

Prados de la Escosura, Leandro

Working Paper

Capital in Spain, 1850-2019

EHES Working Paper, No. 197

Provided in Cooperation with:

European Historical Economics Society (EHES)

Suggested Citation: Prados de la Escosura, Leandro (2020) : Capital in Spain, 1850-2019, EHES Working Paper, No. 197, European Historical Economics Society (EHES), s.l.

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/247127>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

EHES Working Paper | No. 197 | October 2020

Capital in Spain, 1850-2019

Leandro Prados de la Escosura,
Universidad Carlos III and CEPR

Capital in Spain, 1850-2019^{*}

Leandro Prados de la Escosura¹,
Universidad Carlos III and CEPR

Abstract

The rising trend in the capital-output ratio and the productivity slowdown have put capital back in the economist's agenda. This paper contributes to the debate by providing new estimates of net capital stock and services for Spain over the last 170 years. The net capital (wealth) stock-GDP ratio rose over time and doubled in the last half-a-century. Capital services grew fast over the long-run accelerating in the 1920s and from the mid-1950s to 2007. Until 1975 its acceleration was helped by an increase in the 'quality' of capital. Capital deepening proceeded steadily, accelerating during 1955-1985, and slowing down thereafter for expanding sectors attracted less investment-specific technological progress. Although capital consumption rose over time, the rate of depreciation fell from 1970 to 2007 as new capital goods' relative prices declined due to embodied technological change.

JEL Codes: D24, E01, E22, N33, N34

Keywords: Capital Stock and Services, Capital Deepening, Capital-output ratio, Spain

^{*} I thank Eva Benages, Juan Carlos Robledo, Lorenzo Serrano, Ezequiel Uriel, and, especially, Matilde Mas and Ilya Voskoboynikov for their most valuable comments. Juan Carlos Robledo and Eva Benages kindly provided me with Ivie's detailed capital stock and capital services dataset. A research grant from Fundación Rafael del Pino is gratefully acknowledged.

¹ Corresponding Author: leandro.prados.delaescosura@uc3m.es

Notice

The material presented in the EHES Working Paper Series is property of the author(s) and should be quoted as such. The views expressed in this Paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views of the EHES or its members

I. Introduction

Capital is back in the economist's agenda. Thomas Piketty's (2014) claim of rising capital-output ratio over time has triggered an interest in historical research. The debate on the productivity slowdown has also stimulated the search for its historical roots and, in particular, the role played by capital accumulation.

By providing new estimates of net capital stock and capital services for Spain over the last 170 years this paper aims at contributing to both debates. Using OECD (2009) methodology consistent and integrated estimates of net capital (wealth) stock, relevant for welfare and distribution, and a volume index of capital services, relevant for productivity growth, have been constructed.¹ The main findings can be summarised as follows.

1) Capital input (namely, the flow of capital services into production) grew at 3.6% during the last 170 years accelerating in the 1920s and from the mid-1950s to the onset of the Global Financial Crisis (2008). Until 1975 the acceleration of capital input growth was helped by an increase in the 'quality' of capital, that is, a compositional shift towards more productive assets.

2) Capital deepening (that is, capital services per hour worked) grew steadily up to 1930, accelerating between the mid-1950s and mid-1980s, and slowing down thereafter, as expanding economic sectors attracted less investment-specific technological progress.

3) The net capital (wealth) stock-GDP ratio, at current prices, rose over time, with a 4-fold increase between 1886 and 2013, contradicting one of Kaldor's (1957) stylised facts, and doubled during the last half-a-century, in line with Piketty and Zucman (2014) findings for western Europe's wealth-income ratio.

4) The consumption of fixed capital (CFC) in terms of GDP increased over time, shadowing the capital-output ratio but, as a proportion of the net capital stock (that is, the rate of depreciation), only rose up to the 1960s, falling from 1970 to 2007 as the relative prices of new capital goods declined due to embodied technological change.

¹ By consistent and integrated estimates Oulton and Wallis (2016) mean a common dataset and a common set of assumptions in the construction of long run estimates of capital stock and capital services.

The paper is organized as follows. In section I the concepts, method, and sources used are discussed. Section II presents new estimates of net capital stock and productive capital stock derived with the Perpetual Inventory Method, tests its sensitivity, and compares the results to available series of capital stock. In Section III, a volume index of capital services, in which the user cost of capital is derived with an ex-ante exogenous rate of return, is provided. Then, the volume index of capital services (VICS) is compared to the productive capital stock, as a growing gap between them reveals the shift from low return and long live assets to higher return but shorter live assets, that is, an increase in the “quality” of capital. Next, trends in VICs and capital deepening are offered and weighed against available estimates. Lastly, Section IV offers the evolution of the capital-output ratio, as well as the consumption of fixed capital (% of GDP) and the depreciation rate (% net capital stock).

II. Capital Stock: Concept, Method, and Sources

The publication of the OECD Manual in 2009 (OECD, 2009) provided a unified methodology to measuring capital stock and services that builds bridges between OECD previous methodology and the one pioneered by Jorgenson (1963) and further developed by Jorgenson (1989, 1990) and Hulten (1990).² This paper follows the OECD approach and distinguish between net capital stock, also labelled wealth, which measures capital assets at their market price, and productive stock, an intermediate stage to derive a volume index of capital services (capital input), that is, the flow of capital services into production.

In the construction of net capital stock estimates, the Perpetual inventory Method (PIM) is used, cumulating flows of investment, corrected for retirement and depreciation, for each asset. Implementing the PIM requires, by type of asset, a) investment volumes and deflators; b) average service lives; c) depreciation rates; and d) an initial benchmark level of capital stock.

a) Four different types of asset have been distinguished: dwellings, other construction, transport equipment, and machinery and equipment, to which biological resources and intellectual property products have been added as information on these

² OECD (1993, 2001). For developments and applications of the Jorgenson approach, cf. Jorgenson and Griliches (1967), Hall and Jorgenson (1967), Christensen, Cummings, and Jorgenson (1980), Jorgenson, Gollop, and Fraumeni (1987), Elías (1978), and Young (1995).

two assets is only available in national accounts since 1980.³ No distinction has been made between ICT and non-ICT assets due to dearth of data in national accounts and to the aim of providing homogeneous long-run series of capital stock.⁴

Gross fixed capital formation (GFCF) volume series for each type of asset are obtained by deflating current values, and expressed in 2010 Euro. GFCF current value and deflator series come from Prados de la Escosura (2017, updated to 2019). GFCF series are derived from spliced national accounts for 1958-2019 (see Appendix A), and through the commodity flow method (CFM), that is, production and trade data to proxy investment by asset type, for 1850-1958.⁵

It is worth noting that the GFCF deflator series have been smoothed using a Hodrick-Prescott filter in order to avoid negative values for the unit user costs. The same smoothing procedure has been applied to the general price index used that, in our case, is the GDP deflator.⁶

b) The choice of average services lives, that is, the length of time that assets are retained in the capital stock, presents a challenge. Although choosing different average lives for different periods represents the usual historical practice (Feinstein, 1988; Prados de la Escosura and Rosés, 2010) a single set of average service lives is used here in order to facilitate comparisons with other estimates, as services lives for each asset type are kept constant in most country studies. Moreover, there is no concluding evidence that service lives fall over the long run, as offsetting tendencies are at work.⁷ Thus, dwellings and other construction are assigned average service lives of 60 and 40 years, respectively, while transport and machinery equipment are attributed 15 years

³ Conference Board (2020) follows the same practice. As a sensitivity test, we have replicated the estimates of net capital stock using six, rather than four types of assets (that is, considering, biological resources and intellectual property products separately) from 1980 onwards. No trend discrepancies are found between the two set of estimates even though the 6 assets estimates exhibit a slightly lower level (See Figures A5 and A10 in Appendix C).

⁴ See Pérez et al. (2019) and Conference Board (2020) for estimates for Spain which distinguish between ICT and non-ICT of assets.

⁵ The CFM approach is widely used to reconstruct GFCF series in present-day developing countries (Conference Board, 2017). Also, in the Penn World Tables 9.1, in the absence of direct estimates, investment in an asset is assumed to vary with the economy-wide supply (production + imports - exports) (Feenstra et al., 2015, updated).

⁶ Alternative estimates using the private consumption deflator provide similar results.

⁷ On the one hand, service lives tend to fall as “product cycles” become shorter and capital goods face higher rates of obsolescence but, on the other, some assets become more durable (OECD, 2009). Maddison (1995) used fixed average lives for his historical estimates.

each one.⁸ Nonetheless, compositional changes in the capital stock imply that the average service life of total capital varies over time and, in so far a shift towards more productive assets takes place, it declines.

c) As regards depreciation rates, a declining balance is chosen, that is, a geometric rate, $\delta = R/T$, being T the asset's average service life and R the selected parameter. Geometric depreciation rates differ across assets but are constant over time. Following US Bureau of Economic Analysis (Fraumeni, 1997) Hulten and Wykoff's (1981) directly computed depreciation rates and implicit R values, 1.65 for transport equipment and machinery and 0.91 for structures, have been accepted. The resulting depreciation rates are, thus, 1.52%, 2.28%, 11.0%, and 11.0% for dwellings, other constructions, transport equipment, and machinery and equipment (plus intellectual property and biological resources since 1980), respectively.⁹

d) In the absence of an initial stock of capital, two main approaches have been used to derive it. One assumes, after Harberger (1978), that the economy is at its steady-state and derives it for each asset type as,

$$W^{t0} = I^{t0} / (\delta + \theta) \quad (1)$$

being I, real investment; δ , the rate of depreciation; and θ , the growth rate of investment in early years.

An alternative to the steady state assumption approach is to estimate a functional relationship between real GFCF and GDP and, supposing that such a relationship is stable over time, to derive volume GFCF series for the previous period

⁸ These service lives are in line with those used by Pérez et al. (2019). Alternative estimates have been computed with another set of longer average service lives: 70 years (dwellings), 50 years (other construction), and 20 years (transport equipment and machinery). Although longer service lives increase the gross stock and reduce depreciation and, hence, deliver a larger net capital stock, the comparison between the two set of estimates reveals minor differences over time. A third set of estimates has been derived by combining the longer average lives set for 1850-1958 and the shorter average lives set for 1959-2019. Interestingly, the result is lower growth of aggregate capital stock than when the shorter lives set is employed for the entire time span. This finding may be attributed to the fact that the set of average assets lives for the pre-1958 period assigns larger weight to slower growing assets and, consequently, result in lower net capital stock. (See the resulting alternative Net Capital Stock/GDP ratios in Figure A11 in Appendix C).

⁹ Hulten and Wykoff (1981) implicit R values were also used in Prados de la Escosura and Rosés (2010). Alternative estimates have been obtained using a double declining balance ($T=2$) and the same average service lives, with the resulting depreciation rates of 3.3%, 5.0%, 13.3%, and 13.3% for each of the four asset types. Figure A12 in Appendix C compares the net capital stock derived alternatively with the double declining balance and Hulten and Wykoff's R values, revealing that the net capital stock derived with the double declining balance is lower as the depreciation rates are larger for the same average lives of assets, and so is the consumption of fixed capital (Figure A13).

on the basis of available GDP series. Here the relationship between each asset type and GDP has been estimated for 1850-1920 and the regression coefficients applied to the available real GDP estimates to produce GFCF volume series for each type of asset between 1780 and 1850.¹⁰

The initial (1850) level for each capital asset type has been derived with the PIM and the average lives and depreciation rates accepted for the post-1850 period with each approach. Figure 1 compares the results of the two approaches. It can be observed that their difference disappears by 1880. As the alternative option to the steady state approach seems to be less stringent, it has been preferred here.




Figure 1. Initial Net Capital Stock: Alternatives Estimates, 1850-1900 (2010 Million Euro) (natural logs)

Another important issue is how sensitive are the net capital stock series to the choice of its initial level. Thus, the estimates have been replicated adopting as initial

¹⁰ The OLS regression results are (with standard error in parentheses),
 $\ln(\text{Dwellings}) = -5.75 + 1.23 \ln(\text{GDP})$
(0.995) (0.095) Adj. R² = 0.70
 $\ln(\text{Other Construction}) = -11.23 + 1.70 \ln(\text{GDP})$
(1.271) (0.121) Adj. R² = 0.74
 $\ln(\text{Machinery}) = -29.07 + 3.19 \ln(\text{GDP})$
(1.062) (0.101) Adj. R² = 0.93
 $\ln(\text{Transport Equipment}) = -17.18 + 2.07 \ln(\text{GDP})$
(2.755) (0.263) Adj. R² = 0.47

capital both half and twice the level obtained in the favoured option. Figure 2 shows that differences diminish as time goes by and fade away by the 1920s. Thus, the estimates seem to be robust to alternative ways of computing the initial level for, at least, the last hundred years.




Figure 2. Initial Net Capital Stock: Sensitivity to Alternative Options, 1850-1930 (2010 Million Euro) (natural logs)

Next, the Net Capital Stock has been computed for 1850-2019 using the stock-flow relationship (PIM). If we define the net stock at the beginning (^B) of the first year, 1850, as $W^{1850,B}$, end-year (^E) net stocks for each asset in all consecutive years are,

$$W^{tE} = W^{tB} + I^t - \delta(I^t/2 + W^{tB}) \quad (2)$$

being I^t , real yearly gross fixed capital formation and δ , the rate of depreciation. All stocks are valued at average prices of 2010 and adding them up the Net Capital Stock in 2010 Euro is obtained.

