University of St. Gallen

School of Management, Economics, Law, Social Sciences,
International Affairs and Computer Science

Academic Term Paper:

Topic: Which development theories best explain how less developed countries can achieve economic growth?

Kuendig Davia

15.04.2026

Robin Lefebvre

+41 78 207 37 10

robin.lefebvre@student.unisg.ch

matriculation number: 24-611-691

DRC Democratic Republic of the Congo
FDI Foreign Direct Investment
GDP Gross Domestic Product
IMF International Monetary Fund
ISI Import Substitution Industrialisation
LDC Less Developed Country / Countries
MNC Multinational Corporation
OECD Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
R&D Research and Development
TFP Total Factor Productivity
UN United Nations
WB World Bank
WC Washington Consensus

Abstract

The Puzzle. Blanchard's neoclassical model predicts conditional convergence: because capital is scarce in less developed countries, its marginal product should be high, foreign investment should flow in, and per-capita incomes should gradually close the gap with the wealthy world. Few predictions in economics are more intuitively appealing, and few have been so comprehensively contradicted. Between 1960 and 2020, South Korea began with a per-capita income of roughly $1,100 (PPP, 2017 USD) and ended with roughly $43,000, joining the OECD and overtaking several European economies along the way. The Democratic Republic of Congo began at a comparable level, around $900, and ended near $1,050 — sixty years of nominal motion and near-zero real progress. Both countries were capital-scarce, labour-abundant, and technologically behind the frontier. The model predicts convergence for both. The data show it for one. That discrepancy is the central puzzle this paper addresses.

The Argument. This paper argues that Blanchard's (2017) framework is indispensable but bounded. Three of its core assumptions break down systematically in less developed contexts: perfect capital mobility, exogenous technology treated as a costless public good, and institutionally neutral factor markets. Endogenous growth theory — principally Romer (1990) and Lucas (1988) — corrects the technology assumption: the productivity term A is not a free endowment but an output of deliberate investment in human capital and research. Yet even that correction proves insufficient. Institutional economics, drawing on North (1990, 1991), Acemoglu, Johnson and Robinson (2001, 2002), and Rodrik, Subramanian and Trebbi (2004), identifies the deeper variable: the quality of institutions governs the effective savings rate, the returns to capital, and the incentive to generate technological progress in the first place. The synthesis is captured in a reformulated production function, $Y = A(I) \cdot F(K(I), N(I))$, where I denotes institutional quality, and in which all three of Blanchard's growth engines — capital, labour, and technology — are themselves functions of institutional environment.

The Evidence. Applied to the Korea–DRC dyad, this synthesised framework achieves what neither Blanchard alone nor endogenous growth theory alone can. It explains why capital did not flow to the DRC despite extreme capital scarcity — the Lucas Paradox dissolved through the lens of institutional risk premia that depress the expected return below the world rate. It explains why TFP contracted in the DRC across multiple decades, a logical impossibility within Blanchard's standard apparatus. And it explains why Korea's savings rate rose from approximately three percent to thirty-five percent of GDP within a generation: not spontaneously, but as a consequence of a developmental state architecture that made productive investment credible, enforceable, and profitable. The proximate causes of growth remain capital accumulation and rising total factor

productivity. The sufficient cause — the condition that determines whether those proximate mechanisms can activate — is institutional quality.

Policy Implication. The Washington Consensus failed in the DRC not because its macroeconomic prescriptions were incoherent — fiscal balance, trade liberalisation, and privatisation are Blanchard-consistent — but because they were applied in the absence of the institutional foundations that make those prescriptions effective. Rodrik et al. (2004) demonstrate empirically that in a statistical horse race between institutions, geography, and integration, institutions win by a wide margin. The policy implication follows directly: institutional reform is not a complement to standard stabilisation programmes; it is their necessary precondition.

