


# **Climate, Water Navigability, and Economic Development**

Andrew D. Mellinger, Jeffrey D. Sachs,  
and John L. Gallup

CID Working Paper No. 24  
September 1999

© Copyright 1999 Andrew D. Mellinger, Jeffrey D. Sachs, John L. Gallup,  
and the President and Fellows of Harvard College



## **Working Papers**

**Center for International Development  
at Harvard University**

## Climate, Water Navigability, and Economic Development

Andrew D. Mellinger, Jeffrey D. Sachs, and John L. Gallup\*

### Abstract

Geographic information systems (GIS) data was used on a global scale to examine the relationship between climate (ecozones), water navigability, and economic development in terms of GDP per capita. GDP per capita and the spatial density of economic activity measured as GDP per km<sup>2</sup> are high in temperate ecozones and in regions proximate to the sea (within 100 km of the ocean or a sea-navigable waterway). Temperate ecozones proximate to the sea account for 8 percent of the world's inhabited land area, 23 percent of the world's population, and 53 percent of the world's GDP. The GDP densities in temperate ecozones proximate to the sea are on average eighteen times higher than in non-proximate non-temperate areas.

**JEL codes:** O10 Economic Development – General, O 40 – Economic Growth and Aggregate Productivity, R10 – General Spatial Economics

**Keywords:** geography, economic development, economic density, climate, GDP per capita

---

**Andrew D. Mellinger** is a Research Associate at the Center for International Development specializing in the multi-disciplinary application of geographic information systems. His areas of research include landscape ecology, analysis and planning, the modeling of urbanization and alternative futures, sustainable land-use planning, and comparing road networks in spatial ecological change models. [Andrew\\_mellinger@harvard.edu](mailto:Andrew_mellinger@harvard.edu)

**Jeffrey D. Sachs** is the Director of the Center for International Development and the Galen L. Stone Professor of International Trade in the Department of Economics at Harvard. His current research interests include emerging markets, global competitiveness, economic growth and development, transition to a market economy, international financial markets, international macroeconomic policy coordination and macroeconomic policies in developing and developed countries. [Jeffrey\\_sachs@harvard.edu](mailto:Jeffrey_sachs@harvard.edu)

**John L. Gallup** is a Research Fellow at the Center for International Development, an Institute Associate at the Harvard Institute for International Development, and a Lecturer in the Department of Economics at Harvard University. His recent research focuses on economic geography, malaria, and the relationship between economic growth and poverty alleviation. [John\\_gallup@harvard.edu](mailto:John_gallup@harvard.edu)

---

\*This research is part of an ongoing project at Harvard's Center for International Development investigating the linkages between geography and economic development. The author's wish to thank Karin Johnson, Andrew Warner, and Steve Radelet for their work on this paper and related efforts.

## Climate, Water Navigability, and Economic Development

Andrew D. Mellinger, Jeffrey D. Sachs, and John L. Gallup

### I. Introduction

One of the central issues of economics is the enormous disparity in economic performance between rich and poor regions of the world. Modern economics got its start, in fact, with Adam Smith's *Inquiry into the Wealth of Nations* in 1776, in which Smith identified social and geographical factors that could account for differential economic performance across regions of the world. Smith is remembered today mainly for his theory that market institutions would enable societies to develop a richer division of labor, and therefore higher living standards, than societies subject to extensive government controls. He is less remembered for his equally astute geographical observations. Smith asserted that the division of labor is limited by the extent of the market, and that coastal regions, by virtue of their ability to engage in sea-based trade, enjoy a wider scope of the market than interior regions. In Smith's words:

As by means of water carriage a more extensive market is opened to every sort of industry than what land carriage alone can afford it, so it is upon the sea-coast, and along the banks of navigable rivers that industry of every kind begins to sub-divide and improve itself, and it is frequently not till a long time after that those improvements extend themselves to the inland part of the country

Based on the importance of sea-based trade, Smith drew pessimistic conclusions regarding inland Africa and large parts of Russia, Siberia and Central Asia:

All the inland parts of Africa, and all that part of Asia which lies any considerable way north of the Black and Caspian Seas, the ancient Scythia, the modern Tartary and Siberia, seem in all ages of the world to have been in the same barbarous and uncivilized state in which we find them at present. . . There are in Africa none of those great inlets . . . to carry maritime trade into the interior parts of that great continent. . .

Smith was less aware of the effects of climate on economic performance. Climatic conditions have pervasive effects on disease, agriculture, human physiology, and other factors

that may affect economic performance. Recent studies (Gallup, Sachs, and Mellinger, 1998; Bloom and Sachs, 1998) have noted that tropical areas are consistently poorer than temperate zone areas, because of the intrinsic effects of tropical ecology on human health and agricultural productivity. Tropical infectious diseases, for example, impose very high burdens on human health, that in turn may lead to shortfalls in economic performance much larger than their direct, short-run effects on health. Another recent study (Gallup and Sachs 1999), found that after controlling for material inputs such as capital, labor, and fertilizers, the productivity of tropical food production still falls far short of the productivity of temperate zone food production.

