

State and Development: The Need for a Reappraisal of the Current Literature[†]

PRANAB BARDHAN*

This essay tries to bring out some of the complexities that are overlooked in the usual treatment of the state in the institutional economics literature and supplement the latter with a discussion of some alternative approaches to looking at the possible developmental role of the state. It refers to a broader range of development goals (including the structural transformation of the economy) and focuses on problems like the resolution of coordination failures and collective-action problems, the conflicting issues of commitment and accountability and the need for balancing the trade-offs they generate, some ingredients of state capacity and political coalition building usually missed in the literature, the possible importance of rent sharing in a political equilibrium, the advantages and problems of political centralization and decentralization, and the multidimensionality of state functions that may not be addressed by markets or private firms. (JEL D72, H11, H77, K00, O17, O43, P26)

1. Introduction

Since the flourishing of institutional economics in the 1990s, some ideas on the role of the state have come to dominate the development literature. Although different writers—say, North and Weingast (1989, 2000), Besley and Persson (2011), and Acemoglu and Robinson (2012)—have different points of emphasis, there is some commonality in this literature on the role of

the state. The state has to be strong enough to provide a solid minimum framework of law and order, enforcement of contracts, and other basic institutions underpinning the market, while at the same time the state executive has to be constrained not to interfere with security of property rights. There is no doubt that this points to some important features of the state that are conducive to the incentive framework of investment, enterprise, and development. We shall try to capture some of the nuances of this approach as discussed in the more recent literature, but we'll also consider cases where it may actually limit our perspective in understanding the diversity of development experience in different parts of the world and point to aspects of state-related development that

*Department of Economics, University of California, Berkeley. I am grateful to the Editor and four referees, and to Masahiko Aoki, Vijay Joshi, Kalle Moene, Dilip Mookherjee, and Gerard Roland for comments on earlier drafts.

[†]Go to <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/jel.20151239> to visit the article page and view author disclosure statement(s).

are overlooked or underemphasized in this now-dominant tradition. In particular, we shall refer to a broader range of development goals (including the structural transformation of an economy) and multidimensionality of state functions compared to those that have been usually considered in the institutional economics literature.

A strong state may help economic growth, but what does one mean by a strong state? In the different strands of the literature one can decipher defining issues like a certain commitment ability of the state to transcend narrow sectarian pressures, and that of political centralization that allows the state to transcend diffuse local interests. But the *ability* to transcend narrow interests may not necessarily be accompanied by *willingness* to do so, thus constraints on executive power are considered necessary to restrain pandering to narrow interests or self-aggrandizement on the part of the leadership (hence the frequent call for strong but “limited” government).

But if the social goal is broad-based development, such essentially negative bars restraining government are not enough. In many cases, it may be imperative for the state to play a more positive role. Pluralistic institutions, in the sense of being respectful of diversity of interests and goals, may facilitate such a positive role of the state. But those institutional economists who see the need for pluralism do not always pay attention to the possible tension between pluralism and the ability to carry out collective action toward development goals, or even to secure property rights; similarly, those who advocate political centralization do not give enough weight to its trade-off with local accountability, or the trade-off between commitment and flexibility. Democratic accountability mechanisms in this literature mainly take the form of constraints on the executive or checks and balances; but there are other aspects of the democratic process

that form integral parts of the development process—for example, popular participation and democratic deliberation lend legitimacy and sustainability to development. On the other hand, the political competition of democracy can occasionally lead to a “race to the bottom” and, instead of focusing the leadership’s attention on broad-based interests, may in some cases encourage political clientelism to win elections. In contrast with the general impression in the literature that “all good things go together,” we’ll point to these kinds of antinomies and trade-offs that are largely missing in the discussion.

There is now a burgeoning literature on state capacity contributing to the aforementioned state “strength,” spelling out the various ingredients, particularly fiscal, legal, and military aspects of capacity. For example, the role of wars in forging such capacity, and that of a Weberian bureaucracy, its autonomy from the political process, its career paths, and incentive payments have been discussed in this context. Less often discussed is the nature of political coalition among different interest or identity groups and “social pacts” and intertemporal bargains that make the key difference and the underlying problems of collective action that have to be overcome in building the all-important *political* capacity of the state.

The focus on security of property rights and market institutions has also diverted attention from the important issue of developing state capacity in resolving coordination failures. This issue used to be at the forefront of discussion in the early development literature, particularly when structural transformation used to be regarded as the core of development. In the more recent literature, there has been some parallel discussion of state promotion of industrial policy and the lessons one can learn from its experience in several East Asian countries. In political sociology there has been active discussion on the so-called developmental

state in this context. Much of this has been sidelined in the institutional economics discussion on property rights and state capacity, mainly drawing examples from premodern European and Atlantic economy, and more recently from institutional failures in Latin America and Africa, largely overlooking the analytical lessons from the experience of East and South Asia. It is time to join the stream of the literature on industrial policy with the mainstream on state capacity for market-supporting institutions, and discuss the problems and prospects of industrial policy in this larger context, particularly if it can be moved away from its old protectionist association and oriented to improving productivity, rather than distorting prices. Of course, targeting of sectors and firms will generate rental opportunities, but in contrast with the strictures on rent seeking in the earlier literature on the state, the new literature has emphasized how in second-best situations, particularly in early stages of development when entrepreneurship and capital are the binding constraints, some amount of rent generation within broad limits of market discipline can provide dynamic incentives for new investments and learning processes. Rent sharing may also be important in forging political coalitions behind structural change.

In general, the purpose of this essay will be to open up the role of the state in the development context beyond the narrow confines to which much of the institutional economics literature has limited it, apart from pointing to the various trade-offs among the types of roles already envisaged. Beyond being a “nightwatchman” of property rights and markets, the state often needs to be a guide, coordinator, stimulator, and a catalytic agent for economic activities in situations where, for various historical and structural reasons, the development process has been atrophied and the path forward is darkened by all kinds of missing information

and incomplete markets. The trade-offs between different aspects discussed here also suggest the need for some balance in working toward multifaceted development goals, and a prefixed one-sided formula may not be desirable. The multiple functions of the state and the multidimensionality of its agenda (compared to those of private firms or markets) also imply, as we’ll discuss, that even when a state enterprise is inefficient in carrying out its functions, privatization need not always be a better solution, particularly when contracts are necessarily incomplete. Our focus on a broader role of the state, multidimensionality of its functions (and that too at different levels of the political system), and the trade-offs and dissonances between objectives or mechanism designs does not make it easy for a unified theory or tidy, unambiguous conclusions. But as Williamson (2000) said in a *JEL* survey of institutional economics, “there being many instructive lenses for studying complex institutions, pluralism is what holds promise for overcoming our ignorance.”

The roadmap in this essay is as follows. In section 2, we start with the idea of a “strong but limited” government and its various ramifications. We concentrate in section 2.1 on two related aspects of state strength suggested in the literature, one on commitment ability and the other is political centralization. In the context of state strength, we shall comment in section 2.2 on the different ingredients of state capacity discussed in a growing literature. In connection with limited government, we discuss in section 2.3 the constraints on the executive and the role of other accountability mechanisms. In section 3, we shall start our critique of the view discussed in the previous two sections by pointing to tensions and trade-offs between different aspects of governance recommended in the literature. In section 4, we wade into a small part of the large literature on democracy and development, keeping our attention on how

the democratic accountability mechanisms discussed earlier help in the development process and at the same time point to features of political competition in a democracy that may actually hinder development. In section 5, we shall draw upon the growing literature on decentralization and accountability downward and show how the latter may provide a counterweight to the advantages of political centralization discussed in section 2, while at the same time drawing attention to trade-offs in terms of special problems that afflict decentralized governance in pursuit of development goals. In this context, we shall discuss the unique combination of political centralization and economic decentralization that the recently successful case of the Chinese state represents, and also the pitfalls of the Chinese state model. In section 6, we discuss the broader role of the state in coordinating investment activities and learning processes and how the potential dynamic role of rental opportunities that sectoral targeting in industrial policy generates needs to be tamed by market discipline. In section 7, we discuss the special, often multidimensional, functions of public enterprises and the uncertainty of their role in fostering necessary innovations once the developmental catch-up process in technology is over. In the final section 8, we have some concluding comments and brief suggestions on under-researched areas.

Much of the analysis in this essay, as in the literature discussed, is comparative and historical-institutional. Although we shall often refer to the quantitative-empirical literature available, the latter is as yet relatively scanty, scattered, and not always satisfactory in terms of the identification strategies applied. For example, as the growth econometrics literature¹ makes it amply clear, the cross-country regressions of the literature

on the state are riddled with problems in causal interpretation.² In addition, unlike in the case of some macroeconomic policies, it matters a great deal more in this literature that the effectiveness of the state varies enormously across localities and administrative levels within the same country in their effect on the development process, not at all captured in data that take a whole-country average as the point of observation, which is particularly problematic for countries with a medium- to large-sized population. On top of all this, there are inherent difficulties of measuring quality of public goods and services. There are a few micro experimental studies now available, but as usual the relevance of the conclusions faces problems in scaling up or in “external validity.” There have, however, been some hopeful beginnings of collaboration between the policy-making and research communities in carrying out quasi-experimental evaluation of micro aspects of state policies covering large segments of the population.

Since this essay is not primarily on the process of state formation as such, we shall largely confine ourselves to states that have some minimum coherence in striving for development, and thus leave out many important cases where internecine violence and extreme social fragmentation have not yet allowed the minimum conditions for state building. While keeping in mind that the differences in the relevant state capacity are often a matter of degree rather than kind, we shall bypass the large and growing literature on “failed states” and civil conflicts. For a relatively recent overview piece in *JEL* on civil conflicts,³ which are often associated

²In this essay, while we have not refrained from referring to some cross-country empirical exercises, the purpose is mainly to illustrate findings suggestive of interesting correlation, not causation.

³For my own take on civil conflicts, see Bardhan (2005), chapter 9.

¹See, for example, Durlauf, Johnson, and Temple (2005).

with fragile states, see Blattman and Miguel (2010).

2. *The Call for a Strong but Limited Government*

The idea of a strong but limited government in the institutional economics literature follows a long tradition of Anglo-American political philosophy dating back at least to Hobbes and Locke (the former emphasizing a strong state to prevent “war of all against all,” and the latter emphasizing limits to government at least for securing property rights). This is actually akin to much older ideas familiar from the classical texts of some ancient civilizations.

A major proposition in the recent institutional-economics literature associated with North and Weingast (1989, 2000) and others is that for the purpose of economic development, the state has to be strong enough to protect property rights and other institutions underpinning markets and contracts, but not too strong to be confiscatory, hence the need for democratic checks and balances.⁴ They have cited the landmark historical case of the Glorious Revolution in England in 1688, which by strengthening political institutions that constrained the king enhanced his commitment to securing private property rights and thus fostered economic growth (a major mechanism has been through lowering the cost of capital). Acemoglu and Robinson (2012) in their recent remarkable book⁵ also cite the case

of the Glorious Revolution, resulting in a political pluralism, which along with centralization in England helped to secure private property rights against state predation and allowed private enterprise and capital markets to flourish. Besley and Persson (2011) take a closely related approach, citing Adam Smith that “peace, easy taxes,⁶ and a tolerable administration of justice” are the pillars of the wealth of nations.

2.1 *State Strength*

The “strength” of a state in the development context has, of course, to be defined in a noncircular way (without reference to the development outcome). A search of the literature suggests two (somewhat overlapping) components of a definition of strength, without being just a reflection of the success of the economy: (1) political centralization, and (2) capacity to commit.

Acemoglu and Robinson (2012) are the most emphatic in stressing the importance of political centralization. In their view, nations succeed or fail in development according to how “inclusive”⁷ their political and economic institutions are, and political centralization (a well-functioning state establishing a cohesive order across local jurisdictions) is one of their essential inclusive political institutions. It can internalize externalities generated by policy actions of different local authorities, enabling an encompassing organization to override various pressures of local clientelism. This

at the background provide the theoretical and empirical underpinnings, we pay more attention to the book in this essay as it provides in one place a coherent framework for their understanding of institutions and development.