Keywords: *economic development; neoclassical growth model; institutional economics; total factor productivity; South Korea; Democratic Republic of Congo; conditional convergence; developmental state; Washington Consensus*

Table of contents

Introduction

1.1 The Convergence Paradox and the Research Question

The organising puzzle of modern development economics is deceptively simple to state. Standard neoclassical theory, as presented in Blanchard's *Macroeconomics* (2017, Ch. 12–13), predicts that economies with lower capital per effective worker should grow faster than those near their steady state. The logic is compelling. In a world of diminishing marginal returns to capital, a dollar invested in a capital-scarce economy should earn more than the same dollar invested where capital is already abundant. Capital should therefore flow from rich countries to poor ones, accelerating accumulation in the latter and — over time — compressing the income gap between them. This prediction, known as conditional convergence, has an elegant mathematical form and a robust empirical record among OECD economies. Among less developed countries, the story is radically different.

The empirical record of the post-war era shows not convergence but bifurcation. Pritchett (1997) documents what he calls "divergence, big time": between 1870 and 1990, the ratio of per-capita income in the wealthiest to the poorest economies increased from roughly nine to one to more than forty-five to one. Within this broad pattern, however, a sharp divergence is visible between two groups: a handful of East Asian economies that converged dramatically toward the technological frontier, and most of sub-Saharan Africa and parts of Latin America that stagnated or regressed. No version of Blanchard's baseline model — in which capital and technology are the only growth engines — can explain this within-group heterogeneity without additional analytical structure. This paper builds that structure.

The research question is precise: *which combination of development theories, applied through Blanchard's analytical apparatus, best explains the differential growth trajectories of less*

developed countries, and what does this synthesis imply for development policy? The paper's answer is that the neoclassical baseline is necessary but insufficient. It must be extended through endogenous growth theory to explain how technology is generated, and through institutional economics to explain why growth-enabling investment — in capital, in human capital, in R&D — takes place in some countries and not in others. The result is a synthesis with superior explanatory power.

1.2 Case Selection: South Korea and the Democratic Republic of Congo

The paper tests its theoretical framework against two countries chosen for maximum analytical leverage: South Korea and the Democratic Republic of Congo. The methodological logic of this pairing is specific. As of 1960, both nations shared several structural features that Blanchard's model treats as key growth determinants. Both were capital-scarce and labour-abundant, placing them far below their steady-state capital-per-worker ratios. Both faced low initial levels of total factor productivity. Both carried the institutional legacy of extractive colonialism — Korea under Japan until 1945, the Congo under Belgium until 1960. Both had an abundance of natural resources. The model should predict comparable trajectories.

The outcomes diverged absolutely. By 2020, South Korea's GDP per capita (PPP, 2017 USD) stood at roughly $43,000, representing an annual average growth rate of approximately six percent over six decades. The DRC's stood near $1,050 — barely above where it began. This divergence is not a gradual statistical drift; it is a categorical qualitative separation. A two-country deep-comparison extracts far more theoretical leverage from this contrast than would a multi-country breadth survey, because it holds constant the initial Blanchard variables and isolates the single dimension that differs: institutional trajectory. Every theoretical claim in this paper can be tested against the same two empirical referents, and the juxtaposition sharpens each analytical point.

The comparison is deliberately asymmetric in one respect. South Korea is not a typical less developed country by the end of the period — it *graduated* from that category. That graduation is precisely what needs explaining. The DRC remained deeply embedded in low-income status. Together, they bookend the space of possible outcomes, and they do so from a common starting

point. No pair of countries better illustrates the full explanatory range of the synthesis this paper advances.

1.3 Scope, Delimitations, and Structure of the Paper

The paper analyses the period 1960–2020. All sources cited are drawn exclusively from the bibliography provided with this assignment. Blanchard's *Macroeconomics*, seventh edition, serves as the primary analytical framework; every formula employed in the analysis is drawn from that text and cited by chapter. The paper does not undertake original econometric estimation; it applies and interrogates established theoretical frameworks against documented empirical evidence. No claim is made that the Korea–DRC pair exhausts the universe of development trajectories; the conclusion explicitly discusses the limits of two-country inference.

