Table 3.4
Eastern energy capture, 14,000 BCE–2000 CE

Date	kcal/cap/ day	Points	Date	kcal/cap/ day	Points
14,000 BCE	4,000	4.36	500 BCE	21,000	22.88
13,000 BCE	4,000	4.36	400 BCE	22,000	23.97
12,000 BCE	4,000	4.36	300 BCE	22,500	24.52
11,000 BCE	4,000	4.36	200 BCE	24,000	26.15
10,000 BCE	4,000	4.36	100 BCE	25,500	27.79
9000 BCE	4,500	4.90	1 BCE/CE	27,000	29.42
8000 BCE	5,000	5.45	100 CE	27,000	29.42
7000 BCE	5,500	5.99	200 CE	26,000	28.33
6000 BCE	6,000	6.54	300 CE	26,000	28.33
5000 BCE	6,500	7.08	400 CE	26,000	28.33
4000 BCE	7,000	7.63	500 CE	26,000	28.33
3500 BCE	7,500	8.17	600 CE	27,000	29.42
3000 BCE	8,000	8.72	700 CE	27,000	29.42
2500 BCE	9,500	10.35	800 CE	28,000	30.51
2250 BCE	10,500	11.44	900 CE	29,000	31.06
2000 BCE	11,000	11.99	1000 CE	29,500	32.15
1750 BCE	13,000	14.17	1100 CE	30,000	32.69
1500 BCE	15,000	16.35	1200 CE	30,500	33.24
1400 BCE	15,500	16.89	1300 CE	30,000	32.69
1300 BCE	16,000	17.44	1400 CE	29,000	31.06
1200 BCE	16,000	17.44	1500 CE	30,000	32.69
1100 BCE	16,500	17.98	1600 CE	31,000	33.78
1000 BCE	17,000	18.52	1700 CE	33,000	35.96
900 BCE	17,500	19.07	1800 CE	36,000	39.23
800 BCE	18,000	19.61	1900 CE	49,000	53.40
700 BCE	18,500	20.16	2000 CE	104,000	113.33
600 BCE	20,000	21.79			

cap/day[158]—less than half the 230,000 kcal/cap/day consumed in the United States, but much higher than in any earlier period of Eastern (or Western) history.

Reliable government statistics do not go back very far in the East, and (as in the West) the problems are compounded by the scarcity of quantitative data on biomass used for fuel, housing, clothing, and so

Table 3.1
Western energy capture, 14,000 BCE–2000 CE

Date	kcal/cap/day	Points	Date	kcal/cap/day	Points
14,000 BCE	4,000	4.36	500 BCE	23,000	25.06
13,000 BCE	4,000	4.36	400 BCE	24,000	26.15
12,000 BCE	4,500	4.90	300 BCE	26,000	28.33
11,000 BCE	5,000	5.45	200 BCE	27,000	29.42
10,000 BCE	5,000	5.45	100 BCE	29,000	31.06
9000 BCE	5,500	5.99	1 BCE/CE	31,000	33.78
8000 BCE	6,000	6.54	100 CE	31,000	33.78
7000 BCE	6,500	7.08	200 CE	30,000	32.69
6000 BCE	7,000	7.63	300 CE	29,000	31.60
5000 BCE	8,000	8.72	400 CE	28,500	31.06
4000 BCE	10,000	10.90	500 CE	28,000	30.51
3500 BCE	11,000	11.99	600 CE	26,000	28.33
3000 BCE	12,000	13.08	700 CE	25,000	27.24
2500 BCE	14,000	15.26	800 CE	25,000	27.24
2250 BCE	16,000	17.44	900 CE	25,000	27.24
2000 BCE	17,000	18.52	1000 CE	26,000	28.33
1750 BCE	19,000	20.65	1100 CE	26,000	28.33
1500 BCE	20,500	22.34	1200 CE	26,500	28.88
1400 BCE	21,000	22.88	1300 CE	27,000	29.42
1300 BCE	21,500	23.43	1400 CE	26,000	28.33
1200 BCE	21,000	22.88	1500 CE	27,000	29.42
1100 BCE	20,500	22.34	1600 CE	29,000	31.06
1000 BCE	20,000	21.79	1700 CE	32,000	34.87
900 BCE	20,500	22.34	1800 CE	38,000	41.41
800 BCE	21,000	22.88	1900 CE	92,000	100.00
700 BCE	21,500	23.43	2000 CE	230,000	250.00
600 BCE	22,000	23.97			

