

Matthew Kuperus Heun, Michael Carbajales-
Dale, Becky Roselius Haney

Beyond GDP

National accounting in the age of resource
depletion

September 14, 2014

Springer

Contents

Preface	xvii
References	xviii
Acknowledgements	xxi
Prologue	xxv
References	xxvii
1 Introduction: The end of an era	1
1.1 (Mis)measuring the wealth of nations	3
1.2 Nations at risk	5
1.3 Understanding the biophysical economy	6
1.3.1 Coupling between energy and the economy	7
1.3.2 Stalled growth is related to non-renewable stocks	12
1.3.3 Stalled growth is related to capital stock	16
1.4 Consumption-driven solutions are unsustainable	17
1.5 Change is needed!	18
References	20
2 Accounting for the wealth of nations	23
2.1 Three eras	24
2.1.1 Era of abundance	24
2.1.2 Era of energy constraints	27
2.1.3 Age of resource depletion	30
2.2 The economy is society's metabolism	31
2.2.1 Anabolism (capital formation)	34
2.2.2 Catabolism (energy production)	34
2.2.3 Autophagy (recycling)	35
2.2.4 Issues of scale	36
2.2.5 Benefits of the metabolism metaphor	37
2.3 New national accounting	39

2.4	Structure of the book	41
	References	41

Part I Material and Energy

3	Stocks and flows of materials	47
3.1	Methodology	50
3.1.1	Accounting in everyday life	50
3.1.2	Product, resource, short-lived, and capital flows	52
3.2	Example A: single-sector economy	54
3.3	Example B: two-sector economy	61
3.4	Example C: three-sector economy	67
3.5	Materials in the US auto industry	74
3.6	Summary	77
	References	77
4	Flows of direct energy	81
4.1	Methodology	82
4.2	Example A: single-sector economy	84
4.3	Example B: two-sector economy	87
4.4	Example C: three-sector economy	90
4.5	Direct energy in the auto industry	92
4.6	Summary	93
	References	94
5	Stocks and flows of embodied energy	95
5.1	Methodology	96
5.1.1	Total energy accounting	97
5.1.2	Embodied energy accounting	98
5.2	Example A: single-sector economy	100
5.2.1	Simplification of the embodied energy accounting equation ..	102
5.2.2	Substitution of First Law into the embodied energy accounting equation	103
5.2.3	Physical depreciation	104
5.3	Example B: two-sector economy	105
5.4	Example C: three-sector economy	108
5.5	Embodied energy in the US auto industry	112
5.6	Summary	113
	References	114

Part II Economic Value and Energy Intensity

6	Stocks and flows of economic value	117
6.1	Subjective theory of value	117
6.2	Methodology	120
6.3	Example A: single-sector economy	121
6.3.1	Economic transactions	123
6.3.2	Value generation	123
6.3.3	Value destruction	124
6.3.4	GDP	124
6.4	Example B: two-sector economy	125
6.5	Example C: three-sector economy	127
6.6	Stocks and flows of economic value in the US auto industry	129
6.7	Summary	133
	References	133
7	Energy intensity	135
7.1	Background	135
7.2	Methodology	140
7.3	Example A: single-sector economy	141
7.4	Example B: two-sector economy	142
7.5	Example C: three-sector economy	143
7.5.1	Total energy accounting equation	143
7.5.2	Matrix formulation	143
7.6	What is endogenous?	146
7.7	Choice of energy input vector	147
7.8	Energy intensity in the US auto industry	149
7.9	Summary	151
	References	151

Part III Implications and Summary

8	Implications	157
8.1	Metrics	157
8.2	Implications for the I-O method	158
8.2.1	Product-based vs. physical approaches	159
8.2.2	Capital flows and stock	160
8.2.3	Energy input from society	165
8.2.4	Recommendation	165
8.3	Implications for economic growth	167
8.4	Implications for recycling, reuse, and dematerialization	169
8.5	Comparison to a steady-state economy	170
8.5.1	Constant level of capital stock	171
8.5.2	Constant material throughput	172
8.5.3	Constant GDP	173
8.6	Summary	174
	References	175

9	Next steps	179
	References	181
Appendix A	Value flows for the US auto industry	185
	References	189
Appendix B	Infinite series representation of energy intensity	191
Appendix C	Proof of Equation 7.31	193
Appendix D	Estimating the Input-Output matrix (A)	195
Appendix E	Column vs. row vectors in energy intensity equations	197
	References	198
Bibliography	199
Glossary	215
Index	217

List of Figures

1.1	Economic growth, 1960–2013	2
1.2	Energy and economic activity	7
1.3	Gasoline shortage	8
1.4	Oil prices and production	9
1.5	World Oil Supply	12
1.6	Oil company free cash flow	15
2.1	The traditional economic model	26
2.2	The machine model	28
2.3	The metabolism model	33
2.4	Vintage autos in Cuba	36
2.5	Kleiber’s law for metabolic rates of animals	37
3.1	Material flows into and out of a single sector of the economy	53
3.2	Flows of materials for a one-sector economy	55
3.3	Material flows through an economic sector with waste treatment	60
3.4	Flows of materials for a two-sector economy	62
3.5	Flows of materials for a three-sector economy	68
3.6	The matrix of biosphere-economy flows	74
4.1	Energy content of material flows for a single sector	82
4.2	Aggregated direct energy flows for a single sector	83
4.3	Direct energy flows a one-sector economy	85
4.4	Direct energy flows for a two-sector economy	88
4.5	Direct energy flows for a three-sector economy	91
4.6	Direct energy flows for the US automobile industry	93
5.1	Total energy flows for a single sector	97
5.2	Total energy flows in a one-sector economy	101
5.3	Flows of total energy in a two-sector economy	106
5.4	Flows of total energy in a three-sector economy	109

5.5	Embodied energy flows for the US automobile industry	112
6.1	Aggregated flows of value for a single sector including flows to and from the biosphere	119
6.2	Flows of value for a single sector	120
6.3	Aggregated flows of value for a single sector	121
6.4	Flows of value for a one-sector economy	122
6.5	Flows of value within a two-sector economy	126
6.6	Flows of value within a three-sector economy	128
6.7	Value of material and energy flows into and out of the US automobile industry	132
7.1	The basic unit of input-output analysis	136
7.2	System boundary for process and I-O analyses	139
7.3	Top-down vs. bottom-up analyses	139
7.4	Units for input-output ratios	141
8.1	Coordinates of analysis for implications for the I-O method	158
B.1	Process flows in a single-sector economy	191

List of Tables

2.1	Examples used throughout this book	41
3.1	List of material input and output flows for the US auto industry	76
4.1	Energy inputs to US auto industry in 2010	93
6.1	Data Sources for auto industry (IOC 3361MV) example	133
7.1	Motor vehicles and equipment energy intensity	149
7.2	Selected US economic sector energy intensities, 1972	150
7.3	Automobile manufacturing sector energy intensity	150
7.4	Selected US economic sector energy intensities, 1997	151
8.1	Manufacturing efficiencies for selected goods	163
A.1	Data sources and calculations for auto industry example	185
A.1	Data sources and calculations for auto industry example	186
A.1	Data sources and calculations for auto industry example	187
A.2	BEA data sources	188

List of Symbols

Roman

a	stock of apples [-]
a	input output ratio, mixed units
a_0	LINEX fitting parameter [-]
\dot{a}	apple flow rate [apples/s]
A	technology augmentation factor [-]
\mathbf{A}	input output matrix, mixed units
B	ecosystem biomass stock [kg]
B	embodied energy [MJ]
\dot{B}	embodied energy flow rate [MJ/year]
\mathbf{B}_K	column vector of energy embodied in capital stock [MJ]
\mathbf{B}_W	column vector of waste flows [MJ/year]
c_t	LINEX fitting parameter [-]
e	indexed energy [-]
E	direct energy [MJ]
E_s	elasticity of substitution [-]
E_s	elasticity of supply [-]
\dot{E}	direct energy flow rate [MJ/year]
\mathbf{E}_0	column vector of direct energy inputs from the biosphere [MJ/year]
$EROI$	Energy Return On (energy) Invested [-]
f_E	energy cost share [-]
k	indexed capital stock [-]
K	mass of capital goods [kg]
\dot{K}	capital goods mass flow rate [kg/year]
l	indexed labor [-]
m	mass [kg]
n	number of sectors in the economy
p	a system property

P	ecosystem photosynthetic energy production rate [J/year]
P	price [\$]
P	mass of products [kg]
\dot{P}	product mass flow rate [kg]
Q	quantity of production or demand [various]
q_0	proportionality constant [W/kg ^{3/4}]
\dot{Q}	energy consumption rate in Kleiber's Law [W]
\dot{Q}	waste heat flow rate [MJ/year]
R	mass of resource [kg]
\dot{R}	mass flow rate of resources [kg/year]
s	stock of steel [kg]
\dot{s}	mass flow rate of steel [kg/year]
S	mass of short-lived goods [kg]
\dot{S}	mass flow rate of short-lived goods [kg/year]
t	time [year]
T	total energy [MJ]
\dot{T}	total energy flow rate [MJ/year]
\mathbf{T}_1	column vector of total energy flows (\dot{T}) from society to the economy [MJ/year]
\dot{W}	waste flow rate [kg/year]
X	stock of economic value [\$]
\dot{X}	economic value flow rate, mixed units
\mathbf{X}_t	transaction matrix [\$/year]
$\hat{\mathbf{X}}$	diagonal matrix of sector outputs in mixed units [\$/year or MJ/year]
y	indexed economic output [-]
<i>Greek</i>	
α	ratio of inflowing capital stock rate to capital stock [1/year]
α	output elasticity of capital [-]
$\hat{\alpha}$	diagonal matrix of ratios incoming embodied energy in capital [-]
β	output elasticity of labor [-]
δ_{ij}	Kronecker delta
ε	energy intensity [MJ/\$]
$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$	column vector of sector energy intensities [MJ/\$]
η_R	resource efficiency [kg/kg]
γ	output elasticity of energy [-]
γ	depreciation rate [1/year]
$\hat{\gamma}$	diagonal matrix of depreciation rates [1/year]
ρ_k	ratio of indexed capital to the average of indexed labor and energy [-]
ρ_l	ratio of indexed labor to indexed energy [-]
ρ_S	ratio of short-lived material flow rate to resource flow rate [kg/kg]
<i>Subscripts</i>	
0	Biosphere
1	Society (Example A) or Final Consumption (Examples B and C)
2	Production sector (Example B) or Energy sector (Example C)
3	Goods and Services sector (Example C)

<i>a</i>	pertaining to making available to society
<i>B</i>	pertaining to embodied energy
<i>c</i>	pertaining to consumption
<i>dest</i>	destruction
<i>gen</i>	generation
<i>i</i>	energy type
<i>i</i>	economic sector index
<i>in</i>	inflow
<i>j</i>	economic sector index
<i>k</i>	economic sector index
<i>K</i>	pertaining to capital stock
<i>out</i>	outflow
<i>soc</i>	society
<i>t</i>	transaction
<i>waste</i>	pertaining to waste

Preface

*It was six men of Indostan
To learning much inclined,
Who went to see the Elephant
(Though all of them were
blind),
That each by observation
Might satisfy his mind.*

⋮

*And so these men of Indostan
Disputed loud and long,
Each in his own opinion
Exceeding stiff and strong,
Though each was partly in the
right,
And all were in the wrong!*

Moral.

*So oft in theologic wars
The disputants, I ween,
Rail on in utter ignorance
Of what each other mean,
And prate about an Elephant
Not one of them has seen!*
[1, p. 259–261]

—John Godfrey Saxe

In 1992, the Union of Concerned Scientists published the *World Scientists' Warning to Humanity*,¹ an appeal for humanity to “bring environmentally damaging activities under control to restore and protect the integrity of the earth’s systems we depend on.” [2] The *Warning* stated that “[h]uman beings and the natural world are on a collision course,” warned of “[h]eedless exploitation” of natural resources, and explained that “[d]estructive pressure” on water, soil, and atmosphere “put at serious risk the future that we wish for human society. . . .” More than two decades later, we are encountering limits to the rates at which natural resources can be extracted, limits for the rate at which wastes (including anthropogenic carbon emissions) can be assimilated by the biosphere, and limited options for human ingenuity to substitute for depleted natural capital and diminished ecosystem capacity. Because of these factors, the future health and viability of all economies are at risk.[3]

In contrast, the vast majority of economists and policy-makers predict that quality of life into the future will continue to improve. Economists point out that standards of living have increased steadily over time, and living standards for even the poorest nations are “accelerating markedly.” [4] They expect GDP per capita and living standards to grow continuously into the foreseeable future, even under the most pessimistic assumptions.[4, p. 170] The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), for example, forecasts an average global GDP growth rate of approximately 2% per year for the next several decades.[5, Table A.1]

There is a stark contrast between these two visions of the future, because the two groups (scientists and economists) focus on different parts of the economy. Scientists

¹ The *World Scientists' Warning to Humanity* was signed by some 1,700 of the world’s leading scientists, including the majority of Nobel laureates in the sciences.

observe the planet's natural capital dwindling, and foresee declining quality of life. Economists observe the stock of manufactured capital growing, and growing increasingly efficient, and foresee continued improvement in quality of life.

The differences between scientists and economists revolve around the understanding and role of capital. Physical scientists often focus on the dependence of our living standards on the availability of natural capital, but ignore the multiplying power of manufactured capital. Conversely, economists place their faith in the ability of manufactured capital to continually increase production rates, but ignore constraints of natural capital.

In the ancient fable, six blind men discern six different parts of an elephant and draw different conclusions about the unseen animal before them. Today, scientists and economists discern two different parts of the economy and draw strikingly different conclusions about the unseen future ahead. We contend that both scientists and economists need to take off their blinders and appreciate that capital in all forms (natural, manufactured, human, social, and financial) is necessary to generate the services an economy requires. These two perspectives must be brought together to understand the potential futures we are facing. These two perspectives must inform the data we collect about our economies.

But, what would we do with integrated and comprehensive environmental-economic data, including natural and manufactured capital, if they were routinely and readily available? The goal of this book is to answer that question. Herein, we develop an accounting framework and analysis approach that could take advantage of such data, and we draw several implications from our framework.

We look forward to the day when such data are readily available!

References

- [1] John Godfrey Saxe. The Blind Men and the Elephant. In *The poems of John Godfrey Saxe*, pages 259–261. J. R. Osgood, Boston, 1873.
- [2] Union of Concerned Scientists. 1992 World Scientists' Warning to Humanity. <http://www.ucsusa.org/about/1992-world-scientists.html>, 1992.
- [3] T. F. et al. Stocker, editor. *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contributions of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- [4] Khalid Malik. The Rise of the South: Human Progress in a Diverse World. Human development report 2013, United Nations Development Programme, 2013.
- [5] Åsa Johansson, Yvan Guillemette, Fabrice Murtin, David Turner, Giuseppe Nicoletti, Christine de la Maisonnette, Guillaume Bousquet, and Francesca Spinelli. Looking to 2060: Long-term global growth prospects. OECD economic

policy papers, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris, November 2012.

Acknowledgements

We extend our thanks and appreciation to...

- Frederick Soddy, Lesley White, Eugene Ayres, Charles Scarlott, Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen, Herman Daly, and Kenneth Boulding for being so far ahead of the curve,
- Fred Cottrell, Peter Chapman, Gerald Leach, Malcolm Slessor, John Peet, Cutler Cleveland, Robert Costanza, and Charles Hall for showing the way on energy-economy interactions,
- Clark W. Bullard III, Robert Herendeen, and Stephen Casler for leading the way with energy input-output analysis,
- David Wasshausen, Erich Strassner, and Dennis Fixler at the US Bureau of Economic Analysis for clear explanations and wise guidance in using the industry and national accounts,
- Kurt Schaefer (Calvin College) for insightful comments on the discussion of theories of value,
- Charlie Barnhart, Adam Brandt, Carey King, David Murphy, Sally Benson, Pat Bodger, and Susan Krumdieck for many, many enlightening and engaging conversations and insightful comments on all matters energy related,
- John Wertz (Calvin College) for insightful comments on the metabolism metaphor, and
- Janet Weathers and Maria Steblay for important editorial comments on early drafts of the manuscript.

Without the support and encouragement of our spouses (Tracy Kuperus, Patricia Carbajales-Dale, and Lawrence Haney) and families, none of this would have been possible. We are eternally grateful!

*Matthew Kuperus Heun
Michael Carbajales-Dale
Becky Roselius Haney*

“Now! Now!” cried the Queen. “Faster! Faster!” And they went so fast that at last they seemed to skim through the air, hardly touching the ground with their feet, till suddenly, just as Alice was getting quite exhausted, they stopped, and she found herself sitting on the ground, breathless and giddy. The Queen propped her against a tree, and said kindly, “You may rest a little now.”

Alice looked round her in great surprise. “Why, I do believe we’ve been under this tree all the time! Everything’s just as it was!”

“Of course it is,” said the Queen: “what would you have it?”

“Well, in *our* country,” said Alice, still panting a little, “you’d generally get to somewhere else—if you ran very fast for a long time, as we’ve been doing.”

“A slow sort of country!” said the Queen. “Now, here, you see, it takes all the running you can do, to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that!”

—Lewis Carroll. 1897. *Through the Looking-Glass and What Alice Found There*.
Henry Altemus Company, Philadelphia, p. 49.

Prologue

The economic light is brightest under the lamppost of the market, but neither drunks nor statisticians should confine their search there. In extending the accounts, we must endeavor to find dimly lit information outside our old boundaries of search, particularly when the activities are of great value to the nation. [1, p. 23]

—William Nordhaus

One of the first calls for integrated and comprehensive reporting of environmental-economic data, including natural and manufactured capital,¹ came from the Brundtland Commission (1983–1987), which recognized the need to devise rigorous methods for integrating environmental assets into national balance sheets and income statements. In its final report, entitled *Our Common Future*, the commission highlighted the need for all nations to include a full (economic) accounting of the use and development of natural resources in national accounts:

The process of economic development must be more soundly based upon the realities of the stock of capital that sustains it. This is rarely done in either developed or developing countries. For example, income from forestry operations is conventionally measured in terms of the value of timber and other products extracted, minus the costs of extraction. The costs of regenerating the forest are not taken into account, unless money is actually spent on such work. Thus figuring profits from logging rarely takes full account of the losses in future revenue incurred through degradation of the forest. Similar incomplete accounting occurs in the exploitation of other natural resources, especially in the case of resources that are not capitalized in enterprise or national accounts: air, water, and soil. In all countries, rich or poor, economic development must take full account in its measurements of growth of the improvement or deterioration in the stock of natural resources.[2, Chapter 2, Paragraph 36]

In response to the call by the Brundtland Commission, economist Peter Bartelmus led an effort at the UN Statistics Division to develop a set of satellite accounts, called the System for Environmental and Economic Accounting (SEEA), which accompanies the UN System of National Accounts framework.[3] The UN published the first Handbook for the SEEA in 1993, and it is now in its third edition.[4] The Philippines served as a pilot study for the new integrated environmental-economic accounting approach, and the island nation's current concerns about mitigating the impacts of rising sea levels has reinvigorated this aspect of their national accounting.[5, 6] The Netherlands currently leads the way among developed nations with a complete National Accounting Matrix that includes Environmental Accounts.[7] Many Euro-

¹ We use the phrase “accounting for the environment” as shorthand for the process of gathering, analyzing, and disseminating integrated and comprehensive environmental-economic data that includes natural in addition to manufactured capital.

pean Union member states, as well as Canada and Australia have integrated some environmental accounts with their national accounting.[8]

Shortly after the publication of the UN's SEEA methodology, the US Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) began development of its own framework for environmental-economic satellite accounts called the Integrated Environmental-Economic System of Accounts (IEESA). The motivation, methodology, and first set of data tables were published in April 1994.[9] These accounts provided a range of numbers to bracket the value of the stocks of subsoil mineral assets in the nation's portfolio. The IEESA data and the detailed plans for additional phases of development were comprehensive and methodologically rigorous. This effort on the part of the BEA represented a tremendous leap forward for national accounting in the US.

Unfortunately, progress toward integrated environmental-economic accounting in the US came to a screeching halt immediately after the first IEESA tables were published. The US Congress responded swiftly and negatively. The House Report that accompanied the next appropriations bill explicitly forbade the BEA from spending any additional resources to develop or extend the integrated environmental and economic accounting methodology.

The conferees understand that there has been considerable debate over the years as to the objectivity, methodology, and applicability of "Integrated Environmental-Economic Accounting" or "Green GDP." The conferees understand that the Department [the BEA] has completed the development of Phase I of this initiative. The conferees believe that an independent review, by an external organization such as the National Academy of Sciences, should be conducted to analyze the proposed objectivity, methodology, and application of environmental accounting. The conferees expect BEA to use \$400,000 under this account to fund this independent study, as suggested by the House report. The conferees expect BEA to suspend development of Phase II of this initiative until the review has been completed and the results have been submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate, as well as the appropriate authorizing committees.[10]

Esteemed economist William Nordhaus chaired the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) review panel that evaluated whether the BEA should extend the national income and product accounts to include "assets and production activities associated with natural resources and the environment." [1, p. 2] Five years later, in 1999, the panel submitted its comprehensive report to Congress strongly recommending that the BEA be authorized to continue producing the environmental-economic satellite accounts.[1]

The report illuminated the need for the nation to keep "comprehensive economic accounts" that "provide a complete reckoning of economic activity, whether it takes place inside or outside the boundary of the marketplace." [1, p. 29] The panel noted that the data would be used by states, local governments, businesses, and investors alike to make sound economic decisions. The panel asked reasonable questions and showed how a system like the IEESA could provide sensible answers. For example, should the timber from an old growth forest be harvested? Using data that are limited to income-generating transactions only, the answer is "yes," because the harvest adds directly to national income. However, the value of foregone "hunting, fishing, and other forms of nonmarket forest recreation" services over time (likely to exceed the

value of the harvested timber) cannot be part of the decision unless a system such as the IEESA is in place.[1, p. 30]

Despite the review panel's ringing endorsement of the BEA's work, Congress continued to expressly forbid the BEA's efforts. Appropriations bills through FY 2002 contained the sentence:

The Committee continues the prohibition on use of funds under this appropriation, or under the Census Bureau appropriation accounts, to carry out the Integrated Environmental-Economic Accounting or "Green GDP" initiative.

Today, congressional appropriations bills no longer expressly prohibit work on the IEESA, but the BEA is understandably gun-shy after their experience in the 1990s. Unfortunately, the BEA did not receive the necessary political backing despite a Democratic administration and two Democratically-controlled chambers of Congress. Restarting an effort similar to the IEESA will require a specific mandate from both the administration and Congress, a significant political task to be sure.

We believe that the benefits of accounting for the environment by including both natural and manufactured capital will be worth the political efforts needed to resume the practice. After reading this book, we hope you will agree.

References

- [1] William D Nordhaus and Edward C (eds.) Kokkelenberg. *Nature's Numbers: Expanding the National Economic Accounts to Include the Environment*. National Academies Press, Washington, DC, 1999.
- [2] World Commission on Environment and Development. *Our common future*. Oxford paperbacks. Oxford University Press, Oxford ; New York, 1987.
- [3] Peter Bartelmus, Carsten Stahmer, and Jan van Tongeren. INTEGRATED ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC ACCOUNTING: FRAMEWORK FOR a SNA SATELLITE SYSTEM. *Review of Income and Wealth*, 37(2):111–148, June 1991.
- [4] United Nations. *Integrated environmental and economic accounting: interim version*. Number no. 61 in Studies in methods. United Nations, New York, 1993.
- [5] Kimio Uno and Peter Bartelmus. *Environmental Accounting in Theory and Practice*. Springer, Dordrecht ; Boston, 1997 edition edition, January 1998.
- [6] World Bank. Philippines. <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/ENVIRONMENT/0,,contentMDK:23144834~menuPK:242154~pagePK:210058~piPK:210062~theSitePK:244381,00.html>.
- [7] Sjoerd Schenau, Roel Delahaye, Cor Graveland, and Maarten van Rossum. The dutch environmental accounts: present status and future developments. Technical report, Statistics Netherlands, February 2009.
- [8] United Nations Statistical Division. System of environmental-economic accounting (seea). <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/envaccounting/seea.asp>.

- [9] Bureau of Economic Affairs. Integrated economic and environmental satellite accounts. *Survey of Current Business*, pages 33–49, April 1994.
- [10] U.S. House. Committee on appropriations. departments of commerce, justice, and state, the judiciary, and related agencies appropriations bill, FY 1995. Technical Report 103 H. Rpt. 708.

Chapter 1

Introduction: The end of an era

Where there is no reliable accounting and therefore no competent knowledge of the economic and ecological effects of our lives, we cannot live lives that are economically and ecologically responsible. It is futile to plead and protest and lobby in favor of public ecological responsibility while, in virtually every act of our private lives, we endorse and support an economic system that is by intention, and perhaps by necessity, ecologically irresponsible. [1, p. 26]

—Wendell Berry

The world is entering a new economic era. There is widespread agreement that economic growth in mature economies is unlikely reach the rates seen in the 20th Century ever again. Indeed, over the last fifty years, Figure 1.1 shows that the economic growth rate for the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) member states has fallen precipitously. The long-term forecast from the OECD is that mature economies will grow only 1.5–2.0% annually over the next fifty years. Similarly, the US Congressional Budget Office forecasts an average growth rate of 2.2% for the US economy from 2018–2024.[2, 3]

The stagnation of economic growth for mature economies (as measured by annual percentage change in GDP per capita) is even more striking when compared to the explosive growth of emerging economies. Figure 1.1 shows economic growth rates for China and India since 1965. The trendline of the OECD is clearly downward, while the trendline of Chinese and Indian growth is clearly upward. Indeed, the OECD itself says that the “combined GDP of China and India was 33% of the OECD in 2010 (on a PPP basis), but is expected to rise to 73% by 2060.” [2, p. 214] Slowing OECD growth illustrates that mature economies are hitting a wall.

Is stalled economic growth a problem? Most analysts believe it is. History suggests that GDP growth raises living standards and human well-being, as measured by various indices. Julian Simon’s volume, *The State of Humanity*, catalogues the great improvements in life span, housing, environment, food quality and availability, water cleanliness, etc. that have coincided with economic growth over the last three centuries.[5]

Thus, stalled economic growth can be expected to be accompanied by slowing or reversing of the upward trend in quality of living. The economic establishment’s prescription to avoid backsliding of quality of life and human well-being is continued economic growth by (nearly) any means necessary. And, at the moment, continued economic growth appears to be the only politically-viable policy instrument.

What do economists believe is causing the slowdown of economic growth in mature economies?

Mainstream economic theory considers economic growth to be driven by four factors: (1) increasing labor utilization as a result of increasing the number of workers




Fig. 1.1: Five-year trailing averages of economic growth, 1965–2013.[4]

or worker hours, (2) increasing human capital through improved education levels, skill levels, or health, (3) increasing capital/labor ratio because of expanded capital investments, and (4) increasing worker productivity due to technological innovation. In recent years, the economy has deteriorated on all four factors. Economist Tyler Cowen argues that large productivity gains through innovation have permanently plateaued leading to a “great stagnation” in economic growth.[6] The Cato Institute’s economic growth specialist, Brink Lindsey, suggests that growth has permanently stalled, because *all four* of the primary drivers of economic growth have plateaued; hours worked, worker skill level, and the amount of capital invested per worker have reached a low, slow, steady state and are unlikely to rebound.[7]

The Cowen and Lindsey analyses represent mainstream explanations for the growth slowdown, and they are based squarely on the assumption that technology augments capital and labor, the inputs to economic growth.¹ If economic slowdown is caused by anything besides technology, capital, or labor, mainstream economic

¹ The mainstream model for economic growth is encapsulated in the Cobb-Douglas production function, which takes the mathematical form

$$y = Ak^\alpha l^{1-\alpha}$$

where y is economic output, A is technological progress, k is capital stock, l is labor, α is the factor share of capital, and $1 - \alpha$ is the factor share for labor.

analysis can't provide any assistance in either diagnosing the problem or prescribing a cure.

We believe that the mainstream approach is too narrow and that there may be other factors that cause economic slowdown. In particular, we contend that binding constraints on economic growth may arise from at least two sources: material inputs from the biosphere and the energy to run the “economic engine.”

Our approach may be outside the economic mainstream, but we are not alone. There are several inter-disciplinary fields (industrial ecology, ecological economics, biophysical economics, and materials flow analysis) where the relationship between the economy and the biosphere is a natural feature of the intellectual landscape, and assessment of patterns of economic growth and economic downturns includes consideration of biophysical limits. This emerging paradigm is taking shape with the leadership of theorists such as Robert Ayres [8], Kenneth Boulding [9], Roger Boyd [10], Robert Costanza [11], Herman Daly [12], Blair Fix [13], Charles Hall [14], Steven Kopits [15], Marina Fischer-Kowalski [16], and others. Throughout this book, we'll refer to this approach as a “biophysical” approach to the economy.

Those who adopt the biophysical approach to economics have consistently raised the concern that material and energy constraints could lead to the end of the era wherein economic growth could be achieved simply by increasing consumption. And the explanatory power of the biophysical paradigm is becoming increasingly difficult to ignore. With startling prescience, Robert Ayers predicted in 1996 that this era would end in a great recession within twenty years:

It is difficult to say when, or how, the current economic growth “system” will collapse; it has proved more resilient than many would have predicted. But, unless job-creating growth can be sharply accelerated the choice facing governments is stark: either there will be very sharp and painful cuts in entitlements and social welfare or there will be a financial crisis, probably sudden (like the onset of the Great Depression) and probably within twenty years. The traditional Keynesian job creation mechanisms are ineffective or inapplicable, while trade liberalization and “globalization” are making the unemployment problem worse, not better. Western democracies are, like the passengers on the Titanic, heading “full steam ahead” into extremely dangerous waters. Icy reality lies dead ahead, already dimly visible through the fog. Collision is inevitable, unless we change course sharply.[17]

1.1 (Mis)measuring the wealth of nations

An ironic consequence of economists taking biophysical reality seriously is a return to the roots of economic theory. At some point between Adam Smith and the present day, economic concern veered away from the nature and causes of the *wealth* of nations toward stimulating and counting the *income* of nations. Today's mainstream quantification of economic health, GDP, measures only *income*, a *flow* of money (currency) in units of, say, \$/year. Many now raise the concern that the economic mainstream's focus solely on GDP mis-measures economic health and reveals little about a nation's *wealth*. The missing piece in mainstream economic theory is a biophysical understanding of the role of a nation's *capital*.

A nation's wealth consists of physical *stock*, including both manufactured and natural capital. The word "capital" can be used in many ways, usually referring to assets of one form or another: financial capital, natural capital, human capital, social capital, physical capital, and manufactured capital, to name a few. In this book, we use the term "manufactured capital" or simply "capital" to indicate things such as machines, buildings, roads, vehicles, and computers, all physical items used in and necessary for the production process. Manufactured capital is not normally used up during production of goods and rendering of services, although it depreciates over time. As manufactured capital depreciates, future income is put at risk. We use the term "natural capital" to include oil, coal, and natural gas deposits. But, clean air and water, soils, forests, and natural areas² are counted as natural capital, too. Natural capital depletes when consumed (e.g., fossil fuels) or degrades when soils are mistreated, clean air and water are polluted, and wetlands are contaminated. In a manner similar to manufactured capital, as natural capital dwindles, the future capacity for income generation dwindles.

Both manufactured and natural capital (as well as human, social, and financial capital), provide the services an economy uses to produce income. To provide a constant or increasing standard of living into the future, each generation must forego some consumption to invest in maintenance, repair, and replacement of its capital for the future. From Robinson Crusoe to the US, every economy must answer this question: how much of our income should be consumed today and how much should be saved for tomorrow?

Now, let's turn back to GDP as a quantification of economic health. GDP is an estimate of the *income* of an economy. Because firms gain income from the consumption of natural and manufactured capital, estimates of GDP include these transactions. Thus, depletion of natural capital and consumption of manufactured capital (both stocks) are counted as "income" (a flow) in national accounts, and both are "good" for the economy. The focus on GDP as the indicator of economic health creates a perverse incentive to consume the very stocks upon which economic health depends. There is no incentive to manage a nation's stock of natural capital for the future, because depletion of natural capital increases GDP today.

There are many examples of the perverse accounting that arises from the use of GDP to (mis)measure economic health. When Lake Erie turned toxic for several days in 2014 due to algae blooms caused by agricultural runoff, GDP grew by the spending on bottled water and goods and services to repair the damage. Clearcutting of forests improves GDP in the short run but eliminates opportunities for recreation-related income in the future. Sickness adds the cost of health care to GDP.

Using GDP as the measure of economic health mis-measures economic health, because it blurs the distinction between stocks and flows and masks the fundamental tradeoff between today and tomorrow. Economic expansion (as measured by GDP) beyond the rate at which stocks can be replenished deprives the economy of the wealth it needs to generate future income! And, continued economic expansion (in GDP terms) is likely to cause the economy to reach biophysical limits in terms of

² Natural areas provide eco-system services such as water purification, carbon sequestration, and erosion control.

both the stock of non-renewable resources supplied by the biosphere and the capacity of the biosphere to assimilate all of society's pollution and physical waste.

Thus, both stocks and flows of both natural and manufactured capital are important, and both should be accounted and reported in addition to GDP in national accounts. National accounts gather, evaluate, and disseminate data on economic activity at the national level. The UN's international standards for national accounting, aptly named the System of National Accounts (SNA), suggest accounting for natural capital that is both owned (by firms or the government) and used in production. However, not all countries base their national accounts on the SNA (the United States, China, and France, for example, do not), and not all natural capital is "owned." Clean air and water are not accounted in the SNA, for example. The US ignores natural capital outright.

Although there is nothing in the SNA framework that prevents accounting for assets (manufactured and natural capital), the focus of national accounting is squarely on income (GDP), not wealth (manufactured and natural capital). [18, p. 415] This predilection results in national accounting, particularly in the US, that collects and analyzes a trove of data to produce a robust *income statement* of financial flows within the economy (GDP), yet mostly ignores the data needed to produce a similarly rigorous *balance sheet* of assets (stocks) that measure the value of a nation's wealth, including manufactured and natural capital. counts all forms of productive capital (natural, human, and manufactured) By focusing nearly-exclusively on income, today's national accounting is blind to an important aspect of the modern world: economies deplete natural capital in the pursuit of income.

Without a complete national balance sheet alongside an income statement, policy-makers can unwittingly draw down a nation's wealth (natural capital) to generate today's income (GDP). In so doing, future living standards are put at risk.

1.2 Nations at risk

The risk to a nation's living standards from ignoring the effect of economic activity on the nation's balance sheet is borne out in the UN's *Inclusive Wealth Report 2012*. [19] This report sums together all forms of productive capital (natural, human, and manufactured) as a measure of wealth for each nation. This biophysical and social approach to economic measurement reveals that several nations' wealth is currently declining even as their GDP grows. For the years 1990–2008, Saudi Arabia, Russia, Venezuela, South Africa, and Nigeria had declining wealth coincident with income growth, thereby diminishing the productive capacity of future generations in order to support consumption by the current generation. Saudi Arabia's GDP per capita grew at 0.4% per year, while its wealth declined at a rate of 1.1% per year, and Nigeria's GDP per capita grew at 2.5% per year, while its wealth declined at a rate of 1.8% per year. According to the *Inclusive Wealth Report*, not all nations consume

their wealth in pursuit of today's income. However, wealth is growing at a slower rate than income in most countries. For example, GDP per capita for the US grew on average 1.8% per year, while the nation's wealth grew at only 0.7% per year.[19, p. 44]

Because society (mis)measures economic health by focusing nearly completely on GDP, countries adopt policies that encourage consumption. Such policies lead to high flow-to-stock ratios, and economies with these policies are more likely to deplete natural resources faster due to unsustainable natural resource extraction rates. The end result is that we can consume manufactured and natural capital (our wealth) in the hopes of increasing today's income. As Robert Ayres foresaw, this is not a sustainable approach.

Given the above, we contend that nations need both income statements and balance sheets to ensure sustainability. Nations must monitor and manage not only the goods and services they produce today, but also their stocks of capital (both natural and manufactured) and the state of that capital. Many questions, such as "How might an economy be affected as an increasing share of production is directed toward replacing degraded ecosystem services," and others enumerated in the next chapter (in Section 2.3) are unanswerable without both.

But, how could we do better? How could we structure a biophysical approach to national accounting? We must first understand the biophysical economy. We must go *Beyond GDP!*

1.3 Understanding the biophysical economy

As mentioned above, very little of the discourse about mature economy slowdown in mainstream economic circles involves biophysical factors.³ Mainstream economics considers biophysical factors to be *exogenous* to the economy.⁴

Arguably, the most important (but certainly not the only) biophysical factor vis-à-vis the economy is energy. If we are to understand how exogenous factors can cause economic slowdown and, conversely, drive economic growth, we would do well to understand how energy operates in the economy. Thus, we first discuss the correlation between energy consumption and economic activity (Section 1.3.1). Then, we show how economic demands for energy and materials are related to important stocks of raw materials and energy resources in the biosphere (Section 1.3.2) and the stocks of manufactured capital in the economy (Section 1.3.3).

³ In this context, we are using the term "biophysical factors" to indicate any factor related to the extraction, transport, processing, manipulation, and disposal of the physical (as opposed to financial) manifestation of any material or energy resource in the economy.

⁴ Of course, mainstream economics discusses *prices* of raw materials, goods, and services. And, to the extent that biophysical factors affect prices, it could be said that mainstream economic discussions involve biophysical factors. However, biophysical factors are rarely acknowledged as causal for establishing the prices of goods and services and the raw materials of which they are comprised.

1.3.1 Coupling between energy and the economy

All manufactured goods are made and services provided from raw materials that have been manipulated, processed, transported, or otherwise transformed using energy. Indeed, energy consumption and economy activity are highly correlated, as Cleveland et. al. [11] showed in a 1984 cover story for *Science*. (See Figure 1.2.)




Fig. 1.2: The famous graph from Cleveland, et. al. [11] showing the strong correlation between energy consumption and economic activity in the US from 1890 to 1982.
 **** © Somebody. Used by permission. ****

Because of the high correlation between energy consumption and economic activity, it stands to reason that energy shortage relative to demand will hinder economic activity. Of course, there are degrees of shortage. In extreme cases, and in the absence of price controls, goods become hard to find and prices spike as observed in the US during 1970s oil crisis. (See Figure 1.3.)




Fig. 1.3: Gasoline shortages in 1973.[20]

In mild cases, shortage of any good relative to demand leads to rising prices, even when goods remain available. For example, Figure 1.4 shows oil prices (line) and worldwide oil production (vertical bars) before, during, and after the Great Recession. Demand for oil increased steadily in the early 2000s due to worldwide economic growth, and production mostly kept pace through early 2005. However, demand continued to increase while production flat-lined from early 2005 through late 2007, leading to a steep price increase. From late 2007 through the end of 2008, the small amount of remaining reserve oil production capacity was brought online, but it was too little, too late. Prices spiked above \$130/barrel in mid-2007. The Great Recession reduced demand slightly (by about 2 Mb/day) and the price collapsed to about \$40/barrel. Thereafter, demand and price rose to their previous levels as the world pulled out of the Great Recession. In the years since 2008, oil production has risen slightly past the previous record highs as additional production capacity has come online.

In both cases (1970s and 2000s), significant slowing of economic activity (recessions) followed the oil shortages and prices spikes. These were not isolated cases.




Fig. 1.4: Oil prices (left axis, data points) and production (right axis, vertical bars).
© Rune Likvern, <http://www.fractionalflow.com>. Used by permission.

Hamilton noted that 10 of the 11 US postwar recessions involved the same pattern.[21, p. 45] It is clear that there is a correlation between energy consumption and economic activity.

But, what are the dynamics that cause economic slowdowns to follow energy price spikes? When prices rise faster than the cost of production, the profit motive should, according to economic theory, induce new firms to enter the market and established firms to increase production. However, the timing of supply and demand events is crucial. If firms can't or don't increase production to meet demand, prices will remain elevated. Even without increased production, falling demand will bring prices back to earth.

In terms of energy, and oil in particular, the *rate* at which production can be increased is of the utmost importance, and there are physical and technological limits. Consider this series of thought experiments: We know that increasing the worldwide oil production rate by, say, 20% involves finding additional oil deposits, drilling additional wells, installing new pumps, and expanding transport and delivery infrastructure worldwide. In 1960, would it have been possible to achieve such an increase over a span of 5 years? Yes. In fact, the worldwide oil production rate increased at a faster rate during the 1960s. There was enough oil in the ground, and the economy could absorb the demand for additional steel, vehicles, energy, etc. required to emplace the required infrastructure. The impact on the financial system was minimal, because the cost of materials, equipment, labor, and energy was spread out over a long-enough timeframe (in this thought experiment, 5 years). But, in 1960 could the oil production rate have been increased by 20% in 3 months? No. There was enough oil in the ground, but it would have been practically impossible to

manufacture, transport, and put into service all the necessary capital in such a short time. Biophysical constraints limit the rate at which oil production can be increased. What about 2 years? Probably not. It might have been physically possible, but the financial cost would have been too much to bear over such a short timeframe, and the profit motive would evaporate.

This thought experiment shows that time constraints, layered upon physical and technological constraints, are the ties that bind the financial to the biophysical. Put another way, time constraints are the point at which the economy becomes coupled to the biosphere.

In economic terms, biophysical constraints reduce the price elasticity of supply: the percent change in supply for a one percent change in price during a given period of time.⁵ Figure 1.4 shows that a *very large* percentage change in the price of oil was required to increase production by only a *very small* percentage in the 2005–2008 timeframe. World oil production rose from 78 million barrels per day to 86 million barrels per day, an increase of only 10%.^[22] However, the inflation-adjusted price of oil increased 260%, from around \$35 to a peak of \$126 per barrel (in constant 2010 USD). Thus, the supply of oil is nearly perfectly price inelastic; its short-run (2005–2008) price elasticity of supply is only 0.04.⁶ Since 2010, the price of oil has remained over \$80 per barrel, suggesting that production cannot increase quickly enough relative to demand to bring prices back down to historical levels. Persistently high prices for such an important commodity suggest very real limits to production; supply is constrained relative to demand.

In these circumstances, oil supply is said to be very *inelastic* (unresponsive) to price. The observed price inelasticity is caused by the biophysical limits to oil production discussed above. Nothing, not even historically-high prices, can induce producers to increase the rate of supply in the short term (say, a 5-year time span), because it is physically impossible to do so. In 2008, the world was running at full oil production capacity, but economies demanded more! Because it was physically impossible to meet that demand, prices spiked.

But, what caused the recession that followed? Recently, a few authors have found that *energy cost share*, the fraction of GDP spent on energy, is an explanatory variable for these dynamics.⁷ To our knowledge, Bashmakov was the first to identify a long-

⁵ The mathematical definition of elasticity of supply (E_s) is

$$E_s \equiv \frac{\frac{1}{Q} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial t}}{\frac{1}{P} \frac{\partial P}{\partial t}},$$

where Q is quantity of production, P is price, and t is time.

⁶ That is, a 1% change in the oil price will generate only a 0.04% increase in oil supply. A price elasticity of 0.04 is extremely low (inelastic). For comparison, agricultural output is also considered fairly price inelastic in the short-run, but Pandey, et al. estimate the short-run (2-year) price elasticity of supply of Australian agricultural output to be around 0.30.[23, p. 215]

⁷ Mathematically, energy cost share (f_E) is defined as

$$f_E \equiv \frac{1}{GDP} \sum_i P_i Q_i,$$

term sustainable range for energy cost share in mature economies.[24] He also showed that developed economies can sustain high total energy cost share for a short period of time (possibly 2–3 years) before recessionary pressures destroy energy demand,⁸ stimulate energy efficiency,⁹ reduce energy prices, and return total energy cost share to its long-term sustainable range. On the other hand, reduction of total energy cost share below a lower bound provides economic stimulus, increases energy demand, provides upward pressure on energy prices, and returns energy cost share to its long-term sustainable range. Bashmakov speculates that “energy affordability thresholds and behavioral constants” are responsible for the stable range of energy cost share over many decades.[24, p. 3585] The long-term stable range for economy-wide energy cost share (which includes all forms of energy, including oil, natural gas, and electricity) is 9–11% for the OECD. For oil only, Murphy and Hall found that the oil cost share threshold that correlates with US recessions is about 5.5%.[25]

The picture emerging from this research shows that the cost share of energy in the economy (and, perhaps more narrowly, oil cost share in the economy) is an important factor in stimulating or restraining economic growth, despite its small numerical value (typically, less than 10%).¹⁰ It appears that the economy-biosphere system has a built-in feedback mechanism that enforces alignment between biophysical limits and the economy.

This may be somewhat surprising in light of mainstream economic theory, which ascribes economic importance based on financial cost share, not biophysical factors. Indeed, the cost share of energy in mature economies is low, and viewing energy as relatively unimportant is justified if one’s view of “importance” is limited to financial information only. But, many have noted that the physical importance of energy to the economy far exceeds its cost share.[27] And, as discussed above, because the economy is coupled to the biophysical world through time constraints (as manifest by the low price elasticity of energy supply), the physical importance of energy far exceeds its financial importance. Ironically, low energy cost share is precisely the condition that has allowed economies to be incredibly productive over the last century.

The connection between energy and the economy may be difficult to see, but, eventually, it becomes impossible to ignore.

where the subscript i indicates types of energy (electricity, gasoline, natural gas, etc.), P indicates the price of energy, Q indicates the quantity of energy purchased within the economy, and GDP is gross domestic product.

⁸ Note that “destruction of energy demand” is accomplished through recession in the short run.

⁹ Like increasing oil production, increasing energy efficiency also has physical and technological limits. Improving energy efficiency is a medium- to long-term process.

¹⁰ Embarking on an economic growth path appears to reduce the energy cost share in an economy from very high values (indicating that nearly all economic activity is focused on procuring energy) to small values that remain within a stable range. For example, Sweden’s energy cost share has stabilized at 12% since 1970, although it was nearly 100% in 1800.[26].

1.3.2 Stalled growth is related to non-renewable stocks

Given the tight coupling between the biospherical world and the economy, especially regarding energy, discussed in Section 1.3.1 above, it is prudent to consider the important economic role of material and energy stocks in the biosphere.

The Best-First Principle [28] indicates that the economy will extract the easiest-to-obtain stocks of mineral and energy resources first. “Best” and “easiest” can be assessed in several ways, but physical factors that make a resource “best” or “easiest to extract” eventually manifest as lower cost. For example, inexpensive-to-obtain West Texas crude oil was extracted before expensive-to-obtain offshore oil. Surface deposits of gold and diamonds are exhausted before subsurface veins and kimberlite pipes are exploited. High-purity mineral deposits are exploited before low-purity deposits. As a result, it becomes more “difficult” to continually increase extraction rates as time proceeds. To continue with our energy example, historical oil production trends reflect these realities. Through time, the annual rate of increase of worldwide oil production has declined from 7.8 %/year to 0.7 %/year. (See Figure 1.5.)




Fig. 1.5: Slowing growth in world oil supply.[29, Figure 3] © Gail Tverberg, <http://www.ourfiniteworld.com>. Used by permission.

It is important to realize that it takes energy to make energy available to society. Oil production requires energy for the ongoing operation of pumps, transportation of crude to the refinery, refinement of crude to useable petroleum products, and transportation of refined products to consumers and firms. In addition, it takes energy to manufacture the wells, pumps, tankers, pipelines, and refineries used in oil production and distribution. Furthermore, it takes energy to use energy. The economy

uses energy to manufacture the machines (vehicles, mostly) that consume refined oil products.

Application of the Best-First Principle to the energy production process indicates that it will take more energy to make the same rate of energy available to society as non-renewable energy resources in the biosphere are depleted. The metric that measures the energy impacts of the Best-First Principle is Energy Return on Investment ($EROI_{soc}$), the ratio of energy provided to society by the energy consumed in making it available.¹¹ As energy resources in the biosphere are depleted, the Best-First Principle entails that $EROI_{soc}$ will decline. Indeed it has.

Despite increasing levels of technological efficiency, for example in consumer goods such as refrigerators and cars, evidence shows that the energy intensity of primary resource extraction, i.e. the energy required to extract raw materials from the environment, has been steadily increasing over the last fifty years.[30–32] Turning again to our oil example, $EROI_{soc}$ for production of US oil has declined from a value of 23 in the 1950s to 10 in 2007.[33, Fig. 2] $EROI_{soc}$ for production of oil worldwide has declined from a value of 35 in 1999 to 18 in 2006.[34, Fig. 1]. In other words, it takes about twice as much energy today than in years past to make a barrel of oil available to society.

Decreasing $EROI_{soc}$ means that less *net energy* is available for downstream uses, given the same gross energy production. If the downward tendency of net energy availability outpaces technological advances in energy efficiency, there may be negative effects on the economic output of the economy. The need to increase productive capacity merely to maintain the current level of production has been termed the “Red Queen syndrome;”¹² we must run faster and faster just to stay in place.[35]

Economic impacts of declining $EROI_{soc}$ are observable over the past few decades. Both Heun and de Wit [36] and King and Hall [37] show that declining $EROI_{soc}$ correlates with higher prices for oil, because declining $EROI_{soc}$ provides upward pressure on production costs, and therefore, prices as time proceeds.

Given constant “effort” for resource extraction, the Best-First Principle can also indicate that the additional physical effort required to extract increasingly-marginal resources will lead to decreased extraction rates. The early 19th century economist David Ricardo applied this principle to the theory of land rents. As population increases, the demand for food will increase. Because arable land is not reproducible,

¹¹ Energy return on investment ($EROI_{soc}$) at the societal level is defined as

$$EROI_{soc} \equiv \frac{\dot{E}_a}{\dot{E}_c},$$

where \dot{E}_a is the rate of energy made available to society in MJ/year and \dot{E}_c is the rate of energy consumed in the energy production process in MJ/year. Note that this definition of $EROI_{soc}$ is flow based. Other definitions of $EROI$ are accounted over the full lifetime of a project, e.g., comparing the lifetime electricity generation of a wind turbine to the energy required in its manufacture (including extraction of raw materials), installation, operation, and decommission.

¹² Of course, in any deck of cards there are two Red Queens. In Section 8.2.2, we discuss the need to increasingly divert production to maintain levels of capital stock.

less-productive land will be utilized for crops. These factors lead to increasing profits accruing to owners of the best land.

In the energy markets, recent increases in unconventional oil production (from tar sands and shale) have been made possible by new extraction and refining technologies. But most unconventional oil production is accompanied by the same or lower $EROI_{soc}$ compared to conventional crude oil production. Furthermore, similar to farming marginal land, today's unconventional oil comes from "marginal" locations and is more expensive to produce than the crude of yesteryear. Consequently, oil prices must remain high for unconventional production to remain financially feasible into the foreseeable future. Unfortunately, Section 1.3.1 showed that high energy prices can lead to high energy cost share in the economy and recessionary pressure.

The fact that shortages of crude oil provide incentives for technological advancements that bring unconventional production online appears, at first glance, to be a good thing. However, energy substitutions are beneficial to society in the long run only when the $EROI_{soc}$ of the substitute is equal to or higher than the original. Thus, the benefits of unconventional oils are modest, at best, when the high financial and energy costs of production are considered.

That said, transitions to new sources of energy will be a feature of the economy in the age of resource depletion. But, there is evidence of limits to energy substitution at the macroeconomic level. Pelli, in a study of 21 countries found that clean¹³ and dirty¹⁴ inputs to electricity production are complementary (as opposed to substitutable).[38] His conclusion is dire:

On the one hand, according to the model, if we keep producing electricity using dirty inputs, we head toward an environmental disaster. On the other hand, looking at the empirical results, it seems impossible to stop producing electricity with polluting resources. The policy implication of this paper thus, seems to be that we need more important subsidies to research, as fast as possible, and high carbon taxes combined with a complete halt of the growth rate of the production of electricity. In this way, according to the model, we may be able to avoid an environmental disaster.[38, p. 25]

In a meta-analysis of 15 papers that studied the economic evidence for macro-substitutability among factors of production (materials, capital, labor, and energy), de Wit et. al. [39] found that the elasticity of substitution was below unity for all combinations of factors of production. Furthermore, they argue that,

[because all of the] results show elasticity of substitution below unity, none of the factor inputs are perfectly substitutable, and all tend toward complementarity in varying degrees. Such results suggest that transitions from one production or consumption structure to another can be disruptive and that the transitions need to be modeled dynamically to the extent possible.[39, p. 8]

The challenges of energy substitutions are highlighted when examining the financial situation of oil producers. Figure 1.6 shows that despite the recent increase in oil

¹³ Nuclear, conventional hydroelectric power, wood and waste biomass, geothermal, solar/photovoltaic, and wind.

¹⁴ Coal, petroleum, natural gas, and other gasses.

production rate and continued high prices, the free cash flow¹⁵ of independent oil producers is negative. This situation implies that capital investments are unproductive to date. It remains to be seen how independent producers can continue advancing the oil production rate (which implies capital investment) while their free cash flow is negative. One possible cure for negative free cash flow is higher oil prices. But higher oil prices will lead to increasing energy cost share, and we saw in Section 1.3.1 that high energy cost share provides recessionary pressure.




Fig. 1.6: Oil company free cash flow.[40] **** Obtain updated chart from Steve Kopits. **** © Somebody. Used by permission. ****

All of this comes about simply because it is more physically “difficult,” and, as a consequence, more financially expensive to extract oil today than it was just a few decades ago. It is more difficult to obtain oil today because we have depleted the stocks of easy-to-obtain crude oil from the biosphere. And, the remaining stocks are either lower quality (e.g., shale) or further away (e.g., deeper offshore).