The paper proceeds as follows. Chapter 2 presents Blanchard's neoclassical growth framework in full analytical detail, deriving each key equation before applying it. Chapter 3 confronts that framework with empirical evidence and identifies three structural gaps: the Lucas Paradox, the TFP gap, and the absence of institutional variables. Chapter 4 builds the institutional extension of the production function, integrating North, Acemoglu–Johnson–Robinson, and Rodrik into Blanchard's mechanics. Chapter 5 applies the synthesised framework to South Korea. Chapter 6 applies it to the DRC. Chapter 7 directly answers the research question, derives policy implications, and acknowledges the study's limitations.

2. Blanchard's Neoclassical Growth Framework: The Baseline Model

Before Blanchard's model can be extended or critiqued, it must be understood on its own terms. This chapter presents the full analytical apparatus that the rest of the paper interrogates. Every formula derived here recurs in Chapters 3 through 6, applied to the Korea–DRC dyad. The goal is not simply to summarise the textbook — it is to establish the model as a rigorous, internally consistent benchmark whose explanatory failures in LDC contexts are genuine and theoretically important, not artefacts of misapplication.

2.1 The Aggregate Production Function: Y = F(K, AN)

Blanchard's growth analysis begins with the aggregate production function (2017, Ch. 12, p. 228):

$$Y = F(K, AN)$$

where Y denotes aggregate output, K is the stock of physical capital, N is the number of workers, and A is the state of technology or, more precisely, the level of total factor productivity (TFP). The term AN is called *effective labour*: it combines the quantity of workers with the quality of the technology they employ. This formulation embodies the assumption that technology is *labour-augmenting*, a specification Blanchard (2017, p. 229) notes is consistent with balanced growth path properties.

The standard empirical implementation uses the Cobb-Douglas functional form:

$$Y = K^{\alpha} (AN)^{1-\alpha}$$

where the parameter α (alpha) represents capital's share of output. Blanchard (2017, p. 233) and empirical literature (Mankiw, Romer & Weil, 1992) calibrate $\alpha \approx 1/3$ for most economies. This implies that labour's share of output is approximately 2/3, consistent with the observed relative stability of factor income shares in developed economies. Dividing through by effective labour AN, we obtain output per effective worker, y = Y/AN, and capital per effective worker, k = K/AN:

$$y = f(k) = k^{\alpha}$$

This per-effective-worker representation is foundational. It condenses the two-dimensional growth problem — more workers, more capital — into a single-dimensional one. All of the model's subsequent conclusions about steady states and convergence are derived in (k, y) space. For an economy like Korea or the DRC in 1960, both starting well below any plausible k*, the distance from the steady state was large, and the implied growth rate (if the model's other conditions held) should have been high for both. That symmetry is precisely what the empirical record shatters.

2.2 Capital Accumulation, the Savings Rate, and the Steady State

The second pillar of Blanchard's framework is the capital accumulation equation. Given that investment equals a fixed savings rate s times output, and that capital depreciates at rate δ, while

technology grows at rate g and population at rate n, the change in capital per effective worker is given by (Blanchard, 2017, p. 262):

$$\Delta k = sf(k) - (\delta + g + n)k$$

The term sf(k) represents the gross investment per effective worker generated by the economy's savings behaviour. The term (δ + g + n)k represents the rate at which capital per effective worker is eroded, by physical depreciation δ, by the dilution effect of technological progress g (which raises the denominator AN without requiring new investment), and by population growth n (which adds new workers who must be equipped). The steady state k* is defined by the condition Δk = 0:

$$sf(k^*) = (\delta + g + n)k^*$$

At the steady state, the economy's investment exactly replaces what depreciation, technology, and population growth remove. The steady-state level of output per effective worker y* = f(k*) is therefore a function of four parameters: s, δ, g, and n. Blanchard (2017, p. 265) shows that a higher savings rate s raises both k* and y* so more investment, more capital, and higher steady-state income. A higher depreciation rate δ lowers both. The implication for development policy appears direct: raise s, lower δ, and convergence follows.

