

# Malthusian assumptions lead to Boserupian phenology in a global model of the transitions to agriculture \*

Carsten Lemmen

Institut für Küstenforschung, Helmholtz-Zentrum Geesthacht, Max-Planck Straße 1,  
21501 Geesthacht, Germany ([carsten.lemmen@hzg.de](mailto:carsten.lemmen@hzg.de))

**Abstract.** In the many transitions from foraging to agropastoralism it is debated whether innovation in technology or increase of population is the primary driver. The driver discussion traditionally separates Malthusian (technology driven) from Boserupian (population driven) theories. I present a numerical model of the transition to agriculture and discuss this model in the light of the population versus technology debate and in Boserup's analytical framework in development theory. Although my model is based on ecological—Neomalthusian—principles, the coevolutionary positive feedback relationship between technology and population results in apparent Boserupian behaviour: innovation is greatest when population pressure is highest. This outcome is not only visible in the theory-driven reduced model, but is also present in a corresponding “real world” simulator which was tested against archaeological data, and which thus demonstrates the relevance and validity of the coevolutionary model. The lesson to be learned is that not all that acts Boserupian needs Boserup at its core.

## 1 Transitions to agriculture

The relationship between humans and their environment underwent a radical change during the last 10000 years: from mobile and small groups of foraging people to sedentary extensive cultivators and on to high-density intensive agriculture modern society turned the formerly predominantly passive human user of the environment into an active component of the Earth system. The most striking global impact is only visible and measurable during the last 150 years (*Crutzen and Stoermer, 2000; Crutzen, 2002*); much earlier, however, the use of forest resources for metal smelting from early Roman times and the medieval extensive agricultural system had already changed the landscape (*Barker, 2011; Kaplan et al., 2009*); the global effects of these early extensive cultivation and harvesting practices are yet under debate (*Rudiman, 2003; Lemmen, 2009; Kaplan et al., 2011; Stocker et al., 2011*).

---

\*Chapter manuscript submitted to “Society, Nature and History: The Legacy of Ester Boserup” 15th June 2022

Transitions to agriculture occurred in almost every region of the world, earliest in China and the Near East over 9000 years ago (*Kuijt and Goring-Morris, 2002; Londo et al., 2006*), and latest in Australia and Oceania with the arrival of Polynesian and European immigrants few hundred years ago (*Diamond and Bellwood, 2003*). While each local transition can be considered revolutionary, the many diverse mechanisms, environments, and cultural contexts of each agricultural transition make it difficult to speak of the one ‘Neolithic revolution’, as the transition to farming and herding was termed by V. G. Childe almost a century ago (*Childe, 1925*).

The transition from foraging to farming was not only one big step, but may have consisted of many intermediary stages: *Bogaard (2005)* looks at the transition in terms of the land use systems: she sees first inadvertent cultivation then horticulture then simple and then advanced agriculture, while *Boserup (1965)* discriminates these stages by the management practice ranging from forest, bush and short fallow to annual and multi cropping.

Studies of contemporary hunting-gathering societies showed that much less time has to be devoted to procuring food (*Sahlins, 1972*) than with agriculture, and that much less labour is required *Boserup (1965)* for long fallow systems compared to intensive multi-cropping agriculture. So why farm? While many different answers have been given to this question from archaeology (*Barker, 2011*), demography (*Turchin and Nefedov, 2009*) historical economy (*Weisdorf, 2005*), and ecosystem modeling (*Wirtz and Lemmen, 2003*), possibly the simplest relationship was proposed by *Malthus (1798)*, who expressed the dynamics between population and food productivity as a reciprocal: more people meant more food production, more production enabled higher populations.

Malthus’ reciprocal relationship constitutes a positive feedback loop, which ideally results in ever greater (geometric) growth and productivity increases; that this is not the case in a world with finite resources was expressed by *Malthus (1798)* by stating that “Population, when unchecked, increases at a geometrical ratio. Subsistence increases only in an arithmetical ratio. A slight acquaintance with numbers will show the immensity of the first power in comparison with the second.”; Malthus identified the need for positive and preventive checks to balance population increase with the limited capacity of resources.

How does an increase in productivity come about? First and foremost, the input of more labour increases productivity as stated by *Malthus (1798)*. While he focused on this extensive and inherent productivity increase, the intensification component of productivity increase was highlighted by *Boserup (1965)*. Investments in a more intensive production system would—however—require large additional labour, and the benefits of such investments were often small. To stimulate an investment in more intensive agriculture, Boserup requires population pressure.