⁶The idea of “easy taxes” was explicit in the Indian epic *Mahabharata*, where it was suggested that taxes should be gathered in the manner of “the bee taking honey from the flower.”

⁷Acemoglu and Robinson keep the definition of “inclusive” somewhat vague. One presumes an inclusive political institution is one where large numbers (possibly a majority) of people are included in the process of governance. Similarly, an inclusive economic institution expands economic rights to large numbers of people.

⁴A referee has rightly pointed out that there is a distinction between a “limited” government and a “constrained” one. North and Weingast do talk about a limited government that has strict limits on interfering with private property rights and markets. Scholars in the public choice tradition also explicitly talk about limited government. Acemoglu and Robinson also emphasize security of property rights, but I presume they are more open to a more active role of the government.

⁵Even though the book is meant primarily for a nonspecialist readership and their various technical articles

also provides incentives for incumbent political leaders to invest in the creation of fiscal and legal capacity, as suggested by Besley and Persson (2011).⁸ Empirically, Osafo-Kwaako and Robinson (2013) cite evidence from a cross-cultural sample for a strong positive correlation between political centralization (in the sense of “jurisdictional hierarchy beyond local community”) and different measures of public goods and development outcomes. For eleven European countries over four centuries, Dincecco and Katz (2016) show a direct positive relation between fiscal centralization and economic growth. For different African polities, Bandyopadhyay and Green (2012) and Michalopoulos and Papaioannou (2013) provide direct econometric evidence of positive impact of historical measures of political centralization on contemporary economic development.

While political centralization refers to encompassing the divergent local interests and decisions, a more general characteristic of a strong and effective state is the capacity to make credible commitments in the face of pressures from diverse interest groups. One can depict the relationship between the ruler and the ruled in such a strong state in terms of a simple principal–agent model.⁹ Suppose the ruler of a strong state is envisaged as maximizing his own objective function, subject to the reaction function of the ruled, and in the process the ruler internalizes the economic costs and benefits of his actions in accordance with that reaction function. In this case, the ruler is taken to

be a Stackelberg leader. In contrast, one can say that the weak or the “soft” state is a Stackelberg follower; it cannot commit to a particular policy and merely reacts to the independent actions of the private actors like special-interest groups. In this model it is easy to show that compared to the “strong” state, the “soft” state will have *too much undesirable intervention* (creating distortions in the process of generating rent for the lobbying groups), as the institutional economists (as well as the earlier public choice theorists on rent seeking) usually emphasize. But they do not usually note that by the same logic, the “soft” state will have *too little desirable intervention*, since the state does not take into account or internalize the positive effects of its own policies (for example, the positive externalities of public investment). So the distinction between a “strong” state (say, in much of East Asia) and a “soft” state (say, in much of Africa or South Asia) is not necessarily in the *extent* of intervention, but in its *quality*.

An important example of the strong state’s ability to precommit like the Stackelberg leader arises in the case of the popular infant-industry argument for protection. In the last two hundred years this argument has been applied by the state in many countries in the early stages of industrialization, with a few successes and numerous failures, which has partly to do with the strength of the state or lack of it. At the time when such protection is initiated, by the very nature of this argument for temporary protection, it is granted for a short period until the industrial infant stands up on its feet. But in most countries, infant industry protection inevitably faces the “time inconsistency” problem: when the initial period of protection nears its completion, the political pressures for its renewal from the vested interests become inexorable, and in this way the infant industry in a weak state can degenerate into a geriatric protection lobby (the history of import-substituting

⁸The theoretical model of Besley and Persson is that of a contest between an incumbent ruler and a challenger. Aoki (forthcoming) has a model of a more complex three-person game, played by the ruler, the challenger and the opportunist (say, the local gentry) who chooses a strategic position between them, applied to interpret the transition out of the premodern states of Tokugawa Japan and Qing China.

⁹For expositions of the strong state in these terms, see Rodrik (1992), Bardhan (1990), and Bardhan and Udry (1999), chapter 17.

industrialization in developing countries is littered with examples of this).

In the recent history of the strong states of East Asia, however, there have been some remarkable instances of the government keeping its commitment, withdrawing protection from an industry if it does not shape up after the lapse of a preannounced duration, letting the industry sink or swim in international competition.¹⁰ In terms of political preconditions for commitment, Elster (1995) has argued that to be credible and effective, commitment requires democracy. The promises of a ruler are considered much more credible if well-established procedures exist for throwing the ruler out of office for failure to keep those promises; this is a central theme of much of the literature on constitutional political economy. However, some of those strong regimes in East Asia were not at that time democratic, but over time they had established reputational alternatives to formal commitment devices. On the other hand, in democracies when the so-called infant-industry protection is prolonged violating earlier commitments, there is little popular pressure organized against it. No conniving leader faces dismissal on this ground, making constitutional provisions for throwing out the ruler largely irrelevant here.

A closely related commitment issue is that of enforcing a hard budget constraint in public-sector run or funded projects. A strong state should be better at resisting the inevitable bailout pressures from interests involved in failing projects. A weak state is unable to make a credible commitment to terminate a bad public project, since sunk costs in earlier periods of investment make it sequentially rational to refinance projects even when one realizes down the line that they had negative net-present value initially.¹¹

Another important aspect of the quality of state intervention in East Asian recent history had to do with the use, by and large, of clear, well-defined, preannounced rules of performance criteria. In the Republic of Korea (South Korea), for example, the heavy involvement of the state in directing investment through subsidized credit allocation has been largely successful because of its strict adherence to the criterion of export performance. Through this precommitment device, the strong Korean state has used the vital disciplining function of foreign competition in encouraging quick learning and cost and quality consciousness among domestic enterprises, something that has been conspicuously absent in many other interventionist regimes (even though the Korean state, at least until the 1980s, shared with the latter regimes many of the restrictive policies on imports and foreign investment). We'll come back to this issue of combining sectoral commitment with competition in section 6 on industrial policy.

Somewhat paradoxically, the idea of the "weak" state buffeted by pressures from interest groups, which is a staple of public choice theory and the literature on "rent seeking" by lobbying groups, has family resemblance to the older Marxist theory of the state on the other end of the political spectrum. But mainstream economists are often unaware that quite some decades back, the latter theory went beyond this and adopted a theory that emphasized state strength. Orthodox Marxists used to consider the state as a tool of, or dancing to the tune of, the dominant interest group, i.e., the capitalist class.¹² Then in the 1960s and 1970s a group of neo-Marxist political writers developed the idea of what they called the "relative autonomy" of the state, whereby the

¹⁰For some examples of this, see Wade (1990).

¹¹For the micro-foundations of such "soft" financing problems, see Dewatripont and Maskin (1995).

¹²There is clear evidence that Marx himself essentially abandoned this view after 1850. For an elaboration on this see Elster (1985).

state supersedes the narrow or particularistic interests of the capitalists and takes independent decisions and policies, even though it by and large safeguards their long-term systemic interests. (In non-Marxist literature, during a depression or financial crises this sometimes appears in the form of a call for the state to “save capitalism from capitalists.”)¹³ Later, many political sociologists in and outside this group went even beyond this, and recognized several historical instances of the clearly vital role of the strong state. For example, Skocpol (1982) refers to “the explanatory centrality of states as potent and autonomous organizational actors.” There are, of course, serious constraints posed by the imperatives of the dominant proprietary classes (after all, they provide the main source of public revenue), but these writers recognized that to focus exclusively on those constraints is often to ignore the large range of choices in goal formulation, agenda setting, and policy execution that the state leadership usually has. The strong state thus acts neither at the behest of, nor on behalf of, the dominant classes.

Of course in most actual situations, the state is neither a Stackelberg leader nor a Stackelberg follower; neither the state actors nor the private interest groups usually have the power to define unilaterally the parameters of their action. Both may be strategic actors with some power to influence the terms, and the outcome of the bargaining game will depend on their varying bargaining strengths in different situations.

2.2 *Ingredients of State Capacity*

Besley and Persson (2011) associate a weak state with a lack of state capacity, particularly fiscal, legal, and military capacity,

to be able to provide public goods and services (including law and order). In the burgeoning literature on state capacity, different writers have emphasized different aspects. A well-known line of thinking associated with Tilly (1985) links the historical making of the fiscal-military state in early modern Europe with interstate wars (or threats thereof). Levi (1988) associated state making with inducing citizen compliance in providing revenue and conscripts for war. Others,¹⁴ however, have suggested that in more recent times and outside Europe, states have been formed without wars, and there have been cases where wars have unraveled preexisting states.

In examining the ingredients of state capacity, Evans and Rauch (1999) stressed the importance of certain Weberian characteristics of the state bureaucracy, like meritocratic recruitment and long-term career rewards for officials. There is also a cumulative logic of bureaucratic functioning. A long history of continuous bureaucratic structure in place may foster a helpful bureaucratic culture¹⁵ or *esprit de corps* that can contribute to state effectiveness. Bockstette, Chanda, and Putterman (2002) have computed an index of state antiquity (continuous territory-wide state structure above the tribal domains over the last two millennia). It shows that among developing countries, this index is much lower for sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America than for Asia, and even in Asia the index for South Korea is several times that for the Philippines (a country that lacked an encompassing state before the sixteenth-century colonization by Spain). A cross-country statistical exercise¹⁶ shows a

¹⁴See, for example, Leander (2004), and Taylor and Botea (2008).

¹⁵Analogous to the term “democratic capital” that Persson and Tabellini (2009) have used, one may call this historical experience of bureaucracy a kind of “bureaucratic capital,” though one should be careful in not stretching the definition of capital too far.

¹⁶See Bardhan (2005), chapter 1.

¹³Marx in *Capital* volume I, when discussing the English Factory Acts, deduces the necessity of the state as a particular form “alongside and outside bourgeois society”, protecting capital from its own “unrestrainable passion, its werewolf hunger for surplus labor”.

significant positive association between this state antiquity index and that for the rule of law currently in the country.

The effectiveness of a bureaucracy, of course, depends on the compensation structure and incentives.¹⁷ There is now a growing literature on experimental evaluation of incentive and monitoring reforms in bureaucracy; for an overview, see Finan, Olken, and Pande (forthcoming). For example, Dal Bo, Finan, and Rossi (2013) provide experimental evidence from Mexico that not merely do higher wages attract higher-quality recruits to the government (even in difficult locations), but also, contrary to a common presupposition, they do not “crowd out” the intrinsic nonpecuniary motivations¹⁸ valuable in public service.

Cornick (2013) has classified the different types of state capacity into technical, organizational, and political. Technical capacity is particularly relevant, for example, in the context of screening worthwhile public projects or monitoring the delivery to intended beneficiaries in social programs. Information technology has expanded the realm of possibilities here. Muralidharan, Niehaus, and Sukhtankar (2014) evaluate the impact of a biometrically authenticated payments infrastructure on public employment and pension programs in India, using a large-scale experiment that randomized the rollout of the new system over 158 subdistricts and 19 million people. They find that the new system delivered a faster, more predictable, and less corrupt payments process without adversely affecting program access. These

results suggest that investing in secure authentication and payments infrastructure can significantly add to state capacity in effective implementation of social programs in developing countries. Similar issues arise in the context of building capacities in judicial, auditing, and regulatory bodies.

Organizational capacity of a state is often crudely measured in the empirical literature in terms of tax–GDP ratio. But, as is usually recognized, this ratio may be relatively high in a natural resource abundant country on account of the resource rents, not necessarily organizational capacity, or low in a poor country where for independent reasons (say, the nature of factor market imperfections), the informal sector is large. Organizational capacity is also related to modes of governance. For example, Bandiera, Pratt, and Valletti (2009) show (from a policy experiment associated with a national procurement agency in Italy) that much of the sheer wastage in public procurement arises from some organizational modes (“top-down” governance modes in public bodies perform the worst). Organizational capacity, of course, varies between different types of state functions. The Indian state shows extraordinary capacity in some large episodic matters, like organizing the complex logistics of the world’s largest elections or the world’s second largest Census. But it displays poor capacity in, for example, some regular essential activities like cost-effective pricing and distribution of electricity. This is partly because local political considerations interfere in matters like under-recovery of costs from a large and politically sensitive customer base.