The value of the consumption of fixed capital (depreciation) for each asset at 2010 prices, D^t/P_0^t , results from applying the rate of depreciation to the net stock at the beginning of the period plus half the current period's investment,

$$D^t/P_0^t = \delta[I^t/2 + W^{tB}]. \quad (3)$$

The net (wealth) capital stock at current prices, $P_0^t W^t$, is obtained by reflatting the average of the net capital stock at the beginning and the end of each year with the average yearly price index for each asset, P_0^t and, then, adding them up.

$$P_0^t W^t = P_0^t (W^{tB} + W^{tE})/2 \quad (4)$$

Similarly, the current value of the consumption of fixed capital, D^t , has been derived by revaluing its constant price value with the deflator for each asset, P_0^t .

$$D^t = \delta [I^t/2 + W^{tB}] P_0^t \quad (5)$$

A last step is to consider the destruction of capital stock resulting from the Spanish Civil War (1936-39). Although capital assets in transport equipment and dwellings derived through PIM appear to capture war damage, it does not seem to be the case for other construction and machinery as destruction estimates in the historical literature appear to be larger than those resulting from the PIM exercise. Hence, the historical estimates of asset destruction have been accepted and distributed it at constant yearly rates over 1936-39.¹¹ The resulting figures imply a 4.9% contraction of the total net capital stock between 1935 and 1939 which, by asset type, represent a fall of 2.0% (dwellings), 6.8% (other construction), 13.7% (machinery and equipment), and 30.4% (transport equipment), much lower than Maddison's (1995: 138) guesstimates for World War II destruction in belligerent European countries, except the UK.

How do the new estimates compare to the established Ivie's figures (Pérez et al., 2019) and to the recent computations of the net stock of fixed capital by the Spanish official statistical office, Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE)? Figure 3a presents the logarithmic deviations between the new estimates and these two sets at current prices and expressed in percentages.¹² The new estimates match rather closely INE's figures, with lower levels in the 2000s and higher ones in the 2010s, and an average absolute difference of 8.2% (standard deviation 3.8).

¹¹ The yearly rates assumed are -2.75% for other construction and -5.8% for machinery, following Prados de la Escosura and Rosés (2010). Although the destruction, as a share of net capital stock, is lower in the new estimates, 5% versus 7%, a fact that derives from the use of different asset average service lives and from methodological differences in the computation of the capital stock.

¹² The formula used is $100 * (\text{natural log } X - \text{natural log } Y)$, being X the new estimates and Y, Ivie and INE figures, alternatively.




Figure 3a. Net Capital Stock*: Differences with INE and Ivie Estimates, 1964-2017 (natural logs %) (current prices) * computed with Interpolated GFCF and declining balance.

However, with Ivie’s figures the average (absolute) difference is almost double, 15.6% (s.d. 6.0) during a similar time span, 2000-2016, and also for the entire period covered by Ivie’s estimates, 1964-2016, 15.5% (s.d. 10.5), although from the early 1990s onwards, the difference is positive, that is, the new estimates are larger, and negative, that is, smaller, in the three previous decades. Furthermore, Ivie figures are lower than INE’s and their average absolute (log) difference is 19.5% (s.d. 3.9).

Why such a discrepancy exist between the new historical estimates and Ivie’s? Two differential features may explain it. One is that although Ivie also uses geometric depreciation, it is double declining balance (that is, $R=2$), while following Fraumeni (1997), the new estimates adopt Hulten and Wykoff’s (1981) empirically obtained R . Another difference is that the GFCF series for the period 1965-1995 employed by Ivie have been spliced using the retropolation method, not through interpolation as in our case (See Appendix A). In Figure 3b we have replicated the comparison but, now, the new net capital stock estimates are computed with retropolated GFCF series and double declining balance geometric depreciation. The resulting gap between the two series narrows down remarkably with the average (absolute) difference shrinking to

7.1% (s.d. 8.0). Therefore, methodological differences explain about half of the discrepancy between the two set of estimates.




Figure 3b. Net Capital Stock computed with Interpolated GFCF and declining balance and with retropolated GFCF and Double Declining Balance: Differences with Ivие Estimates, 1964-2016 (natural logs %) (current prices)

Another test results from comparing the estimates obtained with the PIM and the capital stock derived from a wealth survey for 1965 (Universidad Comercial de Deusto, 1968-1972), often used to initialise capital stock series.¹³ It can be observed that the wealth survey exaggerates the size of the capital stock (Table 1).¹⁴

Table 1. Wealth Survey and Perpetual Inventory Method Estimates in 1965
(000 million Peseta)

| | (I) Wealth Survey | (II) PIM Estimate | (III) [(II)/(I)] |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Dwellings | 1166 | 1006 | 0.86 |
| Other Structures | 1236 | 827 | 0.67 |
| Machinery and Equipment | 633 | 352 | 0.56 |
| Transport Equipment | 194 | 146 | 0.75 |
| Total Capital Stock | 3229 | 2330 | 0.72 |

Sources: Universidad Comercial de Deusto (1968-72), reproduced in Myro (1983) Table 2.3; PIM estimates, see text.

¹³ For example, in Myro (1983) and Mas et al. (2000).

¹⁴ Cf. Young (1995: 650-1) for similar results in the cases of South Korea and Taiwan.

Lastly, productive stock, K^t , has been obtained by adding investment in the latest period to the net capital (wealth) stock,

$$K^t = I^t/2 + W^{tB} \quad (6)$$

It is worth noting that while to derive the net capital stock the cumulating flow of investment is corrected for retirement and depreciation, in the case of productive capital only efficiency losses are detracted. In practical terms, their difference results from the fact that the net capital is valued at the end of the year and the productive capital represents the average value in the year. Moreover, productive stocks for each type of asset are computed at constant prices only and used to derive capital service flows.




Figure 4a. Productive Capital Stock, 1950-2019: Comparison with PWT9.1 and Ivie Estimates (2010=100) (natural logs)

It is worth comparing our results for the productive capital stock (PKS) to those already available. Figure 4a presents the new estimates along those provided for Spain by the Penn World Tables 9.1 (PWT 9.1) (Feenstra et al., 2015, updated) and Ivie (Pérez et al., 2019) since 1950 and 1964, respectively. Although the three series present similar trends, the new estimates exhibit a steeper trend, that is, grow at a faster pace. The explanation of the differential partly lies in the use of retroplated GFCF series before 1995 and the double declining balance geometric depreciation, particularly in

the case of the PWT9.1 series, since the difference narrows down sharply when the new PKS estimates are replicated with retroplated GFCF series and double declining balance (Figure 4b). In the case of Ivie's series, however, other elements also contribute to explain it (i.e., its initial level derived from the 1965 wealth survey and a more detailed breakdown by asset type).




Figure 4b. Productive Capital Stock derived with GFCF retroplated series and double declining balance geometric depreciation, 1950-2019. Comparison with PWT9.1 and Ivie Estimates (2010=100) (logs)

III. Capital Services

We can now proceed to compute the capital input, that is, the flow of capital services into production. To do so, a volume index of capital services is derived as a weighted average of productive stock indices by type of asset in which each asset's share in total user cost of capital (that is, the current value of capital services) are the weights. This procedure implies that, for each asset, its flow of capital services is proportional to its productive stock, although the rate of variation of capital services differs across assets (Jorgenson and Griliches, 1967).

Thus, we need to compute the unit user cost of capital for each asset, that is, the price of capital services per unit of productive stock, and represents the marginal returns an asset generates during one period of production (OECD, 2009). Once

obtained, the unit use cost, F_0^t , is multiplied by the asset's productive capital stock, $K^{k,t}$, to derive the value of its capital services, $U^{k,t}$. Adding up all assets' values we get the total value of capital services, U^t .

Different rates of return have been used to compute the unit user cost in empirical studies. The *ex-post* endogenous rate of return is the realised rate of return and, in principle, preferable. For example, The Penn World Tables 9.1 (Feenstra et al., 2015, updated) and Conference Board (2020) use it. An *ex-post endogenous* rate of return equals the value of capital services to capital compensation in national income (that is, the gross operating surplus plus the capital share in gross mixed income), which is consistent with an economy of perfect competition and constant returns to scale (OECD, 2009).¹⁵ The use of an *ex-post endogenous* rate of return requires, however, a complete coverage of all assets and a distinction between market and government sectors. Otherwise, the rate of return will be biased.¹⁶ Unfortunately, our data do not meet such stringent requirements.

The alternative is, then, to compute an *ex-ante* rate of return, that is, the one expected by the investor.¹⁷ In an *ex-ante* approach, the rate of return for investment on a given asset should not be higher than in an alternative investments of comparable risk. The OECD Manual (OECD, 2009) recommends working with real rates of return

¹⁵ Thus, the endogenous, *ex-post* rate of return for every period is computed by equating capital compensation G^t plus capital related taxes on production T_K^t to the total user costs of capital U^t

$$G^t + T_K^t = U^t = \sum_{k=1}^N P_0^{k,tB} (1+\rho^t) [r^{t*} + \delta^k(1+i^{k,t*}) - i^{k,t*}] K^{k,t} \quad (7)$$

From which the *ex-post* endogenous real rate of return can be derived,

$$r^{t*} = \{(G^t + T_K^t) (1+\rho^t) - \sum_{k=1}^N P_0^{k,tB} [\delta_0^k(1+i^{k,t*}) - i^{k,t*}] K^{k,t}\} / \{\sum_{k=1}^N P_0^{k,tB} K^{k,t}\} \quad (8)$$

Then, the *ex-post* user cost per unit of capital services for a particular type of asset is obtained as

$$F_0^t = P_0^{k,tB} (1+\rho^t) [r^{t*} + \delta_0^k(1+i^{k,t*}) - i^{k,t*}] \quad (9)$$

where G^t Non-labour income consists of gross operating surplus and the part of mixed income that can be attributed to capital

T_K^t taxes on production

$P_0^{k,tB}$ is the purchase price of a new asset at the beginning (^B) of year t

ρ^t is the rate of change of the consumer price index at the beginning of period t

r^{t*} is the real rate of return that applies at the beginning of period t

δ^k is the rate of depreciation for a new asset k

$i^{k,t*}$ is the *ex-post*, real rate of asset price inflation for asset k during period t

$K^{k,t}$ is the productive capital stock of asset k during period t

¹⁶ Upwards biased if coverage is incomplete, since capital income will be compared to an under-valued capital stock, and downwards biased if no clear distinction is made between market and government sectors since, probably, only market capital income will be compared to the value of the total capital stock.

¹⁷ Nonetheless, capital services have also been derived using an *ex-post* endogenous rate of return in order to provide a contrast to the *ex-ante* exogenous estimates. See Appendix C.

and real changes in asset prices as they are independent from inflation and less volatile, and, in particular, suggests a 4% real rate of return, which is close to Spain's historical rate, and adopted in Ivie's estimates (Pérez et al., 2019).¹⁸ In fact, assuming a fixed real rate of return on investment matches one of Kaldor's (1957) stylised facts, namely, the rate of return on investment is roughly constant over long periods of time. It can be objected, though, that when an ex-ante exogenous rate of return is chosen the resulting value of capital services may not match capital compensation in national income.

The ex-ante unit user cost, or capital service price, F_0^t , can be defined as

$$F_0^t = P_0^{k,tB} (1+\rho_{(tB)}) [r_a^* + \delta_0(1+i_{(tB)}^*) - i_{(tB)}^*] \quad (10)$$

The ex-ante user cost of an asset,

$$U^{k,t} = F_0^t K^{k,t} \quad (11)$$

And the total user cost of capital,

$$U^t = \sum_{k=1} U^{k,t} \quad (12)$$

being $P_0^{k,tB}$ the purchase price of a new asset at the beginning (^B) of year t, $\rho_{(tB)}$ the rate of change of the price index (GDP deflator) at the beginning (^B) of year t, r_a^* the real rate of return (the nominal rate corrected for inflation), 4%, in this case, $i_{(tB)}^*$ the real anticipated change in asset prices at beginning (^B) of year t, δ_0 the rate of depreciation of a new asset, $K^{k,t}$ the productive capital stock of asset k during period t

Furthermore, a simplified ex-ante exogenous rate of return can be derived by setting the anticipated real holding gains term i^{*t} equal to zero. Although this approach has the advantage that does not require to estimate anticipated real holding gains, it is only a reasonable alternative if asset price changes do not deviate significantly from changes in the GDP deflator. The resulting user cost, then, becomes,

$$SF_0^t = P_0^{k,tB} (1+\rho_{(tB)}) [r_a^* + \delta_0] \quad (13)$$

Lastly, a Törnqvist index of aggregate capital services is computed as,

$$\ln(KS^{k,t}/KS^{k,t-1}) = \sum \bar{v}^{k,t} \ln(K^{k,t}/K^{k,t-1}) \quad (14)$$

¹⁸ Actually, in Ivie's estimates 4% real rate of return is chosen for the market sector and 3.5% rate for the non-market sector. The average real rate of return of bank deposits in Spain since 1850 is 4.5% (computed from underlying data in Prados de la Escosura and Rosés (2010), updated to 2019).

where $K^{k,t}$ is the productive capital stock of asset k and $\bar{v}^{k,t} = \frac{1}{2} (v^{k,t-1} + v^{k,t})$ the two adjacent year average share of each asset in total user cost of capital, being $v^{k,t} = U^{k,t}/U$. Then, the volume index of capital services (VICS) is obtained as the exponential.




Figure 5. Net Capital Stock Composition (current prices) (%)

It is worth noting the different weighting of the capital stock (the share of assets in its total current value) and the index of capital services (the share of assets in total returns to capital). Figure 5 shows the composition of the net capital stock, dominated by structures (dwellings and other construction) that in spite of the long-term fall in the share of dwellings until the early 1990s and the rise of machinery and equipment up to the early 1960s, still contribute four-fifths of the net capital stock value in 2019. A different and more volatile picture results from the composition of capital returns as assets with lower average service lives (and, hence, higher depreciation rates) have higher marginal returns (Figure 6). Thus, machinery and equipment matches the share of other construction since mid-20th century and the share of dwellings declines more than in the net capital stock.¹⁹

¹⁹ Similar trends, although less marked, and machinery and equipment never matches other construction, are observed when the ex-post endogenous rate of return is used (Figure A1).




