opposite to condition (iii). Thus, neither (i) and (iii) are particularly attractive ways to obtain downward sloping demand at equilibrium, and by Proposition 2 to rule out “Reverse Rybczynski”. The second condition is similarly not very attractive, since when endowments are proportional, we rule out the primary reason for trade in the Heckscher-Ohlin theory. Of course, with taste biases, trade can take place even when factor endowments are proportional. Finally, the attractiveness of (iv) depends in the manner in which we aggregate commodities; that is, whether or not what we arbitrarily call the aggregate commodity x is highly substitutable for other commodities which we call y .

Proof: We prove parts (i) and (ii) of this proposition by reinterpreting T in Figure 1 as the production possibilities frontier of the world economy. Recall that if either preferences are homothetic and identical across countries, or if preferences are homothetic and endowments proportional across countries, then the demand side of the world economy is generated by the homothetic preferences of a single consumer who

owns the aggregate endowments of the world. This is Eisenberg's theorem (Shafer and Sonnenschein 1982) and Chipman's corollary of this theorem (1974, 2006). Thus, in the case in which either (i) or (ii) is satisfied, equilibrium world production and consumption are at point a of Figure 1. At this point the boundary of the production possibilities frontier T is tangent to the highest world indifference curve, and world prices are given by the negative of the slope of the line tangent at a .

For prices lower (higher) than the equilibrium price, consumption must occur below (above) the ray originating at the origin and passing through a . By revealed preference, it must also be above the price line tangent to a . Thus, the world demand for x must increase (decrease). Hence, if world demand is differentiable at equilibrium, which we assume, it must slope down. In fact, as long as demand is generated by smooth social indifference curves an approach via the implicit function theorem will guarantee this conclusion.

Next assume (iii) and consider the Edgeworth Box pure exchange economy defined by endowing the representative consumer in each country with the equilibrium supply of x and y that is chosen in his country at the equilibrium price p (and associated equilibrium factor prices). Since the home country has relatively more labor, the endowment in the Edgeworth Box is below the diagonal connecting the origins of the home and foreign countries. The linear income expansion paths associated with the equilibrium price ratio p intersect at the equilibrium consumption allocation, and by (iii) this is above the diagonal. At lower p , then, by the envelope theorem, the rate of change in demand in each country is "as if" production, from which income is derived, does not readjust as prices change. At this lower price, demand must be on the new (flatter) budget

line, below the home country's original income consumption path, and above the foreign country's original consumption path. This means that world demand must now be positive. In other words, world demand has a negative slope in a neighborhood of p .

Now assume (iv). Since foreign demand is generated by homothetic preferences its demand for the importable has a negative slope in the neighborhood of the equilibrium price p . Thus it is sufficient to prove that home demand has a negative slope at the equilibrium price p . From the envelope theorem it follows that $dx_h^d(p)/dp$ is the same whether one holds the home country to its profit maximizing supply at p , from which its income is derived, or allows the firms to readjust their production so that it remains profit maximal at p . Let $[x_h^s(p), y_h^s(p)] > \mathbf{0}$ be the profit maximizing supply of outputs at the equilibrium price p and hold this vector constant. It is elementary that with income derived from this vector and elasticity of substitution unitary $dx_h^d(p)/dp < 0$. The assumption that the elasticity of substitution is greater than one magnifies this result.

The following proposition, which calls for a little more than collecting the results that we have established so far, explains when the Rybczynski closed economy analysis gives a correct view of the comparative statics of the Heckscher-Ohlin model associated with an increase in labor endowment in the home country.

Proposition 4. *Consider the Rybczynski closed economy model and our Heckscher-Ohlin framework both of which were specified in earlier sections. Assume that in both cases there is a unique equilibrium at price p . If the endowment of L increases (in the Rybczynski closed economy and in the home country of the Heckscher-Ohlin model) then:*

- (i) *the equilibrium price falls in both Rybczynski's closed economy and in the Heckscher-Ohlin model.*

- (ii) *With price fixed at its original equilibrium value, the supply of x must increase and the supply of y must decrease in the Rybczynski closed economy (Rybczynski, 1955). The same is true in both the home country and the world in the Heckscher-Ohlin model.*
- (iii) *World demand must be downward sloping at p in the Rybczynski closed economy. The equilibrium world supply of x (= world demand for x) must increase and the equilibrium supply of y may increase or decrease in the Rybczynski closed economy.*
- (iv) *In the Heckscher-Ohlin model with downward sloping world demand at p the equilibrium supply of x must increase in both the home country and the world. The equilibrium supply of y can increase or decrease in the home country and the world.*
- (v) *In the Heckscher-Ohlin model world demand may slope upward at p . In this case the quantities supplied of x and y may increase or decrease in the home country and the world⁹.*

We conclude this section by discussing the welfare economics associated with a change in resource endowments. Since the welfare effects of an endowment change can be completely classified according to whether or not the changing country is relatively abundant in the endowment that is being changed, this issue is completely addressed by considering an increase in each of the endowments in the home country. Because welfare in the foreign country varies inversely with p , welfare in the foreign country increases with an increase in L in the home country and falls with an increase in K in the home country. This result requires only that equilibrium is unique (or Walrasian stable) and that preferences are “normal”. If the endowment of K increases in the home country, then the price of x must increase, and as a result welfare must increase in the home country. The ambiguous case arises when the home endowment of L increases. Then, it is possible that utility will fall and this will be a case of immiserizing factor growth. If the home country is infinitesimal (or sufficiently small) relative to the market, then p will not