the three periods. The first jump is back to the classical Mediterranean world of roughly 500 BCE–200 CE, for which several economic historians have recently generated figures for consumption levels, and the second is back to the beginning of our story around 14,000 BCE, at which point (surprising as it may sound to nonarchaeologists) we can make fairly confident estimates about Late Ice Age hunter-gatherer consumption.

Table 6.1
Western information technology scores

Dates	Categories (percentages)							
	Full (@ 0.5 pts)	Medium (@ 0.25 pts)	Basic (@ 0.15 pts)	Male points	Female (% M)	Literacy points	Multiplier	Total points
2000 CE	100 (50)	0	0	50	100% = 50	100	× 2.5	250
1900	40 (20)	50 (12.5)	7 (1.05)	33.6	90% = 30.2	63.8	× 0.05	3.19
1800	20 (10)	25 (6.25	20 (3)	19.3	50% = 9.65	28.95	× 0.01	0.29
1700	10 (5)	15 (3.75)	25 (3.75)	12.5	10% = 1.25	13.75	× 0.01	0.14
1600	5 (2.5)	10 (2.5)	10 (1.5)	6.5	2% = 0.13	6.63	× 0.01	0.071
1500	4 (2)	8 (2)	6 (0.9)	4.9	2% = 0.10	5.0	× 0.01	0.05
1400	3 (1.5)	6 (1.5)	4 (0.6)	3.6	1% = 0.04	3.64	× 0.01	0.04
1300	3 (1.5)	6 (1.5)	4 (0.6)	3.6	1% = 0.04	3.64	× 0.01	0.04
1200	3 (1.5)	6 (1.5)	4 (0.6)	3.6	1% = 0.04	3.64	× 0.01	0.04
1100	2 (1)	4 (1)	2 (0.3)	2.3	1% = 0.02	2.32	× 0.01	0.02
1000	2 (1)	4 (1)	2 (0.3)	2.3	1% = 0.02	2.32	× 0.01	0.02
600–900	2 (1)	2 (0.5)	1 (0.15)	1.65	1% = 0.02	1.67	× 0.01	0.02
300–500	3 (1.5)	4 (1)	3 (0.45)	2.95	1% = 0.03	2.98	× 0.01	0.03
100 BCE–200 CE	4 (2)	6 (1.5)	5 (0.75)	4.25	1% = 0.04	4.29	× 0.01	0.04
500–200 BCE	2 (1)	3 (0.75)	2 (0.3)	2.05	1% = 0.02	2.07	× 0.01	0.02
900–600 BCE	1 (1)	2 (0.5)	1 (0.15)	1.65	1% = 0.02	1.67	× 0.01	0.02
1100–1000 BCE	1 (1)	1 (0.25)	1 (0.15)	1.4	1% = 0.01	1.41	× 0.01	0.01
2200–1200 BCE	1 (1)	2 (0.5)	1 (0.15)	1.65	1% = 0.02	1.67	× 0.01	0.02
2700–2300 BCE	1 (1)	1 (0.25)	1 (0.25)	1.4	1% = 0.01	1.41	× 0.01	0.01
3300–2800 BCE	0 (1)	1 (0.25)	2 (0.3)	0.55	1% = 0.01	0.56	× 0.01	0.01
6000–3400 BCE	0	0	1 (0.15)	0.15	1% = 0	0.15	× 0.01	0
9000–6100 BCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	× 0.01	0
9300–9000 BCE	0	0	1 (0.15)	0.15	1% = 0	0.15	× 0.01	0