In an overview of economic development and geography (Gallup, Sachs, and Mellinger, 1998) the latitudinal belt between the Tropics of Cancer (23.45 N) and Capricorn (23.45 S) was used to separate the geographical tropics from the rest of the world. They showed that economies in the geographic tropics have lower income levels and lower growth rates than the rest of the world, and that the shortfall is evident after controlling for other standard economic variables that affect economic performance. Their analysis is extended here by using ecological measures of the tropics rather than the simple latitudinal definitions.

In the following sections, we examine the geographic distribution of per capita GDP, GDP density (defined as GDP per km<sup>2</sup>), and population density. These variables are highly influenced by climate and proximity to the sea. We find strong evidence that the ecological tropics, the dry regions, and the sub-tropical regions are systematically poorer than temperate ecozones. Moreover, the temperate ecozones proximate to the sea, though a small part of the world's inhabited landmass, account for a remarkably high proportion of the world's annual economic output. Section II describes the data set we developed for this research. Section III describes the global distributions of GDP and population across the ecozones. Section IV

examines the distributions within continents. Section V offers some further discussion of the results and presents conclusions and questions for investigation.

## **II. Data and Methods**

A geographic information system (GIS) was assembled containing four variables: climate zones, population, navigable rivers and Gross Domestic Product on a per capita basis for 152 countries with a population of 1 million or more in 1995. In 1995 these countries had a combined population of 5.65 billion, 99.7 percent of the world's population (Tobler, et al, 1995). GIS is a computer-based relational database used for the storage, analysis, and display of geographically referenced data. The inherent advantage to using a GIS is that data can be analyzed spatially.

A digital map of climate was constructed using the classification devised by Wladimir Köppen in 1918 and revised in 1953 by his students Geiger and Pohl to determine climate boundaries that coincided with major vegetation types (Strahler and Strahler, 1992). The usefulness of this approach to classification lies in its empirical delineation of climatic boundaries based on either monthly or annual actual temperature and precipitation values. The Köppen -Geiger-Pohl classification designates major climate groups, subgroups within the major groups, and further divides the subgroups to capture seasonal differences in temperature and precipitation.

The six major categories of climate zones are designated by a capital letter: A = tropical, rainy; B = dry; C = mild, humid; D = snow, forest; E = polar; and H = highland. The subgroups are classified by the addition of another letter. Adding the lower case *f* used with Af, Cf, and Df indicates climates that are moist with adequate precipitation in all months with no dry season.

The *w* used with *Aw* and *Cw* denotes a dry winter season in the respective hemisphere. The *m*, which is only used with the *A* climate, indicates a rainforest climate despite a short, dry season in monsoon-like precipitation cycles. The *s* used with *Cs* indicates a dry season in the summer of the respective hemisphere. The upper case *W* represents arid, desert climates and the *S* indicates semiarid, steppe climates. The *W* and *S* are used only with the dry *B* climates. The *H* and *E* zones do not have further subdivision. Figure 1 depicts the global extent of the subgroups. We mainly are concerned with the eleven classifications of the second tier, *Af*, *Am*, *Aw*, *BS*, *BW*, *Cf*, *Cs*, *Cw*, *Df*, *DW*, and *H*. The *E* climate is generally excluded because the 4 percent of the world's land area in this polar zone (e.g. the tundra of Northern Russia) has almost no human population.

Figure 2 shows the global distribution of population density as of 1994 (Tobler, et al, 1995) measured as population per km<sup>2</sup>. Tobler et al (1995) obtained a resolution of 5 minutes by 5 minutes, approximately 7.5 km<sup>2</sup> at the equator. Some of the underlying data, however, is less refined, with population interpolated to the 5 minute by 5 minute grid. A detailed description of the gridded population dataset is in the endnote reference.

Since we are concerned with modern economic development as driven by international trade, rivers were mapped based on navigability for ocean-going vessels. Rivers categorized as navigable in the ArcAtlas (ESRI, 1996) database are pared down according to three rules using information taken from Rand McNally (1980), Britannica Online (1998), and Encyclopedia Encarta (1998): whether a river accommodates vessels with a minimum draft of approximately 3 meters (anything smaller is not considered ocean-going); the point at which a navigable river becomes obstructed by falls, rapids, locks or dams; and whether the river is frozen during winter. The coastline used is free from pack ice throughout the year (ESRI, 1996; Rand McNally, 1994).

Using this classification Figure 3 shows the land area in the world that is within 100 km of the ocean coast or a sea-navigable river. As Adam Smith noted, Africa has no sea-navigable rivers that extend from the oceans to the interior of the continent. High continental tableland precludes navigability, even with investment. By contrast, North America has two navigable waterways that link the continent's vast interior with the ocean: the St. Lawrence Seaway and Great Lakes system, and the Mississippi River system (and its major tributaries such as the Missouri and Ohio Rivers)<sup>1</sup>.