We contend that similar dynamics will apply to any non-renewable material (e.g., copper, fish, soil, timber) or energy stock (natural gas, hydro dam sites) in the biosphere for which substitution is difficult. Using oil as our example, we observe that stocks of natural capital, especially energy resources, have significant economic

¹⁵ Free cash flow is defined as the cash produced by a firm’s operations less the cost of expanding its asset base. Free cash flow is different from profit, and is thought to be a more-reliable indicator of the ability of a firm to produce profit.

implications. Both the declining *quantity* and the diminishing *quality* of remaining non-renewable biosphere stocks are contributing to the slowdown of growth in mature economies discussed at the outset of this chapter.

Stocks of another sort also play a role in the slowdown of growth experienced by mature economies, because they are important drivers of material and energy consumption. In the next section, we turn our attention away from the biosphere toward the economy and its stock of capital.

1.3.3 Stalled growth is related to capital stock

Capital is extremely valuable and, in most cases, essential to production processes: machines reduce per-unit costs of production; buildings provide space to work and protection for capital; roads provide networks for vehicular transport of raw materials, finished goods, and capital itself; and computers enhance the efficiency of workers and enable technological breakthroughs. There are several types of capital flows to and from its stock in the economy. We use the term “emplacement” to denote a flow of capital into the economy, for example when a new machine is put into service, when a new building is constructed, or when a new road is opened. “Depreciation” is normal wear-and-tear experienced by capital, a type of outflow of capital from the economy. Financial depreciation involves the write-off of a percentage of the value of capital. Physical depreciation involves wear and tear of parts within or sections of the capital. Financial depreciation usually occurs faster than physical depreciation. “Maintenance” is servicing of capital to overcome the effects of physical depreciation. “Disposal” is the physical outflow of capital from the economy to the biosphere upon removal from service. Capital “formation” is the rate of net addition to capital stock in the economy, the difference between inflows and outflows during a time interval. Traditionally, stocks and flows of capital are measured by currency units, \$ and \$/year, respectively. However, we argue later (Section 8.2) that a physical basis for capital accounting is also warranted.

It is important to note that it takes materials and energy to manufacture and emplace capital at its point of use. Furthermore, once emplaced, capital consumes energy to process raw materials into intermediate and finished products and for its own maintenance. The energy required to manufacture and emplace capital (including all upstream processes) is called *embodied* energy. In addition to capital, energy is embodied in all manufactured materials and products.¹⁶ The ratio of energy embodied in products to their price is the energy *intensity* of output (ε , in units of J/\$).¹⁷ Both embodied energy and energy intensity are key metrics for understanding the economy. To first approximation, energy embodied in capital provides an estimate of the energy needed for replacement. The distribution of energy intensity across products and sectors provides a picture of energy demands caused by consumption.

¹⁶ See Chapter 5 for more details on embodied energy.

¹⁷ See Chapter 7 for more details on energy intensity.

Most capital (especially machines) is considerably more expensive than the individual products it makes. So, it takes significant financial resources (relative to sales) to purchase and emplace capital. Capital is so beneficial (i.e., productive in the economic sense), that firms pursue and obtain debt financing to cover large capital expenses. In the case of public goods like roads, bridges, and utilities, governments pursue debt financing via municipal bonds. The long-term financial obligations associated with capital financing mean that the capital is expected to be in service for at least the repayment period of the debt, usually much longer.

The long-term commitment to capital and production means that emplacement of capital is a bond, a claim on future raw material and energy *consumption*. And, it is an assurance of raw material and energy *extraction* from the biosphere for many years to come. Furthermore, extant productive capital stock can't be fed just any material or energy; capital is designed to work with only certain types of materials and energy. An auto body panel stamping machine is designed to form steel, perhaps even a specific grade or alloy of steel; feeding plastic won't do. The machine likely runs on electricity; feeding gasoline won't do.

Thus, the stock of capital in the economy is an important driver of not only the rate but also the type of material and energy flows from the biosphere. The emplacement of productive capital "locks in" demand for specific types of materials and energy for a long time to come. As such, long-term commitments associated with emplaced capital provide limits to the rate at which society can effect transitions to different raw materials and energy sources. Again, we observe tight coupling between the economy and the biosphere!

Given the discussion in Section 1.3.2 regarding the economic dynamics of biophysical limits to raw material and energy extraction, we see that expansion of an economy's capital stock may increase GDP in the short run, but it also "locks in" future material and energy demands from the biosphere. These "locked in" demands bring the economy closer to the biophysical extraction limits that will eventually lead to economic slowdown.

Paradoxically, and contrasting with mainstream policy prescriptions, expansion of the stock of capital in the economy can contribute to the ultimate slowdown of economic growth.

1.4 Consumption-driven solutions are unsustainable

In Section 1.3.3 above, we noted that today's consumption-enhancing policies have the side-effect of increasing many material and energy flow rates into the economy. Thus, today's policies also hasten the day when we reach binding biophysical constraints due to resource depletion. Unfortunately, biophysical limits are not included in the mainstream economic thinking and modeling that informs today's policy

decisions.¹⁸ Three factors, in combination, are vitally important but nearly-always ignored: (1) the economy is tightly coupled to the biosphere, (2) there are physical and technological limits to the rate at which materials and energy can be extracted from the biosphere, and (3) today's emplacement of manufactured capital locks in tomorrow's material and energy demands for both operation and maintenance of that capital. Set against the backdrop of Section 1.3, we see that consumption-enhancing policies are ineffective, because of the biophysical limits that ultimately constrain the scale of the economy.

In short, the economic analyses that support consumption-driven policies are incomplete, and consumption-driven economic growth is ultimately unsustainable.

Adoption of consumption-enhancing policies when society is already encountering resource depletion constraints will result in see-saw economic performance. In fact, we may have already entered a regime of boom-bust economic dynamics, because of a binding constraint for oil extraction rate as discussed in Section 1.3. In the face of see-saw dynamics, it is difficult to make wise and insightful long-term investment or policy decisions, because you're perpetually recovering from the most-recent bust.

In the age of resource depletion, we need to move beyond GDP. These dynamics should cause us to measure and report the material and energy demands that products and capital stock make upon the biosphere. We should know these factors in *physical* as well as financial terms, for the constraints of the physical world lead to problems in the economy. These data should be available routinely from a centralized location.

This is the end of an era. In mature economies, consumption-enhancing economic policies can no longer guarantee growth of living standards and well-being. But, the mainstream is blind to what should be done instead.

1.5 Change is needed!

The fact that we (as a society) do not include exogenous, biophysical factors in economic decision-making indicates that we do not fully understand how the real economy operates. Society is ignorant of the role that natural and manufactured¹⁹ capital together play in both sustaining today's economy and constraining future economic prospects and choices. At present, markets are virtually the only tool at our disposal to help us understand the characteristics of the real economy. What benefits do markets provide? Markets are, at least in economic theory, extremely efficient allocators of resources, provided that all relevant information is available to market participants. Mainstream economic theory holds that prices are the mechanism by which signals of value are communicated to sellers and buyers: sellers receive information about how goods are valued by consumers, and buyers receive information about the cost of materials accrued by producers.

¹⁸ More on the problematic nature of this oversight can be found in Chapter 2.

¹⁹ Manufactured capital presupposes the existence of significant levels of human and social capital.

In the age of resource depletion, are price signals sufficient to indicate shortages, especially of important and difficult-to-substitute resources? It appears that some signals are getting through. Heun and de Wit [36] showed that scarcity (as indicated by low $EROI_{soc}$) correlates with higher oil prices. And, higher prices spur energy efficiency improvements.[41]

However, the market's price mechanism may not be enough. We showed in Section 1.3.1 that the physical importance of scarce and difficult-to-substitute resources (e.g., oil) far exceeds cost share in the economy, suggesting that prices alone cannot provide comprehensive signals of importance to producers and consumers. Consequently, producers and consumers participate in the market with incomplete information. This is a serious problem, because the allocative efficiency of markets is predicated upon correct and complete information being available to market participants.

Furthermore, a good must be owned before it can be sold. Thus, prices cannot be set and market value cannot be determined for goods that are not considered "property," such as clean water, clean air, and other "ecosystem services." In addition, today's markets are simply incapable of deciding important issues such as the optimal scale (size) of the economy relative to the biosphere. (See Section 2.2.4.)

In the age of resource depletion, the allocative efficiency of markets is attractive. Indeed, life would be better if the markets could simply and automatically shift supply and demand away from binding biophysical constraints when they are encountered. But, lack of information in today's markets leads us to argue that they are not up to the task. Today's markets are a poor choice for allocative decisions about scarce and difficult-to-substitute resources (such as oil) or non-property goods (such as clean air, clean water, and other ecosystem services).

What additional information would be helpful? We contend that detailed information about energy, embodied energy, and energy intensity would be a good place to start. We, as a society, routinely account and publish data on energy flow rates only.²⁰ We do not, however, routinely update energy *intensity*²¹ estimates (ϵ) and, therefore, we have little idea of where energy is embodied in our capital stock and in the products we consume. Furthermore, when energy intensity (ϵ) of products is estimated, it does not account for the energy embodied in our stock of capital and is therefore in error.²²

We suggest that all of this information (economic, material, and energy indicators) should be collated by a single agency and reported from a single location. Doing so will provide convenience and consistency and indicate the interconnectness of the economy and the biosphere to both policymakers and researchers.

We understand that these suggested changes will be both revolutionary in scope and challenging to implement politically. Therefore, we would do well to be sure of our direction. We would do well to put ourselves on rigorous and firm theoretical

²⁰ Energy consumption rates are routinely published by the US Energy Information Agency (EIA) and the International Energy Agency (IEA).

²¹ Estimates of energy intensity are not included in systems of national accounts. And, such work is rarely undertaken by academics.[42, 43]

²² See Section 8.2 for our suggested remedy.

ground *before* proceeding toward implementation. The role of this book is to provide just that: a rigorous theoretical framework for a better system of national accounts, one that goes beyond GDP and one that is relevant to the age of resource depletion.

Until these crucial pieces of information are routinely available in a centralized location within a rigorous theoretical framework, society will be unable to properly frame and conceptualize the “problem” of “stalling” growth. Until this information is available to markets, investment, consumption, and policy decisions cannot lead to socially optimal outcomes.

References

- [1] Wendell Berry. The whole horse: Agrarianism is a culture at the same time as it is an economy. *Resurgence*, (188):26–31, May/June 1998.
- [2] OECD. *OECD Economic Outlook, Volume 2014 Issue 1*, volume 2014 of *OECD Economic Outlook*. OECD Publishing, June 2014.
- [3] Congressional Budget Office. The budget and economic outlook: 2014 to 2024. Technical Report 4869, February 2014.
- [4] World Bank. GDP per capita (current US\$). <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD>, 24 August 2014.
- [5] Julian Simon. *The State of Humanity*. Wiley-Blackwell, 1 edition edition, January 1996.
- [6] Tyler Cowen. *The Great Stagnation: How America Ate All the Low-Hanging Fruit of Modern History, Got Sick, and Will(Eventually) Feel Better*. Dutton Adult, June 2011.
- [7] Brink Lindsey. Why growth is getting harder. Technical report, Cato Institute.
- [8] Robert U Ayres and Benjamin S Warr. *The Economic Growth Engine: How Energy and Work Drive Material Prosperity*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK, 2010.
- [9] Kenneth E Boulding. The economics of the coming spaceship earth. *Environmental quality in a growing economy*, 2:3–14, 1966.
- [10] Roger Boyd. *Energy and the Financial System: What Every Economist, Financial Analyst, and Investor Needs to Know*. Springer, New York, 2013.
- [11] Cutler J Cleveland, Robert Costanza, and Charles A S Hall. Energy and the US Economy: a Biophysical Perspective. *Science*, 225(31 August):890–897, 1984.
- [12] Herman E Daly. Steady-state economics. *San Francisco*, 1977.
- [13] Blair Fix. *Rethinking Growth Theory From a Biophysical Perspective*. (In Press). Springer, New York, 2014.
- [14] Charles A. S. Hall and Kent A. Klitgaard. *Energy and the wealth of nations: understanding the biophysical economy*. Springer, New York, 2011.
- [15] Steven Kopits. Oil: What Price Can America Afford? Research note, Douglas-Westwood Energy Business Analysts, New York, 22 June 2009.
- [16] Marina Fischer-Kowalski and Walter Hüttler. Society’s metabolism. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 2(4):107–136, 1999.

- [17] Robert U. Ayres. Turning Point: The End of the Growth Paradigm. Working Paper 96/49/EPS, INSEAD's Centre for the Management of Environmental Resource, July 1996.
- [18] United Nations, European Commission, International Monetary Fund, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, and World Bank. *System of national accounts 2008*. United Nations, New York, 2009.
- [19] United Nations University International Human Dimensions Programme and United Nations Environment Programme. *Inclusive Wealth Report 2012: Measuring Progress Toward Sustainability*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, July 2012.
- [20] David Falconer. Gasoline shortage 06/1973. <http://arcweb.archives.gov/arc/action/ExternalIdSearch?id=548053>, June 1973.
- [21] James D Hamilton. Oil Prices, Exhaustible Resources, and Economic Growth. In *Handbook on Energy and Climate Change*, pages 29–63. Edward Elgar, 2013.
- [22] EIA. International Energy Statistics, <http://www.eia.gov/countries> accessed 4/17/2014. Technical report, US Energy Information Administration, 2014.
- [23] S. Pandey, R. R. Piggott, and T. G. MacAulay. The elasticity of aggregate australian agricultural supply: Estimates and policy implications. *Australian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 26(3):202–219, 1982.
- [24] Igor Bashmakov. Three Laws of Energy Transitions. *Energy Policy*, 35(7):3583–3594, July 2007.
- [25] David J Murphy and Charles A S Hall. Energy return on investment, peak oil, and the end of economic growth. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1219(1):52–72, February 2011.
- [26] David I Stern and Astrid Kander. The Role of Energy in the Industrial Revolution and Modern Economic Growth. *The Energy Journal*, 33(3):125–152, July 2012.
- [27] Robert U. Ayres, Jeroen C.J.M. van den Bergh, Dietmar Lindenbergerf, and Benjamin Warr. The Underestimated Contribution of Energy to Economic Growth. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 27:79–88, 2013.
- [28] Cutler J. Cleveland. Natural Resource Quality. In Robert Costanza, editor, *The Encyclopedia of Earth, Energy*. 2008.
- [29] Gail Tverberg. Our Oil Problems are Not Over! <http://ourfiniteworld.com/2013/10/02/our-oil-problems-are-not-over/>, 2 October 2013.
- [30] Charles A S Hall, Cutler J Cleveland, and Robert Kaufman. *Energy and Resource Quality: The Ecology of the Economic Process*. John Wiley & Sons, 1986.
- [31] Gavin M Mudd. The environmental sustainability of mining in australia: key mega-trends and looming constraints. *Resources Policy*, 35(2):98–115, 2010.
- [32] Adam R Brandt. Oil depletion and the energy efficiency of oil production: The case of california. *Sustainability*, 3(10):1833–1854, 2011.
- [33] Megan C Guilford, Charles A S Hall, Pete O Connor, and Cutler J Cleveland. A New Long Term Assessment of Energy Return on Investment (EROI) for

- U.S. Oil and Gas Discovery and Production. *Sustainability*, 3(10):1866–1887, October 2011.
- [34] Natha Gagnon, Charles A. S. Hall, and Lysle Brinker. A Preliminary Investigation of Energy Return on Energy Investment for Global Oil and Gas Production. *Energies*, 2:490–503, July 2009.
- [35] John E Ross. The red queen syndrome: Running faster–going nowhere? *Environment and Development: Building Sustainable Societies. Lectures from the 1987 Summer Forum at the University of Wisconsin-Madison*, page 67, 1988.
- [36] Matthew Kuperus Heun and Martin de Wit. Energy Return on (Energy) Invested (EROI), Oil Prices, and Energy Transitions. *Energy Policy*, 40(C):147–158, January 2012.
- [37] Carey W King and Charles A S Hall. Relating Financial and Energy Return on Investment. *Sustainability*, 3(10):1810–1832, October 2011.
- [38] Martino Pelli. The Elasticity of Substitution between Clean and Dirty Inputs in the Production of Electricity. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Sustainable Resource Use and Economic Dynamics (SURED 2012)*, Ascona, Switzerland, 4–7 June 2012.
- [39] Martin de Wit, Matthew Kuperus Heun, and Douglas Crookes. An overview of salient factors, relationships, and values to support integrated energy-economic systems dynamic modelling. Working Paper 02/13, Department of Economics and the Bureau for Economic Research at the University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch, South Africa, February 2013.
- [40] Steven Kopits. Guest blog: Hamilton has it right on oil. <http://blogs.platts.com/2014/07/30/peak-oil-forecasts/>, 30 July 2014.
- [41] Bill Vlasic and Jaclyn Trop. Vehicle Fuel Efficiency Reaches a High, Nearing Goal for 2016. New York Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/11/business/energy-environment/fuel-economy-hits-six-year-high.html>, 11 September 2013.
- [42] Clark W Bullard and Robert A Herendeen. The energy cost of goods and services. *Energy Policy*, 3(4):268–278, 1975.
- [43] Carnegie Mellon University Green Design Institute. Economic Input-Output Life Cycle Assessment (EIO-LCA), US 1997 Industry Benchmark model. <http://www.eiolca.net>, Accessed 1 January 2014.

Chapter 2

Accounting for the wealth of nations

Essentially, all models are wrong, but some are useful. [1, p. 424]
—George E. P. Box

The Introduction (Chapter 1) opened with (a) the observation that economic growth has slowed in mature economies of the world and (b) the forecast that growth will remain slow for the foreseeable future. This is seen as a problem, because robust economic growth is thought to be a necessary condition for maintaining growth in living standards. The observation and forecast are widely shared among mainstream economic analysts who blame stagnation in the conventional factors of production (manufactured capital, labor, and technology—all endogenous to the economy) for the bleak situation. Proposed solutions to this economic problem include investment in manufactured capital and technology (supply-side policies) or boosting consumption (demand-side policies).

We also presented evidence for an additional, biophysical reason for the slowdown: the economy is tightly coupled to the biosphere, and we are depleting stocks of natural capital, particularly stores of energy. As these natural resources are depleted, they become more expensive to produce, and economic growth suffers. We suggested the startling notion that because standard economic theory does not perceive the slowdown in biophysical terms, the mainstream prescription of investment in manufactured capital could fail as it locks in future demand for natural resources that become ever more expensive to extract. Thus, policy prescriptions based on the conventional wisdom can, unwittingly, exacerbate economic slowdown in the long-term.

How could it be that mainstream, growth-targeted economic policies actually contribute to slowdown? Could it be that the mainstream model is incomplete or ill-suited for the age of resource depletion?

Before exploring these questions, we note that models (economic and otherwise) are informed by metaphors, simplified ways of explaining and framing the world in which we live. Looking back, we note that the Introduction (Chapter 1) contained much metaphorical language.¹ We spoke of “driving” economic growth and of “fueling” the “economic engine.” And, we said that the economy has “stalled.” Society’s

¹ The use of mechanical metaphor language in Chapter 1 was deliberate decision to bring attention to the dominant metaphors of the day.

manner of speaking about the economy reveals that the dominant mainstream economic metaphor is mechanical. In this chapter, we explore how a machine metaphor for the economy came to be and suggest that a new metaphor can inform development of national accounting that is appropriate for the age of resource depletion.

2.1 Three eras

There have been three eras of the relationship between the biosphere and the economy in recent human experience. We'll call them the era of abundance, the era of energy constraints, and the age of resource depletion. The era of abundance began with the dawn of the industrial revolution and continued to the oil embargoes of the 1970s;² the era of energy constraints covers the time between the oil embargoes and the runup to the Great Recession;³ and, today, we are entering the age of resource depletion.⁴ Each era is associated with a metaphor that explains the economy, an economic model that guides national accounting, and an economic production function that describes output (usually measured by GDP). From one era to the next, there is revision and refinement of the human understanding of the relationship between the biosphere and the economy. Each revision of understanding is informed by a change in the dominant metaphor that explains the economy. Each transition brings changes in national accounting⁵ and modifications to the production function.

Today, we stand at the dawn of the age of resource depletion, and it is an important time to review past eras and anticipate changes ahead. By doing so, we can anticipate some important questions: What new economic metaphors and models are appropriate for the age of resource depletion? How should we now measure and model economic growth? And, what changes should occur in national accounting?

2.1.1 *Era of abundance*

The defining characteristic of the era of abundance was plentiful natural resources relative to economic demand. Society had not moved too far along the path foretold by the Best-First Principle (Section 1.3.2), and materials and energy were easy to obtain from the biosphere. On the global scale, ecosystem services, particularly

² Roughly speaking, 1850–1973, with pauses for the World Wars.

³ Approximately, 1973–2003.

⁴ From 2003 to the present.

⁵ In this section, the term “national accounting” does not connote the Systems of National Accounts (SNAs) that are necessarily financial in nature. Rather, we’re using “national accounting” to indicate accounting of a variety of quantities at the national level in both physical as well as financial terms, including energy production and consumption, material extraction rates, and ecosystem services.

waste assimilation, were sufficient for the scale of the economy.⁶ In this era, the abundance of natural resources made industrialization possible in many economies. The binding economic constraint was the availability of manufactured capital and/or labor. Expanding the stock of capital or the pool of labor generated, to a greater or lesser extent, economic growth.

In the era of abundance, the dominant metaphor for the economy was the “clockwork” mechanism from classical physics. By associating complex phenomena with something simpler and well-understood, all metaphors help us make sense of the world around us, and the clockwork metaphor signaled that the economy was as predictable and regular as time itself.

The traditional model of the economy (Figure 2.1) was unashamedly mechanistic and was based on classical physics’ models of mechanical equilibrium which arose from the “clockwork universe.” [4–6] In the traditional model, goods and services flow from the production sector to the household sector (consumption) in exchange for payments (spending). Factors of production are sold by the household sector to the production sector in exchange for wages and rents (income). Attention is primarily focused on the circular, clock-like flow of money (dashed line).

The traditional model is reflected in the economic production functions that arose in the era of abundance. Economic output (y) was deemed to be a function of the factors of production (manufactured capital, k , and labor, l) and augmenting technology (A) in the Cobb-Douglas equation [8]:

$$y = Ak^\alpha l^\beta, \quad (2.1)$$

where α is the output elasticity of capital, β is the output elasticity of labor, and $\alpha + \beta = 1$ if constant returns to scale are assumed.⁷

In the era of abundance, the clockwork metaphor, the traditional model, and the Cobb-Douglas production function were all, in some sense, appropriate: capital and labor were the key drivers of economic performance. And, national accounting reflected the binding constraints of the time. Economist Simon Kuznets led the development of the first official national accounting tables in response to the extreme unemployment of the Depression. The first US national accounts (published in 1947)

⁶ There are notable *local* exceptions such as the lethal 1952 smog cloud in London, caused by coal-burning power station emissions, that, according to some, claimed as many as 12,000 lives [2, 3]; pollution in the Cuyahoga river and Love Canal; and the legendary smog problems in Los Angeles.

⁷ Constant Elasticity of Substitution (CES) production functions also appeared in this era. CES productions functions have the form

$$y = A[\delta_1 k^\rho + (1 - \delta_1)l^\rho]^{\frac{1}{\rho}},$$

where δ_1 is the factor share for capital (k), $\rho \equiv \frac{1}{1-\sigma}$, and σ is the elasticity of substitution between capital (k) and labor (l). [8] Although the form of the CES model is different from the Cobb-Douglas equation, the functional relationship remains the same: output (y) is a function of manufactured capital (k) and labor (l) only.




Fig. 2.1: In the traditional economic model, the economy is represented as a circular flow of goods and services between two sectors. Producers manufacture goods and services by taking in labor and capital. Consumers exchange labor for wages which are used to purchase the goods and services of the producers. There are no connections between the economy and the biosphere. We use energy circuit diagrams to represent the flow of materials, energy and information.[7]

were focused primarily on financial quantifications of flows of capital and labor among sectors of the economy.⁸ And, they still are.

Today, with the benefit of hindsight, we note that the clockwork metaphor, the traditional model of the economy, and the first US national accounts precluded any sort of connection between the economy and the biosphere.⁹ Thus, only the internal dynamics of the economy were important.¹⁰ By implication, the clockwork

⁸ Natural resources, including energy, were, and still are, included in Systems of National Accounts as *costs*. They are counted in financial units (dollars and yen), not physical units (barrels, tonnes, and gigajoules).

⁹ To this day, US national accounts still do not include interactions between the economy and the biosphere.

¹⁰ Because Figure 2.1 has no flow of energy into the economy, we may consider the traditional model of the economy to be a perpetual motion machine of the *first kind*: the economy works without the input of energy, thus violating the First Law of Thermodynamics—the law of conservation of energy.[9]

metaphor and traditional model signaled that natural resources were unimportant, effectively assuming that the biosphere would always provide. If a particular natural resource became scarce, substitution to a different, more-readily-available resource would be made. Wastes were quantitatively unimportant, effectively assuming that the biosphere had infinite assimilative capacity. Economic forces, through prices and market mechanisms, were thought to effectively guide any necessary transition within the economy. With the clockwork metaphor, physical constraints imposed by the biosphere on allocation of resources, distribution of outputs, and scale of the economy were outside the scope of economic discussion.[10]

In short, the clockwork metaphor and the traditional model of the economy told us that the clockwork-economy could and would carry on.

But, what happens when availability of manufactured capital and labor are no longer the binding constraints on an economy? The answer arrived with the era of energy constraints.

2.1.2 Era of energy constraints

It came as a severe shock to the economic establishment that energy constraints brought about by the oil embargos of the early 1970s wrought such economic havoc.[11, p. 3] The global economy “stalled” due to scarcity of a single, highly-constrained resource relative to demand: fuel. How could it be that economists were taken by surprise?

Looking back, we realize that all metaphors inform our thinking about the real world, but, consequently, they also constrain our ability to frame reality. Erroneously, we can mistake the model-metaphor for reality, and we interact with reality in the same manner as we interact with the abstract objects of our models.¹¹ Classical physics told us the universe was *like* clockwork, so we began to interact with the universe as if it *really were* clockwork. During the era of abundance, economists, guided by the clockwork metaphor and traditional model, were focused on manufactured capital and labor only; they ignored the physical role that energy plays in the economy.

The defining characteristic of the era of energy constraints was the scarcity, relative to demand, of fossil fuel energy resources, particularly oil. (See Section 1.3.1.) These energy constraints on western economies were caused not by the depletion of oil reserves but by withholding oil supply for political objectives¹² or other geopolitical events.¹³

¹¹ This fallacious process is known as *reification*; the making (*facere*, Latin) real of something (*res*, Latin) that is merely an idea. Alfred Whitehead refers to this as *the fallacy of misplaced concreteness*. [12]

¹² For example, the October 1973–March 1974 oil embargo against Canada, Japan, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States was a response to US decision to supply arms to Israel during the Yom Kippur War.

¹³ For example, the 1979 Iranian revolution disrupted oil supply.

If they didn't already know it, many economists and scientists came to realize that energy was required for successful operation of the economic "engine." Some saw that ignoring energy during the era of abundance had been a mistake! The desire to include energy resources in the economic picture spurred the efforts of early (net) energy analysts.[13, 14] Indeed, Figure 1.2 can be seen as an early attempt to understand the role that energy plays in the economy. In the process, a machine metaphor and accompanying engine model for the economy rose to prominence.

The engine model (Figure 2.2) accounts for energy flows from the biosphere to the economy. With the new metaphor, the economy changed from being an *isolated* system (Figure 2.1) to being a *closed* system (Figure 2.2). The importance of input energy was acknowledged, but wastes were still missing. And, the biosphere was positioned as the provider of energy resources, the larder and gas station of the economy.[15]




Fig. 2.2: The machine model of the economy includes flows of energy into the economy from the biosphere. This may be considered a perpetual motion machine of the second kind.

In addition to re-evaluating the economic metaphor, some researchers reconsidered the production function.¹⁴ Energy augmentation of the Cobb-Douglas production function took several forms [16, Equation 1], one of which [17, Equation 3.10] is

$$y = Ak^\alpha l^\beta e^\gamma, \quad (2.2)$$

where e is energy input to the economy,¹⁵ γ is the output elasticity of energy, and $\alpha + \beta + \gamma = 1$ if constant returns to scale are assumed.¹⁶ In addition, a new production function, the LINEar EXponential (LINEX) function, appeared.[22, 25, 26]

$$y = A e \quad (2.3)$$

$$A \equiv e^{a_0 \left[2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{\rho_k} \right) + c_l (\rho_l - 1) \right]} \quad (2.4)$$

In the LINEX function (Equation 2.3), energy (e) is *the only* factor of production. $\rho_k \equiv \frac{k}{1/2(l+e)}$ is a measure of capital deepening, and $\rho_l \equiv \frac{l}{e}$ describes the increase of labor (l) relative to energy (e). When either ρ_k or ρ_l increases, the only factor of production (energy, e) is augmented (A). a_0 and c_l are fitting parameters, and e in Equation 2.4 is the exponential function.

In the era of energy constraints, the machine metaphor, the engine model, and energy-augmented production functions were, arguably, apt for their time: energy *was* the binding constraint on the economy. The appearance of energy in the engine model and energy-augmented production functions (Equations 2.2 and 2.3) was mirrored by international efforts to include energy in national accounting.¹⁷ The International Energy Agency (IEA) “was founded in response to the 1973/4 oil crisis in order to help countries co-ordinate a collective response to major disruptions in oil supply.” [27] One of the primary objectives of the IEA was “to operate a permanent information system on the international oil market.” [27] Today, that “permanent information system” [28] remains one of the most important sources of economy-level energy production and consumption statistics in physical units.¹⁸ And, the IEA’s annual World Energy Outlook series [29] is one of the premier sources

¹⁴ It must be said that the efforts to include energy as anything other than a cost of production remains outside the economic mainstream even today.

¹⁵ There is debate in the literature about quantification of energy input to the economy (e). Most researchers use the thermal equivalent of primary energy.[18–21] Others use useful work obtained by efficiencies from primary exergy.[22]

¹⁶ The Constant Elasticity of Substitution (CES) production function can be augmented with energy in several ways, depending upon the desired nesting of energy (e) relative to the other factors of production (capital, k , and labor, l).[23, 24] Three options exist, but a common approach is:

$$y = A \left\{ \delta [\delta_1 k^{-\rho_1} + (1 - \delta_1) l^{-\rho_1}]^{\rho/\rho_1} + (1 - \delta) e^{-\rho} \right\}^{-1/\rho}.$$

¹⁷ Again, we are using the term “national accounting” not in the sense of Systems of National Accounts but rather in the sense of data collected at the national level.

¹⁸ As opposed to financial units (currency). Physical units include barrels of oil, tonnes of coal, and gigajoule energy values.

of forward-looking analysis on the relationship between energy and the economy. Although physical energy statistics and indicators were not inserted into Systems of National Accounts, the dawn of the era of energy constraints provided the impetus for gathering and disseminating the world's energy data.

Today, with the benefit of hindsight, we note that the machine metaphor and the engine model of the economy continued to ignore the flow of wastes from the economy to the biosphere; the engine model still assumed that the biosphere had infinite assimilative capacity. But, according to the Second Law of Thermodynamics, all real-world processes involve the generation of entropy manifest as the degradation of material and, especially, energy resources.¹⁹ High quality (low entropy) material and energy come in; low quality (high entropy) material and energy go out. Wastes exist! Because the generation of high entropy (low quality) output is a necessary feature of all processes (including economic processes), the generation of wastes is a normal feature of the economy, not an anomaly. The engine model had it wrong.

Furthermore, we see that the machine metaphor and the engine model of the economy were adopted in an era where scarcity of oil supply relative to demand was caused not by the issues associated with the Best-First Principle (Section 1.3.2), but rather by politically-motivated withholding of supply or other geopolitical events. The forward-looking projections from the IEA (and other organizations) continued to assume that there were effectively no physical limitations to increasing the rate of fossil fuel extraction from the biosphere. The presence of natural capital (e.g., oil) was acknowledged, but the quantity of natural capital (e.g., oil remaining underground) was not thought to constrain the extraction rate. In that era, neither the machine metaphor nor engine model deemed that the effects of the Best-First Principle were a factor in economic performance.

In short, the machine metaphor and the engine model of the economy told us that the engine-economy could and would carry on, so long as it was supplied with energy.

But, what happens when the availability of natural resources, especially energy, is no longer merely a political matter? What happens when stocks of natural resources especially energy, are depleted to such an extent that it becomes too expensive for the economy to obtain them?

The answer arrived with the age of resource depletion.

2.1.3 Age of resource depletion

Much of Chapter 1 was spent describing the age of resource depletion, whose defining characteristic is that stocks of natural capital constrain economic growth. The effects of the Best-First Principle (exemplified by decreasing $EROI_{soc}$ for oil) and the limited waste-assimilation capacity of the biosphere relative to the disposal rate of materials

¹⁹ The depiction of the economy in Figure 2.2 can be classified as a perpetual motion machine of the second kind: it perfectly converts energy resources into work (useful energy services) without generating any entropy, in violation of the Second Law of Thermodynamics.

are now affecting the economy in ways they never did before. Richard England puts it this way:

[T]here must arrive a moment in the world's history when natural capital is no longer relatively abundant and human-made [manufactured] capital is no longer relatively scarce. At that moment, aggregate output is no longer constrained by the populations of humans [labor] and their artifacts [manufactured capital] and by the productivity of human effort [A in Equations 2.1 and 2.2]. Rather, the scale of economic activity is constrained by the remaining stock of natural capital and by its productivity. . . . When this moment arrives, a new era of history has begun.[30, p. 430]

Prior to the age of resource depletion, mainstream economists assumed that the ability to increase the rates of extraction of natural capital was not a factor in economic growth. They assumed that the biosphere had infinite assimilative capacity for the physical waste of an economy. But, things have changed. As Richard England said (and we echoed at the end of Section 1.4), “a new era of history has begun.”

When society transitioned from the era of abundance to the era of energy constraints, three important events occurred. (1) The dominant economic metaphor was re-evaluated, and the clockwork metaphor and traditional model (Figure 2.1) were replaced by the machine metaphor and the engine model (Figure 2.2). (2) The production function was modified to include energy as a factor of production. And, (3) national accounting changed: energy indicators and statistics in physical units were collected and disseminated for all countries.

All of which raises the question, how should the transition from the era of energy constraints to the age of resource depletion affect (1) society's dominant metaphors for and models of the economy, (2) the production function, and (3) national accounting? In the next section (2.2), we present a new metaphor, and the heart of this book (Chapters 3–7) provides theoretical grounding for national accounting in the age of resource depletion. The way forward on production functions is beyond the scope of this text.²⁰

2.2 The economy is society's metabolism

In our opinion (and that of several others²¹) an apt metaphor for the economy in the age of resource depletion should provide for robust interaction and suggest tight coupling between the biosphere and the economy. Specifically, it should account for the following facts about real economies. Economies:

1. intake material and energy from the biosphere;
2. exchange materials, energy, and information internally;
3. discharge material and energy wastes to the biosphere;

²⁰ See England [30] for a starting point.

²¹ An incomplete list of authors who are either (a) progenitors for or (b) directly associated with the metabolism metaphor includes Georgescu-Roegen [31], Odum [32], Daly [33], and Hall [34]. Heijman [35], Haberl [36], Fischer-Kowalski [37], Liu and Hanauer [38], and Giampietro [39].

4. are affected by energetic costs;
5. are affected non-linearly by scarcity in the face of low substitutibility;
6. can change non-linearly or in discrete steps with the potential for structural transformation;
7. accumulate embodied energy in material stocks; and
8. maintain organizational structure despite changes in their environment.²²

Metabolisms²³ exhibit the characteristics in the list above. Metabolisms and the organisms they support are intimately connected with the biosphere: they withdraw materials and energy from the biosphere (1), transfer materials and energy internally via metabolic processes (2), and discharge wastes back to the biosphere (3); in fact, their very survival depends on these processes. Extending Figures 2.1 and 2.2 to include the facts in items (1)–(3), we obtain Figure 2.3. Metabolisms are affected by energetic costs (4): an organism that obtains less energy than it expends is doomed. Withholding life-sustaining resources brings drastic, non-linear consequences for any metabolism (5). Metabolisms enable non-linear, structural transformations in their host organisms (e.g., metamorphosis, puberty, and evolution) (6). And, energy absorbed by a metabolism is considered to be “embodied” in the cells of the organism (7). Metabolisms exist in a state of dynamic stability (8), adjusting and readjusting to maintain their internal conditions despite changes in the environment; for a metabolism, equilibrium means death!

The economy is society’s metabolism.

Although we’re not the first to suggest the metabolism metaphor for the economy, we believe that the metabolism metaphor is underutilized on both practical and theoretical levels. On the practical level, the metabolism metaphor is underutilized because Systems of National Accounts, to date, are built upon the clockwork metaphor and traditional model for the economy (Section 2.1.2). This book attempts to correct that oversight by using the metabolism metaphor to develop a rigorous theoretical framework for comprehensive national accounting. (See Chapters 3–7.) On a theoretical level, the metabolism metaphor is underutilized, because, many researchers (with the exception of the authors listed in Footnote 21) use the metabolism metaphor merely as a framing device for analyses of raw material flows into the economy for the purpose of understanding stocks of raw materials in the biosphere.²⁴ Some who employ the metabolism metaphor tend to focus little attention on capital stock

²² We note that several areas of the literature speak to the items in this list. Materials Flow Analysis (MFA) and Economy-Wide Materials Flow Analysis (EW-MFA) stress the importance of material intake by the economy. (See Section 3.5.) The Input-Output (I-O) method highlights the effects of internal exchanges of material and information with economies. (See Chapter 7.) Life-Cycle Assessment (LCA) techniques focus attention on otherwise-neglected wastes. (See Section 7.8.) Net Energy Analysis (NEA) predicts that energy resource scarcity reduces Energy Return on Investment (EROI) and increases energy prices. (See Sections 1.5 and 4.3.) The Energy Input-Output (EI-O) method gives prominence to energetic costs of internal material and energy flows. (See Chapter 7.) And, thermodynamic control-volume modeling describes transient behavior and system transformations. (See Chapters 3–6.)

²³ The Greek root of metabolism (*metabolē*) means “change.”

²⁴ The field most closely associated with the metabolism metaphor is Materials Flow Analysis (MFA). To be fair, materials flow analysts clearly acknowledge that materials flow into the economy




Fig. 2.3: The metabolism model provides a comprehensive view of the economy, fully consistent with the laws of thermodynamics, including degraded resources (waste) expelled to the environment as a necessary consequence of economic activity.

within the economy itself. In effect, this is the same oversight as national accounting: under-appreciation of the important role of capital in determining material and energy demand for its emplacement, use, maintenance, and replacement.

It becomes a vicious cycle. By not accounting for capital stock on a physical basis in national accounting, society is unable to appreciate the important physical role that capital stock plays in the economy (Section 1.3.3). Because society under-appreciates

(minerals and ores, especially), in part, for the purpose of building up stocks of technical infrastructure (buildings), livestock, and people.[37, p. 116] However, there is little emphasis on quantifying *levels* of material stock in *Materials Flow Analysis*, as its name implies. In fact, the equations in MFA [37, Equation 1] are almost always written as

$$\text{inflow} = \text{outflow} + \text{accumulation} ,$$

reflecting the focus on material inflow to the economy. In this book, similar equations (see Equation 3.2) are written as

$$\text{accumulation} = \text{inflow} - \text{outflow} ,$$

thereby focusing on accumulation of stocks within the economy.

the physical role of capital stock in the economy, there is little urgency to begin accounting for manufactured capital on a physical (rather than financial) basis.

We think that a deeper understanding of the metabolism metaphor can serve to both highlight the important physical roles of both resource extraction and manufactured capital stock and provide the basis for a rigorous theoretical framework for comprehensive national accounting. In the following sections, we deepen the metabolism metaphor by considering anabolism (capital formation), catabolism (energy production), autophagy (recycling), and issues of scale.²⁵ Thereafter, we summarize the benefits of the metabolism metaphor for national accounting.

2.2.1 Anabolism (capital formation)

Metabolic processes are classified as anabolic and catabolic (Section 2.2.2). Anabolic processes build up materials within the body (bones, muscles, and other tissues). For example, anabolic steroids are hormones that stimulate the human body's natural muscle and bone growth processes. Anabolic processes are fueled by the breakdown of adenosine triphosphate (ATP), the cellular energy source. Raw materials for anabolic processes are provided by food, which, ultimately, comes from the biosphere.

The economic analog to biological anabolism is capital formation, net addition to the stock of capital (infrastructure, more generally) within a period of time. Traditionally, capital formation is measured in currency units. Thus, capital formation is the financial evidence of the emplacement of manufactured infrastructure. Whereas biological anabolism is fueled by ATP, capital formation is fueled by the energy sector of the economy. The raw material for capital formation comes to the economy from the biosphere.

We discuss extraction and use of materials in Chapter 3 and the importance of capital stock throughout the book.

2.2.2 Catabolism (energy production)

Catabolic processes break down and destroy material stocks within an organism through an oxidation process. At the cellular level, catabolic oxidation releases chemical free energy, some of which synthesizes adenosine triphosphate (ATP), thereby providing fuel to cells. The remainder of the released energy is manifest as waste heat. One of the waste products of cellular catabolism is CO₂. Catabolic processes are part of a chain of material and energy transformations wherein stored chemical energy is converted to useful energy with waste heat and CO₂ as byproducts.

²⁵ For the purposes of this discussion, our focus is on metabolic processes as they occur in eukaryotic animal cells (cells with a nucleus containing genetic material), thereby avoiding complexities associated with organisms that also perform photosynthesis.

The analogy between catabolic processes and energy transformation processes within the economy is striking. Power plants (fired by coal, oil, natural gas, or refined liquid fuels) in either the energy sector or the final consumption sector break down fossil fuels in an oxidation process (combustion) to produce useful energy (typically, electricity or mechanical drive [22]), thereby providing energy to sectors of the economy. Both waste heat and CO_2 are byproducts of combustion, and O_2 is consumed in the process. Energy production in the economy is a chain of material and energy transformations wherein machines and engines convert stored chemical energy to useful energy with waste heat and CO_2 as byproducts.

We focus on energy flows among sectors of the economy in Chapter 4.

2.2.3 Autophagy (recycling)

One catabolic pathway, autophagy, involves the breakdown of damaged, unneeded, or dysfunctional cellular components (proteins and cell organelles) for the purpose of re-use within the organism. Autophagy can be an adaptive response to low calorie intake, promoting cell survival.

Again, the analogy between cellular metabolism and the economy is striking. Whereas cellular autophagy repurposes proteins and cell organelles for re-use by an organism, recycling repurposes degraded yet economically-valuable materials for re-use by the economy. Furthermore, recycling can also be an adaptive response to reduced material and energy inputs. One famous example can be found on the streets of Cuba. In the face of economic sanctions, government restrictions on vehicle purchases, and high import tariffs, automobile imports by Cuba are very low. As a result, Cuba hyper-recycles autos that were imported prior to sanctions and manufactures replacement parts locally. The average lifespan of automobiles has been extended such that an estimated 60,000, pre-1960 cars [40] (so-called “yank tanks”) are in service on the island.²⁶ (See Figure 2.4.)

It's not difficult to imagine that dynamics similar to Cuba's will emerge if the inflow rate of any important natural but recyclable resource is reduced to a trickle by the effects of depletion.²⁷

Regardless of the origin of material constraints, the effect on the economy will be the same: re-use, recycling, and, where possible, substitution to other resources will become increasingly imperative.

We focus on recycling in Section 8.4.

²⁶ Despite the recent change allowing new car purchases by individuals, astronomical import taxes mean that Cuban streets remain populated with vintage 1950s autos.[41]

²⁷ See Section 1.3.2 for a discussion of depletion of a non-recyclable natural resource, oil.



Fig. 2.4: Vintage autos (“yank tanks”) in Cuba (2011). **** © Larry Cowles, <http://lcowlesphotography.wordpress.com>. *Used by permission*. Permission not yet obtained. ****

2.2.4 Issues of scale

The metabolism metaphor brings to light issues of scale (size) for economies and societies. First, scale is directly related to material flow rates. Larger organisms consume food at higher rates than smaller organisms, in part to obtain essential nutrients to replenish cellular structures. Similarly, economies with higher levels of emplaced capital require larger material flow rates to provide raw materials to machines and food to people. (See Section 1.3.3 for more on this topic.)

In Figure 2.5, we see Max Kleiber’s empirically-determined relationship between metabolic rate (heat production, in kcal/day) and animal mass (in kg) plotted on a log-log scale for a variety of animals, from mice to whales. Dashed lines represent theoretical scaling due to either mass (weight) or surface area. The best fit to the data (thick line) passes between the weight and surface area lines.

Kleiber’s law which states this relationship mathematically, is defined as

$$\dot{Q} = q_0 m^{3/4} \quad (2.5)$$

where \dot{Q} is metabolic rate (heat production), m is the mass of the animal, and q_0 is a mass-independent normalization constant. From Equation 2.5, we see that doubling the mass increases the metabolic rate by $2^{3/4} = 1.68$ times. To compensate for higher rates of heat loss due to high surface area-to-volume ratio, small animals have higher metabolic rates and larger food requirements per unit mass.²⁸

If the economy is society’s metabolism and the scale of an organism corresponds to the inventory of capital stock in an economy, the metabolism metaphor suggests

²⁸ On a per-unit-mass basis, Kleiber’s Law becomes




Fig. 2.5: Kleiber's law for metabolic rates (heat production) of different-sized animals.[42, p. 530] Larger animals, as determined by mass, have a higher metabolic rate, but the relationship between mass and metabolic rate is not linear.

that larger economies will require a higher rate of energy supply. In fact, we know this to be true. Built-out, industrialized economies with higher levels of emplaced capital (those with more roads, cars, and buildings) tend to consume energy at a higher rate, both in an absolute sense and on a per-capita basis, compared to developing economies.

2.2.5 Benefits of the metabolism metaphor

The metabolism metaphor is compelling, because it helps us to see more clearly and understand more deeply how the real, biophysical economy operates. But does the metabolism metaphor lead us to a better understanding of the coupling between the

$$\frac{\dot{Q}}{m} = q_0 m^{-1/4}, \quad (2.6)$$

from which it can be seen that larger organisms (larger mass, m) consume less energy per unit mass (\dot{Q}/m), and smaller organisms consume more energy per unit mass.

biosphere and the economy and provide guidance for more-comprehensive national accounting? We think so.

In terms of a better understanding of the economy, the metabolism metaphor teaches us that the economy is a biophysical entity that requires both materials and energy for survival. We learn that economic activity is *natural*. It can be likened to breathing (respiration): O_2 is consumed as CO_2 is produced. It can be likened to digestion: raw materials and chemical potential energy are ingested, the body grows, and energy is provided for everyday activities. Just as food from the biosphere provides materials and energy for anabolic and catabolic processes in an organism, materials and fuels from the biosphere provide matter and energy for capital formation and energy production in society. Without materials and energy from the biosphere, metabolisms fail and organisms die. Without materials and energy from the biosphere, the economies collapse and societies fade away. In short, the economy is coupled to the biosphere, because it is utterly and completely dependent upon it.

The metabolism metaphor teaches us that larger economies demand increasingly larger material and energy flow rates from the biosphere. We see that limits to economic growth are both possible and expected. From the metaphor we learn that economic “stall” is not pathological, but natural, especially in mature economies that have encountered some type of biophysical limit. (See Section 1.3.2.) We might expect to encounter any number of limits: supply rates of materials from the biosphere, supply rates of energy from the biosphere, scale of the economy relative to the biosphere. In the metabolism metaphor, autophagy indicates that stocks of capital within society are reservoirs of material and (embodied) energy that can and should be broken down and re-used or re-purposed, rather than discarded, when out of service.

Through an understanding of the deep interconnectedness and complexity of organisms and species in the biosphere, we come to appreciate the interdependence among actors within and sectors of the economy. Furthermore, an appreciation of the complex nature of economies leads us to acknowledge the difficulty in discerning precisely which limit(s) is (are) encountered when growth stalls. In fact, there is no single explanation for the slowdown of growth in OECD economies discussed at the outset of Chapter 1. The best explanation to date involves many intertwining factors: slowing growth of energy input rate, decreasing energy return on investment in the liquid fuel sector, problems in the credit markets, etc.

In terms of national accounting, a deeper understanding of the metabolism metaphor will lead to significant changes in national accounting. It will lead us to acknowledge the important role of *both* flows (e.g., GDP, rates of material and energy extraction from the biosphere, rates at which money spins through the economy) *and* stocks (e.g., manufactured capital, monetary savings, non-renewable energy supplies). Furthermore, appreciation of the physical basis of the real economy will lead us to account for both stocks and flows in physical units (kg and kJ) as well as financial units (currency).

Deeper understanding of the metabolism metaphor will lead systems of national accounts to become focused as much on stocks as on flows. Systems of national accounts will expand beyond financial accounting to become a compendia of both

physical as well as financial assets of an economy. By counting flows *and* stocks in both physical and monetary units, national accounting will provide a comprehensive picture of both the *health* and the *wealth* of economies, respectively.

2.3 New national accounting

Society needs to respond to the material and energy shortages that we now face (Chapter 1), and part of that response should involve more-comprehensive national accounting guided by a deeper understanding of the real, biophysical economy gained through the metabolism metaphor (Section 2.2). It is imperative that we begin now to help society deal with impending biophysical limits.

But how? What should we be counting and in what units? And, how should the data be analyzed?

As discussed in the Prologue, the UN System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) is a conceptual framework that was developed by a wide range of experts beginning in the early 1990s. This framework has just undergone a third, thorough revision using a global collaborative process. The SEEA are national accounts that capture data related to “interactions between the economy and the environment, and the stocks and changes in stocks of environmental assets.” [43, p. 1] These accounts measure physical as well as financial flows, and are designed to dovetail with the SNA. As such, the UN SEEA represents the state of the art, in terms of accounting material and energy resource flows through our economies. If implemented, the SEEA allows national governments to answer questions that were previously unknown, such as, “At what rate do we use steel?” or “How much concrete is embodied within our economy?” Indeed, analyses similar to the one presented in Figure 1.2 (GDP vs. as a function of fuel consumption) might be undertaken for any material (e.g., iron or water) tracked by the SEEA. Governments gain a great deal of understanding about the energetic and material requirements of the country through the use of SEEA.

However, because the SEEA framework is defined at the economy-wide (E-W) scale, there are many more important questions that still cannot be answered. One such question is, “What are the material and energetic requirements to scale up the renewable energy industry?” This is a highly important question for future sustainable development, not just for nations, but for the globe as a whole. Furthermore, the accumulation of materials and embodied energy in the manufactured capital stock of a particular economic sector is impossible to estimate with economy-wide analyses. Such an analysis would require measuring inter-sectoral (i.e., intra-economy) flows of materials and energy. In the age of resource depletion, we believe obtaining inter-sectoral flows to be an essential aspect of extended national accounting.

Firm theoretical grounding is needed *before* we begin the process of expanding national accounts. We need a framework, a way to organize our thoughts about the notion of national accounting in the age of resource depletion. This book is an attempt to provide just that: a theoretical framework for comprehensive national accounting in the age of resource depletion that could be adopted in systems of national accounts.

The first question above (“What should we be counting and in what units?”) is the topic for the remainder of this section, and the answer provides the structure for the heart of the book. The second question above (“How should the data be analyzed?”) is the topic of Chapter 7.

We believe the key to understanding society’s metabolism in the age of resource depletion is to understand how materials, energy, embodied energy, and economic value each interacts with the economy. Specifically, it is important to understand how each accumulates within the economy and how each flows into, within, and out of the economy. The first three items (materials, energy, and embodied energy) are inspired directly by the metabolism metaphor. The fourth item (economic value) is necessary to understand the way that the lifeblood of economies (currency) flows through the economy. Of course, each of the items in the list interacts with the others and the biosphere dynamically. If we can begin to carefully track these items, we will be on our way toward gathering the information necessary to improve national accounting for the age of resource depletion.

National accounts that are informed by the metabolism metaphor and account for materials, energy, embodied energy, and economic value may allow consumers, producers, and policy-makers to answer critical questions that are not answerable today, such as:

1. **How much energy was used in the manufacture and transport of two competing goods in the supermarket?** (Or, equivalently, how much energy is embodied in two competing goods in the supermarket?)
2. **What might be the optimal scale of an economy in terms of GDP and what are the impacts of an optimally-sized economy on natural capital?**
3. **How is dependence upon scarce fossil fuels embedded in the interwoven fabric of the economy?**
4. **How will economies that are dependent on coal, oil, and other forms of non-renewable energy transition to renewable forms of energy?**
5. **How might an economy be affected as an increasing share of production is directed toward replacing degraded ecosystem services?** [44, p. 221]
6. **What are the material and energy requirements to scale up the renewable energy industry?**

Our approach to developing a rigorous theoretical foundation for comprehensive national accounting is to develop a dynamic model by applying rigorous thermodynamics to materials and energy flows into, among, and out of economic sectors, informed by the metabolism metaphor, in a manner that is verifiable against the existing (or expanded) national accounts.

2.4 Structure of the book

The list of items to be accounted (materials, energy, embodied energy, and economic value) provides structure for our proposed framework and much of the rest of this book.

Part I addresses flows of physical matter and energy through the economy. Chapter 3 discusses material flows and accumulation. Flows of energy are covered in Chapter 4, and a rigorous, thermodynamics-based definition of and accounting for embodied energy is presented in Chapter 5.