Both *Malthus (1798, 1826)* and *Boserup (1965, 1981)* concentrate on the role of labour (and later division of labour and social/family organisation) and neglect the role of labour-independent innovation; these are not storage or tools (which requires labour for harvesting, building, and tool processing), but rather innovations in the resources themselves, such as cultivation of higher-yielding grains or imported high yield varieties, or their management (such as water rights); this distinction may not unambiguous for some innovations, but is used here for simplification. Labour-independent innovation can be stimulated by diversity in (and thus size of) a population (*Darwin, 1859, p. 156*): Aggregation is a motor of technological and

cultural change (*Smith, 1776; Boyd and Richerson, 1995*)<sup>1</sup>.

## 2 Models of population, production, and innovation

In 1996, E. Boserup reflected on the problems arising from the differences in terminology and methodology when comparing different models of development theories (*Boserup, 1996*). She suggested a common framework to facilitate interdisciplinary cooperation based on six structures: Environment (E), Population (P), technology, occupational structure, family structure and culture. In this framework, she then interpreted the major works of Adam Smith, Thomas Malthus, Max Weber, Karl Marx, David Ricardo, and Neomalthusian thinking, as well as her own view on different stages of the developmental process.

For many of the theories and models discussed by Boserup in this framework, the partitioning in six structures can be simplified. by (a) aggregating technology and occupational structure into a single entity technology (T), and by (b) aggregating culture and family structure into a single entity culture (C), thus forming a four-compartment framework of population, environment, technology, and culture (PETC, Figure 1).

In this PETC framework, one of the simplest models is the one referring to *Malthus (1798)*, it involves only population and environment; population growth exerts pressure on the environment, and failure to provide adequate resources from the environment acts as a positive check on population with higher mortality (Figure 1, panel a). Technology does not play a role in this simplified Malthusian model<sup>2</sup>. Culture in the form of preventive checks—such as birth control—acts on population only in later versions of his theory (*Malthus, 1826*). At the core of Malthusian theory is “the dependent role he assigns to population growth in relation to independent factors of environment and technology ” (*Marquette, 1997*).

E. *Ricardo (1821)* proposed that the incentive to intensify and develop technologies comes from a stimulus in population pressure. The demand for more land (*E*), however, leads to declining marginal benefits of and a negative feedback on innovation (*T*) due to high costs of renting the land (Figure 1, panel b). In Ricardo’s work, population is independent, and technology and environment are the dependent variables.

Population is also the driving factor in *Boserup (1965, 1981)*’s works. Of the six transitions which *Boserup (1996)* suggested, five can be accommodated in the the four compartment framework as a succession of population, environment, technology, and culture: foraging to crop production, village development, Eastern hemisphere pastoralism, urbanization, and industrialisation (Figure 1, panel c)<sup>3</sup>. In all these transitions, population growth leads to pressure felt from the limited environmental resources, which in turn stimulates technological and organizational change, and later results in cultural changes evident in cults, social hierarchies, women’s status, and status symbols. Within this group of five transitions, her model of village development, in addition, has a direct population–technology link, and allows for a feedback of the land resources on occupational structure (dotted lines in Figure 1c). Furthermore, her

<sup>1</sup>This does not, however, give the reason for a particular choice of one innovation over another (*Sober, 1992*).

<sup>2</sup>Malthus considered the increase of carrying capacity by autonomously occurring inventions (*Lee, 1986*), however, this was not discussed by *Boserup (1996)* in her model intercomparison.

<sup>3</sup>The sixth transition—Western European fertility decline—follows a different path as a succession of technology, environment, culture, and last population; it is not considered here.




Figure 1: Four compartment framework for the interrelationship between population, environment, technology, and culture. Four economic theories are contrasted: the essays on the principles of population by T. *Malthus* (1798, 1826) (panel a, dotted line indicates the revised essay including culture change); D. *Ricardo* (1821)'s principles of economy (panel b); E. *Boserup* (1965, 1981)'s theories for five transitions explained in *Boserup* (1996) (panel c, 1981 refinements shown as dotted lines); and the ecological model proposed in this chapter. The framework is a simplification of the six compartment framework originally proposed by *Boserup* (1996).

model of the foraging to farming transition includes a feedback from culture to organizational structure, which is not shown here.

