

Discussion of
**“Persistence and Path Dependence
in the Spatial Economy”**
by Allen and Donaldson

Jeffrey Lin

Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia

November 2022

The views expressed here are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia or the Federal Reserve System.

Motivation & contribution

Theories of cities feature increasing returns, externalities, spillovers, ...

...Often accompanied by multiplicity, **path dependence** & self-fulfilling prophecies.

- A challenge for modeling and policy analysis.

Motivation & contribution

Theories of cities feature increasing returns, externalities, spillovers, ...

...Often accompanied by multiplicity, **path dependence** & self-fulfilling prophecies.

- A challenge for modeling and policy analysis.

This paper develops a **quantitative, dynamic spatial equilibrium model** that:

- Rationalizes prior evidence of **path dependence** in spatial structure (Bleakley & Lin, ...).
- And is amenable to quantitative analysis (even for “big” policies, e.g, TVA).

The core modeling feature

Separate **contemporaneous** and **historical** agglomeration spillovers.

$$A_{i,t} = \bar{A}_{i,t} L_{i,t}^{\alpha_1} L_{i,t-1}^{\alpha_2}$$

$$u_{i,t} = \bar{u}_{i,t} L_{i,t}^{\beta_1} L_{i,t-1}^{\beta_2}$$

The core modeling feature

Separate **contemporaneous** and **historical** agglomeration spillovers.

$$A_{i,t} = \bar{A}_{i,t} L_{i,t}^{\alpha_1} L_{i,t-1}^{\alpha_2}$$

$$u_{i,t} = \bar{u}_{i,t} L_{i,t}^{\beta_1} L_{i,t-1}^{\beta_2}$$

If contemporaneous spillovers ($\alpha_1 + \beta_1$) and forward-looking behavior (δ) weak, then dynamic equilibrium path is unique (**Prop 1**).

The core modeling feature

Separate **contemporaneous** and **historical** agglomeration spillovers.

$$A_{i,t} = \bar{A}_{i,t} L_{i,t}^{\alpha_1} L_{i,t-1}^{\alpha_2}$$

$$u_{i,t} = \bar{u}_{i,t} L_{i,t}^{\beta_1} L_{i,t-1}^{\beta_2}$$

If contemporaneous spillovers ($\alpha_1 + \beta_1$) and forward-looking behavior (δ) weak, then dynamic equilibrium path is unique (Prop 1).

At the same time, if historical spillovers ($\alpha_2 + \beta_2$) strong, multiple steady states (Prop 3).

→ History can matter, even in the long run.

Answers and questions

A very important contribution.

Neat (elegant, novel) answer that accomodates theory, evidence on path dependence in quantitative analysis.

Open questions.

What about self-fulfilling expectations?

What progress are we making on “fundamentals”?

When path dependence?

Expectations

Paper wants to “embrace both sides of the ‘history’ versus ‘expectations’ trade-off.”

This is an important frontier, for both theory and empirics.

How might self-fulfilling expectations “work” in this framework?


The Gateway to the West



In early 19th c., considerable uncertainty about which city would become “Gateway to the West.”

- Many sites thought to be destined to host great cities. “If waterway geography were the determinant of urban growth, the major inland city would surely be St. Louis” (Cronon, 1991).
- At Chicago’s incorporation in 1833, St. Louis had a population $>16\times$ larger and had been a major trading post for 70+ years.

The rise of Chicago through the lens of this model



Claim: In 1833 (or later?), neither **nature** nor **history** had not uniquely determined the rise of Chicago.

Instead, **expectations** may have played some role (Cronon, 1991; Krugman, 1993; Glaeser, 2013).


Expectations-driven dynamics: High δ or strong $\alpha_1 + \beta_1$?

- What about **Prop 1**?
- Coarseness of discrete time.
- Model + data on investment?

Unpacking “fundamentals”

Allen & Arkolakis


$$A_{i,t} = \bar{A}_{i,t} L_{i,t}^{\alpha_1}$$



Unpacking “fundamentals”

Allen & Arkolakis

$$A_{i,t} = \bar{A}_{i,t} L_{i,t}^{\alpha_1}$$




Fall-line cities (Bleakley & Lin)



Unpacking “fundamentals”

Allen & Arkolakis

$$A_{i,t} = \bar{A}_{i,t} L_{i,t}^{\alpha_1}$$



Fall-line cities (Bleakley & Lin)



This paper

$$A_{i,t} = \bar{A}_{i,t} L_{i,t}^{\alpha_1} L_{i,t-1}^{\alpha_2}$$


???

Does “controlling” for history
weaken the link between scale,
fundamentals?

Unpacking “fundamentals”

Allen & Arkolakis

$$A_{i,t} = \bar{A}_{i,t} L_{i,t}^{\alpha_1}$$



Fall-line cities (Bleakley & Lin)



This paper

$$A_{i,t} = \bar{A}_{i,t} L_{i,t}^{\alpha_1} L_{i,t-1}^{\alpha_2}$$


???

Does “controlling” for history
weaken the link between scale,
fundamentals?

Can we leverage restrictions on fundamentals (e.g., portage) to better estimate this model?


When should we expect path dependence?

Davis & Weinstein




Bleakley & Lin

Figure 7: Portage and population density, 1790–2000




When should we expect path dependence?

Davis & Weinstein



Bleakley & Lin

Figure 7: Portage and population density, 1790–2000




Possible explanations:

- Natural heterogeneity
- Size of shock
- Expectations
- Capital versus labor


When should we expect path dependence?

Davis & Weinstein



Bleakley & Lin

Figure 7: Portage and population density, 1790–2000



Possible explanations:

- Natural heterogeneity
- Size of shock
- Expectations
- Capital versus labor

Framework could be used to investigate these hypotheses, and perhaps more.

- How big did TVA need to be?

Summary

An important paper that will (should) inspire a lot of future work.

Framework with potential to answer big questions in policy and urban economics.