Figure 6. Capital Services' Composition (ex-ante exogenous rate of return) (current prices) (%)

But how different is the composition of capital services when they are obtained with the simplified ex-ante exogenous rate of return, as favoured in Ivie's estimates (Pérez et al., 2019)? Similar but less volatile trends appear even though machinery and equipment's remains below other construction's share (Figure A2), but the validity of the simplified approach depends on the stability of relative GFCF prices.

Figure 7 offers the evolution of the price of each type of asset relative to the GDP deflator and shows how they fluctuate.²⁰ For example, the relative price of both machinery and transport equipment experienced a decline between the late 1850s and 1880s, that coincided with the railways construction and the early stage of industrialisation, and a sustained fall from the 1950s, steeper until the late 1970s. Embodied technological change in helps explain these assets' trends. Thus, assuming that assets' prices mimic the general price index is unrealistic and alters the weighting of the volume index of capital services.

²⁰ Similar results are obtained using the private consumption deflator.




Figure 7. GFCF Prices Relative to the GDP Deflator (2010=1) (Hodrick-Prescott smoothed)




Figure 8. Volume Index of Capital Services (ex-ante exogenous rate of return) and Productive Capital Stock, (1850=100) (natural logs)

The different weighting of the net capital stock and capital services also reflects in the evolution of productive capital stock and the volume index of capital services

since VICS grows faster than PKS as more dynamic assets are usually those of shorter average service life but higher returns. Figure 8 confirms their divergent evolution that has widened since the 1970s.²¹

An index of capital “quality” that measures the capital input’s composition effect can be derived as the ratio between the volume index of capital services and that of productive capital stock,

$$KQ^{k,t} = KS^{k,t} / K^{k,t} \quad (15)$$




Figure 9. Capital Quality (ex-ante exogenous rate of return) (1850=1)

Note: Capital Quality = Ratio of Volume Index of Capital Services to Productive Capital Stock

Figure 9 shows a long run increase in the “quality” of capital, punctuated by reversals, in which a contraction during the Civil War (1936-39) and its autarkic aftermath (1939-53) and a fast increase between the mid-1950s and the late 1970s, followed by deceleration, stand out. A rise in the index signals a shift towards capital goods with higher unit user costs and, hence, higher marginal productivity.²²

²¹ The gap is narrower gap when VICS is obtained with an ex-post endogenous, rather than an ex-ante exogenous rate of return. This finding is consistent with the presumed underestimate of capital services derived with an ex-post endogenous rate of return when information on capital assets is incomplete as it is our case (Figure A3).

²² Although the evolution of “quality” of capital using alternatively ex-ante exogenous and ex-post endogenous rates of return share the same tendencies, the level of capital “quality” is lower for the

It is worth stressing that the VICS derived with the full and simplified ex-ante exogenous rate of return are practically identical until 1970 when the ‘simplified’ VICS lags gradually behind the “full” VICS (Figure A4). Thus, the choice of a ‘simplified’ VICS underestimates the improvement in capital quality since the late 1960s (Figure A6b).




Figure 10. Volume Index of Capital Services*: Comparison with Prados de la Escosura and Rosés (2010) (1850=100) (natural logs) *ex-ante exogenous rate of return

A comparison between the new volume index of capital services and earlier estimates is pertinent. In the first place, let us compare the new results with Prados de la Escosura and Rosés (2010) estimates, under similar assumptions (namely, Hulten and Wykoff’s declining balance depreciation rates and GFCF series spliced through interpolation). A common pattern is found but the new VICS presents lower levels, although tend to converge in the late 20th century (Figure 10). Such a difference may derive from the lower (and fixed) average service lives used here, while Prados de la Escosura and Rosés employed higher (and variable) average service lives, which, by increasing the gross stock and reducing depreciation, result in a larger net capital stock.

latter as could be anticipated due to the possible underestimate of capital services when they are computed with incomplete information (Figure A6a).




Figure 11a. Volume Index of Capital Services: Comparison with PWT9.1, CB, and Ivie Estimates, 1950-2019 (2010=100) (natural logs)




Figure 11b. VICs, 1950-2019. Alternative estimates derived with GFCF retroplated series and double declining balance Comparison with PWT9.1, CB, and Ivie Estimates (1850=100) (natural logs)

Another contrast is carried out with VICS derived by PWT9.1 and Ivie (Pérez et al., 2019) to which Conference Board (2020) estimates since 1990 have been added. Slower growth result from PWT9.1 and Ivie series, but slightly faster from the Conference Board series (Figure 11a).²³ The main explanation of the different pace of growth is that both PWT9.1 and Ivie estimates are based on pre-1995 GFCF series spliced through retropolation, unlike the new VICS that draw on GFCF interpolated series. Figure 11b confirms that when VICS are derived using retropolated GFCF series and double declining balance geometric depreciation, the gap with PWT9.1 and Ivie narrows down sharply, especially from the late 1970s onwards. Moreover, as PWT9.1 estimates are derived with an ex-post endogenous rates of return, the differential narrows further down when the new VICS are computed with this rate of return (Figure A8). The comparison in terms of capital quality, that is, the ratio between capital services and productive capital indices, reveals that quality gains are much larger in the new estimates and Ivie's than in the PWT9.1 ones (Figure 12).²⁴




Figure 12. Capital Quality: Comparison with PWT9.1 and Ivie Estimates, 1950-2019 (2010=1)

²³ See Figure A7 for a comparison that included the new estimates derived with both ex-ante exogenous and ex-post endogenous rate of return.

²⁴ Figure A9 adds up the new estimates of capital quality derived with ex-post endogenous rate of return that exhibits milder gains than when obtained with the ex-ante exogenous rate of return..

Table 2. Capital input* Growth, 1850-2019 (annual average logarithmic rates %)

*ex-ante exogenous rate of return

| | Productive Capital Stock | Capital Quality | Capital Input |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| 1850-2019 | 3.0 | 0.5 | 3.6 |
| 1850-1872 | 2.2 | 0.4 | 2.6 |
| 1873-1892 | 1.9 | 0.2 | 2.2 |
| 1893-1913 | 2.1 | 0.3 | 2.4 |
| 1914-1919 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 2.0 |
| 1920-1929 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 4.2 |
| 1930-1935 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 3.2 |
| 1936-1939 | -0.8 | -0.9 | -1.7 |
| 1940-1945 | 1.4 | -0.3 | 1.1 |
| 1946-1953 | 2.5 | 0.1 | 2.6 |
| 1954-1958 | 4.6 | 1.4 | 6.1 |
| 1959-1975 | 6.6 | 1.7 | 8.3 |
| 1976-1985 | 4.7 | 0.5 | 5.2 |
| 1986-2007 | 4.6 | 0.3 | 4.9 |
| 2008-2013 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 2.7 |
| 2014-2019 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 1.6 |

What are the observed trends in capital input? Capital services grew at 3.6% during the last 170 years but its pace was uneven. It is possible to distinguish a period of steady growth, slightly above 2% per year, up to 1920, in which the compositional change of capital (capital quality) represented a minor proportion (Table 2). In the 1920 the growth rate doubled, with more than one-third contributed by capital quality. The slowdown of the early 1930s did not revert to the pre-1920 growth, thanks to its compositional change. After shrinking during the Civil War and recovering mildly in World War II years, capital input growth went back to its pre-1920 growth trend until the mid-1950s when began an acceleration that lasted for half a century and was cut short by the onset of the Global Financial Crisis (2008). During Spain's delayed and short Golden Age (1959-75) capital input growth was nearly four-fold that of the pre-1920 era, with capital quality contributing at least one-fifth of it. The oil shocks that coincided with the decade of 'transition to democracy' (1976-85) represented a substantial slowdown in absolute and per capita GDP but not in terms of capital input that, with hardly any quality improvement, kept growing at 5% yearly during the 'transition' decade and after Spain's accession to the European Union. The

Great Recession (2008-13) nearly halved the post-1975 rate of capital services growth and, since 2014, capital input has been growing at the slowest pace since World War II.

Table 3. Capital Deepening* Growth, 1850-2019 (annual average logarithmic rate %)

*ex-ante exogenous rate of return

| | Productive Capital Stock/hour | Capital Input/hour |
|------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1850-2019 | 2.6 | 3.1 |
| 1850-1872 | 1.6 | 2.0 |
| 1873-1892 | 1.9 | 2.1 |
| 1893-1913 | 1.5 | 1.8 |
| 1914-1919 | 0.8 | 1.6 |
| 1920-1929 | 2.3 | 3.6 |
| 1930-1935 | 0.4 | 1.6 |
| 1936-1939 | -0.1 | -1.1 |
| 1940-1945 | 0.7 | 0.4 |
| 1946-1953 | 1.2 | 1.3 |
| 1954-1958 | 3.9 | 5.3 |
| 1959-1975 | 6.4 | 8.1 |
| 1976-1985 | 7.8 | 8.3 |
| 1986-2007 | 2.2 | 2.5 |
| 2008-2013 | 5.7 | 5.7 |
| 2014-2019 | -0.8 | -0.6 |




Figure 13. Capital Deepening* (2010=100) (natural logs of x100 level)

Note: * Volume Index of Capital Services (ex-ante exogenous rate of return) per Hour Worked.

If we look now at the volume of capital services per hour worked, that is, capital intensity or deepening, it grew steady up to 1930 and after nearly stagnating for two decades, it expanded at an accelerated pace between the early-mid 1950s and mid-1980s (Table 3 and Figure 13). Capital deepening slowed down thereafter, particularly between the mid-1990s and 2007 and, after a spurt during the Great Recession, has declined mildly in recent years. A comparison with alternative capital deepening figures shows that the new estimates grew faster than those resulting PWT9.1 and slightly slower than Conference Board's since 1989 (Figure 14).




Figure 14. Capital Deepening*, 1950-2019: Comparison with PWT9.1 and Ivie (2010=100) (natural logs)
 * Volume Index of Capital Services (ex-ante exogenous rate of return) per Hour Worked.

It is worth highlighting the inverse association between capital deepening and employment growth in post-Franco's Spain (Figure 15). Employment destruction during the decade of 'transition to democracy' (1976-85) and the Great Recession (2008-13) contribute to explain capital deepening in those years; conversely, from the accession to the EU to the onset of the Global Financial Crisis (1986-2007), and in the post-2014 recovery, employment creation underlies the deceleration and contraction in capital deepening. Thus, capital deepening slowdown since 1986 suggests that expanding sectors have not attracted much investment-specific technological progress.




Figure 15. Volume Index of Capital Services* (ex-ante exogenous rate of return): Growth Breakdown (%)
 Note: * VICS = VICS/hour x Hours worked

IV. Capital-Output Ratio and Capital Consumption

Capital has a dual nature as a storage of wealth and provider of capital services to production (OECD, 2009). So far the focus has been on capital services. Let us now look at the evolution of wealth or net capital stock.

Piketty's (2014) claim of a fluctuating capital-output ratio going back to the 18th century has challenged one of Kaldor's (1957) stylised facts, namely, the stability of the capital-output ratio. Such claim is, nonetheless, hardly news for economic historians who have long been sceptical about empirical regularities. Prados de la Escosura and Rosés (2010) challenged the long-run stability of the capital-output ratio, and Gallardo-Albarrán and inklaar (2020) have rejected it for more than 30 countries over the last hundred years.

The evolution of Net Capital Stock ratio to GDP, expressed at current prices, shows that after declining until the early 1880s, a sustained increase took place, with the capital-output ratio rising 4-fold between 1886 and 2013 (Figure 16). A first phase of expansion reached up to the early 1930s, in which the ratio more than doubled, peaking during the Civil War (1936-39) for economic activity severely contracted. Relative stability from the late 1940s to 1960, with the ratio ranging between 2.0 and

2.5, was followed by a dramatic fall until the mid-1960s, at a time of fast economic growth, and a subsequent recovery that heralded a strong and sustained increase in the capital-output ratio, punctuated by reversals in the late 1980s and, again, in the late 2010s.




Figure 16. Net Capital Stock/GDP Ratio (current prices): With and Without Dwellings




Figure 17. Capital Productivity (ex-ante exogenous rate of return) (2010=100) (natural logs)

Note: Capital Productivity: Ratio of Real GDP to Volume Index of Capital Services

The sustained rise of the capital-output ratio and capital deepening led to the decline of capital productivity (that is, real GDP per VICS) over the long run (Figure 17).

From the late 1990s low interest rates and the scarcity of urban land fuelled a boom in the price of dwellings -as the increase in the relative price of dwellings until the mid-2000s confirms (Figure 7)- that contributed to the rise of the capital-output ratio. That is why the capital-output ratio excluding dwellings is also presented. The same trends, but with less intensity, are confirmed.

The evolution of the capital-output ratio in Spain matches the experience a large sample of countries during the last century in which the capital output ratio doubled (Gallardo-Albarrán and Inklaar, 2020), although the increase seems to have been more intense in the Spanish case, unlike the UK's where the capital-output ratio stopped its expansion and declined during the last two decades of the past century (Oulton and Wallis, 2016). By 2013, the capital (wealth)-output ratio at current prices reached a value of 4, when it was just 2 in 1970, in line with Piketty and Zucman (2014) findings for western European countries. However, this represents practically half the ratio of personal wealth to national income estimated for Spain, although it also doubled during the same time span (Artola Blanco et al., 2018). A necessary caveat is that private wealth estimates add financial assets to the net capital (wealth) stock (that is, non-financial assets), while exclude financial liabilities.