Political capacity is often largely an issue of commitment and resisting pressures for short-termism and soft budget constraints, as we have discussed above. In many parts of India and Africa, the police and bureaucracy are highly politicized and deliberately incapacitated to serve short-term political goals of leaders. In such contexts, measures

¹⁷ However, the recent evidence of Bandiera, Pratt, and Valletti (2009) on passive waste in public procurement in Italy and Chong et al. (2014) on effectiveness of postal systems across several countries suggests that bureaucratic performance is not a matter of incentives alone.

¹⁸ Ashraf, Bandiera, and Jack (2014) find experimental evidence in Zambia that financial incentives augment, rather than crowd out, public service motivation. A somewhat contrary evidence is found in Uganda by Deserranno (2015)

to improve bureaucratic autonomy may enhance performance. In a study of 4,700 public sector projects implemented by the Nigerian civil service, Rasul and Rogger (forthcoming) find that a one standard deviation increase in autonomy for bureaucrats corresponds to significantly higher project completion rates of 18 percent. In general, as Aghion and Tirole (1997) have pointed out in the context of allocation of authority in even private firms, in complex projects autonomy for an agent (the bureaucrat) who may be better informed than the principal (the politician) is called for.

2.3 *Limits to Government*

As we have mentioned before, the institutional-economics literature emphasizes that the state has to be strong, but limited for helping development. In other words, not merely should it be insulated from the political pressures from special interest groups, but it should have enough constraints on its powers so that private property rights are secure from its “grabbing hand”¹⁹ and the state-provided institutions for supporting markets and contracts can operate unhindered. For this, various kinds of checks and balances including constitutional constraints on executive power, separation of powers, electoral rules, independent judiciary, free media, and other such accountability mechanisms for the state leadership have been regarded as necessary. Apart from securing property rights from undue state encroachment, these checks and balances may also limit the ruler’s attempts at pushing for narrow-based or particular group-favoring programs. In Besley and Persson (2011), states with weak constraints are described as having rather weak compulsions on the ruling groups to supply

common-interest services; constraints on the executive tend to diminish the concern that the government is run in the interests of a narrow group. We shall come back to the accountability mechanisms when we discuss democracy and development in section 4.

3. *A Critique of the Dominant Institutional View*

After our discussion of the different elements of strength and limits to government, both of which are clearly important in the process of development, we shall now provide a critique of some of the basic ideas in this literature. Let us start with political centralization. Acemoglu and Robinson (2012) regard this as a key “inclusive” political institution along with a pluralistic distribution of political power. But the idea that political centralization is an element of political inclusiveness is rather puzzling. Most historical instances of political centralization, either in the empire states of the past or in the modern nation states (such as Meiji Japan, Ataturk’s Turkey, and Mao’s China), have been associated with less political inclusiveness in important respects. Secondly, and a related point is that there is actually a degree of potential conflict between those two key political institutions stressed by Acemoglu and Robinson. To be sure, a certain degree of political unification is necessary to build a coherent institutional framework for long-term development policies. But centralization and pluralism may not be always compatible. Pluralism in the sense of a social idea that encourages diversity of goals and interests of a variety of social groups can inhibit centralization and society’s collective action on long-run decisions and projects. India has been a major example of intensive pluralism and political competition resulting, in general, in weak political centralization or collective action. This suggests the need for more attention

¹⁹This is the title of the book by Shleifer and Vishny (2002).

to be paid in this literature to the theory of the determinants of collective action. Thirdly, economic inclusion in the world of Acemoglu and Robinson requires secure property rights. But political inclusion, with its pluralistic distribution of political power and broad popular participation, may not always secure the property rights of the few against the numerous encroachers and squatters or against high taxes. Similarly, in the world of Besley and Persson, all good things go together (like pluralism and security of property rights), and thus they ignore the possible tension between those factors. Or, to take another example, the rule of law—part of political inclusion—is often an instrument used to protect the propertyless from the propertyless, thus enforcing economic exclusion.²⁰ English enclosure laws famously turned the poor users of the village commons into poachers. Of course, the rule of law may be, on balance, a very good thing, even if it is sometimes at odds with economic inclusion.²¹

There is also a definitional problem. Acemoglu and Robinson say they will “refer

²⁰ “Civil government, so far as it is instituted for the security of property, is in reality instituted for the defense of the rich against the poor, or of those who have some property against those who have none at all”—this is a quote not from Marx, but from Adam Smith in the *Wealth of Nations*.

²¹ The nature of the tension involved in the rule of law is captured well in the nuanced conclusion of *Whigs and Hunters* (1975), by the Marxist historian E. P. Thompson:

We reach, then, not a simple conclusion (law = class power) but a complex and contradictory one. On the one hand, it is true that the law did mediate existent class relations to the advantage of the rulers. . . . On the other hand, the law mediated these class relations through legal forms, which imposed, again and again, inhibitions upon the actions of the rulers. . . . In a context of gross class inequalities, the equity of the law must always be in some part sham. . . . We ought to expose the shams and inequities which may be concealed beneath this law. But the rule of law itself, the imposing of effective inhibitions upon power and the defense of the citizen from power's all-intrusive claims, seems to me to be an unqualified human good.

to political institutions that are *sufficiently* centralized and pluralistic as inclusive political institutions” (italics added). This is unsatisfactory without an independent measure of sufficiency, since “sufficiently” leaves the door open for circularity. Clearly we do not want to call institutions “politically inclusive” when they are inclusive enough to yield development and still claim that inclusive institutions foster development.

Historically, however, England has indeed been a successful case where political centralization and pluralism have fit together. But, contrary to North, Weingast, Acemoglu, and Robinson, economic historians like Epstein (2000), Clark (2007), and Allen (2009) have expressed doubts if the economic success of England can be mostly attributed to the constitutional changes that came with the Glorious Revolution. Even some of the more recent defenders of North and Weingast, like Cox (2012) and Pincus and Robinson (2011), agree that neither cost of capital nor enforcement of property rights improved significantly after that Revolution,²² even though it represents an important constitutional watershed (Cox) or an institutional change shifting the balance of power from the king to the new manufacturing classes (Pincus and Robinson). Nor did it lead to a particularly limited government; in fact taxes and public debt increased sharply after the Revolution.²³

On the state's ability to commit, it is important to keep in mind that in some cases of state effectiveness commitment has not

²² On this, see also Hoppit (2011) and Sussman and Yafeh (2006).

²³ Outside England, across early modern Europe, Stasavage (2011) cites evidence of how the government's ability to raise long-term credit depended on assemblies where merchant representatives looking after lenders' interests had some political control over fiscal affairs. Dincecco (2011) shows how across countries in Europe in the period 1650–1913, political centralization combined with parliamentary oversight of the executive helped develop fiscal structures.

been necessary; as we have indicated before, reputational substitutes for formal commitment devices established over a period have worked. More importantly, there are costs of commitment, say in terms of sacrifice of flexibility in dealing with changing technical and market conditions and in correcting wrong decisions. As part of the flexibility, some political sociologists, like Evans (1995), have emphasized the need for a Weberian bureaucratic structure with meritocratic recruitment *to be combined with* channels of deliberative processes involving the important political stakeholders in the development process—what he calls “embedded autonomy” prominent in his account of South Korea. But we know that not all stakeholders were included—the autonomous Korean state for some decades had also ensured political suppression of the labor movement so that the profits of the business stakeholders were not threatened too much. In a different political context, the Indian experience has shown how the political process can erode the commitment capacity of a meritocratically recruited bureaucracy, particularly as politicians can manipulate transfers and promotion of officers.²⁴

In general, our discussion of political capacity in the previous section needs to be linked with the ability to form “social pacts” among important political stakeholders and the nature of distribution of power and political coalitions. The Korean political coalition in the early decades of development involved a tight integration between a military bureaucracy and conglomerate business, which was clearly out of bounds for the elite to accomplish in democratic India. But within a democratic framework, the relative

weakness of state capacity in India has been more a symptom of the underlying political difficulty of organizing collective action for the long term²⁵ (even among its divided elite), not because the country lacks administratively capable people. Consistent with the theory of collective action,²⁶ India’s large heterogeneous population, fragmented polity, and high social and economic inequality make it hard to agree on long-term common goals and, even when the latter is achieved, to get its act together in pursuit of those goals. Moreover, in recent years in many developing countries (including India), short-term considerations have sometimes predominated in the interest conflicts between rentier and entrepreneurial capitalism—as the price of land (and other natural resources) shot up with economic growth, a growing nexus between politicians and rentier interests like real estate magnates, builders, and contractors has often worked to undermine state capacity for good governance and long-term productive enterprise. In general, divided societies and polities will have weaker common interests, and as Besley and Persson (2011) have pointed out, in such cases the incentive to invest in state capacity will be less.²⁷ In contrast, in the postwar decades in northeastern Asia and northwestern (particularly Nordic) Europe, relative social homogeneity and less unequal distribution of wealth and human capital may have made it somewhat less difficult to enlist the support of most social groups in

²⁵For an analysis of the difficulty of collective action in India in terms of the large numbers and heterogeneity of influential socioeconomic groups, see Bardhan (1984).

²⁶See, for example, Bardhan (2005) chapters 10 and 11 for a general theoretical and empirical analysis of collective action, in particular the impact on it of inequality.

²⁷For some cross-country evidence on the relation between ethno-linguistic fragmentation and governance, see Alesina et al. (2003). The experimental evidence for Uganda in Habyarimana et al. (2007) suggests that ethnic homogeneity facilitates coordination on public goods provision.

²⁴For evidence on manipulative transfers of Indian administrative officers, see Iyer and Mani (2012). A randomized experimental study in the police department in Rajasthan, India, by Banerjee et al. (2012) showed that a freeze on transfer of police staff increased police effectiveness.

making short-run sacrifices and coordinating on growth-promoting policies. This also means that in terms of our earlier discussion, the “strength” of the state is ultimately sustainable by the breadth of support in the general population.

These matters are obviously helped if, as some cultural theorists point out,²⁸ the predominant culture in society is “collectivist” (when individuals internalize group interests), which is prominent in some description of East Asian societies, as opposed to “individualist.” Going into the cultural issues is beyond the scope of this paper, except only to note that the issue of culture is a welcome reminder that some institutions of state capacity may not be easily transplanted in an alien cultural context.

An important but complicated question relating to the prevailing political coalition, and hence the political capacity of the state, seldom discussed in this context is its link with globalization, even apart from the usual constraints on state power in a global economy posed by volatile capital flows and international credit ratings. On the one hand, international competition and integration may strengthen domestic political accountability processes and make the political coalition somewhat more broad based—historically, Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson (2005) show that the rise of international trade in the Atlantic economies during the early modern period promoted a demand for institutional reforms; in more recent periods, the European economic integration has been reported to have improved some governance institutions in Europe’s southern and eastern periphery. On the other hand, much depends on the initial conditions, the type of goods internationally traded, and the nature of political and economic competition. In many historical cases, trade expansion in

natural resource-intensive products (like oil, sugar, bananas, timber, and diamonds), for example, has strengthened the political power of plantation elites and other large exporters who raised domestic barriers to entry and promoted oligarchic dominance over the state.²⁹ More recently, globalization in the context of asymmetric international mobility of capital relative to labor has weakened labor organizations and practices in many countries and altered the political equilibrium in favor of capital.³⁰ The fall in customs revenue and capital taxes in a more open economy may also affect state fiscal capacity.

4. *Political Decentralization and Local Accountability*

There are trade-offs between commitment structures and accountability processes. Political centralization, for example, often leads to distant insulated bureaucracies that are insensitive to local needs and concerns and that fail to tap local information, initiative, and ingenuity. The central government, of course, may also care about winning elections locally, but electoral sanctions are usually more effective at the local elections than at national or even provincial elections, since at the latter forums multiplicity of electoral issues dilutes responsibility compared to the narrower agenda of local elections.³¹ As opposed to the interjurisdictional encompassing advantage of centralization, there are many who argue for the local accountability and other advantages of decentralization. These include peer-monitoring, ease of citizen participation, and relative transparency of decision making and program benefits at

²⁹For a recent survey of these issues see Nunn and Treffer (2014), section 5.