In Part II, we turn to flow and accumulation of non-physical entities through the economy. Flows and accumulation of economic value are discussed in Chapter 6. In Chapter 7, we combine the results from Chapters 5 and 6 to develop an important indicator of economic activity: the energy intensity of economic production.

Part III gives context to the framework developed in Parts I and II. Chapter 8 draws out some of the direct implications of our model. And, we end with a summary and a proposed list of next steps in Chapter 9.

Throughout the methodological chapters (3–7), our accounting framework is developed through a series of increasingly-disaggregated models of the economy (Table 2.1) using, as much as possible, the same structure for each. Doing so provides a detailed, step-by-step explanation of our proposed accounting framework. We use the US auto industry as a running example for application and discussion.

Table 2.1: Examples used throughout this book.

Example	Sector 0	Sector 1	Sector 2	Sector 3
A	Biosphere	Society	NA	NA
B	Biosphere	Final Consumption	Production	NA
C	Biosphere	Final Consumption	Energy	Goods & Services

References

- [1] George E P Box and Norman R Draper. *Empirical Model-Building and Response Surfaces*. Wiley, 1987.
- [2] Devra L Davis. A look back at the london smog of 1952 and the half century since. *Environmental health perspectives*, 110(12):A734, 2002.
- [3] Michelle L Bell, Devra L Davis, and Tony Fletcher. A retrospective assessment of mortality from the london smog episode of 1952: the role of influenza and pollution. *Environmental health perspectives*, 112(1):6, 2004.

- [4] Bruna Ingraio and Giorgio Israel and Ian McGilvray. *The invisible hand: economic equilibrium in the history of science*. MIT Press Cambridge, MA, 1990.
- [5] Léon Walras. Geometrical theory of the determination of prices. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 3(1):45–64, 1892.
- [6] Léon Walras. *The equilibrium economics*, 1993.
- [7] Howard T Odum. *Environmental accounting : EMERGY and environmental decision making*. Wiley, New York, 1996.
- [8] Robert M Solow. A Contribution to the Theory of Economic Growth. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 70(1):65–94, 1956.
- [9] YVC Rao. *An Introduction To Thermodynamics*. Universities Press, 2004.
- [10] Herman E Daly. Consumption and welfare: two views of value added. *Review of Social Economy*, 53(4):451–473, 1995.
- [11] Robert Ayres. *Turning Point: End of the Growth Paradigm*. Routledge, August 1997.
- [12] Alfred North Whitehead. *Science and the modern world*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1926 [2011].
- [13] Martha W Gilliland. Energy analysis and public policy. *Science*, 189(4208):1051–1056, 1975.
- [14] Peter Chapman. Energy analysis: A review of methods and applications. *Omega*, 4(1):19–33, 1976.
- [15] Richard B Norgaard. Ecosystem services: From eye-opening metaphor to complexity blinder. *Ecological Economics*, 69(6):1219–1227, 2010.
- [16] Ibrahim Kavrakoglu. Modelling energy-economy interactions. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 13(1):29–40, May 1983.
- [17] Reiner Kümmel, W Strassl, A Gossner, and W Eichhorn. Technical Progress and Energy Dependent Production Functions. *Journal of Economics*, 45(3):285–311, 1985.
- [18] Cutler J Cleveland, Robert Costanza, and Charles A S Hall. Energy and the US Economy: a Biophysical Perspective. *Science*, 225(31 August):890–897, 1984.
- [19] M Fröling. Energy use, population and growth, 1800–1970. *Journal of Population Economics*, 24(3):1133–1163, 2009.
- [20] David I Stern and Astrid Kander. The Role of Energy in the Industrial Revolution and Modern Economic Growth. *The Energy Journal*, 33(3):125–152, July 2012.
- [21] Willem P Nel and Gerhardus van Zyl. Defining limits: Energy constrained economic growth. *Applied Energy*, 87(1):168–177, January 2010.
- [22] Robert U Ayres and Benjamin S Warr. *The Economic Growth Engine: How Energy and Work Drive Material Prosperity*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK, 2010.
- [23] St. Rath-Nagel and Alfred Voß. Energy Models for Planning and Policy Assessment. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 8(2):99–114, 1981.
- [24] Bob CC van der Zwaan, Reyer Gerlagh, G Klaassen, and Leo Schrattenholzer. Endogenous technological change in climate change modelling. *Energy Economics*, 24(1):1–19, 2002.

- [25] Reiner Kümmel. *Growth Dynamics of the Energy Dependent Economy*. Mathematical Systems in Economics. Oeigeschlager, Gunn, and Hain, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1980.
- [26] Reiner Kümmel. The impact of energy on industrial growth. *Energy*, 7(2):189–203, 1982.
- [27] International Energy Agency. IEA History. <http://www.iea.org/aboutus/history/>, accessed 31 August 2014.
- [28] International Energy Agency. IEA Statistics. <http://www.iea.org/statistics/>, accessed 31 August 2014.
- [29] International Energy Agency. IEA World Energy Outlook. <http://www.worldenergyoutlook.org>, accessed 31 August 2014.
- [30] Richard W. England. Natural Capital and the Theory of Economic Growth. *Ecological Economics*, 34:425–431, 2000.
- [31] Nicolas Georgescu-Roegen. *The Entropy Law and the Economic Process*. Harvard University Press, 1971.
- [32] Howard T. Odum. Energy, ecology, and economics. *Ambio*, 2(6):220–227, 1973.
- [33] Herman E Daly. Steady-state economics. *San Francisco*, 1977.
- [34] Charles A S Hall, Cutler J Cleveland, and Robert Kaufman. *Energy and Resource Quality: The Ecology of the Economic Process*. John Wiley & Sons, 1986.
- [35] Wim Heijman. *The Economic Metabolism*. Kluwer, 1988.
- [36] Helmut Haberl. The energetic metabolism of societies part i: accounting concepts. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 5(1):11–33, 2001.
- [37] Marina Fischer-Kowalski and Walter Hüttler. Society’s metabolism. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 2(4):107–136, 1999.
- [38] Eric Liu and Nick Hanauer. The machine and the garden. The New York Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/11/opinion/our-gardenbrain-economy.html>, 10 July 2012.
- [39] Mario Giampietro and Kozo Mayumi. Multiple-scale integrated assessment of societal metabolism: introducing the approach. *Population and Environment*, 22(2):109–153, 2000.
- [40] Richard Schweid. *Che’s Chevrolet, Fidel’s Oldsmobile: On the Road in Cuba*. University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- [41] Jay Ramey. New Car Sales in Cuba Soured by 400-percent Markups. *Autoweek*, 5 April 2014.
- [42] Max Kleiber. Body size and metabolic rate. *Physiol. Rev*, 27(4):511–541, 1947.
- [43] United Nations. *System of Environmental-Economic Accounting 2012 Central Framework*. United Nations Statistics Division, 2014.
- [44] Reiner Kümmel. *The Second Law of Economics: Energy, Entropy, and the Origins of Wealth*. Springer, June 2011.

Part I
Material and Energy

Chapter 3

Stocks and flows of materials

*Well, I have my rights, sir, and I'm telling you I intend to go on doing just what I do! And, for your information, you Lorax, I'm figgering on biggering and BIGGERING and **BIGGERING** and **BIGGERING**...* [1]

—The Once-ler

In Chapter 2, we introduced the metaphor that the economy is society's metabolism, using energy and material resources extracted from the natural environment for the construction, maintenance, and growth of society. We also noted, in Section 2.3, that to utilize the metabolism metaphor, we must account for material and energy flows *and accumulations* not just at the economy-wide level, but also at the sectoral level. This chapter explores this idea further by observing the accumulation and interchange of materials *within* an economy, as well as exchanges of materials between an economy and its surrounding environment—the biosphere.

Just as a biological organism metabolizes food, water and air, so too an economy must take in raw materials from its environment. To a large extent, the major exchanges of materials between industrial economies and the natural environment mirror those of an animal. Large inputs of fresh water, hydrocarbons, and oxygen result in the emission of carbon dioxide and polluted water.[2] These materials inputs are used for a number of different purposes. In anabolic processes (see Section 2.2.1), materials extracted from the environment become the building blocks from which the physical structures within the economy—buildings, roads, even people—are composed. The extraction and processing of materials requires energy resources. In industrial economies, this is achieved primarily by combustion of fossil fuels, which requires the presence of oxygen in the atmosphere and results in the emission of carbon dioxide. Many processes also require flows of materials, especially fresh water, that are not directly embodied in the final product. As such, many material resources flow through the economy without accumulating within physical infrastructure.

There are, however, many easily observable instances of material accumulations within an economy. A typical office contains a computer screen, coffee cup and myriad other items. Beyond the window, there is a street and the building opposite.

There are also innumerable material flows between the biosphere and the economy that most of us never observe. The extraction of raw materials generates additional overburden—earth that must be extracted and processed and ultimately discarded without ever entering the economy proper. Other flows cannot be seen with the naked eye. The cars outside in the street suck in nitrogen and oxygen (without which

the engine would not work) and emit water vapor, carbon dioxide, and other, more harmful, wastes.

Even services that we consider “non-material” require at least some material infrastructure. The hairdresser requires scissors (and to a greater or lesser extent some hair) with which to work. Even the internet, often lauded as the exemplar of dematerialization of the economic process, requires a whole host of infrastructure including uninterrupted electricity supply, data servers, telephone networks, and a computer by which to access it.

It almost goes without saying that all materials within the economy (the *economy* [3]) started their “lives” within the biosphere, be they food, water or paper, petroleum, or rock. In fact, the economy is in a continual state of material exchange with its surrounding environment; raw materials are pulled in and wastes are emitted. It is this exchange that intimately couples the two spheres, intertwining their mutual fate.

As discussed in the Preface and Chapter 2, researchers are beginning to quantify these material exchanges. Further work, such as that by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) International Resource Panel (IRP), is attempting to measure the total stock of materials within society.[4] Over the past two centuries, human demand for materials has increased at a phenomenal pace. This demand has driven ever increasing extraction rates of raw materials from the biosphere. Production of all materials increased from around 12 Gt/yr (10^9 t/yr) to around 35 Gt/yr in the period 1945–1980 and up to 68 Gt/yr by the year 2009.[5] That is, the flow of materials into the economy from the biosphere has grown over five-fold since the end of the Second World War and has doubled in the last thirty years. But what has driven this incredible growth?

An obvious answer to this question is population. The global population has increased by a factor of nearly three during the post-war period.[6] More people obviously leads to greater demand. Living standards have also increased, leading to still greater demands for material possessions. The UNEP-IRP report, *Metal Stocks in Society* estimates that if the global in-use per capita stock of metals were to increase to the level of industrialized nations, the total stock might be 3–9 times the present level.[4]

A less obvious answer comes from social science. In 1980, Schnaiberg [7] introduced the concept of the “treadmill of production” to describe the systemic process of ever-increasing capital investment (and thus demand for materials) inherent in capitalist society.¹ The treadmill leads to “higher and higher levels of demand for

¹ The logic of the treadmill is:

1. capital (production equipment) is accumulating in Western economies as labor is replaced by technologies;
2. these technologies require far more materials and/or energy than the previous, labor-intensive processes;
3. moreover, unlike labor, the new technologies represent forms of sunk capital;
4. because the remaining labor inputs can more readily be cut back (as opposed to sunk capital, see Section 1.3.3) labor is further reduced to sustain production at higher levels;
5. more capital is added to replace further reduced levels of labor.[8, p. 296]

natural resources for a given level of social welfare.” [8, p.297] The treadmill of production is evident today, driving up demand for many commodities. From an economic perspective, we may view the treadmill as the striving for productivity from factors of production. In the substitution of capital for labor, total factor productivity (A in Equation 2.1) is increased. The substitution increases the requirement for natural resources (particularly energy to drive the capital equipment), but these are assumed to be “free” within traditional economic growth models, hence do not count towards productivity; the substitution obtains a free productivity boost from nature.

But what about the downstream effects of this increased materials extraction? Obviously all of that “stuff” has to go somewhere. As our economies pull in more materials from the biosphere, so too do they expel more wastes, leading to an increase in total throughput of materials. And, as we pointed out at the start of this chapter, not all materials flow straight through the economy. They accumulate as objects: buildings, cars, and even people.

When accumulation is not accounted for, the hidden assumption is that all flows in and out balance instantaneously. Imagine a bath tub where the water flowing in through the tap is exactly balanced by the water flowing out the plughole. The state of the system (the amount of water within the bath) is fixed—therefore we say the system is in steady-state. Or, imagine a growing baby. The inputs of food and other materials, though small compared to an adult, exceed the output of excreta (gas, solid, and liquid). While this may be hard for new parents to believe (how can there be possibly be more going in than is coming out!), it is simply this imbalance that induces the growth of the baby. Materials accumulate within the baby’s body. Obviously, this imbalance (and the subsequent growth induced) slows as the child grows up to adulthood. Nevertheless, adults still maintain the ability to accumulate materials. We can gain (or lose) weight; a fact to which any yo-yo dieter will readily attest.

Both population and capital equipment are stocks; accumulations of people, machines, equipment, roads, and buildings that have built up over time. As discussed in Section 1.3.3, we contend that stocks are the drivers of demand, of flows of materials. People demand food, clothing, shelter, all of the basic necessities of life, as well as all of the trappings of modern life; buildings, vehicles, and computers. The delivery of the material to satisfy human wants requires capital equipment; more stocks which also have needs. They require flows of materials and energy to build, operate, and maintain them. Thus, to properly understand the economic structure and the real drivers of change, we must understand the accumulation of materials within our economies.

In the rest of this chapter, we will define a mathematical accounting framework to track the flow and accumulation of materials within an economy, building from a one-sector economy up to examples of both two- and three-sector economies. We will finally apply this framework to the illustrative example of the US automobile industry that runs through the whole book. First, we outline the basic methodology.

3.1 Methodology

This book is about tracking (accounting) flows through the economy with a focus on counting materials, energy, and value. That an entire academic discipline and industry are focused on counting money (“accounting”) is evidence of its importance in today’s economies. That energy is required to do *anything* is evidence of its importance in the economic activity of our daily lives. And, we believe that the interplay between money and energy has shaped the past and will continue to influence the future. In this section, we define rigorous “counting” methods that will be applied to materials (this chapter), energy (Chapter 4), embodied energy (Chapter 5), and money (Chapter 6) throughout this book.

3.1.1 Accounting in everyday life

We all count material (and non-material) stocks and flows every day, be it the people in a room, the gasoline we consume on our way to work, or the money in our bank account. Rigorous counting at the scale of whole economies requires precise definition of *what* we will be counting, as well as both *when* and *where* we will be doing the counting. Engineers often call the definition of a region in space over which accounting will be performed a “control volume.” Another way to think of creating a control volume is drawing a boundary. What gets counted is what passes through the boundary. For example, we may wish to count (or “make an accounting of”) the stock of apples in our home over the course of a week. We draw a spatial boundary (control volume) around our house and a temporal boundary “around” the week. We count the apples that enter and leave our home, any apples that are eaten (consumed), and, if we own an apple tree (lucky us!), apples that ripen (are produced) during a week. A rigorous apple accounting equation, in units of apples, is:

$$\Delta \text{apples} = \text{apples in} - \text{apples out} + \text{apples grown} - \text{apples eaten}. \quad (3.1)$$

More generally, we may say:

$$\text{accumulation} = \text{transfers in} - \text{transfers out} + \text{production} - \text{consumption}. \quad (3.2)$$

Notice that, when discussing apples we use the specific terms “grown” and “eaten,” instead of the more general terms “produced” and “consumed.” Later, in Chapter 6, when discussing economic value, we will use the terms “generated” or “added” and “destroyed.” For our purposes, these terms all have equivalent meanings, and we use them interchangeably.

After accounting for the stock of apples in a week, we can reframe the question to ask, “at what rate does the stock of apples change $\left(\frac{da}{dt}\right)$?” That is, we can examine the rate of change of the apple stock per unit of time relative to the flow of apples (\dot{a}), in which case our accounting equation becomes:

$$\frac{da}{dt} = \dot{a}_{in} - \dot{a}_{out} + \dot{a}_{grown} - \dot{a}_{eaten} \quad (3.3)$$

where the dot above the variable (\dot{a}) indicates a flow rate per unit time [apples/time] and the time derivative ($\frac{da}{dt}$) is the rate of change of the stock of apples per time unit, or more simply, the accumulation rate.

Instead of focusing on apples as our unit of accounting, we could track the mass flow (in units of mass per unit time, for instance [kg/sec]) of the main chemical elements within the apples. From this perspective, although an *apple* may be consumed, the *elements* of which the apple is composed—hydrogen, oxygen (coupled together as water to form the overwhelming majority of the mass), and carbon (which, bonded with hydrogen as carbohydrates make up most of the remaining mass)—are *not* consumed. They flow through the consumption process unaffected. The chemical elements will instead be either stored within our body, leave the house as waste (in the apple core), remain in the house (stored within the apple seed that rolled under the sofa) or, eventually, leave via the air (as carbon dioxide and water vapor) or otherwise (as excreta) after they have been metabolized.

If, instead of a home, we drew a spatial control volume around a sector of an economy, similar accounting methods can be applied. In fact, throughout this book, we will illustrate theoretical concepts with a running example of a control volume (boundary) around the US auto industry. If we account for steel (in units of kg) in the auto industry, we might write an equation like this:

$$\Delta \text{steel} = \text{steel in} - \text{steel out} \quad (3.4)$$

Note that the production and consumption terms are zero because steel is neither created nor destroyed within the automobile sector. Tracking the rate flows of steel, \dot{s} (in kg/s), we would write the following equation:

$$\frac{ds}{dt} = \dot{s}_{in} - \dot{s}_{out} \quad (3.5)$$

Again, the last two terms (representing steel production and consumption) are not present. This is in direct contrast with apple accounting outlined in Equation 3.3. Despite the fact that steel is neither produced nor consumed within the *automobile sector*, there *are* sectors of the economy that *do* produce steel, by mixing molten iron with varying amounts of carbon. The flow of steel through an economy illustrates that although economic products (steel) may be produced or destroyed, the mass flows of *elemental materials* (iron and other chemical elements) is unaffected, even as the structure changes form (e.g. from iron to steel) through the many economic processes.² In fact, we may go further. Every act of economic production has an associated act of consumption or destruction. Indeed, within the car industry, inputs

² For the sake of absolute rigor, we must point out that, in actuality, iron *is* created within the core of silicon-burning stars. Mass and energy may also be converted in such processes, such that only mass-energy is conserved. However, for the purposes of terrestrial processes, the total mass (in kg) of iron (Fe) is constant. There are, additionally, some economic processes, within nuclear reactors, that change the atomic structure of elements and thus violate the accounting law presented

of steel, glass, plastic, rubber, etc. are *consumed* in the very process of producing cars, such that *cars* are (literally) *created* within the automobile industry. You can't make an omelet without breaking a few eggs; you can't make a car without consuming a few sheets of steel. An accounting equation for cars within the economy must include terms for production and destruction³ of cars. Again, focusing on mass flows of the chemical elements avoids this necessity, because mass is *conserved* in physical processes. Any mass entering a control volume (transfer in) must go somewhere, whether it stays within the volume (accumulation) or is transferred out. Conservation of mass is expressed in equations such as the ones above for apples in a home and steel in the auto industry.

Another important conservation principle is the conservation of energy. Similar to the principle of the conservation of mass, the First Law of Thermodynamics says that *energy can neither be created nor destroyed*. In the discussion that follows (Chapters 4 and 5 in particular), we will make great use of the First Law. If I eat an apple, it is no longer an apple, but the materials (i.e. chemical elements) and energy contained within the apple can still be traced via their elemental mass and energy, even if they change form (apples into compost or chemical potential energy into thermal energy). Thus, the apple accounting equation (Equation 3.3) can include terms accounting for the production and consumption of apples. However, mass and energy accounting equations *never* include terms for the production or destruction of mass or energy. Rather, any addition of mass or energy *into* the economy or discharge of waste material or energy *from* the economy occurs as an interaction between the economy and the biosphere. This chapter, as well as Chapters 4 and 5, covers mass and energy accounting for economies. Accounting for economic value, in contrast, *requires* terms for both the creation and destruction of economic value, as discussed in Chapter 6.

3.1.2 *Product, resource, short-lived, and capital flows*

When applying accounting equations to economic sectors, we distinguish among four types of materials flowing into or out of a production sector: products (P), resources (R), short-lived goods (S), and capital goods (K), as shown in Figure 3.1.

Resource materials (\dot{R}) enter the sector from the left. They comprise those materials that are destined to be *embodied* in the goods produced by the sector (\dot{P}), which leave from the right, except for some proportion that is wasted. All wastes depart from the bottom of the sector and are returned to the biosphere. For example, sheet metal, rubber, and glass (as well as many other materials) enter the automobile sector as resources and end up as material parts of the cars that are produced. Some fraction

here. Because the mass flows involved with these nuclear plants is negligible compared with total materials flows, we shall assume that the mass of elements are conserved for this book.

³ In economic terms, destruction of physical goods is often called "depreciation." We shall explore the importance of and distinctions between physical depreciation and economic depreciation in Chapters 5–8.




Fig. 3.1: Material flows into and out of a single sector of the economy. Resource flows (\dot{R}) enter the sector from the left and are embodied in products (\dot{P}) which leave from the right. Some waste resources leave the sector at the bottom and are returned to the biosphere. Short-lived material flows (\dot{S}) enter the sector from above and leave from below to return to the biosphere. Only capital stock (\dot{K}) may accumulate within the sector, depicted by the storage tank. These also enter the sector from above. Depreciated capital leaves the sector from below and is returned to the biosphere. Energy flows (green lines) are associated with all flows of materials, but are not drawn explicitly in this diagram. Flows of energy will be depicted in diagrams in later chapters.

of these resources (\dot{R}) may not make it into the final product, such as trimming scrap from metal parts stamping, and may be either recycled internally, or wasted to the biosphere. In this material accounting framework, resource materials are not accumulated within a sector.

Short-lived goods (\dot{S}) include those materials that are necessary for the production processes of a sector, but are neither accumulated within the sector, nor destined to become materially part of the product of the sector. They enter the sector from above and leave the sector from below to return to the biosphere. Examples of these short-lived flows include energy resources, such as the electricity needed to run automobile factories and process water used by the sector. Resources and short-lived materials make up Georgescu-Roegen's "flow" elements⁴ [9] or Daly's "material causes." [10]

Many of the material flows into the sector, such as production equipment, are necessary for the continued operation of a sector but are not counted as short-lived goods, because the operation of the sector is dependent upon the accumulation of these materials within the sector. Such flows are counted as capital goods (K). Capital flows (\dot{K}) also enter from above, but are stored within the sector (represented by a

⁴ In fact, Georgescu-Roegen does not make a distinction between resource flows (that are *physically embodied* in the product) and other flows necessary to support production of the product.

storage tank) and are returned to the biosphere as physical capital depreciation. Examples of these capital flows would be the factory and office buildings or manufacturing equipment within the automobile industry.

We assume (for simplicity) that there is no re-use of capital stock by other sectors of an economy, e.g. resale of vehicles or other equipment after depreciation, or recycling of material from capital stock into other goods, e.g. scrap metal. The issue of recycling is discussed in greater detail in Sections 2.2.3 and 8.4.

All products (\dot{P}) leave to the right of the sector. A fraction of the \dot{P} flow may be returned to the sector as self-consumption, accounted either as resources destined to be embodied in the product (\dot{R}), as short-lived materials (\dot{S}), or as capital goods (\dot{K}). The remainder flows to other sectors within the economy or to Final Consumption (1). In this material accounting framework, energy may be accounted as either an \dot{R} flow or an \dot{S} flow. An example of energy as an \dot{R} flow is crude oil to be converted into gasoline within a refinery: the resource inflow (crude oil) is *literally embodied* (i.e., atoms from the crude oil are physically contained) within the out-flowing product (gasoline). An example of energy as an \dot{S} flow is electricity used by an automobile factory: the resource inflow (electrons) is not embodied *literally* in the out-flowing product (automobiles). Similarly, the coal or natural gas flowing into a power plant is accounted as an \dot{S} flow, because the incoming chemical elements (carbon and hydrogen) *do not* depart the plant contained within the product, but leave the economy in the form of carbon dioxide. (The product of a power plant is electrons that “travel” through electricity transmission lines.) We also set up another material flow, that of *wastes* (\dot{W}) which include both resource and short-lived goods flowing to the biosphere from sector j , such that:

$$\dot{W}_{j0} = \dot{R}_{j0} + \dot{S}_{j0} \quad (3.6)$$

This waste flow will be useful later in Section 5.4. We now track these material flows through some model economies.

3.2 Example A: single-sector economy

Our first example considers the case where all processes within the economy occur within one sector—Society (1)—which exchanges materials with the Biosphere (0) as depicted in Figure 3.2.




Fig. 3.2: Flows of materials for a one-sector economy. Resources (\dot{R}_{01}) and short-lived materials (\dot{S}_{01}) flow into the Society (1) from the Biosphere (0). Waste resources (\dot{R}_{10}) short-lived materials/goods (\dot{S}_{10}) and capital goods (\dot{K}_{10}) are returned to the biosphere.

Resources, or perhaps more accurately raw materials (\dot{R}_{01}), such as crude oil or iron ore, and short-lived materials (\dot{S}_{01}), such as oxygen or water that flow *through* economic processes but are not literally *embodied* within the output, flow into Society (1) from the Biosphere (0).⁵ These materials are processed within the economy into products (\dot{P}_1) consisting of resource goods (\dot{R}_{11}), short-lived goods (\dot{S}_{11}), and capital goods (\dot{K}_{11}) which are able to be accumulated at some rate $\frac{dK_1}{dt}$ within the stock of materials within society.⁶ Waste resources (\dot{R}_{10}) and used short-lived materials/goods (\dot{S}_{10}) are returned to the biosphere without accumulating in Society (1). Capital goods are returned to the biosphere when they are physically depreciated (\dot{K}_{10}).

Drawing control volumes around both the Biosphere (0) and Society (1) in Figure 3.2, we can construct material accounting equations, such that:

$$\frac{dR_0}{dt} + \frac{dS_0}{dt} + \frac{dK_0}{dt} = \dot{R}_{10} + \dot{S}_{10} + \dot{K}_{10} - \dot{R}_0 - \dot{S}_0 \quad (3.7)$$

$$\frac{dR_1}{dt} + \frac{dS_1}{dt} + \frac{dK_1}{dt} = \dot{R}_{01} + \dot{S}_{01} + \dot{R}_{11} + \dot{S}_{11} + \dot{K}_{11} - \dot{P}_1 - \dot{R}_{10} - \dot{S}_{10} - \dot{K}_{10}. \quad (3.8)$$

Because mass is conserved, we find that:

$$\dot{R}_0 = \dot{R}_{01}, \quad (3.9)$$

$$\dot{S}_0 = \dot{S}_{01}, \quad (3.10)$$

$$\dot{P}_1 = \dot{R}_{11} + \dot{S}_{11} + \dot{K}_{11}, \quad (3.11)$$

Clearly, $\dot{R}_{01} \neq \dot{R}_{10}$ because some resources are converted into short-lived goods (\dot{S}_{11}) or man-made capital (\dot{K}_{11}) and are only returned to the biosphere as either \dot{S}_{10} or \dot{K}_{10} , respectively. Hence, we may say that:

$$\frac{dR_0}{dt} = \dot{R}_{10} - \dot{R}_{01} \neq 0. \quad (3.12)$$

Similarly, we know that $\dot{S}_{01} \neq \dot{S}_{10}$.⁷

In this framework, neither resources (R) nor short-lived goods (S) accumulate within economic sectors, so we may state:

⁵ Double subscripts on quantities (e.g., \dot{R}_{ij}) indicate a flow from sector i to sector j . The first index always indicates the sector *from* which a quantity flows, and the second index indicates the sector *to* which a quantity flows. Single subscripts on quantities such as K can mean one of two things: \dot{K}_j (with a dot to indicate a flow) refers to the outflow of capital from sector j , whereas K_j (without the dot) denotes the capital stock of sector j .

⁶ See Footnote 8 in Chapter 3 for more discussion on the inclusion of human beings as societal capital stock.

⁷ While this inequality may be true in theory, it may be that in practice, the large amount of material, e.g. water or oxygen, that passes straight through the economy “unaffected,” i.e. without being embodied in products, is very large compared to the additional flow of short-lived goods produced within the economy, i.e. $\dot{S}_{11} \ll \dot{S}_{01}$.

$$\frac{dR_1}{dt} = 0 \quad (3.13)$$

$$\frac{dS_1}{dt} = 0. \quad (3.14)$$

Because the only “capital” that accumulates in the biosphere is that which is a waste flow (capital depreciation) from the economy, (worn-out machines in the scrap yard), we may say that:

$$\frac{dK_0}{dt} = \dot{K}_{10} \quad (3.15)$$

Looking deeper at flows of resources and short-lived goods, we can make some further observations. Imagine following a kilogram of coal on its journey through the economy. It is pulled out of the earth as part of flow \dot{R}_{01} . It enters the economy and while most is transformed into useful products (part of \dot{P}_1) some (hopefully small) fraction is wasted (\dot{R}_{10}). Some of the coal is destined for electricity generation and so re-enters the economy as part of flow \dot{S}_{11} , because the coal is *not physically contained* in the electricity and leaves the economy (in the form of carbon dioxide and ash) as part of flow \dot{S}_{10} . Some of the coal is destined for metallurgical processes (such as the production of steel) and so re-enters the economy within flow \dot{R}_{11} , because the carbon in the coal ends up *physically contained* within the steel in flow \dot{P}_1 . Again, some of the coal is wasted (maybe within slag), leaving the economy as flow \dot{R}_{10} . The steel may re-enter the economy as part of the resource flow \dot{R}_{11} and be manufactured into steel products (maybe a car) to leave as part of flow \dot{P}_1 (again some being discharged within \dot{R}_{10}). At this point the carbon (within the steel, within the car) re-enters the economy as part of flow \dot{K}_{11} and is accumulated within stock K_1 . Here it sits until such time as it is depreciated, to leave the economy bound up in flow \dot{K}_{10} .⁸

⁸ There is an open question as to what sort of *stuff* should be included within the capital that accumulates in society. Should the material constituting literal *human capital*—human bodies—be included? If humans are to be included within K_1 , some resource flow (\dot{R}_{11}) must be converted into human capital flow (\dot{K}_{11}) which then adds to the stock of human capital (K_1) within society. This resource flow is food. Food itself represents a large “resource” flow and has a large associated energy content. Additionally, within industrial economies, a large amount of energy resources are channeled toward the production of food, meaning that the *embodied energy* of food may actually be several times larger than the direct energy content of the food itself.

Further questions arise. What is the “product” of society? A materialistic view might hold that the product of society is human bodies and the labor they can accomplish. If so, should the agriculture industry be accounted as part of the energy sector because its aim is to provide an energy service (labor)? For non-industrial, agrarian societies, the proportion of total energy flow comprised by manual (or draft) energy may be large. In industrialized societies, it may be negligible, however, the energy flows necessary to support agriculture may be many times larger than the food energy (and certainly many times larger than the labor energy) delivered, therefore entailing an EROI of less than unity. Agrarian societies are necessarily constrained by the fact that the energy content of the food delivered *must be* greater than the labor (and draft animal) energy required to produce it.

Another view is that societal capital (K_1) includes only man-made capital, i.e. items manufactured by humans, but not humans themselves. For the purposes of the framework outlined in this book, we favored the latter view. Other researchers favor the opposing view.[11] However, the framework presented in this book is general enough to encompass either point of view.

In summary, we may say that short-lived materials flow “straight through” the economy and end up in the biosphere. Resources are destined to end up either physically embodied within products or waste “resources.” They cycle through the economy, entering and re-entering, until they are turned either into short-lived goods, whereupon they flow “straight through” into the biosphere, or they are turned into capital goods and accumulate.

As such, we may state that:

$$\frac{dR_1}{dt} = \dot{R}_{01} + \dot{R}_{11} - \dot{P}_1 - \dot{R}_{10} = 0, \quad (3.16)$$

$$\frac{dS_1}{dt} = \dot{S}_{01} + \dot{S}_{11} - \dot{S}_{10} = 0, \quad (3.17)$$

We may rearrange these equations in terms of the important variable as:

$$\dot{P}_1 = \dot{R}_{01} + \dot{R}_{11} - \dot{R}_{10}, \quad (3.18)$$

and

$$\dot{S}_{11} = \dot{S}_{10} - \dot{S}_{01}. \quad (3.19)$$

Substituting Equations 3.9, 3.10 and 3.15 into Equation 3.7 we obtain:

$$\frac{dR_0}{dt} + \frac{dS_0}{dt} = \dot{R}_{10} + \dot{S}_{10} - \dot{R}_{01} - \dot{S}_{01}. \quad (3.20)$$

Equation 3.20 states that the rate of “accumulation” (or more accurately depletion) of natural capital (R_0 and S_0) is dependent on the rates at which society extracts these materials from the biosphere (\dot{R}_{01} and \dot{S}_{01}) and the rates of disposal of waste materials back to the biosphere (\dot{R}_{10} and \dot{S}_{10}). Notice however, that although Equation 3.20 is true for the total mass of materials, it does not account for the *quality* of these materials. An intact brick is of higher material quality—is of more use—than the brick dust that has been eroded by weather and scattered on the wind. Many material stocks or flows have been concentrated by natural biophysical processes. We do not mine desirable material from locations with the average abundance of crustal materials. Instead, society relies heavily on extracted resources from naturally occurring resources that are far from equilibrium with their surroundings, e.g. fossil fuel reservoirs or seams of high-grade ore. We may measure the material quality of a resource in reference to its environment, in this case, the average chemical composition of its environment. The more concentrated the resource, the further it is from chemical equilibrium with the environment and the higher the quality. Exergy is a measure of this kind of quality. The further a resource is from chemical equilibrium with its environment, the higher the exergetic content.

As these high quality material reserves are depleted and society must turn to lower grade reserves (as predicted by the Best-First Principle), more total material must flow through the process (including overburden and tailings—the wasted portion that is extracted), more productive capital must be deployed and the greater wear and tear on

equipment in order to maintain the same level of production. [12, 13] Additionally, it takes more energy to process less concentrated resources. This additional processing requirement entails that we will likely never mine average crustal abundance for needed materials, or mine gold from seawater.

Furthermore, it also entails that recycling—the act of turning low quality materials into high quality resources—requires energy and degrades equipment. The lower quality the waste, the more energy and degradation occurs such that one hundred percent recycling of materials is almost certainly practically (and possibly theoretically) impossible.⁹

It is likely that the quality of flow \dot{R}_{01} is higher than flow \dot{R}_{10} (e.g. overburden from mining operations). If this were not the case, \dot{R}_{10} could be easily substituted into the production process (i.e. recycled) thus offsetting the need for primary resource extraction.

We have here assumed that all waste flows (\dot{W}_{j0}) and depreciated capital flows (\dot{K}_{j0}) from economic sector j flowed straight to the biosphere. In general, this is not the case within the economy. The Waste Management and Remediation Services sector (NAICS 562) has the responsibility, within the US economy, of collecting and disposing of wastes. Additionally, much material is recycled within the economy (rather than being disposed into the biosphere) and many capital goods are sold for re-use prior to recycling of materials, for example second-hand cars and office equipment.

We may represent these flows of resources (\dot{R}_j), short-lived goods (\dot{S}_j), and capital goods (\dot{K}_j) as flows other than the product flow (\dot{P}_j) leaving sector j as in Figure 3.3.¹¹ In this book we will continue with the assumption that there is only one product leaving a sector that stays within the economy, i.e. there is no recycling of products. The issue of recycling is discussed in more detail in Section 8.4.

Substituting Equation 3.17 into Equation 3.8, we obtain:

$$\frac{dK_1}{dt} = \dot{R}_{01} + \dot{R}_{11} + \dot{K}_{11} - \dot{P}_1 - \dot{R}_{10} - \dot{K}_{10}. \quad (3.21)$$

Because we have two different formulations for \dot{P}_1 , represented by Equations 3.11 and 3.18, we may substitute either into Equation 3.21. Substituting Equation 3.18 into Equation 3.21, we obtain:

⁹ As such, we can deduce that the economy *must always* be a subsidiary of the biosphere, *open* to flows of materials both from (resources) and to (wastes) the biosphere. This fact has direct implications for dematerialization of our economies, which was discussed in reference to our framework in Section 8.4. There are fundamental limits to the amount of material that must be directed to desired end services. For example, automobiles must have a minimum level of embodied materials.¹⁰ Despite the drive to dematerialization and the apparent “unhooking” of the material and energy intensity of GDP, much of the dematerialization of “developed” nations has been by exporting manufacturing to other countries.[15] The material footprint of OECD nations, when weighted by consumption, has increased significantly since 1990.[16]

¹¹ Note that such flows violate the ‘one sector-one product’ assumption of the Leontief inversion method which we will use in Chapter 7. Other methods based on make-use tables, as developed by von Neumann [17] and Sraffa [18] are able to account for multiple products from each sector.




Fig. 3.3: Material flows through an economic sector with waste treatment flows to other economic sectors.

$$\frac{dK_1}{dt} = \dot{K}_{11} - \dot{K}_{10}, \quad (3.22)$$

which tells us that accumulation of capital in society (K_1) is dependent only on inflows of capital into society (\dot{K}_{11}) and depreciation of capital to the biosphere (\dot{K}_{10}).

Substituting instead Equation 3.11 into Equation 3.21, we obtain:

$$\frac{dK_1}{dt} = \dot{R}_{01} - \dot{R}_{10} - \dot{S}_{11} - \dot{K}_{10}. \quad (3.23)$$

The last depreciation term (\dot{K}_{10}) may be rewritten as the total stock of man-made capital (K_1) multiplied by some depreciation rate (γ_{K_1}),¹² where γ_{K_j} is defined as:

$$\gamma_{K_j} \equiv \frac{\dot{B}_{j0}}{B_j}, \quad (3.24)$$

i.e. the depreciation *per unit* of capital stock,¹³ such that Equation 3.23 may be rewritten:

$$\frac{dK_1}{dt} = \dot{R}_{01} - \dot{R}_{10} - \dot{S}_{11} - \gamma_{K_1} K_1. \quad (3.25)$$

We may rearrange Equation 3.25 as:

¹² γ_{K_1} has units of inverse time, e.g. 1/year, and is inversely proportional to the average lifetime of man-made capital.

¹³ This depreciation term will be discussed in more depth in Sections 5.2.3 and 8.2.2.2.

$$\dot{R}_{01} - \dot{R}_{10} = \frac{dK_1}{dt} + \dot{S}_{11} + \gamma_{K_1} K_1. \quad (3.26)$$

Noticing that the left-hand side of Equation 3.26 is the negation of the right-hand side of Equation 3.12, we may rewrite Equation 3.26 in terms of the accumulation (or more accurately, depletion) of natural resources:

$$-\frac{dR_0}{dt} = \frac{dK_1}{dt} + \dot{S}_{11} + \gamma_{K_1} K_1. \quad (3.27)$$

Equation 3.27 tells us that depletion of natural resources $\left(-\frac{dR_0}{dt}\right)$ is used within society to:

- build up societal capital stock $\left(\frac{dK_1}{dt}\right)$,
- provide short-lived goods and energy to run society (\dot{S}_{11}) , and
- overcome depreciation $(\gamma_{K_1} K_1)$.

In other words, the economy is completely dependent on stocks of natural resources within the biosphere for all of these activities. We now turn to a slightly more disaggregated model of the economy.

3.3 Example B: two-sector economy

In our second example B, we split society into two sectors: Production (2) and Final Consumption (1), as depicted in Figure 3.4. Production (2) makes all of the goods and services that are delivered to Final Consumption (1), as well as all of the intermediate goods that are not “consumed” by Final Consumption, but stay within Production, such as manufacturing equipment.




Fig. 3.4: Flows of materials for a two-sector economy.

As can be seen in Figure 3.4, Production (2) resembles very closely the basic unit shown in Figure 3.1. Resource flows from the biosphere (\dot{R}_{02}) and those produced by Sector (2) itself (\dot{R}_{22}) are *transformed* into product flow (\dot{P}_2). Flows of short-lived goods (\dot{S}) and capital (\dot{K}) are required to support this transformative process. Much of the product flow from (\dot{P}_2) enters Final Consumption (1) as resource flows (\dot{R}_{21}), short-lived goods (\dot{S}_{21}) and capital goods (\dot{K}_{21}) flows.

One point worth noting is that our flow of “capital goods” into Final Consumption (\dot{K}_{21}) includes consumer durables and housing in addition to typical items such as bridges and other public infrastructure. We chose this approach because some goods (refrigerators, televisions, apartment blocks) may accumulate within Sector (1) and would be represented within flow \dot{K}_{21} , whereas other short-lived goods (newspapers, plastic packaging, electricity) do not accumulate within Sector 1 and are represented by flow \dot{S}_{21} .

There is also a product outflow from Final Consumption (\dot{P}_1), some of which is returned to Final Consumption (1) as resources (\dot{R}_{11}), short-lived goods (\dot{S}_{11}) and capital goods (\dot{K}_{11}) flows.¹⁴ There is no resource (\dot{R}_{12}) nor capital good (\dot{K}_{12}) flow from Final Consumption (1) to Production (2). This is because the “product” of Final Consumption (1) is labor services and because Final Consumption (1) consumes, rather than produces, final goods. No resource materials flow from Final Consumption (1) to be *physically embodied* within the product output (\dot{P}_2), therefore $\dot{R}_{12} = 0$. Additionally, no capital goods flow from Final Consumption (1) to accumulate within the production sector, therefore $\dot{K}_{12} = 0$. The flow of short-lived goods (\dot{S}_{12}) from Final Consumption (1) to Production (2) represents labor, specifically the material flow associated with labor’s energy which is used within the production sector.¹⁵

Resource flow \dot{R}_{21} into Final Consumption represents the material flow that will be *physically embodied* within the “product” of Final Consumption (1)—human labor—which is food produced by the agriculture industry

As in Example A, we set control volumes around the biosphere and our two economic sectors, such that the material accounting equations become:

$$\frac{dR_0}{dt} + \frac{dS_0}{dt} + \frac{dK_0}{dt} = \dot{R}_{10} + \dot{R}_{20} + \dot{S}_{10} + \dot{S}_{20} + \dot{K}_{10} + \dot{K}_{20} - \dot{R}_0 - \dot{S}_0 \quad (3.28)$$

$$\frac{dR_1}{dt} + \frac{dS_1}{dt} + \frac{dK_1}{dt} = \dot{R}_{11} + \dot{R}_{21} + \dot{S}_{01} + \dot{S}_{11} + \dot{S}_{21} + \dot{K}_{11} + \dot{K}_{21} - \dot{P}_1 - \dot{R}_{10} - \dot{S}_{10} - \dot{K}_{10}, \quad (3.29)$$

$$\frac{dR_2}{dt} + \frac{dS_2}{dt} + \frac{dK_2}{dt} = \dot{R}_{02} + \dot{R}_{22} + \dot{S}_{02} + \dot{S}_{12} + \dot{S}_{22} + \dot{K}_{22} - \dot{P}_2 - \dot{R}_{20} - \dot{S}_{20} - \dot{K}_{20}, \quad (3.30)$$

¹⁴ In actuality, both \dot{R}_{11} and \dot{S}_{11} are zero, as will be discussed shortly.

¹⁵ We assume that flow (\dot{S}_{12}) is the adenosine triphosphate (ATP), used as an energy carrier within the cells of organisms, which is consumed during activity (labor)

Because no resources flow directly to Final Consumption (1) from the Biosphere (0),¹⁶ we may say:

$$\dot{R}_0 = \dot{R}_{02}. \quad (3.31)$$

In contrast, short-lived materials *do* flow directly to Final Consumption (1) from the Biosphere (0), for example the flow of photons in Sunlight or oxygen into car engines and lungs. We can redefine flow \dot{S}_0 :

$$\dot{S}_0 = \dot{S}_{01} + \dot{S}_{02}. \quad (3.32)$$

As in Example A, we may easily define the balance of resources (\dot{R}), short-lived materials (\dot{S}) and capital (\dot{K}) within the biosphere:

$$\frac{dR_0}{dt} = \dot{R}_{10} + \dot{R}_{20} - \dot{R}_{02}, \quad (3.33)$$

$$\frac{dS_0}{dt} = \dot{S}_{10} + \dot{S}_{20} - \dot{S}_{01} - \dot{S}_{02}, \quad (3.34)$$

$$\frac{dK_0}{dt} = \dot{K}_{10} + \dot{K}_{20}. \quad (3.35)$$

Because we are assuming that only man-made capital (and not human beings themselves) are accounted within the physical stock of Final Consumption¹⁷ (K_1) and that the “product” of Final Consumption (1) is labor (a short-lived material flow, \dot{S}), then we may also state that

$$\dot{R}_{11} = 0, \quad (3.36)$$

because labor is not a resource flow—it is not *physically embodied* within products produced within the production sector—and additionally that,

$$\dot{K}_{11} = 0, \quad (3.37)$$

because all capital goods are produced within the Production sector (2).

From conservation of mass, we can also define product flows \dot{P}_1 and \dot{P}_2 as:

$$\dot{P}_1 = \dot{S}_{11} + \dot{S}_{12}, \quad (3.38)$$

and

$$\dot{P}_2 = \dot{R}_{21} + \dot{R}_{22} + \dot{S}_{21} + \dot{S}_{22} + \dot{K}_{21} + \dot{K}_{22}. \quad (3.39)$$

¹⁶ A counter-example to this assumption is the production of food outside of the agricultural industry, i.e. by households, which may be large in agrarian economies.

¹⁷ If we were assuming that the human population was accounted within \dot{K}_1 , then the “product” of Final Consumption (1) would be human beings (and the labor they provide), resource flow \dot{R}_{11} would be material resources provided to human reproduction and “capital goods” flow \dot{K}_{11} would be material added to the human population stock. Again, this issue is discussed in greater detail in Footnote 8 of Chapter 3.

Again, remembering that resources (R) and short-lived goods (S) do not accumulate within any sectors of the economy:

$$\frac{dR_1}{dt} = 0, \quad (3.40)$$

$$\frac{dR_2}{dt} = 0, \quad (3.41)$$

$$\frac{dS_1}{dt} = 0, \quad (3.42)$$

and

$$\frac{dS_2}{dt} = 0. \quad (3.43)$$

As in Example A, we may also define the resource-product and short-lived goods flows balances separately for each of the sectors of the economy:

$$\frac{dR_1}{dt} = \dot{R}_{21} - \dot{P}_1 - \dot{R}_{10} = 0, \quad (3.44)$$

$$\frac{dS_1}{dt} = \dot{S}_{01} + \dot{S}_{11} + \dot{S}_{21} - \dot{S}_{10} = 0, \quad (3.45)$$

$$\frac{dR_2}{dt} = \dot{R}_{02} + \dot{R}_{22} - \dot{P}_2 - \dot{R}_{20} = 0, \quad (3.46)$$

and

$$\frac{dS_2}{dt} = \dot{S}_{02} + \dot{S}_{12} + \dot{S}_{22} - \dot{S}_{20} = 0. \quad (3.47)$$

We may rearrange these equations in terms of the important variables to obtain:

$$\dot{P}_1 = \dot{R}_{21} - \dot{R}_{10} \quad (3.48)$$

$$\dot{S}_{11} = \dot{S}_{10} - \dot{S}_{21}, \quad (3.49)$$

$$\dot{P}_2 = \dot{R}_{02} + \dot{R}_{22} - \dot{R}_{20}, \quad (3.50)$$

and

$$\dot{S}_{22} = \dot{S}_{20} - \dot{S}_{02} - \dot{S}_{12}. \quad (3.51)$$

Substituting Equations 3.31-3.35 into Equation 3.28, gives

$$\frac{dR_0}{dt} + \frac{dS_0}{dt} = \dot{R}_{10} + \dot{R}_{20} + \dot{S}_{10} + \dot{S}_{20} - \dot{R}_{02} - \dot{S}_{01} - \dot{S}_{02}. \quad (3.52)$$

Substituting Equations 3.40, 3.45 and 3.47 into Equations 3.29 and 3.30, respectively, we obtain:

$$\frac{dK_1}{dt} = \dot{R}_{21} + \dot{K}_{21} - \dot{P}_1 - \dot{R}_{10} - \dot{K}_{10} \quad (3.53)$$

and

$$\frac{dK_2}{dt} = \dot{R}_{02} + \dot{R}_{22} + \dot{K}_{22} - \dot{P}_2 - \dot{R}_{20} - \dot{K}_{20}, \quad (3.54)$$

As in Example A, we again have two definitions for \dot{P}_1 (Equations 3.38 and 3.48) and \dot{P}_2 (Equations 3.39 and 3.50) which may be substituted into Equations 3.53 and 3.54, respectively. Let us start by substituting Equations 3.48 and 3.50, in which case we obtain:

$$\frac{dK_1}{dt} = \dot{K}_{21} - \dot{K}_{10}, \quad (3.55)$$

and

$$\frac{dK_2}{dt} = \dot{K}_{22} - \dot{K}_{20}. \quad (3.56)$$

Equations 3.55 and 3.56 tell us that accumulation of man-made capital (K) in each sector (j) is dependent only on inflows of capital goods into that sector (\dot{K}_{2j}) and depreciation of capital to the biosphere from that sector (\dot{K}_{j0}).

Now, substituting Equations 3.38 and 3.39, we obtain:

$$\frac{dK_1}{dt} = \dot{R}_{21} + \dot{K}_{21} - \dot{S}_{11} - \dot{S}_{12} - \dot{R}_{10} - \dot{K}_{10}, \quad (3.57)$$

and

$$\frac{dK_2}{dt} = \dot{R}_{02} - \dot{R}_{21} - \dot{S}_{21} - \dot{S}_{22} - \dot{K}_{21} - \dot{R}_{20} - \dot{K}_{20}, \quad (3.58)$$

to which we may make the substitution of the depreciation term (as in Example A) and rearrange to obtain:

$$-\dot{R}_{10} = \frac{dK_1}{dt} - \dot{R}_{21} - \dot{K}_{21} + \dot{S}_{11} + \dot{S}_{12} + \gamma_{K_1} K_1, \quad (3.59)$$

and

$$\dot{R}_{02} - \dot{R}_{20} = \frac{dK_2}{dt} + (\dot{R}_{21} + \dot{S}_{21} + \dot{K}_{21}) + \dot{S}_{22} + \gamma_{K_2} K_2. \quad (3.60)$$

Equation 3.60 tells us that the resources extracted and used by the production sector ($\dot{R}_{02} - \dot{R}_{20}$) are for the purposes of:

- building up capital stock in the production sector ($\frac{dK_2}{dt}$),
- providing goods for Final Consumption ($\dot{R}_{21} + \dot{S}_{21} + \dot{K}_{21}$),
- providing short-lived goods to support the production sector (\dot{S}_{22}), and

- overcoming depreciation of production capital stock ($\gamma_{K_2} K_2$).

Adding Equations 3.59 and 3.60 together, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{dR_0}{dt} &= \dot{R}_{02} - \dot{R}_{10} - \dot{R}_{20} \\ &= \frac{dK_1}{dt} + \frac{dK_2}{dt} + \dot{S}_{11} + \dot{S}_{12} + \dot{S}_{21} + \dot{S}_{22} + \gamma_{K_1} K_1 + \gamma_{K_2} K_2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.61)$$

which tells us that the depletion of natural resources ($\frac{dR_0}{dt}$) is used within the whole economy to:

- build up capital stock ($\frac{dK_1}{dt} + \frac{dK_2}{dt}$),
- produce short-lived goods ($\dot{S}_{11} + \dot{S}_{12} + \dot{S}_{21} + \dot{S}_{22}$), and
- overcome depreciation ($\gamma_{K_1} K_1 + \gamma_{K_2} K_2$).

We now turn to a three-sector model of the economy in order to generalize these results.

3.4 Example C: three-sector economy

In Example C, we differentiate between two production sectors, sector (2) produces energy and sector (3) produces other goods and services, as depicted in Figure 3.5.




Fig. 3.5: Flows of materials for a three-sector economy.

In this example, we will take a slightly different approach than in the previous two examples. Instead of discerning whether or not certain flows exist (asking for example, “is there a flow of resources (\dot{R}_{21}) from Energy (2) to Final Consumption (1)?”), we shall account for all flows, *even if* those flows are zero. In this way, we may build up a completely general framework for material accounting within an economy of any size.