Using the Cobb-Douglas specification, the steady-state output per effective worker can be written explicitly as:

$$y^* = (s / (\delta + g + n))^{(\alpha / (1-\alpha))}$$

This expression is the quantitative workhorse of the paper's case analyses. In Chapter 5, it will be used to compute the implied increase in Korea's steady-state income from the savings takeoff. In Chapter 6, it will show why the DRC's persistently low s and elevated effective δ locked the economy near subsistence. The formula's elegance conceals a critical limitation that only becomes visible when its parameters are treated as genuinely fixed: they are not, and the institutional framework of Chapter 4 explains why.

2.3 The Solow Residual and Total Factor Productivity

The third element of Blanchard's framework is the treatment of technological progress. The model assumes that A grows at an exogenous, constant rate g — determined outside the model by science, engineering, and organisational knowledge that the economy takes as given. The empirical counterpart of A is total factor productivity (TFP), measured as the residual once capital and labour contributions are accounted for. Solow (1957) derived this residual formally. Taking the growth-rate version of the Cobb-Douglas production function (Blanchard 2017, p.259) :

$$g_Y = \alpha\, g_K + (1-\alpha)\, g_N + g_A$$

where g_Y is the growth rate of output, g_K is the growth rate of capital, g_N is the growth rate of labour, and g_A is the growth rate of TFP. Rearranging:

$$g_A = g_Y - \alpha\, g_K - (1-\alpha)\, g_N$$

This Solow residual g_A captures everything that output growth cannot attribute to observable capital and labour inputs. Solow's original application to the United States (1957) found that roughly 87 percent of per-capita output growth between 1909 and 1949 was attributable to technical change, not to capital deepening. The implication is that factor-accumulation is a secondary explanation for long-run growth. TFP is primary.

Blanchard (2017, p. 267) presents this result as a feature, not a flaw, of the neoclassical model: in the long run, only sustained technological progress can raise the standard of living, because capital accumulation runs into diminishing returns. But the treatment of g_A as exogenous is the model's Achilles heel in LDC contexts. If technology is a free public good that diffuses costlessly across borders, then LDCs should rapidly absorb the global frontier.

2.4 Conditional Convergence: The Model's Core Prediction

The model's most powerful prediction — and the one this paper subjects to the most sustained scrutiny, is conditional convergence. Because the production function f(k) = kα exhibits diminishing returns to capital, economies with lower k grow faster per unit of capital than

economies with higher k. Blanchard (2017, p. 239) formalises this through the linearised convergence equation. Let y_t denote log output per effective worker. Then:

$$(y^* - y_t) \propto -\lambda (y_t - y^*)$$

The implied convergence speed λ (the rate at which an economy closes the gap to its steady state each period) is approximately given by (Barro & Sala-i-Martin, 2004, p. 47):

$$\lambda \approx (1-\alpha)(\delta + g + n)$$

With α = 1/3, δ = 0.05, g = 0.02, and n = 0.02, this yields λ ≈ 6 percent per year — implying that an economy closes roughly six percent of its gap to the steady state annually. Barro and Sala-i-Martin (2004) estimate the empirical convergence speed in cross-country data at approximately two percent per year, suggesting that the theoretical prediction is too fast even for economies that do converge. The critical word, however, is *conditional*: convergence holds controlling for differences in savings rates, population growth, and the level of technology. Economies are converging to their *own* steady states, which may differ vastly. Two economies with identical initial incomes but different s or different institutions are not predicted to converge to the same y*, and the model is silent on why s and institutions differ. That silence becomes deafening when confronted with Korea and the DRC.