³⁰For a discussion of these issues see, for example, Rodrik (2011).

³¹See on this Seabright (1996).

²⁸On this, see references that are cited in Gorodnichenko and Roland (2013).

the local level. Brazil now has a participatory budgetary (PB) process (with citizens' direct input in budgeting and investment priorities) in a substantial fraction of municipalities. From a panel dataset from all Brazilian municipalities over 1990–2004, Gonçalves (2014) shows that municipalities adopting PB increased spending on health and sanitation significantly more than those that did not, and this has already had sizeable effects on outcomes like infant mortality.

Contrary to the earlier fiscal federalism literature, the more recent literature³² on decentralization and development has pointed out the political-economy and institutional issues (like malfeasance, rent seeking, shirking and absenteeism, and other agency problems of governance) involved in political centralization. Decentralization also enables competition among regional governments for mobile private capital, which may keep them on their toes and off excessive rent extraction. In some developing countries—say, Brazil, South Africa, and Indonesia—decentralization has been an integral part of the democratic transition itself and has significantly affected the structure of subsequent development policy, particularly in the delivery of social services.

On the contrary, decentralized governance is often prone to local capture by a collusive elite (landed oligarchy, in some agrarian contexts), proximity making collusion easier, as James Madison worried more than 200 years back in the *Federalist Papers*. The well-known safeguard in the fiscal federalism literature in the form of the Tiebout

(1956) mechanism, by which fully informed and mobile citizens vote with their feet in response to differential public performance, is of limited applicability in the context of many poor societies (largely on account of various types of factor market imperfections). The empirical literature³³ on capture suggests that the preconditions of local capture depend on:

- (i) The initial social and economic inequality in the local area
- (ii) The degree of political competition in the area
- (iii) How regular and well-functioning the deliberative processes of local democracy (public hearings, town hall meetings, etc.) are
- (iv) How free the flow of information is regarding the functioning of governments and the entitlements and allocations at the local level. Here, the importance of information campaigns (and media exposure) about resources allocated to local governments and how they have been spent and audited (if there are provisions of periodic independent audits of accounts) are clear.

Apart from trying to improve matters³⁴ relating to (i) through (iv), attempts at mitigation of the effects of capture have included political reservation of seats at local councils and their headships for disadvantaged social groups, like mandatory reservations for lower castes, tribes, and women in India.

³²We are somewhat cryptic in our discussion here of the growing literature, as we want to confine ourselves only to issues that are directly relevant in the contrast with the earlier discussion of political centralization that is supposed to be associated with better state capacity. The reader interested in more detail may refer to surveys of this literature in Bardhan (2002) and Mookherjee (2015), and to case studies from developing countries in different continents in Bardhan and Mookherjee (2006).

³³See, for example, Galasso and Ravallion (2005) for Bangladesh; Araujo et al. (2008) for Ecuador; Ferraz and Finan (2008) for Brazil; Bardhan and Mookherjee (2010) for West Bengal, India; Bjorkman and Svensson (2010) for Uganda; and de Janvry, Finan, and Sadoulet (2012) for Brazil.

³⁴Welfare losses from local elite capture may not always be large, as Alatas et al. (2013) show from a study of targeted welfare programs in Indonesia.

There is now a growing empirical literature on its impact on targeting of benefits, starting with the papers by Chattopadhyay and Duflo (2004), which found significant positive effects of reservation of the position of village council head for women. The subsequent literature, including our own work—see Bardhan, Mookherjee, and Torrado (2010) and the literature cited there—has not confirmed this for the case of women, although there is evidence for political reservation for some ethnic minority groups in improving targeting of some benefits. Of course, even apart from immediate benefits targeting, the more important consideration may be that political reservation may have effects in empowering and confidence building in potential leaders from disadvantaged groups over a longer period, as shown in the case of women by Beaman et al. (2009). The way to reconcile the contrasting empirical findings in this literature may be to recognize the initial handicaps the leaders from disadvantaged groups in reserved positions suffer from, particularly in terms of information, networks, contacts with higher-up authorities, and administrative experience, in all of which those leaders may gain over time and generate confidence in their leadership in themselves (and others).

Apart from capture distorting local governance within a community, decentralization can also have more widespread adverse effects, if: (1) regional competition leads to a “race to the bottom,”³⁵ provincial protectionism corroding the federal state, as has been the case in Russia immediately before Vladimir Putin’s centralization of power³⁶ (broadly similar accounts of rent extraction

by provincial politicians in Argentina are available in Gervasoni (2010)); or (2) it accentuates regional inequality on account of varying local endowments and institutions and richer areas having more clout with authorities above who allocate resources.³⁷ In Bolivia and South Africa, however, decentralization improved regional equality by improving the criteria of allocation of federal transfers to regions.³⁸

In many areas, there is also a considerable gap between *de jure* and *de facto* decentralization. Higher level governments often devolve responsibilities for social services to the lower level, without corresponding devolution of funds or personnel—the notorious but frequent case of “unfunded mandates.” In general, the political and institutional context and the design and implementation of decentralization vary widely across areas, and it is not surprising that the limited number of empirical studies on the effects of decentralization in different developing countries show mixed results (even after accounting for the endogeneity of the decentralization decision). It is also the case that, while in some matters local knowledge and information working in favor of decentralization are important (as in finding appropriate technology or in tapping indigenous natural and human resources), in other matters supralocal expertise is more important (for example, on issues like public health and sanitation, river systems or water quality, or on curriculum development for schools or application of methods of monitoring like auditing). Agglomeration economies also work sometimes in draining away talent from local governments to central bureaucracies

³⁵A different example of adverse effects of jurisdictional competition is given by Burgess et al. (2012), who show evidence of how an increase in the number of political jurisdictions in Indonesian decentralization has been associated with increased deforestation.

³⁶See, for example, Cai and Treisman (2004) and Slinko, Yakovlev, and Zhuravskaya (2005).

³⁷Galiani, Gertler, and Schargrotsky (2008) study the distributional effects of decentralization across municipalities on educational quality in Argentine secondary schools and find that schools in poorer municipalities fell further behind, while those in better-off areas improved.

³⁸See the chapters on Bolivia and South Africa in Bardhan and Mookherjee (2006).

and professions, and so supralocal expertise may come to weigh more. Accordingly, comparative advantage of decentralization will vary from case to case and over time.

In the debates on centralization versus decentralization, it is important to note that China, a recent dramatically successful state in achieving high growth, has been in this respect a unique hybrid institutional case, with a high degree of political centralization, meritocratic recruitment, and personnel control under an authoritarian party, at the same time combined with a great deal of regional decentralization, competition, and experimentation. Xu (2011) has described the system as “regionally decentralized authoritarianism,” in contrast with most authoritarian systems that are highly centralized. Particularly in the first two decades after economic reform started, decentralization has helped local business development in rural China through regional competition and a somewhat hard budget constraint enforced on failing local business enterprises. These were the essentials of the so-called market-preserving federalism—see, for example, Qian and Weingast (1997) and Qian and Roland (1998). But, as Rodden and Rose-Ackerman (1997) have pointed out in a general critique of market-preserving federalism, the institutional milieu determines whether political leaders of a local government respond positively to highly mobile investors or instead pay more attention to the demands of strong distributive coalitions dominated by less mobile factors. It is possible that the highly egalitarian distribution of land cultivation rights following decollectivization of agriculture in rural China meant that the local capture by oligarchic owners of immobile factors like land, familiar in many developing countries, was unimportant for China, at least in the initial years after reform.

The Chinese system of bureaucratic promotion, unlike the Indian (which is based more on seniority than on performance),

gives considerable weight to the performance of the local economy that the official is in charge of (along with maintenance of political “stability” in the area), thus combining political centralization with local bureaucratic performance incentives.³⁹

Jia, Kudamatsu, and Seim (2015) show from the data on the CVs of political leaders in China between 1993 and 2009, the interesting complementary roles of political patronage connection and local growth performance in the promotion of provincial leaders. This complementarity is found to be stronger the younger the provincial leaders are, relative to their connected top leaders. But while connections with their patron/mentors increase the likelihood of promotion, provincial leaders with weak local economic performance are unlikely to be promoted. The Chinese system thus allows for a rather rare combination of political loyalty and meritocracy.

But the Chinese authoritarian system without sufficiently independent sources of collecting information has from time to time made catastrophic mistakes (Great Leap Forward, Cultural Revolution, etc., in the past), and the lack of institutions of accountability makes course correction even in the case of lesser mistakes delayed and difficult. Similarly, the absence of checks and balances in China allows the tight political-business relations both at the central and the local levels to easily degenerate into massive corruption and abuse of power (resulting in recent years in high inequality, arbitrary land grabs, unsafe working conditions and food supply chains, and toxic pollution). Thus, there is

³⁹Persson and Zuravskaya (2016), however, note on the basis of career background data for provincial party secretaries between 1980 and 2005, a distinction between native-born provincial leaders and outsiders—the former spend more on education and health and less on infrastructure. It is possible that the local leaders have some allegiances that compete with their career concerns outside the province.

now quite often capture of local governments by a collusion between commercial interests and local officials. There are also fewer checks on overinvestment and excess capacity in state-controlled or politically connected firms. All this brings us to the general question of the relationship between democratic governance and development, an issue that has been prominent in the discussion on the comparative performance of the two largest developing countries, China and India.⁴⁰ In view of the clearly superior overall economic performance of China, compared to India, over the last three decades or so, it has been the conviction of the elite in China as well as some outside China (often termed as “the Beijing Consensus”) that authoritarianism is good for development. As we discuss in the next section, this is a false and pernicious generalization, but one should be careful in not jumping to the equally facile but opposite generalities about the unambiguously positive effects of democracy on development.

5. *Democracy and Development*

The literature on democracy and development is by now large, and we want to wade into only a small part of it that is relevant to our discussion of the trade-off between political centralization of power and accountability. I agree with Acemoglu and Robinson that economic performance crucially depends on political structures, but the political and the economic institutions may sometimes coevolve and there may be strategic interactions between them that may not allow us to unambiguously privilege one over the other. In particular, the relationship between democracy or pluralism (politically “inclusive” institutions, in general) and development is actually rather complex—a

complexity not captured in the usual cross-country regressions in the literature on the subject. As Durlauf, Johnson, and Temple (2005) and Brock and Durlauf (2001) indicate, the democracy–growth relation in these regressions is not robust, the identification strategies are not credible, and different papers in the literature have different results because of different choices of control variables and other forms of model uncertainty. For our present purpose, what is important is that the regressions do not help us in understanding the mechanism in the complex process involved.

Democracy is, of course, slow but its deliberative and electoral processes manage social conflicts better and lend some stabilizing legitimacy to policy decisions that grow out of the “conditional consent” of citizens⁴¹—apart from enriching individual autonomy and freedom, participation, and deliberation, which some would regard as an important part of development itself.⁴² Democracy also tends to curb the excesses of capitalism and thus render development more sustainable by, for example, encouraging social movements as watchdogs against environmental despoliation. To the autocrat, power is too valuable to lose, hence violence and the attendant potential shattering of economic stability and the social fabric are never very far off. It is also generally the case that the variance in economic performance is larger among autocratic regimes than among democratic ones, as the checks and balances in the latter weed out some of the worst leaders and outcomes.⁴³

On the other side, there are many cases of electoral democracies functioning without

⁴¹This is emphasized by Levi (2006).

⁴²See, for example, Sen (1999).

⁴³This may not always be the case when weakly institutionalized democracies perform quite badly. On the other hand, even in the case of the best autocrats there is no inherent institutional guarantee that they will continue to be so.