### 3 A combined model and 'real' world application

I suggest here a different model of population development taking the foraging to farming transition as an example (Figure 1, panel d). This model is a reduced form of the Global

Land Use and technological Evolution Simulator (GLUES, see description below), which has been operationally applied to a number of problems in archaeology ([Lemmen and Wirtz, 2010](#); [Lemmen et al., 2011](#)) and climate research ([Lemmen, 2009](#); [Kaplan et al., 2011](#)). The reduced model shares the same functional behaviour as the original model, but is not spatially explicit and the biogeographic and climate background is regarded as constant; all equations for the reduced model can be found in the appendix.

In terms of the PETC framework, the dynamics between population, environment, technology and culture is the following (cmp. Figure 1 and [Boserup 1996](#), p. 509).

1.  $P \rightarrow T$  Population growth stimulates innovation by aggregation and diversity.
2.  $P \rightarrow E \rightarrow P$  Population growth uses ever more land for hunting and exerts pressure on the game stock, higher population densities damage the environment, and food shortage leads to reduced fertility (preventive check) or higher mortality (positive check). The rising capacity of the environment supports higher population.
3.  $T \rightarrow E$  More intensive foraging or farming strategies damage the environment, while efficiency gains lead to higher capacity of the environment.
4.  $T \rightarrow C$  Adoption of novel technologies induces changes in social structure where specialists and leaders or cults emerge.

[Richerson and Boyd \(1998\)](#) claim that basically all models which are rooted in ecology are Neomalthusian in essence, i.e. they can be characterized by a  $P \rightarrow T \rightarrow E$  loop in [Boserup \(1996\)](#)'s framework. This loop can be detected in the model I propose here, as well; in fact, historically it developed from ecosystem models of tree stands or algal communities ([Wirtz and Eckhardt, 1996](#)). Unlike many other models, however, GLUES is based on coevolutionary dynamics of technologies and population, and as such has no a priori information on whether there is a (Malthusian) "invention-pull view of population history" ([Lee, 1986](#), p. 98), or whether population is the (Boserupian) driver of development. Applications of GLUES show that there is an emergent emancipation of population development from the environment with increasing population and innovation ([Lemmen and Wirtz, 2010](#); [Lemmen et al., 2011](#)).

GLUES mathematically resolves the dynamics of population density and three population-average characteristic sociocultural traits: technology  $T_A$ , share of agropastoral activities  $C$ , and economic diversity  $T_B$ . These are defined for preindustrial societies as follows:

1. Technology  $T_A$  is a trait which describes the efficiency of food procurement—related to both foraging and farming—and improvements in health care. In particular, technology as a model describes the availability of tools, weapons, and transport or storage facilities. It aggregates over various relevant characteristics of early societies and also represents social aspects related to work organisation and knowledge management. It quantifies improved efficiency of subsistence, which is often connected to social and technological modifications that run in parallel. An example is the technical and societal skill of writing as a means for cultural storage and administration, with the latter acting as an organisational lubricant for food procurement and its optimal allocation in space and among social groups.  $T_A$  is labour dependent.

2. A second model variable  $C$  represents the share of farming and herding activities, encompassing both animal husbandry and plant cultivation. It describes the allocation of energy, time, or manpower to agropastoralism with respect to the total food sector.
3. Economic diversity  $T_B$  resolves the number of different agropastoral economies available to a regional population. This trait is in the full model closely tied to regional vegetation resources and climate constraints; in this reduced model, it denotes a labour-independent technology. A larger economic diversity offering different niches for agricultural or pastoral practices enhances the reliability of subsistence and the efficacy in exploiting heterogeneous landscapes.

The temporal change of each of these characteristic traits follows the direction of increased benefit for success (i.e. growth) of its associated population (Appendix equation 2); this concept had been derived for genetic traits in the works of *Fisher (1930)*, and was recently more stringently formulated by Metz and colleagues (*Metz et al., 1992; Kisdi, 2010*) as adaptive dynamics (AD). In AD, the population averaged value of a trait changes at a rate which is proportional to the gradient of the fitness function evaluated at the mean trait value. The AD approach was extended to functional traits of ecological communities (*Wirtz and Eckhardt, 1996; Merico et al., 2009*), and was first applied to cultural traits of human communities by *Lemmen (2001)* and *Wirtz and Lemmen (2003)*.