Accounting for the material flows into and out of the Biosphere (0) gives the following equation:

$$\frac{dR_0}{dt} + \frac{dS_0}{dt} + \frac{dK_0}{dt} = \dot{R}_{10} + \dot{R}_{20} + \dot{R}_{30} + \dot{S}_{10} + \dot{S}_{20} + \dot{S}_{30} + \dot{K}_{10} + \dot{K}_{20} + \dot{K}_{30} - \dot{R}_0 - \dot{S}_0, \quad (3.62)$$

which may be rewritten as:

$$\frac{dR_0}{dt} + \frac{dS_0}{dt} + \frac{dK_0}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{R}_{i0} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{S}_{i0} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{K}_{i0} - \dot{R}_0 - \dot{S}_0, \quad (3.63)$$

where the sum represents flows into the biosphere from each of the other i sectors. Similarly, flows for the other sectors may be written:

$$\frac{dR_1}{dt} + \frac{dS_1}{dt} + \frac{dK_1}{dt} = \dot{R}_{01} + \dot{S}_{01} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{R}_{i1} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{S}_{i1} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{K}_{i1} - \dot{P}_1 - \dot{R}_{10} - \dot{S}_{10} - \dot{K}_{10}, \quad (3.64)$$

$$\frac{dR_2}{dt} + \frac{dS_2}{dt} + \frac{dK_2}{dt} = \dot{R}_{02} + \dot{S}_{02} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{R}_{i2} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{S}_{i2} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{K}_{i2} - \dot{P}_2 - \dot{R}_{20} - \dot{S}_{20} - \dot{K}_{20}, \quad (3.65)$$

and

$$\frac{dR_3}{dt} + \frac{dS_3}{dt} + \frac{dK_3}{dt} = \dot{R}_{03} + \dot{S}_{03} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{R}_{i3} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{S}_{i3} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{K}_{i3} - \dot{P}_3 - \dot{R}_{30} - \dot{S}_{30} - \dot{K}_{30}. \quad (3.66)$$

As in previous examples, we may define the balance of resources (\dot{R}), short-lived materials (\dot{S}) and capital (\dot{K}) within the biosphere as:

$$\frac{dR_0}{dt} = \dot{R}_{10} + \dot{R}_{20} + \dot{R}_{30} - \dot{R}_{01} - \dot{R}_{02} - \dot{R}_{03}, \quad (3.67)$$

$$\frac{dS_0}{dt} = \dot{S}_{10} + \dot{S}_{20} + \dot{S}_{30} - \dot{S}_{01} - \dot{S}_{02} - \dot{S}_{03}, \quad (3.68)$$

and

$$\frac{dK_0}{dt} = \dot{K}_{10} + \dot{K}_{20} + \dot{K}_{30}, \quad (3.69)$$

which may be rewritten:

$$\frac{dR_0}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{R}_{i0} - \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{R}_{0j}, \quad (3.70)$$

$$\frac{dS_0}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{S}_{i0} - \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{S}_{0j}, \quad (3.71)$$

and

$$\frac{dK_0}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{K}_{i0}. \quad (3.72)$$

Applying conservation of mass allows us to define the product flows (\dot{P}) as:

$$\dot{P}_1 = \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{R}_{1j} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{S}_{1j} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{K}_{1j}, \quad (3.73)$$

$$\dot{P}_2 = \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{R}_{2j} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{S}_{2j} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{K}_{2j}, \quad (3.74)$$

$$\dot{P}_3 = \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{R}_{3j} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{S}_{3j} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{K}_{3j}. \quad (3.75)$$

As in Example B, Final Consumption (1) provides only labor (represented by \dot{S} flows) to the other sectors of the economy. The Energy sector (2) provides energy products (\dot{S}_{2j}) to the other sectors of the economy. It may also provide resources to itself (\dot{R}_{22}) and to the Goods and Services sector (3), as in the case of metallurgical coke or natural gas for fertilizer. The energy sector does not produce capital goods, hence, for $j \in [1, 3] : \dot{K}_{2j} = 0$. The Goods and Services sector (3) does not provide resources for the Energy sector (2),¹⁸ hence $\dot{R}_{32} = 0$.

Because we do not allow accumulation of either resources (R) or short-lived capital goods (S) in economic sectors, then we may say:

$$\frac{dR_j}{dt} = 0, \quad j \in [1, 3], \quad (3.76)$$

$$\frac{dS_j}{dt} = 0, \quad j \in [1, 3]. \quad (3.77)$$

¹⁸ There may be some exceptions to this, as in the case of energy from industrial waste streams.

As before, we may also define the resource-product and short-lived goods flows balances separately for each of the sectors of the economy:¹⁹

$$\frac{dR_1}{dt} = \dot{R}_{01} + \dot{R}_{11} + \dot{R}_{21} + \dot{R}_{31} - \dot{P}_1 - \dot{R}_{10} = 0, \quad (3.78)$$

$$\frac{dS_1}{dt} = \dot{S}_{01} + \dot{S}_{11} + \dot{S}_{21} + \dot{S}_{31} - \dot{S}_{10} = 0, \quad (3.79)$$

$$\frac{dR_2}{dt} = \dot{R}_{02} + \dot{R}_{12} + \dot{R}_{22} + \dot{R}_{32} - \dot{P}_2 - \dot{R}_{20} = 0, \quad (3.80)$$

$$\frac{dS_2}{dt} = \dot{S}_{02} + \dot{S}_{12} + \dot{S}_{22} + \dot{S}_{32} - \dot{S}_{20} = 0, \quad (3.81)$$

$$\frac{dR_3}{dt} = \dot{R}_{03} + \dot{R}_{13} + \dot{R}_{23} + \dot{R}_{33} - \dot{P}_3 - \dot{R}_{30} = 0, \quad (3.82)$$

$$\frac{dS_3}{dt} = \dot{S}_{03} + \dot{S}_{13} + \dot{S}_{23} + \dot{S}_{33} - \dot{S}_{30} = 0, \quad (3.83)$$

and then rearrange the equations in terms of the important variable:

$$\dot{P}_1 = \dot{R}_{01} + \dot{R}_{11} + \dot{R}_{21} + \dot{R}_{31} - \dot{R}_{10} \quad (3.84)$$

$$\dot{S}_{11} = \dot{S}_{10} - \dot{S}_{01} - \dot{S}_{21} - \dot{S}_{31}, \quad (3.85)$$

$$\dot{P}_2 = \dot{R}_{02} + \dot{R}_{12} + \dot{R}_{22} + \dot{R}_{32} - \dot{R}_{20}, \quad (3.86)$$

$$\dot{S}_{22} = \dot{S}_{20} - \dot{S}_{02} - \dot{S}_{12} - \dot{S}_{32}, \quad (3.87)$$

$$\dot{P}_3 = \dot{R}_{03} + \dot{R}_{13} + \dot{R}_{23} + \dot{R}_{33} - \dot{R}_{30}, \quad (3.88)$$

$$\dot{S}_{33} = \dot{S}_{30} - \dot{S}_{03} - \dot{S}_{13} - \dot{S}_{23}. \quad (3.89)$$

We now make use of Equations 3.76, 3.79, 3.81 and 3.83, in simplifying Equations 3.64 - 3.66, to obtain:

$$\frac{dK_1}{dt} = \dot{R}_{01} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{R}_{i1} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{K}_{i1} - \dot{P}_1 - \dot{R}_{10} - \dot{K}_{10}, \quad (3.90)$$

$$\frac{dK_2}{dt} = \dot{R}_{02} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{R}_{i2} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{K}_{i2} - \dot{P}_2 - \dot{R}_{20} - \dot{K}_{20}, \quad (3.91)$$

and

$$\frac{dK_3}{dt} = \dot{R}_{03} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{R}_{i3} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{K}_{i3} - \dot{P}_3 - \dot{R}_{30} - \dot{K}_{30}. \quad (3.92)$$

As in previous examples, we have two different formulations for the \dot{P} terms. Substituting, first, Equations 3.84, 3.86 and 3.88, we obtain:

¹⁹ It is worth remembering here that $\dot{R}_{01} = \dot{R}_{21} = 0$, because Final Consumption (1) takes resources (in the form of food) from Goods and Services (3) only and that $\dot{R}_{32} = 0$ because the Goods and Services sector (3) does not provide resources to the Energy sector (2).

$$\frac{dK_1}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{K}_{i1} - \dot{K}_{10}, \quad (3.93)$$

$$\frac{dK_2}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{K}_{i2} - \dot{K}_{20}, \quad (3.94)$$

and

$$\frac{dK_3}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{K}_{i3} - \dot{K}_{30}, \quad (3.95)$$

which we may rewrite as the more general result:

$$\frac{dK_j}{dt} = \sum_i \dot{K}_{ij} - \dot{K}_{j0}. \quad (3.96)$$

Equation 3.96 states that for any economic sector, j , the accumulation of man-made capital stock (K_j) is dependent only on inflows of capital stock from other economic sectors (\dot{K}_{ij}) and depreciation of capital stock back to the biosphere from sector j , (\dot{K}_{j0}).

Instead, substituting the alternative formulation for \dot{P} from Equations 3.73 - 3.75 into Equations 3.90 - 3.92, respectively, we obtain:

$$\frac{dK_1}{dt} = \dot{R}_{01} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{R}_{i1} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{K}_{i1} - \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{R}_{1j} - \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{S}_{1j} - \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{K}_{1j} - \dot{R}_{10} - \dot{K}_{10}, \quad (3.97)$$

$$\frac{dK_2}{dt} = \dot{R}_{02} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{R}_{i2} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{K}_{i2} - \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{R}_{2j} - \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{S}_{2j} - \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{K}_{2j} - \dot{R}_{20} - \dot{K}_{20}, \quad (3.98)$$

and

$$\frac{dK_3}{dt} = \dot{R}_{03} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{R}_{i3} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{K}_{i3} - \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{R}_{3j} - \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{S}_{3j} - \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{K}_{3j} - \dot{R}_{30} - \dot{K}_{30}. \quad (3.99)$$

As before, we can rearrange these equations to obtain:

$$\dot{R}_{01} - \dot{R}_{10} = \frac{dK_1}{dt} - \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{R}_{i1} - \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{K}_{i1} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{R}_{1j} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{S}_{1j} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{K}_{1j} + \dot{K}_{10}, \quad (3.100)$$

$$\dot{R}_{02} - \dot{R}_{20} = \frac{dK_2}{dt} - \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{R}_{i2} - \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{K}_{i2} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{R}_{2j} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{S}_{2j} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{K}_{2j} + \dot{K}_{20}, \quad (3.101)$$

and

$$\dot{R}_{03} - \dot{R}_{30} = \frac{dK_3}{dt} - \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{R}_{i3} - \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{K}_{i3} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{R}_{3j} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{S}_{3j} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{K}_{3j} + \dot{K}_{30}. \quad (3.102)$$

Summing Equations 3.100 - 3.102, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{dR_0}{dt} &= \sum_{j=1}^3 \dot{R}_{0j} - \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{R}_{i0} \\ &= \frac{dK_1}{dt} + \frac{dK_2}{dt} + \frac{dK_3}{dt} - \sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{R}_{ij} - \sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{K}_{ij} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{R}_{ij} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{S}_{ij} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{K}_{ij} + \dot{K}_{10} + \dot{K}_{20} + \dot{K}_{30}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.103)$$

which, after substituting for the depreciation term (\dot{K}_{i0}), can be simplified to:

$$-\frac{dR_0}{dt} = \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{dK_j}{dt} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{i=1}^3 \dot{S}_{ij} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \gamma_{K_j} K_j \quad (3.104)$$

or, more generally:

$$-\frac{dR_0}{dt} = \sum_j \frac{dK_j}{dt} + \sum_{i,j} \dot{S}_{ij} + \sum_j \gamma_{K_j} K_j. \quad (3.105)$$

Similarly to what we saw in Examples A and B, Equation 3.105 tells us that depletion of natural resources in the biosphere ($-\frac{dR_0}{dt}$) by the economy is used for the purposes of:

- increasing man-made capital stocks within the economy ($\frac{dK_j}{dt}$),
- providing short-lived goods exchanged within the economy (\dot{S}_{ij}), and
- overcoming depreciation of man-made capital stocks ($\sum_j \gamma_{K_j} K_j$).

This implications of this will be discussed in greater detail in Section 8.5 concerning sustainable scale of the economy and the concept of a steady-state economy.

The exchange of resources (\dot{R}) and short-lived goods (\dot{S}) among each of the four “sectors” (the biosphere and the three economic sectors) may be thought of as four matrices (as depicted in Figure 3.6 for \dot{S} flows): one 3×3 matrix of flows entirely within the economy, a 3×1 row vector of flows from the biosphere into the economy (extraction), a 1×3 column vector of flows from the economy into the biosphere (waste), and a 1×1 matrix of flows solely within the biosphere (environment), that do not enter the economy.

We now see how the formulation derived here may be applied to the real-world case of the US auto industry.




Fig. 3.6: The matrix of biosphere-economy flows. Note that flow \dot{S}_{00} is not included within our framework.

3.5 Materials in the US auto industry

Throughout the book, we shall be applying the methodology that has been outlined through Examples A–C to the real-world case of the US auto industry. The running example of the US auto industry demonstrates that our dynamic model can be tied into national accounts. The US auto industry example shows where data are:

- currently available (e.g., economic value, Chapter 6 and direct energy, Chapter 4),
- where it is old (e.g., energy intensity, Chapter 7), and
- where it has never been available (e.g., materials, current chapter, and accumulated embodied energy, Chapter 5).

The US auto industry is, therefore, illustrative of the challenges inherent in obtaining data that would feed our model.

Although our choice for using the auto industry is somewhat arbitrary, there are a number of compelling reasons for its selection. Automobile manufacturing has been used previously in the literature in both process-based [19–25] and Input-Output [26–28] analysis methods. The automobile boom was clearly central to the development of most Western countries during the 20th Century. Furthermore, the industry still remains a large portion of many industrialized economies. The automobile industry is a large consumer of material resources, some of which are listed below in Table 3.1. The automobile has obvious links with the energy industry, both in the direct demand for energy used in automobile manufacture, and also indirectly for the refined oil products needed to operate vehicles. This dependence aptly demonstrates demand “lock-in,” discussed in Section 1.4. The industry also shows evidence of post-industrial decline (shrinking profit margins, etc.) and thus represents a sector-level analogy of the maturation and decline in growth of economies.

Thinking about the flows of resources, short-lived, and capital materials into the auto industry, we can say that because the industry does not extract resources directly from the biosphere, the rate of flow of resources (\dot{R}_{0j}) from the biosphere to the auto industry has a zero value. Each of the other inflows and outflows is, in actuality, a vector of hundreds (or even thousands!) of elemental material flows, each of which must be accounted (and balanced) separately.

There are a number of key material inputs into the production of automobiles, directly as resources (\dot{R}) as well as short-lived materials (\dot{S}) and capital goods (\dot{K}) outlined in Table 3.1. Data on the actual flow rates at the industry level is very hard to obtain.²⁰ In Europe, economy-wide material flow accounts (EW-MFA) have been produced by measurement of the physical flows of materials into and out of economies of each of the member states.[29] Work is ongoing to characterize the inter-sectoral flows of these materials [30] which can be analyzed by converting financial data (which is available, as discussed in Section 6.6) into physical flow data via knowledge of the entry points of materials into the economy, i.e. via the extraction industries.

Using EW-MFA data on materials, together with financial flows among sectors as a proxy for material flows, researchers could begin to understand the material intensity of different sectors of the economy in an analogous fashion to the manner in which energy input-output (EI-O) methods calculate energy intensities for sectors within the economy; to produce physical input-output (PI-O) tables. [33] Work is being done in this direction with the Environmental Input-Output Life-Cycle Assessment (EIOLCA) models (the model used in studies [27] and [28]), among others. [34] A short-coming of this approach is that materials accumulate within economic sectors. This sector accumulation is ignored by current PI-O methods, a short-coming this book serves to address.

A number of studies, rather than looking at industry-level activity, have instead looked at the material and energy flows associated with specific or representative vehicle manufacturing *processes*. [22–25, 27, 28, 31, 32] The US automobile industry is composed of many such manufacturing processes. According to the International Organization of Motor Vehicle Manufacturers (OICA), 2.7 million cars were produced in 2010²¹ in the US.[35] In theory, a representation of the industry-level flows could be “built up” by assuming that the results from these process-based analysis methods represent average processes within the whole industry and scaling the material flows accordingly, with appropriately wide uncertainty bounds. A problem with this product-focused approach is that the studies seldom account for material usage not directly associated with vehicle manufacturing process, for example, materials used in factory construction, that is, accumulation within the sector is neglected, and all inputs to the manufacturing process are incorrectly assumed to be physically embodied in the product.[25] This neglect provides more impetus for the methodology developed herein.

²⁰ The issue of lack of physical flow data is discussed in several places in this book, especially in Chapter 9.

²¹ In 2006, prior to the Great Recession, the automobile industry purchased 40 trillion kJ (4.0×10^{13} kJ) of total energy and produced 4.4 million cars.

Table 3.1: List of material input and output flows for the US auto industry (IOC:3361MV) as resources (\dot{R}), short-lived materials (\dot{S}), and capital goods (\dot{K}) using data from [22, 27, 31, 23, 28, 32, 24, 25]. This list is illustrative and by no means exhaustive.

Material Flow		Materials
Resources from biosphere	\dot{R}_{0j}	none
Short-lived from biosphere	\dot{S}_{0j}	oxygen, nitrogen, water
Resources from other sectors	\dot{R}_{ij}	cast iron (engine block); steel (chassis, panels); aluminum (body parts); copper (wiring); zinc, chromium, carbon (alloying); lead, nickel (battery cells); glass (windows, wind shield); rubber (tires); plastic (bodywork, interiors, seals) petroleum (paints, lubricants)
Short-lived from other sectors	\dot{S}_{ij}	energy (oil, natural gas, electricity) water (process) petroleum (solvents) plastic (packaging) paper (towels, packaging)
Capital from other sectors	\dot{K}_{ij}	steel (buildings, equipment) concrete (buildings) glass (windows, screens) plastic (fixtures, fittings, equipment) petroleum (paints, lubricants)
Product output	\dot{P}_j	auto parts and motor vehicles
Resource self-consumption	\dot{R}_{jj}	auto parts
Short-lived self-consumption	\dot{S}_{jj}	none
Capital self-consumption	\dot{K}_{jj}	motor vehicles
Resources to biosphere	\dot{R}_{j0}	trimmings and dust (metal, plastic, rubber)
Short-lived to biosphere	\dot{S}_{j0}	air emissions (GHG, NO _x , SO _x) emissions to water
Capital to biosphere	\dot{K}_{j0}	depreciated equipment depreciated buildings

3.6 Summary

In this chapter we saw how we all use accounting in our everyday lives to count not just physical things (people, apples) but also non-physical things (money). We developed a rigorous procedure for accounting by defining the *what*, *when*, and *where*: what are we counting, when we begin and end counting, and where is our system boundary (control volume) located. We saw that some things (e.g., apples) can be created and destroyed, but other things (mass, energy) are neither created nor destroyed.

We then applied this accounting procedure to materials flowing through an economy. We defined four different types of materials: *resources*, *short-lived goods*, and *capital* which are used to make *products* and specified that only capital may accumulate within economic sectors. We used these definitions in three examples, building from a one-sector model of the economy to a general framework for flows (and accumulation) of materials. Finally, we applied the accounting framework to the real-world example of the US auto industry. We categorized the types of materials used to produce automobiles, but found that industry-level data are difficult to obtain.

In the following two chapters of Part I, we will apply our accounting framework to direct energy (Chapter 4) and embodied energy (Chapter 5).

References

- [1] Dr. Seuss. *The Lorax*. Random House, New York, N.Y., 1971.
- [2] Stuart Sweeney Smith, Adelaide Calbry-Muzyka, Adam Brandt, and Christopher F. Edwards. Economy-wide exergy accounting for energy technologies: Integrating life cycle analysis and thermodynamics. Presented at GCEP Research Symposium 2013, 2013.
- [3] Kenneth E Boulding. The economics of the coming spaceship earth. *Environmental quality in a growing economy*, 2:3–14, 1966.
- [4] TE Graedel. *Metal Stocks in Society: Scientific Synthesis*. United Nations Environment Programme, 2010.
- [5] Fridolin Krausmann, Simone Gingrich, Nina Eisenmenger, Karl-Heinz Erb, Helmut Haberl, and Marina Fischer-Kowalski. Growth in global materials use, gdp and population during the 20th century. *Ecological Economics*, 68(10):2696–2705, 2009.
- [6] United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. World population prospects: The 2012 revision. <http://esa.un.org/wpp/>.
- [7] Allan Schnaiberg. *Environment: from surplus to scarcity*. Oxford University Press, 1980.
- [8] Kenneth A Gould, David N Pellow, and Allan Schnaiberg. Interrogating the treadmill of production everything you wanted to know about the treadmill but were afraid to ask. *Organization & Environment*, 17(3):296–316, 2004.

- [9] Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen. The economics of production. *The American Economic Review*, 60(2):1–9, 1970.
- [10] Herman E Daly. Sustainable development—definitions, principles, policies. In *The future of sustainability*, pages 39–53. Springer, 2006.
- [11] Mario Giampietro, Kozo Mayumi, and Alevgü H Şorman. *Energy Analysis for a Sustainable Future: Multi-scale Integrated Analysis of Societal and Ecosystem Metabolism*. Routledge, 2013.
- [12] Gavin M Mudd. Global trends in gold mining: Towards quantifying environmental and resource sustainability. *Resources Policy*, 32(1):42–56, 2007.
- [13] Gavin M Mudd. The environmental sustainability of mining in australia: key mega-trends and looming constraints. *Resources Policy*, 35(2):98–115, 2010.
- [14] Amory B Lovins, Michael M Brylawski, David R Cramer, and Timothy C Moore. *Hypercars: Materials, manufacturing, and policy implications*. 1996.
- [15] Julian M Allwood, Jonathan M Cullen, Mark A Carruth, Daniel R Cooper, Martin McBrien, Rachel L Milford, Muiris C Moynihan, and Alexandra CH Patel. *Sustainable Materials: with both eyes open*. UIT Cambridge Limited, 2012.
- [16] Thomas O Wiedmann, Heinz Schandl, Manfred Lenzen, Daniel Moran, Sangwon Suh, James West, and Keiichiro Kanemoto. The material footprint of nations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, page 201220362, 2013.
- [17] John von Neumann. A model of general economic equilibrium. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 13(1):1–9, 1945.
- [18] Piero Sraffa. Production of commodities by means of commodities: Prelude to a critique of economic theory, 1960.
- [19] R Stephen Berry and Margaret F Fels. The energy cost of automobiles. *Science and Public Affairs*, 29(10):11–17, 1973.
- [20] John L Sullivan and Jenny Hu. Life cycle energy analysis for automobiles. In *SAE CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS P*, pages 7–20. SOC AUTOMATIVE ENGINEERS INC, 1995.
- [21] Frank Stodolsky, Anant Vyas, Roy Cuenca, and Linda Gaines. Life-cycle energy savings potential from aluminum-intensive vehicles. Technical report, Argonne National Lab., IL (United States), 1995.
- [22] John L Sullivan, Ronald L Williams, Susan Yester, Elisa Cobas-Flores, Scott T Chubbs, Steven G Hentges, and Steven D Pomper. Life cycle inventory of a generic us family sedan: Overview of results uscar amp project. *SAE transactions*, 107(6):1909–1923, 1998.
- [23] David L McCleese and Peter T LaPuma. Using monte carlo simulation in life cycle assessment for electric and internal combustion vehicles. *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 7(4):230–236, 2002.
- [24] John L Sullivan, Andrew Burnham, and Michael Wang. Energy-consumption and carbon-emission analysis of vehicle and component manufacturing. Technical report, Argonne National Laboratory (ANL), 2010.

- [25] Troy R Hawkins, Bhawna Singh, Guillaume Majeau-Bettez, and Anders Hammer Strømman. Comparative environmental life cycle assessment of conventional and electric vehicles. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 17(1), 2012.
- [26] Clark W Bullard, Peter S Penner, and David A Pilati. Net energy analysis: Handbook for combining process and input-output analysis. *Resources and energy*, 1(3):267–313, 1978.
- [27] Heather L MacLean and Lester B Lave. Peer reviewed: A life-cycle model of an automobile. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 32(13):322A–330A, 1998.
- [28] Heather L MacLean and Lester B Lave. Life cycle assessment of automobile/fuel options. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 37(23):5445–5452, 2003.
- [29] Julie Hass and Cristina Popescu. *Economy-wide material flows: European countries required more materials between 2000 and 2007*. eurostat, 2011.
- [30] Stefan Bringezu, Marina Fischer-Kowalski, René Kleijn, and Viveka Palm, editors. *The ConAccount Agenda: The Concerted Action on Material Flow Analysis and its Research & Development Agenda*. Wuppertal Institute, 1998.
- [31] Georg W Schweimer and Marcel Levin. Life cycle inventory for the golf a4. *Research, Environment and Transport*, 2000.
- [32] Andrew Burnham, MQ Wang, and Y Wu. Development and applications of greet 2.7—the transportation vehicle-cyclemodel. Technical report, ANL, 2006.
- [33] Rutger Hoekstra and Jeroen CJM van den Bergh. Constructing physical input-output tables for environmental modeling and accounting: Framework and illustrations. *Ecological Economics*, 59(3):375–393, 2006.
- [34] Carnegie Mellon University Green Design Institute. Economic Input-Output Life Cycle Assessment (EIO-LCA), US 1997 Industry Benchmark model. <http://www.eiolca.net>, Accessed 1 January 2014.
- [35] International Organization of Motor Vehicle Manufacturers (OICA). 2010 production statistics. <http://www.oica.net/category/production-statistics/2010-statistics/>, 2010.

Chapter 4

Flows of direct energy

Living organisms need to be open to a constant flow of resources (energy and matter) to stay alive; human organizations need to be open to a flow of mental resources (information and ideas), as well as to the flows of energy and materials that are part of the production of goods or services. [1, p.117]

—Fritjof Capra

In Chapters 1 and 2, we showed that energy consumption is intimately linked to economic activity and deepened the metabolism metaphor for the economy. From the metabolism metaphor, we understand that the economy consists of producers and consumers who exchange goods and services and factors of production while extracting resources from and disposing wastes to the biosphere. In Chapter 3, we established the material basis of economies: economies processes raw resources for the benefit of producers and consumers while generating unavoidable wastes. In this chapter, we describe and analyze the direct energy that is associated with economic activity within an economy.

All forms of energy provide the potential¹ to do mechanical work.² Energy (as mechanical work) is an essential aspect of the metabolic economy; with it, materials are refined, shaped, and assembled into useful intermediate and final products; food is made available to people in society; jobs are made easier for workers; human ingenuity is multiplied; and complex systems and civilizations are possible. In the absence of high rates of energy available at low cost, life becomes much more difficult, even impossible, for many people.

The analogy for this chapter is this: energy is to thermodynamics as money is to financial accounting. Or, energy is the *currency of thermodynamics*. Just as an accountant understands a firm by watching how and where currency flows through it, so we can understand an economy by watching how and where energy flows through it. Accounting for energy flows through an economy is essential for developing a dynamic picture of its metabolism.

The purpose of this chapter is to develop a framework for accounting energy flows within economies. To do so, we will employ the First Law of Thermodynamics which tells us that the quantity of energy is conserved in every process.³ With an energy framework in hand, we will be positioned to assess the rate at which consumed

¹ The quantification of the mechanical work potential of energy is *exergy*. When energy is “consumed” by an economy, exergy (work potential) is destroyed.

² Mechanical work is the product of a force and the distance through which it acts.

³ The First Law does not speak about the quality of energy—not all forms of energy are equally *useful*. There are several ways to assess the quality of energy. Hammond and Winnett note the

direct energy becomes embodied within the products and services that an economy provides (Chapter 5).

4.1 Methodology

We begin by noting that direct energy travels with material through an economy. “Direct” energy refers to forms of energy accounted by the First Law of Thermodynamics, including chemical potential energy, nuclear potential energy, gravitational potential energy, thermal energy, and kinetic energy. We distinguish between “direct” energy and “embodied” energy, which will be discussed in Chapter 5. Examples of direct energy flows include the chemical potential energy of coal inflows to an energy sector, the thermal energy of process steam into a textile plant, and the thermal energy of CO₂ automobile exhaust. Each of these example flows is an example of a “transfer in” or a “transfer out,” in the language of Section 3.1.1. In each case, the material (coal, steam, and CO₂) carries direct energy with it. Figure 4.1 shows a corresponding direct energy flow for each material flow of Figure 3.1.




Fig. 4.1: Energy content (\dot{E}) of material flows (\dot{R} , \dot{S} , and \dot{K}) from Figure 3.1.

For any boundary or control volume (around, say, a machine, a plant, a sector of the economy, or the entire economy itself), the First Law of Thermodynamics says that the accumulation rate of direct energy within the boundary ($\frac{dE}{dt}$) is equal to the sum of the incoming and outgoing direct energy transfer rates (\dot{E}) less outflowing

importance of the concept of *exergy* to describe the maximum physical work which can be performed by an energy resource as it comes into equilibrium with its environment.[2]

The quality of energy can be assessed in terms of economic value, too. Some energy resources, such as liquid fuels, are more economically valuable than others, i.e. within society, there is a preference for these resources, such that, “accounting for energy quality reveals a relatively strong relationship between energy use and economic output.” [3, p. 313] We see this preference played out on a daily basis when coal is converted to electricity at an average efficiency of around one third. Society is willing to pay a premium for electricity over coal due to its vastly superior usefulness for a multitude of tasks.

energy carried by wastes (\dot{Q}_{out}). As discussed in Section 3.1.1, energy is conserved: it be neither created nor destroyed.

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \sum \dot{E} - \sum \dot{Q}_{out} \quad (4.1)$$

When there is no accumulation of direct energy within the boundary ($\frac{dE}{dt} = 0$), the sum of all signed direct energy flow rates (\dot{E}) and waste heats (\dot{Q}_{out}) will be zero

$$0 = \sum \dot{E} - \sum \dot{Q}_{out}, \quad (4.2)$$

and outgoing waste heat ($\sum \dot{Q}_{out}$) will balance incoming direct energy ($\sum \dot{E}$).

It is important to note that the direct energy associated with some material flows can be so small as to be negligible compared to other direct energy flows in the economy. For example, there is a small amount of chemical potential energy in steel that could be released upon combustion. However, the direct energy associated with flows of steel within the economy is almost negligible. (The *embodied* energy of the steel is most certainly *not* negligible, as will be discussed in Chapter 5.) On the other hand, the direct energy flow rates for fossil fuels (coal, oil, and natural gas) are typically orders of magnitude larger than any other material flows due to large chemical potential energy content.

To simplify the direct energy analysis, we can aggregate the direct energy flows of Figure 4.1 into single arrows when appropriate. For example, the direct energy inputs from other sectors of the economy (labeled as \dot{E}_R , \dot{E}_S , and \dot{E}_K at the top of Figure 4.1) can be summed to \dot{E} (in Figure 4.2) such that

$$\dot{E} = \dot{E}_R + \dot{E}_S + \dot{E}_K. \quad (4.3)$$





Fig. 4.2: Aggregated direct energy flows (\dot{E}) around the producer of Figure 4.1.

4.2 Example A: single-sector economy

Aggregated direct energy flows are now applied to Example A, the single-sector economy shown in Figure 3.2. By summing the direct energy flows associated with each material flow of Figure 3.2, we obtain a simplified picture of direct energy flows in the economy, as shown in Figure 4.3.

Fig. 4.3: Direct energy flows (\dot{E}) a one-sector economy.

We distinguish useful direct energy inputs to a sector of the economy (\dot{E}_{01} in Figure 4.3) from wasteful direct energy flows (\dot{Q}_{10} in Figure 4.3), because \dot{Q} typically denotes thermal energy, and most waste energy is in the form of thermal energy, i.e., waste heat. In Figure 4.3, direct energy input to the economy (\dot{E}_{01}) is shown as being extracted from the biosphere, because the vast majority of direct energy today is derived from fossil fuels. Waste heat from the economy (\dot{Q}_{10}) is shown as returning to the biosphere.

As discussed in Section 4.1, both direct energy (\dot{E}), and waste heat (\dot{Q}) are accounted by the First Law of Thermodynamics. Accounting for possible accumulation of direct energy, the First Law of Thermodynamics for Example A indicates that

$$\frac{dE_0}{dt} = \dot{Q}_{10} - \dot{E}_{01}, \quad (4.4)$$

and

$$\frac{dE_1}{dt} = \dot{E}_{01} + \dot{E}_{11} - \dot{E}_1 - \dot{Q}_{10}. \quad (4.5)$$

Note that \dot{E}_1 is the gross direct energy production rate of society. For example, firms extract crude oil from the biosphere (a component of \dot{E}_{01}) and refine it into petroleum products (which in Figure 4.3, leave as part of flow \dot{E}_1) that are then consumed by society. The direct energy consumption of extraction and refining firms is a component of \dot{E}_{11} , that is some of the energy that circulates back into society in flow \dot{E}_{11} is used within the extraction and refining processes to generate flow \dot{E}_{01} from the biosphere.

Aside from, for example, the US Strategic Petroleum Reserve, we are not stockpiling oil and coal at any meaningful rate, i.e. we consume fossil fuels at a rate equal to their extraction rate. Thus, the world is not accumulating direct energy in the economy.⁴ (The world *is*, however, accumulating *embodied* energy in the economy as we shall see in Chapter 5.) Thus, the accumulation rates for direct energy ($\frac{dE}{dt}$) in the above equations could be set to zero as follows:

$$0 = \dot{Q}_{10} - \dot{E}_{01}, \quad (4.6)$$

and

$$0 = \dot{E}_{01} + \dot{E}_{11} - \dot{E}_1 - \dot{Q}_{10}. \quad (4.7)$$

However, we shall see later (in Chapter 4) that keeping direct energy accumulation terms ($\frac{dE}{dt}$) provides an advantage when deriving embodied energy accounting equations.

⁴ A counter-example could be made for nuclear fuels where “spent” fuel represents a large exergetic stockpile. However, this reserve is not (presently) economically useful.

4.3 Example B: two-sector economy

For Example B, we split Production (2) from Society (1). Figure 4.4 shows aggregated direct energy flows associated with the material flows of Figure 3.4.




Fig. 4.4: Direct energy flows (\dot{E}) for a two-sector economy.

The First Law of Thermodynamics requires that both direct energy and waste heat be conserved around each entity (1 and 2) as well as around the Biosphere (0).

First Law energy accounting around the Biosphere (0) and Society (1) gives

$$\frac{dE_0}{dt} = \dot{Q}_{10} + \dot{Q}_{20} - \dot{E}_{02}, \quad (4.8)$$

and

$$\frac{dE_1}{dt} = \dot{E}_{11} + \dot{E}_{21} - \dot{E}_1 - \dot{Q}_{10}. \quad (4.9)$$

Note that \dot{E}_{12} represents useful work that people and draft animals contribute to Production (2). Ayres and Warr [4, 5] call this “muscle work.” \dot{E}_{11} represents the muscle work required for consumption. Direct energy (electricity, oil, natural gas, etc.) required for consumption by final demand is included in \dot{E}_{21} .

The First Law around Production (2), including the accumulation rate of direct energy in the sector $\left(\frac{dE_2}{dt}\right)$, yields

$$\frac{dE_2}{dt} = \dot{E}_{02} + \dot{E}_{12} + \dot{E}_{22} - \dot{E}_2 - \dot{Q}_{20}. \quad (4.10)$$

It is notable that Production (2) consumes (\dot{E}_{22}) a portion of its gross energy output (\dot{E}_2): *it takes energy to make energy*. The gross direct energy production of the Energy sector (2) is \dot{E}_2 , and the direct energy consumption of the Energy sector (2) is $\dot{E}_{12} + \dot{E}_{22}$. The net direct energy production Energy (2) is given by $\dot{E}_2 - (\dot{E}_{12} + \dot{E}_{22})$. The *energy return on investment (EROI)* [6, 7] of the Energy sector (2) is given by

$$EROI_2 = \frac{\dot{E}_2}{\dot{E}_{12} + \dot{E}_{22}}. \quad (4.11)$$

EROI represents the energy production *per unit* of energy invested by society in the production process and may be considered a measure of the ease of obtaining energy resources from the biosphere. Although the definition of *EROI*, as outlined here, is easy to articulate (essentially, $\frac{\text{energy out}}{\text{energy in}}$), the EROI calculation involves many system boundary considerations. These issues are discussed thoroughly by both Murphy, et al. [8] and Brandt, et al. [9, 10] who outline several EROI ratios according to the factors included in the calculation. Because we are dealing only with direct energy in this chapter (and not upstream energy embodied in materials), the EROI defined here is $EROI_{2,d}$ [8, Table 1] or GER_γ [11, Table 1], where GER stands for *gross energy ratio* an equivalent metric to EROI.

As discussed in Chapter 3, society relies heavily on concentrations of high quality material resources. As we mine lower quality material resources we require larger inputs of energy both directly, to process greater volumes of material, but also indirectly to build the extra capital equipment necessary to do the processing. The same is also true of energy resources within the environment. Fossil fuels represent stocks of solar energy accumulated (in the form of biomass) over many millions of years. These resources are extremely far from equilibrium with the environment.

EROI can be considered an indicator of energy resource quality. As EROI (and thus energy quality) declines, more energy is needed to extract and deliver energy from the environment, both directly, for example the energy to pump oil from deeper underground, and indirectly, in order to build the extra oil rigs necessary to maintain production levels.⁵

Equation 4.8 can be generalized with a sum as

$$\frac{dE_0}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^n (\dot{Q}_{i0} - \dot{E}_{0i}), \quad (4.12)$$

where n is the number of economic sectors in the accounting framework (in this example, $n = 2$). Similarly, Equations 4.9 and 4.10 can be generalized with a sum as


$$\frac{dE_j}{dt} = \sum_{i=0}^n \dot{E}_{ij} - \dot{E}_j - \dot{Q}_{j0}, \quad (4.13)$$

where $j \in [1, n]$.

4.4 Example C: three-sector economy

We can extend Example B, to include an Energy sector (2) and a Goods and Services sector (3), thereby obtaining a fuller picture of direct energy flows among sectors (Figure 4.5).

⁵ This issue of resource quality will be re-visited in Chapter 6.

Fig. 4.5: Direct energy flows (\dot{E}) for a three-sector economy.

The First Law of Thermodynamics applied to the Biosphere (0), Society (1), and the Energy (2) gives

$$\frac{dE_0}{dt} = \dot{Q}_{10} + \dot{Q}_{20} + \dot{Q}_{30} - \dot{E}_{02} - \dot{E}_{03}, \quad (4.14)$$

$$\frac{dE_1}{dt} = \dot{E}_{11} + \dot{E}_{21} + \dot{E}_{31} - \dot{E}_1 - \dot{Q}_{10}, \quad (4.15)$$

and

$$\frac{dE_2}{dt} = \dot{E}_{02} + \dot{E}_{12} + \dot{E}_{22} + \dot{E}_{32} - \dot{E}_2 - \dot{Q}_{20}. \quad (4.16)$$

The First Law applied to the Goods and Services sector (3) including, for now, the accumulation rate of direct energy in the sector $\left(\frac{dE_3}{dt}\right)$ yields

$$\frac{dE_3}{dt} = \dot{E}_{03} + \dot{E}_{13} + \dot{E}_{23} + \dot{E}_{33} - \dot{E}_3 - \dot{Q}_{30}. \quad (4.17)$$

Similar to Example B, we can generalize Equations 4.14–4.17 with sums to obtain

$$\frac{dE_0}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{Q}_{i0} - \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{E}_{0i} \quad (4.18)$$

and

$$\frac{dE_j}{dt} = \sum_{i=0}^n \dot{E}_{ij} - \dot{E}_j - \dot{Q}_{j0}, \quad (4.19)$$

where $j \in [1, n]$. Equations 4.18 and 4.19 are identical to Equations 4.12 and 4.13, indicating that we have successfully generalized the framework to any number of sectors.

In this economy, the purpose of Goods and Services (3) is to produce goods and provide services, it provides no direct energy to society. The purpose of Energy (2) is to make direct energy (\dot{E}) available to the economy and society in a useful form. We may simplify the above equations by realizing that (a) $\dot{E}_3 = \dot{E}_{3i} = 0$, because Goods and Services (3) is assumed to produce no direct energy, and (b) $\dot{E}_{03} = 0$, because Goods and Services (3) receives no direct energy from the Biosphere (0), except via the Energy sector (2). Thus, several terms in the sums of Equation 4.19 will be zero.

4.5 Direct energy in the auto industry

In this section we discuss inflow of direct energy into the automobile industry as shown in Figure 4.6. In 2010, the automobile industry purchased 28 trillion kJ of energy in total from all sources. Table 4.1 shows the breakdown of energy by source.

Total energy use can also be estimated by summing the energy use of the underlying detailed processes in manufacturing automobiles. Sullivan et al. arrive at an




Fig. 4.6: Direct energy flows for the US automobile industry.[12, Table 7.6]

Table 4.1: Energy inputs to US auto industry (NAICS Code 336111) in 2010.[12, Table 7.6]

Source	Quantity	Energy content [kJ]
Electricity	$3.0 \times 10^9 \text{ kW-hr}$	$10.8 \times 10^{12} \text{ }^a$
Natural gas	$1.5 \times 10^{10} \text{ ft}^3$	16.3×10^{12}
Other	$1.0 \times 10^{12} \text{ BTU}$	1.1×10^{12}
Total	$2.8 \times 10^{13} \text{ kJ (thermal equivalent)}$	

^a Non-quality corrected value

estimate of the “gate-to-gate” energy used in the process of creating one automobile (the direct energy used within the automobile manufacturing process only).[13] This estimate can be multiplied by the number of vehicles manufactured in a given year to obtain total energy use by the automobile industry. Sullivan estimated a total direct energy use of 34,000 MJ for a generic 1,532 kg vehicle.

4.6 Summary

In this chapter, we have developed equations, assisted by the First Law of Thermodynamics, that describe the flow of direct energy (\dot{E}) through economies (Section 4.1). Examples A–C afforded the opportunity to apply the equations to analyze economies with increasing levels of disaggregation (Sections 4.2–4.4). Finally, the energy flows for our running example, the US auto industry, were discussed in Section 4.5.

In the next chapter, the direct energy equations developed above will be used to develop *embodied* energy accounting equations for Examples A–C.

References

- [1] Fritjof Capra. *The Hidden Connections: A Science for Sustainable Living*. Anchor Books, New York, January 2004.
- [2] Geoffrey P Hammond and Adrian B Winnett. The influence of thermodynamic ideas on ecological economics: An interdisciplinary critique. *Sustainability*, 1:1196–1225, 2009.
- [3] Cutler J Cleveland, Robert K Kaufmann, and David I Stern. Aggregation and the role of energy in the economy. *Ecological Economics*, 32:301–317, 2000.
- [4] Robert U Ayres, Leslie W Ayres, and Benjamin S Warr. Exergy, power and work in the us economy, 1900–1998. *Energy*, 28(3):219–273, March 2003.
- [5] Benjamin S Warr and Robert U Ayres. Useful work and information as drivers of economic growth. *Ecological Economics*, 73(C):93–102, January 2012.
- [6] DM Smith. The yield and energy content of milk and the energetic efficiency of sows on different levels of nutrition during gestation and lactation. *New Zealand Journal of Agricultural Research*, 3(5):745–763, 1960.
- [7] Charles A S Hall, Cutler J Cleveland, and Robert Kaufman. *Energy and Resource Quality: The Ecology of the Economic Process*. John Wiley & Sons, 1986.
- [8] David J Murphy, Charles AS Hall, Michael Dale, and Cutler Cleveland. Order from chaos: a preliminary protocol for determining the eroi of fuels. *Sustainability*, 3(10):1888–1907, 2011.
- [9] Adam R Brandt and Michael Dale. A general mathematical framework for calculating systems-scale efficiency of energy extraction and conversion: Energy return on investment (eroi) and other energy return ratios. *Energies*, 4(8):1211–1245, 2011.
- [10] Adam R Brandt, Michael Dale, and Charles J Barnhart. Calculating systems-scale energy efficiency and net energy returns: A bottom-up matrix-based approach. *Energy*, 62:235–247, 2013.
- [11] Adam R Brandt. Oil depletion and the energy efficiency of oil production: The case of california. *Sustainability*, 3(10):1833–1854, 2011.
- [12] EIA. 2010 manufacturing energy consumption survey (MECS) survey data. Technical report, US Energy Information Administration, 2010.
- [13] John L Sullivan, Andrew Burnham, and Michael Wang. Energy-consumption and carbon-emission analysis of vehicle and component manufacturing. Technical report, Argonne National Laboratory (ANL), 2010.

Chapter 5

Stocks and flows of embodied energy

One of the main sinks of energy in the “developed” world is the creation of stuff. In its natural life cycle, stuff passes through three stages. First, a new-born stuff is displayed in shiny packaging on a shelf in a shop. At this stage, stuff is called “goods.” As soon as the stuff is taken home and sheds its packaging, it undergoes a transformation from “good” to its second form, “clutter.” The clutter lives with its owner for a period of months or years. During this period, the clutter is largely ignored by its owner, who is off at the shops buying more goods. Eventually, by a miracle of modern alchemy, the clutter is transformed into its final form, rubbish. To the untrained eye, it can be difficult to distinguish this “rubbish” from the highly desirable “good” that it used to be. Nonetheless, at this stage the discerning owner pays the dustman to transport the stuff away. [1, p.88]

—David MacKay

In Chapter 1, we noted that manufactured capital is a significant driver of material and energy demand from the biosphere and that approaching limits to the extraction rate of materials may have negative effects on the economy. (See Section 1.3.2.) Systems of national accounts measure the level of manufactured capital and capital formation in financial terms, but the biophysical perspective shows that it is important to measure the level of capital on a physical basis, too.

One way to assess the level of manufactured capital on a physical basis is to estimate the energy *embodied within* that capital. Because capital is created using output from other economic sectors, it is necessary to estimate the energy embodied in products (\dot{P}), too. The energy embodied in products (e.g., energy embodied in the automobiles produced by the automotive sector) is related to the sum of all direct energy consumed in the manufacture of its products, including all upstream processing stages. For example, the upstream energy consumed by an auto parts supplier to fabricate windows will be embodied in the finished automobile. Embodied energy gives an indication of the energy demand from consumption of goods and services within an economy.

In most cases, embodied energy is many times higher than the direct energy (Chapter 4) consumed by the final stage of the supply chain. In the case of energy production, the energy embodied in energy products (e.g., fossil fuels and food) can be significantly higher than the direct energy used by the production sector to create the energy product. This is true even for food production, where the embodied energy of processed foods can be about three times larger than its chemical energy content at the point of departure from the factory.[2] Distribution and cooking embody additional energy before it reaches the plate.

To assess the embodied energy of products and economic sectors, we will adapt the First Law discussed in Chapter 4.¹

Fundamentally, nearly all energy on Earth comes from or came from the Sun. In the framework for embodied energy that we develop below, we consider the embodiment of solar energy *after* its conversion to another energy form, e.g., fossil fuels, hydroelectricity, or solar PV electricity. Other approaches are possible. The *energy* method counts all material flows in terms of *embodied solar energy*. [3, 4] The basic unit of measure is the *emjoule* which is often given in terms of flows of solar energy embodied in the energy (or material)—the solar emjoule—per unit of resource, abbreviated to seJ/J for energy resources, or seJ/kg for materials. As such, even fossil fuels, e.g. coal, extracted from the earth have an embodied energy of around 67,000 seJ/J. [5] The decision about solar energy is a boundary choice. Our choice to account post-solar embodied energy is consistent with the direct energy reporting practices of the International Energy Agency (IEA) and the US Energy Information Administration (EIA).

Embodied energy is a very useful way to assess the level of manufactured capital. First, we note that the machines, factories, and stores in which energy becomes embodied are essential for the efficient operation of any economic sector. A sector can't operate without its manufactured capital! Second, to first approximation, embodied energy is a good estimate of the energy that will be demanded to replace depreciated capital. Furthermore, we will need to know the embodied energy content of economic products to estimate energy intensity in Chapter 7. Third, the amount of energy embodied in the sector is an indicator of the complexity of the sector.²

The purpose of this chapter is to develop a framework for accounting embodied energy accumulation and flow within economies. With an embodied energy accounting framework in hand, we will be positioned to develop a method for analyzing the energy intensity of goods and services within an economy (Chapter 7).

5.1 Methodology

We begin the derivation of embodied energy accounting equations by defining the concept of *total* energy.

¹ To the authors' knowledge, this is the first appearance in the literature of a systematic, detailed, and mathematically-rigorous derivation of embodied energy accounting equations derived from the laws of thermodynamics.

² The amount of energy embodied in an entire economy may be an indicator of its level of "development." See Section 8.3 for a discussion of several indicators of economic "development."

5.1.1 Total energy accounting

Total energy (T) is defined as the sum of direct energy (E , see Chapter 4) and embodied energy (B), which we will not define at present. This analysis will lead us to a mathematical definition of embodied energy.

$$T \equiv E + B \quad (5.1)$$

The flow rate of total energy (\dot{T}) among sectors in the economy, the biosphere, and society is the sum of direct energy (\dot{E}) and embodied energy (\dot{B}).

$$\dot{T} = \dot{E} + \dot{B} \quad (5.2)$$

Figure 5.1 illustrates that total energy flows are comprised of direct energy (\dot{E}) and embodied energy (\dot{B}).




Fig. 5.1: Total energy flows (\dot{T}) for a single sector of an economy. For the sake of clarity, direct (\dot{E}) and embodied (\dot{B}) energy flows are shown separately for material inflows from other sectors only.

In some cases, a material flow may include either direct energy (\dot{E}) or embodied energy (\dot{B}), exclusively. For example, the flow of extracted crude oil from the earth consists of direct energy only ($\dot{B} = 0$ and $\dot{T} = \dot{E}$), because, in this framework, no embodied energy (B) is added to the crude oil until it reaches the downstream side of the oil rig. Conversely, the material produced by a non-energy sector of the economy consists of embodied energy only ($\dot{E} \approx 0$, and therefore $\dot{T} \approx \dot{B}$), because direct energy (E) produced by a non-energy sector is negligible in this framework.

In other cases, a material flow may include both a direct energy flow (\dot{E}) component *and* an embodied energy flow (\dot{B}) component. For example, the outgoing flow of refined petroleum from the energy sector has both a direct energy (\dot{E} , the energy content of the oil product, usually represented by chemical potential energy)

and embodied energy (\dot{B} , which accounts for the energy (a) consumed in upstream processes to extract and refine the crude oil and (b) consumed by the refinery itself).³

Most of the Energy Input-Output (EI-O) literature [6, 7] applies the following (and often unstated) assumptions:

- flows of total energy (\dot{T}) are conserved,⁴
- total energy does not accumulate in economic sectors,
- there is never a flow of embodied energy to the biosphere, and
- all total energy inflow to a sector is allocated to the products of that sector (i.e., there is no “waste” of total energy).

Like the EI-O literature, we assume that total energy (T) is conserved and never wasted.⁵ However, we depart from the EI-O literature by explicitly accounting a stock for total energy accumulation in economic sectors.

Total energy (T) may accumulate within an economic sector as stocks of direct energy materials (piles of coal or tanks of oil)⁶ but also as energy embodied in stocks of capital goods (e.g., machinery or buildings). The rate of accumulation of total energy in a sector of the economy, the biosphere, or society is given by the time derivative of total energy:

$$\frac{dT}{dt} = \frac{dE}{dt} + \frac{dB}{dt}. \quad (5.3)$$

The following equation provides a total energy accounting for a sector of the economy, where the \dot{T} terms are signed: positive for total energy input and negative for total energy output.

$$\frac{dT}{dt} = \sum \dot{T} \quad (5.4)$$

By substituting Equations 5.2 and 5.3 into Equation 5.4, we obtain

$$\frac{dE}{dt} + \frac{dB}{dt} = \sum (\dot{E} + \dot{B}). \quad (5.5)$$

5.1.2 Embodied energy accounting

We note that the definition of total energy (Equation 5.1) includes direct energy (E) and embodied energy (B) terms. On the other hand, the First Law of Thermodynamics (Equation 4.1) includes direct energy (E) and waste heat (Q) terms. The consequence

³ Outputs from agricultural sectors will be similar: both (a) the direct energy component (comprising chemical potential energy) and (b) the embodied energy component (representing upstream energy consumed in food production) will be non-zero.

⁴ Total energy can be neither created nor destroyed.

⁵ Of course, waste heat exists and is accounted by the First Law of Thermodynamics. However, waste heat is ignored when accounting for total energy.

⁶ But little direct energy accumulation actually occurs. We use energy as fast as we make it available to society.

of the foregoing difference is that an interesting relationship exists between embodied energy (B) and waste heat (Q), as we shall see below.

To derive an accounting equation for embodied energy, we substitute the First Law of Thermodynamics (Equation 4.1) into the total energy accounting equation (Equation 5.5).

$$\frac{dB}{dt} = \sum \dot{B} + \sum \dot{Q}_{out} \quad (5.6)$$

The waste energy terms (\dot{Q}_{out}) in Equation 5.6 are *outflows* of energy from the sector. The embodied energy terms (\dot{B}) represent embodied energy of inflows and outflows of material. Splitting the \dot{B} term into inflows and outflows gives

$$\frac{dB}{dt} = \sum \dot{B}_{in} - \sum \dot{B}_{out} + \sum \dot{Q}_{out}. \quad (5.7)$$

In words, the rate of accumulation of embodied energy in a sector of the economy ($\frac{dB}{dt}$) is equal to the sum of the rates of inflow of embodied energy into the sector (\dot{B}_{in}) less the rate of output of embodied energy from the sector (\dot{B}_{out}) *plus* the rate of waste heat from the sector (\dot{Q}_{out}). The first two terms on the right side of Equation 5.7 are expected: accumulation is the difference between inflow and outflow rates. The final term (\dot{Q}_{out}) is a proxy for all direct energy (\dot{E}) consumed within the sector.

Rearranging Equation 5.7 yields another version of the embodied energy accounting equation: one that illuminates issues related to stages of growth for an economic sector.

$$\sum \dot{B}_{in} + \sum \dot{Q}_{out} = \frac{dB}{dt} + \sum \dot{B}_{out} \quad (5.8)$$

From Equation 5.8, we see that incoming embodied energy (\dot{B}_{in}) and waste heat⁷ (\dot{Q}_{out}) can be used to increase either (a) the embodied energy within a sector of the economy ($\frac{dB}{dt}$) or (b) the embodied energy output of a sector of the economy (\dot{B}_{out}), depending on decisions by actors (firms, households, or the government) within the sector. If the sector is “building up” production capacity, much of the incoming embodied energy (\dot{B}_{in}) and direct energy consumption (represented by \dot{Q}_{out}) will be used to increase infrastructure (and associated embodied energy, B) within the sector, and $\frac{dB}{dt}$ will be positive. If, on the other hand, the sector is not expanding, much of the incoming embodied energy (\dot{B}_{in}) and direct energy consumption (represented by \dot{Q}_{out}) will be used for production of goods (\dot{B}_{out}), and $\frac{dB}{dt}$ will be close to zero. Equation 5.7 shows that an economic sector in decline may experience an outflow of embodied energy (via products or depreciation) in excess of the sum of its embodied energy inflows (\dot{B}_{in}) and direct energy consumption (represented by \dot{Q}_{out}), and $\frac{dB}{dt}$ will be negative.