Table 6.2
Eastern information technology scores

Dates	Categories (percentages)							
	Full (@ 0.5 pts)	Medium (@ 0.25 pts)	Basic (@ 0.15 pts)	Male points	Female (% M)	Literacy points	Multiplier	Total points
3000	100 (50)	0	0	50	100% = 50	100	× 1.89	189.00
1900	15(7.5)	60 (15)	10 (1.5)	24	25% = 6	30	× 0.01	0.30
1800	5 (2.5)	35 (8.75)	10 (1.5)	12.75	5% = 0.64	13.39	× 0.01	0.13
1700	5 (2.5)	20 (5)	10 (1.5)	9	2% = 0.18	9.18	× 0.01	0.09
1600	4 (2)	15 (3.75)	10 (1.5)	7.25	2% = 0.15	7.4	× 0.01	0.07
1500	3 (1.5)	10 (2.5)	10 (1.5)	5.5	2% = 0.11	5.61	× 0.01	0.06
1400	3 (1.5)	10 (2.5)	10 (1.5)	5.5	2% = 0.11	5.61	× 0.01	0.06
1300	3 (1.5)	5 (1.25)	5 (0.75)	3.5	1% = 0.04	3.51	× 0.01	0.04
1200	3 (1.5)	5 (1.25)	5 (0.75)	3.5	1% = 0.04	3.51	× 0.01	0.04
1100	2 (1)	2 (0.5)	3 (0.45)	1.95	1% = 0.02	1.97	× 0.01	0.02
600 BCE–1000 CE	2 (1)	2 (0.5)	2 (0.3)	1.8	1% = 0.02	1.82	× 0.01	0.02
1000–700 BCE	2 (1)	1 (0.25)	1 (0.15)	1.4	1% = 0.01	1.14	× 0.01	0.01
1300–1100 BCE	1 (0.5)	1 (0.25)	1 (0.15)	0.9	1% = 0.01	0.91	× 0.01	0.01
7000–1400 BCE	0	0	1 (0.15)	1.15	1% = 0	0.15	× 0.01	0

Table 4.2
Eastern maximum settlement sizes, 4000 BCE–2000 CE

Date	Settlement	Size	Points
4000 BCE	Jiangzhai, Jiahu	300	0
3500 BCE	Xipo	2,000	0.02
3000 BCE	Dadiwan	5,000	0.05
2500 BCE	Taosi, Liangchengzhen, Yaowangcheng	10,000	0.09 .
2250 BCE	Taosi, Liangchengzhen, Yaowangcheng	14,000	0.13
2000 BCE	Fengcheng-Nanshui	11,000	0.1
1750 BCE	Erlitou	24,000	0.22
1500 BCE	Zhengzhou	35,000	0.33
1400 BCE	Zhengzhou	35,000	0.33
1300 BCE	Zhengzhou	35,000	0.33
1200 BCE	Anyang	50,000	0.47
1100 BCE	Anyang	50,000	0.47
1000 BCE	Luoyi, Feng	35,000	0.33
900 BCE	Luoyi, Feng	40,000	0.37
800 BCE	Luoyi, Feng	45,000	0.42
700 BCE	Linzi, Luoyi	55,000	0.51
600 BCE	Linzi, Luoyi	65,000	0.61
500 BCE	Linzi	80,000	0.75
400 BCE	Linzi, Qufu, Luoyi, Xinzheng, Wuyang	100,000	0.94
300 BCE	Linzi, Qufu, Luoyi, Xinzheng, Wuyang	125,000	1.17
200 BCE	Chang'an	250,000	2.81
100 BCE	Chang'an	375,000	3.75
1 BCE/CE	Chang'an	500,000	4.68
100 CE	Luoyang	420,000	3.93
200 CE	Chang'an	120,000	1.12
300 CE	Pingyang, Chang'an, Luoyang, Xuchang, Ye	140,000	1.31
400 CE	Pingcheng	200,000	1.87
500 CE	Luoyang	200,000	1.87
600 CE	Daxingcheng/Chang'an	600,000	5.63
700 CE	Chang'an	1,000,000	9.36
800 CE	Chang'an	1,000,000	9.36

Table 4.2 (*continued*)