2.5 The Model's Implicit Assumptions and Their LDC Relevance

Three assumptions embedded in Blanchard's framework require explicit identification because they are the precise points at which the model breaks down in LDC contexts. First, **perfect capital mobility**: the model assumes that capital flows freely to where its marginal product is highest. If this were true, capital would flow massively from rich to poor countries. Second, **exogenous technology**: A grows at rate g regardless of the economy's choices — human capital investment, R&D spending, institutional quality. Technology is a free, non-rival public good that all countries access equally. Third, **institutionally neutral markets**: the production function maps inputs to outputs without mediation by governance, property rights, or contract enforcement. A dollar of capital in Korea is assumed to be as productive as a dollar of capital in the DRC, conditional on the same K, A, and N.

Mankiw, Romer and Weil (1992) partially relax the second assumption by augmenting the production function with human capital H, yielding $Y = K^{\alpha} H^{\beta} (AN)^{1-\alpha-\beta}$. This extension improves the model's empirical fit significantly, explaining roughly 78 percent of cross-country income variation compared to 59 percent in the basic Solow specification. But it still treats the accumulation of human capital as operating in an institutional vacuum. All three assumptions are defensible for OECD economies where capital mobility is real, technology diffuses rapidly, and institutions are broadly inclusive. They become systematically misleading when applied to economies where property rights are insecure, political risk is high, and the state is itself an agent of capital destruction. The next chapter documents this failure quantitatively.

3. Confronting the Model: Empirical Failures and Theoretical Gaps

Between 1960 and 2020, South Korea's per-capita income increased roughly thirty-nine-fold. The DRC's barely moved. That single comparison is enough to put Blanchard's baseline model under serious strain. This chapter confronts the framework with three specific empirical failures that are structural rather than accidental, and traces each to a theoretical gap that subsequent chapters address.

3.1 The Empirical Record: Divergence, Not Convergence

The broadest empirical indictment of unconditional convergence comes from Pritchett (1997, pp. 3-7). Between 1960 and 2000, the standard deviation of log GDP per capita across countries increased rather than decreased. The countries that failed to converge were concentrated in sub-Saharan Africa and parts of Latin America, regions with systematically different institutional environments from the converging East Asian economies.

The Korea-DRC comparison crystallises this divergence. In 1960, the two economies were broadly comparable in per capita income, each near what Pritchett (1997, p. 3) describes as the typical starting point for post-colonial developing economies. By 2020, Korea had achieved one of the most dramatic income transformations in recorded economic history, while the DRC remained trapped near its 1960 level in real terms. The contrast traces almost the full arc of the divergence Pritchett documented: between 1870 and 1990, the ratio of income in the wealthiest to the poorest

economies grew from roughly nine to one to over forty-five to one, and these two economies move from near-parity to deep divergence within a single generation.

Table 1. South Korea, Key Economic Indicators (1960–1990)

Panel A: Output and Labour Growth Rates (Young, 1995, p. 642, Table I). N = numerator growth; D = denominator growth; N−D = output per unit of labour input.

Series	N (% p.a.)	D (% p.a.)	N−D (% p.a.)
GDP per capita	8.5	1.7	6.8
GDP per worker	8.5	2.8	5.6
Excl. agriculture	10.3	5.4	4.9
Manufacturing	14.1	6.3	7.8
Δ Participation rate	—	—	0.27 → 0.36

Panel B: Total Factor Productivity Growth, South Korea: Annual Growth of:

Reproduced from Young (1995, p. 660, Table VII). Bold rows = period averages. Weighted inputs are translog indices adjusting for sex, age, education and hours of work.

Time period	Output	Raw capital	Weighted capital	Raw labor	Weighted labor	TFP	Labor share
Economy — excluding agriculture:							
60–66	0.077	0.069	0.070	0.062	0.072	0.005	0.690
66–70	0.144	0.167	0.194	0.095	0.103	0.013	0.690
70–75	0.095	0.121	0.118	0.052	0.055	0.019	0.661
75–80	0.093	0.158	0.178	0.040	0.052	0.002	0.694
80–85	0.085	0.102	0.099	0.031	0.047	0.024	0.729
85–90	0.107	0.105	0.108	0.061	0.072	0.026	0.739
66–90	**0.103**	**0.129**	**0.137**	**0.054**	**0.064**	**0.017**	**0.703**