Equations 5.7 and 5.8 highlight a contrast between our dynamic analysis and the EI-O literature. The traditional assumption of steady-state conditions in economic sectors is tantamount to assuming that $\frac{dB}{dt} = 0$ in Equations 5.7 and 5.8. That assump-


⁷ Because we have substituted the First Law of Thermodynamics into the total energy accounting equation, \dot{Q}_{out} is a proxy for direct energy consumption by the sector.

tion precludes analysis of stages of growth and the embodied energy implications thereof.

Equations 5.7 and 5.8 are generalized embodied energy accounting equations that we will see again for Examples A–C in the sections that follow.

5.2 Example A: single-sector economy

Figure 5.2 shows the flows of total energy (\dot{T}) through the single-sector economy.

Fig. 5.2: Total energy flows (\dot{T}) in a one-sector economy.

As discussed above, we follow the EI-O literature in assuming that total energy (T) is conserved. A total energy accounting around the Biosphere (0) and Society (1) gives

$$\frac{dT_0}{dt} = \dot{T}_{10} - \dot{T}_{01}, \quad (5.9)$$

and

$$\frac{dT_1}{dt} = \dot{T}_{01} + \dot{T}_{11} - \dot{T}_1 - \dot{T}_{10}. \quad (5.10)$$

Substituting Equations 5.2 and 5.3 into Equations 5.9 and 5.10 yields

$$\frac{dE_0}{dt} + \frac{dB_0}{dt} = \dot{E}_{10} + \dot{B}_{10} - \dot{E}_{01} - \dot{B}_{01} \quad (5.11)$$

and

$$\frac{dE_1}{dt} + \frac{dB_1}{dt} = \dot{E}_{01} + \dot{B}_{01} + \dot{E}_{11} + \dot{B}_{11} - \dot{E}_1 - \dot{B}_1 - \dot{E}_{10} - \dot{B}_{10}. \quad (5.12)$$

At this point, we can proceed in two directions. The first direction, simplifying Equations 5.11 and 5.12, provides an intuitive result. The second direction, substituting the First Law of Thermodynamics into Equations 5.11 and 5.12, provides the advantage of cancelling most of the direct energy terms. We begin with the first approach: simplification.

5.2.1 Simplification of the embodied energy accounting equation

To simplify Equations 5.11 and 5.12, we first realize that, by definition, no embodied energy flows from the earth with extracted material, so $\dot{B}_{01} = 0$ and $\dot{T}_0 = \dot{E}_{01}$ as shown in Figure 5.2. Second, we can assume that direct energy (E) does not accumulate in the economy such that $\frac{dE_0}{dt} = 0$ and $\frac{dE_1}{dt} = 0$. Finally, we note that $\dot{E}_{10} = 0$, because society does not supply direct energy to the biosphere. Thus, Equations 5.11 and 5.12 become

$$\frac{dB_0}{dt} = \dot{B}_{10} - \dot{E}_{01} \quad (5.13)$$

and

$$\frac{dB_1}{dt} = \dot{E}_{01} + \dot{E}_{11} + \dot{B}_{11} - \dot{E}_1 - \dot{B}_1 - \dot{B}_{10}. \quad (5.14)$$

These equations show that direct energy consumed by a sector (\dot{E}_{01}) increases the energy embodied within the sector (B_1), whereas waste from the sector produces an embodied energy outflow (\dot{B}_{10}) that reduces the energy embodied within the sector.

5.2.2 Substitution of First Law into the embodied energy accounting equation

The second approach to the derivation of embodied energy accounting equations is to substitute the First Law (Equations 4.4 and 4.5) into the total energy accounting equations (Equations 5.11 and 5.12).

$$\frac{dB_0}{dt} = \dot{E}_{10} + \dot{B}_{10} - \dot{B}_{01} - \dot{Q}_{10} \quad (5.15)$$

$$\frac{dB_1}{dt} = \dot{B}_{01} + \dot{B}_{11} - \dot{B}_1 - \dot{B}_{10} - \dot{E}_{10} + \dot{Q}_{10} \quad (5.16)$$

This substitution has the advantage of canceling most of the direct energy terms from the embodied energy accounting equations. And, it is no longer necessary to assume that the accumulation rate of direct energy $\left(\frac{dE}{dt}\right)$ is zero, because the $\frac{dE}{dt}$ term is cancelled by the substitution.

We can simplify Equations 5.15 and 5.16 using the assumptions of Section 5.2.1 (namely, that $\dot{B}_{01} = 0$ and $\dot{E}_{10} = 0$) to obtain

$$\frac{dB_0}{dt} = \dot{B}_{10} - \dot{Q}_{10} \quad (5.17)$$

and

$$\frac{dB_1}{dt} = \dot{B}_{11} - \dot{B}_1 - \dot{B}_{10} + \dot{Q}_{10}. \quad (5.18)$$

The material model of this framework (see Chapter 3) indicates that materials are comprised of resources (R), short-lived materials (S), and capital (K). Thus, we can write

$$\frac{dB_1}{dt} = \frac{dB_{R1}}{dt} + \frac{dB_{S1}}{dt} + \frac{dB_{K1}}{dt}, \quad (5.19)$$

but neither resources (R) nor short-lived materials (S) accumulate in economic sectors at a significant rate. Thus,

$$\frac{dB_1}{dt} = \frac{dB_{K1}}{dt}. \quad (5.20)$$

We can substitute Equation 5.20 into Equation 5.18 to obtain

$$\frac{dB_{K1}}{dt} = \dot{B}_{11} - \dot{B}_1 - \dot{B}_{10} + \dot{Q}_{10}. \quad (5.21)$$

Equations 5.17 and 5.21 are the embodied energy accounting equations for Example A.

In Examples B and C following, we will choose the approach of this section, namely substitution of the First Law of Thermodynamics into the total energy accounting equation (instead of simplifying the total energy equation as discussed in Section 5.2.1), because of the benefit of canceling direct energy flow terms (\dot{E}).

5.2.3 Physical depreciation

The term \dot{B}_{10} in Equation 5.21 represents the disposal rate of embodied energy from Society (1) to the Biosphere (0), i.e., depreciated physical assets. Figure 3.2 shows that the outgoing material flow from Society (1) is comprised of resources (\dot{R}_{10}), short-lived materials (\dot{S}_{10}), and capital (\dot{K}_{10}). Each of these material flows will have associated embodied energy such that

$$\dot{B}_{10} = \dot{B}_{\dot{R}_{10}} + \dot{B}_{\dot{S}_{10}} + \dot{B}_{\dot{K}_{10}}. \quad (5.22)$$

The term $\dot{B}_{\dot{K}_{10}}$ represents the energy embodied in depreciated physical assets. Physical depreciation is counted at the moment when material physically departs an economic sector and enters the biosphere, presumably a landfill, where the material in the wasted assets will decay. Financial depreciation is usually faster than physical depreciation according to rates set by accounting rules. The embodied energy associated with physical depreciation ($\dot{B}_{\dot{K}_{10}}$) can be represented by a depreciation term such as

$$\dot{B}_{\dot{K}_{10}} = \gamma_B B_{K_1}, \quad (5.23)$$

where γ_B represents the depreciation rate of embodied energy in units of inverse time (e.g., 1/year) with $\gamma_B > 0$.⁸ The depreciation rate (γ_B) indicates that a fraction of the energy embodied in capital stock is disposed over a period of time (e.g., $\gamma_B = 0.05/\text{year}$). In the absence of other inputs or outputs, this depreciation function provides exponential decay of embodied energy (B) in an economic sector. γ_B is, in general, a function of time.

Equation 5.23 can be substituted into Equation 5.22 to obtain

$$\dot{B}_{10} = \dot{B}_{\dot{R}_{10}} + \dot{B}_{\dot{S}_{10}} + \gamma_B B_{K_1}. \quad (5.24)$$

Equation 5.24 can be substituted into Equations 5.17 and 5.21 to obtain

$$\frac{dB_0}{dt} = \dot{B}_{\dot{R}_{10}} + \dot{B}_{\dot{S}_{10}} + \gamma_B B_{K_1} - \dot{Q}_{10} \quad (5.25)$$

and

$$\frac{dB_{K_1}}{dt} = \dot{B}_{11} - \dot{B}_1 - \dot{B}_{\dot{R}_{10}} - \dot{B}_{\dot{S}_{10}} - \gamma_B B_{K_1} + \dot{Q}_{10}. \quad (5.26)$$

Equation 5.26 indicates that the accumulation rate of embodied energy in an economic sector $\left(\frac{dB_{K_1}}{dt}\right)$ is equal to the sum of the embodied energy input to the sector (\dot{B}_{11}) and waste heat from the economic sector (\dot{Q}_{10}), less embodied energy the leaves the sector in its products (\dot{B}_1), less the rate of disposal of embodied energy associated with scrap resources ($\dot{B}_{\dot{R}_{10}}$), short-lived material ($\dot{B}_{\dot{S}_{10}}$), and depreciated capital stock ($\gamma_B B_{K_1}$).

⁸ Note that γ_B will, in general, be different from γ_K defined in Section 3.2. γ_B will equal γ_K if and only if the depreciated capital has an embodied energy content that is identical to the average embodied energy content of the sector on a per-unit-mass basis.

As discussed in previous Chapters, natural resource quality has a direct impact on both material and energy intensity of economic processes. The Best-First Principle (Section 1.3.2) indicates that as we extract lower quality resources we require larger inputs of materials and energy, to process greater volumes of material and to build the extra capital equipment necessary to do the extra processing. An analogous impact is seen in the embodied energy. A greater amount of energy is embodied within the material and energy products of a sector and the extra capital equipment represents a greater amount of energy embodied within the production sector. Additionally, each unit of capital will have a greater amount of energy embodied within it due to increases in the material and energy intensity of upstream sectors.⁹ We turn now to Example B, a two-sector economy.

5.3 Example B: two-sector economy

For the two-sector economy of Figures 3.4 and 4.4, we again follow the EI-O literature by assuming that total energy (T) is conserved. Figure 5.3 shows total energy flows for the two-sector economy.

⁹ This issue of resource quality will be re-visited in Chapter 6.




Fig. 5.3: Flows of total energy (\dot{T}) in a two-sector economy.

Accounting for accumulation of total energy and using the assumption that total energy is conserved, we can write the following equations.

$$\frac{dT_0}{dt} = \dot{T}_{10} + \dot{T}_{20} - \dot{T}_{02}, \quad (5.27)$$

$$\frac{dT_1}{dt} = \dot{T}_{11} + \dot{T}_{21} - \dot{T}_1 - \dot{T}_{10}, \quad (5.28)$$

and

$$\frac{dT_2}{dt} = \dot{T}_{02} + \dot{T}_{12} + \dot{T}_{22} - \dot{T}_2 - \dot{T}_{20}. \quad (5.29)$$

Substituting Equations 5.2 and 5.3 into Equations 5.27 through 5.29 gives

$$\frac{dB_0}{dt} + \frac{dE_0}{dt} = \dot{E}_{10} + \dot{B}_{10} + \dot{E}_{20} + \dot{B}_{20} - \dot{E}_{02} - \dot{B}_{02}, \quad (5.30)$$

$$\frac{dB_1}{dt} + \frac{dE_1}{dt} = \dot{E}_{11} + \dot{B}_{11} + \dot{E}_{21} + \dot{B}_{21} - \dot{E}_1 - \dot{B}_1 - \dot{E}_{10} - \dot{B}_{10}, \quad (5.31)$$

and

$$\frac{dB_2}{dt} + \frac{dE_2}{dt} = \dot{E}_{02} + \dot{B}_{02} + \dot{E}_{12} + \dot{B}_{12} + \dot{E}_{22} + \dot{B}_{22} - \dot{E}_2 - \dot{B}_2 - \dot{E}_{20} - \dot{B}_{20}. \quad (5.32)$$

As in Example A, we can substitute the First Law of Thermodynamics (Equations 4.8–4.10) into the total energy accounting equations (Equations 5.30–5.32) and employ the assumptions that $\dot{E}_{i0} = 0$ and $\dot{B}_{0j} = 0$ to obtain

$$\frac{dB_0}{dt} = \dot{B}_{10} + \dot{B}_{20} - \dot{Q}_{10} - \dot{Q}_{20}, \quad (5.33)$$

$$\frac{dB_1}{dt} = \dot{B}_{11} + \dot{B}_{21} - \dot{B}_2 - \dot{B}_{10} + \dot{Q}_{10}, \quad (5.34)$$

and

$$\frac{dB_2}{dt} = \dot{B}_{12} + \dot{B}_{22} - \dot{B}_2 - \dot{B}_{20} + \dot{Q}_{20}. \quad (5.35)$$

Similar to Example A, we observe that the accumulation rate of embodied energy in the economic sectors (1 and 2) is the sum of the rates of waste heat flowing from the sector (\dot{Q}_{20}) and embodied energy into the sector ($\dot{B}_{12} + \dot{B}_{22}$) less the rate of embodied energy leaving the sector on its output streams ($\dot{B}_2 + \dot{B}_{20}$).

Equations 5.33–5.35 can be simplified using sums:

$$\frac{dB_0}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{B}_{i0} - \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{Q}_{i0} \quad (5.36)$$

and

$$\frac{dB_j}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{B}_{ij} - \dot{B}_j - \dot{B}_{j0} + \dot{Q}_{j0}, \quad (5.37)$$

where $j \in [1, n]$.

As in Example A, we can disaggregate the accumulation and waste embodied energy terms and express physical waste of capital stock as depreciation in Equations 5.36 and 5.37 to obtain

$$\frac{dB_0}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^n (\dot{B}_{\dot{R}_{i0}} + \dot{B}_{\dot{S}_{i0}} + \gamma_{B_i} B_{K_i}) - \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{Q}_{i0} \quad (5.38)$$


and

$$\frac{dB_{K,j}}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{B}_{ij} - \dot{B}_j - (\dot{B}_{\dot{R}_{j0}} + \dot{B}_{\dot{S}_{j0}} + \gamma_{B_j} B_{K_j}) + \dot{Q}_{j0}. \quad (5.39)$$

In the next section, we apply embodied energy accounting to Example C, a three-sector economy.

5.4 Example C: three-sector economy

Again, we begin with the diagram showing total energy (\dot{T}) flows among the economic sectors of Example C (Figure 5.4).

Fig. 5.4: Flows of total energy (\dot{T}) in a three-sector economy.

Accounting for accumulation of total energy and applying the assumption that total energy is conserved, we can write the following equations. We build from the derivation in Section 5.3 and utilize sums for each equation below:

$$\frac{dT_0}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{T}_{i0} - \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{T}_{0j} \quad (5.40)$$

and

$$\frac{dT_j}{dt} = \sum_{i=0}^n \dot{T}_{ij} - \dot{T}_j - \dot{T}_{j0}. \quad (5.41)$$

where $j \in [1, n]$.

Substituting Equations 5.2 and 5.3 into Equations 5.40 and 5.41 gives

$$\frac{dE_0}{dt} + \frac{dB_0}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{E}_{i0} + \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{B}_{i0} - \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{E}_{0j} - \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{B}_{0j} \quad (5.42)$$

and

$$\frac{dE_j}{dt} + \frac{dB_j}{dt} = \sum_{i=0}^n \dot{E}_{ij} + \sum_{i=0}^n \dot{B}_{ij} - \dot{E}_j - \dot{B}_j - \dot{E}_{j0} - \dot{B}_{j0}. \quad (5.43)$$

Substituting the First Law of Thermodynamics (Equations 4.18 and 4.19) into the total energy accounting equations (Equations 5.42 and 5.43) and recognizing that $\dot{B}_{0j} = 0$ for $j \in [1, n]$ and $\dot{E}_{i0} = 0$ for $i \in [1, n]$ gives embodied energy accounting equations for Example C:

$$\frac{dB_0}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{B}_{i0} - \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{Q}_{i0} \quad (5.44)$$

$$\frac{dB_j}{dt} = \sum_{i=0}^n \dot{B}_{ij} - \dot{B}_j - \dot{B}_{j0} + \dot{Q}_{j0} \quad (5.45)$$

As in Example B, we can disaggregate the accumulation and waste embodied energy terms and express physical waste of capital stock as depreciation in Equations 5.44 and 5.45 to obtain

$$\frac{dB_0}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^n (\dot{B}_{\dot{R}_{i0}} + \dot{B}_{\dot{S}_{i0}} + \gamma_{B_i} B_{K_i}) - \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{Q}_{i0} \quad (5.46)$$

and

$$\frac{dB_{K_j}}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{B}_{ij} - \dot{B}_j - (\dot{B}_{\dot{R}_{j0}} + \dot{B}_{\dot{S}_{j0}} + \gamma_{B_j} B_{K_j}) + \dot{Q}_{j0}, \quad (5.47)$$

which are the same as Equations 5.38 and 5.39, indicating that we have successfully generalized the embodied energy equations to an arbitrarily-large economy.

To verify the above derivation, we sum Equations 5.46 and 5.47 for all sectors of the economy ($j \in [1, n]$) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dB_0}{dt} + \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{dB_{K_j}}{dt} &= \sum_{i=1}^n (\dot{B}_{R_{i0}} + \dot{B}_{S_{i0}} + \gamma_{B_i} B_{K,i}) - \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{Q}_{i0} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{B}_{ij} - \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{B}_j \\ &\quad - \sum_{j=1}^n (\dot{B}_{R_{j0}} + \dot{B}_{S_{j0}} + \gamma_{B_j} B_{K,j}) + \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{Q}_{j0}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.48)$$

Using the identities

$$\dot{B}_j = \sum_{k=1}^n \dot{B}_{jk} \quad (5.49)$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \dot{B}_j = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \dot{B}_{jk} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \dot{B}_{ik} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{B}_{ij} = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{B}_{ij}, \quad (5.50)$$

Equation 5.48 becomes

$$\frac{dB_0}{dt} + \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{dB_j}{dt} = 0, \quad (5.51)$$

as expected. The total embodied energy content of the system remains constant with respect to time in this framework.

We can further simplify the above equations by expressing the embodied energy of the inflowing capital ($\sum_{i=1}^n \dot{B}_{ij}$) as a fraction ($\alpha_{B,j}$) of the energy embodied in the capital stock (B_{K_j})

$$\alpha_{B,j} \equiv \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \dot{B}_{ij}}{B_{K_j}} \quad (5.52)$$

and resource and short-lived material flows as waste

$$\dot{B}_{W_j} \equiv \dot{B}_{R_{j0}} + \dot{B}_{S_{j0}}. \quad (5.53)$$

With the above definitions, Equation 5.47 can be expressed as

$$\frac{dB_{K_j}}{dt} = (\alpha_{B_j} - \gamma_{B_j}) B_{K_j} - \dot{B}_{W_j} - \dot{B}_j + \dot{Q}_{j0}. \quad (5.54)$$

With Equation 5.54, we see that the rate of accumulation of embodied energy in the capital stock of an economic sector ($\frac{dB_{K_j}}{dt}$) is affected by the balance between the inflow (α_{B_j}) and depreciation (γ_{B_j}) rates, the rate of wasting embodied energy (\dot{B}_{W_j}),

the rate at which embodied energy leaves with the products of the sector (\dot{B}_j), and the waste heat that leaves the sector (\dot{Q}_{j0}).

5.5 Embodied energy in the US auto industry

In this section, we apply the framework developed above to flows of total energy in the US auto industry, as depicted in Figure 5.5. As in Section 3.5, we face difficulties due to lack of data. We know that some flows will have zero value, as shown in Figure 5.5. For instance, there is zero energy content (direct or embodied) associated with flows from the biosphere into the auto industry. Furthermore, we may assume that the resource flows (\dot{R} , red in Figure 5.5) and capital flows (\dot{K} , black in Figure 5.5) will have no direct energy (\dot{E}) associated with them.¹⁰ Firstly, because energy products enter the industry as short-lived flows (\dot{S} , blue in Figure 5.5) and secondly, because energy products are not stored as capital within the sector. In fact, we can assume that all flows, other than inputs of short-lived goods (\dot{S}), will have no direct energy content (\dot{E}) associated with them.




Fig. 5.5: Embodied energy flows (\dot{B}) for the US automobile industry.

Historically, very few estimates of embodied energy of automobiles have been made. In 1973, Berry and Fels, used a process-based analysis (rather than an input-output analysis), to find that the energy cost of automobile manufacturing¹¹ in the US

¹⁰ Exceptions to this assumption may be the direct energy content of rubber, plastic and other petroleum products, e.g. motor oils which are used as resource inputs to the auto industry.

¹¹ The “energy cost” estimated by Berry and Fels is the energy embodied in a single automobile. The “energy cost” (in kW-hr/automobile) multiplied by the the production rate (in automobiles/year) gives the rate of gross embodied energy outflow in the product stream of the auto sector ($\dot{B}_{P_{gross}}$). A limitation of the process-based approach employed by Berry and Fels is truncation error for upstream energy demand. See Section 7.1 for details.

was 37,275 kW-hr (134 GJ or $134 \times 10^9 \text{ J}$) per vehicle.[8, Table 2] Of this, 100 GJ was (upstream) energy embodied in the materials (\dot{B}_R) and the remaining was (direct) energy used within the auto industry to manufacture, assemble, and transport the automobile.

Two decades later (1995), Stodolsky et al. estimated the energy consumed in materials and manufacturing automobiles to be 79 GJ per vehicle for a conventional automobile and 66 GJ per vehicle for an aluminum intensive vehicle, both under a maximum-recycling scenario.[9, p.11]. Three years later (1998), MacLean and Lave estimated the embodied energy for an automobile to be 113.6 MBTU (120 GJ, of which 13 GJ were consumed upstream and 107 GJ were consumed direct in the auto sector) per vehicle [10, Figure 2], which they compare with contemporaneous estimates from Sullivan of 81 GJ per vehicle [11] and Volkswagen of 62 GJ per vehicle.[12]

Estimates of vehicle embodied energy are related to contemporary debates on whether Electric Vehicles (EVs) reduce CO_2 emissions relative to Internal Combustion Vehicles (ICVs), insofar as embodied energy includes upstream supply chain energy consumption, a major contributor to both EV and ICV lifecycle emissions. Although EVs have no direct emissions during operation, accounting for the upstream energy consumed in generating electricity, the manufacture of batteries, and the production of lightweight materials (employed to offset the weight of EV battery packs) leads to significantly increased lifecycle emissions. Many studies find that negligible or negative emissions savings are achieved by EVs compared to ICVs.[13–15]

5.6 Summary

This chapter relies upon the results from Chapter 4 to develop equations that describe the flow of *embodied* energy (\dot{B}) through economies (Section 5.1). We found that waste heat from a sector (\dot{Q}) is additive to the energy embodied within products of a sector, thereby providing the mechanism for accumulating embodied energy along the manufacturing supply chain. The embodied energy accounting equations were applied to example economies A–C in Sections 5.2–5.4. Finally, we discussed embodied energy in the context of our running example, the US auto industry (Section 5.5). We found that there are few historical estimates of energy embodied within automobiles, with a range of 62–134 GJ/vehicle.

In Chapter 6, we develop theory and equations to account for value flows through economies, leading (in Chapter 7) to techniques to estimate energy intensity of economic products.

References

- [1] David MacKay. *Sustainable Energy—without the hot air*. UIT Cambridge, Cambridge, England, 2009.
- [2] Abbe Hamilton, Stephen B. Balogh, Adrienna Maxwell, and Charles A. S. Hall. Efficiency of Edible Agriculture in Canada and the U.S. over the Past Three and Four Decades. *Energies*, 6:1764–1793, 2013.
- [3] Howard T Odum. Energy analysis and net energy, 1975.
- [4] Howard T Odum. *Environmental accounting : EMERGY and environmental decision making*. Wiley, New York, 1996.
- [5] Mark T Brown, Sergio Ulgiati, and J Cleveland Cutler. Emergy analysis and environmental accounting. pages 329–354. Elsevier, New York, 2004.
- [6] Clark W Bullard and Robert A Herendeen. The energy cost of goods and services. *Energy Policy*, 3(4):268–278, 1975.
- [7] Robert A Herendeen. Input-output techniques and energy cost of commodities. *Energy Policy*, 6(2):162–165, 1978.
- [8] R Stephen Berry and Margaret F Fels. The energy cost of automobiles. *Science and Public Affairs*, 29(10):11–17, 1973.
- [9] Frank Stodolsky, Anant Vyas, Roy Cuenca, and Linda Gaines. Life-cycle energy savings potential from aluminum-intensive vehicles. Technical report, Argonne National Lab., IL (United States), 1995.
- [10] Heather L MacLean and Lester B Lave. Peer reviewed: A life-cycle model of an automobile. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 32(13):322A–330A, 1998.
- [11] John L Sullivan and Jenny Hu. Life cycle energy analysis for automobiles. In *SAE CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS P*, pages 7–20. SOC AUTOMATIVE ENGINEERS INC, 1995.
- [12] Georg W Schweimer and Manfred Schuckert. Life cycle inventory of a golf. *VDI BERICHTE*, 1307:235–256, 1996.
- [13] Don Anair and Amine Mahmassani. State of charge: Electric vehicles’ global warming emissions and fuel-cost saving across the united states. Technical report, Union of Concerned Scientists, 2012.
- [14] Troy R Hawkins, Bhawna Singh, Guillaume Majeau-Bettez, and Anders Hammer Strømman. Comparative environmental life cycle assessment of conventional and electric vehicles. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 17(1), 2012.
- [15] Ozzie Zehner. Unclean at any speed. *IEEE Spectrum*, 50(7):40–45, 2013.

Part II
Economic Value and Energy Intensity

Chapter 6

Stocks and flows of economic value

We try to measure what we value. We come to value what we measure. [1, p. 2]

—Donella Meadows

In Chapters 4 and 5, we noted that energy is the currency of thermodynamics, and we developed accounting equations for flows and accumulation of direct (\dot{E} and $\frac{dE}{dt}$) and embodied (\dot{B} and $\frac{dB}{dt}$) energy through an economy. In this chapter, we develop a framework for accounting value flows (\dot{X}) through economies. Accounting for flows and accumulation of economic value is routinely done in Systems of National Accounts, however, this chapter demonstrates that such accounting fits comfortably within the framework we have developed thus far (Chapters 3–5). Accounting flows of value within our framework is a necessary step along the path to developing equations (in Chapter 7) to estimate the energy intensity (ϵ) of intermediate and final products within an economy.

6.1 Subjective theory of value

We begin by explicitly stating what we mean by value. We follow the mainstream approach of using the market price at the time of an exchange to determine the economic value of the flows of products (goods, services and capital). As materials and energy flow in one direction between sectors, currency flows in the opposite direction. The monetary flow is an easy and logical (though imperfect) proxy for the value of the material and energy that exchanges hands from seller to buyer. Market transactions are easily documented, and the data to estimate the economic value of these flows is available in most countries.[2]

Although the market price is readily available and conveys important information (such as relative scarcity of the good and relative usefulness of the good to fulfill human wants), we note that market price is *subjective*. Value is based on the agreement of a mutually acceptable price by the human trading partners. The market price is not a measure of any *intrinsic* value of the goods (e.g., for bio-diversity or ecosystem services). Market prices ignore the costs and benefits that accrue to other parties (externalities), including the impact of trade on the quality of human relations, just distribution of resources, or sustainable scale of the economy.[3, p. 55]

The subjective theory of value, while convenient and prevalent, does not provide market participants with complete information, a particularly troubling fact in the age of resource depletion. (See Section 1.5.) The limitations of the subjective theory of value have been a philosophical concern to economists, and others, since the beginning of economics. Throughout history, economists (particularly the classicals) and non-economists alike have searched for an invariant, objective, *intrinsic* determinant of value, one that is not reliant solely on human wants at a particular point in time.¹ Adam Smith, Karl Marx, David Ricardo, and neo-Ricardian Piero Sraffa, for example, have all proposed alternative determinants of value. Their proposed objective theories of value were based on identifying the primary input into production, such as *labor* (Marx) or *land* (Malthus), and using that input as a numeraire, a way to measure value across the entire spectrum of goods and services in commensurate units.

More recently, some have proposed an *energy* theory of value. Costanza [4], in particular, makes the case for energy as the only truly primary input into production and thus an, or rather *the*, objective determinant of value. On a global scale, he notes, (solar) energy (including that which is stored in fossil fuels) is the only primary input into production: everything else is an intermediate input. Thus, free energy input to production (accounting for all upstream energy) could be the basis for an objective (intrinsic), energy theory of value.²

Mainstream economics rejected the energy theory of value, as well as all earlier alternative theories of value, in favor of the subjective theory of value. However, as discussed in Section 1.5, the information and signals provided by markets and prices may not be sufficient for national accounting in the age of resource depletion. To paraphrase Herman Daly, national accounting focuses on measuring value-added, but it ignores “that to which value is being added.” [5, p. 453] Ignoring the value provided by natural capital distorts the measures of economic value provided by the subjective theory of value. In particular, ignoring “that to which value is being added” tends to overestimate GDP. When easily accessible forms of energy (e.g., oil extracted from the Texas panhandle) are used up and more difficult locations must be tapped (e.g., Alaskan north slope or the Gulf of Mexico), the economy appears to grow. The “value-added” by human and manufactured capital increases as humans must do more work to extract increasingly marginal energy resources. However, what is actually happening is that the stock of natural resources is diminishing in both quantity and quality, and the drawdown of natural capital is (mis)measured by GDP as an increase in income.[3, pp. 66 and 75]

As discussed in Chapter 1, when the level of the stock of “that to which value is added” (natural capital) declines, the economy begins to reach binding material and energy constraints, and economic growth suffers. Thus, identifying the right economic scale—the rate at which materials are put through the economy—becomes an optimization problem. If the material throughput rate is too small, economies

¹ Following the ecological economics literature, we use the term *intrinsic* in the sense of “objective.” Costanza [4] notes that a better term would be objective, thereby avoiding moral overtones associated with the term intrinsic.

² This line of inquiry has yielded some interesting analysis of the amount of solar energy required to run the economy. See Chapter 5 for further discussion of the concept of *emergy*.

don't provide enough goods and services for society. If the material throughput rate is too high, the biosphere cannot replenish natural resources fast enough and binding constraints are reached with dire economic consequences. Unfortunately, this is an optimization problem that the market alone cannot solve.

Despite the considerable drawbacks to the subjective theory of value, using market transactions to confer economic value on flows of energy and material goods is widely accepted and understood, and better measures of value are difficult to implement. Thus, in the development of our framework, we use market prices at the time of transaction to determine the value of material and energy flows. However, we do so for pragmatic, rather than philosophical, reasons.

That being said, we also believe that our framework demonstrates the urgent need for additional valuation methods to be used alongside market prices to provide the information needed for national accounting in the age of resource depletion. The UN System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA)³ provides rigorous methodology to estimate the value of material and energy flows between the biosphere and the economy. (See Figure 6.1.) Such a system should be used consistently by all nations to estimate the value of these flows, as depicted in the accounting framework below. Without SEEA, or something similar,⁴ these flows cannot be valued. Thus, those flows are conspicuously absent from the model for the flow of economic value presented in the next section. (See, e.g., Figure 6.2.)




Fig. 6.1: Aggregated flows of value for a single sector, including flows to and from the biosphere.

³ As of this printing, the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) [6] is in its third edition, having been thoroughly reviewed and revised by a global consultation process. The SEEA contains internationally agreed-upon standards for quantifying the value of flows of material and energy between the economy and the biosphere. SEEA is a system that is designed to work hand in hand with the System of National Accounts (SNA), the international standard for measuring economic value creation consistently across nations, and several OECD member states currently use the SEEA alongside their national accounting.

⁴ As described in the Prologue, the US BEA developed its analogous methodology in the early 1990s, the Integrated Environmental Economic System of Accounts (IEESA), but has been politically hamstrung for over 20 years from publishing the data.

6.2 Methodology

Because the basic unit of analysis in our framework is the economic sector, flows of value within the economy are based on the prices from inter-sectoral market transactions. The flows of value that accompany material and energy flows in and out of one sector in an economy are depicted in Figure 6.2. The solid lines represent flows of economic value whose direction is the same as the flow of material and energy. The dashed lines represent the equal and opposite flows of currency used to pay for the material and energy.⁵ The negotiated price diamonds (also seen in Figures 2.1–2.3) indicate that the economic value of material and energy flows is set by agreement between buyers and sellers, the subjective theory of value.




Fig. 6.2: Flows of economic value (\dot{X}) for a single sector. The economic value flows are associated with each of the different material and energy flows outlined in previous chapters. The dashed lines represent the equal and opposite flows of the currency used to pay for the material and energy.

As mentioned in the discussion of the subjective theory of value in Section 6.1, today's national accounting focuses on measuring value-added. We denote creation and destruction of value within a sector using the notion of “source” and “sink.” In Figure 6.3, the open circle, “source,” inside the economic sector represents the value-added, that is, the value that is created by the economic processes within that sector. Flows of economic value from a value-source are denoted \dot{X}_{gen} . Similarly, filled circles represent the value “sinks” where value is destroyed by economic processes or natural disasters. Flows of economic value into a value-sink are denoted \dot{X}_{dest} . Although we do not define the value creation and destruction processes any further (mathematically), we discuss what is meant by the underlying processes in Section 6.3.2.

⁵ Because the currency lines clutter the diagram, we will omit currency flows from all following diagrams in this chapter.




Fig. 6.3: Aggregated flows of value (\dot{X}) for a single sector. Distinction is made between value flows that enter the sector and are accumulated (i.e. capital goods) and value flows that are not accumulated. Within the sector there is destruction of value \dot{X}_{dest} , represented by the downward arrow flowing into the filled-circle sinks and generation of value, represented by the arrow flowing out of an open-circle source.

6.3 Example A: single-sector economy

Figure 6.4 shows flows of value in the single-sector economy. Following typical assumptions in economic modeling, the economy is *completely isolated* from the biosphere in terms of both material inputs and wastes. In other words, the value flows of an economy are *independent from* material inputs and wastes. Value flows are independent from material inputs, because raw materials have no economic value until they have been removed from the biosphere by an extraction industry. Value flows are independent from wastes, because wastes, by definition, have no economic value upon leaving the economy.




Fig. 6.4: Flows of value (\dot{X}) for a one-sector economy.

The contrast between the biophysical picture (as represented in Figures 3.2 and 4.3) on the one hand, and the conventional viewpoint of economics (as represented in Figure 6.4) on the other, is striking. The biophysical picture of material and energy flows in Figures 3.2 and 4.3 emphasizes interaction with and dependence upon the biosphere that is not reflected in the typical economic model of value flows depicted in Figure 6.4. As discussed in Section 6.1, the isolation of the value flows from the biosphere is a consequence of the subjective theory of value that underpins modern economics. The biosphere is akin to a third party with no voice in determining the value of a transaction: it is neither buyer nor seller.

Equation 6.1 describes the accumulation of value (X) in Society (1).

$$\frac{dX_1}{dt} = \dot{X}_{11} - \dot{X}_1 + \dot{X}_{gen,1} - \dot{X}_{dest,1}. \quad (6.1)$$

The following subsections discuss the terms in Equation 6.1.

6.3.1 *Economic transactions* (\dot{X}_{11} and \dot{X}_1)

The returning arrow in Figure 6.4 represents transactions between

- buyers (who receive things of value, \dot{X}_{11} , in exchange for currency) and
- sellers (who give up things of value, \dot{X}_1 , in exchange for currency).

It is interesting to note that when a good is sold for more than the producer paid for its inputs, the seller has created value and sold it into the economy. As a consequence, the seller's stock of currency grows, providing the seller with an increased level of claim on value in the economy.

The subjective theory of value (Section 6.1) posits that buyers and sellers agree on value at the time of the transaction. Thus, $\dot{X}_1 = \dot{X}_{11}$, and Equation 6.1 simplifies to

$$\frac{dX_1}{dt} = \dot{X}_{gen,1} - \dot{X}_{dest,1}, \quad (6.2)$$

indicating that value accumulates in the economy $\left(\frac{dX_1}{dt}\right)$ due to value generation ($\dot{X}_{gen,1}$) and destruction ($\dot{X}_{dest,1}$) processes only.

6.3.2 *Value generation* (\dot{X}_{gen})

In Equation 6.1, the value generation term (\dot{X}_{gen}) is akin to growing apples. The term \dot{X}_{gen} is accounted as “value added” to an industry in national accounts. It is calculated as the difference between gross economic output of the industry and the cost of its intermediate inputs.[7] A simple way to think of value added is the increase in value

of the raw materials from the work performed on them by workers and manufactured capital.

Much of the value added that is attributed to the manufacturing process was actually value provided by natural capital, at no monetary cost to producers. For example, in Section 3.1, the apples that are produced would be counted in national accounting as value added by capital and labor, when in reality, the value is provided by the biosphere and natural capital, including:

- the flow of solar energy into the economy, directly as in the case of growing apples, and indirectly as energy embodied in fossil fuels
- the extraction of resources (e.g., water, minerals, and fossil fuels) or any other unpriced goods from the biosphere, and
- the exploitation of the unpriced waste assimilation capacity of the biosphere.

The subjective theory of value indicates that there is no economic value associated with these “transactions,” because no currency is exchanged.

The above factors indicate that the process of value generation has both direct and indirect impacts on the biosphere. The direct impacts are obvious: extraction of non-renewable resources from the biosphere, at rates greater than their natural accretion, represents unsustainable overuse of natural capital. The indirect impacts are less obvious: the value generated by these transactions can lead to increased wealth, leading to increased demand rates for goods and services, whose production requires ever-increasing rates of unsustainable natural resource extraction.

6.3.3 Value destruction (\dot{X}_{dest})

In Equation 6.1, the value destruction term (\dot{X}_{dest}) is akin to consuming apples: value is destroyed by a process that consumes, or otherwise renders unusable, previously-valuable things in the economy (see Section 3.1). The factors that lead to value destruction (\dot{X}_{dest}) include:

- depreciation, usually associated with disposal of materials and equipment to the biosphere at end of life and
- natural disasters, such as hurricanes and typhoons, that destroy equipment and property.

\dot{X}_{dest} is accounted as depreciation, or “consumption of fixed capital,” to an industry in the national accounts. It is a monetary estimate of the physical effects on assets from “wear and tear, obsolescence, accidental damage, and aging.” [8]

6.3.4 GDP

If Society (1) in Figure 6.4 represents the economy of an entire country, \dot{X}_1 is its gross domestic product (GDP) in units of \$/year. Although GDP is often considered

a stock, it is not. It is a flow. X_1 is a stock, akin to monetary wealth. However, X_1 is a very narrow definition of wealth that neglects the value of natural resources, the value of social capital, and any other “wealth” that cannot be exchanged for money.

6.4 Example B: two-sector economy

Figure 6.5 shows flows of value (\dot{X}) within a two-sector economy. Again, we note the isolation of the economy from the biosphere.




Fig. 6.5: Flows of value (\dot{X}) within a two-sector economy.

We can account for value flows by writing the following equations:

$$\frac{dX_1}{dt} = \dot{X}_{11} + \dot{X}_{21} - \dot{X}_1 + \dot{X}_{gen,1} - \dot{X}_{dest,1} \quad (6.3)$$

and

$$\frac{dX_2}{dt} = \dot{X}_{12} + \dot{X}_{22} - \dot{X}_2 + \dot{X}_{gen,2} - \dot{X}_{dest,2}. \quad (6.4)$$

Equations 6.3 and 6.4 can be generalized as

$$\frac{dX_j}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{X}_{ij} - \dot{X}_j + \dot{X}_{gen,j} - \dot{X}_{dest,j}, \quad (6.5)$$

where n is the number of sectors in the economy, and $j \in [1, n]$.

6.5 Example C: three-sector economy

Figure 6.6 shows flows of value (\dot{X}) within a three-sector economy.




Fig. 6.6: Flows of value (\dot{X}) within a three-sector economy.

The equations representing flows of value in Example C are:

$$\frac{dX_j}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{X}_{ij} - \dot{X}_j + \dot{X}_{gen,j} - \dot{X}_{dest,j}, \quad (6.6)$$

where n is the number of sectors in the economy, and $j \in [1, n]$. Equation 6.6 is identical to Equation 6.5. If we sum the value accounting equations for the entire economy, we obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{dX_j}{dt} = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{X}_{ij} - \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{X}_j + \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{X}_{gen,j} - \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{X}_{dest,j}. \quad (6.7)$$

With the identities

$$\dot{X}_j = \sum_{k=1}^n \dot{X}_{jk} \quad (6.8)$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \dot{X}_j = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \dot{X}_{jk} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \dot{X}_{ik} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{X}_{ij} = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{X}_{ij}, \quad (6.9)$$

Equation 6.7 becomes

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{dX_j}{dt} = \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{X}_{gen,j} - \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{X}_{dest,j}, \quad (6.10)$$

for $j \in [1, n]$, indicating that value generation ($\dot{X}_{gen,j}$) and destruction ($\dot{X}_{dest,j}$) are the only mechanisms by which value is accumulated or lost ($\frac{dX_j}{dt}$) within the economy. Equation 6.10 is a mathematical representation of the value-added approach to measuring GDP. The sum of the value-added across all industries is equivalent to the total value of final produced goods.[9, p. 196]

6.6 Stocks and flows of economic value in the US auto industry

To estimate value flows through the automobile industry, we use publicly available data from the US BEA.⁶ The tables needed to estimate dynamic value flows and capital accumulation within the economy are primarily the KLEMS⁷ Intermediate Use tables and the Fixed Asset, non-residential detail table. The KLEMS data tables are based on the Input-Output (I-O) tables, but are at a lower level of aggregation, and the inputs are categorized into three broad types: energy, materials, and services.

⁶ A primer on using the US BEA industry data can be found on the BEA website.[10]

⁷ KLEMS is an acronym for capital (K), Labor, Energy, Materials, and Services.

The KLEMS intermediate use data are categorized in the same way as the input flows in our framework. The total material inputs into the auto industry (IOC 3361MV) represents the value of resource flows (\dot{X}_R). Similarly, the total direct energy inputs into the auto industry represents the value of energy flows (\dot{X}_E), and the total service inputs into the auto industry represents short-lived goods (\dot{X}_S). The Fixed Asset accounts are used to estimate capital value flows (\dot{X}_K) as well as self-use of capital. The I-O tables are used to determine gross economic output of the auto industry ($\dot{X}_{P_{Gross}}$). And subtracting self-use capital and resources from Gross Economic Output yields Net Economic Output ($\dot{X}_{P_{net}}$).

The capital flow (\dot{X}_K) values represent the flows of physical capital which are calculated as the sum of the Equipment and Structures categories from the Fixed Assets tables. The first number is the value for physical capital flows only; the number in parentheses, and denoted “w/ R&D,” adds in flows of intangible capital assets from the Intellectual Property category on the Fixed Assets table. The importance of this distinction is discussed below.

Figure 6.7 populates the flows of economic value figure with these data for the US auto industry. This example illustrates that our framework can be combined with national accounting data to provide estimates of the flows of economic value for a typical industrial sector. In general, all of the data needed to calculate the matrix of inter-sectoral flows of economic value for the economy are publicly accessible, and the mapping from the national accounts to our framework is straightforward. Table 6.1 contains a brief summary of the data sources that were used to obtain the values in Figure 6.7. Appendix A contains detailed calculations and sources of data.

Another issue that the auto industry example in Figure 6.7 highlights is the evolution of the treatment of capital in national accounts. Note the difference between the two values for self-use capital flows: \$795 million in flows of physical capital only and \$15,181 million in flows that include R&D. In the case of the auto industry, and most industries in general, this difference is an order of magnitude. The larger figure (\$15,181 million) includes Intellectual Property assets and is consistent with the current official definition of Fixed Assets in the US national accounts.

The expansion of the definition of Fixed Assets by the BEA reveals a continual evolution away from physical capital to intangible capital in the BEA’s measurement of US capital stock. Until the mid-1990s, Fixed Assets included only manufactured, physical assets: equipment and structures. In 1996, the BEA expanded the definition to include software. Doing so added about \$174 billion to the nation’s private fixed asset account and \$56 billion to the nation’s public fixed asset account, less than 1% of \$23.8 trillion in stock of fixed assets at the time.[11, p. 20]

In 2013, the BEA fundamentally revised the definition of Fixed Assets again to include Research & Development, as well as production of creative works, such as art, music, and long-running television shows. These types of assets, along with software, were combined together into a sub-category in the Fixed Assets account labeled “Intellectual Property.”[12] The Fixed Assets tables were revised retrospectively to conform to the new definition. In 2012, intellectual property accounts for approximately 11% of the non-residential, private fixed investment (\$3.4 trillion (line 20) out of \$32.1 trillion total Private and Government non-residential fixed assets

(line17)). For comparison, the \$3.4 trillion in value the US places on Intellectual Property is more than half the value the nation ascribes to its stock of Equipment for the same year (\$6.6 trillion (line 18)). [13]

We are concerned that the evolution of the definition of capital assets is indicative of an ill-timed tendency for national accounting to be revised toward measurement of intangible assets. Does this reflect an underlying belief that the country can invent its way out of having to face biophysical limits to the economy? If so, we believe that this approach will lead to the inability to both (a) assess the biophysical reality of the economy economic reality and (b) develop effective policies in the age of resource depletion.

Today, the limited, and dwindling, budget allocated toward national accounting in the US is being steered toward rigorous and time-consuming valuation of intangible (albeit financially valuable) assets and away from assessment of biophysical reality. The satellite accounts that once captured estimates of environmental economic data were shelved by order of Congress (see the Prologue) and replaced by R&D satellite accounts, which have been permanently integrated into national accounts. The evolution of the definition of capital assets in US national accounting is not comensurate with a direction that will lead to effective policy in the age of resource depletion.




Fig. 6.7: Value of material and energy flows into and out of the US automobile industry (in millions of 2011 US\$).

Table 6.1: Data sources for auto industry (IOC 3361MV) example.

Value Flow	2011 USD (millions)	BEA Data Source
Resources	\$175,491	2011 KLEMS Total Material Inputs
Energy	3,637	2011 KLEMS Total Energy Inputs
Short-lived Goods	74,578	2011 KLEMS Total Services Inputs
Capital	14,532	2011 Fixed Assets 2011 (non-residential detailed estimates)
Gross Economic Output	482,269	2011 Input-Output Use Tables
Resources (self-use)	133,961	2011 Input-Output Use Tables
Short-lived Goods (self-use)	0	2011 Input-Output Use Tables
Capital (self-use)	795	2011 Fixed Assets (non-residential detailed estimates)
Net Economic Output	347,513	Authors' calculations

6.7 Summary

In this chapter, we developed techniques to account for flows of economic value (\dot{X}) through economies (Section 6.2). We began with a discussion about theories of value and settled on the prevailing subjective theory of value for our framework. Thereafter, value accounting equations were developed and applied to example economies A–C in Sections 6.3–6.5. We noted the need for terms that describe creation and destruction of value (\dot{X}_{gen} and \dot{X}_{dest} , respectively) within economic sectors. Finally, we explored value flows to and from the US auto economy (Section 6.6).

It is important to note at this point that, in contrast to materials and energy, we found that there is no lack of data on value flows to and from industry sectors available from the US BEA. The value flows are relatively easily derived from the data captured at the point of sale in market transactions. However, the US BEA has no values for material and energy flows *to and from the biosphere*, and we are concerned that the evolution of the definition of capital assets will not lead to effective policy for the age of resource depletion.

In Chapter 7, we combine results from Chapters 4, 5, and 6 to develop techniques the estimate the energy intensity of economic products.

References

- [1] Donella Meadows. Indicators and information systems for sustainable development. Report to the Balton Group, The Sustainability Institute, Hartland Four

- Corners, Vermont, September 1998.
- [2] International Input-Output Association. IO-data. <http://www.iioa.org/io-data/io-data.html>.
 - [3] Herman E Daly. *Beyond growth: the economics of sustainable development*. Beacon Press, 1997.
 - [4] Robert Costanza. Value theory and energy. In Cutler J. Cleveland, editor, *Encyclopedia of Energy*, volume 6, pages 337–346. Elsevier, March 2004.
 - [5] Herman E Daly. Consumption and welfare: two views of value added. *Review of Social Economy*, 53(4):451–473, 1995.
 - [6] United Nations. *System of Environmental-Economic Accounting 2012 Central Framework*. United Nations Statistics Division, 2014.
 - [7] Bureau of Economic Analysis. What is industry value added? http://www.bea.gov/faq/index.cfm?faq_id=184.
 - [8] Arnold J. Katz. Accounting for obsolescence: An evaluation of current NIPA practice. White Paper WP2008-05, Bureau of Economic Analysis, May 2008.
 - [9] J Steven Landefeld, Eugene P Seskin, and Barbara M Fraumeni. Taking the pulse of the economy: Measuring GDP. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 22(2), Spring 2008.
 - [10] Mary L. Streitwieser. *Measuring the Nation's Economy: An Industry Perspective. A Primer on BEA's Industry Accounts*. Bureau of Economic Analysis, US Department of Commerce, May 2011.
 - [11] Herman, Shelby. Fixed assets and consumer durable goods: Estimates for 1925-98 and new nipa table—changes in net stock of produced assets. *Survey of Current Business*, pages 17–30, April 2000.
 - [12] BEA. Preview of the 2013 comprehensive revision of the national income and product accounts: Changes in definitions and presentations goods. *Survey of Current Business*, pages 13–39, March 2013.
 - [13] U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. “table 1.1. current-cost net stock of fixed assets and consumer durable goods (sep. 30, 2013 revision). <http://bea.gov/iTable/iTable.cfm?ReqID=10&step=1#reqid=10&step=1&isuri=1> (accessed September 12, 2014).

Chapter 7

Energy intensity

Accounting systems change behavior.

—unknown NASA JPL accountant

At the end of Chapter 1, we noted that in the age of resource depletion, routine dissemination of information regarding energy, embodied energy, and energy intensity would provide firms and consumers with better information to navigate the era of resource depletion. To that end, we developed equations that describe the flow and accumulation of direct energy, embodied energy, and economic value within an economy in Chapters 4, 5, and 6. In this chapter, we merge energy and economic value together to estimate the energy intensity (ε) of economic sectors, measured in joules per dollar.¹

7.1 Background

Input-Output (I-O) analysis, developed by Wassily Leontief in the 1930s as an extension to the work of Quesnay and Walras [2], is of primary importance in national accounting. The method allows for the investigation of economic interdependencies within the economy, i.e., how much economic activity in each main sector of the economy is used to generate a product consumed by “final demand.” The traditional Leontief method relies upon financial quantifications of flows of value through an economy.

The basic premise of the I-O method, as depicted in Figure 7.1A, is that each economic sector takes in factors of production from other sectors (and possibly itself) to produce an economic good at some rate.² For example, the automotive sector takes in steel, rubber, glass, etc. and produces a number of cars per year. In contrast to high-level economic growth models that include only a few factors of

¹ The literature discusses the energy embodied in *products* for example, “The data and methodologies described in this report permit calculation of five types of energy ‘embodied’ in a particular goods [*sic*] or service.” [1, p. 268] It can be meaningful to discuss the energy intensity of *processes*, too, and we switch between these two meanings of the word “embodied.”

² Note that Figure 7.1A is similar to the clockwork metaphor and traditional model of the economy discussed in relation to the era of abundance in Section 2.1.1.

production (such as land, capital, and labor),³ the I-O analysis technique allows many differentiated factors of production and raw material feedstocks.[3] This is important, because, in reality, each economic process exists in a complex network of interacting processes that comprise the entire economy. Bullard et al. said “each step in a process analysis may be viewed as an expansion of the system boundary (around the item being analyzed) into the economic system.” [1, p. 281] Figure 7.2 shows that every process calls on every other process within the economy, even if only minutely and indirectly at many steps removed.




Fig. 7.1: The basic unit of input-output analysis: **A** the standard economic approach includes only transactions among sectors of the economy; **B** the Energy Input-Output (EI-O) method allows inputs from the natural environment to be factors of production; **C** including waste flows to the environment makes the model physically consistent; and **D** the framework developed and presented herein accounts also for accumulation in capital stock (K) of embodied energy within materials in economic sectors.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the oil shocks of the 1970's spurred great interest in the important role of energy in economic production. In addition to the productive services provided by stocks of capital and labor, a flow of energy⁴ is required for

³ The traditional primary factors of production (land, capital, and labor) are not *flows* into the production processes. Rather, they are *stocks* that, when present, allow factors of production (steel, rubber, and glass) to be transformed into final products (automobiles). The quantity and quality of these stocks determine the quantity and quality of their flow of productive services.

⁴ Or, more precisely, the degradation of an exergetic gradient/destruction of exergy.

economic activity. These energy flows originate from the biosphere, recognition of which prompted researchers from the field of Net Energy Analysis (NEA) to extend the traditional Leontief input-output method to include important energy flows from the environment, developing an Energy Input-Output (EI-O) method as depicted in Figure 7.1B.⁵ [4–7, 3, 8–10] While the Leontief input-output method relies exclusively on monetary units to represent flows of economic value among sectors of an economy, the EI-O method relies upon physical units (especially energy units of joules) to represent some of the flows among economic sectors. In doing so, energy intensities (ε) of products can be estimated in a manner that includes the “upstream” energy consumed in the supply chain.