⁴⁰For a detailed discussion of this relationship in the context of China and India, see Bardhan (2013), chapter 10.

regular institutionalized procedures of accountability, and there are some obvious cases of “illiberal democracy.”⁴⁴ Even in liberal democracies, accountability processes to the general public are seriously undermined by the influence of money protecting and promoting the interests of the wealthy and powerful. Besides, while in analogy with market competition political competition is usually assumed to be a good thing, there are cases, as we have noted before, when competition can lead to a race to the bottom.⁴⁵ Without political centralization, political competition under democracy can encourage competitive populism or short-termism; come election time, Indian politicians, for example, often promise free electricity and water, which can wreck the prospects of long-term investments in them, or bank loan waivers for farmers, which can wreck the banking system. Many scarce resources are thus frittered away in short-run subsidies and handouts, which hurt the cause of long-run pro-poor investments (like in roads, irrigation, water, and electricity). Bates (2008) gives examples from Africa of how competitive democracy could induce the ruling party to use its power to loot the public resources for short-term gain. Bardhan and Yang (2004) construct some models to show that while political competition can yield allocative benefits for the public, it can also generate aggregate welfare costs by constricting the set of politically feasible public investments. Of course, in social

service delivery, political competition can work better when executive action is easily verifiable (for example, verifiability in the lowering of school fees is easier than in the improvement of school quality). Consistent with this, Harding and Stasavage (2014) cite evidence that in Africa, democracies have higher rates of school attendance than in nondemocracies. Fujiwara (2015) finds that changes in voting technology in Brazil that enabled the political participation of the poor and the illiterate resulted in greater health spending and improved child health outcomes. Kudamatsu (2012), using retrospective fertility surveys in twenty-eight African countries, shows that infant mortality falls significantly after democratization.

In some cases, instead of providing broad-based public goods, the political leaders can work out a clientelistic system for dispensing selective benefits (private or club goods), at least to a group of swing voters, to win elections. Anecdotes on this are easy to find, but for theoretical and empirical analyses of such systems, see Bardhan and Mookherjee (2012) and Robinson and Verdier (2013).⁴⁶ In a household survey in rural West Bengal, Bardhan et al. (2009) find evidence that voting behavior is significantly influenced more by recurring benefits arranged by local governments (like subsidized credit or agricultural inputs, employment on public works, help in personal emergencies, etc.) than by even large one-time benefits (like land reforms, or provision of houses and latrines), suggesting political clientelism. Also, in situations of social and ethnic heterogeneity where vote mobilization gets organized on sectarian lines, there may be more selective patronage distribution and less political interest in

⁴⁴For a popular-level discussion of these cases see Zakaria (2004). It also involves a definitional issue: in our judgment, democracy should not be identified with just regular elections even where the incumbent has a chance of being defeated, but some accountability processes in day-to-day administration and respect for basic human rights should also be essential parts of the definition of democracy.

⁴⁵This is related to the proposition in Persson, Roland, and Tabellini (1997) that separation of powers can make citizens worse off by creating a common-pool problem in public decision making.

⁴⁶There is direct evidence of vote buying reported in Khemani (2015) from household surveys in a province in the Philippines. However, the sources of variation in vote buying across villages are not clear.

investing in general-purpose public goods. Wantchekon (2003) conducted a field experiment in Benin in which political candidates were persuaded to randomly vary their electoral platforms between a clientelistic program providing cash to specific ethnic groups and a developmental, local, public-good oriented program—the former platform ended up generating higher votes. Such political clientelism, even while helping some poor people, can harm the cause of general pro-poor public investments. Fujiwara and Wantchekon (2013) cite some experimental evidence from Benin that shows how informed public deliberation in town hall meetings can reduce clientelism.

The incidence of clientelism may in general depend on the stage of development.⁴⁷ As incomes rise and markets develop, the need for political connections for jobs or personalized help may decline (though rather slowly, as many cases in southern Italy suggest even now); also, voters become more expensive to buy. With the spread of education and information, the importance of the local vote mobilizer who provides selective benefits (the proverbial ward captain in Chicago precincts) diminishes, and herding of voters by ethnicity or regional affinity may also decline. With the development of transport and communication, the reduction of territorial insulation allows for supralocal affinities that may diminish the importance of the local patron. For evidence of the erosion of the incumbent rulers' clientelistic arrangements following the introduction of nationwide development programs, see de Janvry, Gonzalez-Navarro, and Sadoulet (2014) for a Mexican program of land rights

and Frey (2015) for the Brazilian cash transfer program of *Bolsa Familia*.

Myerson (2013) has stressed how democratic decentralization can improve opportunities and incentives for local leaders to build reputations for using public funds responsibly, and may even reduce political entry barriers for them in national elections. Some of these reputation incentives linked with local development have been built into the career promotion schemes in China, even without democracy. In general, on the relation between political systems and development, a great deal of institutional conditions and contingencies are involved, and under the circumstances it is easy to see that democracy (or the lack of it, for that matter) is neither necessary nor sufficient for economic development. At the same time, going back to the China–India case, one cannot deny a basic comparative political feature related to the source of legitimacy. The pragmatic and professional Chinese leadership often show the ability to take quick and decisive actions more than the elected Indian leaders, but in the face of crisis or political shocks, the former often overreact, suppress information, and act heavy-handedly, which raise the chances of going off the rails or the danger of instability. For all their apparent messiness, the Indian democratic governments are in a deeper sense less fragile, as they draw their strength from legitimacy derived from democratic pluralism.

6. *The Role of the State in Resolving Coordination Failures*

The institutional-economics literature preoccupied with the capacity of the state to secure property rights leaves out a very important aspect of the necessary state capacity in early stages of industrialization, that of resolving coordination failures, which the early development literature used to emphasize. In this respect, the East Asian

⁴⁷Camp, Dixit, and Stokes (2014) show, in the context of a model with two competing parties, how with industrialization and increasing income, a former system of agent-mediated vote buying can become costlier and generate forces for its decline.

state has been historically distinctive. East Asian growth was not simply a product of the state securing property rights and providing some market-supporting institutions. Analogous to the “varieties of capitalism” literature where Hall and Soskice (2001) pointed to the qualitative differences between Anglo-American “liberal market economies” and the “coordinated market economies” of Germany and Scandinavia, it may be important to bring out the varieties of developmental roles of the state in terms of liberal market support vis-à-vis coordination.

The large political sociology literature on the so-called developmental state of East Asia is suggestive and descriptive but—with exceptions like Evans (1995)—not always analytically clear about the mechanisms involved. Aoki, Murdock, and Okuno-Fujiwara (1997) have more fruitfully described the deal between the state and large business conglomerates in South Korea and Japan as assuring some form of “cooperation-contingent rent” that will accrue to the latter in exchange for playing a role in the state coordination efforts. In this perspective,⁴⁸ economic development in these countries was not founded just on institutions that secure property rights and enforce contracts—no doubt very important for long-term investment—but on a state that helped to foster coordination (particularly in financial markets in early stages of industrialization), facilitate interdependent investment decisions in orchestrated networks of producers and suppliers, establish public development banks and other institutions for long-term industrial finance, and nudge firms to upgrade their technology and move into sectors that fit with a national vision of development goals. Enabling and encouraging such coordination is fundamentally different from protecting property rights.

⁴⁸This is consistent with the well-known 1993 World Bank report on *The East Asian Miracle*.

The recent literature on industrial policy has the virtue of recognizing this. But industrial policy has to be dissociated from the old-fashioned support for blanket protectionist policies, which are now particularly ill-suited to industries that can thrive only in the world of global supply-chain networks. Hausmann and Rodrik (2003) have emphasized that industrial policy should have less to do with the impossible task of “picking winners”—the usual argument against industrial policy—but more with a way of “discovering” a country’s range of potential comparative advantage in a coherent way in a world of uncertainties and missing information. There will be private underinvestment in any such discovery process, since the positive results are likely to be appropriated by others in the business. State involvement in helping and coordinating such exploration into new economic activities inevitably implies many trial-and-error experiments, some of which are bound to fail. The main state capacity issue here is not that of picking winners, but more of letting losers go, which is politically difficult, as we have discussed earlier on the question of soft budget constraints.

As with many other important development-policy questions, the underlying issues involved here—capital constraints and credit market imperfections, learning spillovers, lumpy interdependent investments requiring coordination—are easy to conceptualize but difficult to quantify.⁴⁹ On learning processes in new exportable activities, there have been many case studies, even outside East Asia. Sutton (2012) shows how in the Indian (as in the Chinese) car industry, within a few years after the arrival of international car makers, the domestic producers of car components in India attained “world-class” standards (as measured, say, by conventional defect rates

⁴⁹Rodrik (2008a) discusses the difficulties involved in statistical inference on this topic, particularly when policy adoptions are endogenous.

in the parts supplied). The process involved the state at that time providing many kinds of support, including local-content protectionism (which is, of course, now WTO-illegal). Sabel et al. (2012) report many case studies of public-supported export pioneers from Latin America—for example, floriculture in Colombia, furniture making and commercial aircrafts in Brazil, avocados in Mexico, veterinary vaccines in Uruguay, etc.—where an ensemble of public-support policies facilitated coordination, provided industry-specific public or club goods (say in the form of specialized services like technical assistance, help in meeting phyto-sanitary and other quality standards, etc.), and enabled export production activities to gain from substantial agglomeration economies in clusters of a large number of specialized firms. The studies also garner insights from “counterfactuals” of failed efforts in broadly similar cases.

Of course, empirically, even careful case studies of export pioneers from developing countries suffer from replicability issues, apart from a frequent selection bias (successful cases surviving to get discussed). There is a sizable empirical literature on “learning by exporting,” but much of it is marred by the possibility that more productive firms may select into exporting and by measurement issues in the absence of detailed firm-level performance data. A paper that is largely free of both problems is that of Atkin, Khandelwal, and Osman (2014), which, on the basis of a randomized control trial that generates exogenous variation in the access to foreign markets for rug-making firms in Egypt, finds substantial learning effects.

Harrison and Rodriguez-Clare (2010) have recommended a whole range of “soft” industrial policies, not incompatible with WTO regulations (like encouraging R&D, extension services, vocational training, supporting collective action for self-help in business clusters, improving regulations and

infrastructure, and so on), where the goal is to develop domestic policies of coordination that improve productivity more than interventions that distort prices. Aghion et al. (2015) cite panel data from medium and large Chinese enterprises over 1998 to 2007 to show that industrial policies targeted to competitive sectors or that foster competition (say, policies that are more dispersed across firms in a sector or measures that encourage younger and more productive enterprises in a sector) increase productivity growth. Further advances in the industrial policy literature have to explore the particular institutional combinations of domestic political coalitions and market structure and the design of particular policies that make the difference between success and failure, along with rigorous empirical and experimental studies to discern the link between policy and outcome.

In the near future, the issue of state coordination may also become important in inducing investment in “green” technology that reduces negative externalities. It may be similarly important, as some developing countries graduate to the middle-income stage, in fostering frontier innovations⁵⁰ beyond the simple catch-up process (of learning and imitating off-the-shelf technology), or in finding some alternative⁵¹ to the current intellectual property rights regime, which sometimes transfers too high a monopoly rent to the innovator at the expense of poor consumers and future innovators trying to build on the current innovation.

Industrial policy is itself often suspected of generating rent-seeking opportunities. The emphasis on combining sectoral targeting

⁵⁰In this context Aghion and Roulet (2014) call for a “strategic state” that “acts as a catalyst using selective and properly governed support to the market-driven innovation process”.

⁵¹Alternatives like the state buying the patent and putting it in the public domain have been suggested. This is, of course, subject to the arbitrariness and moral hazard in the pricing of the patent by the state.

with some form of market discipline is therefore necessary to curb excessive rent creation. But as Rodrik (2008b) has pointed out, some amount of rent generation may be indispensable to preserve what he calls “second-best” institutions, when first-best institutional rules or best practices are not feasible in the usual political-economy context of developing countries. If entrepreneurial activity is a binding constraint, rents may provide dynamic incentives (as in some Schumpeterian growth models), or when the main challenge is to stimulate investment in a weak capital market, rents sustained by moderate amounts of entry restrictions may provide the necessary finance. Acemoglu and Robinson (2013) show more generally how rents are often necessary for a balance of political power or preservation of a political equilibrium, and how insistence on first-best rules to eliminate rents may have unintended or counterproductive political consequences. In a somewhat different context North, Wallis, and Weingast (2009) consider the creation of rents as the key to controlling violence in what they call “limited access social order” often prevalent in developing countries. Particularly in weak or fragile states, where there is an “oligopoly” of violence in contrast to the Weberian “monopoly of violence” vested in the state, they consider rent sharing as important in preserving order.