Per capita Gross Domestic Product (GDP) was measured at standardized purchasing power parity (PPP) at both the national and sub-national level. Figure 4 depicts global distribution of GDP per capita in 1995. To capture intra-country variance in income distribution, sub-national per capita GDP data was gathered for 19 of the 152 countries in our GIS, including most of the large economies. These are Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, France, Germany, Greece, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, Spain, United Kingdom, United States, and Uruguay. Since the sub-national data of these countries was collected in local currency rather than in a comparable \$US purchasing power parity basis, the local-currency measures were adjusted to create internationally comparable sub-national measures.<sup>2</sup> The two major gradients of per capita GDP that result are climate and distance from

---

1 The Saint Lawrence Seaway is partly man-made, but the improvements upon its already largely navigable course made this river system fully passable to the Atlantic.

2 The country-level \$US PPP-adjusted GDP is used for each country for 1995 (GDPc below), available from the World Bank (1998) World Development Indicators, supplemented by CIA World Factbook (1996, 1997) estimates. For each sub-national region *i*, the \$US PPP GDP<sub>*i*</sub> is calculated accordingly:

$$\text{\$US PPP GDP}_i = \text{GDP}_c \times (\text{GDP}_i / \text{GDP}_a)$$

GDP<sub>*i*</sub> is the GDP per capita of region *i* in local currency, and GDP<sub>*a*</sub> is the country-average per capita GDP in local currency. GDP<sub>*a*</sub> is calculated as  $\Sigma(\text{GDP}_i \times \text{Pop}_i) / \Sigma(\text{Pop}_i)$ . Sub-national regional GDP was collected from national sources, mainly government statistical yearbooks. Thus, provincial populations and provincial income data are used to calculate a country's average GDP per capita, and then used to calculate the ratio of each province's per capita GDP to the national average. We then multiply that ratio by the \$US PPP GDP, to calculate a GDP on a PPP basis

the coast. The tropical regions are almost all poor and coastal regions tend to have higher incomes than interior regions. These effects are quantified in the next section.

### **III. Spatial distribution of population and economic density**

Using the GIS population data, GDP per capita, and climate zone, the distribution of economic activity and global population according to ecozones and proximity to the sea is calculated. Tables 1-3 show the proportions of global land area, population, and total GDP within each of the eleven climate zones. Each climate zone is separated into two sub-regions: “near,” signifying within 100 km of the sea (i.e. ocean coast or ocean-navigable river); and “far,” signifying beyond 100 km of the sea. Four sub-zones (Cf, Cs, Dw, and Df) are classified as “temperate.” The Cw zone is mainly sub-tropical but is included here as part of the tropical zone rather than the temperate zone (it encompasses the Gangetic valley of India, stretches in South America south of the Amazon, in Southern Africa and a small belt in northeastern Australia).

The near temperate zone which is within 100km of the sea and in a temperate climate plays a dominant role in the world economy, see Figure 5. Note that much of the United States’ coasts, Great Lakes, and Mississippi River are included, almost all of Western Europe, much of East Asia including coastal China, South Korea, and Japan, coastal Australia, New Zealand, South America’s Chile, coastal Argentina, and a small part of coastal Brazil, part of North Africa’s coast, and the southern tip of South Africa. These regions contain almost all of the world’s economic powerhouse economies, and as is demonstrated a significant proportion of global production.

---

for each region. This calculation assumes that the ratio of the regional GDP per capita to national GDP per capita in local currency equals the ratio of the regional GDP to national GDP on a PPP basis.



Table 1 shows the proportion of global land area in each ecozone. Note that 17.4 percent of the world's land area is within 100 km of the sea. 39.2 percent of the world's land area lies within the four sub-zones designated "temperate." By calculating the intersection of the two areas, the near temperate zone constitutes 8.3 percent of the world's land. Nearly one third of the world's land area (29.6 percent) lies in the dry climate zones (desert and steppes), along with a smaller proportion of the world's population (18.0 percent). The dry zones tend to be among the least densely populated places on the planet. 19.9 percent of the world's land area lies within the tropics (Af, Am, Aw and Cw), and 7.3 percent within the populated highlands.

Table 2 repeats this exercise for world population. 34.9 percent live in the temperate zone, and 49.9 percent live within 100 km of the sea. The near temperate region includes 22.8 percent of the world's population, located on 8.4 percent of the world's landmass, making it a densely populated part of the world. 24.3 percent live in the tropical A zones, while another 16.0 percent of the world, mainly in India and China, live in the sub-tropical Cw zone. 6.2 percent of the world's population lives in desert (BW) regions, which comprises 17.3 percent of the land.

Table 3 shows the spatial distribution of the world's GDP by climate zone. For each sub-region, per capita GDP (measured at PPP) is multiplied by the population, giving the total GDP for the sub-region. The world's GDP is the sum of these sub-regional GDPs. A striking 67.6 percent of the world's GDP is produced within 100 km of the sea, though that area comprises only 17.4 percent of the world's landmass. 67.2 percent of the world's GDP is produced in the temperate climates, though these account for only 39.2 percent of the world's landmass. The near temperate region, with 8.3 percent of the world's landmass and 22.8 percent of the world's population, produces a remarkable 52.9 percent of the world's GDP.