The consumption of fixed capital, expressed as a proportion of GDP, follows the pattern of the capital-output ratio, jumping from 3 to nearly 15% between the late 1880s and 2013 (Figure 18). However, when the ratio of capital consumption to net capital stock -that is, the depreciation rate- is considered, it expanded up to the mid-1930s and, again, since 1950, peaking in the late 1960s, and, then, declined steadily until the mid-2000s, to rebound later. What explains this behaviour? As the composition of capital stock changes towards more productive but higher depreciation assets, one would expect a rise in the depreciation rate. However, new capital goods are more productive as they embodied new vintage technology, so a decline in its relative prices would accompany its expansion (Figure 7) and helps explain the fall in the rate of depreciation between 1970 and 2007.²⁵

²⁵ It is worth stressing that the described patterns for the capital-output ratio and the consumption of fixed capital are confirmed for alternative estimates derived using different average service lives and




Figure 18. Consumption of Fixed Capital (% GDP) and Depreciation Rate (CFC as % Net Capital Stock), (current prices).

VI. Conclusions

The on-going debate on the rising trend in the capital-output ratio and the productivity slowdown requires long run, consistent, and integrated series of output and production factors. This paper presents new estimates of net capital (wealth) stock and capital services for Spain during the last 170 years that allow us to address welfare and growth issues.

The new net capital stock estimates are not off the mark when compared to official national statistical series for the early 21st century and their differences for the last half a century with the Penn World Tables 9.1 and Ivie's figures largely result from methodological differences.

Capital services expanded over time accelerating in the 1920s and between the mid-1950s and 2007, with capital 'quality' contributing until 1975. Capital deepening increased in the long-run, especially from 1955 to 1985, slowing down after Spain's

depreciation rates. Longer lives, by reducing depreciation, increase the level of net capital stock (Figure A11), and the use of the double declining balance implies higher depreciation rates which increases capital consumption and, hence, reduces the level of net capital stock (Figure A12), while increases the ratio of the consumption of fixed capital ratio to GDP and net capital stock, respectively (Figure A13).

accession to the European Union, as expanding economic sectors attracted less investment-specific technological progress.

The net capital (wealth) stock-GDP ratio rose over time, contradicting Kaldor's (1957) stylised fact while confirming Piketty and Zucman (2014) results. Although the consumption of fixed capital (% GDP) shadowed the capital-output ratio, the rate of depreciation fell from 1970 to the onset of the Global Financial Crisis as new capital goods' relative prices declined due to embodied technological change.

The inverse association between capital deepening and employment growth in post-Franco's Spain mimics the behaviour of labour productivity, which raises when employment falls and declines when employment expands (Prados de la Escosura, 2017). How much did capital deepening contribute to raising labour productivity over the long run? Providing an answer is the matter for a new investigation.

References

Artola Blanco, M., L. Estévez Bauluz, and C. Martínez-Toledano (2018), "Wealth in Spain, 1900-2014: A Country of Two Lands", World Inequality Lab Working Papers 2018/5 <https://hal-pse.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-02878216>

Christensen, L.R., D. Cummings, and D.W. Jorgenson (1980), "Economic Growth, 1947-1973: An International Comparison," in J.W. Kendrick and B.N. Vaccara (eds.) *New Developments in Productivity Measurement and Analysis*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press/NBER, pp. 595-698.

Conference Board (2020), Total Economy Database. Growth Accounting and Total Factor Productivity, 1990-2019, dataset accessible at <https://www.conference-board.org/data/economydatabase/total-economy-database-productivity>

Elías, V.J. (1978), "Sources of Economic Growth in Latin American Countries", *Review of Economics and Statistics* 60 (3) (Aug., 1978): 362-370.

Feinstein, C.H. (1988), "Sources and Methods of Estimation for Domestic Reproducible Fixed Assets, Stocks and Works in Progress, Overseas Assets, and Land", in C.H. Feinstein and S. Pollard, eds., *Studies in Capital Formation in the United Kingdom 1750-1920*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 257-471.

Feenstra, R. C., R. Inklaar and M.P. Timmer (2015), "The Next Generation of the Penn World Table", *American Economic Review* 105 (10): 3150-3182, Updated dataset at www.ggdnc.net/pwt

Fraumeni, B.M. (1997), "The Measurement of Depreciation in the U.S. National Income and Product Accounts, *Survey of Current Business* July: 7-23

Gallardo-Albarrán, D. And R. Inklaar (2020), "The Role of Capital and Productivity in Accounting for Income Differences Since 1913", *Journal of Economic Surveys* (forthcoming).

Hall, R. and D.W. Jorgenson (1967), "'Tax Policy and Investment Behavior,'" *American Economic Review* 57 (3): 391-414

Harberger, A. (1978), "Perspectives on Capital and Technology in Less Developed Countries", in M.J. Artis and A.R. Nobay (eds.), *Contemporary Economic Analysis*, London: Croom Helm, pp. 15-40.

Hulten, Ch. (1990), "The measurement of capital", in E. Berndt and J. Tripplett (eds), *Fifty Years of Economic Measurement. The Jubilee of the Conference on Research in Income and Wealth*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press// NBER, pp. 119-152.

Hulten, Ch. and F. Wykoff (1981), "The Estimation of Economic Depreciation Using Vintage Asset Prices", *Journal of Econometrics* 15: 367-96.

Jorgenson, D.W. (1989), "Capital as a Factor of Production", in D.J. Jorgenson and R. Landau (eds.), *Technology and Capital Formation*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 1-35.

Jorgenson, D.W. (1990), "Productivity and Economic Growth", in E. Berndt and J. Tripplett (eds.), *Fifty Years of Economic Measurement. The Jubilee of the Conference on Research in Income and Wealth*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press and NBER, pp. 19-118.

Jorgenson, D. W (1963), "Capital Theory and Investment Behavior", *American Economic Review* 53 (2): 247–259.

Jorgenson, D.W. and Z. Griliches (1967), "The Explanation of Productivity Change", *Review of Economic Studies* 39 (3) 99: 249-282.

Jorgenson, D.W., F. Gollop and B. Fraumeni (1987), *Productivity and US Economic Growth*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kaldor, N. (1957), "A Model of Economic Growth", *Economic Journal* 67 (268): 591–624

Maddison, A. (1995), "Standardised Estimates of Fixed Capital Stock: A Six Country Comparison", in A. Maddison, *Explaining the Economic Performance of Nations. Essays in Time and Space*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar, pp. 137-66.

Mas, M., F. Pérez, and E. Uriel (2000), "Estimation of the Stock of Capital in Spain", *Review of Income and Wealth* 46 (1): 103-116.

Myro, R. (1983), "La evolución de la productividad global de la economía española en el período 1965-1981", *Información Comercial Española* 594: 115-127.

OECD (1993), *Methods Used by OECD Countries to Measure Stocks of Fixed Capital*. National Accounts: Sources and Methods No. 2, Paris: OECD.

OECD (2001), *Measuring Capital: Measurement of Capital Stock, Consumption of*

OECD (2009), *Measuring Capital: OECD Manual*, Paris: OECD.

Oulton, N. And G. Wallis (2016), "Capital Stocks and Capital Services: Integrated and Consistent Estimates for the United Kingdom, 1950–2013", *Economic Modelling* 54: 117-125.

Pérez, F., M. Mas, L. Serrano and E. Uriel (2019), El stock de capital en España y sus comunidades autónomas, Fundación BBVA, Documentos de Trabajo 1.

Piketty, T. (2014), *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Piketty, T. and G. Zucman (2014), "Capital is Back: Wealth-Income Ratios in Rich Countries 1700–2010", *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 129 (3): 1255–1310.

Prados de la Escosura, L. (2016), "Mismeasuring Long Run Growth. The Bias from Spliced National Accounts: The Case of Spain", *Cliometrica* 10 (3): 251-275

Prados de la Escosura, L. (2017), *Spanish Economic Growth, 1850-2015*, London: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://www.palgrave.com/la/book/9783319580418> Updated data accessible at https://frdelpino.es/investigacion/en/category/01_social-sciences/01_spanish-economy/04_historical-perspective-1850-2018-spanish-economy/

Prados de la Escosura, L. and J.R. Rosés, (2010), "Capital Accumulation in the Long-Run: The Case of Spain, 1850-2000", *Research in Economic History* 27: 141-200.

Universidad Comercial de Deusto (1968-1972), *Riqueza nacional de España*, Bilbao: Universidad Comercial de Deusto. 5 vols.

Young, A. (1995), "The Tyranny of Numbers: Confronting the Statistical Realities of the East Asian Growth Experience", *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 90, 2: 641-80.

Appendix A. A Note on Splicing GFCF Series in Spain's National Accounts

Available national accounts' series are provided for different and usually short periods on the basis of different benchmark or reference years and different methodologies. In order to present a single homogeneous series, splicing is required. There is no consensus on how to do it. The most frequent splicing procedure has been retropolation in which the value provided by the latest benchmark estimate is projected backward with the rate of variation for previous benchmark series so the earlier series is re-scaled to match the new benchmark level. The practical advantage is that it preserves the rate of variation of the earlier benchmark series. On the downside, however, retropolation tends to overexaggerate past levels since new rounds of national accounts introduce new definitions and classifications and new sources and estimation procedures that usually translate into higher levels for the new benchmark series at the year in which the new and the old benchmark series overlap.

The interpolation method, instead, accepts the levels computed directly for each benchmark-year as the best possible estimates -as they are computed with 'complete' information on quantities and prices-, and distributes the gap between the 'new' and 'old' benchmark series in the overlapping year at a constant rate over the time span in between the old and new benchmark years. By respecting the levels for the different benchmark years, the interpolation method alters the rate of variation, unlike the retropolation method. The consequence is that earlier levels are usually lower in the interpolated series than in the retroplated series.

In other words, the retropolation method presumes the error lies in the level of the 'old' series, but not in its rate of variation. The interpolation method challenges this assumption and deems the cumulative result of the emergence of new goods and services, not considered in the old benchmark series, the source of error.

The interpolation method appears provides a superior alternative, supported by the fact that recent rounds of national accounts have chosen it. In the case of Spain, for 1995-2019, national accounts provide spliced estimates in which, once adjustments are made for methodological changes, the different benchmark series are interpolated (Prados de la Escosura (2016, 2017)). Thus, the dilemma about the splicing method

refers only to the pre-1995 period (with the exception of 198-86 in which national accounts were also interpolated).²⁶

More specifically, since the 2000 benchmark (CNE00) the *interpolation* method was used after adjusting upwards the old benchmark series for methodological changes. Thus, the gap between, say, CNE15 and CNE10 in the year 2015, was decomposed into methodological and statistical plus other differences. Firstly, CNE10 series for 2010-2014 were adjusted upwards for methodological discrepancies with CNE15. Then, the *residual* gap, due to statistical and other differences, was distributed at a constant rate throughout the in-between benchmarks years, 2011-2014.²⁷ A detailed discussion of the splicing of Spanish national accounts and the available alternatives is provided in Prados de la Escosura (2017, Ch. 9)

https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-58042-5_9

²⁶ A break in the linkage of GDP series through retropolation was introduced in CNE86, when national accounts were spliced using the interpolation approach and the GDP differential between CEN86 and CEN80 in 1985 was distributed at a constant rate over the years 1981-1984.

²⁷ The Spanish Statistical Institute notes, for example, “The [remaining] differences between both estimates [say, CNE00 and CNE95 in the year 2000] are due to the statistical changes, and given that information is not available regarding how and at what time they have been generated, it is assumed that this has occurred progressively over time, from the beginning of the previous base” (INE, 2007: 5).

Appendix B. Statistical Series

Table A1

Net Capital Stock and Consumption of Fixed Capital, 1850-2019 (million current Euro)

| | Dwellings | Other Construction | Machinery and Equipment* | Transport Equipment | Total | Consumption of Fixed Capital |
|------|-----------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-------|---------------------------------|
| 1850 | 24 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 40 | 0.9 |
| 1851 | 23 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 40 | 0.9 |
| 1852 | 24 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 40 | 0.9 |
| 1853 | 24 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 40 | 0.9 |
| 1854 | 23 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 40 | 0.9 |
| 1855 | 23 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 39 | 0.9 |
| 1856 | 23 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 39 | 0.9 |
| 1857 | 23 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 40 | 0.9 |
| 1858 | 23 | 15 | 1 | 2 | 41 | 1.0 |
| 1859 | 24 | 15 | 1 | 2 | 42 | 1.1 |
| 1860 | 25 | 16 | 1 | 2 | 44 | 1.1 |
| 1861 | 26 | 17 | 1 | 2 | 46 | 1.2 |
| 1862 | 27 | 18 | 1 | 3 | 48 | 1.2 |
| 1863 | 27 | 19 | 1 | 3 | 50 | 1.3 |
| 1864 | 28 | 19 | 1 | 3 | 51 | 1.4 |
| 1865 | 28 | 20 | 1 | 3 | 53 | 1.4 |
| 1866 | 28 | 20 | 1 | 4 | 53 | 1.5 |
| 1867 | 28 | 20 | 1 | 4 | 54 | 1.5 |
| 1868 | 28 | 21 | 1 | 4 | 55 | 1.6 |
| 1869 | 28 | 21 | 1 | 4 | 54 | 1.5 |
| 1870 | 28 | 21 | 1 | 4 | 54 | 1.5 |
| 1871 | 28 | 21 | 1 | 4 | 55 | 1.5 |
| 1872 | 29 | 21 | 1 | 4 | 55 | 1.5 |
| 1873 | 29 | 22 | 1 | 4 | 56 | 1.5 |
| 1874 | 29 | 22 | 1 | 4 | 56 | 1.5 |
| 1875 | 30 | 22 | 1 | 3 | 56 | 1.5 |
| 1876 | 30 | 22 | 1 | 3 | 56 | 1.5 |
| 1877 | 30 | 22 | 1 | 3 | 57 | 1.5 |
| 1878 | 30 | 22 | 1 | 3 | 57 | 1.5 |
| 1879 | 30 | 22 | 1 | 4 | 57 | 1.6 |
| 1880 | 30 | 22 | 2 | 4 | 58 | 1.6 |
| 1881 | 30 | 22 | 2 | 4 | 58 | 1.6 |
| 1882 | 30 | 22 | 2 | 4 | 58 | 1.6 |
| 1883 | 30 | 22 | 2 | 4 | 59 | 1.7 |
| 1884 | 31 | 23 | 2 | 5 | 60 | 1.8 |
| 1885 | 31 | 23 | 2 | 5 | 60 | 1.8 |
| 1886 | 31 | 23 | 2 | 5 | 60 | 1.8 |
| 1887 | 31 | 23 | 2 | 5 | 60 | 1.8 |
| 1888 | 31 | 23 | 2 | 4 | 60 | 1.8 |
| 1889 | 31 | 23 | 2 | 4 | 61 | 1.8 |
| 1890 | 31 | 24 | 3 | 4 | 62 | 1.8 |