Manufacturing:							
60–66	0.123	0.105	NA	0.115	0.115	0.013	0.504
66–70	0.204	0.205	NA	0.104	0.108	0.048	0.504
70–75	0.165	0.133	NA	0.084	0.088	0.053	0.477
75–80	0.127	0.207	NA	0.047	0.062	−0.007	0.503
80–85	0.106	0.075	NA	0.019	0.039	0.051	0.547
85–90	0.118	0.147	NA	0.069	0.082	0.008	0.572
66–90	**0.141**	**0.151**	**NA**	**0.063**	**0.074**	**0.030**	**0.521**
Other industry:							
60–66	0.127	0.188	NA	0.082	0.097	−0.012	0.537
66–70	0.176	0.258	NA	0.165	0.166	−0.033	0.537
70–75	0.085	0.104	NA	0.006	0.014	0.028	0.528
75–80	0.117	0.180	NA	0.051	0.071	0.010	0.672
80–85	0.089	0.131	NA	0.051	0.051	0.014	0.693
85–90	0.119	0.058	NA	0.040	0.050	0.066	0.674
66–90	**0.115**	**0.142**	**NA**	**0.058**	**0.067**	**0.019**	**0.624**
Services:							
60–66	0.059	0.052	0.048	0.040	0.054	0.007	0.804
66–70	0.118	0.142	0.163	0.079	0.089	0.014	0.804
70–75	0.083	0.124	0.131	0.043	0.042	0.022	0.782
75–80	0.073	0.140	0.139	0.033	0.045	0.009	0.796
80–85	0.074	0.107	0.113	0.034	0.047	0.016	0.828
85–90	0.099	0.096	0.098	0.060	0.069	0.025	0.821

Panel C: Education, Investment and Growth Decomposition.

Indicator	Value	Year / Period	Source
Labour force: secondary+ education	26.5%	1966	Young (1995, p. 642, Table II)
Labour force: secondary+ education	75.0%	1990	Young (1995, p. 642, Table II)
Labour force: no education	31.1%	1966	Young (1995, p. 642, Table II)
Labour force: no education	6.4%	1990	Young (1995, p. 642, Table II)
Investment / GDP (constant prices)	~5%	Early 1950s	Young (1995, p. 644)
Investment / GDP (constant prices)	~30%	Late 1970s	Young (1995, p. 644)
Investment / GDP (constant prices)	~40%	~1991	Young (1995, p. 644)
Capital share in national output	0.32	1966–1990	Easterly & Levine (2001, p. 183, Table 1)
Capital contribution to GDP growth	46%	1966–1990	Easterly & Levine (2001, p. 183, Table 1)
TFP contribution to GDP growth	12%	1966–1990	Easterly & Levine (2001, p. 183, Table 1)

Table 2. Democratic Republic of Congo, Development Indicators

Note: DRC entry in Hall & Jones (1999) is labelled "Zaire," the country's name until 1997. SSA rows report Sub-Saharan Africa unweighted country averages from Collier & Gunning (1999).

Indicator	Value	Period	Source
GNP per capita (PPP, current int'l $)	$698	1997	Collier & Gunning (1999, p. 5, Table 1)
Annual GNP per capita growth	−3.7% p.a.	1965–1997	Collier & Gunning (1999, p. 5, Table 1)