But rent sharing as a way of political coalition building can be and has been an important feature of the political equilibrium, even in well-functioning states. The East Asian cases suggest that technological dynamism in large conglomerates has coexisted with rent sharing, with political parties deeply implicated in rent seeking (of which the Japanese LDP is an old and durable example).⁵² As we have

mentioned before, it is possible that a long and continuous history of state institutions over many centuries that East Asian countries in general had, in contrast with those in Africa and Latin America, helped in building a bureaucratic culture, which along with a dense network of ties between public officials and private entrepreneurs, may have moderated the excesses of rent seeking. Possibly more importantly, the state-directed pressure of export success in an open economy in East Asia has disciplined these excesses, and the need for cost and quality consciousness in global competition has kept collusion-prone firms and bureaucrats on their toes. In the absence of strict market discipline, there is plenty of evidence in developing countries of dysfunctional industrial policies with politically connected firms in kleptocratic states making money while the development process is atrophied.

7. *Public Enterprises and State Effectiveness*

As we have indicated in section 4, in recent decades the Chinese case has been distinctive in decentralized development, with local governments playing an active role not just in delivering social services, but in vigorously pursuing local business development, some of the most successful companies being run and funded by municipal governments. Even beyond the local level, the Chinese state has been remarkable in presiding over a reinvigorated model of what used to be called state capitalism⁵³ (where state-run or guided enterprises pursue profits or surplus). In recent years we have seen aspects of it in Brazil and Russia as

⁵² Even in early-modern West European history, there are cases where patrimonial, rather than Weberian impersonal rule-bound, arrangements between ruling families, civil servants, and merchant capitalists have been important in fostering the growth process. See Adams

(2005) for an example from the seventeenth-century Netherlands.

⁵³ This term originated in its negative use by anarchists and other socialists, but with more positive use by Vladimir Lenin and his followers.

well, but nowhere as prominently and in as large a scale as in China. Large state-owned enterprises (SOEs) dominate in transport, energy, basic metals, finance, and telecom in China. Some of the Chinese SOEs are now important players in the global market competition. They are often highly commercialized: in recruiting professional managers, broadening their investor base, and shedding their earlier bloated labor force and traditional social and political obligations, many Chinese SOEs do not conform to the usual stereotypes about SOEs. Their listing in foreign stock markets often subjects them to international rules of corporate governance. There are also some successful Chinese private companies (Lenovo, Huawei, Haier, Geely, Alibaba, etc.), heralded as national champions, but they often operate in the shadow of the state, with the state if not owning shares actively guiding and helping them. The state-owned or supported companies have the advantage of deep pockets to back them or easier access to bank loans and land, can usually take a longer-run perspective compared to most purely private companies (that are anxiously watching short-run share prices and quarterly earnings reports), and can ride out the business cycle a bit better. On the other hand, their profitability is often based on monopolistic power⁵⁴ and their survival dependent on political connections and soft-budget favors (giving rise to the frequent charge of crony capitalism). Even the better-performing SOEs may be thriving in the catch-up phase of development, but some—for example, Acemoglu and Robinson (2012)—doubt if they will perform

when it comes to innovations and “creative destruction.”⁵⁵

This raises a general question about the relation between large conglomerates (private or public) and different types of innovations. The role of these large organizations in stimulating research and development and the innovation process may vary depending on the type of innovation one has in mind, whether it is of the “disruptive” kind that challenges incumbent firms (which the US private innovators in collaboration with venture capitalists are good at and a large entrenched organization usually isn’t), or the steady “incremental” kind that adds up to significant gains (the Japanese call it *kai-zen*), in which some large organizations in Germany and East Asia have excelled. It is, of course, hard to deny that in both kinds of innovations in most countries, some form of background (if not always proactive) support of the state has been significant. But there is always a danger that too-big-to-fail organizations (private or public) may ultimately turn into rental havens.

Without more empirical studies, not just anecdotes, this debate about innovations under state capitalism is difficult to settle. Ernst and Naughton (2012) cite examples of new directions of Chinese innovations from the integrated circuit-design industry. Away from the government-sponsored attempts at “indigenous innovations,” China seems to be more successful in innovating in areas that involve global technology sourcing and quickly responding to changes in the increasingly fine divisions of the global value

⁵⁴Li, Liu, and Wang (2012) suggest that the Chinese economy is largely dualistic in a vertical economic structure, with the state deriving profits and political rent from its monopolistic control in the upstream sectors that provide capital and inputs and services to the successful downstream, largely private (including joint-venture), or hybrid sectors.

⁵⁵A “collectivist” culture encouraging conformity, rather than creativity, may also be not very conducive to innovations. For general evidence on the positive link between “individualist” culture and innovations, see Gorodnichenko and Roland (2013). This may also suggest that in collectivist societies, the state may have a special role in stimulating individual creativity and innovation. But if the state is autocratic, it may dampen the creative and free spirit often important for innovation.

chain. At the same time, there is evidence that large SOEs and politically connected private firms in China may have spawned a serious misallocation of capital (and managerial talent) and build-up of excess capacity. Such misallocation may have more bite in the future, as Chinese saving and investment rates (as well as the unpopular land grabbing by the state) come down. Meanwhile, entrenched vested interests of the political elite with stakes in incumbent firms may make resistance to change stronger.

Finally, it should be stressed that in general, the performance of state enterprises in any country is often discussed in the literature in a kind of political and organizational vacuum and in terms of a single and simple metric of narrowly defined efficiency. Questions like the relative efficiency of delivery of public services by state or private organizations abound in the public-economics literature. Standard comparisons of efficiency of firms are often vitiated by frequent cases of private monopoly after privatization substituting for public monopoly, or by political agenda and soft budget constraints for public firms replaced by regulatory capture by private firms. Still, much of the empirical literature⁵⁶ shows superior efficiency of private firms, whereas the literature on privatization of public utilities gives mixed results.⁵⁷ In building infrastructure,

public-private partnerships (PPPs) are increasingly in vogue. While these may usefully harness the services of profit-seeking private finance and expertise, in actual cases quite often the downside risks are in the public sector, either through opportunistic renegotiation of terms or bad loans in public-sector banks that the taxpayers have to recapitalize. Acemoglu and Robinson (2013) emphasize the political consequences of privatization; well-intentioned, efficiency-minded privatization programs sometimes upset old rental and political arrangements and may be counterproductive. An obvious example is in the case of the political consequences of Russian privatization in the 1990s: redistributing assets extremely unequally in favor of a plundering oligarchy, the backlash to which paved the way for Putin's authoritarian crony-capitalist regime.

There are also organizational counterfactuals to which the public sector reform debates often do not pay enough attention. In assessing the inefficiency of a public utility, for example, we have to keep in mind the simultaneous and conflicting objectives it is required to serve (like cost recovery, cross-subsidization as in the case of commercial freights vis-à-vis passenger fares in railways, providing cheap service to the weaker sections of the population and remote areas, etc.). In such a usual context of multiple mandates, multidimensional goals, conflicting political principals facing agents, multiplicity of tasks, and imprecisely measured and incompletely contractible outcomes that such an agency often faces, all of the inefficiency of the state agency may not be "remediable" in the sense of Williamson (1996) in a simple way by alternative organizational devices like the market or the private firm. As Dixit (2012) has argued, while state agencies obviously have some crass inefficiencies (particularly when budget constraints are politically "soft"), remediable

⁵⁶There are quite a few survey articles. See, for example, Parker and Kirkpatrick (2005). The *JEL* published an overview on the effects of privatization in transition economies by Estrin et al. (2009).

⁵⁷For example, in privatization of water supply, Galiani, Gertler, and Scharrodsky (2005) show in a panel-data framework that in Argentine municipalities where water services were privatized, there is indirect evidence that access and water quality improved. Using an almost similar method, Borraz, Gonzalez Pampillon, and Olarreaga (2013) find direct evidence that nationalization of water companies in Uruguay, after a period of privatization, delivered progress in terms of both access and water quality relative to companies that were consistently publicly owned.

by organizational reforms and incentive designs, they are often called upon to undertake functions that are too complex for the private sector to perform. Privatizing these functions may even make things worse, as private firms are not capable of coping with the transaction and governance costs of the complex and multidimensional issues that state agencies must handle. Hart, Shleifer, and Vishny (1997) give an example from the issue of prison privatization to make the general point that when a government contracts out a service to a private provider the noncontractible aspects of the service quality are likely to suffer. The dilemma in public-sector administrative reform is that in the context of multidimensionality of goals and tasks and hard-to-measure outcomes, it is difficult to devise high-powered incentive contracts for civil servants. On the other hand, with low-powered incentives, they are prone to corruption and capture by special interest groups.⁵⁸

8. *Concluding Comments*

In general, different types of governance mechanisms are appropriate for different tasks. Take the general task of coordination. Economies at early stages of development are beset with coordination failures of various kinds, and alternative coordination mechanisms—the state, the market, community organizations—all play different roles, sometimes conflicting and sometimes complementary, in overcoming these failures. These roles change in various stages of development in highly context-specific and path-dependent ways. To proclaim the universal superiority of one coordination mechanism over another is simplistic and ahistorical. Markets are superb coordination mechanisms in harmonizing numerous

noncooperative interactions, disciplining inefficiency, and rewarding high-valued performance. But when residual claimancy and control rights are misaligned (say, on account of initial asset ownership differences that constrain contractual opportunities) and there are important strategic complementarities in long-term investment decisions, markets fail to coordinate efficiently. In particular, the implications of “imperfections” and contract “incompleteness” in credit and insurance markets are severe for the poor, sharply reducing a society’s potential for productive investment, innovation, and human-resource development. The state can provide leadership (and offer selective incentives and disincentives) to stimulate individuals to interact cooperatively in situations where noncooperative interactions are inefficient. But the state officials may have neither the information nor the motivation to carry out this role. They may be inept or corrupt or simply truant, and the political accountability mechanisms are often much too weak to discipline them. We thus need a whole variety and intermixture of institutional arrangements to cope with the strengths and weaknesses of different coordination mechanisms, and the nature of optimal intermixture changes in the development process.

The purpose of this essay has been to bring out some of the complexities that are overlooked in the usual institutional-economics literature and supplement the latter with a discussion of some of the alternative approaches to looking at the possible developmental role of the state—particularly involving resolution of coordination failures and collective action problems, the conflicting issues of commitment and accountability and the need for balancing the trade-offs they generate, some ingredients of state capacity and political coalition building usually missed in the literature, the advantages and problems of political centralization and

⁵⁸ For a discussion of incentive and organizational reforms to fight corruption, see Bardhan (2005), chapter 8.

decentralization, the possible importance of rent sharing in a political equilibrium, and the multidimensionality of state functions that may not be addressed by markets or private firms.

The exploration of these problems suggests several underresearched areas in the literature, and we end with a brief enumeration of only a small subset of them.

- (1) The literature is as yet in its infancy in understanding the forces and motivations behind formations of political coalitions and different kinds of elite bargains in different historical contexts. Not merely should the theory be linked up with the general literature on coalitions,⁵⁹ but more empirical analysis and historical case studies on formation and breakdowns of political coalitions will be valuable. The declining role of organizations of unskilled labor in political coalitions, given the nature of technological progress and globalization in recent years and its impact on state policy and (the already weak) welfare regimes in poor countries, is a neglected area that needs to be discussed in this context.
- (2) The theory of collective action and its various determinants need to be far richer than the free-rider issues emphasized originally by Olson (1965). For example, collective action may break down if there is a bargaining impasse on the perceived fairness of distribution of gains among different groups, and this and other distributive conflicts are likely to play a role in the political coalition formation issues mentioned in (1).
- (3) As we have noted in the context of industrial policy in section 6, more empirical and experimental studies are needed in understanding the precise link between policy and outcome, and a better insight into the particular institutional combinations of domestic political coalitions and market structure and the design of particular industrial policies.
- (4) As indicated in section 7, the relation between large public firms and the innovation process, particularly in medium-income developing countries is a relatively unexplored research area. We do not yet have enough empirical studies in those countries on how entrenched incumbent firms hinder the innovation process or how the incremental innovations associated with some of those firms (particularly if there is workplace democracy encouraging exchange of ideas between workers and managers) can delay the set-in of diminishing returns in technological advances.
- (5) Similarly, the experience in the many recent cases of PPPs in large infrastructural projects needs to be critically examined, in the light of initial enthusiasm and recent onset of disillusion, in some cases.
- (6) In the discussion of political accountability, the original hope from decentralization and devolution of power tried in many developing countries has faded somewhat on account of the various capture and dysfunctionality issues raised in section 4. The empirical findings are mixed, primarily because the political and institutional context of decentralization, and

⁵⁹See, for example, Ray and Vohra (2014).

hence the design and implementation of devolution projects, are widely divergent. It is time we dig a little deeper and try to decipher from micro empirical and experimental studies if there are any patterns in the jumble. Also, there are very few empirical studies that bring out clearly the contrasting benefits and costs of centralization vis-à-vis decentralization, even though that has been a primary concern in the theoretical and policy literature.