By dividing the cells of Table 2 by those of Table 1, shown in Table 4, the population density of the climate zones is shown relative to the global average population density, which is 42.5 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> (Tobler et al, 1995). Thus, the Cf-near zone has a relative population density of 3.15, or a population density 3.15 times the world average, which is 133.9 people per km<sup>2</sup> (= 3.15 x 42.5). The overall near temperate region is densely populated, with a relative density of 2.72. The near zones are more densely populated than the far zones in every climate zone.

Dividing the cells of Table 3 by those of Table 2, shown in Table 5, the GDP per capita relative to the world average (or \$5,500 at PPP) is presented. The GDP per capita shows two systematic gradients: the near regions are higher than the far regions for every ecozone averaging 1.4 times the world average in the near regions and .7 times the world average in the far regions. And the temperate ecozones' GDP per capita is higher than the non-temperate (except in the DW zone which mostly encompasses Siberia) averaging 1.9 times the world average in the temperate zones and .5 times the world average in the non-temperate zones. The highest total income ecozone is the Cf (mild, temperate) climate, followed by the Cs (Mediterranean) climate and the Df (snow) climate (the order of these three changes when you compare near and far GDP-per capita). Per capita GDP is especially high in the regions that are both temperate and proximate to the sea, with 2.32 times the world average or \$12,760 in PPP currency units (2.32 x \$5,500). The near temperate zone has 6 times the per capita GDP of the far tropical zone.

GDP density, measured as total GDP per km<sup>2</sup>, is a useful measure for understanding where overall production of goods and services takes place. Since GDP density is equal to per capita GDP multiplied by population density, and since both GDP per capita and population density are especially high in the near temperate zones, the GDP density is extremely high in

those regions. Table 6 shows GDP density calculated by dividing the cells of Table 3 by those of Table 1. The GDP density in the Cf near zone is a remarkable 7.63 times the world average GDP density equaling \$230,000 per km<sup>2</sup>. The highest income densities are found in the near zones, the temperate climates, and also the sub-tropical Cw climate. The latter ecozone is characterized by a relatively low GDP per capita, but an extremely high population density. The near ecozones have on average 10 times the GDP densities of the far zones. The near temperate ecozones produce income densities that average 18 times that of the far non-temperate ecozones.

Thus far averages have been examined for population density, GDP per capita, and GDP per km<sup>2</sup> by region. Sharp differences were found according to coastal proximity and ecozone. But how significant are these differences? While *formal* statistical tests of differences of means are not readily viable (there being little justification in assuming that the variables are drawn from any particular underlying distribution), the overall distributions of the variables were examined to assess how different these distributions are across regions. Table 7 shows the distribution of GDP per capita by ecozone in both the near and far regions. The top half of the table refers to regions proximate to the sea, and the bottom half refers to regions far from the sea. For each ecozone, the percentage of the population living at each level of GDP per capita<sup>3</sup> is calculated.

Differences in per capita income across ecozones are reflected in sharp differences in the overall distribution, not just in the means. Among the near regions, for example, no more than 1 percent of the populations in tropical regions (Af, Am, Aw, or Cw) are in the high-income

---

<sup>3</sup> Note that we have GDP per capita on a national basis for most countries (133 with population of one million or more), and a sub-national (provincial or state) basis for 19 countries, giving us 455 administrative units in total for which we have an estimate of average GDP per capita. To make the calculations for Tables 3, 5, and 7, we assume that the entire population within each administrative unit has the average GDP per capita of that unit. Thus, we ignore income inequality *within* administrative units.

category (\$16,000 or more), while 47 percent of the populations of the temperate regions are in the high-income category. The tropical regions are nearly uniformly poor. While temperate regions have a wide income range with a small proportion (7 percent) of the temperate-zone populations at income levels below \$2,000, compared with 42 percent of the tropical zone population.

The same calculations are made for distribution of population density by ecozone, shown in Table 8, again dividing the near and far regions for separate analysis. One systematic gradient is that the near ecozones are uniformly more densely populated than the far ecozones. There is much less homogeneity of population density within the tropical and temperate ecozones. The ecozones are less defining of population density than they are of GDP per capita. The tropical zones display regions of both high population densities, 320+ per km<sup>2</sup>, and low population densities, 0-20 per km<sup>2</sup>. The same is true of temperate ecozones.

#### **IV. Continental Patterns**

As a final exercise in this section, the allocation of populations of major continental regions into ecozones and coastal proximity is shown in Table 9. The near temperate regions were noted earlier for having much higher levels of income per capita than all other categories. The continental regions differ markedly in the shares of their populations and land areas that fall within these advantaged or disadvantaged zones. We divide the world into nine broad regions: North America, Latin America, Western Europe, Middle East and North Africa, Sub-Saharan Africa, East Asia, South Asia, Oceania, and Eastern Europe and Former Soviet Union.