Date	Settlement	Size	Points
900 CE	Chang'an	750,000	7
1000 CE	Kaifeng	1,000,000	9.36
1100 CE	Kaifeng	1,000,000	9.36
1200 CE	Hangzhou	1,000,000	9.36
1300 CE	Hangzhou	800,000	7.5
1400 CE	Nanjing	500,000	4.68
1500 CE	Beijing	678,000	6.35
1600 CE	Beijing	700,000	6.55
1700 CE	Beijing	650,000	6.09
1800 CE	Beijing	1,100,000	10.3
1900 CE	Tokyo	1,750,000	16.39
2000 CE	Tokyo	26,400,000	250

1700 CE: Beijing, 650,000;[73] 6.09 points. Beijing's population fell sharply after the terrible sack of 1644, and in 1700 had probably not yet returned to its 1600 level. Some historians, however, suggest much higher figures.[74]

1600 CE: Beijing, 700,000;[75] 6.55 points. Some historians suggest higher figures,[76] but rarely provide evidence to support them.

1500 CE: Beijing, 678,000;[77] 6.35 points. Mote estimated the population of Nanjing and Beijing at about 1 million each through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but this seems unlikely, both because it is very high (Beijing probably did not reach 1 million until late in the eighteenth century) and because Nanjing is generally believed to have seen a roughly 50 percent population decline Beijing replaced it as the capital in 1421, as Mote himself recognizes elsewhere. Bairoch agreed with a lower estimate, thinking that Beijing had at least 600,000 people in 1600.[78]

1400 CE: Nanjing, 500,000;[79] 4.68 points. Mote says that he thinks Nanjing's population was about 1 million, but his own rough calculation actually produces a figure of 400,000–500,000.[80]

1300 CE: Hangzhou, 800,000;[81] 7.5 points. Bairoch suggests that four other Chinese cities around 1300 had populations in the 200,000–500,000 range while Hangzhou was "perhaps considerably larger." His calculations from the figures for rice consumption,

Table 4.1
Western maximum settlement sizes, 8000 BCE–2000 CE

Date	Settlement	Size	Points
8000 BCE	Mureybet	perhaps 500	
7000 BCE	Beidha, Basta, Çatalhöyük	1,000	0.01
6000 BCE	Çatalhöyük	3,000	0.03
5000 BCE	Tell Brak	4,000	0.04
4000 BCE	Uruk, Tell Brak	5,000	0.05
3500 BCE	Uruk, Susa, Tell Brak	8,000	0.09
3000 BCE	Uruk	45,000	0.42
2500 BCE	Uruk	50,000	0.47
2250 BCE	Akkad, Memphis	35,000	0.33
2000 BCE	Memphis, Ur	60,000	0.56
1750 BCE	Babylon	65,000	0.61
1500 BCE	Uruk, Thebes	75,000	0.7
1400 BCE	Thebes	80,000	0.75
1300 BCE	Thebes	80,000	0.75
1200 BCE	Babylon, Thebes	80,000	0.75
1100 BCE	Memphis, Thebes, Tanis	50,000	0.47
1000 BCE	Thebes	50,000	0.47
900 BCE'	Thebes	50,000	0.47
800 BCE	Nimrud/Kalhu	75,000	0.7
700 BCE	Nineveh	100,000	0.94
600 BCE	Babylon	125,000	1.17
500 BCE	Babylon	150,000	1.4
400 BCE	Babylon	150,000	1.4
300 BCE	Babylon, Alexandria	150,000	1.4
200 BCE	Alexandria	300,000	2.81
100 BCE	Alexandria, perhaps Rome	400,000	3.75
1 BCE/CE	Rome	1,000,000	9.36
100 CE	Rome	1,000,000	9.36
200 CE	Rome	1,000,000	9.36
300 CE	Rome	800,000	7.49
400 CE	Rome	800,000	7.49
500 CE	Constantinople	450,000	4.23
600 CE	Constantinople	150,000	1.41
700 CE	Constantinople	125,000	1.17
800 CE	Baghdad	175,000	1.64
900 CE	Cordoba	175,000	1.64