The adaptive coevolution of the food production system  $\{T_A, T_B, C\}$  and population  $P$  (Appendix equations 1–4), which is at the heart of this model’s implementation, had also been found empirically by *Boserup (1981, p. 15)*: “The close relationship which exists today between population density and food production system is the result of two long-existing processes of adaptation. On the one hand, population density has adapted to the natural conditions for food production []; on the other hand, food supply systems have adapted to changes in population density.”

#### 4 Innovation in the transition to agriculture

The outcome of the coevolutionary model simulation with the reduced GLUES is shown in Figure 2. I have divided both the trajectories (temporal evolution of state variables, left panel) and the the phase space (right panel) into six stages, which I discuss below.

1. Growth phase: Starting from a Malthusian perspective, and looking only at population and environment (quantified here as the ecosystem capacity, i.e. the ratio of birth over mortality terms in the growth rate equation equation 3), it is clear that in a first phase population grows towards its capacity with diminishing returns as  $P$  approaches  $E$ ; The growth phase spans only a short period of time but covers a large area in phase space.
2. Persistent innovation in Technology  $T_A$  and associated investments in tool making and administration allow sustained slow growth of population  $P$  and alleviates the built-up population pressure; in contrast to the growth phase, the phase space coverage is very small while the temporal extent of this phase is large.




Figure 2: Trajectories of population  $P$ , environment  $E$ , and technologies  $T_A, T_B$  (left panel) and phase diagram of innovation rate versus population pressure (right panel) from a simulation with a simplified version of the Global Land Use and technological Evolution Simulator. The trajectories describe the temporal evolution of population density, capacity denoted as environment, a labour dependent technology  $T_A$ , and a labour-independent technology  $T_B$ . Numbers identify the different stages of development in the phase diagram to the right. In this phase diagram, the innovation rate, derived as the cumulative change in  $T_A + T_B$ , is shown in relation to population pressure, calculated as  $1 - E + P$ .

3. Transition phase: rapid innovation in a labour-independent technology  $T_B$  leads to
4. Pressure relief, but induces also a change in culture (not shown);
5. Equilibration: Innovation slows but has led to a wider gap between  $P$  and  $E$  because of the investments made in manufacturing and organisation during the transition: accordingly, population pressure increases more slowly and up to a lower value than in the growth phase (1.).
6. Persistent innovation: corresponds to phase (2.) and is again characterized by persistent innovation in technology  $T_A$  and a slow population pressure relief.

What can be learned about the relationship between population pressure and innovativity from Figure 2? Firstly, innovation is greatest at high population pressure. Secondly, in this model there is always innovation, at no time is technology change negative. Thirdly, the relationship between innovativity and population pressure changes profoundly during the foraging-farming transition; three different regimes can be identified: (a) a positive relationship where acceleration of innovation corresponds to population pressure increases (phases 1., 2., 6.), (b) a negative relationship with pressure relief during accelerating innovation (phase 3., 4.), and (c) a negative relationship with deceleration of innovativity at increasing pressure (phase 5.).

A superficial analysis would come to the conclusion that population pressure is the motor of innovation in this example. Only a detailed look at phases 2. and 3. shows that innovativity decelerates at very high population pressure and that the largest innovation occurs slightly below the highest population pressure. In fact, the driver in the transition depicted here is not population, but technology<sup>4</sup>. Only the different coevolutionary time scales of population growth (fast) and innovation (slow) yield the seemingly Boserupian behaviour.

The same model—plus spatial and biogeographic aspects—has been used to successfully simulate the many transitions to agriculture in Neolithic Europe (*Lemmen et al., 2011*), with good agreement with the radiocarbon record. Also there, the transitions are phenologically Boserupian, with critical innovations occurring at high population pressure. If the numerical analysis had not been available (and proved that this is in fact technology driven), such as it is in the discretely sampled data from observations of technological change, one would have to have come to the conclusion that this type of innovation was population driven.