- (7) The puzzle of how the Chinese authoritarian system has been able, in general, to maintain some sort of a balance between patronage and political loyalty considerations in career promotion, on the one hand, and a reasonably competent meritocracy, on the other (as we have noted in section 4), needs more analysis from historical and current case studies. This balance has been difficult to achieve in other autocracies.
- (8) An important, yet largely unresolved, issue is to find clear directions from empirical data about when democratic processes lead to long-term investments in public goods serving the poor and when they instead degenerate into short-term populism and clientelistic patronage distribution. What, empirically, is the pattern of the dynamics of erosion of political clientelism, and why does it vary so markedly between countries or even regions?

REFERENCES

- Acemoglu, Daron, Simon Johnson, and James A. Robinson. 2005. "The Rise of Europe: Atlantic Trade, Institutional Trade, and Economic Growth." *American Economic Review* 95 (3): 546–79.
- Acemoglu, Daron, and James A. Robinson. 2012. *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty*. New York: Random House, Crown Business.
- Acemoglu, Daron, and James A. Robinson. 2013. "Economics versus Politics: Pitfalls of Policy Advice." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 27 (2): 173–92.
- Adams, Julia. 2005. *The Familial State: Ruling Families and Merchant Capitalism in Early Modern Europe*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Aghion, Philippe, Jing Cai, Mathias Dewatripont, Luoshu Du, Ann Harrison, and Patrick Legros. 2015. "Industrial Policy and Competition." *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* 7 (4): 1–32.
- Aghion, Philippe, and Alexandra Roulet. 2014. "Growth and the Smart State." *Annual Review of Economics* 6: 913–26.
- Aghion, Philippe, and Jean Tirole. 1997. "Formal and Real Authority in Organizations." *Journal of Political Economy* 105 (1): 1–29.
- Alatas, Vivi, Abhijit Banerjee, Rema Hanna, Benjamin A. Olken, Ririn Purnamasari, and Matthew Wai-Poi. 2013. "Does Elite Capture Matter? Local Elites and Targeted Welfare Programs in Indonesia." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 18798.
- Alesina, Alberto, Arnaud Devleeschauwer, William Easterly, Sergio Kurlat, and Romain Wacziarg. 2003. "Fractionalization." *Journal of Economic Growth* 8 (2): 155–94.
- Allen, Robert C. 2009. *The British Industrial Revolution in Global Perspective*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Aoki, Masahiko. Forthcoming. "Strategies and Public Propositions in Games of Institutional Change: Comparative Historical Cases." *Journal of Comparative Economics*.
- Aoki, Masahiko, Kevin Murdock, and Masahiro Okuno-Fujiwara. 1997. "Beyond *The East Asian Miracle*: Introducing the Market-Enhancing View." In *The Role of Government in East Asian Economic Development: Comparative Institutional Analysis*, edited by Masahiko Aoki, Hyung-Ki Kim, and Masahiro Okuno-Fujiwara, 1–40. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Araujo, M. Caridad, Francisco H. G. Ferreira, Peter Lanjouw, and Berk Özler. 2008. "Local Inequality and Project Choice: Theory and Evidence from Ecuador." *Journal of Public Economics* 92 (5–6): 1022–46.
- Ashraf, Nava, Oriana Bandiera, and B. Kelsey Jack. 2014. "No Margin, No Mission? A Field Experiment on Incentives for Public Service Delivery." *Journal of Public Economics* 120: 1–17.
- Atkin, David, Amit Khandelwal, and Adam Osman. 2014. "The Impact of Exporting: Evidence from a Randomised Trial." Unpublished.
- Bandiera, Oriana, Andrea Prat, and Tommaso Valletti. 2009. "Active and Passive Waste in Government Spending: Evidence from a Policy Experiment." *American Economic Review* 99 (4): 1278–1308.
- Bandyopadhyay, Sanghamitra, and Elliott Green. 2012. "Pre-colonial Political Centralization and Contemporary Development in Uganda." London School of Economics and Political Science Suntory and Toyota

- International Centres for Economics and Related Disciplines Discussion Paper EOPP 039.
- Banerjee, Abhijit, Raghavendra Chattopadhyay, Esther Duflo, Daniel Keniston, and Nina Singh. 2012. "Can Institutions Be Reformed from Within? Evidence from a Randomized Experiment with the Rajasthan Police." Centre for Economic Policy Research Discussion Paper 8869.
- Bardhan, Pranab. 1984. *The Political Economy of Development in India*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bardhan, Pranab. 1990. "Symposium on the State and Economic Development." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 4 (3): 3–7.
- Bardhan, Pranab. 2002. "Decentralization of Governance and Development." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 16 (4): 185–205.
- Bardhan, Pranab. 2005. *Scarcity, Conflicts, and Cooperation: Essays in the Political and Institutional Economics of Development*. Cambridge, MA, and Oxford: MIT Press.
- Bardhan, Pranab. 2013. *Awakening Giants, Feet of Clay: Assessing the Economic Rise of China and India*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Bardhan, Pranab, Sandip Mitra, Dilip Mookherjee, and Abhirup Sarkar. 2009. "Local Democracy and Clientelism: Implications for Political Stability in Rural West Bengal." *Economic and Political Weekly* 44 (9): 46–58.
- Bardhan, Pranab, and Dilip Mookherjee, eds. 2006. *Decentralization and Local Governance in Developing Countries: A Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge, MA, and London: MIT Press.
- Bardhan, Pranab, and Dilip Mookherjee. 2010. "Determinants of Redistributive Politics: An Empirical Analysis of Land Reforms in West Bengal, India." *American Economic Review* 100 (4): 1572–1600.
- Bardhan, Pranab, and Dilip Mookherjee. 2012. "Political Clientelism and Capture: Theory and Evidence from West Bengal, India." Boston University Institute for Economic Development Working Paper 216.
- Bardhan, Pranab, Dilip Mookherjee, and Monica Parra Torrado. 2010. "Impact of Political Reservations in West Bengal Local Governments on Anti-poverty Targeting." *Journal of Globalization and Development* 1 (1): 1–34.
- Bardhan, Pranab, and Christopher Udry. 1999. *Development Microeconomics*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bardhan, Pranab, and Tsung-Tao Yang. 2004. "Political Competition in Economic Perspective." Bureau for Research and Economic Analysis of Development Working Paper 78.
- Bates, Robert H. 2008. *When Things Fell Apart: State Failure in Late-Century Africa*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Beaman, Lori, Raghavendra Chattopadhyay, Esther Duflo, Rohini Pande, and Petia Topalova. 2009. "Powerful Women: Does Exposure Reduce Bias?" *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 124 (4): 1497–1540.
- Besley, Timothy, and Torsten Persson. 2011. *Pillars of Prosperity: The Political Economics of Development Clusters*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Bjorkman, Martina, and Jakob Svensson. 2010. "When Is Community-Based Monitoring Effective? Evidence from a Randomized Experiment in Primary Health in Uganda." *Journal of the European Economic Association* 8 (2–3): 571–81.
- Blattman, Christopher, and Edward Miguel. 2010. "Civil War." *Journal of Economic Literature* 48 (1): 3–57.
- Bockstette, Valerie, Areendam Chanda, and Louis Putterman. 2002. "States and Markets: The Advantage of an Early Start." *Journal of Economic Growth* 7 (4): 347–69.
- Borraz, Fernando, Nicolas Gonzalez Pampillon, and Marcelo Olarreaga. 2013. "Water Nationalization and Service Quality." *World Bank Economic Review* 27 (3): 389–412.
- Brock, William A., and Steven N. Durlauf. 2001. "What Have We Learned From a Decade of Empirical Research on Growth? Growth Empirics and Reality." *World Bank Economic Review* 15 (2): 229–71.
- Burgess, Robin, Matthew Hansen, Benjamin A. Olken, Peter Potapov, and Stefanie Sieber. 2012. "The Political Economy of Deforestation in the Tropics." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 127 (4): 1707–54.
- Cai, Hongbin, and Daniel Treisman. 2004. "State Corroding Federalism." *Journal of Public Economics* 88 (3–4): 819–43.
- Camp, Edwin, Avinash Dixit, and Susan Stokes. 2014. "Catalyst or Cause? Legislation and the Demise of Machine Politics in Britain and the United States." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 39 (4): 559–92.
- Chattopadhyay, Raghavendra, and Esther Duflo. 2004. "Women as Policy Makers: Evidence from a Randomized Policy Experiment in India." *Econometrica* 72 (5): 1409–43.
- Chong, Alberto, Rafael La Porta, Florencio Lopez-de-Silanes, and Andrei Shleifer. 2014. "Letter Grading Government Efficiency." *Journal of the European Economic Association* 12 (2): 277–99.
- Clark, Gregory. 2007. *A Farewell to Alms: A Brief Economic History of the World*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Cornick, Jorge. 2013. "Public Sector Capabilities and Organization for Successful PDPs." Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank.
- Cox, Gary W. 2012. "Was the Glorious Revolution a Constitutional Watershed?" *Journal of Economic History* 72 (3): 567–600.
- Dal Bo, Ernesto, Frederico Finan, and Martin A. Rossi. 2013. "Strengthening State Capabilities: The Role of Financial Incentives in the Call to Public Service." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 128 (3): 1169–1218.
- de Janvry, Alain, Frederico Finan, and Elisabeth Sadoulet. 2012. "Local Electoral Incentives and Decentralized Program Performance." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 94 (3): 672–85.
- de Janvry, Alain, Marco Gonzalez-Navarro, and