Four continental regions have large populations living in non-temperate climates; South Asia has no temperate climate, 96 percent of Sub-Saharan Africans, 88 percent of Latin

Americans and 70 percent of Middle Eastern and North Africans live in non-temperate climates. The global average shows 65 percent of population residing in non-temperate climates. The global average for population living in non-temperate far regions is 38 percent. The same four continental regions again have higher shares, 78 percent of Sub-Saharan Africans, 59 percent of South Asians; 48 percent in Latin Americans, and 45 percent of the Middle Eastern and North Africans live in non-temperate far regions. In Latin America, one-fifth of the population lives in a highland (H) climate far from the coast.

The people living on the other five continental regions are distributed mostly among the temperate climates. East Asia is included in this grouping because its non-temperate far population of 25 percent is lower than the global average of 38 percent. East Asia also has an advantage with the majority of its population living in a region near to the sea. Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union have 74 percent of the population in temperate climates, but only 33 percent in a near temperate zone. For Russia alone, the population share in the near temperate region is only 6 percent.

Western Europe, North America, and Oceania are all especially favored. Western Europe has a striking 96 percent of the population in a temperate ecozone, with 87 percent in near temperate ecozones. North America has 88 percent of the population in temperate ecozones and 63 percent of the population in near temperate ecozones. In Oceania, 74 percent of the population lives in the temperate ecozones, with 63 percent of the population in near temperate ecozones. Figures 1 and 5 show that the continents with the highest concentrations of near temperate populations, Western Europe, North America and Oceania, are also the richest. Conversely, the two continents with the highest population in far tropical ecozones, Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, are also the poorest.

## **V. Discussion and Future Research**

Climate and coastal proximity are two key geographical gradients of economic development. Temperate ecozones and regions within 100 km of sea navigable waterways are home to more than 50 percent of the world's economic output, but encompass only 8 percent of the world's inhabited landmass. When population is factored in the inequality is even greater. The near ecozones contain on average ten times the GDP densities of the far ecozones. Comparing the economic density of the near temperate ecozones with the far non-temperate ecozones, the GDP densities are on average 18 times greater. It is the task of the science of economic development to give an interpretation of these patterns.

Three hypotheses seem appropriate for further exploration. The simplest hypothesis is that the intrinsic characteristics of the tropics and interior regions are indeed highly detrimental to long-term economic development. Tropical climates are burdened by much higher levels of infectious disease than temperate climates, and are generally less productive in food production. Interior regions suffer from much higher transport costs than coastal regions. The combination of being both interior and non-temperate is therefore doubly detrimental. Sub-Saharan Africa has no less than 78 percent of its population living in far and non-temperate regions.

A second hypothesis is that tropical climates are detrimental, but only modestly so. If the world is subject to increasing-returns-to-scale production technologies, however, then small initial disadvantages can cumulate into larger and larger differences over time. An example might be the following. Suppose that tropical climates were only, say, 25 percent disadvantaged 200 years ago, but that innovative activity is ecozone-specific (for example in health and agricultural technology) and is determined by the size of the market. A small initial advantage in

the temperate zone could then multiply as a result of much larger induced innovative activity in the temperate zones as a result of the initial modest advantage. In this case, the main policy implication would be the importance of re-directing scientific and technological efforts towards tropical ecozone problems. This position is advocated in Sachs (1999).

A third kind of hypothesis would hold that the technological disadvantages of the tropics, or of interior regions, is a thing of the past; that the disadvantages were once important, but no longer are. In this case, the major differences in income levels across regions would tend to diminish over time, except to the extent that increasing-returns-to-scale processes (such as innovative activity) continue to magnify the former disadvantages into permanent differences.

We have been beginning some of this work, by examining the role of climate in the process of technological innovation and technological diffusion. It seems, for example, to be the case that innovative efforts in public health are still overwhelmingly directed at “temperate-zone diseases,” and that the resulting technological innovations do not always cross the ecological divide. There is remarkably little research on malaria vaccines, for example, even though the technological barriers could likely be overcome in just a few years (Hamoudi, Kremer, and Sachs, 1999). We have also found that the growth in total factor productivity in agriculture was considerably higher in the temperate zones than the tropical zones during the period 1961 – 94 (See Gallup and Sachs, 1999).

With regard to coastal proximity, it might be supposed that the vast cost reductions in air and land travel, and in telecommunications and data transmission, this century would have greatly reduced the advantages of a coastal location. Such does not seem to be the case, however. In the United States, for example, the proportion of the population living near the sea coast has been rising steadily this century (Rappaport and Sachs, 1999). Also, coastal proximity

has given developing countries a clear advantage in the past thirty years in establishing competitive manufacturing export sectors, which in turn have been important contributors to overall economic growth (Radelet and Sachs, 1999).