When applying the EI-O method, it is important to clearly define what counts for energy input to a sector of the economy. The early pioneers of the EI-O method counted only post-solar (i.e., fossil fuel) energy inputs to the economy, in a manner similar to our approach as discussed in the introduction to Chapter 5. About a decade later, Costanza [11] included an option to consider solar energy as an input to the economy, thereby significantly increasing the energy intensity of agricultural sectors and other sectors that depend upon agricultural outputs. However later work by Costanza [3, 12] did not include solar input to the economy.

Whether solar input to the economy should be included in an EI-O analysis within a materials, energy, and economic value accounting framework is probably dependent upon the objectives of the analysis. The motivation for this particular book is primarily the effects of declining energy natural resource quality on industrialized economies in the age of resource depletion. As such, inclusion of solar flows is probably unnecessary. However, expanding the framework to include non-industrialized or agrarian societies may require accounting for solar energy flows.⁶

The early EI-O method assumed that each economic sector makes a single product (\dot{P}).^[13] In later years, the EI-O method was extended in the literature to include co-products for each economic sector.^[12, 8] To do so, both *make* and *use* data must be employed.⁷ For the purposes of simplicity, we decided to leverage the older, single-product formulation of the EI-O method. The materials, energy, and value accounting framework presented herein is more easily understood without the additional complexity of the make-use formulation of the EI-O method. Recent work has shown that converting between the single-product and make-use forms of the EI-O method is possible.^[14]

The EI-O method can be considered a “top-down” analysis approach for estimating energy intensity. An alternative, “bottom-up” approach, that we will discuss here

⁵ Note that Figure 7.1B is similar to the machine metaphor and engine model from the era of energy constraints discussed in Section 2.1.2.

⁶ In our framework, solar energy flows could be accounted as short-term (\dot{S}) flows for agricultural and forestry sectors and for solar thermal, solar photovoltaic, wind, ocean thermal, hydro, and biomass renewable energy production sectors. Doing so would not account for longer-term storage of solar energy used to form fossil fuels, but fossil fuels are already accounted by the energy input vector (\mathbf{E}_0) in the framework presented in this book. See the introduction to Chapter 5 for a short discussion of another approach: *emergy*.

⁷ The *make-use* method is sometimes also called the *supply-use* method.

briefly but not employ in this book, consists of detailed, process-based analysis of specific economic processes. Process analysis calculates the energetic and material flows associated with the process under study by disaggregating the process into several components or sub-processes. Model specification and data collection for process analysis is arduous, time-consuming, and costly. Obviously, the time, effort, and cost involved with trying to model and measure all of the flows in process analysis becomes daunting for even low numbers of interacting processes. The decision of where to draw the boundary of a process analysis is known in the lifecycle assessment literature as the *truncation problem*.^[15] A comparison of the top-down and bottom-up approaches is provided in Figure 7.3. For the purposes simplicity, we focus on top-down EI-O methods in this book.⁸

Both the original Leontief input-output method (Figure 7.1A) and the EI-O extension cited above (Figure 7.1B) assume steady-state conditions in an economy, i.e., flows of economic value and material into and out of each economic sector are in balance. Wastes are not present, and dynamic or transient behavior of the economic system is not considered. Thus, in the EI-O analysis technique, there is no accumulation of economic factors or embodied energy within any of the sectors.

The EI-O approach provides “snapshots” of economic activity at an instant in time, but its model is incomplete. Figures 7.1C and D show that wastes exist and materials can accumulate in economic sectors as manufactured capital.⁹ In fact, assuming no accumulation of materials, within economic sectors or society itself, is tantamount to assuming that *all* material flows through the economy are directed toward the production of non-durable goods. However, evidence of the durability of goods and the accumulation of materials surrounds us. Furthermore, energy was required to both fabricate and emplace the durable goods and infrastructure of modern economies.¹⁰ As Georgescu-Roegen notes, “in the everyday world one cannot possibly cross a river only on the flow of maintenance materials of a non-existent bridge.” [20]

Historically, many mainstream economists have spurned analyses aimed at determining energy intensity, because energy intensity and the Energy Input-Output (EI-O) method were significant features of the proposal for an energy theory of value.¹¹[21] However, we recognize that all economic activity requires energy. Thus, we contend that society needs to understand well the way energy flows through economies. And, we argue that energy intensity does not necessarily lead to an energy theory of value. Rather, it is an inherently useful metric that describes the energy associated with the pathways traveled by products through an economy. We view energy intensity

⁸ It is possible to pursue hybrid top-down and bottom-up analysis methods. They hybrid approach utilizes data from an EI-O analysis to supplement the missing data from truncation of a process analysis. The financial cost of goods and services identified by the process analysis are converted to energy (or material) flows via the EI-O method. The truncation error is replaced by a smaller aggregation error due to limitations of the EI-O method.^[1] A variety of other hybrid methods exist which also aim to overcome the limitations of either process or I-O method individually.^[1, 15–18]

⁹ Note that Figures 7.1C and D are similar to the metabolic metaphor that we propose for the age of resource depletion as discussed in Section 2.1.3.

¹⁰ The energy it took to create and emplace durable goods and infrastructure can be considered “embodied” within the built environment, a point to which we will return in detail later.

¹¹ See Section 6.1 for a discussion of theories of value.




Fig. 7.2: System boundary for process and I-O analyses, adapted from [1].

	PROS	CONS
TOP-DOWN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Comprehensiveness * Economy-wide analysis * System-level comparison * Publicly available data * Reproducible results * Assessment of future product development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Aggregated data * Process analysis difficult * Reliance on financial data * Imports treated as domestic products * Lack of physical data * Data uncertainty
BOTTOM-UP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Detail and specificity * Comparison of specific products or processes * Identifies process improvements * Assessment of future product development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Subjective system boundary * Time intensive and costly * Difficult to apply to new product or process * Lack of data or reliance on proprietary data * Reproducibility of results * Data uncertainty

Fig. 7.3: Advantages (pros) and disadvantages (cons) of “top-down,” I-O and “bottom-up,” process-based analyses. Adapted from [19].

as a key piece of information that will help consumers and firms alike make wise consumption and investment decisions in the age of resource depletion.

The steady-state EI-O techniques of Bullard, Herendeen, and others [5, 7] offer a starting point toward determining energy intensity. But, we need to move toward a fuller picture of the role of energy and manufactured capital in the economy; we need to move toward Figures 7.1C and D. In the sections below, we utilize the the results from Chapters 3–6 and extend the steady-state EI-O techniques to estimate energy intensity given the existence of wastes and the accumulation of embodied energy.

7.2 Methodology

Energy intensity (ε) is the ratio of total energy (\dot{T}) and value (\dot{X}) outflow rates from an economic sector (e.g., the auto industry), such that for sector j ,

$$\varepsilon_j \equiv \frac{\dot{T}_j}{\dot{X}_j}, \quad (7.1)$$

and ε is in units of J/\$.¹² Energy intensity (ε_j) represents the total energy demanded by sector j (both for sector j itself and the energy required to create the inputs to sector j) per dollar of output from sector j . Equation 7.1 includes the embodied energy of products in the numerator (\dot{T}_j) term. A narrower definition of energy intensity would be $\varepsilon_j \equiv \frac{\dot{Q}_j}{\dot{X}_j}$, which includes only energy consumed by sector j in the numerator and excludes the energy demanded upstream by the resource flows (\dot{R}) that comprise the product of the sector (\dot{P}). We choose the broader definition of Equation 7.1, because it accounts for upstream energy consumption, thereby providing an estimate of the true total energy cost of products.

For inter-sector flows, we have

$$\varepsilon_j = \frac{\dot{T}_{jk}}{\dot{X}_{jk}}. \quad (7.2)$$

for all k , because the energy intensity of output from sector j is independent of its destination (k). In other words, all goods produced by a sector are produced at the average energy intensity of that sector.¹³

We define the input-output ratio (a_{ij}) that represents the input of good i required to produce a unit of output from sector j .

$$a_{ij} \equiv \frac{\dot{X}_{ij}}{\dot{X}_j} \quad (7.3)$$

¹² It may be instructive to consider energy intensity as the quotient of embodied energy (in units of J/kg) and price (in \$/kg).

¹³ If this approach is unsatisfactory, the sector may be divided into sub-sectors each with its own energy intensity.

We note that the value (\dot{X}) of all material flows must be counted such that

$$a_{ij} = \frac{\dot{X}_{R_{ij}} + \dot{X}_{S_{ij}} + \dot{X}_{K_{ij}}}{\dot{X}_{R_j} + \dot{X}_{S_j} + \dot{X}_{K_j}}. \quad (7.4)$$

where R represents resources, S represents short-lived materials, and K represents capital, as discussed in Chapter 3.

Input-output ratios (a_{ij}) are given in mixed units, depending on both the purpose of each sector of the economy and the type of input as shown in Figure 7.4.

		OUTPUT FROM		
		FINAL CONSUM.	ENERGY SECTOR	GOODS SECTOR
INPUT FROM	FINAL CONSUM.	$\left[\frac{\$/\$}{\$/\$} \right]$	$\left[\frac{\$/J}{\$/J} \right]$	$\left[\frac{\$/\$}{\$/\$} \right]$
	ENERGY SECTOR	$\left[\frac{J/\$}{J/\$} \right]$	$\left[\frac{J/J}{J/J} \right]$	$\left[\frac{J/\$}{J/\$} \right]$
	GOODS SECTOR	$\left[\frac{\$/\$}{\$/\$} \right]$	$\left[\frac{\$/J}{\$/J} \right]$	$\left[\frac{\$/\$}{\$/\$} \right]$

Fig. 7.4: Units for input-output ratios (a).

Equations 7.2 and 7.3 can be combined to give

$$\dot{T}_{jk} = \varepsilon_j a_{jk} \dot{X}_k. \quad (7.5)$$

That is, the flow of total energy from sector j into sector k (\dot{T}_{jk}), is given by the energy intensity of sector k (ε_j) multiplied by the amount of input good j is required to produce a unit of output from sector k (a_{jk}) multiplied by the output flow of value from sector k (\dot{X}_k).

7.3 Example A: single-sector economy

With reference to Figures 4.3, 5.2, and 6.4, the energy intensity (ε_1) of a single-sector economy is calculated by

$$\varepsilon_1 = \frac{\dot{T}_1}{\dot{X}_1} = \frac{\dot{T}_{11}}{\dot{X}_{11}}. \quad (7.6)$$

Appendix B illustrates that the energy intensity of a single-sector economy (ε_1) is comprised of the sum of the infinite recursions of energy consumed during production of output (\dot{X}_1).

To estimate energy intensities when more than one economic sector is involved, we move to Examples B and C in the following sections.

7.4 Example B: two-sector economy

With reference to Figures 4.4, 5.3, and 6.5, the energy intensity (ε_2) of the production sector is given by

$$\varepsilon_2 = \frac{\dot{T}_2}{\dot{X}_2} = \frac{\dot{T}_{22}}{\dot{X}_{22}}. \quad (7.7)$$

Thus,

$$\dot{T}_2 = \varepsilon_2 \dot{X}_2. \quad (7.8)$$

The input-output ratio for the production sector's self-use of output (a_{22}) is

$$a_{22} = \frac{\dot{X}_{22}}{\dot{X}_2}, \quad (7.9)$$

thus

$$\dot{T}_{22} = \varepsilon_2 a_{22} \dot{X}_2. \quad (7.10)$$

We can rewrite the total energy accounting equation for Production (2)

$$\frac{d\dot{T}_2}{dt} = \dot{T}_{02} + \dot{T}_{12} + \dot{T}_{22} - \dot{T}_2 - \dot{T}_{20} \quad (5.29)$$

using energy intensity by realizing that:

- $\frac{d\dot{E}_2}{dt} = 0$ meaning that $\frac{d\dot{T}_2}{dt} = \frac{d\dot{B}_2}{dt}$, because direct energy does not accumulate within economic sectors,
- $\frac{d\dot{B}_2}{dt} = \frac{d\dot{B}_{K_2}}{dt}$, because resources (R) and short-lived materials (S) do not accumulate at appreciable rates in economic sectors,
- $\dot{B}_{02} = 0$ meaning that $\dot{T}_{02} = \dot{E}_{02}$, because flows from the biosphere have yet to have any energy from society embodied in them,
- $\dot{E}_{20} = 0$ meaning that $\dot{T}_{20} = \dot{B}_{20}$, because direct energy is not wasted to the biosphere at any significant rate,¹⁴ and
- $\dot{B}_{20} = (\dot{B}_{R_{20}} + \dot{B}_{S_{20}} + \dot{B}_{K_{20}}) = (\dot{B}_{R_{20}} + \dot{B}_{S_{20}} + \gamma_{B_2} \dot{B}_{K_2})$, as shown in Section 5.4.

If we substitute Equations 7.8 and 7.10 into Equation 5.29, we obtain

$$\frac{d\dot{B}_{K_2}}{dt} = \dot{E}_{02} + \dot{T}_{12} + \varepsilon_2 a_{22} \dot{X}_2 - \varepsilon_2 \dot{X}_2 - (\dot{B}_{R_{20}} + \dot{B}_{S_{20}} + \gamma_{B_2} \dot{B}_{K_2}). \quad (7.11)$$

Equation 7.11 can be solved for energy intensity (ε_2) to obtain

$$\varepsilon_2 = (1 - a_{22})^{-1} \dot{X}_2^{-1} \left[\dot{E}_{02} + \dot{T}_{12} - \frac{d\dot{B}_{K_2}}{dt} - \dot{B}_{R_{20}} - \dot{B}_{S_{20}} - \gamma_{B_2} \dot{B}_{K_2} \right] \quad (7.12)$$

To extend Equation 7.12 to a matrix formulation, we turn to Example C.

¹⁴ Oil spills and gas leaks notwithstanding. Remember also that waste heat outflows (\dot{Q}_{20}) are allocated to the product.

7.5 Example C: three-sector economy

The three-sector economy of Example C affords the opportunity to develop a matrix version of the total energy accounting equation (5.41) and to develop an equation that estimates the energy intensity of economic sectors. We begin by deriving a matrix version of the total energy accounting equation.

7.5.1 Total energy accounting equation

We apply Equation 5.41 to the three-sector economy shown in Figures 4.5, 5.4, and 6.6 to obtain the following total energy accounting equations for the Energy (2) and Goods and Services (3) sectors of Example C:

$$\frac{dT_2}{dt} = \dot{T}_{02} + \dot{T}_{12} + \dot{T}_{22} + \dot{T}_{32} - \dot{T}_2 - \dot{T}_{20} \quad (7.13)$$

and

$$\frac{dT_3}{dt} = \dot{T}_{03} + \dot{T}_{13} + \dot{T}_{23} + \dot{T}_{33} - \dot{T}_3 - \dot{T}_{30}. \quad (7.14)$$

Similar to Example B, we realize that:

- $\frac{dE_i}{dt} = 0$ meaning that $\frac{dT_i}{dt} = \frac{dB_i}{dt}$, because direct energy does not accumulate within economic sectors,
- $\frac{dB_i}{dt} = \frac{dB_{K_i}}{dt}$, because resources (R) and short-lived materials (S) do not accumulate at appreciable rates in economic sectors,
- $\dot{B}_{0j} = 0$ meaning that $\dot{T}_{0j} = \dot{E}_{0j}$, because flows from the biosphere have yet to have any energy from society embodied in them,
- $\dot{E}_{j0} = 0$ meaning that $\dot{T}_{j0} = \dot{B}_{j0}$, because direct energy is not wasted to the biosphere at any significant rate, and
- $\dot{B}_{j0} = (\dot{B}_{\dot{R}_{j0}} + \dot{B}_{\dot{S}_{j0}} + \dot{B}_{\dot{K}_{j0}}) = (\dot{B}_{\dot{R}_{j0}} + \dot{B}_{\dot{S}_{j0}} + \gamma_{B_j} B_{K_j})$, as shown in Section 5.4.

to obtain

$$\frac{dB_{K_2}}{dt} = \dot{E}_{02} + \dot{T}_{12} + \varepsilon_2 \dot{X}_{22} + \varepsilon_3 \dot{X}_{32} - \varepsilon_2 \dot{X}_2 - (\dot{B}_{\dot{R}_{20}} + \dot{B}_{\dot{S}_{20}} + \gamma_{B_2} B_{K_2}) \quad (7.15)$$

and

$$\frac{dB_{K_3}}{dt} = \dot{E}_{03} + \dot{T}_{13} + \varepsilon_2 \dot{X}_{23} + \varepsilon_3 \dot{X}_{33} - \varepsilon_3 \dot{X}_3 - (\dot{B}_{\dot{R}_{30}} + \dot{B}_{\dot{S}_{30}} + \gamma_{B,3} B_{K_3}). \quad (7.16)$$

7.5.2 Matrix formulation

Equations 7.15 and 7.16 can be rewritten in vector notation as

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{Bmatrix} \frac{dB_{K_2}}{dt} \\ \frac{dB_{K_3}}{dt} \end{Bmatrix} &= \begin{Bmatrix} \dot{E}_{02} \\ \dot{E}_{03} \end{Bmatrix} + \begin{Bmatrix} \dot{T}_{12} \\ \dot{T}_{13} \end{Bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \dot{X}_{22} & \dot{X}_{32} \\ \dot{X}_{23} & \dot{X}_{33} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \varepsilon_2 \\ \varepsilon_3 \end{Bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \dot{X}_2 & 0 \\ 0 & \dot{X}_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \varepsilon_2 \\ \varepsilon_3 \end{Bmatrix} \\ &\quad - \begin{Bmatrix} \dot{B}_{\dot{R}_{20}} \\ \dot{B}_{\dot{R}_{30}} \end{Bmatrix} - \begin{Bmatrix} \dot{B}_{\dot{S}_{20}} \\ \dot{B}_{\dot{S}_{30}} \end{Bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_{B_2} & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_{B,3} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} B_{K_2} \\ B_{K_3} \end{Bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.17)$$

If we define the following matrices and vectors:

$$\mathbf{B}_K \equiv \begin{Bmatrix} B_{K_2} \\ B_{K_3} \end{Bmatrix}, \quad (7.18)$$

$$\frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt} \equiv \begin{Bmatrix} \frac{dB_{K_2}}{dt} \\ \frac{dB_{K_3}}{dt} \end{Bmatrix}, \quad (7.19)$$

$$\mathbf{E}_0 \equiv \begin{Bmatrix} \dot{E}_{02} \\ \dot{E}_{03} \end{Bmatrix}, \quad (7.20)$$

$$\mathbf{T}_1 \equiv \begin{Bmatrix} \dot{T}_{12} \\ \dot{T}_{13} \end{Bmatrix}, \quad (7.21)$$

$$\mathbf{X}_t \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \dot{X}_{22} & \dot{X}_{23} \\ \dot{X}_{32} & \dot{X}_{33} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (7.22)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \equiv \begin{Bmatrix} \varepsilon_2 \\ \varepsilon_3 \end{Bmatrix}, \quad (7.23)$$

$$\mathbf{B}_{\dot{W}} \equiv \begin{Bmatrix} \dot{B}_{\dot{W}_{20}} \\ \dot{B}_{\dot{W}_{30}} \end{Bmatrix} \equiv \begin{Bmatrix} \dot{B}_{\dot{R}_{20}} \\ \dot{B}_{\dot{R}_{30}} \end{Bmatrix} + \begin{Bmatrix} \dot{B}_{\dot{S}_{20}} \\ \dot{B}_{\dot{S}_{30}} \end{Bmatrix}, \quad (7.24)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}} \equiv \delta_{ij} \dot{X}_j = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{X}_2 & 0 \\ 0 & \dot{X}_3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (7.25)$$

and

$$\hat{\gamma}_B \equiv \delta_{ij} \gamma_{B_j} = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_{B_2} & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_{B_3} \end{bmatrix}; \quad (7.26)$$

with the “Kronecker delta” (δ_{ij}), being a function of two integer variables (i and j) that has value of 1 if i and j are equal and zero otherwise;

$$\delta_{ij} \equiv \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \neq j \\ 1 & \text{if } i = j \end{cases}; \quad (7.27)$$

we can rewrite Equation 7.17 compactly in matrix notation as

$$\frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt} = \mathbf{E}_0 + \mathbf{T}_1 + \mathbf{X}_t^T \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \hat{\mathbf{X}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \mathbf{B}_{\dot{W}} - \hat{\gamma}_B \mathbf{B}_K. \quad (7.28)$$

Equation 7.28 can be simplified to

$$\frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt} = \mathbf{E}_0 + \mathbf{T}_1 + (\mathbf{X}_t^T - \hat{\mathbf{X}})\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \mathbf{B}_{\dot{W}} - \hat{\gamma}_B \mathbf{B}_K. \quad (7.29)$$

We can define the input-output matrix (\mathbf{A}) as

$$\mathbf{A} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} a_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{32} & a_{33} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7.30)$$

Appendix C shows that

$$\mathbf{X}_t^T - \hat{\mathbf{X}} = \hat{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{A}^T - \mathbf{I}), \quad (7.31)$$

which allows Equation 7.29 to be recast as

$$\frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt} = \mathbf{E}_0 + \mathbf{T}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{A}^T - \mathbf{I})\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \mathbf{B}_{\dot{W}} - \hat{\gamma}_B \mathbf{B}_K. \quad (7.32)$$

Equation 7.32 is the matrix version of the total energy accounting equation written in terms of embodied energy (\mathbf{B}), energy intensities ($\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$), and input-output ratios (\mathbf{A}). Equation 7.17 applies for the three-sector economy of Example C, but the equivalent matrix formulation (Equation 7.32) can be extended to any desired level of economic and energy sector disaggregation by expanding the vectors and matrices in Equations 7.19–7.18 and 7.30 to include all sectors ($2 \dots n$) of an n -sector economy.[1, 8]

Equation 7.32 provides a means to estimate the embodied energy accumulation rate in economic sectors ($\frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt}$) knowing only direct energy inputs to the economy from the biosphere (\mathbf{E}_0), total energy inputs from society to the economy (\mathbf{T}_1), sector outputs ($\hat{\mathbf{X}}$), sector input-output ratios (\mathbf{A}), sector energy intensities ($\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$), energy embodied in wastes from the economy ($\mathbf{B}_{\dot{W}}$), and physical depreciation rates of capital stock ($\hat{\gamma}_B \mathbf{B}_K$). In theory, the transaction matrix (\mathbf{X}_t) is not required if the input-output matrix (\mathbf{A}) is known, though in practice, knowledge of input-output matrix (\mathbf{A}) would be derived from the transaction matrix (\mathbf{X}_t), as shown in Appendix D.

Equation 7.32 can be rearranged to obtain

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{A}^T - \mathbf{I})\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt} + \mathbf{B}_{\dot{W}} + \hat{\gamma}_B \mathbf{B}_K - \mathbf{E}_0 - \mathbf{T}_1 \quad (7.33)$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = [\hat{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{A}^T - \mathbf{I})]^{-1} \left[\frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt} + \mathbf{B}_{\dot{W}} + \hat{\gamma}_B \mathbf{B}_K - \mathbf{E}_0 - \mathbf{T}_1 \right]. \quad (7.34)$$

We apply the matrix identity [22, Formula 6.2, p. 308]

$$(\mathbf{FGH})^{-1} = \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{G}^{-1} \mathbf{F}^{-1} \quad (7.35)$$

to the right side of Equation 7.34 to obtain

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\mathbf{A}^T - \mathbf{I})^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{X}}^{-1} \left[\frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt} + \mathbf{B}_{\dot{W}} + \hat{\gamma}_B \mathbf{B}_K - \mathbf{E}_0 - \mathbf{T}_1 \right]. \quad (7.36)$$

Finally, we can multiply both parenthetical terms¹⁵ on the right side of Equation 7.36 by -1 to obtain

$$\varepsilon = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}^T)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{X}}^{-1} \left[\mathbf{E}_0 + \mathbf{T}_1 - \frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt} - \mathbf{B}_{\dot{W}} - \hat{\gamma}_B \mathbf{B}_K \right]. \quad (7.37)$$

Equation 7.37 is the key energy intensity equation in this section. In words, it says that the energy intensity of economic sector output (ε) is a function of the energy input from the biosphere (\mathbf{E}_0), the energy input from society (\mathbf{T}_1), less the rate at which energy is embodied in the sector ($\frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt}$), less the rate at which energy embodied in resource and short-lived material streams end up as waste ($\mathbf{B}_{\dot{W}}$), less the rate at which embodied energy is discarded from the sector in depreciated capital ($\hat{\gamma}_B \mathbf{B}_K$).

Comparison of Equations 7.37 and 7.12 shows that the matrix form is an extension of the algebraic form of the energy intensity equation.

Equation 7.37 provides a means to estimate energy intensity (ε) of the sectors of the economy, under the assumption that Final Consumption (1) is exogenous to the economy (Sectors 2... n). We discuss Equation 7.37 further in Section 8.2. But first, we address a few methodological issues followed by an examination of energy intensity in the context of our running example, the US auto industry.

7.6 What is endogenous?

There is debate in the literature about whether government and households (Final Consumption (1) in Figure 3.4) should be endogenous to economic models. This debate is fundamentally a discussion about the appropriate analysis boundary. Costanza [3] was the first to endogenize government and households, because households provide services to the economy (labor) in exchange for wages and government provides services to the economy in exchange for taxes, both of which require energy. Costanza [3] also demonstrated that energy intensity results are a function of boundary (control volume) selection. By including government and households as sectors in the model, the variation of energy intensity is significantly reduced across all sectors of the economy.

The key energy intensity equation above (Equation 7.37) was derived under the assumption that Final Consumption (1) is exogenous to energy intensity calculation. However, Equation 7.37 could be re-derived to endogenize Final Consumption (1).

The total energy accounting equation for Final Consumption (1) in Figure 5.4 can be written analogously to Equations 7.15 and 7.16 as

$$\frac{dB_{K1}}{dt} = \dot{E}_{01} + \varepsilon_1 \dot{X}_{11} + \varepsilon_2 \dot{X}_{21} + \varepsilon_3 \dot{X}_{31} - \varepsilon_1 \dot{X}_1 - (\dot{B}_{\dot{R}10} + \dot{B}_{\dot{S}10} + \gamma_{K,1} B_{K1}). \quad (7.38)$$

¹⁵ The parenthetical terms on the right side of Equation 7.36 are $(\mathbf{A}^T - \mathbf{I})$ and $\left[\frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt} + \mathbf{B}_{\dot{W}} + \hat{\gamma}_B \mathbf{B}_K - \mathbf{E}_0 - \mathbf{T}_1 \right]$.

Furthermore, Equations 7.15 and 7.16 can be rewritten as

$$\frac{dB_{K_2}}{dt} = \dot{E}_{02} + \varepsilon_1 \dot{X}_{12} + \varepsilon_2 \dot{X}_{22} + \varepsilon_3 \dot{X}_{32} - \varepsilon_2 \dot{X}_2 - (\dot{B}_{R_{20}} + \dot{B}_{S_{20}} + \gamma_{K,2} B_{K_2}) \quad (7.39)$$

and

$$\frac{dB_{K_3}}{dt} = \dot{E}_{03} + \varepsilon_1 \dot{X}_{13} + \varepsilon_2 \dot{X}_{23} + \varepsilon_3 \dot{X}_{33} - \varepsilon_3 \dot{X}_3 - (\dot{B}_{R_{30}} + \dot{B}_{S_{30}} + \gamma_{K,3} B_{K_3}). \quad (7.40)$$

Following the derivation of Chapter 7, we can obtain an updated version of Equation 7.37:

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}^T)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{X}}^{-1} \left[\mathbf{E}_0 - \frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt} - \mathbf{B}_W - \hat{\gamma}_B \mathbf{B}_K \right], \quad (7.41)$$

wherein

- the vectors and matrices of Equations 7.18–7.26 and 7.30 have been extended to include Final Consumption (1) and
- Final Consumption (1) has been endogenized (the \mathbf{T}_1 term of Equation 7.37 has been subsumed into the $(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}^T)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{X}}^{-1}$ term of Equation 7.41).

Future work could estimate energy intensity ($\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$) using Equations 7.37 and 7.41 with updated economic data for a wider range of countries.¹⁶ Doing so could provide further insight on Costanza's result [3] that endogenizing Final Consumption (1) reduces variation of energy intensity ($\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$) across all sectors of the economy.

7.7 Choice of energy input vector

There is discussion in the literature about the \mathbf{E}_0 vector and how it should be applied to the economy. Costanza and Herendeen [12] counted fossil fuel input from the biosphere to the economy at both

1. the points where direct energy physically enters the economy from the biosphere, typically energy-producing sectors (called the DIRECT method), and
2. the points of conversion to useful work, typically all energy *consuming* sectors (called the Direct Energy Conversion (DEC) method).

Costanza and Herendeen justified the Direct Energy Conversion (DEC) approach on both thermodynamic and economic grounds. The thermodynamic justification derived from the purpose of energy consumption in an economy, namely to produce useful work. If direct energy flows *through* a sector, it should not be counted *against* that sector: only energy that is converted to useful work *within* a sector should be counted against that sector. The economic justification derives from the typical treatment of transportation sectors of the economy. Costanza and Herendeen note:

¹⁶ Costanza's analysis [3] was conducted using US data for 1963, 1967, and 1972.

The primary energy sectors functions [*sic*] are like the transportation sectors, which also [*sic*] require special treatment in I-O analysis based on the difference between the services they provide and their physical inputs and outputs. If a strictly physical interpretation were applied to the transportation sectors, they would receive almost all goods produced in the whole economy as inputs and redistribute them as output, masking information on transfers of goods between sectors. For this reason, the transportation sectors in I-O analysis are thought of as providing transportation services that are purchased by the producing sector, preserving the connection between the producing and consuming sector but adding a ‘transportation margin.’ For analogous reasons, the primary energy sectors should be thought of as providing a ‘transportation service’ in moving primary energy from nature to the consuming sectors. The DEC energy input vector incorporates this interpretation.[12, p. 151]

The derivation of the materials, energy, and value accounting framework presented herein counts energy flows from the biosphere to the economy at the point of physical inflow to the economy. That is, elements of the energy input vector (\mathbf{E}_0) are non-zero only for those sectors that receive energy directly from the biosphere. So, for example, in Figure 4.5 from Example C, $\dot{E}_{03} = 0$ and $\dot{E}_{02} \geq 0$. Our approach is equivalent to Costanza’s DIRECT method. We believe that the DIRECT approach is correct and that the DEC method is unwarranted.

Justification for our position comes from the detailed derivation of the materials, energy, and value framework presented in Chapters 3–6.

1. Firstly, \mathbf{E}_0 was defined as a flow from the biosphere to economic sectors into which direct energy *physically* flows. It is inappropriate to route the energy elsewhere.
2. Secondly, Costanza and Herendeen’s concern [12, pp. 130 & 138] about flow-through of direct energy is unfounded, because direct energy outflows from a sector are *never* counted against the sector with the DIRECT method. We see this fact in the following terms:
 - a. $-\dot{E}_1$ in Equation 5.12,
 - b. $-\dot{E}_j$ in Equation 5.43,
 - c. $-\begin{bmatrix} \dot{X}_2 & 0 \\ 0 & \dot{X}_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \varepsilon_2 \\ \varepsilon_3 \end{Bmatrix}$ in Equation 7.17, and
 - d. $-\hat{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ in Equation 7.28.
3. Thirdly, further proof that the DEC approach is unwarranted comes from equations that show waste heat (\dot{Q}_{j0}) as counting toward the accumulation of embodied energy within an economic sector. Equation 5.16 of Section 5.2.2 is an example. It is the waste heat (\dot{Q}_{10}), i.e. the energy *burned within* the sector, that counts against the sector.

The DIRECT approach *already always* provides the effect that Costanza and Herendeen [12] desired from the DEC approach. Because the DEC approach is unwarranted, we quote DIRECT energy intensity values only when discussing energy intensities in the following section (7.8).

7.8 Energy intensity in the US auto industry

Equation 7.37 shows that it is possible to estimate the energy intensity of products of economic sectors using the Energy Input-Output (I-O) analysis method.¹⁷ Several studies have used similar energy-based, input-output methods (EI-O) to estimate the energetic cost of goods and services produced by various economic sectors.[5, 3, 12, 23, 19, 24–26, 7, 27–29] We review a few of these studies below.

Using national accounts data for 1967, Bullard and Herendeen calculated the total energy consumption rate (\dot{T}) of the US automobile industry as $13,240 \times 10^{15}$ J/year (13.24 EJ/year), which was around 20% of the nation's energy consumption in that year.[5] Around half of this energy was directly consumed within the auto industry itself (\dot{Q}_{j0}), meaning the rest was upstream consumption in material processing that entered the auto industry as embodied energy ($\sum_i \dot{B}_{ij}$). Given the number of autos produced per year, Bullard and Herendeen calculated that the embodied energy per vehicle was 148 GJ (10^9 J), 11% higher than the estimate obtained via process analysis in a study by Berry and Fels [30] two years earlier.¹⁸

In 1980, Costanza [3] estimated the energy intensity of all economic sectors of the US economy using the Input-Output method. Unfortunately, the energy intensity of the Motor Vehicles and Equipment sector (63) was not reported in [3]. Later, Costanza and Herendeen [12] re-estimated energy intensity and reported the energy intensity of outputs from all 87 BEA sectors. The energy intensity of the Motor Vehicles and Equipment sector (63) and selected other sectors are given in Tables 7.1 and 7.2.¹⁹

Table 7.1: Motor Vehicles and Equipment sector (63) energy intensity values.[12]

Year	Energy Intensity [kJ/\$]
1963	1.16×10^5
1967	1.04×10^5
1972	0.95×10^5

The Economic Input-Output Life Cycle Assessment (EIO-LCA) online tool [23] is based on the framework outlined by Hendrickson and Lave [19] and allows computation of the energy flows through the economy based on US national accounts

¹⁷ For a discussion of differences between Equation 7.37 and similar equations in the literature, see Appendix E.

¹⁸ See Section 5.5 for discussion of the Berry and Fels [30] paper.

¹⁹ Values from Costanza and Herendeen's DIRECT method are provided here. See Section 7.7 for discussion of the differences between DIRECT and DEC methods and justification for reporting DIRECT method values only.

Table 7.2: Selected US economic sector energy intensities, 1972.[12]

Sector	Energy Intensity [kJ/\$]
Coal Mining (1)	3.23×10^6
Air Transport (73)	1.76×10^5
New Construction (14)	1.03×10^5
Motor Vehicles and Equipment (63)	9.50×10^4
Auto Repair (82)	8.35×10^4

data from 1992, 1997 and 2002.²⁰ Using the tool with the 2002 producer price model, we find that \$1M of output from the automobile manufacturing industry (NAICS sector 336111) generates a total flow of 8.33 TJ (10^{12} J) of energy through the economy, 2.19 TJ from the power generation and supply sector (221100) and 1.25 TJ from the iron and steel mills sector (331110).

Table 7.3: Automobile manufacturing sector (NAICS 33611x) energy intensity values.[23]

Year	Energy Intensity [kJ/\$]
1992 ^a	1.26×10^4
1997 ^b	0.76×10^4
2002 ^c	0.83×10^4

^a Motor vehicles and Passenger Car Bodies (590301)

^b Automobile and Light Truck Manufacturing (336110)

^c Automobile Manufacturing (336111)

All of these estimates use product-focused accounting frameworks. In Section 8.2.1, we recommended a physical accounting framework. It would be interesting to know how the above energy intensity results vary (a) if a physical accounting framework is employed, (b) with time, and (c) across economies at different stages of industrialization. However, we know of no longitudinal estimates of the energy intensity of automobiles using the EI-O method. In fact, the current account records, upon which the estimates of energy intensity values above are based, are no longer maintained by the US government. So, we could not update the results presented in this section, even if we wanted to. Furthermore, few countries maintain and publish

²⁰ The US national accounts data has not been updated since 2002. The issue of national accounts data is discussed in more detail in Chapter 9.

Table 7.4: Selected US economic sector energy intensities, 1997.[23]

Sector	Energy Intensity [kJ/\$]
Coal Mining (212100)	1.11×10^4
Air Transportation (481000)	2.62×10^4
Manufacturing and Industrial Buildings (230210)	0.76×10^4
Automobile and Light Truck Manufacturing (336110)	0.76×10^4
Automotive Repair and Maintenance, except car washes (8111A0)	0.52×10^4

records with enough detail to perform these analyses. In Chapter 9, we discuss further the need for additional data.

7.9 Summary

In this chapter, we derived algebraic equations, based on the top-down EI-O method, that describe the energy intensity (in units of J/\$) of products of economic sectors. The algebraic equations were applied to Examples A–C to derive a matrix equation for a vector of energy intensities for the entire economy (ϵ). We then reviewed several studies in the literature of energy intensity of the US auto industry and noted a wide range of results from one study to the next. The estimates of energy intensity also vary with time. The range of energy intensities for the auto sector is 0.83×10^4 kJ/\$ to 11.6×10^4 kJ/\$.

In the next chapter, we draw several implications from the material, energy, and value accounting framework presented in Chapters 3–7.

References

- [1] Clark W Bullard, Peter S Penner, and David A Pilati. Net energy analysis: Handbook for combining process and input-output analysis. *Resources and energy*, 1(3):267–313, 1978.
- [2] Wassily Leontief. Quantitative input-output study of the louisiana economy. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 18:105–125, 1936.
- [3] Robert Costanza. Embodied energy and economic valuation. *Science*, 210(4475):1219–1224, 1980.
- [4] Anne P Carter. Applications of input-output analysis to energy problems. *Science*, 184(4134):325–330, 1974.
- [5] Clark W Bullard and Robert A Herendeen. The energy cost of goods and services. *Energy Policy*, 3(4):268–278, 1975.

- [6] Clark W Bullard, Peter S Penner, and David A Pilati. *Net Energy Analysis: Handbook for Combining Process and Input-Output Analysis*. Energy Research Group, Center for Advanced Computation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Ill., 1976.
- [7] Robert A Herendeen. Input-output techniques and energy cost of commodities. *Energy Policy*, 6(2):162–165, 1978.
- [8] Stephen Casler and Suzanne Wilbur. Energy input-output analysis: A simple guide. *Resources and Energy*, 6(2):187–201, 1984.
- [9] Satish Joshi. Product environmental lifecycle assessment using inputoutput techniques. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 3(23):95–120, 1999.
- [10] Sangwon Suh and Gjalt Huppes. Methods in the life cycle inventory of a product. In Sangwon Suh, editor, *Handbook of Input-Output Economics in Industrial Ecology*, volume 23 of *Eco-Efficiency in Industry and Science*, pages 263–282. Springer Netherlands, 2009.
- [11] Robert Costanza. Energy costs of goods and services in 1967 including solar energy inputs and labor and government service feedbacks. Energy Research Group Document No. 262, Energy Research Group, Center for Advanced Computation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, September 1978.
- [12] Robert Costanza and Robert A Herendeen. Embodied energy and economic value in the united states economy: 1963, 1967 and 1972. *Resources and Energy*, 6(2):129–163, 1984.
- [13] Clark W Bullard III and Robert A Herendeen. Energy impact of consumption decisions. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 63(3):484–493, 1975.
- [14] George Soklis. The Conversion of the Supply and Use Tables to Symmetric Input-Output Tables: A Critical Review. *Bulletin of Political Economy*, 3(1):51–70, 2009.
- [15] Sangwon Suh, Manfred Lenzen, Graham J Treloar, Hiroki Hondo, Arpad Horvath, Gjalt Huppes, Olivier Joliet, Uwe Klann, Wolfram Krewitt, Yuichi Moriguchi, Jesper Munksgaard, and Gregory Norris. System boundary selection in life-cycle inventories using hybrid approaches. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 38(3):657–664, 2004.
- [16] Sangwon Suh and Gjalt Huppes. Missing inventory estimation tool using extended input-output analysis. *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 7(3):134–140, 2002.
- [17] Robert H Crawford. Validation of a hybrid life-cycle inventory analysis method. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 88(3):496–506, 2008.
- [18] Pei Zhai and Eric D Williams. Dynamic hybrid life cycle assessment of energy and carbon of multicrystalline silicon photovoltaic systems. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 44(20):7950–7955, 2010.
- [19] Chris T Hendrickson, Lester B Lave, and H Scott Matthews. *Environmental life cycle assessment of goods and services: an input-output approach*. RFF Press, 2006.
- [20] Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen. Dynamic models and economic growth. *World Development*, 3(11-12):765–783, 1975.

- [21] Robert Costanza. Value theory and energy. In Cutler J. Cleveland, editor, *Encyclopedia of Energy*, volume 6, pages 337–346. Elsevier, March 2004.
- [22] William H Beyer. *Standard Mathematical Tables and Formulae*. CRC Press, 29 edition, 1991.
- [23] Carnegie Mellon University Green Design Institute. Economic Input-Output Life Cycle Assessment (EIO-LCA), US 1997 Industry Benchmark model. <http://www.eiolca.net>, Accessed 1 January 2014.
- [24] Robert A Herendeen. Energy cost of goods and services. Technical report, Oak Ridge National Lab., Tenn.(USA), 1973.
- [25] Robert A Herendeen and Clark W Bullard. *Energy Cost of Goods and Services: 1963 and 1967*. Center for Advanced Computation, University of Illinois, 1974.
- [26] Robert A Herendeen. Use of input-output analysis to determine the energy cost of goods and services. *Energy: Demand, Conservation, and institutional problems. Cambridge: MIT press (proceedings)*, pages 140–158, 1974.
- [27] David J Wright. 3. good and services: an input-output analysis. *Energy Policy*, 2(4):307–315, 1974.
- [28] Manfred Lenzen. Primary energy and greenhouse gases embodied in australian final consumption: an input–output analysis. *Energy policy*, 26(6):495–506, 1998.
- [29] Giovanni Machado, Roberto Schaeffer, and Ernst Worrell. Energy and carbon embodied in the international trade of Brazil: an input–output approach. *Ecological economics*, 39(3):409–424, 2001.
- [30] R Stephen Berry and Margaret F Fels. The energy cost of automobiles. *Science and Public Affairs*, 29(10):11–17, 1973.

Part III
Implications and Summary

Chapter 8

Implications

Development without growth beyond the earth's carrying capacity is true progress. [1]

—Herman Daly

Several implications can be drawn from the detailed development of our framework for materials, energy, and value accounting (in Chapters 3–7). In the sections below, we discuss implications for the development of important economic metrics, the Energy Input-Output (EI-O) method itself, implications for economic growth, implications for recycling, reuse, and dematerialization, and comparisons between our framework and the notion of a steady-state economy. We begin by discussing metrics.

8.1 Metrics

Our framework highlights the value that could be derived from continuous monitoring and reporting of several important metrics by national accounting agencies, including

- energy intensity of products of economic sectors (Chapter 7),
- total accumulation of material (Chapter 3) and embodied energy (Chapter 5) in economic sectors,
- the flow rate of energy from the biosphere into economic sectors (Chapter 4),
- the flow rate of materials from economic sectors to the biosphere (Chapter 3), and
- the flow rate of embodied energy from economic sectors to the biosphere (Chapter 5).

In the age of resource depletion, it would be very helpful if these metrics were available for sectors and/or firms on a regular basis.

Both initial conditions and periodic reporting of important data are essential for the ongoing tracking of important economic indicators. Because initial conditions are not known and periodic reporting is not done, the dynamics of the accumulation of materials and embodied energy in economic sectors are not discernible at this time. For example, depreciation of some material from an economic sector will require replacement. The replacement material will have embodied energy. Production of

the replacement places an energy drain on the economy. We have no way of quantifying that drain at the present time. If our model were implemented and periodic updates were available, society would better understand the costs (in terms of both dollars *and* energy) of maintaining capital. And, society would understand how those maintenance flows constrain economic growth.

8.2 Implications for the I-O method

Extension of the Leontief Input-Output method for energy analysis has allowed energy analysts to estimate the energy intensity of economic products (ϵ). As discussed in Section 6.2, we do not take the ability to estimate energy intensity as a license to declare an intrinsic “energy theory of value.” Rather, we believe that energy intensity (ϵ) is an important and useful metric that can assess the energy performance of economies, even within the prevailing subjective theory of value that underlies modern economics. It is important to consider the assumptions behind the literature’s presentation of the EI-O method for estimating the energy intensity of economic output before drawing implications from our framework.

As we investigate, we will use the following coordinates of analysis: product-based vs. physical accounting frameworks, whether capital stock is included in the accounting framework, and whether energy input from society to the economy is included. (See Figure 8.1.) We will end with our recommendation for how best to estimate energy intensity (ϵ) within a materials, energy, and value accounting framework.

		Accounting Framework	
		Product-focused	Physical
Capital Inflows	Excluded	Early EI-O literature	Nonsensical
	Included	Later EI-O literature	<div>Energy input from society ignored</div> <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> <div>Energy input from society included</div>

Fig. 8.1: Coordinates of analysis for implications for the EI-O method.

8.2.1 Product-based vs. physical approaches

The distinction between product-focused and physical accounting frameworks is located in the columns of Figure 8.1. A *physical accounting* framework strictly follows materials through the economy. Embodied energy is allocated to the material stock or material flow in which it resides—wherever it goes, so goes the embodied energy. When the material is scrapped, so is its embodied energy. For example, energy embodied within wastes ($\mathbf{B}_{\dot{W}}$) is not assigned to economic products. Rather, the energy embodied in wastes flows out of sectors into the biosphere *with the waste material*.

In contrast, a *product-focused accounting* framework assigns energy embodied in wastes to the products of the sector. Both product-based and physical accounting frameworks assign direct energy (\dot{E}) consumed by each sector to the products of each sector.

Equation 8.1 below describes the outflow of embodied energy from sector j for a physical accounting system that neglects both capital stock accumulation and capital inflow (upper-right quadrant of Figure 8.1).¹

$$\dot{B}'_j = \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{B}'_{ij} - \dot{B}_{\dot{W}_j} + \dot{Q}_{j0} \quad (8.1)$$

Terms written with a “prime” (e.g. \dot{B}'_j) indicate definitions and terms that exclude input capital flows (\dot{K}) and capital stock (K). The term $\dot{B}_{\dot{W}_j}$ represents the energy embodied within wasted resource (\dot{R}_{j0}) and short-lived (\dot{S}_{j0}) material flows. The $\dot{B}_{\dot{W}_j}$ term is subtracted, because waste material flows *out of* the sector. In a physical accounting framework, the energy embodied in waste flows ($\dot{B}_{\dot{W}_j}$) is not assigned to the product (\dot{B}'_j).

In contrast, Equation 8.2 describes the outflow of embodied energy from sector j , exclusive of capital stock, for a product-focused accounting framework (upper left quadrant of Figure 8.1).

$$\dot{B}'_j = \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{B}'_{ij} + \dot{Q}_{j0} \quad (8.2)$$

Notice that Equation 8.2 does not subtract the energy embodied in waste resource and short-lived material flows ($\dot{B}_{\dot{W}_j}$) on the right side of the equation, because product-focused accounting systems assign energy embodied in wastes to products. The magnitude of $\dot{B}_{\dot{W}_j}$ relative to the $\sum_{i=1}^n \dot{B}'_{ij}$ and \dot{Q}_{j0} terms determines whether, for any particular sector, the value of \dot{B}'_j is different between a physical accounting framework (Equation 8.1) and a product-focused accounting framework (Equation 8.2).

¹ Equation 8.1 is used for illustrative purposes only. A physical accounting framework would necessarily include both flows and stocks of capital. Thus, the upper-right quadrant of Figure 8.1 (physical accounting framework that neglects capital) is labeled as nonsensical.

8.2.2 Capital flows and stock

The rows of Figure 8.1 represent the role of capital flows and stock in an accounting framework. The BEA Industry Accounts include capital flows in the “make” tables for each industry [2, Table 1], but capital inflows are accounted separately from intermediate uses as “Private fixed investment” [2, Table 2]. During the earliest years of the EI-O method (prior to the mid-1970s) both capital inflows to economic sectors and stocks of capital were ignored. In essence, the state of the art was located in the upper-left quadrant of Figure 8.1. In time, Kirkpatrick [3], Bullard and Herendeen [4], and Casler [5] attempted to include inflows of capital in a product-focused accounting framework, thereby moving the state of the art to the lower-left quadrant of Figure 8.1.

We agree with this move, because of the many ways in which capital stock is important for economies. We can use the work of Eugene Odum [6] to explain the importance of capital stock within ecosystems, and we have Herman Daly to thank for making the connection between ecosystems and economies.[7]

In 1969, Odum outlined a number of defining characteristics of both *developmental* (growing) and *mature* (stable) ecosystems in terms of key properties of the system.[6] Ecosystems cannot grow indefinitely in their (photosynthetic) production rate (P) due to the necessity of increasing maintenance demands as the stock of biomass (B) increases. Eventually, all production is used in this manner and growth ceases ($\frac{d}{dt}(P) = 0$).

In the early stages of ecosystem development, the energy production rate per unit of biomass stock ($\frac{P}{B}$) is high. As the ecosystem approaches maturity, this ratio decreases. Put another way, the biomass stock (maintained) per unit of energy produced (the inverse ratio, $\frac{B}{P}$) starts low and asymptotically increases to a maximum when growth (in both P and B) has ceased. The value of $\frac{B}{P}$ at the asymptote may be high or low² and may therefore be considered a measure of the “efficiency” to which the ecosystem applies energy production toward the goal of maintaining biomass stock.

Turning back to economies, Daly has, in our view, correctly applied this concept to societal patterns of economic consumption.[7] Our framework analogously suggests that as capital stock (\mathbf{B}_K) increases, an increasing flow of energy supply (\mathbf{E}_0) will be needed to maintain that stock.³ Thus, it is important to account for capital stock in a material, energy, and value accounting framework.

To see the effect of the move from the upper-left to the lower-left quadrant of Figure 8.1, it is important to understand clearly both the assumptions and data that were used. Energy analysts in the mid-1970s were utilizing the BEA I-O tables,

² The value of $\frac{B}{P}$ at maturity (and the time taken to reach it) “may vary not only with different climatic and physiographic situations but also with different ecosystem attributes in the same physical environment.” [6, p.263]

³ Today’s economies (and economic models and economic assumptions) are still focused on the objective of growth. If energy supply rates (\mathbf{E}_0) are constrained, these dynamics provide a possible reason for the difficulty of maintaining high levels of economic growth in mature economies. Eventually, we must learn to maximize the $\frac{B}{P}$ ratios of our economies ($\frac{\mathbf{B}_K}{\mathbf{E}_0}$).

which include capital flows on the output, but do not include capital flows on the input. Thus, this early literature implicitly assumes that

$$a'_{ij} \equiv \frac{\dot{X}_{\dot{R}_{ij}} + \dot{X}_{\dot{S}_{ij}}}{\dot{X}_{\dot{R}_j} + \dot{X}_{\dot{S}_j} + \dot{X}_{\dot{K}_j}} = \frac{\dot{X}'_{ij}}{\dot{X}_j}. \quad (8.3)$$

Comparison between Equations 7.4 and 8.3 highlights the fact that the early literature neglects flows of capital stock ($\dot{X}_{\dot{K}_{ij}}$) on the input. Thus, the Input-Output matrix in the early EI-O literature (\mathbf{A}') is

$$\mathbf{A}' = \begin{bmatrix} a'_{22} & a'_{23} \\ a'_{32} & a'_{33} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (8.4)$$

The implicit assumptions of the early energy I-O literature are consistent with the upper-left quadrant of Figure 8.1, and the energy intensity equation found in most of the early literature is

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}' = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}'^T)^{-1} (\hat{\mathbf{X}})^{-1} \mathbf{E}_0. \quad (8.5)$$

Bullard and Herendeen [4], following Kirkpatrick [3], added flows of capital as inputs to each sector [4, Figure 5], and, in so doing, changed Equation 8.5 to Equation 8.6:

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \left[\mathbf{I} - (\mathbf{A}'^T + \mathbf{A}_K^T) \right]^{-1} (\hat{\mathbf{X}})^{-1} \mathbf{E}_0 \quad (8.6)$$

with

$$\mathbf{A}_K \equiv \begin{bmatrix} a_{\dot{K}_{22}} & a_{\dot{K}_{23}} \\ a_{\dot{K}_{32}} & a_{\dot{K}_{33}} \end{bmatrix} \quad (8.7)$$

and

$$a_{\dot{K}_{ij}} \equiv \frac{\dot{X}_{\dot{K}_{ij}}}{\dot{X}_j}. \quad (8.8)$$

Bullard and Herendeen counted embodied energy from incoming capital stock in \mathbf{A}_K only if it was used for replacement.[4, p. 488] Consequently, they did not count incoming energy embodied in capital if the incoming capital was used to increase the stock of capital within a sector. In fact, Bullard and Herendeen's product-focused accounting framework did not include an embodied energy stock for economic sectors (\mathbf{B}) at all. They assumed instead that half of the incoming capital went toward replacement. These early researchers moved from the upper-left quadrant to the lower-left quadrant of Figure 8.1. And, Equation 8.6 represents a partial step toward developing a method for estimating energy intensity ($\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$) that fully accounts for capital stock.

As stated above, we agree with Kirkpatrick [3], Bullard and Herendeen [4], and Casler [5] that incoming capital is important and should be included in an accounting framework (i.e., we should be on the lower half of Figure 8.1). But, we recommend that inclusion of incoming capital should be done within a *physical* accounting framework, i.e. we should make a second move from the lower-left to the lower-right quadrant of Figure 8.1. Specifically, incoming capital should be included not only on incoming material streams but also as a stock that can accumulate within the economic sector itself.