| | | | | | | |
|------|-----|-----|----|----|-----|------|
| 1891 | 32 | 24 | 3 | 4 | 63 | 1.8 |
| 1892 | 33 | 25 | 3 | 4 | 64 | 1.9 |
| 1893 | 33 | 26 | 3 | 4 | 66 | 1.9 |
| 1894 | 34 | 27 | 3 | 3 | 68 | 1.9 |
| 1895 | 35 | 27 | 3 | 3 | 70 | 2.0 |
| 1896 | 36 | 28 | 4 | 3 | 72 | 2.0 |
| 1897 | 37 | 29 | 4 | 3 | 74 | 2.1 |
| 1898 | 38 | 30 | 4 | 3 | 76 | 2.1 |
| 1899 | 40 | 31 | 4 | 4 | 79 | 2.3 |
| 1900 | 41 | 33 | 5 | 5 | 84 | 2.5 |
| 1901 | 43 | 34 | 5 | 6 | 88 | 2.7 |
| 1902 | 44 | 35 | 5 | 6 | 90 | 2.8 |
| 1903 | 45 | 36 | 6 | 6 | 92 | 2.8 |
| 1904 | 46 | 37 | 6 | 5 | 95 | 2.9 |
| 1905 | 48 | 38 | 6 | 5 | 97 | 2.9 |
| 1906 | 49 | 39 | 6 | 5 | 99 | 3.0 |
| 1907 | 50 | 40 | 7 | 5 | 102 | 3.1 |
| 1908 | 51 | 41 | 7 | 5 | 105 | 3.2 |
| 1909 | 53 | 43 | 8 | 5 | 109 | 3.3 |
| 1910 | 56 | 45 | 8 | 5 | 114 | 3.5 |
| 1911 | 59 | 49 | 9 | 6 | 121 | 3.7 |
| 1912 | 62 | 53 | 9 | 6 | 130 | 4.0 |
| 1913 | 67 | 57 | 11 | 7 | 142 | 4.4 |
| 1914 | 72 | 63 | 12 | 8 | 155 | 4.9 |
| 1915 | 78 | 69 | 13 | 9 | 169 | 5.3 |
| 1916 | 85 | 76 | 14 | 9 | 184 | 5.7 |
| 1917 | 92 | 82 | 15 | 10 | 200 | 6.3 |
| 1918 | 100 | 89 | 17 | 13 | 218 | 7.0 |
| 1919 | 108 | 95 | 18 | 15 | 236 | 7.7 |
| 1920 | 116 | 101 | 19 | 18 | 253 | 8.3 |
| 1921 | 124 | 107 | 20 | 20 | 272 | 9.0 |
| 1922 | 132 | 114 | 21 | 22 | 288 | 9.6 |
| 1923 | 140 | 119 | 21 | 22 | 302 | 9.9 |
| 1924 | 147 | 124 | 22 | 23 | 316 | 10.3 |
| 1925 | 153 | 129 | 23 | 24 | 329 | 10.7 |
| 1926 | 160 | 133 | 24 | 24 | 341 | 11.1 |
| 1927 | 166 | 137 | 25 | 26 | 355 | 11.7 |
| 1928 | 173 | 142 | 28 | 29 | 371 | 12.5 |
| 1929 | 181 | 146 | 31 | 33 | 392 | 13.6 |
| 1930 | 190 | 152 | 35 | 36 | 414 | 14.7 |
| 1931 | 197 | 157 | 40 | 36 | 431 | 15.5 |
| 1932 | 202 | 162 | 44 | 35 | 442 | 16.0 |
| 1933 | 207 | 168 | 47 | 35 | 457 | 16.5 |
| 1934 | 214 | 176 | 50 | 36 | 476 | 17.3 |
| 1935 | 223 | 186 | 53 | 38 | 500 | 18.3 |
| 1936 | 234 | 195 | 56 | 39 | 524 | 18.9 |
| 1937 | 246 | 203 | 57 | 39 | 545 | 19.4 |

| | | | | | | |
|------|--------|--------|-------|-------|--------|---------|
| 1938 | 262 | 213 | 58 | 38 | 571 | 19.8 |
| 1939 | 280 | 225 | 59 | 38 | 603 | 20.6 |
| 1940 | 302 | 245 | 64 | 40 | 651 | 22.3 |
| 1941 | 333 | 275 | 73 | 43 | 723 | 24.9 |
| 1942 | 373 | 312 | 83 | 49 | 818 | 28.3 |
| 1943 | 422 | 358 | 95 | 56 | 932 | 32.3 |
| 1944 | 480 | 413 | 109 | 59 | 1062 | 36.5 |
| 1945 | 546 | 477 | 126 | 63 | 1212 | 41.3 |
| 1946 | 624 | 549 | 147 | 69 | 1390 | 47.4 |
| 1947 | 722 | 636 | 174 | 76 | 1608 | 54.7 |
| 1948 | 848 | 741 | 204 | 84 | 1877 | 63.6 |
| 1949 | 993 | 863 | 240 | 95 | 2190 | 74.0 |
| 1950 | 1150 | 999 | 284 | 107 | 2540 | 86.1 |
| 1951 | 1320 | 1149 | 332 | 121 | 2923 | 99.4 |
| 1952 | 1502 | 1313 | 388 | 136 | 3340 | 114.3 |
| 1953 | 1702 | 1492 | 459 | 152 | 3806 | 131.5 |
| 1954 | 1935 | 1687 | 544 | 173 | 4339 | 151.8 |
| 1955 | 2207 | 1908 | 640 | 204 | 4959 | 175.9 |
| 1956 | 2522 | 2159 | 762 | 246 | 5689 | 205.6 |
| 1957 | 2854 | 2425 | 914 | 302 | 6495 | 240.9 |
| 1958 | 3184 | 2690 | 1069 | 370 | 7313 | 278.0 |
| 1959 | 3511 | 2941 | 1196 | 440 | 8087 | 311.7 |
| 1960 | 3813 | 3167 | 1304 | 505 | 8789 | 341.7 |
| 1961 | 4119 | 3388 | 1443 | 570 | 9519 | 375.2 |
| 1962 | 4469 | 3646 | 1605 | 631 | 10351 | 412.5 |
| 1963 | 4887 | 3987 | 1757 | 695 | 11325 | 451.8 |
| 1964 | 5410 | 4425 | 1899 | 775 | 12508 | 495.7 |
| 1965 | 6045 | 4971 | 2114 | 876 | 14006 | 554.8 |
| 1966 | 6790 | 5653 | 2464 | 995 | 15901 | 636.5 |
| 1967 | 7687 | 6548 | 2878 | 1143 | 18255 | 736.1 |
| 1968 | 8855 | 7708 | 3336 | 1321 | 21220 | 854.8 |
| 1969 | 10435 | 9153 | 3930 | 1525 | 25043 | 1005.0 |
| 1970 | 12504 | 10972 | 4678 | 1761 | 29915 | 1193.1 |
| 1971 | 15167 | 13263 | 5539 | 1999 | 35968 | 1414.4 |
| 1972 | 18633 | 16234 | 6650 | 2308 | 43824 | 1700.9 |
| 1973 | 23214 | 20190 | 8211 | 2812 | 54428 | 2102.5 |
| 1974 | 29192 | 25457 | 10329 | 3569 | 68547 | 2649.7 |
| 1975 | 36639 | 32159 | 12960 | 4544 | 86302 | 3337.5 |
| 1976 | 45568 | 40282 | 16051 | 5608 | 107510 | 4144.6 |
| 1977 | 56134 | 50148 | 19756 | 6862 | 132901 | 5110.3 |
| 1978 | 68355 | 62021 | 24112 | 8416 | 162905 | 6258.2 |
| 1979 | 82080 | 75870 | 28831 | 10157 | 196939 | 7538.6 |
| 1980 | 97214 | 91854 | 33987 | 12143 | 235198 | 8969.1 |
| 1981 | 113806 | 109594 | 39729 | 14317 | 277446 | 10552.2 |
| 1982 | 131759 | 128657 | 45746 | 16715 | 322877 | 12244.9 |
| 1983 | 150500 | 149320 | 52133 | 19254 | 371208 | 14045.8 |
| 1984 | 169582 | 170889 | 58674 | 21460 | 420605 | 15851.9 |

| | | | | | | |
|------|---------|---------|--------|--------|---------|----------|
| 1985 | 188909 | 193318 | 65418 | 23608 | 471253 | 17698.4 |
| 1986 | 209032 | 217497 | 72947 | 26045 | 525521 | 19722.4 |
| 1987 | 230829 | 243660 | 81960 | 28983 | 585431 | 22048.7 |
| 1988 | 255144 | 272472 | 93152 | 32650 | 653417 | 24812.9 |
| 1989 | 282188 | 305770 | 106521 | 36888 | 731368 | 28042.0 |
| 1990 | 312084 | 344605 | 120978 | 41214 | 818882 | 31579.0 |
| 1991 | 344517 | 388124 | 135114 | 45154 | 912909 | 35180.1 |
| 1992 | 378386 | 433336 | 148211 | 48500 | 1008433 | 38652.1 |
| 1993 | 413583 | 477214 | 158809 | 50754 | 1100360 | 41695.7 |
| 1994 | 450866 | 520929 | 167912 | 52464 | 1192171 | 44530.1 |
| 1995 | 492333 | 567145 | 178732 | 54655 | 1292865 | 47741.9 |
| 1996 | 539027 | 614504 | 191916 | 57218 | 1402666 | 51378.3 |
| 1997 | 590196 | 662730 | 206881 | 60553 | 1520360 | 55400.2 |
| 1998 | 646917 | 714821 | 224138 | 65307 | 1651184 | 60027.9 |
| 1999 | 711743 | 772893 | 243779 | 71574 | 1799989 | 65370.6 |
| 2000 | 789340 | 835443 | 265250 | 79390 | 1969422 | 71404.9 |
| 2001 | 879501 | 901806 | 287198 | 87463 | 2155969 | 77804.6 |
| 2002 | 977864 | 974087 | 308170 | 94431 | 2354553 | 84223.4 |
| 2003 | 1084202 | 1051549 | 329273 | 101213 | 2566237 | 90876.9 |
| 2004 | 1196849 | 1133442 | 351225 | 108870 | 2790385 | 97929.3 |
| 2005 | 1313187 | 1220117 | 374914 | 117704 | 3025923 | 105487.8 |
| 2006 | 1430988 | 1311749 | 401684 | 127757 | 3272178 | 113682.9 |
| 2007 | 1542452 | 1404752 | 432236 | 138633 | 3518074 | 122348.9 |
| 2008 | 1632320 | 1492554 | 464172 | 148079 | 3737125 | 130559.6 |
| 2009 | 1684091 | 1565374 | 488423 | 150829 | 3888718 | 136169.6 |
| 2010 | 1700370 | 1620623 | 506585 | 149469 | 3977046 | 139645.4 |
| 2011 | 1693083 | 1662165 | 524286 | 149211 | 4028744 | 142520.4 |
| 2012 | 1669379 | 1689997 | 538478 | 149142 | 4046996 | 144442.6 |
| 2013 | 1637954 | 1707152 | 549051 | 149465 | 4043622 | 145625.4 |
| 2014 | 1610472 | 1719360 | 558619 | 151150 | 4039600 | 146796.2 |
| 2015 | 1592908 | 1731685 | 570797 | 154824 | 4050214 | 148656.6 |
| 2016 | 1585571 | 1744493 | 586661 | 159018 | 4075742 | 151174.0 |
| 2017 | 1590518 | 1757582 | 605134 | 164363 | 4117597 | 154323.3 |
| 2018 | 1607210 | 1774012 | 625736 | 171347 | 4178305 | 158167.5 |
| 2019 | 1632386 | 1792942 | 648118 | 178795 | 4252241 | 162460.2 |

* includes biological resources and "other" that, after 1995, incorporates intellectual property

