The assumption that agricultural regions were price-takers was questioned by the author. It was thought that the trends in prices and rates of technical change could be explained by the closed-economy case. could explain agricultural improvement and should have been given more consideration than K&W gave it.

Upon further reflection, it has been decided that one need not question the assumption that agricultural enterprises were price-takers. One may still have a 'closed-economy' situation, if one assumes instead that the world market is closed. This seems quite reasonable. Then, the situation is as follows. The small country-economies' agricultural industries respond as price-takers in world markets in an exactly analogous way to the way in which agricultural enterprises respond as price-takers in the closed country-economy. The net result of many small-countries' industries trying to be competitive would be to increase the world's supply of agricultural products. This would have the result of reducing the price along an inelastic curve, and reducing total income to each country's agricultural industry.

2/18/2026 box

Perhaps fortunately for the final analysis (if Algerian enterprises are indeed price-takers), the author decided not to try to investigate the price-elasticity of demand in Algeria, or to try to determine whether or not Algerian enterprises were responding to world prices or local prices. It was thought that this would take the research too far from its focus on migration.

An investigation into

was not attempted.

I really can't understand why you're keeping in this ...

You seem to be clutching to a bad idea that has no significance ...

now. Please drop this, it's starting to annoy readers