## References

- Bloom, David and Jeffrey Sachs. 1998. "Geography, Demography, and Economic Growth in Africa." Center for International Development, Cambridge, Mass. *Mimeo*.
- Britannica Online. 1998. <http://www.eb.com>.
- CIA. 1996. *The World Factbook*. Washington, D.C.: Central Intelligence Agency.
- CIA. 1996. *The World Factbook*. <http://www.odci.gov/cia/publications/>
- Encyclopaedia Encarta*. <http://encarta.msn.com>.
- ESRI (Environmental Systems Research Institute). 1992. *ArcWorld's User Guide and Data Reference*. Redlands, Calif.
- ESRI. 1996a. *ArcAtlas: Our Earth*. Redlands, Calif.
- ESRI. 1996b. *ArcWorld Supplement Data Reference and User's Guide*. Redlands, Calif.
- Gallup, John L., Jeffrey D. Sachs, and Andrew D. Mellinger. 1998. "Geography and Economic Development." Annual World Bank Conference on Development Economics: 1998. Edited by Boris Pleskovic and Joseph E. Stiglitz. The World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- Gallup, John L. and Jeffrey D. Sachs. 1999. "Agricultural Productivity and Geography." Center for International Development, Cambridge, Mass. *Mimeo*.
- Hamoudi, Amar, Michael Kremer, and Jeffrey D. Sachs. 1999. "The Case for a Vaccine Purchase Fund." *Mimeo*. <http://cid.harvard.edu/cidmalaria/>
- Köppen, Wladimir. 1918. "Klassifikation der Klimate nach Temperatur, Niederschlag and Jahreslauf," *Petermanns Geographische Mitteilungen*. Volume 64, pp. 193-203, 243-48.
- Rappaport, Jordan and Jeffrey Sachs. 1999. "The United States as a Coastal Nation." *Mimeo*.
- Radelet, Steven and Jeffrey Sachs. 1999. "Shipping Costs, Manufactured Exports, and Economic Growth." Presented at the American Economics Association annual meeting, January 1998.
- Rand McNally and Co. 1980. *Encyclopaedia of World Rivers*, New York: Rand McNally and Co.
- Sachs, Jeffrey D. 1999. "Helping the World's Poorest." *The Economist*. 352:8132:17-20.
- Smith, Adam. 1976. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. 2 Vols. Edited by Edwin Canaan. Chicago, Ill.: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Strahler, Alan H. and Arthur N. Strahler. 1992. *Modern Physical Geography*. Fourth Edition. John Wiley and Sons, Inc. New York, New York. Map originally published in Geiger, R. and W. Pohl, Revision of the Köppen -Geiger *Klimakarte der Erde* (Darmstadt: Justus Perthes, 1953), 4 sheets, 1:16 Million: R. Geiger, "Eine neue Wandkarte der Klimagebiete der Erde," *Erdkunde*, Vol. 8 (1954), pp. 58-61.

Tobler, Waldo, Uwe Deichmann, John Gottsegen, Kelley Maloy, "The Global Demography Project" Technical Report 95-6, National Center for Geographic Information and Analysis, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA, 1995. The data are also freely available on the World Wide Web at CIESIN, "Gridded Population of the World," <http://www.ciesin.org.html>

World Bank. 1998. *World Development Indicators 1998 CD-ROM*. Washington, D.C.: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

**TABLE 1. LAND AREA BY CLIMATE ZONE**

Climate zone	Land area		
	Near	Far	Total
Af	1.7%	2.3%	4.0%
Am	0.7%	0.1%	0.8%
Aw	2.5%	8.3%	10.8%
Cw	0.6%	3.7%	4.3%
BS	1.1%	11.2%	12.3%
BW	1.9%	15.4%	17.3%
H	0.4%	6.9%	7.3%
E	0.1%	3.9%	4.0%
Cf	4.8%	2.9%	7.7%
Cs	1.3%	0.8%	2.2%
Df	2.0%	21.0%	23.0%
DW	0.2%	6.2%	6.4%
Tropical <sup>1</sup>	6.1%	38.6%	44.7%
Non-temperate <sup>2</sup>	9.0%	51.8%	60.8%
Temperate <sup>3</sup>	8.4%	30.9%	39.2%
Total	17.4%	82.6%	

1) Tropical = Af, Am, Aw, and Cw

2) Non-temperate = Tropical + BS, BW, H and E

3) Temperate = Cf, Cs, Df, & DW

**TABLE 2. POPULATION BY CLIMATE ZONE**

Climate zone	Population		
	Near	Far	Total
Af	3.8%	0.6%	4.4%
Am	2.3%	0.1%	2.4%
Aw	9.3%	8.2%	17.5%
Cw	6.4%	9.6%	16.0%
BS	2.3%	9.4%	11.8%
BW	2.1%	4.1%	6.2%
H	0.9%	5.9%	6.8%
E	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cf	15.0%	4.5%	19.5%
Cs	3.6%	0.7%	4.3%
Df	2.7%	3.1%	5.8%
DW	1.5%	3.8%	5.3%
Tropical <sup>1</sup>	21.8%	18.5%	40.3%
Non-temperate <sup>2</sup>	27.1%	38.0%	65.1%
Temperate <sup>3</sup>	22.8%	12.1%	34.9%
Total	49.9%	50.1%	