## 5 Conclusion

I presented a reduced version of the Global Land Use and technological Evolution Simulator, a numerical model which is capable of realistically simulating regional foraging-farming transitions worldwide. The simulated—and possibly also observed—transitions are seemingly Boserupian, i.e. population driven: innovation is greatest when population pressure is high. Analytical examination of the model, however, shows that technological change is the driver,

---

<sup>4</sup>There would be no evolution of  $T$  without  $P$  due to the coevolutionary definition of the system. The dynamics of  $T$ , however, leads the dynamics of  $P$  at the foraging farming transition.



and that in the context of a simplified version of *Boserup* (1996)'s framework in development theory the model should be classified as Neomalthusian. I thus demonstrated that Boserupian phenology may be based on Malthusian assumptions; I caution not to infer too quickly a Boserupian mechanism for an observed “real world” system when its dynamics appears to be population pressure driven.

## Appendix: the reduced GLUES model

A coevolutionary system of population  $P$  and characteristic traits  $X \in \{T_A, T_B, C\}$  is defined by the evolution equations

$$\frac{dP}{dt} = P \cdot r \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{dX}{dt} = \delta_X \cdot \frac{\partial r}{\partial X}, \quad (2)$$

where  $r$  denotes the specific growth rate of population  $P$ , and the  $\delta_X$  are (assumed constant) variability measures for each  $X$ . Growth rate  $r$  is defined as

$$r = \mu \cdot (1 - \omega T_A) \cdot (1 - \gamma \sqrt{T_A P}) \cdot SI - \rho \cdot T_A^{-1} \cdot P, \quad (3)$$

with coefficients  $\mu, \rho, \omega, \gamma$ . In this formulation, the positive term including food production  $SI$  is modulated by labour loss for administration ( $-\omega T_A$ ) and by overexploitation of the environment ( $-\gamma \sqrt{T_A P}$ ). Food production depends on the cultural system  $C$  and available technologies as follows:

$$SI = (1 - C) \cdot \sqrt{T_A} + C \cdot T_A \cdot T_B, \quad (4)$$

where the left summand denotes foraging activities and the right summand agropastoral practice.

To produce the results for Figure 2, I assumed the following parameter values:  $\mu = \rho = 0.004$ ,  $\omega = 0.04$ ,  $\gamma = 0.12$ ,  $\delta_{T_A} = 0.025$ ,  $\delta_{T_B} = 0.9$ ; a variable  $\delta_C = C \cdot (1 - C)$ ; and initial values for  $P_0 = 0.01$ ,  $T_{A,0} = 1.0$ ,  $T_{B,0} = 0.8$ , and  $C_0 = 0.04$ .

**Acknowledgments.** This study was partly funded by the German National Science Foundation (DFG priority project 1266 Interdynamik). This paper received great stimulus from the discussions during the Ester Boserup Conference 2010—A Centennial Tribute: Long-term trajectories in population, gender relations, land use, and the environment, November 15–17, 2010 in Vienna, Austria. GLUES is free and open source software and can be obtained from <http://glues.sourceforge.net/>.

## References

Barker, G. (2011), Archaeology: The cost of cultivation, *Nature*, 473, 163–164.

- Bogaard, A. (2005), Garden agriculture and the nature of early farming in Europe and the Near East, *World Archeology*, 37(2), 177–196.
- Boserup, E. (1965), *The conditions of agricultural growth*, Aldine Chicago.
- Boserup, E. (1981), *Population and technological change: A study of long-term trends*, University of Chicago Press Chicago.
- Boserup, E. (1996), Development theory: An analytical framework and selected application, *Population and Development Review*, pp. 505–515.
- Boyd, R., and P. J. Richerson (1995), Why does culture increase human adaptability?, *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 16, 125–143.
- Childe, V. G. (1925), *The Dawn of European civilization*, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, London.
- Crutzen, P. J. (2002), Geology of mankind, *Nature*, 415, 23.
- Crutzen, P. J., and E. F. Stoermer (2000), The anthropocene, *IGBP Newsletter*, 41.
- Darwin, C. (1859), *The origin of species*, 811 pp., Hayes Barton Press, reprinted 1958.
- Diamond, J., and P. Bellwood (2003), Farmers and their languages: The first expansions, *Science*, 300(5619), 597–603.
- Fisher, R. A. (1930), *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection*, Dover, New York.
- Kaplan, J. O., K. M. Krumhardt, and N. Zimmermann (2009), The prehistoric and preindustrial deforestation of Europe, *Quaternary Science Review*, 28(27-28), 3016–3034.
- Kaplan, J. O., K. M. Krumhardt, E. C. Ellis, W. F. Ruddiman, C. Lemmen, and K. Klein Goldewijk (2011), Holocene carbon emissions as a result of anthropogenic land cover change, *The Holocene*, 21(5), 775–791, doi:[10.1177/0959683610386983](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959683610386983).
- Kisdi, S. A. H., Éva and Geritz (2010), Adaptive dynamics: a framework to model evolution in the ecological theatre, *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 61, 165–169, doi:[10.1007/s00285-009-0300-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00285-009-0300-9).
- Kuijt, I., and N. Goring-Morris (2002), Foraging, farming, and social complexity in the pre-pottery Neolithic of the southern Levant: A review and synthesis, *Journal of World Prehistory*, 16(4), 361–440.
- Lee, R. (1986), Malthus and baserup: A dynamic synthesis, in *The state of population theory: Forward from Malthus*, edited by D. Coleman and R. Schofield, pp. 96–130, B. Blackwell.
- Lemmen, C. (2001), Understanding the regional rise of civilizations by means of a dynamic model, Master thesis, Carl von Ossietzky University, Oldenburg.