Our recommendation is informed by the work of Odum [6] and Daly [7] and is based on the belief that accounting for stocks of capital is important for developing a coherent view of the structure of an economy. Stocks of capital are essential to the production process: without machines and factories, cars cannot be produced. And, in industrialized economies maintenance of capital stock becomes an important driver of both financial and natural resource demands, as illustrated by the following quote from Meadows:

By year 50 the cost of maintaining the capital stock has overwhelmed the income from resource extraction, so profits are no longer sufficient to keep investment ahead of depreciation. The operation quickly shuts down, as the capital stock declines. The last and most expensive of the resource stays in the ground; it doesn't pay to get it out.[8, p. 62]

Thus, the buildup of capital stock (and associated embodied energy) within economic sectors is an essential aspect of the industrialization process. Carefully tracking (on a physical, as opposed to financial, basis) capital stock in each economic sector is essential for understanding the network effects of upstream energy demand as new industries and products arise (e.g., electric vehicles).

In a physical accounting system that includes capital stock (lower-right quadrant of Figure 8.1), energy embodied within accumulated capital stock is not assigned to products (**P**); rather, accumulated embodied energy is assigned to a stock of embodied energy for each sector (**B_K**). And, the stock of embodied energy (**B_K**) can depreciate.

A physical accounting framework that fully includes capital stock (lower-right quadrant of Figure 8.1) is described by Equation 8.9.

$$\varepsilon = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}^T)^{-1} (\hat{\mathbf{X}})^{-1} \left[\mathbf{E}_0 - \frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt} - \mathbf{B}_W - \hat{\gamma}_B \mathbf{B}_K \right]. \quad (8.9)$$

Differences between Equation 8.9 and Equation 8.6 include:

- Equation 8.9 includes **A** while Equation 8.6 splits **A** into **A'** and **A_K** (a difference in appearance only),
- Equation 8.9 subtracts accumulation $\left(\frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt}\right)$ of energy embodied in capital stock, because energy embodied in the stock of capital for a sector (**B_{K_j}**) is assigned to products of the sector,
- Equation 8.9 subtracts waste (**B_W**), because energy embodied in waste products is not assigned to products of the sector, and
- Equation 8.9 subtracts depreciation ($\hat{\gamma}_B \mathbf{B}_K$) of energy embodied in capital stock, because energy embodied in depreciated capital ($\dot{\mathbf{B}}_{Kj0}$) is assigned to products of the sector.

There are two topics related to Equation 8.9 that are worthy of consideration: waste flows and an accounting equation for capital stock.

8.2.2.1 Waste flows

We are unaware of any estimates of the energy embodied in wasted material in an economy (\mathbf{B}_W). But, it may be possible to develop a metric for the resource material efficiency of an economic sector ($\eta_{\dot{R}}$), i.e. the fraction of the material that actually makes it into the product, such that:

$$\eta_{\dot{R}_j} \equiv \frac{\dot{P}_j}{\sum_{i=1}^n \dot{R}_{ij}}. \quad (8.10)$$

With the above definition, the scrap rate for resources could be expressed as $(1 - \eta_{\dot{R}}) \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{R}_{ij}$. Allwood et. al. [9, p. 193] used a process-based approach to manufacturing efficiencies for metals used in manufacturing. The data are summarized in Table 8.1.

Table 8.1: Manufacturing efficiencies ($\eta_{\dot{R}}$, Equation 8.10) for selected manufactured goods.[9]

Product	$\eta_{\dot{R}}$ [%]
Steel I-beam	90
Car Door Panel	50
Aluminium Drink Can	50
Aircraft Wing Skin Panel	10

Furthermore, one could assume that the rate of short-lived materials (\dot{S}) used by a sector could be given as a fraction of the resource (\dot{R}) use rate such that:

$$\rho_{\dot{S}_j} \equiv \frac{\dot{S}_{j0}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \dot{R}_{ij}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \dot{S}_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \dot{R}_{ij}}. \quad (8.11)$$

With the above definitions, the waste resource rate from an economic sector can be given as

$$\dot{R}_{j0} + \dot{S}_{j0} = (1 - \eta_{\dot{R}_j} + \rho_{\dot{S}_j}) \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{R}_{ij}. \quad (8.12)$$

The embodied energy in the waste materials would need to be estimated from the embodied energy of the incoming resource and short-lived material flows as

$$\dot{B}_{\dot{W}_j} = \dot{B}_{\dot{R}_{j0}} + \dot{B}_{\dot{S}_{j0}}. \quad (8.13)$$

8.2.2.2 Simplification via capital stock accounting equation

A possible simplification to Equation 8.9 can be obtained from a control volume around the stock of capital in sector j :

$$\frac{dB_{K_j}}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{B}_{\dot{K}_{ij}} - \gamma_{B_j} B_{K_j}. \quad (8.14)$$

We can express the incoming energy embodied in capital ($\sum_{i=1}^n \dot{B}_{\dot{K}_{ij}}$) as a fraction (α_{B_j}) of the capital stock (B_{K_j}) as

$$\alpha_{B_j} \equiv \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \dot{B}_{\dot{K}_{ij}}}{B_{K_j}} \quad (8.15)$$

for $j \in [2, n]$. Together with the Kronecker delta (δ_{ij}), we can write

$$\hat{\alpha}_B \equiv \delta_{ij} \alpha_{B_j} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{B_2} & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_{B_3} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (8.16)$$

Thus, the embodied energy accounting equation around the stock of capital in the economy can be written in matrix form as

$$\frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt} = \hat{\alpha}_B \mathbf{B}_K - \hat{\gamma}_B \mathbf{B}_K. \quad (8.17)$$

Rearranging slightly gives

$$\hat{\alpha}_B \mathbf{B}_K = \frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt} + \hat{\gamma}_B \mathbf{B}_K, \quad (8.18)$$

which says that incoming capital ($\hat{\alpha}_B \mathbf{B}_K$) can be used to either increase the stock of capital in the economy ($\frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt}$) or overcome depreciation ($\hat{\gamma}_B \mathbf{B}_K$). Substituting Equation 8.18 into Equation 8.9 gives

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}^T)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{X}}^{-1} [\mathbf{E}_0 - \hat{\alpha}_B \mathbf{B}_K - \mathbf{B}_W]. \quad (8.19)$$

8.2.3 Energy input from society

In Sections 8.2.1 and 8.2.2 above, we implicitly assumed that Society (1) (Final Consumption, in example economies A–C) contributes negligible energy to the economy. Thus, all vectors and matrices in Equation 8.9 involve Sectors 2– n , but not Sector 1.

Energy input from society to the economy (\mathbf{T}_1) is “muscle work” supplied by working humans and draft animals.[10–12] This muscle work term (\mathbf{T}_1) should include all upstream energy required to make the labor available.⁴ Equation 7.37 adds the effect of energy input from society to the economy, effectively moving from the top half to the lower half of the lower-right quadrant in Figure 8.1.

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}^T)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{X}}^{-1} \left[\mathbf{E}_0 + \mathbf{T}_1 - \frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt} - \mathbf{B}_{\dot{W}} - \hat{\gamma}_B \mathbf{B}_K \right]. \quad (7.37)$$

For industrialized economies, the direct energy component (\mathbf{E}_1) of muscle work (\mathbf{T}_1) is likely to provide only a small fraction of the energy input from fossil fuels (\mathbf{E}_0). But, the embodied energy of the muscle work (\mathbf{B}_1) is likely to be large. For agrarian and developing economies, \mathbf{T}_1 and \mathbf{E}_0 could be on the same order of magnitude. For both industrial and agrarian economies, neglecting \mathbf{T}_1 could cause errors in estimates of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$. To the extent that \mathbf{T}_1 is significant relative to \mathbf{E}_0 , neglecting \mathbf{T}_1 will underpredict the energy intensity of economic output. Energy input from society is discussed further in Section 7.6.

8.2.4 Recommendation

Sections 8.2.1–8.2.3 discussed three factors that affect the form of the energy intensity equation: product-focused vs. physical accounting frameworks, whether capital stock is included, and whether energy input from society is included. The three factors are summarized in Figure 8.1.

At this point, it is instructive to look back at the product-focused vs. physical discussion in Section 8.2.1. We understand the argument for including capital stock in a product-focused accounting framework (lower-left quadrant of Figure 8.1): capital stock and waste exist solely due to product demand, therefore energy embodied in capital and waste should be assigned to products. However, a product-focused framework that includes capital stock (lower-left quadrant of Figure 8.1) masks

⁴ At this point in the development of our framework, we are assuming that Final Consumption (Sector 1) is exogenous to the economy (Sectors 2... n), and upstream energy consumption needs to be included manually. However, in Section 7.6, we show that Final Consumption can be endogenized. Once endogenized, the energy intensity of Final Consumption (ε_1) will automatically include the upstream energy required to make labor available. (See Appendix B.)

It is important to note, too, that labor can have very high energy intensity, because ε_1 includes the energy required to supply food for and transport to workers.

structural aspects of economies that we believe are essential to fully understanding how and why energy flows through economies, namely the accumulation of capital and associated energy embodied within sectors.

The metabolism metaphor (Chapter 2) provides guidance here. If we were to create a model of an organism that neglects tissues that accumulate embodied energy, the organism (in the model) has nothing with which to absorb, process, waste, or otherwise exchange material with the biosphere. The organism doesn't physically exist (in the model)! Neglecting to account for the stock of capital (and its embodied energy) is tantamount to assuming that economic production occurs out of nothing! Accounting for capital stock is essential.

For our framework, we chose a physical accounting approach (which puts us in the right column of Figure 8.1). We chose the physical approach primarily because of our belief that capital is an important aspect of economies, and the physical accounting framework properly includes a stock of capital for each sector of the economy. Product-based accounting frameworks mask crucial aspects of why and how energy flows through economies. We acknowledge that the choice of a physical accounting framework necessitates careful tracking of capital flows (and associated embodied energy) through the economy. For more on data needs, see Chapter 9.

Finally, we suggest that accounting for energy input from society to the economy is important, and we need to be in the lower half of the bottom-right quadrant of Figure 8.1. So, the state of the art has moved from the nascent energy I-O literature located in the upper-left quadrant of Figure 8.1 as represented by Equation 8.5 through the lower-left quadrant of Figure 8.1 as represented by Equation 8.6 to the lower half of the bottom-right quadrant of Figure 8.1 as represented by Equation 7.37.

The implication of the detailed development of our framework on the EI-O method is some suggested enhancements to the EI-O method, including

- conversion to a physical accounting framework such as the one we propose herein,
- physical (as opposed to financial) tracking of accumulated capital stock within economic sectors,
- redefinition of A and ϵ to include embodied energy on inflows of material, and
- use of Equation 7.37 instead of Equation 8.5 or Equation 8.6 for estimating energy intensity (ϵ) of economic sectors within an economy.

Of course, whether or not any particular flow of embodied energy is included in or excluded from analyses or whether the product-focused or physical form of the framework is adopted is less important than beginning to account for embodied energy and routinely reporting energy intensity values in the first place. Deciding to do so will require an understanding that such analyses are important (see Chapters 1 and 2) and the courage to make some movement in the right direction (see Chapter 9).

8.3 Implications for economic growth

Across the world, economic health and well-being is measured almost exclusively by Gross Domestic Product (GDP). If GDP grows, the economy is said to be growing.⁵ Our framework affords the opportunity to assess economic growth in several dimensions. Viewing these dimensions through the lens of our framework illustrates some important points about measures of economic growth and well-being, including whether it be measured by a stock or a flow, and the roles of currency, capital stock, energy, natural resources, and labor in economic processes.

With reference to Figure 6.6, GDP is calculated by summing value-added across all industry sectors:

$$GDP = \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{X}_j \quad (8.20)$$

where n is the number of sectors in the economy. Equation 8.20 clearly shows that GDP is a *flow* of value in units of \$/year.

A second possible measure of economic well-being is a *stock*, wealth:

$$X_j(t) = X_j(0) + \int_{t=0}^{t=t} \frac{dX_j}{dt} dt, \quad (8.21)$$

where $j = 1$ for societal wealth and $j \in [2, n]$ for corporate wealth, both measured in dollars.

As an economy grows, sectors within the economy accumulate capital stock (K , typically expressed in units of dollars) and associated embodied energy (B_K , expressed in units of joules). If we turn this around, accumulation of embodied energy in economic sectors and society could be considered a *proxy* for growth.⁶ Equation 8.22 indicates how accumulated embodied energy in the capital stock of an economy (B_K) could be calculated:

$$B_K(t) = B_K(0) + \int_{t=0}^{t=t} \frac{dB_K}{dt} dt, \quad (8.22)$$

⁵ GDP is not the only indicator of well-being available; there are several other measures in use. The Human Development Index (HDI) is a globally accepted measure that augments GDP with education and life expectancy.[13] In the US, the state of Maryland has been tracking well-being using the *Genuine Progress Indicator* (MDGPI), which combines measures of economic transactions with environmental and social costs.[14, 15] The MDGPI is closely related to Herman Daly's Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare (ISEW) which allows policy-makers to account for contributions of and impacts on the natural environment.[16, 17] Another example is the Nation of Bhutan's *Gross National Happiness* (GNH), a systematic, annual compilation of survey and other data related to nine factors: ecological diversity and resilience, psychological well-being, health, education, culture, time use, good governance, community vitality, and living standards.[18, 19] These alternatives to GDP are slowly gaining acceptance, particularly as their valuation methods are strengthened.[20]

⁶ Embodied energy as a proxy for economic growth may be overly focused on capital stock, therefore one-dimensional, and reductive, but GDP and other measures are open to similar criticism.

where \mathbf{B}_K is given by Equation 7.18. Equation 8.22 clearly shows that energy embodied in capital (\mathbf{B}_K) is a *stock* (in units of joules), not a flow.

The behavior of \mathbf{B}_K with respect to $\frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt}$ is vitally important. As an economy transitions from agrarian to industrialized, its capital stock (K) and associated embodied energy (B_K) grows ever larger. The outflow of depreciated capital stock and its associated embodied energy will occur at a faster rate, too. As increasingly large amounts of energy are embodied in the capital stock of an economy (B_K), Equation 7.32 shows that increasingly large energy extraction rates (\mathbf{E}_0) are required to maintain capital stock in the sectors of the economy to offset the effects of depreciation ($\hat{\gamma}_B \mathbf{B}_K$), assuming that $\frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt} \geq 0$ is desired.

During a period of rapid industrialization and infrastructure build-out, we expect both GDP and energy embodied in the economy (\mathbf{B}_K) to increase. But, there is no guarantee that GDP and \mathbf{B}_K move in the same direction at all times. Industrialized economies may experience GDP growth while the stock of embodied energy in the economy (\mathbf{B}_K) remains nearly constant, because the economy is running circles to overcome the effects of depreciation.

There can be a time lag between movements of GDP and \mathbf{B}_K , too. At the beginning of an economic downturn (defined as prolonged GDP reduction), capital stock and associated embodied energy (\mathbf{B}_K) will remain approximately constant: GDP moves but \mathbf{B}_K doesn't. But as the GDP decline continues, maintenance flows for capital stock will be reduced. If depreciation overtakes maintenance, \mathbf{B}_K will decline.

"Extract and export" economies may exhibit different dynamics. GDP growth occurs as resources are extracted and sold, but \mathbf{B}_K remains flat if that income is not invested back into the economy as capital. An example of this occurred with rubber exports from the Amazon. Per capita incomes increased by an order of magnitude from 1820 to 1900 during the rubber export boom. However, as Amazon rubber exports dropped in value due to stiff competition from Asian rubber production, per capita incomes dropped precipitously back to original levels. Throughout this period, the capital stock, and presumably the stock of embodied energy (\mathbf{B}_K), remained nearly constant.[21]

In fact, capital (represented by energy embodied in infrastructure, \mathbf{B}_K) and financial resources or wealth (represented by $X_{2...n}$) are complementary factors of production for economic processes. But, we can go further than linking physical capital with financial resources. If capital (\mathbf{B}_K) is to be useful, we need financial resources or currency (\dot{X}) to

- purchase direct energy (\dot{E}) to power the capital,
- purchase resources (\dot{R}) to feed the capital, and
- pay workers (represented by societal energy input to the economy, \mathbf{T}_1) to operate the capital.

Thus, economic growth could be considered a "fully coupled" problem: understanding it requires breadth of knowledge and appreciation for interactions among many important and complementary factors. Each factor discussed above (\dot{X} , X , \mathbf{B}_K , \dot{E} , \dot{R} , and \mathbf{T}_1) is necessary, but not sufficient, for economic growth.

Our framework serves to highlight several issues in economic growth. Should it be measured by a stock or a flow? Which measure is most appropriate? What roles do currency, capital stock, energy, resources, and labor play in economic processes? These are overlapping areas of inquiry, and we encourage further research in all of these areas.

8.4 Implications for recycling, reuse, and dematerialization

Dematerialization is the idea that economic activity can be unlinked from material or energy demands.[22] One method for dematerializing an economy is reuse and recycling of materials from both short-lived goods (\mathbf{B}_W) and depreciated capital stock ($\hat{\gamma}_B \mathbf{B}_K$) that would otherwise have been discarded to the biosphere.⁷

In Chapter 7, we defined the rate of accumulation of embodied energy within the economy ($\frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt}$) by the following equation:

$$\frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt} = \mathbf{E}_0 + \mathbf{T}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{A}^T - \mathbf{I})\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \mathbf{B}_W - \hat{\gamma}_B \mathbf{B}_K \quad (7.32)$$

One effect of recycling is to reduce the magnitude of the waste (\mathbf{B}_W) and depreciation ($\hat{\gamma}_B$) terms. As can be seen in Equation 7.32, reducing both \mathbf{B}_W and $\hat{\gamma}_B$, puts *upward* pressure on the accumulation of energy embodied in capital stock ($\frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt}$), all other things being equal.

Recycling has a mixed effect on energy demand (\mathbf{E}_0). Because recycled materials can displace newly-produced material in the economy and society, recycling will tend to reduce energy demand (\mathbf{E}_0). However, recycling processes require energy to operate, thereby putting upward pressure on energy demand (\mathbf{E}_0). If the energetic cost of recycling is lower than the energetic cost of obtaining virgin materials, as is the case for many metals (e.g. aluminum [25]), the result is a net reduction of energy demand from the biosphere (\mathbf{E}_0). Berry and Fels found that recycling of the material in automobiles would result in energy reduction of 12,640 kW-hr per vehicle.[26, p. 15] Therefore recycling will put *downward* pressure on the growth of embodied energy in the economy ($\frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt}$), via reduced \mathbf{E}_0 , all other things being equal.

If recycling produces a net reduction in energy demand (\mathbf{E}_0), the upward pressure on growth ($\frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt}$) from decrease in depreciation ($\hat{\gamma}_B$) and waste (\mathbf{B}_W) and the downward pressure on growth from net reduction in energy demand (\mathbf{E}_0) can offset each other. Under those conditions, the accumulation rate of energy embodied in capital stock ($\frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt}$) will remain near zero and total embodied energy (\mathbf{B}_K) will remain constant. In that scenario, dematerialization can occur: reduced material and energy input (\mathbf{E}_0) can be accompanied by no change in the growth of the economy ($\frac{d\mathbf{B}_K}{dt}$).

⁷ The other prevailing theory in the economics literature, that dematerialization will occur as the economy substitutes away from production of material goods toward information and services, has been strongly challenged by ecological economists.[23, 24]

The possibility of technology to reduce material and energetic inputs (dematerialization) has caused some cornucopian “techno-optimists” [27] (techno-copians) to speculate on the potential of human ingenuity to endlessly overcome physical resource constraints. If technology can reduce the need for materials and energy (dematerialization), prices will decline. This view should be contrasted with a neo-Ricardian (or doomsayer, or peaknik [28]) perspective which believes that physical constraints are binding and that prices for materials will, all other things being equal, increase in the long run.

The two sides clashed in a famous bet between (techno-copian) economist Julian Simon and (peaknik) biologist Paul Ehrlich (plus colleagues John Harte and John Holdren) on whether the price of five metals (copper, chromium, nickel, tin, and tungsten) would increase or decrease over the 10 year period from 1980–1990. [29, 30] Simon believed that technological innovation would outpace declining ore grade (and allow substitution), thereby reducing prices. Ehrlich believed that rising demand (due mainly to increasing population) and finite resources would cause prices to increase. Simon won the bet in 1990 and Ehrlich (and friends) paid Simon the difference in price for the five metals.

Many were quick to see Simon’s win as a resounding validation of the technocopian perspective. However, were the bet still running today (in 2014), Simon would be losing (as he would have done for most of the 10-year periods during the past century). Were the wager expanded to include all important commodities, Simon would have lost severely.[29, 30]

What was special about the period 1980–1990? As discussed in the Introduction (Chapter 1), the oil crises of the 1970s had caused large increases in the price of oil. In the runup to the start of the wager period, the effects of the embargoes had raised prices on all commodities, including the five metals in the wager. During the 1980s, the return to normal supply rates of oil and recovery from the recessions of the 1970s caused the decline of prices for most commodities. As such, Simon won the bet more by luck, than by judgment.

8.5 Comparison to a steady-state economy

Growth means larger jaws and a bigger digestive tract for more rapidly converting more resources into more waste, in the service of unexamined and frequently destructive individual wants. Development means better digestion of a non-growing throughput, and more worthy and satisfying goals to which our life energies could be devoted.[1]

As discussed in Chapter 1, the human economy is a subset of the biosphere, a finite, non-growing system. Thus, the human economy cannot physically grow indefinitely. The concept of a non-growing or “steady-state” economy has existed for centuries.

There are a number of different conditions that may characterize a system as steady-state. In thermodynamics, steady state is characterized by unchanging system properties (p), such that $\left(\frac{dp}{dt}\right) = 0$. In ecological economics, a steady-state economy

has been defined as a constant rate of material throughput that maintains the stock of ecological capital and provides a qualitatively well-lived life for the population.[31, p. 32] This definition is consistent with zero rate of accumulation of capital stock within the economy and society. Ecological capital is not drawn down, nor is manufactured capital quantifiably increased. Increases in living standards result from economic “development,” in which qualitative improvement in life occurs through increases in “efficiency, technology, and ethics.” [31, p. 167]

Two other conditions that might define a steady-state economy are constant GDP or constant population. Our framework can address the first three steady-state conditions (constant capital stock, constant throughput, and constant GDP). The fourth condition (constant population) could be accommodated with some adaptation of our framework. The issue of human population as part of society’s capital stock is addressed in Footnote 8 of Chapter 3.

8.5.1 Constant level of capital stock

Chapter 3 includes Equation 3.105:

$$-\frac{dR_0}{dt} = \sum_j \frac{dK_j}{dt} + \sum_{i,j} \dot{S}_{ij} + \sum_j \gamma_{K_j} K_j. \quad (3.105)$$

which indicates that natural resources in the biosphere $\left(-\frac{dR_0}{dt}\right)$ are depleted by the economy for the purposes of:

- increasing man-made capital stocks within the economy $\left(\frac{dK_j}{dt}\right)$,
- providing short-lived goods exchanged within the economy $\left(\dot{S}_{ij}\right)$, and
- overcoming depreciation of manufactured capital stocks $\left(\gamma_{K_j} K_j\right)$.

Assuming, first, that a steady-state economy exists when the level of capital stock remains constant $\left(\sum_j \frac{dK_j}{dt} = 0\right)$,⁸ we can see that Equation 3.105 reduces to:

$$-\frac{dR_0}{dt} = \sum_{i,j} \dot{S}_{ij} + \sum_j \gamma_{K_j} K_j. \quad (8.23)$$

A number of interesting concepts may be understood via Equation 8.23. Firstly, if our steady-state economy is to be supported sustainably, then withdrawal of natural resources from the biosphere $\left(\frac{dR_0}{dt}\right)$ had better be at some rate lower than the biosphere can replenish those stocks. In reality, $\frac{dR_0}{dt}$ is really the sum of many different resources (flora and fauna, water) each of which will have its own natural rate of regeneration.

⁸ Note that the steady-state condition does not preclude expansion of some sectors of the economy, provided that there is equal contraction elsewhere.

As such, the sustainability criterion is a vector of values, one for each natural resource, all of which must be met individually.

Secondly, the steady state condition $\left(\sum_j \frac{dK_j}{dt} = 0\right)$ says nothing about the transfer rates of short-lived goods within in the economy $\left(\sum_{i,j} \dot{S}_{ij}\right)$ or the depreciation of capital stock back to the biosphere $\left(\sum_j \gamma_{K_j} K_j\right)$. Equation 8.23 indicates that the higher the rates of these flows, the greater the rate of depletion of natural resources, and the more difficult it will be to meet the sustainability condition (that the withdrawal rate of natural resources from the biosphere is lower than the biosphere replenishment rate). Within industrial society, the flow of short-lived goods (packaging, paper products, disposable tableware, cutlery, and napkins) is large, and, presumably, attaining a sustainable steady-state economy will be difficult. This definition of steady state, constant capital stock $\left(\sum_j \frac{dK_j}{dt} = 0\right)$, does not necessarily coincide with sustainability.

As discussed in Chapter 3, the rate of depreciation (γ_K) is inversely proportional to the average lifetime of capital stock—as the average lifetime of capital stock decreases, the rate of depreciation of capital stock increases thereby increasing the draw on natural resources (by Equation 8.23). It is likely that the average lifetime of capital stock has decreased over the last century, due to a decrease in durability of capital stock (the average table built today is not as durable as the average table built in the early twentieth century) and also due to increasing proportions of consumer electronics with short lifetimes (cell phones, laptops, tablets).⁹ Decreasing lifetime causes higher rates of flow for replacement materials. In the absence of extreme recycling of materials, these large replacement flows place large demands on natural resources.

Thirdly, the maintenance flows necessary to overcome depreciation $\left(\sum_j \gamma_{K_j} K_j\right)$ are proportional to the magnitude of the capital stock (K_j) . As such, a larger stock of capital requires greater draw on natural resources and is thus harder to maintain within any sustainability constraint. These points emphasize that constant capital stock (or analogously constant population) is not a sufficient condition for environmental sustainability.

8.5.2 Constant material throughput

Herman Daly has placed great emphasis on a steady-state economy as having a constant rate of material throughput [32, 31] which, as discussed above, should be below biophysical limits if sustainability is to be achieved. This is often referred to as the “scale” issue—how large is the (currently growing) human economy in relation to the finite, non-growing biosphere of which it is a sub-system? Growth of the human economy must either displace other natural ecosystems (replacing old growth forest

⁹ While computers and software can be considered capital investment by businesses, consumer electronics such as laptops and cell phones, are considered consumption expenditures in the BEA national accounts.

with cultivated crops) or deplete natural capital stocks, be they renewable (fisheries) or non-renewable (fossil fuels). As shown in Figure 3.5, material throughput is composed of two distinct processes: exchange of material *from* the biosphere *into* the economy (extraction) and exchange of material *from* the economy *into* biosphere (waste and depreciation). We may characterize constant material throughput as either constant rate of extraction, constant rate of waste disposal, or both. In the language of our framework, we could write:

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\dot{R}_0) = 0, \quad (8.24)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\dot{S}_0) = 0, \quad (8.25)$$

and

$$\sum_i \left[\frac{d}{dt}(\dot{R}_{i0}) + \frac{d}{dt}(\dot{S}_{i0}) + \frac{d}{dt}(\dot{K}_{i0}) \right] = 0. \quad (8.26)$$

The above equations say nothing about the level of man-made capital stock (K) or the flow rate of short-lived goods (\dot{S}). Thus, within the constant throughput constraint, increasingly effective use of materials could theoretically allow increasing accumulation of man-made capital (K) and increasing flow of short-lived goods (\dot{S}_{ij}) as society learns to use resources better. Eventually, physical limits would entail that capital stock could no longer be increased. Presumably, society would desire that the throughput of materials would be within levels that could be sustained by the biosphere, both at the input side—natural resources extracted at rates lower than natural regeneration rates—and at the output side—wastes emitted at rates below which the biosphere can assimilate. Otherwise, the condition of constant material throughput does not guarantee societal sustainability.

8.5.3 Constant GDP

Although one definition of a steady-state economy is based upon constant levels of *material* throughput, it is possible to examine the implications of constraining the *value* of GDP to be constant.¹⁰ Within our framework, a condition of constant GDP would be characterized by the following equation:

$$\frac{d}{dt}(GDP) = \sum_j \frac{d}{dt}(\dot{X}_j) = 0. \quad (8.27)$$

Because, under the subjective theory of value, no value is attributed to the flow of materials to or from the biosphere, it is unclear what impact constant GDP would

¹⁰ This is a theoretical exercise, as Daly takes great pains to be clear that the steady-state economy is materially-based. “It is not to be thought of as ‘zero growth in GNP’.” [31, p. 32]

have on capital stock (K) or material throughput (both extraction and waste disposal). If we constrained \dot{R}_0 and \dot{S}_0 , it is likely that economic growth would decrease or even become zero or negative ($\frac{d}{dt}(GDP) \leq 0$). It is conceivable that constraining economic growth may act to constrain material throughput, though this is certainly not assured.

Although constraining GDP may not achieve the desired restraint on material throughput, increasing GDP may not produce a desired increase in material well-being, either. This is particularly true for countries that have already achieved high levels of wealth. Many authors argue that increasing GDP no longer guarantees increasing welfare [33–37] for two main reasons:

- firstly, that the costs of growth in GDP (e.g., externalities and defensive expenditures) outweigh any benefit that comes from increasing GDP; and
- secondly, that increased GDP increases relative income inequality, which decreases welfare for both rich and poor alike.[36]

Indeed, it may be the case that at the margin an increase in GDP produces more “illth” than “wealth,” resulting in “uneconomic” growth.[36, p. 42] Uneconomic growth is much more likely to occur in a wealthy society than in a poor one, according to the law of diminishing returns.¹¹ Thus, a case could be made for constraining GDP growth in wealthy countries so that resources may be allocated to poorer countries where growth in GDP is still likely to be “economic.” [36]

8.6 Summary

In this chapter, we discussed several implications that arise from the detailed development of our dynamic framework for material, energy, and value accounting. The first implications are for the EI-O method itself. We recommend a physical accounting framework that fully accounts for capital stock and energy input from society (normally assumed to not provide direct energy to the economy). We then discussed implications for economic “growth,” namely that economic growth could be considered a “fully coupled” problem: understanding it requires breadth of knowledge and appreciation for interactions among many important factors, including financial capital, physical capital and associated embodied energy, direct energy, resources, and societal inputs. Each, alone, is necessary, but not sufficient, for economic growth. We discussed implications for recycling and reuse of materials as well as the concept of dematerialization. Finally, we viewed the concept of a steady-state economy through the lens of our framework. We found that there are many potential definitions of a steady-state economy, none of which are fully satisfying when compared against the ideal of sustainability.

¹¹ Measuring whether or not growth is “economic” cannot be done with traditional measures, such as GDP, since there is no debit column in the ledger for GDP. However, alternative metrics, such as ISEW or GPI, can perform such a function.

In the next chapter, we suggest some next steps toward implementing our framework.

References

- [1] Herman E Daly. Three more growth fallacies. <http://steadystate.org/three-more-growth-fallacies/>, 19 September 2012.
- [2] Mary L. Streitwieser. *Measuring the Nation's Economy: An Industry Perspective. A Primer on BEA's Industry Accounts*. Bureau of Economic Analysis, US Department of Commerce, May 2011.
- [3] Ken Kirkpatrick. Effect of including capital flows on energy coefficients, 1963. CAC Technical Memorandum 32, Urbana, Illinois, August 1974.
- [4] Clark W Bullard III and Robert A Herendeen. Energy impact of consumption decisions. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 63(3):484–493, 1975.
- [5] Stephen Casler. Correcting input-output coefficients for capital depreciation. *Energy Syst. Policy*, 7(3), 1983.
- [6] Eugene P Odum. The strategy of ecosystem development. 1969.
- [7] Herman E Daly. Consumption and welfare: two views of value added. *Review of Social Economy*, 53(4):451–473, 1995.
- [8] Donella H Meadows. *Thinking in systems: A primer*. Chelsea Green Publishing, 2008.
- [9] Julian M Allwood, Jonathan M Cullen, Mark A Carruth, Daniel R Cooper, Martin McBrien, Rachel L Milford, Muiris C Moynihan, and Alexandra CH Patel. *Sustainable Materials: with both eyes open*. UIT Cambridge Limited, 2012.
- [10] Robert U Ayres, Leslie W Ayres, and Benjamin S Warr. Exergy, power and work in the us economy, 1900–1998. *Energy*, 28(3):219–273, March 2003.
- [11] Robert U Ayres and Benjamin S Warr. *The Economic Growth Engine: How Energy and Work Drive Material Prosperity*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK, 2010.
- [12] Benjamin S Warr and Robert U Ayres. Useful work and information as drivers of economic growth. *Ecological Economics*, 73(C):93–102, January 2012.
- [13] Khalid Malik. The Rise of the South: Human Progress in a Diverse World. Human development report 2013, United Nations Development Programme, 2013.
- [14] Maryland Department of Natural Resources. Maryland's genuine progress indicator: An index for sustainable prosperity. <http://www.dnr.maryland.gov/mdgpi/>, 2013.
- [15] Kenneth J. Bagstad and Marta Ceroni. Opportunities and challenges in applying the genuine progress indicator/index of sustainable economic welfare at local scales. *International Journal of Environment, Workplace, and Employment*, 3(2):132–153, 2007.

- [16] Herman E Daly and John B Cobb. *For The Common Good: Redirecting the Economy Toward Community, the Environment, and a Sustainable Future*. Beacon Press, Boston, 1994.
- [17] Maryland Department of Natural Resources. What is the genuine progress indicator? <http://www.dnr.maryland.gov/mdgpi/whatisthegpi.asp>, 2014.
- [18] Karma Ura, Sabina Alkire, Tshoki Zangmo, and Karma Wangdi. *A Short Guide to Gross National Happiness Index*. The Centre for Bhutan Studies, Thimphu, Bhutan, 2012.
- [19] Centre for Bhutan Studies & GNH Research, Thimphu, Bhutan. Gross national happiness. <http://www.grossnationalhappiness.com/>, 2014.
- [20] Philip A Lawn. A theoretical foundation to support the index of sustainable economic welfare (ISEW), genuine progress indicator (GPI), and other related indexes. *Ecological Economics*, pages 105–118.
- [21] Stephen G Bunker. Modes of extraction, unequal exchange, and the progressive underdevelopment of an extreme periphery: The brazilian amazon, 1600-1980. *American Journal of Sociology*, 89(5):1017–1064, March 1984.
- [22] Marina Fischer-Kowalski, Mark Swilling, Ernest U von Weizsacker, Yong Ren, Yuchi Moriguchi, Wendy Crane, Fridolin Krausmann, Nina Eisenmenger, Stefan Glijum, Peter Hennicke, Rene Kemp, Paty Romero Lankao, and Anna B Siriban Manalang. *UNEP [2011] Decoupling Natural Resource Use and Environmental Impacts from Economic Growth. A Report of the Working Group on Decoupling to the International Resource Panel*. United Nations Environmental Programme, New York, 2011.
- [23] Peter Bartelmus. Dematerialization and capital maintenance: two sides of the sustainability coin. *Ecological Economics*, 46(1):61–81, 2003.
- [24] Sergio Parrinello. The service economy revisited. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 15(4):381–400, 2004.
- [25] Peter F Chapman. 4. the energy costs of materials. *Energy Policy*, 3(1):47–57, 1975.
- [26] R Stephen Berry and Margaret F Fels. The energy cost of automobiles. *Science and Public Affairs*, 29(10):11–17, 1973.
- [27] Nick Bostrom and Milan M Cirkovic. *Global catastrophic risks*. Oxford University Press, 2011.
- [28] Neil Cameron. Peakniks, Doomers and Collapse, accessed 09/12/14 2010.
- [29] Katherine Kiel, Victor Matheson, and Kevin Golembiewski. Luck or skill? an examination of the ehrlich–simon bet. *Ecological Economics*, 69(7):1365–1367, 2010.
- [30] Philip Lawn. On the ehrlich–simon bet: Both were unskilled and simon was lucky. *Ecological Economics*, 69(11):2045–2046, 2010.
- [31] Herman E Daly. *Beyond growth: the economics of sustainable development*. Beacon Press, 1997.
- [32] Herman E Daly. Steady-state economics. *San Francisco*, 1977.
- [33] Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen. Energy and economic myths. *Southern Economic Journal*, 41(3):347–381, January 1975.

- [34] Mathis Wackernagel. *Our ecological footprint: reducing human impact on the earth*, volume 9. New Society Publishers, 1996.
- [35] Clifford W Cobb, Gary Sue Goodman, and Mathis Wackernagel. *Why Bigger Isn't Better: The Genuine Progress Indicator: 1999 Update*. Redefining Progress San Francisco, 1999.
- [36] Herman E Daly. Sustainable development—definitions, principles, policies. In *The future of sustainability*, pages 39–53. Springer, 2006.
- [37] Robert Costanza, Ida Kubiszewski, Enrico Giovannini, Hunter Lovins, Jacqueline McGlade, Kate E Pickett, Kristín Ragnarsdóttir, Debra Roberts, Roberto De Vogli, and Richard Wilkinson. Development: Time to leave GDP behind. *Nature*, 505(7483):283–285, 2014.

Chapter 9

Next steps

Only a crisis—actual or perceived—produces real change. When that crisis occurs, the actions that are taken depend on the ideas that are lying around. [1, p. ix]

—Milton Friedman

We indicated at the outset (Chapters 1 and 2) that this book would be about counting and change; counting materials, counting energy, and counting economic value, so that we can manage the upcoming energy transition and navigate our way through the age of resource depletion. Our motivation for counting more carefully is mounting evidence (discussed in Chapter 1) that scarcity of materials, energy, and assimilation capacity of the biosphere is limiting the potential for continued economic growth in mature economies, thereby affecting us all. We need to know precisely *how* and *at what rate* we are using our material and energy resources today if we are to undertake the necessary transition to a more sustainable global economy. But, before collecting data to describe society's metabolism, we argued that we, as a society, need a rigorous theoretical framework for better systems of national accounts, one that goes beyond GDP and one that is relevant to the age of resource depletion.

To develop such an accounting framework guided by the metabolism metaphor, we applied thermodynamic control volume accounting equations (Chapters 3–6) to economic sectors that are *open* to their surroundings, that is they are open to both inflows and outflows of both materials and energy. Application of our framework shows that national accounting should gather and disseminate a great deal of additional physical, material data on real economies. The business axiom “you can't manage what you don't measure” reminds us that we need this additional data if we are to navigate successfully through the age of resource depletion. In short, we need balance sheets in addition to income statements! We need accounting in physical units in addition to financial units. Work to account such flows is starting to be undertaken at the economy-wide level, particularly within Europe. It needs to continue, but sub-economy, inter-sector material and energy accounts need to be developed, too.

The need for rigorous and accurate data is all the more pressing in light of the need, as demonstrated in Chapter 7, to track the accumulation of manufactured capital and associated embodied energy within sectors of the economy. There is a critical need for systematic collection and public dissemination of such data by a centralized agency. However, as discussed in the Prologue, such accounting is currently non-existent in the US. The BEA was expressly forbidden by congress

to collect such data after the first Integrated Environmental-Economic System of Accounts (IEESA) tables were published in 1994.

Thus, we add our voices to those encouraging governments and institutions worldwide to collect and disseminate high-quality data on material and energy stocks and flows. It will be impossible to make wise decisions about which materials to use, which energy sources to develop, and which products and services to incentivize without such data.

To that end, we offer the following suggestions as a way to move forward.

1. National accounting agencies worldwide should seek and be given mandates to estimate and disseminate information on the value of transactions that occur outside of the market. In the US, the Bureau for Economic Analysis (BEA) should seek authorization to re-start the IEESA. (See the Prologue.) Doing so will allow accounting for material and energy resources that are currently outside of the market. (See Sections 1.3.1 and 1.5.)
2. National accounting agencies worldwide should develop and maintain balance sheets of both natural and manufactured capital in addition to national income statements. Doing so will allow countries to assess whether they are at risk of drawing down their wealth to produce today's income, thereby jeopardizing future quality of life. (See the Prologue and Section 1.1.)
3. All stocks and inter-sector flows should be provided in physical as well as financial units. At present, national accounting disseminates data in financial units, not physical units such as kilograms and kilojoules. Doing so will allow analysis of the true *biophysical* nature of the economy.
4. In the US, the BEA should restart detailed Capital, Labor, Energy, Material, and Services (KLEMS) reporting. Until January 2014, KLEMS data were estimated and disseminated by the BEA in a matrix that revealed the source and destination industries for each flow. However, due to budget cuts, only economy-wide aggregate values are captured and reported today. The previous level of detail is needed to obtain sector-level information on material and energy flows in financial units. Doing so will provide a better picture of the structure of materials and energy dependencies among economic sectors.
5. National accounting agencies should provide additional detail for waste flows. At present, only two value flows related to waste are published, and both figures are aggregates of different types of waste: "Waste Management Services" and "Water & Sewage." These streams should be disaggregated and reported in physical units as well. Doing so will allow for analysis of opportunities for recycling and re-use within economies. (See Sections 2.2.3 and 8.4.)
6. All data on stocks and inter-sector flows should be reported by a single, centralized agency. This will require synchronizing and reconciling data sets that are now reported by several different organizations. And, it may require gathering and dissemination of new data. In the US, for example, the Energy Information Agency (EIA) and the BEA should combine their respective energy data. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the BEA should combine their respective waste data. Perhaps more than any other proposed change, cen-

tralized reporting in both physical and financial units would demonstrate the interconnectedness of the economy and the biosphere.

7. National accounting agencies should routinely estimate the energy intensity of economic products using a physical accounting framework, as discussed in Section 8.2. Doing so will provide consumers and firms alike with important information for sound consumption and investment decisions.
8. All of the above should be estimated and disseminated on an annual basis. Doing so will allow for assessment of trends in the material and energy structures of economies.

There should be no illusion that this agenda will be easy to implement; in many places, it will be politically difficult to undertake these changes. But, if we, as a society, can begin collecting these data, perhaps we can begin to also utilize the analytical tools, metrics, and knowledge needed to go beyond GDP and make wise choices for the future.

Our deepest hope is that this book makes a positive contribution in that direction.

References

- [1] Milton Friedman. *Capitalism and Freedom*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1982.

If we apply our minds directly and competently to the needs of the earth, then we will have begun to make fundamental and necessary changes in our minds. We will begin to understand and to mistrust and to change our wasteful economy, which markets not just the produce of the earth, but also the earth's ability to produce. We will see that beauty and utility are alike dependent upon the health of the world. But we will also see through the fads and the fashions of protest. We will see that war and oppression and pollution are not separate issues, but are aspects of the same issue. Amid the outcries for the liberation of this group or that, we will know that no person is free except in the freedom of other persons, and that man's only real freedom is to know and faithfully occupy his place—a much humbler place than we have been taught to think—in the order of creation.

—Wendell Berry. 2002. *The Art of the Commonplace: The Agrarian Essays*. Counterpoint, Berkely, California, p. 89.

Appendix A

Value flows for the US auto industry

This appendix describes the calculations used to estimate the value flows to and from the US Auto Industry in Chapter 6. The details of the calculations and assumptions made to calculate each of the value flows is described in Table A.1. The data sources are described in Table A.2. These data are free and available for download from the BEA website. (See references in Table A.2.)

Table A.1: Data sources and calculations for auto industry (IOC 3361MV) example.

Value Flow	2011 USD (millions)	Data Calculations
Resources	\$175,491	2011 KLEMS Total Material Intermediate Inputs into Auto Industry (IOC 3361MV). Total Material Inputs (\$346,882), less self-use (\$139,259) and inputs recategorized as services (\$32,132). ¹ Self-use Resources are defined as the two intermediate commodity inputs: Motor Vehicles, Bodies, Trailers & Parts (IOC 3361, \$138,077) and Motor Vehicles (IOC 336A, \$1,182).
Energy	3,637	2011 KLEMS Total Energy Intermediate Inputs into Auto Industry. The sum of the value of all “Energy” intermediate inputs.
Short-lived Goods	74,578	2011 KLEMS Total Service Intermediate Inputs into Auto Industry. Total Inputs from Service Sector (\$42,446) plus Wholesale Trade and Truck Transportation from the KLEMS Material category. ¹ The value of waste services that are part of this value flow is the sum of Water & Sewage (IOC 2213, \$123) and Waste Management Services (IOC 5620, \$381).

Table A.1: Data sources and calculations for auto industry (IOC 3361MV) example.

Value Flow	2011 USD (millions)	Data Calculations
Capital	14,532	2011 Fixed Assets (non-residential detailed estimates). The value of Equipment and Structures purchased by the Auto Industry (\$15,327), less the value of the equipment that was produced within the Auto Industry itself (\$795). These figures exclude Intellectual Property, as explained in the calculation of Capital (self-use) below.
Gross Economic Output	482,269	2011 Input-Output accounts. The Use of Commodities by Industries before Redefinitions. (Producers' Prices). Total Industry Output for Industry 3361MV. Data downloaded from http://www.bea.gov for the Automobile Industry (IOC 3361MV).
Resources (self-use)	133,961	2011 Input-Output accounts. Self-Use of Resources that were made in the automobile industry (IOC 3361MV used by IOC 3361MV, \$133,961).
Capital (self-use)	795	2011 Fixed Assets (non-residential detailed estimates). The authors designated capital flows as "self-use" if the Equipment was an item that would be produced within the Automobile Industry: autos, internal combustion engines, light trucks, other trucks, buses and truck trailers. Note: Intellectual property is not counted as a (physical) capital flow in our framework, thus \$14,133 of R&D developed by the auto industry (as well as custom software made within the Auto industry) is excluded from this flow, even though it is considered a capital investment in US national accounting and is part of the total capital investment as calculated in the US Fixed Assets table. Section 6.6 contains further discussion about the implications of including intellectual property as part of the national measure of capital stock.

Table A.1: Data sources and calculations for auto industry (IOC 3361MV) example.

Value Flow	2011 USD (millions)	Data Calculations
Net Economic Output	347,513	2011 Input-Output accounts. The Use of Commodities by Industries before Redefinitions. (Producers' Prices). Total Industry Output, less Capital (self-use) (\$795) and Resources (self-use) (IOC 3361MV used by IOC 3361MV, \$133,961). ²

⁻¹ Two commodities categorized in the KLEMS data as "Material" intermediate inputs are "Wholesale Trade" (IOC 4200, \$26,580) and "Truck Transportation." (IOC 4840, \$5,552). For our calculations, these commodities were recategorized as "Services." The value of the flows in the table reflects the fact that these dollar amounts were subtracted from this "Resource" flow and added to "Short-lived Goods."

⁰ Note that this self-use of resources is slightly lower than the one used to calculate the total of self-use Resources (\$139,259) that was subtracted from total Material inputs (above) to arrive at a figure for Resources from all other sectors (above). This is because the KLEMS data, like the Fixed Asset data, are more detailed than the standard I-O accounts and may contain judgments and trend estimates. For example, in 2011, the KLEMS total intermediate inputs to the auto industry is higher than the amount from the Use table: \$392,965 vs. \$368,476.

¹ Two commodities categorized in the KLEMS data as "Material" intermediate inputs are "Wholesale Trade" (IOC 4200, \$26,580) and "Truck Transportation." (IOC 4840, \$5,552). For our calculations, these commodities were recategorized as "Services." The value of the flows in the table reflects the fact that these dollar amounts were subtracted from this "Resource" flow and added to "Short-lived Goods."

² Note that this self-use of resources is slightly lower than the one used to calculate the total of self-use Resources (\$139,259) that was subtracted from total Material inputs (above) to arrive at a figure for Resources from all other sectors (above). This is because the KLEMS data, like the Fixed Asset data, are more detailed than the standard I-O accounts and may contain judgments and trend estimates. For example, in 2011, the KLEMS total intermediate inputs to the auto industry is higher than the amount from the Use table: \$392,965 vs. \$368,476.

Table A.2: BEA data sources.

Dataset	Details
Use Tables	<p>Annual Input-Output accounts. These are the primary industry data collected by the BEA. The Use tables present what industries use what commodities as intermediate goods, and the value of the commodities that end up as final goods. The values are computed at Producers prices. That is, the value includes the sales price, plus sales and excise taxes, less any subsidies. This table provides a link from Industry data to National data. The sum of all final output is a measure of National GDP. An introduction to these data is available.[1] The tables can be found online.[2]</p>
KLEMS	<p>Capital (K), Labor, Energy, Materials, and purchased Services refers to broad categories of intermediate inputs that are consumed by industries in their production of goods and services.[3] The detailed estimates of intermediate inputs of an industry are classified into one of three cost categories: energy (E), materials (M), and purchased services (S). The labor cost category (L) includes an industrys compensation to labor from value added, and the capital cost category (K) includes the industrys gross operating surplus plus taxes on production and imports less subsidies.</p> <p>Important note: As of January 2014, the 1998–2011 KLEMS tables that were used for the analyses in Chapter 6 are no longer available online. They have been archived and replaced with the 2005–2012 revised format KLEMS dataset. Due to budget cuts, the new KLEMS only contains the Energy, Materials, and Service value flow <i>totals</i>. It no longer captures the underlying detail sources. Thus, the authors’ calculations for self-use of materials, and re-categorization of some material inputs to service inputs are not possible with the revised data. The original dataset used for these analyses are available by request from the BEA. For more information on the KLEMS revision, see [4] and [5].</p> <p>The authors hope, of course, that a reinviored focus on the importance of these details for national accounting will provide justification for the BEA to return to making publicly available the underlying detailed KLEMS data.</p>
Fixed Assets	<p>Fixed Assets Table. Detailed Fixed Assets Table. Categorizes capital investment by industry into three categories: equipment, structure, and software. To obtain an estimate of self-use of capital, we went to the more detailed tables, which are less reliable than the standard tables. The BEA notes on the detailed tables indicates that “the more detailed estimates are more likely to be based on judgmental trends, on trends in the higher level aggregate, or on less reliable source data.” [6, Table 2.5]</p>

References

- [1] Mary L. Streitwieser. *Measuring the Nation's Economy: An Industry Perspective. A Primer on BEA's Industry Accounts*. Bureau of Economic Analysis, US Department of Commerce, May 2011.
- [2] Bureau of Economic Analysis. Input-output accounts data. http://www.bea.gov/industry/io_annual.htm.
- [3] Erich H. Strassner, Gabriel W. Medeiros, and George M. Smith. Annual industry accounts: Introducing klems input estimates for 1997–2003. *Survey of Current Business*, September 2005.
- [4] Donald D. Kim, Erich H. Strassner, and David B. Wasshausen. Industry economic accounts: Results of the comprehensive revision revised statistics for 1997-2012. *Survey of Current Business*, February 2014.
- [5] Bureau of Economic Analysis. Input-output accounts data. <http://www.bea.gov/industry/more.htm>.
- [6] Bureau of Economic Analysis. Detailed data for fixed assets and consumer durable goods. <http://www.bea.gov/national/FA2004/Details/Index.html>.

Appendix B

Infinite series representation of energy intensity

In this appendix, we show that the EI-O method accounts for the infinite recursion of energy demands for production.

The single-sector economy of Figures 3.4, 4.4, 5.3, and 6.5 can be re-drawn as shown in Figure B.1.




Fig. B.1: Process flows in a single-sector economy.

If we consider the Biosphere (0) to be producing a valuable product, namely energy, we can say

$$\dot{X}_{02} = \dot{E}_{02} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

and

$$a_{02} \equiv \frac{\dot{E}_{02}}{\dot{X}_2}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

The economy produces output at a rate of \dot{X}_2 , but it requires energy from the biosphere ($\dot{E}_{02} = a_{02}\dot{X}_2$) to do so. The economy also consumes a fraction of its own gross output ($\dot{X}_{22} = a_{22}\dot{X}_2$). To produce $a_{22}\dot{X}_2$, the economy requires an additional $a_{02}a_{22}\dot{X}_2$ of energy from the biosphere. The sum of all direct energy required for the economy to produce at a rate of \dot{X}_2 ($\dot{E}_{demand,tot}$) is an infinite sum.

$$\dot{E}_{demand,tot} = a_{02}\dot{X}_2 + a_{02}a_{22}\dot{X}_2 + a_{02}a_{22}^2\dot{X}_2 + \dots \quad (\text{B.3})$$

The energy intensity of the economy (ε_2) is

$$\varepsilon_2 = \frac{\dot{E}_{demand,tot}}{\dot{X}_2} = a_{02}(1 + a_{22} + a_{22}^2 + \dots) = a_{02} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{22}^n. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Realizing that $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{22}^n = \frac{1}{1-a_{22}}$ and $a_{02} = \frac{\dot{E}_{02}}{\dot{X}_2}$ gives

$$\varepsilon_2 = (1 - a_{22})^{-1} \dot{X}^{-1} \dot{E}_{02}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Accounting for the differences between scalar and matrix equations and neglecting energy flows from society to the economy ($\dot{T}_{12} = 0$), accumulation of embodied energy in the economy ($\frac{dB_2}{dt} = 0$), and physical depreciation ($\gamma_{B_2} B_2 = 0$), Equations 7.37 and B.5 are identical, indicating that the EI-O approach accounts for the infinite recursion of energy demand by the economy.