1) Tropical = Af, Am, Aw, and Cw

2) Non-temperate = Tropical + BS, BW, H and E

3) Temperate = Cf, Cs, Df, & DW

**TABLE 3. GDP BY CLIMATE ZONE**

Climate zone	GDP		
	Near	Far	Total
Af	2.5%	0.3%	2.8%
Am	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%
Aw	3.6%	3.0%	6.6%
Cw	3.4%	3.6%	7.0%
BS	1.9%	4.6%	6.5%
BW	1.4%	2.2%	3.6%
H	0.9%	4.4%	5.3%
Cf	36.3%	7.4%	43.7%
Cs	7.9%	1.1%	9.1%
Df	7.3%	3.7%	11.0%
DW	1.4%	2.0%	3.4%
Tropical <sup>1</sup>	10.5%	6.9%	17.4%
Non-temperate <sup>2</sup>	14.7%	18.1%	32.8%
Temperate <sup>3</sup>	52.9%	14.3%	67.2%
Total	67.6%	32.4%	

1) Tropical = Af, Am, Aw, and Cw

2) Non-temperate = Tropical + BS, BW, H and E

3) Temperate = Cf, Cs, Df, & DW

**TABLE 4. POPULATION DENSITY BY CLIMATE ZONE**

Climate zone	Population		
	Near	Far	Total
Af	2.17	0.28	1.10
Am	3.56	0.62	3.16
Aw	3.67	0.99	1.62
Cw	11.03	2.57	3.70
BS	2.19	0.84	0.96
BW	1.12	0.27	0.36
H	2.23	0.85	0.93
Cf	3.15	1.57	2.55
Cs	2.66	0.90	1.99
Df	1.36	0.15	0.25
DW	6.05	0.61	0.82
Tropical <sup>1</sup>	3.59	0.48	0.90
Non-temperate <sup>2</sup>	3.01	0.73	1.07
Temperate <sup>3</sup>	2.72	0.39	0.89
Total	2.87	0.61	

1) Tropical = Af, Am, Aw, and Cw

2) Non-temperate = Tropical + BS, BW, H and E

3) Temperate = Cf,Cs, Df, & DW

**TABLE 5: GDP PER CAPITA (GDP/pop)**

Climate zone	GDP per capita		
	Near	Far	Total
Af	0.66	0.54	0.64
Am	0.41	0.30	0.41
Aw	0.39	0.36	0.38
Cw	0.54	0.37	0.44
BS	0.80	0.49	0.55
BW	0.65	0.54	0.58
H	1.01	0.75	0.78
Cf	2.42	1.63	2.24
Cs	2.22	1.51	2.10
Df	2.67	1.22	1.90
DW	0.92	0.53	0.64
Tropical <sup>1</sup>	0.48	0.37	0.43
Non-temperate <sup>2</sup>	0.54	0.48	0.50
Temperate <sup>3</sup>	2.32	1.18	1.94
Total	1.35	0.65	

1) Tropical = Af, Am, Aw, and Cw

2) Non-temperate = Tropical + BS, BW, H and E

3) Temperate = Cf,Cs, Df, & DW

**TABLE 6: GDP DENSITY (GDP/km<sup>2</sup>)**

Climate zone	GDP Density		
	Near	Far	Total
Af	1.42	0.15	0.70
Am	1.46	0.19	1.28
Aw	1.43	0.36	0.61
Cw	5.91	0.95	1.61
BS	1.75	0.41	0.53
BW	0.73	0.15	0.21
H	2.26	0.64	0.73
Cf	7.63	2.56	5.71
Cs	5.91	1.37	4.18
Df	3.63	0.18	0.48
DW	5.57	0.33	0.53
Tropical <sup>1</sup>	1.90	0.48	0.87
Non-temperate <sup>2</sup>	1.63	0.35	0.53
Temperate <sup>3</sup>	6.32	0.46	1.72
Total	3.89	0.39	

1) Tropical = Af, Am, Aw, and Cw

2) Non-temperate = Tropical + BS, BW, H and E

3) Temperate = Cf,Cs, Df, & DW



**TABLE 7. GDP PER CAPITA DISTRIBUTION**

% of population within each zone

<b>Near</b>	\$0-1,000	\$1,000-2,000	\$2,000-4,000	\$4,000-8,000	\$8,000-16,000	\$16,000+
Af	16%	6%	59%	8%	10%	1%
Am	4%	40%	52%	3%	0%	0%
Aw	29%	37%	21%	12%	1%	1%
Cw	25%	15%	34%	20%	6%	0%
BS	2%	21%	55%	8%	9%	5%
BW	11%	11%	50%	15%	11%	2%
H	5%	3%	52%	22%	8%	10%
Cf	0%	5%	15%	21%	6%	53%
Cs	1%	2%	11%	30%	24%	33%
Df	0%	1%	13%	30%	0%	56%
DW	22%	0%	15%	39%	24%	0%
Tropical <sup>1</sup>	23%	26%	35%	13%	4%	1%
Non-temperate <sup>2</sup>	19%	23%	38%	13%	5%	1%
Temperate <sup>3</sup>	2%	3%	14%	24%	9%	47%