Trade as % of GDP (PPP)	7%	1997	Collier & Gunning (1999, p. 5, Table 1)
Output per worker (ratio to US)	0.033	1988	Hall & Jones (1999, p. 91, Table I)
Capital intensity, (K/Y)^(α/1−α), ratio to US	0.499	1988	Hall & Jones (1999, p. 91, Table I)
Human capital per worker (H/L), ratio to US	0.408	1988	Hall & Jones (1999, p. 91, Table I)
Total factor productivity (A), ratio to US	0.160	1988	Hall & Jones (1999, p. 91, Table I)
SSA life expectancy (regional avg.)	45.2 years	1970	Collier & Gunning (1999, p. 7, Table 2)
SSA GDP per capita growth (regional avg.)	0.5% p.a.	1965–1990	Collier & Gunning (1999, p. 7, Table 2)
SSA investment rate (regional avg.)	18%	1997	Collier & Gunning (1999, p. 7, Table 2)
SSA capital flight / private wealth (regional avg.)	39%	1990	Collier & Gunning (1999, p. 7, Table 2)

Korea’s gross savings rate rose from below five percent of GDP in the early 1960s to over thirty percent by the late 1980s; the DRC’s collapsed during the Mobutu period and has remained persistently low. But factor accumulation alone does not explain the gap. Easterly and Levine (2001, p. 179) document that sub-Saharan Africa’s slow growth is overwhelmingly a TFP phenomenon rather than a savings or investment failure. For Korea, the growth accounting debate between Young (1995) and Klenow and Rodriguez-Clare (1997), turns precisely on how much of Korea’s output growth reflects productivity gains versus factor inputs: both agree on extraordinary performance; they differ on its composition. On the institutional dimension, Rodrik, Subramanian and Trebbi (2004, pp. 135-136) demonstrate econometrically that institutional quality accounts for the dominant share of cross-country income variation, with Korea improving steadily toward OECD norms and the DRC deteriorating to near the bottom of the global distribution.

The numbers are stark. Korea's savings rate multiplied more than tenfold. Its TFP grew at nearly three percent annually through the high-growth era. The DRC's savings rate fell. Its TFP contracted. These are not differences of degree; they are differences of developmental kind. And the DRC's poor performance cannot be attributed to low initial income (Korea started comparably) or lack of natural resources (the DRC possesses some of the world's richest mineral endowments). The Blanchard model, calibrated with these starting conditions, predicts robust growth for both. It has to explain why it failed for one.

3.2 The Lucas Paradox: Why Capital Does Not Flow to Poor Countries

Lucas (1990, p.92) posed the question directly: if capital has diminishing returns, why does it not flow from rich countries, where the marginal product of capital is low, to poor countries, where it is high? The predicted magnitude of capital flows in the standard model is enormous. Lucas computed that if capital's marginal product in India were proportional to its income gap relative to the United States, the implied marginal product in India would be approximately 58 times that in the US. Such a differential should produce massive capital inflows. In practice, net flows are modest, volatile, and frequently reversed.

Lucas's own preferred resolution was human capital complementarity: capital is more productive when paired with educated, skilled workers. If poor countries have thin human capital stocks, their effective marginal product of capital may not be as high as its physical scarcity implies. This explanation has real merit — Schultz (1961) established that investment in human capital raises labour productivity in precisely the way that complements physical capital. But it is only a partial answer. It explains why Korea's rapidly rising human capital stock attracted investment and made that investment productive. It does not explain why human capital investment in the DRC failed to take off, or why the modest foreign capital that did enter the DRC was so often diverted, expropriated, or simply destroyed.

The fuller resolution comes through institutional risk pricing. In Blanchard's framework, the net return to capital investment equals the marginal product of capital minus the depreciation rate: $r = MPK - \delta$. In an economy with insecure property rights and significant expropriation risk, the investor must price in the probability ρ of losing the asset entirely:

$$r\_effective = MPK - \delta - \rho$$

If ρ is high enough, as it was during Mobutu's kleptocratic era in the DRC, when firms were nationalised without compensation and contracts were selectively enforced: the effective return to investment can fall below the world interest rate even when the physical marginal product of capital is high. Capital does not flow to the DRC because the risk-adjusted return does not justify it. This is not a failure of Blanchard's formula; it is a demonstration that the formula requires an institutional parameter that the standard model omits.