Table A2
Net Capital Stock/GDP Ratio, 1850-2019

| | Net Capital Stock /GDP | Net Capital Stock/GDP (excluding dwellings) |
|------|------------------------|--|
| 1850 | 1.6 | 0.6 |
| 1851 | 1.5 | 0.6 |
| 1852 | 1.5 | 0.6 |
| 1853 | 1.3 | 0.5 |
| 1854 | 1.2 | 0.5 |
| 1855 | 1.2 | 0.5 |
| 1856 | 1.2 | 0.5 |
| 1857 | 1.2 | 0.5 |
| 1858 | 1.3 | 0.5 |
| 1859 | 1.2 | 0.5 |
| 1860 | 1.2 | 0.5 |
| 1861 | 1.3 | 0.5 |
| 1862 | 1.3 | 0.6 |
| 1863 | 1.3 | 0.6 |
| 1864 | 1.3 | 0.6 |
| 1865 | 1.4 | 0.7 |
| 1866 | 1.3 | 0.6 |
| 1867 | 1.3 | 0.6 |
| 1868 | 1.5 | 0.7 |
| 1869 | 1.6 | 0.8 |
| 1870 | 1.5 | 0.7 |
| 1871 | 1.4 | 0.7 |
| 1872 | 1.2 | 0.6 |
| 1873 | 1.2 | 0.6 |
| 1874 | 1.2 | 0.6 |
| 1875 | 1.2 | 0.6 |
| 1876 | 1.2 | 0.6 |
| 1877 | 1.1 | 0.5 |
| 1878 | 1.1 | 0.5 |
| 1879 | 1.1 | 0.5 |
| 1880 | 1.1 | 0.5 |
| 1881 | 1.0 | 0.5 |
| 1882 | 1.0 | 0.5 |
| 1883 | 1.0 | 0.5 |
| 1884 | 1.0 | 0.5 |
| 1885 | 1.0 | 0.5 |
| 1886 | 1.0 | 0.5 |
| 1887 | 1.1 | 0.5 |
| 1888 | 1.1 | 0.5 |
| 1889 | 1.2 | 0.6 |
| 1890 | 1.2 | 0.6 |

| | | |
|------|-----|-----|
| 1891 | 1.2 | 0.6 |
| 1892 | 1.2 | 0.6 |
| 1893 | 1.3 | 0.6 |
| 1894 | 1.3 | 0.7 |
| 1895 | 1.3 | 0.7 |
| 1896 | 1.4 | 0.7 |
| 1897 | 1.4 | 0.7 |
| 1898 | 1.3 | 0.7 |
| 1899 | 1.4 | 0.7 |
| 1900 | 1.4 | 0.7 |
| 1901 | 1.4 | 0.7 |
| 1902 | 1.4 | 0.7 |
| 1903 | 1.4 | 0.7 |
| 1904 | 1.3 | 0.7 |
| 1905 | 1.4 | 0.7 |
| 1906 | 1.4 | 0.7 |
| 1907 | 1.4 | 0.7 |
| 1908 | 1.5 | 0.8 |
| 1909 | 1.5 | 0.8 |
| 1910 | 1.6 | 0.8 |
| 1911 | 1.6 | 0.8 |
| 1912 | 1.7 | 0.9 |
| 1913 | 1.7 | 0.9 |
| 1914 | 1.9 | 1.0 |
| 1915 | 1.9 | 1.0 |
| 1916 | 1.8 | 0.9 |
| 1917 | 1.8 | 0.9 |
| 1918 | 1.6 | 0.9 |
| 1919 | 1.6 | 0.9 |
| 1920 | 1.4 | 0.8 |
| 1921 | 1.7 | 0.9 |
| 1922 | 1.7 | 0.9 |
| 1923 | 1.8 | 1.0 |
| 1924 | 1.7 | 0.9 |
| 1925 | 1.7 | 0.9 |
| 1926 | 1.8 | 1.0 |
| 1927 | 1.8 | 0.9 |
| 1928 | 1.9 | 1.0 |
| 1929 | 1.9 | 1.0 |
| 1930 | 2.0 | 1.1 |
| 1931 | 2.1 | 1.1 |
| 1932 | 2.1 | 1.2 |
| 1933 | 2.3 | 1.3 |
| 1934 | 2.2 | 1.2 |

| | | |
|------|-----|-----|
| 1935 | 2.2 | 1.2 |
| 1936 | 2.9 | 1.6 |
| 1937 | 2.8 | 1.6 |
| 1938 | 2.6 | 1.4 |
| 1939 | 2.4 | 1.3 |
| 1940 | 2.1 | 1.1 |
| 1941 | 2.1 | 1.1 |
| 1942 | 2.0 | 1.1 |
| 1943 | 2.1 | 1.1 |
| 1944 | 2.1 | 1.1 |
| 1945 | 2.4 | 1.3 |
| 1946 | 2.1 | 1.2 |
| 1947 | 2.1 | 1.2 |
| 1948 | 2.3 | 1.3 |
| 1949 | 2.5 | 1.4 |
| 1950 | 2.4 | 1.3 |
| 1951 | 2.1 | 1.2 |
| 1952 | 2.2 | 1.2 |
| 1953 | 2.3 | 1.3 |
| 1954 | 2.3 | 1.3 |
| 1955 | 2.4 | 1.3 |
| 1956 | 2.3 | 1.3 |
| 1957 | 2.2 | 1.2 |
| 1958 | 2.1 | 1.2 |
| 1959 | 2.2 | 1.2 |
| 1960 | 2.3 | 1.3 |
| 1961 | 2.2 | 1.2 |
| 1962 | 2.0 | 1.1 |
| 1963 | 1.8 | 1.0 |
| 1964 | 1.8 | 1.0 |
| 1965 | 1.7 | 1.0 |
| 1966 | 1.7 | 1.0 |
| 1967 | 1.7 | 1.0 |
| 1968 | 1.8 | 1.0 |
| 1969 | 1.8 | 1.1 |
| 1970 | 2.0 | 1.2 |
| 1971 | 2.1 | 1.2 |
| 1972 | 2.2 | 1.2 |
| 1973 | 2.2 | 1.3 |
| 1974 | 2.2 | 1.3 |
| 1975 | 2.4 | 1.4 |
| 1976 | 2.5 | 1.4 |
| 1977 | 2.4 | 1.4 |
| 1978 | 2.4 | 1.4 |

| | | |
|------|-----|-----|
| 1979 | 2.5 | 1.4 |
| 1980 | 2.5 | 1.5 |
| 1981 | 2.6 | 1.5 |
| 1982 | 2.6 | 1.6 |
| 1983 | 2.6 | 1.6 |
| 1984 | 2.6 | 1.6 |
| 1985 | 2.7 | 1.6 |
| 1986 | 2.6 | 1.6 |
| 1987 | 2.6 | 1.6 |
| 1988 | 2.6 | 1.6 |
| 1989 | 2.5 | 1.6 |
| 1990 | 2.5 | 1.6 |
| 1991 | 2.6 | 1.6 |
| 1992 | 2.6 | 1.6 |
| 1993 | 2.8 | 1.7 |
| 1994 | 2.8 | 1.7 |
| 1995 | 2.8 | 1.7 |
| 1996 | 2.9 | 1.8 |
| 1997 | 2.9 | 1.8 |
| 1998 | 3.0 | 1.8 |
| 1999 | 3.0 | 1.8 |
| 2000 | 3.0 | 1.8 |
| 2001 | 3.1 | 1.8 |
| 2002 | 3.1 | 1.8 |
| 2003 | 3.2 | 1.8 |
| 2004 | 3.2 | 1.9 |
| 2005 | 3.3 | 1.8 |
| 2006 | 3.3 | 1.8 |
| 2007 | 3.3 | 1.8 |
| 2008 | 3.4 | 1.9 |
| 2009 | 3.6 | 2.1 |
| 2010 | 3.7 | 2.1 |
| 2011 | 3.8 | 2.2 |
| 2012 | 3.9 | 2.3 |
| 2013 | 4.0 | 2.4 |
| 2014 | 3.9 | 2.4 |
| 2015 | 3.8 | 2.3 |
| 2016 | 3.7 | 2.2 |
| 2017 | 3.5 | 2.2 |
| 2018 | 3.5 | 2.1 |
| 2019 | 3.4 | 2.1 |

Table A3
Productive Capital Stock (million 2010 Euro)

| | Dwellings | Other Construction | Machinery and Equipment | Transport Equipment | Total |
|------|-----------|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-------|
| 1850 | 20013 | 6995 | 97 | 222 | 27327 |
| 1851 | 20293 | 7042 | 100 | 211 | 27646 |
| 1852 | 20680 | 7114 | 105 | 202 | 28101 |
| 1853 | 21067 | 7213 | 111 | 204 | 28596 |
| 1854 | 21354 | 7304 | 120 | 210 | 28988 |
| 1855 | 21549 | 7371 | 128 | 207 | 29255 |
| 1856 | 21757 | 7459 | 134 | 220 | 29570 |
| 1857 | 22129 | 7624 | 142 | 249 | 30145 |
| 1858 | 22745 | 7871 | 154 | 312 | 31082 |
| 1859 | 23654 | 8187 | 168 | 380 | 32389 |
| 1860 | 24822 | 8717 | 178 | 400 | 34118 |
| 1861 | 25835 | 9416 | 187 | 420 | 35857 |
| 1862 | 26672 | 10101 | 200 | 464 | 37437 |
| 1863 | 27574 | 10754 | 217 | 514 | 39059 |
| 1864 | 28375 | 11305 | 233 | 564 | 40477 |
| 1865 | 28958 | 11681 | 245 | 622 | 41506 |
| 1866 | 29372 | 11928 | 252 | 698 | 42249 |
| 1867 | 29760 | 12148 | 253 | 788 | 42949 |
| 1868 | 30049 | 12327 | 253 | 800 | 43429 |
| 1869 | 30191 | 12440 | 250 | 737 | 43619 |
| 1870 | 30340 | 12513 | 250 | 701 | 43803 |
| 1871 | 30613 | 12598 | 254 | 683 | 44148 |
| 1872 | 31003 | 12734 | 263 | 671 | 44671 |
| 1873 | 31429 | 12874 | 274 | 648 | 45224 |
| 1874 | 31848 | 13011 | 280 | 632 | 45771 |
| 1875 | 32350 | 13199 | 287 | 614 | 46449 |
| 1876 | 32987 | 13469 | 298 | 604 | 47357 |
| 1877 | 33757 | 13819 | 314 | 607 | 48497 |
| 1878 | 34513 | 14151 | 331 | 683 | 49679 |
| 1879 | 35114 | 14434 | 352 | 770 | 50670 |
| 1880 | 35683 | 14781 | 387 | 816 | 51668 |
| 1881 | 36309 | 15198 | 434 | 843 | 52785 |
| 1882 | 37052 | 15684 | 486 | 849 | 54072 |
| 1883 | 37983 | 16262 | 538 | 949 | 55733 |
| 1884 | 38942 | 16862 | 585 | 1098 | 57487 |
| 1885 | 39694 | 17372 | 620 | 1174 | 58861 |
| 1886 | 40225 | 17818 | 641 | 1167 | 59851 |
| 1887 | 40662 | 18294 | 654 | 1141 | 60751 |
| 1888 | 41062 | 18810 | 660 | 1086 | 61617 |
| 1889 | 41488 | 19285 | 677 | 1049 | 62498 |
| 1890 | 42036 | 19776 | 718 | 1038 | 63567 |

| | | | | | |
|------|-------|-------|------|------|--------|
| 1891 | 42648 | 20324 | 765 | 1004 | 64742 |
| 1892 | 43304 | 20866 | 812 | 947 | 65928 |
| 1893 | 44014 | 21376 | 840 | 896 | 67125 |
| 1894 | 44743 | 21813 | 851 | 851 | 68258 |
| 1895 | 45478 | 22236 | 870 | 808 | 69392 |
| 1896 | 46182 | 22646 | 893 | 775 | 70497 |
| 1897 | 46873 | 22997 | 923 | 753 | 71546 |
| 1898 | 47611 | 23356 | 953 | 740 | 72660 |
| 1899 | 48537 | 23795 | 995 | 844 | 74171 |
| 1900 | 49887 | 24438 | 1078 | 1086 | 76490 |
| 1901 | 51242 | 25112 | 1166 | 1260 | 78780 |
| 1902 | 52263 | 25622 | 1227 | 1288 | 80401 |
| 1903 | 53314 | 26150 | 1287 | 1259 | 82011 |
| 1904 | 54580 | 26755 | 1355 | 1239 | 83928 |
| 1905 | 55736 | 27292 | 1413 | 1237 | 85678 |
| 1906 | 56578 | 27756 | 1471 | 1270 | 87074 |
| 1907 | 57512 | 28320 | 1544 | 1331 | 88707 |
| 1908 | 58657 | 28950 | 1619 | 1341 | 90568 |
| 1909 | 59888 | 29559 | 1688 | 1322 | 92457 |
| 1910 | 61176 | 30336 | 1747 | 1323 | 94582 |
| 1911 | 62578 | 31271 | 1798 | 1314 | 96963 |
| 1912 | 64050 | 32232 | 1859 | 1379 | 99521 |
| 1913 | 65509 | 33158 | 1953 | 1541 | 102161 |
| 1914 | 66895 | 33947 | 2012 | 1657 | 104511 |
| 1915 | 67978 | 34581 | 2003 | 1634 | 106196 |
| 1916 | 68714 | 35052 | 2022 | 1577 | 107364 |
| 1917 | 69165 | 35413 | 2076 | 1638 | 108293 |
| 1918 | 69425 | 35692 | 2147 | 1852 | 109115 |
| 1919 | 69705 | 36019 | 2205 | 2096 | 110025 |
| 1920 | 70417 | 36623 | 2235 | 2321 | 111597 |
| 1921 | 71606 | 37610 | 2329 | 2540 | 114084 |
| 1922 | 72987 | 38861 | 2399 | 2690 | 116936 |
| 1923 | 74664 | 40133 | 2446 | 2702 | 119945 |
| 1924 | 76604 | 41386 | 2556 | 2827 | 123373 |
| 1925 | 78743 | 42835 | 2708 | 2943 | 127229 |
| 1926 | 81095 | 44499 | 2892 | 3006 | 131491 |
| 1927 | 83622 | 46220 | 3120 | 3229 | 136191 |
| 1928 | 86449 | 47986 | 3449 | 3618 | 141503 |
| 1929 | 89705 | 50007 | 3925 | 4152 | 147789 |
| 1930 | 93183 | 52293 | 4562 | 4486 | 154524 |
| 1931 | 95156 | 54279 | 5178 | 4513 | 159126 |
| 1932 | 95520 | 55713 | 5634 | 4338 | 161205 |
| 1933 | 95719 | 57158 | 5984 | 4186 | 163047 |
| 1934 | 95828 | 58698 | 6267 | 4166 | 164959 |
| 1935 | 95901 | 60128 | 6530 | 4165 | 166724 |