- Elisabeth Sadoulet. 2014. "Are Land Reforms Granting Complete Property Rights Politically Risky? Electoral Outcomes of Mexico's Certification Program." *Journal of Development Economics* 110: 216–25.
- Deserranno, Erika. 2015. "Financial Incentives as Signals: Experimental Evidence from a Recruitment of Health Workers." Unpublished.
- Dewatripont, Mathias, and Eric Maskin. 1995. "Credit and Efficiency in Centralized and Decentralized Economies." *Review of Economic Studies* 62 (4): 541–55.
- Dincecco, Mark. 2011. *Political Transformations and Public Finances: Europe, 1650–1913*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dincecco, Mark, and Gabriel Katz. 2016. "State Capacity and Long-Run Economic Performance." *Economic Journal* 126 (590): 189–218.
- Dixit, Avinash. 2012. "Bureaucracy, Its Reform and Development." *Review of Market Integration* 4 (2): 135–57.
- Durlauf, Steven N., Paul A. Johnson, and Jonathan R. W. Temple. 2005. "Growth Econometrics." In *Handbook of Economic Growth: Volume 1A*, edited by Philippe Aghion and Steven N. Durlauf, 555–678. Amsterdam and Boston: Elsevier, North-Holland.
- Elster, Jon. 1985. *Making Sense of Marx*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Elster, Jon. 1995. "The Impact of Constitutions on Economic Performance." In *Proceedings of the World Bank Annual Conference on Development Economics 1994*, 209–26. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Epstein, S. R. 2000. *Freedom and Growth: The Rise of States and Markets in Europe, 1300–1750*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ernst, Dieter, and Barry Naughton. 2012. "Global Technology Sourcing in China's Integrated Circuit Design Industry: A Conceptual Framework and Preliminary Findings." East-West Center Working Paper 131.
- Estrin, Saul, Jan Hanousek, Evzen Kocenda, and Jan Svejnar. 2009. "The Effects of Privatization and Ownership in Transition Economies." *Journal of Economic Literature* 47 (3): 699–728.
- Evans, Peter. 1995. *Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Evans, Peter, and James E. Rauch. 1999. "Bureaucracy and Growth: A Cross-National Analysis of the Effects of 'Weberian' State Structures on Economic Growth." *American Sociological Review* 64 (5): 748–65.
- Ferraz, Claudio, and Frederico Finan. 2008. "Exposing Corrupt Politicians: The Effects of Brazil's Publicly Released Audits on Electoral Outcomes." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 123 (2): 703–45.
- Finan, Frederico, Benjamin A. Olken, and Rohini Pande. Forthcoming. "The Personnel Economics of the State." In *Handbook of Economic Field Experiments: Volume 1*, edited by Esther Duflo and Abhijit Banerjee. Amsterdam and San Diego: Elsevier.
- Frey, Anderson. 2015. "Cash Transfers, Clientelism, and Political Enfranchisement: Evidence from Brazil." Unpublished.
- Fujiwara, Thomas. 2015. "Voting Technology, Political Responsiveness, and Infant Health: Evidence from Brazil." *Econometrica* 83 (2): 423–64.
- Fujiwara, Thomas, and Leonard Wantchekon. 2013. "Can Informed Public Deliberation Overcome Clientelism? Experimental Evidence from Benin." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 5 (4): 241–55.
- Galasso, Emanuela, and Martin Ravallion. 2005. "Decentralized Targeting of an Antipoverty Program." *Journal of Public Economics* 89 (4): 705–27.
- Galiani, Sebastian, Paul Gertler, and Ernesto Scharrotsky. 2005. "Water for Life: The Impact of the Privatization of Water Services on Child Mortality." *Journal of Political Economy* 113 (1): 83–120.
- Galiani, Sebastian, Paul Gertler, and Ernesto Scharrotsky. 2008. "School Decentralization: Helping the Good Get Better, but Leaving the Poor Behind." *Journal of Public Economics* 92 (10–11): 2106–20.
- Gervasoni, Carlos. 2010. "A Rentier Theory of Subnational Regimes: Fiscal Federalism, Democracy, and Authoritarianism in the Argentine Provinces." *World Politics* 62 (2): 302–40.
- Gonçalves, Sónia. 2014. "The Effects of Participatory Budgeting on Municipal Expenditures and Infant Mortality in Brazil." *World Development* 53: 94–110.
- Gorodnichenko, Yuriy, and Gerard Roland. 2013. "Culture, Institutions and the Wealth of Nations." Unpublished.
- Habyarimana, James, Macartan Humphreys, Daniel N. Posner, and Jeremy M. Weinstein. 2007. "Why Does Ethnic Diversity Undermine Public Goods Provision?" *American Political Science Review* 101 (4): 709–25.
- Hall, Peter A., and David Soskice. 2001, eds. *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harding, Robin, and David Stasavage. 2014. "What Democracy Does (and Doesn't Do) for Basic Services: School Fees, School Inputs, and African Elections." *Journal of Politics* 76 (1): 229–45.
- Harrison, Ann, and Andres Rodriguez-Clare. 2010. "Trade, Foreign Investment, and Industrial Policy for Developing Countries." In *Handbook of Development Economics, Volume 5*, edited by Dani Rodrik and Mark Rosenzweig, 4039–4214. Amsterdam and Boston: Elsevier, North-Holland.
- Hart, Oliver, Andrei Shleifer, and Robert W. Vishny. 1997. "The Proper Scope of Government: Theory and an Application to Prisons." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 112 (4): 1127–61.
- Hausmann, Ricardo, and Dani Rodrik. 2003. "Economic Development as Self-Discovery." *Journal of Development Economics* 72 (2): 603–33.
- Hoppit, Julian. 2011. "Compulsion, Compensation and Property Rights in Britain, 1688–1833." *Past and Present* 210 (1): 93–128.
- Iyer, Lakshmi, and Anandi Mani. 2012. "Traveling

- Agents: Political Change and Bureaucratic Turnover in India." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 94 (3): 723–39.
- Jia, Ruixue, Masayuki Kudamatsu, and David Seim. 2015. "Political Selection in China: The Complementary Roles of Connections and Performance." *Journal of the European Economic Association* 13 (4): 631–68.
- Khemani, Stuti. 2015. "Buying Votes versus Supplying Public Services: Political Incentives to Under-invest in Pro-poor Policies." *Journal of Development Economics* 117: 84–93.
- Kudamatsu, Masayuki. 2012. "Has Democratization Reduced Infant Mortality in Sub-Saharan Africa? Evidence from Micro Data." *Journal of the European Economic Association* 10 (6): 1294–317.
- Leander, Anna. 2004. "Wars and the Un-making of States: Taking Tilly Seriously in the Contemporary World." In *Contemporary Security Analysis and Copenhagen Peace Research*, edited by Stefano Guzzini and Dietrich Jung, 69–80. New York and London: Routledge.
- Levi, Margaret. 1988. *Of Rule and Revenue*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Levi, Margaret. 2006. "Why We Need a New Theory of Government." *Perspectives on Politics* 4 (1): 5–19.
- Li, Xi, Xuewen Liu, and Yong Wang. 2012. "A Model of China's State Capitalism." Unpublished.
- Michalopoulos, Stelios, and Elias Papaioannou. 2013. "Pre-colonial Ethnic Institutions and Contemporary African Development." *Econometrica* 81 (1): 113–52.
- Mookherjee, Dilip. 2015. "Political Decentralization." *Annual Review of Economics* 7 (1): 231–49.
- Muralidharan, Karthik, Paul Niehaus, and Sandip Sukhtankar. 2014. "Building State Capacity: Evidence from Biometric Smartcards in India." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 19999.
- Myerson, Roger B. 2013. "Democratic Decentralization and Economic Development." Unpublished.
- North, Douglass C., and Barry R. Weingast. 1989. "Constitutions and Commitment: The Evolution of Institutions Governing Public Choice in Seventeenth-Century England." *Journal of Economic History* 49 (4): 803–32.
- North, Douglass C., and Barry R. Weingast. 2000. "Institutional Analysis and Economic History." *Journal of Economic History* 60 (2): 414–17.
- North, Douglass C., John Joseph Wallis, and Barry R. Weingast. 2009. *Violence and Social Orders: A Conceptual Framework for Interpreting Recorded Human History*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunn, Nathan, and Daniel Treffer. 2014. "Domestic Institutions as a Source of Comparative Advantage." In *Handbook of International Economics, Volume 4*, edited by Gita Gopinath, Elhanan Helpman, and Kenneth Rogoff, 263–316. Amsterdam and Boston: Elsevier, North-Holland.
- Olson, Mancur. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Osofo-Kwaako, Philip, and James A. Robinson. 2013. "Political Centralization in Pre-colonial Africa." *Journal of Comparative Economics* 41 (1): 6–21.
- Parker, David, and Colin Kirkpatrick. 2005. "Privatisation in Developing Countries: A Review of the Evidence and the Policy Lessons." *Journal of Development Studies* 41 (4): 513–41.
- Persson, Petra, and Ekaterina Zhuravskaya. 2016. "The Limits of Career Concerns in Federalism: Evidence from China." *Journal of the European Economic Association* 14 (2): 338–74.
- Persson, Torsten, Gerard Roland, and Guido Tabellini. 1997. "Separation of Powers and Political Accountability." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 112 (4): 1163–1202.
- Persson, Torsten, and Guido Tabellini. 2009. "Democratic Capital: The Nexus of Political and Economic Change." *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* 1 (2): 88–126.
- Pincus, Steven C. A., and James A. Robinson. 2011. "What Really Happened during the Glorious Revolution?" National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 17206.
- Qian, Yingyi, and Gerard Roland. 1998. "Federalism and the Soft Budget Constraint." *American Economic Review* 88 (5): 1143–62.
- Qian, Yingyi, and Barry R. Weingast. 1997. "Federalism as a Commitment to Reserving Market Incentives." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 11 (4): 83–92.
- Rasul, Imran, and Daniel Rogger. Forthcoming. "Management of Bureaucrats and Public Service Delivery: Evidence from the Nigerian Civil Service." *Economic Journal*.
- Ray, Debraj, and Rajiv Vohra. 2014. "Coalition Formation." In *Handbook of Game Theory, Volume 4*, edited by H. Peyton Young and Shmuel Zamir, 239–326. Amsterdam and Boston: Elsevier, North-Holland.
- Robinson, James A., and Thierry Verdier. 2013. "The Political Economy of Clientelism." *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 115 (2): 260–91.
- Rodden, Jonathan, and Susan Rose-Ackerman. 1997. "Does Federalism Preserve Markets?" *Virginia Law Review* 83 (7): 1521–72.
- Rodrik, Dani. 1992. "Political Economy and Development Policy." *European Economic Review* 36 (2–3): 329–36.
- Rodrik, Dani. 2008a. "Normalizing Industrial Policy." Commission on Growth and Development Working Paper 3.
- Rodrik, Dani. 2008b. "Second-Best Institutions." *American Economic Review* 98 (2): 100–104.
- Rodrik, Dani. 2011. *The Globalization Paradox: Democracy and the Future of the World Economy*. New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company.
- Sabel, Charles, Eduardo Fernández-Arias, Ricardo Hausmann, Andrés Rodríguez-Clare, and Ernesto Stein, eds. 2012. *Export Pioneers in Latin America*. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank.
- Seabright, Paul. 1996. "Accountability and Decentralisation in Government: An Incomplete Contracts Model." *European Economic Review* 40 (1): 61–89.

- Sen, Amartya. 1999. *Development as Freedom*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Shleifer, Andrei, and Robert W. Vishny. 2002. *The Grabbing Hand: Government Pathologies and Their Cures*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1982. "Bring the State Back In." In *Items*, Social Science Research Council, New York, nos. 1/2.
- Slinko, Irina, Evgeny Yakovlev, and Ekaterina Zhuravskaya. 2005. "Laws for Sale: Evidence from Russia." *American Law and Economics Review* 7 (1): 284–318.
- Stasavage, David. 2011. *States of Credit: Size, Power, and the Development of European Polities*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Sussman, Nathan, and Yishay Yafeh. 2006. "Institutional Reforms, Financial Development and Sovereign Debt: Britain 1690–1790." *Journal of Economic History* 66 (4): 906–35.
- Sutton, John. 2012. *Competing in Capabilities: The Globalization Process*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, Brian D., and Roxana Botea. 2008. "Tilly Tally: War-Making and State-Making in the Contemporary Third World." *International Studies Review* 10 (1): 27–56.
- Thompson, E. P. 1975. *Whigs and Hunters: The Origin of the Black Act*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Tiebout, Charles M. 1956. "A Pure Theory of Local Expenditures." *Journal of Political Economy* 64 (5): 416–24.
- Tilly, Charles. 1985. "War Making and State Making as Organized Crime." In *Bringing the State Back In*, edited by Peter B. Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol, 169–91. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wade, Robert. 1990. *Governing the Market: Economic Theory and the Role of Government in East Asian Industrialization*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Wantchekon, Leonard. 2003. "Clientelism and Voting Behavior: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Benin." *World Politics* 55 (3): 399–422.
- Williamson, Oliver E. 1996. *The Mechanisms of Governance*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Williamson, Oliver E. 2000. "The New Institutional Economics: Taking Stock, Looking Ahead." *Journal of Economic Literature* 38 (3): 595–613.
- World Bank. 1993. *The East Asian Miracle: Economic Growth and Public Policy*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Xu, Chenggang. 2011. "The Fundamental Institutions of China's Reforms and Development." *Journal of Economic Literature* 49 (4): 1076–1151.
- Zakaria, Fareed. 2004. *The Future of Freedom: Illiberal Democracy at Home and Abroad*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.