- Lemmen, C. (2009), World distribution of land cover changes during pre- and protohistoric times and estimation of induced carbon releases, *Géomorphologie: relief, processus, environnement*, 4, 303–312.
- Lemmen, C., and K. W. Wirtz (2010), Socio-technological revolutions and migration waves re-examining early world history with a mathematical model, in *The Spread of the Neolithic to Central Europe, RGZM Tagungen*, vol. 4, edited by D. Gronenborn and J. Petrasch, pp. 25–38, Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum, Mainz, Germany.
- Lemmen, C., D. Gronenborn, and K. W. Wirtz (2011), A simulation of the Neolithic transition in Western Eurasia, *Journal of Archaeological Science*, in press.
- Londo, J. P., Y.-C. Chiang, K.-H. Hung, T.-Y. Chiang, and B. A. Schaal (2006), Phylogeography of Asian wild rice, *Oryza rufipogon*, reveals multiple independent domestications of cultivated rice, *Oryza sativa Proceedings of the National Academie of Science USA*, 103, 9578–9583.
- Malthus, T. (1798), An essay on the principle of population, in *A Commentary on Malthus' 1798 Essay on the Principle of Population as Social Theory*, edited by F. Elwell, pp. 127–294, Mellen Press, Lewiston, commentary printed 2001.
- Malthus, T. (1826), *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, Cambridge University Press, edited by Patricia James [1989].
- Marquette, C. (1997), Turning but not toppling Malthus: Boserupian theory on population and the environment relationships, *Working papers in development studies and human rights*, 16.
- Merico, A., J. Bruggeman, and K. Wirtz (2009), A trait-based approach for downscaling complexity in plankton ecosystem models, *Ecological Modelling*, 220(21), 3001–3010.
- Metz, J., R. Nisbet, and S. Geritz (1992), How should we define fitness for general ecological scenarios, *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 7, 198–202.
- Ricardo, D. (1821), *Principles of political economy*, third ed., John Murray, London.
- Richerson, P., and R. Boyd (1998), Homage to Malthus, Ricardo, and Boserup: Toward a general theory of population, economic growth, environmental deterioration, wealth, and poverty, *Human Ecology Review*, 4, 85–90.
- Ruddiman, W. F. (2003), The anthropogenic greenhouse era began thousands of years ago, *Climatic Change*, 61(3), 261–293.
- Sahlins, M. (1972), *Stone Age Economics*, 362 pp., Aldine de Gruyter.
- Smith, A. (1776), *The Wealth of Nations [reprinted 1937]*, 740 pp., Modern Library, New York.

- Sober, E. R. (1992), Darwin's nature, in *The concept of Nature*, edited by J. Torrance, pp. 84–96.
- Stocker, B., K. Strassmann, and F. Joos (2011), Sensitivity of holocene atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> and the modern carbon budget to early human land use: analyses with a process-based model, *Biogeosciences*, 8, 69–88.
- Turchin, P., and S. Nefedov (2009), *Secular cycles*, Princeton University Press.
- Weisdorf, J. (2005), From foraging to farming: explaining the Neolithic revolution, *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 19(4).
- Wirtz, K. W., and B. Eckhardt (1996), Effective variables in ecosystem models with an application to phytoplankton succession, *Ecological Modelling*, 92, 33–53.
- Wirtz, K. W., and C. Lemmen (2003), A global dynamic model for the Neolithic transition, *Climatic Change*, 59(3), 333–367.