| | | | | | |
|------|--------|--------|--------|-------|---------|
| 1936 | 95837 | 61300 | 6770 | 4041 | 167947 |
| 1937 | 95447 | 60419 | 6554 | 3722 | 166141 |
| 1938 | 94893 | 59386 | 6287 | 3334 | 163901 |
| 1939 | 94348 | 58163 | 6033 | 3021 | 161564 |
| 1940 | 93858 | 57153 | 5859 | 2830 | 159700 |
| 1941 | 94541 | 58249 | 6104 | 2729 | 161623 |
| 1942 | 96390 | 59732 | 6333 | 2789 | 165244 |
| 1943 | 98398 | 61458 | 6521 | 2835 | 169211 |
| 1944 | 100183 | 63260 | 6653 | 2691 | 172787 |
| 1945 | 101505 | 64694 | 6803 | 2539 | 175540 |
| 1946 | 102891 | 65802 | 7037 | 2461 | 178191 |
| 1947 | 105352 | 67160 | 7309 | 2389 | 182209 |
| 1948 | 109643 | 68962 | 7599 | 2333 | 188537 |
| 1949 | 113978 | 70833 | 7906 | 2333 | 195051 |
| 1950 | 117374 | 72580 | 8282 | 2349 | 200585 |
| 1951 | 120139 | 74165 | 8629 | 2369 | 205303 |
| 1952 | 122371 | 75671 | 9014 | 2387 | 209442 |
| 1953 | 124722 | 77193 | 9574 | 2402 | 213890 |
| 1954 | 128345 | 78942 | 10250 | 2469 | 220007 |
| 1955 | 133758 | 81466 | 11004 | 2660 | 228888 |
| 1956 | 141124 | 84957 | 12067 | 2968 | 241115 |
| 1957 | 149357 | 88895 | 13494 | 3397 | 255142 |
| 1958 | 157660 | 92895 | 14940 | 3926 | 269422 |
| 1959 | 166288 | 96572 | 16008 | 4462 | 283330 |
| 1960 | 174151 | 99659 | 16913 | 4934 | 295657 |
| 1961 | 182231 | 102675 | 18297 | 5405 | 308609 |
| 1962 | 191972 | 106726 | 20034 | 5859 | 324590 |
| 1963 | 203855 | 112962 | 21687 | 6344 | 344847 |
| 1964 | 218750 | 121443 | 23235 | 6994 | 370422 |
| 1965 | 235679 | 132056 | 25630 | 7845 | 401208 |
| 1966 | 252721 | 144757 | 29470 | 8853 | 435801 |
| 1967 | 269073 | 160445 | 33673 | 10087 | 473277 |
| 1968 | 285849 | 178676 | 37757 | 11524 | 513806 |
| 1969 | 303694 | 197783 | 42404 | 13061 | 556942 |
| 1970 | 320522 | 217267 | 47346 | 14672 | 599807 |
| 1971 | 335254 | 236344 | 51686 | 16015 | 639299 |
| 1972 | 349241 | 255865 | 56277 | 17541 | 678925 |
| 1973 | 364954 | 277261 | 62133 | 19992 | 724339 |
| 1974 | 383200 | 301196 | 69119 | 23400 | 776916 |
| 1975 | 402102 | 325679 | 76184 | 27124 | 831089 |
| 1976 | 420509 | 348335 | 82692 | 30146 | 881682 |
| 1977 | 439444 | 370823 | 89336 | 32923 | 932526 |
| 1978 | 459017 | 394077 | 96140 | 35856 | 985091 |
| 1979 | 478676 | 417318 | 102031 | 38359 | 1036384 |
| 1980 | 498648 | 441434 | 107592 | 40697 | 1088370 |

| | | | | | |
|------|---------|---------|--------|--------|---------|
| 1981 | 519647 | 465076 | 113516 | 42718 | 1140957 |
| 1982 | 541210 | 487527 | 119152 | 44621 | 1192510 |
| 1983 | 561164 | 510825 | 125060 | 46292 | 1243341 |
| 1984 | 578286 | 533265 | 130955 | 46858 | 1289364 |
| 1985 | 592747 | 555375 | 137106 | 47285 | 1332513 |
| 1986 | 606529 | 579803 | 144663 | 48358 | 1379354 |
| 1987 | 622197 | 606609 | 154710 | 50391 | 1433908 |
| 1988 | 641618 | 636753 | 168120 | 53635 | 1500125 |
| 1989 | 664791 | 673659 | 184419 | 57703 | 1580571 |
| 1990 | 691530 | 718503 | 201404 | 61801 | 1673238 |
| 1991 | 720753 | 768613 | 216680 | 65278 | 1771324 |
| 1992 | 749864 | 817775 | 229267 | 67931 | 1864836 |
| 1993 | 778360 | 860674 | 237250 | 69163 | 1945447 |
| 1994 | 807137 | 899980 | 242622 | 69811 | 2019550 |
| 1995 | 838926 | 940169 | 250240 | 71222 | 2100559 |
| 1996 | 874071 | 978403 | 260887 | 73182 | 2186542 |
| 1997 | 909900 | 1013695 | 273602 | 76142 | 2273339 |
| 1998 | 946985 | 1049966 | 288934 | 80824 | 2366710 |
| 1999 | 988152 | 1089391 | 306842 | 87246 | 2471632 |
| 2000 | 1039135 | 1129327 | 326521 | 95359 | 2590343 |
| 2001 | 1099209 | 1169172 | 346310 | 103556 | 2718247 |
| 2002 | 1163592 | 1212195 | 364546 | 110244 | 2850577 |
| 2003 | 1234031 | 1258128 | 382652 | 116556 | 2991366 |
| 2004 | 1311454 | 1307130 | 401523 | 123727 | 3143834 |
| 2005 | 1396718 | 1361048 | 422227 | 132087 | 3312079 |
| 2006 | 1491788 | 1421653 | 446316 | 141665 | 3501422 |
| 2007 | 1593055 | 1486637 | 474582 | 152016 | 3706290 |
| 2008 | 1688602 | 1550428 | 504459 | 160698 | 3904187 |
| 2009 | 1762887 | 1603851 | 526293 | 162120 | 4055151 |
| 2010 | 1816516 | 1644413 | 542067 | 159234 | 4162231 |
| 2011 | 1857604 | 1675670 | 557930 | 157629 | 4248833 |
| 2012 | 1887424 | 1696845 | 570610 | 156278 | 4311157 |
| 2013 | 1908335 | 1709833 | 579900 | 155338 | 4353406 |
| 2014 | 1927972 | 1719018 | 588330 | 155747 | 4391068 |
| 2015 | 1950983 | 1728230 | 599468 | 158077 | 4436758 |
| 2016 | 1977936 | 1736839 | 614259 | 160770 | 4489804 |
| 2017 | 2013337 | 1744228 | 631487 | 164463 | 4553515 |
| 2018 | 2059477 | 1753715 | 650658 | 169635 | 4633485 |
| 2019 | 2115429 | 1765048 | 671466 | 175118 | 4727063 |

Table A4
Capital Input, Productive Capital Stock, and Capital Quality (2010=100)

| | ex-ante exogenous rate of return | | |
|------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| | Productive Capital Stock | Capital Quality | Capital Input |
| 1850 | 0.7 | 42.1 | 0.3 |
| 1851 | 0.7 | 42.0 | 0.3 |
| 1852 | 0.7 | 41.8 | 0.3 |
| 1853 | 0.7 | 41.8 | 0.3 |
| 1854 | 0.7 | 41.9 | 0.3 |
| 1855 | 0.7 | 41.9 | 0.3 |
| 1856 | 0.7 | 42.0 | 0.3 |
| 1857 | 0.7 | 42.3 | 0.3 |
| 1858 | 0.7 | 43.0 | 0.3 |
| 1859 | 0.8 | 43.6 | 0.3 |
| 1860 | 0.8 | 43.7 | 0.4 |
| 1861 | 0.9 | 43.9 | 0.4 |
| 1862 | 0.9 | 44.5 | 0.4 |
| 1863 | 0.9 | 45.0 | 0.4 |
| 1864 | 1.0 | 45.5 | 0.4 |
| 1865 | 1.0 | 46.0 | 0.5 |
| 1866 | 1.0 | 46.6 | 0.5 |
| 1867 | 1.0 | 47.3 | 0.5 |
| 1868 | 1.0 | 47.3 | 0.5 |
| 1869 | 1.0 | 46.7 | 0.5 |
| 1870 | 1.1 | 46.3 | 0.5 |
| 1871 | 1.1 | 46.1 | 0.5 |
| 1872 | 1.1 | 45.9 | 0.5 |
| 1873 | 1.1 | 45.6 | 0.5 |
| 1874 | 1.1 | 45.4 | 0.5 |
| 1875 | 1.1 | 45.1 | 0.5 |
| 1876 | 1.1 | 45.0 | 0.5 |
| 1877 | 1.2 | 44.9 | 0.5 |
| 1878 | 1.2 | 45.5 | 0.5 |
| 1879 | 1.2 | 46.1 | 0.6 |
| 1880 | 1.2 | 46.5 | 0.6 |
| 1881 | 1.3 | 46.8 | 0.6 |
| 1882 | 1.3 | 47.0 | 0.6 |
| 1883 | 1.3 | 47.7 | 0.6 |
| 1884 | 1.4 | 48.7 | 0.7 |
| 1885 | 1.4 | 49.1 | 0.7 |
| 1886 | 1.4 | 49.1 | 0.7 |
| 1887 | 1.5 | 49.0 | 0.7 |
| 1888 | 1.5 | 48.6 | 0.7 |

| | | | |
|------|-----|------|-----|
| 1889 | 1.5 | 48.4 | 0.7 |
| 1890 | 1.5 | 48.5 | 0.7 |
| 1891 | 1.6 | 48.4 | 0.8 |
| 1892 | 1.6 | 48.1 | 0.8 |
| 1893 | 1.6 | 47.7 | 0.8 |
| 1894 | 1.6 | 47.3 | 0.8 |
| 1895 | 1.7 | 47.0 | 0.8 |
| 1896 | 1.7 | 46.8 | 0.8 |
| 1897 | 1.7 | 46.7 | 0.8 |
| 1898 | 1.7 | 46.6 | 0.8 |
| 1899 | 1.8 | 47.3 | 0.8 |
| 1900 | 1.8 | 48.8 | 0.9 |
| 1901 | 1.9 | 49.9 | 0.9 |
| 1902 | 1.9 | 50.1 | 1.0 |
| 1903 | 2.0 | 50.0 | 1.0 |
| 1904 | 2.0 | 49.9 | 1.0 |
| 1905 | 2.1 | 49.9 | 1.0 |
| 1906 | 2.1 | 50.1 | 1.0 |
| 1907 | 2.1 | 50.5 | 1.1 |
| 1908 | 2.2 | 50.6 | 1.1 |
| 1909 | 2.2 | 50.6 | 1.1 |
| 1910 | 2.3 | 50.6 | 1.1 |
| 1911 | 2.3 | 50.5 | 1.2 |
| 1912 | 2.4 | 50.7 | 1.2 |
| 1913 | 2.5 | 51.3 | 1.3 |
| 1914 | 2.5 | 51.6 | 1.3 |
| 1915 | 2.6 | 51.3 | 1.3 |
| 1916 | 2.6 | 51.0 | 1.3 |
| 1917 | 2.6 | 51.4 | 1.3 |
| 1918 | 2.6 | 52.5 | 1.4 |
| 1919 | 2.6 | 53.6 | 1.4 |
| 1920 | 2.7 | 54.4 | 1.5 |
| 1921 | 2.7 | 55.4 | 1.5 |
| 1922 | 2.8 | 55.9 | 1.6 |
| 1923 | 2.9 | 55.7 | 1.6 |
| 1924 | 3.0 | 56.1 | 1.7 |
| 1925 | 3.1 | 56.5 | 1.7 |
| 1926 | 3.2 | 56.8 | 1.8 |
| 1927 | 3.3 | 57.6 | 1.9 |
| 1928 | 3.4 | 59.0 | 2.0 |
| 1929 | 3.6 | 60.8 | 2.2 |
| 1930 | 3.7 | 62.4 | 2.3 |
| 1931 | 3.8 | 63.4 | 2.4 |
| 1932 | 3.9 | 63.9 | 2.5 |