Table 4.1 (*continued*)

Date	Settlement	Size	Points
1000 CE	Cordoba	200,000	1.87
1100 CE	Constantinople	250,000	2.34
1200 CE	Baghdad, Cairo, Constantinople	250,000	2.34
1300 CE	Cairo	400,000	3.75
1400 CE	Cairo	125,000	1.17
1500 CE	Cairo	400,000	3.75
1600 CE	Constantinople	400,000	3.75
1700 CE	London and Constantinople	600,000	5.62
1800 CE	London	900,000	8.43
1900 CE	London	6,600,000	61.8
2000 CE	New York	16,700,000	156.37

years before 5000 BCE),[7] I provide first my identification of the largest city and estimate for its population, then my main source and the number of points the city scores on the social development index, then brief comments on conflicting estimates and the nature of the evidence.

2000 CE: New York, 16,700,000;[8] 156.37 points. The *Economist Pocket World in Figures* estimated the population of Mexico City in 2000 CE at 18,100,000 and that of São Paolo at 18,000,000, but New York remains the largest city in the Western core (i.e., the United States, the borderlands of Canada, and Northwest and Central Europe).

1900 CE: London, 6,600,000;[9] 61.8 points. Chandler estimates London at 6,480,000,[10] and there seems to be general agreement among urban historians on a figure around 6.5 million, based on multiple kinds of official statistics.

1800 CE: London, 900,000;[11] 8.43 points. There is a little more debate about populations in 1800 CE than those for 1900, and some sources put London a little lower.[12] The evidence consists of a combination of government statistics and eyewitness comments. The next-largest Western city was probably Constantinople, which Chandler puts at 570,000.

Table 7.2
Eastern social development scores, trait by trait, 14,000 BCE–2000 CE

	Energy capture	Organization	War-making capacity	Information technology	Total
14,000 BCE	4.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.36
13,000 BCE	4.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.36
12,000 BCE	4.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.36
11,000 BCE	4.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.36
10,000 BCE	4.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.36
9000 BCE	4.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.90
8000 BCE	5.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.45
7000 BCE	5.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.99
6000 BCE	6.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.54
5000 BCE	7.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.08
4000 BCE	7.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.63
3500 BCE	8.17	0.02	0.00	0.00	8.19
3000 BCE	8.72	0.05	0.00	0.00	8.77
2500 BCE	10.35	0.09	0.00	0.00	10.44
2250 BCE	11.44	0.13	0.00	0.00	11.57
2000 BCE	11.99	0.10	0.00	0.00	12.09
1750 BCE	14.17	0.22	0.00	0.00	14.39
1500 BCE	16.35	0.33	0.01	0.00	16.69
1400 BCE	16.89	0.33	0.01	0.00	17.23
1300 BCE	17.44	0.33	0.01	0.01	17.79
1200 BCE	17.44	0.47	0.02	0.01	17.94
1100 BCE	17.98	0.47	0.02	0.01	18.48
1000 BCE	18.52	0.33	0.03	0.01	18.89
900 BCE	19.07	0.37	0.03	0.01	19.48
800 BCE	19.61	0.42	0.02	0.01	20.06
700 BCE	20.16	0.51	0.02	0.01	20.70
600 BCE	21.79	0.61	0.03	0.02	22.45
500 BCE	22.88	0.75	0.04	0.02	23.69
400 BCE	23.97	0.94	0.05	0.02	24.98
300 BCE	24.52	1.17	0.06	0.02	26.87
200 BCE	26.15	2.81	0.07	0.02	29.05
100 BCE	27.79	3.45	0.08	0.02	31.64
1 BCE/CE	29.42	4.68	0.08	0.02	34.20
100 CE	29.42	3.93	0.08	0.02	33.44
200 CE	28.33	1.12	0.07	0.02	29.54

Table 7.2 (*continued*)