⁹ The analysis is similar if one considers an increase of the endowment of capital in the home country.

change (or change very little) as home endowment increases, and home welfare increases. However, as we have argued, p may decrease at a substantial rate when home endowment of L increases, and this can cause factor growth to be immiserizing. The next proposition demonstrates that factor growth of L in the home country is always immiserizing in the presence of “Reverse Rybczynski”.¹⁰

Proposition 5. *“Reverse Rybczynski” implies that factor growth is necessarily immiserizing.*

Proof: Recall that if the endowment of L increases in the home country, then p will fall. Since x is not inferior in the foreign country, the quantity demanded of good x must increase in the foreign country and quantity supplied must fall by the law of supply. If welfare is not to decrease in the home country, then the value of consumption at price p for x and unity for y must not decrease. But since p is reduced and since home preferences are homothetic, the ratio of x to y demanded must not decrease. The previous two sentences guarantee that the demand for x in the home country cannot fall. But the hypothesis of “Reverse Rybczynski” means that the home supply of x must fall, and so the (negative) excess demand for x must increase in the home country. But in this case world demand for x must exceed supply at the new equilibrium. This contradiction means that welfare must have been reduced in the home country.

¹⁰ Bhagwati (1958) in his pioneering work on immiserizing growth is clearly interested in the relationship between factor growth and welfare. However, he does not consider the possibility of “Reverse Rybczynski” nor does he connect “Reverse Rybczynski” with immiserization.

5. Notes and conclusions

Within the context of the Heckscher-Ohlin model of international trade we have given a rather complete account of the manner in which outputs, consumption, prices, and welfare change as a result of changes in the factors of production. Thus, we take a significant step in furthering the analysis that was begun by Rybczynski 53 years ago. The “surprise” in our results is the fact that Rybczynski’s single definite result concerning output can be completely reversed as a result of very strong price effects, even when preferences are homothetic. If “Reverse Rybczynski” occurs factor growth is necessarily immiserizing.

The key observation regarding the difference between Rybczynski’s closed economy analysis and the Heckscher-Ohlin analysis is that in the latter the world demand function for a final good can slope upward in a neighborhood of equilibrium, even when preferences are homothetic, production is constant returns to scale, and equilibrium is unique. This is what makes “Reverse Rybczynski” possible.

References

- Arrow, K.J., Chenery, H.B., Minhas, B.S., Solow, R.M., 1961. Capital-labour substitution and economic efficiency. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 43, 225–250.
- Bhagwati, J., 1958. Immiserizing growth: a geometrical note. *Review of Economic Studies* 25, 201-205.
- Cheng, W.L., Sachs, J., Yang, X., 2004. An extended Heckscher-Ohlin model with transaction costs and technological comparative advantage. *Economic Theory* 23, 671-688.
- Chipman, J.S., 1974. Homothetic preferences and aggregation. *Journal of Economic Theory* 8, 26-38.
- Chipman, J.S., 2006. Aggregation and estimation in the theory of demand. *History of Political Economy* 38, 106-129.
- Debreu, G., 1974. Excess demand functions. *Journal of Mathematical Economics* 1, 15-21.
- Gandolfo, G., 1998. *International Trade Theory and Policy*. Springer, Berlin.
- Jones, R. W., 1956. Factor Proportions and the Heckscher-Ohlin Theorem, *The Review of Economic Studies* 24, 1-10.
- Kemp, M.C., Shimomura, K., 2002. The Sonnenschein–Debreu–Mantel proposition and the theory of international trade. *Review of International Economics* 10, 671–679.
- Linder, S. B. (1961). *An Essay on Trade and Transformation*. New York: JohnWiley and Sons.
- Mantel, R.R., 1974. On the characterization of aggregate excess demand. *Journal of Economic Theory* 7, 348-353.
- Mas-Colell, A., Whinston, M.D., Green, J.R., 1995. *Microeconomic theory*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Ohlin, B., 1933. *International and interregional trade*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Rybczynski, T.M., 1955. Factor endowments and relative commodity prices. *Economica* 22, 336–341.
- Samuelson, P.A., 1952a. *Foundations of economic analysis*. Harvard University Press, Massachusetts.
- Samuelson, P.A., 1952b. The transfer problem and transport costs: The terms of trade when impediments are absent. *Economic Journal* 62, 278-304.
- Shafer, W., Sonnenschein, H., 1982. Market demand and excess demand functions, in: Arrow, K.J., Intriligator, M.D. (Eds.), *Handbook of Mathematical Economics*, Vol. 2. North-Holland, Amsterdam, p. 671–693.
- Sonnenschein, H., 1972. Market excess demand functions. *Econometrica* 40, 549-563.
- Sonnenschein, H., 1973. Do Walras' identity and continuity characterize the class of community excess demand functions? *Journal of Economic Theory* 6, 345-354.
- Weder, R., 2003. Comparative home-market advantage: an empirical analysis of British and American exports. *Review of World Economics* 139, 220-247.

Figures

Fig. 1. Production possibilities in the Home economy .




Fig. 2. Home economy's production and trade




Fig. 3. Domestic, foreign, and world markets