| | | | |
|------|------|------|------|
| 1933 | 3.9 | 64.3 | 2.5 |
| 1934 | 4.0 | 64.7 | 2.6 |
| 1935 | 4.0 | 65.1 | 2.6 |
| 1936 | 4.0 | 65.3 | 2.6 |
| 1937 | 4.0 | 64.5 | 2.6 |
| 1938 | 3.9 | 63.6 | 2.5 |
| 1939 | 3.9 | 62.7 | 2.4 |
| 1940 | 3.8 | 62.2 | 2.4 |
| 1941 | 3.9 | 62.2 | 2.4 |
| 1942 | 4.0 | 62.4 | 2.5 |
| 1943 | 4.1 | 62.5 | 2.5 |
| 1944 | 4.2 | 62.0 | 2.6 |
| 1945 | 4.2 | 61.6 | 2.6 |
| 1946 | 4.3 | 61.6 | 2.6 |
| 1947 | 4.4 | 61.4 | 2.7 |
| 1948 | 4.5 | 61.1 | 2.8 |
| 1949 | 4.7 | 60.9 | 2.9 |
| 1950 | 4.8 | 61.1 | 2.9 |
| 1951 | 4.9 | 61.2 | 3.0 |
| 1952 | 5.0 | 61.6 | 3.1 |
| 1953 | 5.1 | 62.1 | 3.2 |
| 1954 | 5.3 | 62.8 | 3.3 |
| 1955 | 5.5 | 63.4 | 3.5 |
| 1956 | 5.8 | 64.3 | 3.7 |
| 1957 | 6.1 | 65.6 | 4.0 |
| 1958 | 6.5 | 66.8 | 4.3 |
| 1959 | 6.8 | 67.5 | 4.6 |
| 1960 | 7.1 | 68.0 | 4.8 |
| 1961 | 7.4 | 68.8 | 5.1 |
| 1962 | 7.8 | 69.6 | 5.4 |
| 1963 | 8.3 | 70.1 | 5.8 |
| 1964 | 8.9 | 70.2 | 6.2 |
| 1965 | 9.6 | 70.9 | 6.8 |
| 1966 | 10.5 | 72.3 | 7.6 |
| 1967 | 11.4 | 74.0 | 8.4 |
| 1968 | 12.3 | 75.5 | 9.3 |
| 1969 | 13.4 | 77.2 | 10.3 |
| 1970 | 14.4 | 79.0 | 11.4 |
| 1971 | 15.4 | 80.4 | 12.4 |
| 1972 | 16.3 | 82.0 | 13.4 |
| 1973 | 17.4 | 84.3 | 14.7 |
| 1974 | 18.7 | 86.9 | 16.2 |
| 1975 | 20.0 | 89.2 | 17.8 |
| 1976 | 21.2 | 90.6 | 19.2 |

| | | | |
|------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1977 | 22.4 | 91.6 | 20.5 |
| 1978 | 23.7 | 92.5 | 21.9 |
| 1979 | 24.9 | 92.9 | 23.1 |
| 1980 | 26.1 | 93.1 | 24.3 |
| 1981 | 27.4 | 93.3 | 25.6 |
| 1982 | 28.7 | 93.4 | 26.7 |
| 1983 | 29.9 | 93.5 | 27.9 |
| 1984 | 31.0 | 93.6 | 29.0 |
| 1985 | 32.0 | 93.7 | 30.0 |
| 1986 | 33.1 | 94.1 | 31.2 |
| 1987 | 34.5 | 94.8 | 32.7 |
| 1988 | 36.0 | 95.8 | 34.5 |
| 1989 | 38.0 | 97.0 | 36.8 |
| 1990 | 40.2 | 97.9 | 39.3 |
| 1991 | 42.6 | 98.3 | 41.8 |
| 1992 | 44.8 | 98.4 | 44.1 |
| 1993 | 46.7 | 98.1 | 45.9 |
| 1994 | 48.5 | 97.6 | 47.4 |
| 1995 | 50.5 | 97.3 | 49.1 |
| 1996 | 52.5 | 97.3 | 51.1 |
| 1997 | 54.6 | 97.4 | 53.2 |
| 1998 | 56.9 | 97.9 | 55.7 |
| 1999 | 59.4 | 98.5 | 58.5 |
| 2000 | 62.2 | 99.2 | 61.7 |
| 2001 | 65.3 | 99.6 | 65.0 |
| 2002 | 68.5 | 99.7 | 68.3 |
| 2003 | 71.9 | 99.7 | 71.6 |
| 2004 | 75.5 | 99.7 | 75.3 |
| 2005 | 79.6 | 99.7 | 79.3 |
| 2006 | 84.1 | 99.8 | 83.9 |
| 2007 | 89.0 | 99.9 | 89.0 |
| 2008 | 93.8 | 100.1 | 93.9 |
| 2009 | 97.4 | 100.1 | 97.5 |
| 2010 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 2011 | 102.1 | 100.0 | 102.1 |
| 2012 | 103.6 | 100.0 | 103.6 |
| 2013 | 104.6 | 100.1 | 104.7 |
| 2014 | 105.5 | 100.1 | 105.7 |
| 2015 | 106.6 | 100.3 | 106.9 |
| 2016 | 107.9 | 100.5 | 108.4 |
| 2017 | 109.4 | 100.7 | 110.2 |
| 2018 | 111.3 | 101.0 | 112.4 |
| 2019 | 113.6 | 101.2 | 114.9 |

Table A5
Capital Deepening*, 1850-2019 (2010=100)

* ex-ante exogenous rate of return

| | |
|------|-----|
| 1850 | 0.6 |
| 1851 | 0.6 |
| 1852 | 0.6 |
| 1853 | 0.6 |
| 1854 | 0.6 |
| 1855 | 0.7 |
| 1856 | 0.6 |
| 1857 | 0.7 |
| 1858 | 0.7 |
| 1859 | 0.7 |
| 1860 | 0.8 |
| 1861 | 0.8 |
| 1862 | 0.8 |
| 1863 | 0.9 |
| 1864 | 0.9 |
| 1865 | 0.9 |
| 1866 | 1.0 |
| 1867 | 1.0 |
| 1868 | 1.0 |
| 1869 | 1.0 |
| 1870 | 1.0 |
| 1871 | 1.0 |
| 1872 | 1.0 |
| 1873 | 1.0 |
| 1874 | 1.0 |
| 1875 | 1.0 |
| 1876 | 1.0 |
| 1877 | 1.0 |
| 1878 | 1.0 |
| 1879 | 1.1 |
| 1880 | 1.1 |
| 1881 | 1.1 |
| 1882 | 1.2 |
| 1883 | 1.2 |
| 1884 | 1.3 |
| 1885 | 1.3 |
| 1886 | 1.4 |
| 1887 | 1.4 |
| 1888 | 1.4 |
| 1889 | 1.4 |

| | |
|------|-----|
| 1890 | 1.4 |
| 1891 | 1.5 |
| 1892 | 1.5 |
| 1893 | 1.5 |
| 1894 | 1.5 |
| 1895 | 1.5 |
| 1896 | 1.5 |
| 1897 | 1.5 |
| 1898 | 1.5 |
| 1899 | 1.5 |
| 1900 | 1.6 |
| 1901 | 1.7 |
| 1902 | 1.7 |
| 1903 | 1.7 |
| 1904 | 1.8 |
| 1905 | 1.8 |
| 1906 | 1.8 |
| 1907 | 1.9 |
| 1908 | 1.9 |
| 1909 | 1.9 |
| 1910 | 2.0 |
| 1911 | 2.0 |
| 1912 | 2.1 |
| 1913 | 2.1 |
| 1914 | 2.2 |
| 1915 | 2.2 |
| 1916 | 2.2 |
| 1917 | 2.2 |
| 1918 | 2.3 |
| 1919 | 2.3 |
| 1920 | 2.4 |
| 1921 | 2.5 |
| 1922 | 2.6 |
| 1923 | 2.6 |
| 1924 | 2.7 |
| 1925 | 2.8 |
| 1926 | 2.9 |
| 1927 | 3.0 |
| 1928 | 3.2 |
| 1929 | 3.4 |
| 1930 | 3.6 |
| 1931 | 3.7 |
| 1932 | 3.7 |
| 1933 | 3.7 |

| | |
|------|------|
| 1934 | 3.7 |
| 1935 | 3.7 |
| 1936 | 3.8 |
| 1937 | 3.7 |
| 1938 | 3.6 |
| 1939 | 3.5 |
| 1940 | 3.5 |
| 1941 | 3.6 |
| 1942 | 3.6 |
| 1943 | 3.7 |
| 1944 | 3.7 |
| 1945 | 3.6 |
| 1946 | 3.6 |
| 1947 | 3.6 |
| 1948 | 3.7 |
| 1949 | 3.7 |
| 1950 | 3.7 |
| 1951 | 3.8 |
| 1952 | 3.9 |
| 1953 | 4.0 |
| 1954 | 4.2 |
| 1955 | 4.3 |
| 1956 | 4.6 |
| 1957 | 4.9 |
| 1958 | 5.3 |
| 1959 | 5.7 |
| 1960 | 6.1 |
| 1961 | 6.4 |
| 1962 | 6.7 |
| 1963 | 7.1 |
| 1964 | 7.7 |
| 1965 | 8.1 |
| 1966 | 9.0 |
| 1967 | 9.8 |
| 1968 | 11.0 |
| 1969 | 12.3 |
| 1970 | 13.4 |
| 1971 | 14.2 |
| 1972 | 15.3 |
| 1973 | 16.4 |
| 1974 | 18.3 |
| 1975 | 20.9 |
| 1976 | 23.1 |
| 1977 | 25.1 |

| | |
|------|-------|
| 1978 | 27.9 |
| 1979 | 30.6 |
| 1980 | 33.7 |
| 1981 | 36.9 |
| 1982 | 39.4 |
| 1983 | 41.9 |
| 1984 | 45.6 |
| 1985 | 47.9 |
| 1986 | 48.9 |
| 1987 | 49.1 |
| 1988 | 50.3 |
| 1989 | 52.1 |
| 1990 | 53.6 |
| 1991 | 56.0 |
| 1992 | 60.0 |
| 1993 | 64.3 |
| 1994 | 66.6 |
| 1995 | 67.8 |
| 1996 | 69.5 |
| 1997 | 69.7 |
| 1998 | 69.5 |
| 1999 | 69.6 |
| 2000 | 70.1 |
| 2001 | 71.2 |
| 2002 | 72.9 |
| 2003 | 74.5 |
| 2004 | 76.1 |
| 2005 | 77.7 |
| 2006 | 79.4 |
| 2007 | 82.2 |
| 2008 | 86.2 |
| 2009 | 95.3 |
| 2010 | 100.0 |
| 2011 | 104.4 |
| 2012 | 111.4 |
| 2013 | 115.8 |
| 2014 | 115.6 |
| 2015 | 113.5 |
| 2016 | 112.2 |
| 2017 | 111.9 |
| 2018 | 111.3 |
| 2019 | 112.1 |

Appendix C. Alternative Estimates: Figures




Figure A1. Capital Services' Composition (ex-post endogenous rate of return) (current prices) (%)




Figure A2. Capital Services' Composition (simplified ex-ante exogenous rate of return) (current prices) (%)




Figure A3. Volume Index of Capital Services (ex-ante exogenous and ex-post endogenous rate of return) and Productive Capital Stock (1850=100) (natural logs)




Figure A4. Volume Index of Capital Services (ex-ante exogenous and simplified ex-ante exogenous rate of return) and Productive Capital Stock (1850=100) (natural logs)




Figure A5. Volume Index of Capital Services* with 4 and 6 Assets, 1980-2019 (2010=100) (natural logs) * ex-ante exogenous endogenous rates of return




Figure A6a. Capital Quality (ex-ante exogenous and ex-post endogenous rate of return) (1850=1) Note: Capital Quality = Ratio of VICs to Productive Capital Stock




Figure A6b. Capital Quality (full and simplified ex-ante exogenous rate of return) (1850=1)
 Note: Capital Quality = Ratio of VICS to Productive Capital Stock




Figure A7. VICS*: Comparison with PWT9.1, CB, and Ivie Estimates, 1950-2019 (2010=100)
 (natural logs)* ex-ante exogenous and ex-post endogenous rates of return




Figure A8. VICS, 1950-2019. Estimates with GFCF Retroplated series, double declining balance, ex-ante exogenous and ex-post endogenous rates of return: Comparisons with PWT9.1, CB, and Ivie (1850=100) (logs)




Figure A9. Capital Quality*: Comparison with PWT9.1 and Ivie Estimates, 1950-2019 (2010=1)
 *New estimates derived with ex-ante exogenous and ex-post endogenous rates of return




Figure A10. Net Capital Stock/GDP Ratio with 4 and 6 Assets, 1980-2019 (current prices)




Figure A11. Net Capital Stock/GDP Ratio: Estimates with Alternative Average Service Lives (current prices)

Note: A, longer lives; B, shorter lives; A-B, A up to 1958 and B thereafter.




Figure A12. Double Declining Balance Net Capital Stock/GDP Ratio (current prices): With and Without Dwellings




Figure A13. Double Declining Balance Consumption of Fixed Capital (% GDP) and Depreciation Rate (CFC as % Net Capital Stock), (current prices).

EHES Working Paper Series

Recent EHES Working Papers

2020

- EHES 196 Lordships, state capacity and beyond: literacy rates in mid-nineteenth-century Valencia,
Francisco J. Beltrán Tapia, Alicia Gómez-Tello, Julio Martínez-Galarraga, Daniel A. Tirado-Fabregat
- EHES 195 Builders' Working Time in Eighteenth Century Madrid,
Mario García-Zúñiga
- EHES 194 Is there a Refugee Gap? Evidence from Over a Century of Danish Naturalizations,
Nina Boberg-Fazlic, Paul Sharp
- EHES 193 Epidemics, inequality and poverty in preindustrial and early industrial times,
Guido Alfani
- EHES 192 The two Revolutions in Economic History,
Martina Cioni, Giovanni Federico, Michelangelo Vasta
- EHES 191 Populism and the First Wave of Globalization: Evidence from the 1892 US Presidential Election,
Alexander Klein, Karl Gunnar Persson, Paul Sharp
- EHES 190 The Feudal Origins of Manorial Prosperity in 11th-century England,
Vincent Delabastita, Sebastiaan Maes
- EHES 189 Paesani versus Paisanos: The Relative Failure of Spanish Immigrants in Buenos Aires during the Age of Mass Migration,
Leticia Arroyo Abad, Noel Maurer, Blanca Sánchez-Alonso
- EHES 188 Blowing against the Wind? A Narrative Approach to Central Bank Foreign Exchange Intervention,
Alain Naef
- EHES 187 Denmark and Russia: What can we learn from the historical comparison of two great Arctic agricultural empires?
Elena Korchmina, Paul Sharp

All papers may be downloaded free of charge from: www.ehes.org

The European Historical Economics Society is concerned with advancing education in European economic history through study of European economies and economic history. The society is registered with the Charity Commissioners of England and Wales number: **1052680**