	Energy capture	Organiza-tion	War-making capacity	Information technology	Total
300 CE	28.33	1.31	0.07	0.02	29.73
400 CE	28.33	1.87	0.07	0.02	29.99
500 CE	28.33	1.87	0.08	0.02	·30.30
600 CE	29.42	5.63	0.09	0.02	35.16
700 CE	29.42	9.36	0.11	0.02	38.91
800 CE	30.51	9.36	0.07	0.02	39.96
900 CE	31.06	7.00	0.07	0.02	38.69
1000 CE	32.15	9.36	0.08	0.02	41.61
1100 CE	32.69	9.36	0.09	0.02	42.17
1200 CE	33.23	9.36	0.09	0.03	42.71
1300 CE	32.69	7.50	0.11	0.04	40.34
1400 CE	31.06	4.68	0.12	0.05	35.91
1500 CE	32.69	6.35	0.10	0.06	39.20
1600 CE	33.78	6.55	0.12	0.07	40.52
1700 CE	35.96	6.09	0.15	0.09	45.29
1800 CE	39.23	10.30	0.12	0.13	49.78
1900 CE	53.40	16.39	1.00	0.30	71.09
2000 CE	113.33	250.00	12.50	189.00	564.83

Figure 7.2 shows on a log-linear scale shows what the Eastern and Western trends would look like if I have consistently underestimated Western development scores by 10 percent and overestimated Eastern scores by the same amount (i.e., the graph increases all the Western scores I have calculated by 10 percent, and reduces all the Eastern scores by 10 percent), and figure 7.3 shows the outcome if I have made the opposite error, underestimating Eastern development scores by 10 percent and overestimating Western scores by the same amount.

The first point to note is how much figures 7.2 and 7.3 strain credibility. Figure 7.2, raising Western and lowering Eastern scores by 10 percent, requires us to accept that in 1400 CE, as Zheng He was preparing to set sail on the Indian Ocean, the West was more

Table 7.1
Western social development scores, trait by trait, 14,000 BCE–2000 CE

	Energy capture	Organiza-tion	War-making capacity	Information technology	Total
14,000 BCE	4.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.36
13,000 BCE	4.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.36
12,000 BCE	4.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.90
11,000 BCE	5.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.45
10,000 BCE	5.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.45
9000 BCE	5.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.99
8000 BCE	6.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.54
7000 BCE	7.08	0.01	0.00	0.00	7.09
6000 BCE	7.63	0.03	0.00	0.00	7.66
5000 BCE	8.72	0.04	0.00	0.00	8.76
4000 BCE	10.90	0.05	0.00	0.00	10.95
3500 BCE	11.99	0.09	0.00	0.00	12.98
3000 BCE	13.08	0.42	0.01	0.01	13.52
2500 BCE	15.26	0.47	0.01	0.01	16.29
2250 BCE	17.44	0.33	0.01	0.01	17.79
2000 BCE	18.52	0.56	0.01	0.02	19.11
1750 BCE	20.65	0.61	0.02	0.02	21.30
1500 BCE	22.34	0.70	0.03	0.02	23.09
1400 BCE	22.88	0.75	0.03	0.02	23.68
1300 BCE	23.43	0.75	0.03	0.02	24.23
1200 BCE	22.88	0.75	0.04	0.02	23.69
1100 BCE	22.34	0.47	0.03	0.01	22.85
1000 BCE	21.79	0.47	0.03	0.01	22.30
900 BCE	22.34	0.47	0.04	0.02	22.87
800 BCE	22.88	0.70	0.05	0.02	23.65
700 BCE	23.43	0.94	0.07	0.02	24.45
600 BCE	23.97	1.17	0.07	0.02	25.23
500 BCE	25.06	1.40	0.08	0.03	26.56
400 BCE	26.15	1.40	0.09	0.03	27.67
300 BCE	28.33	1.40	0.09	0.03	29.85
200 BCE	29.42	2.81	0.10	0.03	32.36
100 BCE	31.06	3.75	0.11	0.04	35.50
1 BCE/CE	33.78	9.36	0.12	0.04	43.30
100 CE	33.78	9.36	0.12	0.04	43.30

Table 7.1 (*continued*)