<b>Far</b>	\$0-1,000	\$1,000-2,000	\$2,000-4,000	\$4,000-8,000	\$8,000-16,000	\$16,000+
Af	39%	9%	18%	20%	7%	7%
Am	3%	67%	30%	0%	0%	0%
Aw	35%	37%	9%	12%	3%	3%
Cw	27%	29%	29%	9%	3%	3%
BS	21%	26%	37%	12%	2%	2%
BW	11%	47%	19%	8%	7%	7%
H	24%	26%	12%	29%	5%	5%
Cf	1%	10%	48%	21%	10%	10%
Cs	2%	3%	32%	30%	16%	16%
Df	0%	0%	8%	91%	0%	0%
DW	1%	15%	59%	14%	5%	5%
Tropical	31%	32%	20%	11%	3%	3%
Non-temperate	25%	31%	23%	13%	4%	4%
Temperate	1%	9%	41%	36%	6%	6%

<b>TOTAL</b>						
Tropical	26%	29%	28%	12%	4%	2%
Non-temperate	23%	28%	29%	13%	4%	3%
Temperate	2%	5%	23%	28%	8%	34%

1) Tropical = Af, Am, Aw, and Cw

2) Non-temperate = Tropical + BS, BW, H and E

3) Temperate = Cf, Cs, Df, & DW

**TABLE 8. POPULATION DENSITY DISTRIBUTION (pop per km<sup>2</sup>)**

% of regional population with:

<b>Near</b>	0-20	20-40	40-80	80-160	160-320	320+
Af	4%	7%	11%	17%	13%	48%
Am	3%	1%	5%	14%	26%	51%
Aw	2%	3%	7%	7%	15%	67%
Cw	0%	0%	1%	3%	8%	88%
BS	3%	2%	14%	15%	18%	49%
BW	9%	8%	8%	7%	13%	56%
H	4%	7%	13%	26%	16%	34%
Cf	2%	2%	7%	16%	18%	54%
Cs	1%	3%	12%	25%	24%	35%
Df	4%	5%	25%	25%	13%	27%
DW	2%	0%	1%	11%	20%	66%
Tropical <sup>1</sup>	2%	3%	7%	13%	17%	57%
Non-temperate <sup>2</sup>	3%	3%	7%	9%	14%	65%
Temperate <sup>3</sup>	2%	3%	10%	18%	18%	49%

<b>Far</b>	0-20	20-40	40-80	80-160	160-320	320+
Af	42%	16%	20%	13%	7%	2%
Am	28%	11%	7%	2%	11%	42%
Aw	14%	9%	14%	22%	27%	14%
Cw	4%	3%	6%	16%	25%	46%
BS	11%	7%	12%	11%	19%	39%
BW	24%	12%	7%	16%	16%	25%
H	10%	12%	19%	22%	13%	24%
Cf	5%	8%	14%	20%	21%	32%
Cs	6%	20%	33%	28%	11%	3%
Df	27%	20%	29%	11%	3%	10%
DW	6%	3%	8%	18%	25%	39%
Tropical	12%	9%	14%	21%	24%	20%
Non-temperate	12%	8%	12%	17%	21%	31%
Temperate	12%	11%	18%	17%	16%	26%

<b>TOTAL</b>						
Tropical	5%	5%	9%	15%	19%	46%
Non-temperate	8%	6%	10%	14%	18%	45%
Temperate	6%	6%	13%	18%	18%	41%

1) Tropical = Af, Am, Aw, and Cw

2) Non-temperate = Tropical + BS, BW, H and E

3) Temperate = Cf, Cs, Df, & DW

**TABLE 9. POPULATION BY CONTINENT**

Continent	Tropical <sup>1</sup>		Non-temperate <sup>2</sup>		Temperate <sup>3</sup>		Total	
	Near	Far	Near	Far	Near	Far	Near	Far
Sub-Saharan Africa	15%	47%	18%	78%	3%	1%	21%	79%
Eastern Europe and Former Soviet Union	0%	0%	6%	20%	33%	41%	39%	61%
South Asia	38%	32%	41%	59%	0%	0%	41%	59%
Latin America	31%	25%	40%	48%	5%	7%	45%	55%
Middle East & North Africa	0%	0%	25%	45%	23%	7%	48%	52%
<i>Global average</i>	22%	18%	27%	38%	23%	12%	50%	50%
East Asia	28%	14%	32%	25%	26%	17%	58%	42%
North America	1%	0%	3%	8%	63%	26%	67%	33%
Oceania	15%	2%	17%	8%	66%	8%	83%	17%
Western Europe	0%	0%	2%	2%	87%	9%	89%	11%

1) Tropical = Af, Am, Aw, and Cw

2) Non-temperate = Tropical + BS, BW, H and E

3) Temperate = Cf,Cs, Df, & DW

Figure 1. Koppen-Geiger climate zones




Figure 2. Population distribution




Figure 3. Land within 100 km of an ice-free coast or sea-navigable river




Figure 4. GDP-PPP 1995 in \$US




Figure 5. GDP-PPP 1995 in \$US in temperate climate zones 0-100km from the coast and sea-navigable rivers