Appendix C

Proof of Equation 7.31

We begin with a restatement of Equation 7.31.

$$\mathbf{X}_t^T - \hat{\mathbf{X}} = \hat{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{A}^T - \mathbf{I}) \quad (7.31)$$

We expand the matrices to obtain

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{X}_{22} & \dot{X}_{32} \\ \dot{X}_{23} & \dot{X}_{33} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \dot{X}_2 & 0 \\ 0 & \dot{X}_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{X}_2 & 0 \\ 0 & \dot{X}_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_{22} - 1 & a_{32} \\ a_{23} & a_{33} - 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (C.1)$$

Subtracting and multiplying matrices gives

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{X}_{22} - \dot{X}_2 & \dot{X}_{32} \\ \dot{X}_{23} & \dot{X}_{33} - \dot{X}_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{X}_2 a_{22} - \dot{X}_2 & \dot{X}_2 a_{32} \\ \dot{X}_3 a_{23} & \dot{X}_3 a_{33} - \dot{X}_3 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (C.2)$$

Using $\dot{X}_j a_{ij} = \dot{X}_{ij}$ (see Equation 7.3) gives

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{X}_{22} - \dot{X}_2 & \dot{X}_{32} \\ \dot{X}_{23} & \dot{X}_{33} - \dot{X}_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{X}_{22} - \dot{X}_2 & \dot{X}_{32} \\ \dot{X}_{23} & \dot{X}_{33} - \dot{X}_3 \end{bmatrix} \quad (C.3)$$

to complete the proof.

Appendix D

Estimating the Input-Output matrix (A)

Using Equation 7.31, which is proved in Appendix C

$$\mathbf{X}_t^T - \hat{\mathbf{X}} = \hat{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{A}^T - \mathbf{I}); \quad (7.31)$$

we can derive an expression for estimating the Input-Output matrix (A) given sector outputs ($\hat{\mathbf{X}}$) and the transaction matrix (\mathbf{X}_t). Premultiplying both sides of Equation 7.31 by $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^{-1}$ gives

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}^{-1}(\mathbf{X}_t^T - \hat{\mathbf{X}}) = \mathbf{A}^T - \mathbf{I} \quad (D.1)$$

Further rearranging gives

$$\mathbf{A}^T = \hat{\mathbf{X}}^{-1}(\mathbf{X}_t^T - \hat{\mathbf{X}}) + \mathbf{I}, \quad (D.2)$$

$$\mathbf{A}^T = \hat{\mathbf{X}}^{-1}\mathbf{X}_t^T - \hat{\mathbf{X}}^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{X}} + \mathbf{I}, \quad (D.3)$$

$$\mathbf{A}^T = \hat{\mathbf{X}}^{-1}\mathbf{X}_t^T - \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{I}, \quad (D.4)$$

$$\mathbf{A}^T = \hat{\mathbf{X}}^{-1}\mathbf{X}_t^T, \quad (D.5)$$

and

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{X}_t(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^{-1})^T. \quad (D.6)$$

Both $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^{-1}$ are diagonal matrices. Therefore, $(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^{-1})^T = \hat{\mathbf{X}}^{-1}$, and Equation D.6 becomes

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{X}_t\hat{\mathbf{X}}^{-1}. \quad (D.7)$$

Expanding the matrices of Equation D.7 gives

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{X}_{11} & \dot{X}_{12} & \cdots \\ \dot{X}_{21} & \dot{X}_{22} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\dot{X}_1} & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\dot{X}_2} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\dot{X}_{11}}{\dot{X}_1} & \frac{\dot{X}_{12}}{\dot{X}_2} & \cdots \\ \frac{\dot{X}_{21}}{\dot{X}_1} & \frac{\dot{X}_{22}}{\dot{X}_2} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}, \quad (D.8)$$

as expected given the definition of the Input-Output ratio (a) in Equation 7.3:

$$a_{ij} \equiv \frac{\dot{X}_{ij}}{\dot{X}_j}. \quad (7.3)$$

Thus, Equation D.7 provides a method of estimating the Input-Output matrix (**A**) using the transaction matrix (**X_t**) and sector outputs (**Ẋ**).

Appendix E

Column vs. row vectors in energy intensity equations

In this manuscript, we choose to define energy intensity (ε) and energy input (\mathbf{E}_0 and \mathbf{T}_1) as a column vectors (see Equations 7.23, 7.20, and 7.21, respectively), because it natural to solve a system of equations for a column vector rather than a row vector. And, Equation 7.17 could not be written as neatly if ε and \mathbf{E}_0 were row vectors.

In contrast, the EI-O literature (see, e.g., [1] and [2]) defines energy intensity and energy input as row vectors. The row vs. column difference is manifest in the appearance of the energy intensity matrix equation.

To demonstrate that our column vector formulation is equivalent to the literature's row vector formulation, this appendix derives a column vector version of the energy intensity equation that is often found in the literature. The point of comparison is Casler.[1] Casler's energy intensity (Equation 6) was derived from row vectors as¹

$$\varepsilon = \mathbf{E}\hat{\mathbf{X}}^{-1}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A})^{-1}. \quad (\text{E.1})$$

We begin with Equations 3 and 4 from Casler [1], converted to overdot notation for rates.

$$\varepsilon_1 \dot{X}_{11} + \varepsilon_2 \dot{X}_{21} = \varepsilon_1 \dot{X}_1 \quad (\text{E.2})$$

$$\varepsilon_1 \dot{X}_{12} + \varepsilon_2 \dot{X}_{22} + \dot{E}_{02} = \varepsilon_2 \dot{X}_2 \quad (\text{E.3})$$

Adding an \dot{E}_{01} term² and utilizing matrix notation with column vectors (instead of row vectors) gives

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{X}_{11} & \dot{X}_{21} \\ \dot{X}_{12} & \dot{X}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \varepsilon_1 \\ \varepsilon_2 \end{Bmatrix} + \begin{Bmatrix} \dot{E}_{01} \\ \dot{E}_{02} \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{X}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \dot{X}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \varepsilon_1 \\ \varepsilon_2 \end{Bmatrix}. \quad (\text{E.4})$$

Substituting $\dot{X}_{ij} = a_{ij}\dot{X}_j$ (from Equation 7.3) gives

¹ Equation E.1 is written according to the variable conventions in this manuscript. The literal Equation 6 in Casler [1] is $\varepsilon = \mathbf{E}\hat{\mathbf{X}}^{-1}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A})^{-1}$.

² Note that $\dot{E}_{01} = 0$ for Casler [1], so \dot{E}_{01} can be included without changing Equation E.2.

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_{11}\dot{X}_1 & a_{21}\dot{X}_1 \\ a_{12}\dot{X}_2 & a_{22}\dot{X}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \varepsilon_1 \\ \varepsilon_2 \end{Bmatrix} + \begin{Bmatrix} \dot{E}_{01} \\ \dot{E}_{02} \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{X}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \dot{X}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \varepsilon_1 \\ \varepsilon_2 \end{Bmatrix}. \quad (\text{E.5})$$

Expanding Equation E.5 gives

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{X}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \dot{X}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{21} \\ a_{12} & a_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \varepsilon_1 \\ \varepsilon_2 \end{Bmatrix} + \begin{Bmatrix} \dot{E}_{01} \\ \dot{E}_{02} \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{X}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \dot{X}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \varepsilon_1 \\ \varepsilon_2 \end{Bmatrix}. \quad (\text{E.6})$$

With the definitions of $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$, \mathbf{A} , $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$, and \mathbf{E}_0 from Equations 7.25, 7.30, 7.20, and 7.23, respectively, we can rewrite Equation E.6 as

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{A}^T\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} + \mathbf{E}_0 = \hat{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}. \quad (\text{E.7})$$

Solving for $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ gives

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}^T)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{X}}^{-1} \mathbf{E}_0. \quad (\text{E.8})$$

The differences between Equations E.1 and E.8 are due to the choice of row vectors (for Equation E.1) or column vectors (for Equation E.8) only. Note that Equation E.8 is similar to Equation 7.37. A detailed discussion of the differences between Equations E.8 and 7.37 can be found in Section 8.2.

References

- [1] Stephen Casler and Suzanne Wilbur. Energy input-output analysis: A simple guide. *Resources and Energy*, 6(2):187–201, 1984.
- [2] Clark W Bullard, Peter S Penner, and David A Pilati. Net energy analysis: Handbook for combining process and input-output analysis. *Resources and energy*, 1(3):267–313, 1978.

Bibliography

- (2010). Economics focus: Agents of change. *The Economist*.
- Allwood, J. M., Cullen, J. M., Carruth, M. A., Cooper, D. R., McBrien, M., Milford, R. L., Moynihan, M. C., and Patel, A. C. (2012). *Sustainable Materials: with both eyes open*. UIT Cambridge Limited.
- Anair, D. and Mahmassani, A. (2012). State of charge: Electric vehicles' global warming emissions and fuel-cost saving across the united states. Technical report, Union of Concerned Scientists.
- Assessment, M. E. (2005a). *Ecosystems and human well-being*, volume 5. Island Press Washington, DC.
- Assessment, U. N. M. E. (2005b). *Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Our Human Planet: Summary for Decision Makers*, volume 5. Island Press, Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (Programme).
- Ayres, R. (1997). *Turning Point: End of the Growth Paradigm*. Routledge.
- Ayres, R. U. (1996). Turning Point: The End of the Growth Paradigm. Working Paper 96/49/EPS, INSEAD's Centre for the Management of Environmental Resource.
- Ayres, R. U. and Ayres, L. W. (2002). *A handbook of industrial ecology*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Ayres, R. U., Ayres, L. W., and Warr, B. S. (2003). Exergy, power and work in the us economy, 1900–1998. *Energy*, 28(3):219–273.
- Ayres, R. U. and Kneese, A. V. (1969). Production, consumption, and externalities. *The American Economic Review*, 59(3):282–297.
- Ayres, R. U., van den Bergh, J. C., Lindenberg, D., and Warr, B. (2013). The Underestimated Contribution of Energy to Economic Growth. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 27:79–88.
- Ayres, R. U. and Warr, B. S. (2010). *The Economic Growth Engine: How Energy and Work Drive Material Prosperity*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.
- Bagstad, K. J. and Ceroni, M. (2007). Opportunities and challenges in applying the genuine progress indicator/index of sustainable economic welfare at local scales. *International Journal of Environment, Workplace, and Employment*, 3(2):132–153.

- Bailey, R., Allen, J. K., and Bras, B. (2004). Applying ecological input-output flow analysis to material flows in industrial systems: Part i: Tracing flows. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 8(1-2):45–68.
- Barradas, G. (1936). *The Economic Organism*. Hooper Printing Company.
- Bartelmus, P. (2003). Dematerialization and capital maintenance: two sides of the sustainability coin. *Ecological Economics*, 46(1):61–81.
- Bartelmus, P., Stahmer, C., and Tongeren, J. v. (1991). INTEGRATED ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC ACCOUNTING: FRAMEWORK FOR a SNA SATELLITE SYSTEM. *Review of Income and Wealth*, 37(2):111–148.
- Bashmakov, I. (2007). Three Laws of Energy Transitions. *Energy Policy*, 35(7):3583–3594.
- BEA (2013). Preview of the 2013 comprehensive revision of the national income and product accounts: Changes in definitions and presentations goods. *Survey of Current Business*, pages 13–39.
- Bell, M. L., Davis, D. L., and Fletcher, T. (2004). A retrospective assessment of mortality from the london smog episode of 1952: the role of influenza and pollution. *Environmental health perspectives*, 112(1):6.
- Bénard, H. (1901). The cellular whirlpools in a liquid sheet transporting heat by convection in a permanent regime. *Ann. Chim. Phys*, 23:62–101.
- Bernardini, O. and Galli, R. (1993). Dematerialization: Long-term trends in the intensity of use of materials and energy. *Futures*, 25(4):431–448.
- Berry, R. S. and Fels, M. F. (1973). The energy cost of automobiles. *Science and Public Affairs*, 29(10):11–17.
- Berry, W. (1998). The whole horse: Agrarianism is a culture at the same time as it is an economy. *Resurgence*, (188):26–31.
- Berry, W. (2002). *The Art of the Commonplace: The Agrarian Essays*. Counterpoint, Berkely, California.
- Beyer, W. H. (1991). *Standard Mathematical Tables and Formulae*. CRC Press, 29 edition.
- Bostrom, N. and Cirkovic, M. M. (2011). *Global catastrophic risks*. Oxford University Press.
- Boulding, K. E. (1945). The consumption concept in economic theory. *The American Economic Review*, 35(2):1–14.
- Boulding, K. E. (1956). General systems theory—the skeleton of science. *Management science*, 2(3):197–208.
- Boulding, K. E. (1966). The economics of the coming spaceship earth. *Environmental quality in a growing economy*, 2:3–14.
- Box, G. E. P. and Draper, N. R. (1987). *Empirical Model-Building and Response Surfaces*. Wiley.
- Boyd, R. (2013). *Energy and the Financial System: What Every Economist, Financial Analyst, and Investor Needs to Know*. Springer, New York.
- Brandt, A. R. (2011). Oil depletion and the energy efficiency of oil production: The case of california. *Sustainability*, 3(10):1833–1854.

- Brandt, A. R. and Dale, M. (2011). A general mathematical framework for calculating systems-scale efficiency of energy extraction and conversion: Energy return on investment (eroi) and other energy return ratios. *Energies*, 4(8):1211–1245.
- Brandt, A. R., Dale, M., and Barnhart, C. J. (2013). Calculating systems-scale energy efficiency and net energy returns: A bottom-up matrix-based approach. *Energy*, 62:235–247.
- Brimblecombe, P. (2006). The clean air act after 50 years. *Weather*, 61(11):311–314.
- Bringezu, S., Fischer-Kowalski, M., Kleijn, R., and Palm, V., editors (1998). *The ConAccount Agenda: The Concerted Action on Material Flow Analysis and its Research & Development Agenda*. Wuppertal Institute.
- Brown, M. T., Ulgiati, S., and Cutler, J. C. (2004). Emergy analysis and environmental accounting. pages 329–354. Elsevier, New York.
- Bullard, C. W. and Herendeen, R. A. (1975). The energy cost of goods and services. *Energy Policy*, 3(4):268–278.
- Bullard, C. W., Penner, P. S., and Pilati, D. A. (1976). *Net Energy Analysis: Handbook for Combining Process and Input-Output Analysis*. Energy Research Group, Center for Advanced Computation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Ill.
- Bullard, C. W., Penner, P. S., and Pilati, D. A. (1978). Net energy analysis: Handbook for combining process and input-output analysis. *Resources and energy*, 1(3):267–313.
- Bullard III, C. W. and Herendeen, R. A. (1975). Energy impact of consumption decisions. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 63(3):484–493.
- Bunker, S. G. (1984). Modes of extraction, unequal exchange, and the progressive underdevelopment of an extreme periphery: The brazilian amazon, 1600-1980. *American Journal of Sociology*, 89(5):1017–1064.
- Bureau of Economic Affairs (1994a). Integrated economic and environmental satellite accounts. *Survey of Current Business*, pages 33–49.
- Bureau of Economic Affairs (1994b). Integrated economic and environmental satellite accounts. *Survey of Current Business*, pages 50–72.
- Bureau of Economic Analysis. Detailed data for fixed assets and consumer durable goods. <http://www.bea.gov/national/FA2004/Details/Index.html>.
- Bureau of Economic Analysis. What is industry value added? http://www.bea.gov/faq/index.cfm?faq_id=184.
- Burnham, A., Wang, M., and Wu, Y. (2006). Development and applications of greet 2.7—the transportation vehicle-cyclemodel. Technical report, ANL.
- Butler, G. C. e. (1978). *Principles of ecotoxicology*. Wiley.
- Cameron, N. (2010). Peakniks, Doomers and Collapse.
- Capra, F. (2004). *The Hidden Connections: A Science for Sustainable Living*. Anchor Books, New York.
- Carnegie Mellon University Green Design Institute (2014). Economic Input-Output Life Cycle Assessment (EIO-LCA), US 1997 Industry Benchmark model. <http://www.eiolca.net>.
- Carroll, L. (1897). *Through the looking glass*. Henry Altemus Co., Philadelphia.

- Carter, A. P. (1974). Applications of input-output analysis to energy problems. *Science*, 184(4134):325–330.
- Casler, S. (1983). Correcting input-output coefficients for capital depreciation. *Energy Syst. Policy*, 7(3).
- Casler, S. and Wilbur, S. (1984). Energy input-output analysis: A simple guide. *Resources and Energy*, 6(2):187–201.
- Centre for Bhutan Studies & GNH Research, Thimphu, Bhutan (2014). Gross national happiness. <http://www.grossnationalhappiness.com/>.
- Chapman, P. (1976). Energy analysis: A review of methods and applications. *Omega*, 4(1):19–33.
- Chapman, P. F. (1975). 4. the energy costs of materials. *Energy Policy*, 3(1):47–57.
- Chu, S. and Majumdar, A. (2012). Opportunities and challenges for a sustainable energy future. *Nature*, 488(7411):294–303.
- Cleveland, C. J. (1987). Biophysical economics: historical perspective and current research trends. *Ecological Modelling*, 38(1):47–73.
- Cleveland, C. J. (2005). Net Energy from the Extraction of Oil and Gas in the United States. *Energy*, 30(5):769–782.
- Cleveland, C. J. (2008). Natural Resource Quality. In Costanza, R., editor, *The Encyclopedia of Earth*, Energy.
- Cleveland, C. J., Costanza, R., and Hall, C. A. S. (1984). Energy and the US Economy: a Biophysical Perspective. *Science*, 225(31 August):890–897.
- Cleveland, C. J., Kaufmann, R. K., and Stern, D. I. (2000). Aggregation and the role of energy in the economy. *Ecological Economics*, 32:301–317.
- Cleveland, C. J. and O'Connor, P. (2010). An Assessment of the Energy Return on Investment (EROI) of Oil Shale. Technical report, Western Resource Advocates, Boulder, CO.
- Cleveland, C. J. and Ruth, M. (1998). Indicators of dematerialization and the materials intensity of use. *Journal of industrial ecology*, 2(3):15–50.
- Cobb, C. W., Goodman, G. S., and Wackernagel, M. (1999). *Why Bigger Isn't Better: The Genuine Progress Indicator: 1999 Update*. Redefining Progress San Francisco.
- Congressional Budget Office (2014). The budget and economic outlook: 2014 to 2024. Technical Report 4869.
- Costanza, R. (1978). Energy costs of goods and services in 1967 including solar energy inputs and labor and government service feedbacks. Energy Research Group Document No. 262, Energy Research Group, Center for Advanced Computation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Costanza, R. (1980). Embodied energy and economic valuation. *Science*, 210(4475):1219–1224.
- Costanza, R. (2004). Value theory and energy. In Cleveland, C. J., editor, *Encyclopedia of Energy*, volume 6, pages 337–346. Elsevier.
- Costanza, R. and Herendeen, R. A. (1984). Embodied energy and economic value in the united states economy: 1963, 1967 and 1972. *Resources and Energy*, 6(2):129–163.

- Costanza, R., Kubiszewski, I., Giovannini, E., Lovins, H., McGlade, J., Pickett, K. E., Ragnarsdóttir, K., Roberts, D., De Vogli, R., and Wilkinson, R. (2014). Development: Time to leave GDP behind. *Nature*, 505(7483):283–285.
- Cowen, T. (2011). *The Great Stagnation: How America Ate All the Low-Hanging Fruit of Modern History, Got Sick, and Will(Eventually) Feel Better*. Dutton Adult.
- Crawford, R. H. (2008). Validation of a hybrid life-cycle inventory analysis method. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 88(3):496–506.
- Dale, M., Krumdieck, S., and Bodger, P. (2012). Global energy modelling—a biophysical approach (gemba) part 1: An overview of biophysical economics. *Ecological Economics*, 73:152–157.
- Daly, H. E. (1977). Steady-state economics. *San Francisco*.
- Daly, H. E. (1995). Consumption and welfare: two views of value added. *Review of Social Economy*, 53(4):451–473.
- Daly, H. E. (1997). *Beyond growth: the economics of sustainable development*. Beacon Press.
- Daly, H. E. (2006). Sustainable development—definitions, principles, policies. In *The future of sustainability*, pages 39–53. Springer.
- Daly, H. E. (2012). Three more growth fallacies. <http://steadystate.org/three-more-growth-fallacies/>.
- Daly, H. E. and Cobb, J. B. (1994). *For The Common Good: Redirecting the Economy Toward Community, the Environment, and a Sustainable Future*. Beacon Press, Boston.
- Daniels, P. L. and Moore, S. (2001). Approaches for quantifying the metabolism of physical economies: Part i: Methodological overview. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 5(4):69–93.
- Davis, D. L. (2002). A look back at the london smog of 1952 and the half century since. *Environmental health perspectives*, 110(12):A734.
- de Wit, M., Heun, M. K., and Crookes, D. (2013). An overview of salient factors, relationships, and values to support integrated energy-economic systems dynamic modelling. Working Paper 02/13, Department of Economics and the Bureau for Economic Research at the University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch, South Africa.
- Diamond, J. (2011). *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed: Revised Edition*. Penguin Books, revised edition edition.
- EIA (2010). 2010 manufacturing energy consumption survey (MECS) survey data. Technical report, US Energy Information Administration.
- EIA (2014). International Energy Statistics, <http://www.eia.gov/countries> accessed 4/17/2014. Technical report, US Energy Information Administration.
- England, R. W. (2000). Natural Capital and the Theory of Economic Growth. *Ecological Economics*, 34:425–431.
- European Commission, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, United Nations, World Bank (2013). System of environmental-economic accounting 2012: Experimental ecosystem accounting. White-cover Publication, pre-edited text subject to official editing.
- Ewing, B. and Network, G. F. (2008). *The ecological footprint atlas 2008*. Global Footprint Network.

- Falconer, D. (1973). Gasoline shortage 06/1973. <http://arcweb.archives.gov/arc/action/ExternalIdSearch?id=548053>.
- Fischer-Kowalski, M. (2003). On the history of industrial metabolism. *Perspectives on industrial ecology*, 1(71):35–45.
- Fischer-Kowalski, M. and Hüttler, W. (1999). Society's metabolism. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 2(4):107–136.
- Fischer-Kowalski, M., Swilling, M., von Weizsacker, E. U., Ren, Y., Moriguchi, Y., Crane, W., Krausmann, F., Eisenmenger, N., Glijum, S., Hennicke, P., Kemp, R., Romero Lankao, P., and Siriban Manalang, A. B. (2011). *UNEP [2011] Decoupling Natural Resource Use and Environmental Impacts from Economic Growth. A Report of the Working Group on Decoupling to the International Resource Panel*. United Nations Environmental Programme, New York.
- Fix, B. (2014). *Rethinking Growth Theory From a Biophysical Perspective*. (In Press). Springer, New York.
- Friedman, M. (1982). *Capitalism and Freedom*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Fröling, M. (2009). Energy use, population and growth, 1800–1970. *Journal of Population Economics*, 24(3):1133–1163.
- Gagnon, N., Hall, C. A. S., and Brinker, L. (2009). A Preliminary Investigation of Energy Return on Energy Investment for Global Oil and Gas Production. *Energies*, 2:490–503.
- Georgescu-Roegen, N. (1970). The economics of production. *The American Economic Review*, 60(2):1–9.
- Georgescu-Roegen, N. (1971). *The Entropy Law and the Economic Process*. Harvard University Press.
- Georgescu-Roegen, N. (1975a). Dynamic models and economic growth. *World Development*, 3(11-12):765–783.
- Georgescu-Roegen, N. (1975b). Energy and economic myths. *Southern Economic Journal*, 41(3):347–381.
- Georgescu-Roegen, N. (1979a). Energy analysis and economic valuation. *Southern Economic Journal*, pages 1023–1058.
- Georgescu-Roegen, N. (1979b). Energy and matter in mankind's technological circuit. *Journal of Business Administration*, 10:107–127.
- Giampietro, M. and Mayumi, K. (2000). Multiple-scale integrated assessment of societal metabolism: introducing the approach. *Population and Environment*, 22(2):109–153.
- Giampietro, M., Mayumi, K., and Şorman, A. H. (2013). *Energy Analysis for a Sustainable Future: Multi-scale Integrated Analysis of Societal and Ecosystem Metabolism*. Routledge.
- Gilliland, M. W. (1975). Energy analysis and public policy. *Science*, 189(4208):1051–1056.
- Gould, K. A., Pellow, D. N., and Schnaiberg, A. (2004). Interrogating the treadmill of production everything you wanted to know about the treadmill but were afraid to ask. *Organization & Environment*, 17(3):296–316.

- Graedel, T. (2010). *Metal Stocks in Society: Scientific Synthesis*. United Nations Environment Programme.
- Grübler, A. (2003). *Technology and global change*. Cambridge University Press.
- Guilford, M. C., Hall, C. A. S., Connor, P. O., and Cleveland, C. J. (2011). A New Long Term Assessment of Energy Return on Investment (EROI) for U.S. Oil and Gas Discovery and Production. *Sustainability*, 3(10):1866–1887.
- Haberl, H. (2001). The energetic metabolism of societies part i: accounting concepts. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 5(1):11–33.
- Hall, C. A. and Klitgaard, K. A. (2011a). *Energy and the wealth of nations: understanding the biophysical economy*. Springer.
- Hall, C. A., Lambert, J. G., and Balogh, S. B. (2014). EROI of Different Fuels and the Implications for Society. *Energy Policy*, 64:141–152.
- Hall, C. A. S., Cleveland, C. J., and Kaufman, R. (1986). *Energy and Resource Quality: The Ecology of the Economic Process*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hall, C. A. S. and Klitgaard, K. A. (2011b). *Energy and the wealth of nations: understanding the biophysical economy*. Springer, New York.
- Hamilton, A., Balogh, S. B., Maxwell, A., and Hall, C. A. S. (2013). Efficiency of Edible Agriculture in Canada and the U.S. over the Past Three and Four Decades. *Energies*, 6:1764–1793.
- Hamilton, J. D. (2013). Oil Prices, Exhaustible Resources, and Economic Growth. In *Handbook on Energy and Climate Change*, pages 29–63. Edward Elgar.
- Hammond, G. P. and Winnett, A. B. (2009). The influence of thermodynamic ideas on ecological economics: An interdisciplinary critique. *Sustainability*, 1:1196–1225.
- Harvey, W. (1628[1889]). *On the Motion of the Heart & Blood in Animals*, volume 1. Bell.
- Hass, J. and Popescu, C. (2011). *Economy-wide material flows: European countries required more materials between 2000 and 2007*. eurostat.
- Hawkins, T. R., Singh, B., Majeau-Bettez, G., and Strømman, A. H. (2012). Comparative environmental life cycle assessment of conventional and electric vehicles. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 17(1).
- Heijman, W. (1988). *The Economic Metabolism*. Kluwer.
- Hendrickson, C. T., Lave, L. B., and Matthews, H. S. (2006). *Environmental life cycle assessment of goods and services: an input-output approach*. RFF Press.
- Herendeen, R. A. (1973). Energy cost of goods and services. Technical report, Oak Ridge National Lab., Tenn.(USA).
- Herendeen, R. A. (1974). Use of input-output analysis to determine the energy cost of goods and services. *Energy: Demand, Conservation, and institutional problems. Cambridge: MIT press (proceedings)*, pages 140–158.
- Herendeen, R. A. (1978). Input-output techniques and energy cost of commodities. *Energy Policy*, 6(2):162–165.
- Herendeen, R. A. and Bullard, C. W. (1974). *Energy Cost of Goods and Services: 1963 and 1967*. Center for Advanced Computation, University of Illinois.
- Herman, Shelby (2000). Fixed assets and consumer durable goods: Estimates for 1925-98 and new nipa table—changes in net stock of produced assets. *Survey of Current Business*, pages 17–30.

- Heun, M. K. and de Wit, M. (2012). Energy Return on (Energy) Invested (EROI), Oil Prices, and Energy Transitions. *Energy Policy*, 40(C):147–158.
- Hirsch, R. L., Bezdek, R., and Wendling, R. (2005). Peaking of world oil production. In *Proceedings of the IV International Workshop on Oil and Gas Depletion*, pages 19–20.
- Hoekstra, R. (2003). *Economic growth, material flows and the environment: New applications of structural decomposition analysis and physical input-output tables*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Hoekstra, R. and van den Bergh, J. C. (2006). Constructing physical input–output tables for environmental modeling and accounting: Framework and illustrations. *Ecological Economics*, 59(3):375–393.
- Ingrao, B. and McGilvray, G. I. I. (1990). *The invisible hand: economic equilibrium in the history of science*. MIT Press Cambridge, MA.
- International Energy Agency (2014a). IEA History. <http://www.iea.org/aboutus/history/>.
- International Energy Agency (2014b). IEA Statistics. <http://www.iea.org/statistics/>.
- International Energy Agency (2014c). IEA World Energy Outlook. <http://www.worldenergyoutlook.org>.
- International Input-Output Association. IO-data. <http://www.iioa.org/io-data/io-data.html>.
- Jevons, W. S. (1865). *The coal question: an inquiry concerning the progress of the nation, and the probable exhaustion of our coal-mines*. The Macmillan Company.
- Johansson, Å., Guillemette, Y., Murtin, F., Turner, D., Nicoletti, G., de la Maison-neuve, C., Bousquet, G., and Spinelli, F. (2012). Looking to 2060: Long-term global growth prospects. OECD economic policy papers, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris.
- Johnson, D., Ambrose, S., Bassett, T., Bowen, M., Crummey, D., Isaacson, J., Johnson, D., Lamb, P., Saul, M., and Winter-Nelson, A. (1997). Meanings of environmental terms. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 26(3):581–589.
- Jones, C. I. (2001). Was an industrial revolution inevitable? economic growth over the very long run. *Advances in Macroeconomics*, 1(2):1–43.
- Joshi, S. (1999). Product environmental lifecycle assessment using inputoutput techniques. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 3(23):95–120.
- Katz, A. J. (2008). Accounting for obsolescence: An evaluation of current NIPA practice. White Paper WP2008-05, Bureau of Economic Analysis.
- Kavrakoglu, I. (1983). Modelling energy-economy interactions. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 13(1):29–40.
- Kiel, K., Matheson, V., and Golembiewski, K. (2010). Luck or skill? an examination of the ehrlich–simon bet. *Ecological Economics*, 69(7):1365–1367.
- Kim, D. D., Strassner, E. H., and Wasshausen, D. B. (2014). Industry economic accounts: Results of the comprehensive revision revised statistics for 1997–2012. *Survey of Current Business*.
- King, C. W. and Hall, C. A. S. (2011). Relating Financial and Energy Return on Investment. *Sustainability*, 3(10):1810–1832.

- Kirkpatrick, K. (1974). Effect of including capital flows on energy coefficients, 1963. CAC Technical Memorandum 32, Urbana, Illinois.
- Kleiber, M. (1947). Body size and metabolic rate. *Physiol. Rev.*, 27(4):511–541.
- Klemick, H., Wolverton, A., and Condon, N. (2013). Impacts of ethanol policy on corn prices: A review and meta-analysis of recent evidence. Technical report, Agricultural and Applied Economics Association.
- Kopits, S. (2009). Oil: What Price Can America Afford? Research note, Douglas-Westwood Energy Business Analysts, New York.
- Kopits, S. (2014). Guest blog: Hamilton has it right on oil. <http://blogs.platts.com/2014/07/30/peak-oil-forecasts/>.
- Krausmann, F., Gingrich, S., Eisenmenger, N., Erb, K.-H., Haberl, H., and Fischer-Kowalski, M. (2009). Growth in global materials use, gdp and population during the 20th century. *Ecological Economics*, 68(10):2696–2705.
- Kümmel, R. (1980). *Growth Dynamics of the Energy Dependent Economy*. Mathematical Systems in Economics. Oeigeschlager, Gunn, and Hain, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Kümmel, R. (1982). The impact of energy on industrial growth. *Energy*, 7(2):189–203.
- Kümmel, R. (2011). *The Second Law of Economics: Energy, Entropy, and the Origins of Wealth*. Springer.
- Kümmel, R., Strassl, W., Gossner, A., and Eichhorn, W. (1985). Technical Progress and Energy Dependent Production Functions. *Journal of Economics*, 45(3):285–311.
- Landefeld, J. S., Seskin, E. P., and Fraumeni, B. M. (2008). Taking the pulse of the economy: Measuring GDP. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 22(2).
- Lawn, P. (2010). On the ehrlich–simon bet: Both were unskilled and simon was lucky. *Ecological Economics*, 69(11):2045–2046.
- Lawn, P. A. A theoretical foundation to support the index of sustainable economic welfare (ISEW), genuine progress indicator (GPI), and other related indexes. *Ecological Economics*, pages 105–118.
- Lawson, A. M. (1997). Benchmark input-output accounts of the United States, 1992. *Survey of Current Business*, pages 36–57.
- Lawson, A. M., Bersani, K. S., and Guo, J. (2002). Benchmark input-output accounts of the United States, 1997. *Survey of Current Business*, 82(12):19–38.
- Lees, L. (1975). Energy conservation: Will it work? *Engineering and Science*, 38(4):3–8.
- Lenzen, M. (1998). Primary energy and greenhouse gases embodied in australian final consumption: an input–output analysis. *Energy policy*, 26(6):495–506.
- Leontief, W. (1936). Quantitative input-output study of the louisiana economy. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 18:105–125.
- Lindsey, B. Why growth is getting harder. Technical report, Cato Institute.
- Liu, E. and Hanauer, N. (2012). The machine and the garden. The New York Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/11/opinion/our-gardenbrain-economy.html>.

- Lockeretz, W. (1978). The lessons of the dust bowl: Several decades before the current concern with environmental problems, dust storms ravaged the great plains, and the threat of more dust storms still hangs over us. *American Scientist*, 66(5):560–569.
- Lovins, A. B., Brylawski, M. M., Cramer, D. R., and Moore, T. C. (1996). Hypercars: Materials, manufacturing, and policy implications.
- Machado, G., Schaeffer, R., and Worrell, E. (2001). Energy and carbon embodied in the international trade of Brazil: an input–output approach. *Ecological economics*, 39(3):409–424.
- MacKay, D. (2009). *Sustainable Energy—without the hot air*. UIT Cambridge, Cambridge, England.
- MacLean, H. L. and Lave, L. B. (1998). Peer reviewed: A life-cycle model of an automobile. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 32(13):322A–330A.
- MacLean, H. L. and Lave, L. B. (2003). Life cycle assessment of automobile/fuel options. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 37(23):5445–5452.
- Malik, K. (2013). The Rise of the South: Human Progress in a Diverse World. Human development report 2013, United Nations Development Programme.
- Maryland Department of Natural Resources (2013). Maryland's genuine progress indicator: An index for sustainable prosperity. <http://www.dnr.maryland.gov/mdgpi/>.
- Maryland Department of Natural Resources (2014). What is the genuine progress indicator? <http://www.dnr.maryland.gov/mdgpi/whatisthegpi.asp>.
- McCleese, D. L. and LaPuma, P. T. (2002). Using monte carlo simulation in life cycle assessment for electric and internal combustion vehicles. *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 7(4):230–236.
- Meadows, D. (1998). Indicators and information systems for sustainable development. Report to the Balton Group, The Sustainability Institute, Hartland Four Corners, Vermont.
- Meadows, D. H. (2008). *Thinking in systems: A primer*. Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Mudd, G. M. (2007). Global trends in gold mining: Towards quantifying environmental and resource sustainability. *Resources Policy*, 32(1):42–56.
- Mudd, G. M. (2010). The environmental sustainability of mining in australia: key mega-trends and looming constraints. *Resources Policy*, 35(2):98–115.
- Murphy, D. J. (2014). The implications of the declining energy return on investment of oil production. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 372(2006):20130126.
- Murphy, D. J., Hall, C. A., Dale, M., and Cleveland, C. (2011). Order from chaos: a preliminary protocol for determining the eroi of fuels. *Sustainability*, 3(10):1888–1907.
- Murphy, D. J. and Hall, C. A. S. (2011). Energy return on investment, peak oil, and the end of economic growth. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1219(1):52–72.
- Murray, J. W. and Hansen, J. (2013). Peak oil and energy independence: Myth and reality. *Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union*, 94(28):245–246.

- Nel, W. P. and van Zyl, G. (2010). Defining limits: Energy constrained economic growth. *Applied Energy*, 87(1):168–177.
- Neumann, J. v. (1945). A model of general economic equilibrium. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 13(1):1–9.
- Nordhaus, W. D. (1999). The future of environmental and augmented national accounts. *Survey of Current Business*, pages 45–65.
- Nordhaus, W. D. and Kokkelenberg, E. C. e. (1999). *Nature's Numbers: Expanding the National Economic Accounts to Include the Environment*. National Academies Press, Washington, DC.
- Norgaard, R. B. (2010). Ecosystem services: From eye-opening metaphor to complexity blinder. *Ecological Economics*, 69(6):1219–1227.
- Odum, E. P. (1969). The strategy of ecosystem development.
- Odum, H. T. (1973). Energy, ecology, and economics. *Ambio*, 2(6):220–227.
- Odum, H. T. (1975). Energy analysis and net energy.
- Odum, H. T. (1996). *Environmental accounting : EMERGY and environmental decision making*. Wiley, New York.
- OECD (2014). *OECD Economic Outlook, Volume 2014 Issue 1*, volume 2014 of *OECD Economic Outlook*. OECD Publishing.
- of Economic Analysis, B. Input-output accounts data. http://www.bea.gov/industry/io_annual.htm.
- of Economic Analysis, B. Input-output accounts data. <http://www.bea.gov/industry/more.htm>.
- of Economic Analysis, U. B. “table 1.1. current-cost net stock of fixed assets and consumer durable goods (sep. 30, 2013 revision). <http://bea.gov/iTable/iTable.cfm?ReqID=10&step=1#reqid=10&step=1&isuri=1> (accessed September 12, 2014).
- of Motor Vehicle Manufacturers (OICA), I. O. (2010). 2010 production statistics. <http://www.oica.net/category/production-statistics/2010-statistics/>.
- Pandey, S., Piggott, R. R., and MacAulay, T. G. (1982). The elasticity of aggregate australian agricultural supply: Estimates and policy implications. *Australian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 26(3):202–219.
- Parrinello, S. (2004). The service economy revisited. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 15(4):381–400.
- Pedersen, O. G. and Haan, M. (2006). The system of environmental and economic accounts—2003 and the economic relevance of physical flow accounting. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 10(1-2):19–42.
- Pelli, M. (2012). The Elasticity of Substitution between Clean and Dirty Inputs in the Production of Electricity. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Sustainable Resource Use and Economic Dynamics (SURED 2012)*, Ascona, Switzerland.
- Programme, U. N. U. I. H. D. and Programme, U. N. E. (2012). *Inclusive Wealth Report 2012: Measuring Progress Toward Sustainability*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Ramey, J. (2014). New Car Sales in Cuba Soured by 400-percent Markups. *Autoweek*.

- Rao, Y. (2004). *An Introduction To Thermodynamics*. Universities Press.
- Rath-Nagel, S. and Voß, A. (1981). Energy Models for Planning and Policy Assessment. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 8(2):99–114.
- Ross, J. E. (1988). The red queen syndrome: Running faster–going nowhere? *Environment and Development: Building Sustainable Societies. Lectures from the 1987 Summer Forum at the University of Wisconsin-Madison*, page 67.
- Roza, A. M. and Shizgal, H. M. (1984). The Harris Benedict Equation Reevaluated: Resting Energy Requirements and the Body Cell Mass. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 40:168–182.
- Saxe, J. G. (1873). The Blind Men and the Elephant. In *The poems of John Godfrey Saxe*, pages 259–261. J. R. Osgood, Boston.
- Schenau, S., Delahaye, R., Graveland, C., and van Rossum, M. (2009). The dutch environmental accounts: present status and future developments. Technical report, Statistics Netherlands.
- Schnaiberg, A. (1980). *Environment: from surplus to scarcity*. Oxford University Press.
- Schnaiberg, A. and Gould, K. A. (1994). *Environment and society: The enduring conflict*. St. Martin's Press New York.
- Schrödinger, E. (1947). *What is life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schweid, R. (2004). *Che's Chevrolet, Fidel's Oldsmobile: On the Road in Cuba*. University of North Carolina Press.
- Schweimer, G. W. and Levin, M. (2000). Life cycle inventory for the golf a4. *Research, Environment and Transport*.
- Schweimer, G. W. and Schuckert, M. (1996). Life cycle inventory of a golf. *VDI BERICHTE*, 1307:235–256.
- Seuss, D. (1971). *The Lorax*. Random House, New York, N.Y.
- Simon, J. (1996). *The State of Humanity*. Wiley-Blackwell, 1 edition edition.
- Simon, J. L. (1981). Population: The ultimate resource.
- Simon, J. L. (1998). *The ultimate resource 2*. Princeton University Press.
- Smil, V. (1994). Energy in world history.
- Smith, D. (1960). The yield and energy content of milk and the energetic efficiency of sows on different levels of nutrition during gestation and lactation. *New Zealand Journal of Agricultural Research*, 3(5):745–763.
- Smith, S. S., Calbry-Muzyka, A., Brandt, A., and Edwards, C. F. (2013). Economy-wide exergy accounting for energy technologies: Integrating life cycle analysis and thermodynamics. Presented at GCEP Research Symposium 2013.
- Soklis, G. (2009). The Conversion of the Supply and Use Tables to Symmetric Input-Output Tables: A Critical Review. *Bulletin of Political Economy*, 3(1):51–70.
- Söllner, F. (1997). A reexamination of the role of thermodynamics for environmental economics. *Ecological Economics*, 22(3):175–201.
- Solow, R. M. (1956). A Contribution to the Theory of Economic Growth. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 70(1):65–94.
- Sraffa, P. (1960). Production of commodities by means of commodities: Prelude to a critique of economic theory.

- Stern, D. I. and Kander, A. (2012). The Role of Energy in the Industrial Revolution and Modern Economic Growth. *The Energy Journal*, 33(3):125–152.
- Stocker, T. F. e., editor (2013). *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contributions of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press.
- Stodolsky, F., Vyas, A., Cuenca, R., and Gaines, L. (1995). Life-cycle energy savings potential from aluminum-intensive vehicles. Technical report, Argonne National Lab., IL (United States).
- Strassner, E. H., Medeiros, G. W., and Smith, G. M. (2005). Annual industry accounts: Introducing klems input estimates for 1997–2003. *Survey of Current Business*.
- Streitwieser, M. L. (2011). *Measuring the Nation's Economy: An Industry Perspective. A Primer on BEA's Industry Accounts*. Bureau of Economic Analysis, US Department of Commerce.
- Suh, S. and Huppes, G. (2002). Missing inventory estimation tool using extended input-output analysis. *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 7(3):134–140.
- Suh, S. and Huppes, G. (2009). Methods in the life cycle inventory of a product. In Suh, S., editor, *Handbook of Input-Output Economics in Industrial Ecology*, volume 23 of *Eco-Efficiency in Industry and Science*, pages 263–282. Springer Netherlands.
- Suh, S., Lenzen, M., Treloar, G. J., Hondo, H., Horvath, A., Huppes, G., Joliet, O., Klann, U., Krewitt, W., Moriguchi, Y., Munksgaard, J., and Norris, G. (2004). System boundary selection in life-cycle inventories using hybrid approaches. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 38(3):657–664.
- Sullivan, J. L., Burnham, A., and Wang, M. (2010). Energy-consumption and carbon-emission analysis of vehicle and component manufacturing. Technical report, Argonne National Laboratory (ANL).
- Sullivan, J. L. and Hu, J. (1995). Life cycle energy analysis for automobiles. In *SAE CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS P*, pages 7–20. SOC AUTOMATIVE ENGINEERS INC.
- Sullivan, J. L., Williams, R. L., Yester, S., Cobas-Flores, E., Chubbs, S. T., Hentges, S. G., and Pomper, S. D. (1998). Life cycle inventory of a generic us family sedan: Overview of results uscar amp project. *SAE transactions*, 107(6):1909–1923.
- Turner, K., Lenzen, M., Wiedmann, T., and Barrett, J. (2007). Examining the global environmental impact of regional consumption activities—part 1: A technical note on combining input–output and ecological footprint analysis. *Ecological Economics*, 62(1):37–44.
- Tverberg, G. (2013). Our Oil Problems are Not Over! <http://ourfiniteworld.com/2013/10/02/our-oil-problems-are-not-over/>.
- Union of Concerned Scientists (1992). 1992 World Scientists' Warning to Humanity. <http://www.ucsusa.org/about/1992-world-scientists.html>.
- United Nations (1993). *Integrated environmental and economic accounting: interim version*. Number no. 61 in Studies in methods. United Nations, New York.

- United Nations (2014). *System of Environmental-Economic Accounting 2012 Central Framework*. United Nations Statistics Division.
- United Nations, European Commission, International Monetary Fund, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, and World Bank (2009). *System of national accounts 2008*. United Nations, New York.
- United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. World population prospects: The 2012 revision. <http://esa.un.org/wpp/>.
- United Nations Environment Programme International Resource Panel. Publications. <http://www.unep.org/resourcepanel/Publications/tabid/54044/Default.aspx>.
- United Nations Statistical Division. System of environmental-economic accounting (seea). <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/envaccounting/seea.asp>.
- Uno, K. and Bartelmus, P. (1998). *Environmental Accounting in Theory and Practice*. Springer, Dordrecht ; Boston, 1997 edition edition.
- Ura, K., Alkire, S., Zangmo, T., and Wangdi, K. (2012). *A Short Guide to Gross National Happiness Index*. The Centre for Bhutan Studies, Thimphu, Bhutan.
- U.S. House. Committee on appropriations. departments of commerce, justice, and state, the judiciary, and related agencies appropriations bill, FY 1995. Technical Report 103 H. Rpt. 708.
- USDA (2014). US Bioenergy Statistics, <http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/us-bioenergy-statistics.aspx>, accessed 4/17/2014. Technical report, US Department of Agriculture.
- van der Zwaan, B. C., Gerlagh, R., Klaassen, G., and Schrattenholzer, L. (2002). Endogenous technological change in climate change modelling. *Energy Economics*, 24(1):1–19.
- Vlastic, B. and Trop, J. (2013). Vehicle Fuel Efficiency Reaches a High, Nearing Goal for 2016. New York Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/11/business/energy-environment/fuel-economy-hits-six-year-high.html>.
- Wackernagel, M. (1996). *Our ecological footprint: reducing human impact on the earth*, volume 9. New Society Publishers.
- Walker, C. H., Sibly, R. M., Hopkin, S. P., and Peakall, D. B. (2012). *Principles of ecotoxicology*. CRC Press.
- Walras, L. (1892). Geometrical theory of the determination of prices. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 3(1):45–64.
- Walras, L. (1993). The equilibrium economics.
- Warr, B. S. and Ayres, R. U. (2012). Useful work and information as drivers of economic growth. *Ecological Economics*, 73(C):93–102.
- Weidema, B. P., Bauer, C., Hischier, R., Mutel, C., Nemecek, T., Reinhard, J., Vadenbo, C. O., and Wernet, G. (2012). Overview and methodology. data quality guideline for the ecoinvent database version 3. ecoinvent report 1 (v3). *St. Gallen: The ecoinvent Centre*.
- Weissenbacher, M. (2009). *Sources of power: how energy forges human history*. ABC-CLIO.

- Wernick, I. K., Herman, R., Govind, S., and Ausubel, J. H. (1996). Materialization and dematerialization: measures and trends. *Daedalus*, 125(3):171–198.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1926 [2011]). *Science and the modern world*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England.
- Wiedmann, T. O., Schandl, H., Lenzen, M., Moran, D., Suh, S., West, J., and Kanemoto, K. (2013). The material footprint of nations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, page 201220362.
- World Bank. Philippines. <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/ENVIRONMENT/0,,contentMDK:23144834~menuPK:242154~pagePK:210058~piPK:210062~theSitePK:244381,00.html>.
- World Bank (2014). GDP per capita (current US\$). <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD>.
- World Commission on Environment and Development (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford paperbacks. Oxford University Press, Oxford ; New York.
- Wright, D. J. (1974). 3. good and services: an input-output analysis. *Energy Policy*, 2(4):307–315.
- Zehner, O. (2013). Unclean at any speed. *IEEE Spectrum*, 50(7):40–45.
- Zhai, P. and Williams, E. D. (2010). Dynamic hybrid life cycle assessment of energy and carbon of multicrystalline silicon photovoltaic systems. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 44(20):7950–7955.

Glossary

ATP	Adenosine Triphosphate
BEA	Bureau of Economic Analysis, US Department of Commerce (http://www.bea.gov)
CES	Constant Elasticity of Substitution
DEC	Direct Energy Conversion
EIA	Energy Information Administration
EI-O	Energy Input-Output
EIOLCA	Economic Input-Output Life Cycle Assessment (http://www.eiolca.net)
EROI	Energy Return on (Energy) Invested
EW-MFA	Economy-Wide Materials Flow Accounts
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GER	Gross Energy Ratio
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
IE	Industrial Ecology
IEA	International Energy Agency
IEESA	Integrated Environmental-Economic System of Accounts
I-O	Input-Output
IRP	International Resource Panel
KLEMS	Capital (K), Labor (L), Energy (E), Materials (M), and Services (S)

LCA	Life Cycle Assessment
LINEX	LINEar Exponential
MFA	Material Flow Analysis
NAICS	North American Industry Classification System
NEA	Net Energy Analysis
OICA	International Organization of Motor Vehicle Manufacturers
OPEC	Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries
PI-O	Physical Input-Output
SEEA	System of Environmental-Economic Accounting
SNA	Systems of National Accounts
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Programme
US	United States

Index

A

accumulation
 of apples 187
 of capital 187
 of direct energy 187
 of economic factors 187
 of economic value 187
 of embodied energy 187
 of goods 187
 of materials 187
 of natural capital 187
 of natural resources 187
 of resources 187
 of short-lived capital 187
 of total energy 187
anabolism 187
autophagy 187

B

Best-First Principle 187
biomass energy 187
biomass stock 187
biophysical 187
biosphere 187
Boulding 187
Bullard 187
Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) 187

C

capital depreciation 187
capital goods 187
catabolism 187
CES 187
chemical energy 187

China 187
climate change 187
clockwork metaphor 187
clockwork universe 187
co-products 187
coal 187
Cobb-Douglas 187
Congressional Budget Office 187
control volume 187
Cuba 187

D

Daly 187
DEC method *see* direct energy conversion
depreciation 187
 capital *see* capital depreciation
 embodied energy *see* embodied energy depreciation
 financial *see* financial depreciation
 physical *see* physical depreciation
development 187
 economic 187
direct (DIRECT) method 187
direct energy
 flow-through of 187
direct energy conversion (DEC) method 187

E

economic development 187
economic value 187
 destruction of 187
 flow of 187
economy
 agrarian 187
 developing 187

econosphere 187
 EI-O *see* energy input-output
 elasticity of substitution 187
 embargo
 oil 187
 embodied energy 187
 depreciation of 187
 emergy 187
 emjoule 187
 energy
 biomass *see* biomass energy
 chemical *see* chemical energy
 direct *see* direct energy
 embodied *see* embodied energy
 gravitational *see* gravitational energy
 hydro *see* hydro energy
 kinetic *see* kinetic energy
 nuclear *see* nuclear energy
 ocean thermal *see* ocean thermal energy
 renewable *see* renewable energy
 solar *see* solar energy
 solar thermal *see* solar thermal energy
 thermal *see* thermal energy
 total *see* total energy
 energy input-output (EI-O) 187
 energy intensity 187
 energy resources 187
 energy return on investment (EROI) 187
 energy theory of value 187
 EROI *see* energy return on investment
 evolution 187
 exergy 187

F

financial depreciation 187
 First Law of Thermodynamics 187
 fossil fuel 187
 free cash flow 187

G

gas
 natural 187
 Georgescu-Roegen 187
 government sector 187
 gravitational energy 187
 Great Recession 187
 gross domestic product (GDP) 187
 gross energy ratio (GER) 187

H

Herendeen 187

household sector 187
 hydro energy 187

I

IEESA 187
 implicit theory of value 187
 India 187
 input-output (I-O)
 energy 187
 matrix 187
 method 187
 physical 187
 ratio 187
 tables 187
 Integrated Environmental-Economic System of
 Accounts *see* IEESA
 irreversibility 187
 thermodynamic *see* thermodynamic
 irreversibility

K

kinetic energy 187
 Kleiber's Law 187

L

Lake Erie 187
 Leontief 187
 LINEX 187
 London 187

M

materials
 quality of 187
 matrix
 transaction *see* transaction matrix
 metabolism metaphor 187
 metamorphosis 187
 metaphor
 clockwork 187
 machine 187
 metabolism 187
 minerals 187
 model
 engine 187
 traditional 187

N

NAICS *see* North American Industry
 Classification System (NAICS)
 natural resources 187
 NEA *see* net energy analysis (NEA)
 net energy analysis (NEA) 187

Newtonian physics 187
 Nigeria 187
 North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) 187
 nuclear energy 187

O

ocean thermal energy 187
 OECD 187
 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development *see* OECD

P

photovoltaic 187
 physical depreciation 187
 Physical Input-Output (PI-O) 187
 price elasticity of supply 187
 production function
 CES *see* CES
 Cobb-Douglas *see* Cobb-Douglas
 constant elasticity of substitution *see* CES
 LINEX *see* LINEX
 puberty 187

R

renewable energy 187
 resource quality 187
 resources 187
 natural *see* natural resources
 Russia 187

S

Saudi Arabia 187
 Second Law of Thermodynamics 187
 SEEA 187
 SNA 187

solar energy 187
 solar thermal energy 187
 South Africa 187
 steam 187
 Strategic Petroleum Reserve 187
 subjective theory of value 187
 System of Environmental-Economic Accounts *see* SEEA
 System of National Accounts *see* SNA

T

theory of value
 energy *see* energy theory of value
 implicit *see* implicit theory of value
 subjective *see* subjective theory of value
 thermal energy 187
 thermodynamic irreversibility 187
 Thermodynamics
 First Law of *see* First Law of Thermodynamics
 Second Law of *see* Second Law of Thermodynamics
 thermodynamics 187

V

value 187
 theory of *see* theory of value, 187
 Venezuela 187

W

waste 187
 World Energy Outlook 187

Y

yank tank 187