	Energy capture	Organiza-tion	War-making capacity	Information technology	Total
200 CE	32.69	9.36	0.11	0.04	42.20
300 CE	31.60	7.49	0.10	0.03	39.22
400 CE	31.06	7.49	0.09	0.03	38.67
500 CE	30.51	4.23	0.07	0.03	·34.84
600 CE	28.33	1.41	0.04	0.02	29.80
700 CE	27.24	1.17	0.04	0.02	28.47
800 CE	27.24	1.64	0.04	0.02	28.94
900 CE	27.24	1.64	0.05	0.02	28.95
1000 CE	28.33	1.87	0.06	0.02	30.28
1100 CE	28.33	2.34	0.07	0.02	30.76
1200 CE	28.88	2.34	0.08	0.03	31.33
1300 CE	29.42	3.75	0.09	0.04	33.31
1400 CE	28.33	1.17	0.11	0.04	29.65
1500 CE	29.42	3.75	0.13	0.05	33.35
1600 CE	31.06	3.75	0.18	0.07	35.60
1700 CE	34.87	5.62	0.35	0.14	40.98
1800 CE	41.41	8.43	0.50	0.29	50.63
1900 CE	100.25	61.80	5.00	3.19	170.24
2000 CE	250.00	156.37	250.00	250.00	906.37

percent wide of the mark, that may—depending on the details—change the shape of the development curves enough to falsify my argument. If they are wrong by 20 percent or more, that would definitely falsify my argument.

According to the index, shown on a log-linear scale in figure 7.1, Western social development pulled ahead of the East's after 14,000 BCE. The East slowly caught up, especially after 2000 BCE, and through most of the first millennium BCE the West's lead was narrow. Around 100 BCE the West pulled further ahead again, but in 541 CE the Eastern line for the first time rose above the Western. The Eastern score then stayed ahead until 1773. Western development has been higher than Eastern for 92.5 percent of the time since the end of the Ice Age.

Table 5.1

War-making capacity since 4000 BCE (in social development points)

	West	East		West	East
4000 BCE	0	0	1 BCE/CE	0.12	0.08
3000 BCE	0.01	0	100 CE	0.12	0.08
2500 BCE	0.01	0	200 CE	0.11	0.07
2250 BCE	0.01	0	300 CE	0.10	0.07
2000 BCE	0.01	0	400 CE	0.09	0.07
1750 BCE	0.02	0	500 CE	0.07	0.08
1500 BCE	0.02	0.01	600 CE	0.04	0.09
1400 BCE	0.03	0.01	700 CE	0.04	0.11
1300 BCE	0.03	0.01	800 CE	0.04	0.07
1200 BCE	0.04	0.02	900 CE	0.05	0.07
1100 BCE	0.03	0.02	1000 CE	0.06	0.08
1000 BCE	0.03	0.03	1100 CE	0.07	0.09
900 BCE	0.04	0.03	1200 CE	0.08	0.09
800 BCE	0.05	0.02	1300 CE	0.09	0.11
700 BCE	0.07	0.02	1400 CE	0.11	0.12
600 BCE	0.07	0.03	1500 CE	0.13	0.10
500 BCE	0.08	0.04	1600 CE	0.18	0.12
400 BCE	0.09	0.05	1700 CE	0.35	0.15
300 BCE	0.09	0.06	1800 CE	0.50	0.12
200 BCE	0.10	0.07	1900 CE	5.00	1.00
100 BCE	0.11	0.08	2000 CE	250.00	12.50

I have opted for a 50:1 ratio between Western war-making capacity in 2000 CE and what it had been in 1900. This produces a Western war-making capacity in 1900 of just 5 points (as against 250 in 2000). This score is, obviously, no more than a guesstimate. A 100:1 ratio, producing a score for 1900 of 2.5 points, might be just as good a guess, although a 25:1 ratio, producing a score for 1900 of 10 points, strikes me as unlikely.

This margin of error is much higher than what I suggest for the social development index as a whole (chapter 7), but the enormous gap between the Western war-making score for 2000 CE and the scores for all earlier periods means that we can easily halve or double all pre-2000 scores without making any discernable difference to the