3.3 The TFP Gap as the Core Explanandum

Perhaps the most damaging finding for the standard model comes from growth accounting. Easterly and Levine (2001, pp. 177-179) find that differences in TFP account for the overwhelming majority of cross-country income variation. Factor accumulation explains relatively little. Klenow and Rodriguez-Clare (1997, p. 81) find that approximately 67 percent of the variation in output per worker is attributable to differences in A, not to differences in factor inputs. The income gap between rich and poor countries is, at its core, a productivity gap.

This finding is simultaneously supportive and devastating for Blanchard's framework. Supportive, because the model correctly identifies TFP as the engine of long-run growth. Devastating, because the model treats A as exogenous. If A grows at rate g for everyone, and the data show TFP growing rapidly in Korea and contracting in the DRC, the model has no language for the discrepancy. Negative TFP growth across an entire decade is analytically incoherent within Blanchard's apparatus. It makes perfect sense within the institutional synthesis.

3.4 Endogenous Growth Theory as a Partial Corrective

The inadequacy of exogenous technology gave rise to endogenous growth theory. Romer (1990) demonstrated that technological progress is the output of deliberate, profit-motivated investment in knowledge. Firms invest in R&D because they expect temporary monopoly rents on the knowledge they create. Lucas (1988) offered a complementary mechanism through human capital: if workers accumulate skills through education and experience, labour quality improves in ways not captured by simply counting heads.

Korea's dramatic education expansion is explicable within this framework. Universal primary enrolment by the mid-1960s, near-universal secondary enrolment by the 1980s, and one of the world's highest tertiary participation rates by the 1990s. The DRC's chronically low enrolment (forty percent at primary level in 1960) reflects the opposite: an environment where returns to education were depressed by instability and the absence of formal employment. These models endogenise the Solow residual, at least partially. But they do not fully explain why some countries invest in human capital and R&D while others do not. The returns to investment are themselves shaped by institutions. That is the argument of Chapter 4.

3.5 The Missing Variable: Institutions

Hall and Jones (1999, pp. 83-84) provide the clearest bridge between the growth accounting literature and the institutional turn. Using data on output per worker across a broad sample of countries, they decompose income variation into contributions from physical capital, human capital, and a residual they term "social infrastructure." Social infrastructure is their empirical proxy for institutions: it combines measures of government anti-diversion policies (property rights, rule of law, absence of corruption) with measures of openness to trade. Their central finding is that social infrastructure accounts for the dominant share of cross-country variation in output per worker, and far more than either physical or human capital.

Rodrik, Subramanian and Trebbi (2004) sharpen this finding through instrumental variable estimation. They run a horse race between three candidate deep determinants of income: institutions (measured by rule of law), geography (measured by distance from the equator), and integration (measured by trade openness). Their result is decisive: institutions trump both geography and integration. One standard deviation improvement in institutional quality is associated with a fivefold increase in per-capita income. Geography and integration matter only insofar as they affect institutional development; they have no significant direct effect on income once institutions are controlled for. The missing variable has been found. Chapter 4 integrates it into Blanchard's production function.

4. The Institutional Extension: Completing Blanchard's Framework

The three empirical failures documented in Chapter 3 all point to a common cause: the omission of institutions from Blanchard's production function. This chapter builds the extension explicitly, proceeding from the theoretical foundations to a reformulated production function in which each of Blanchard's growth variables is a function of institutional quality.

4.1 North's Institutional Framework: Institutions as the Rules of the Game

North (1990, p. 3) defines institutions as " Institutions are the rules of the game in a society or, more formally, are the humanly devised constraints that shape human interaction." He distinguishes between *formal constraints*: codified rules, laws, constitutions, property rights systems. And *informal constraints*: norms of behavior, conventions, and self-imposed codes of conduct. Both categories shape economic incentives, but they do so through different mechanisms and with different degrees of durability. Formal rules can be changed by legislative fiat; informal constraints are deeply embedded in culture and social practice, and they change only gradually through the slow evolution of shared beliefs.

The economic significance of this distinction is profound. Blanchard's production function assumes that the conversion of inputs to outputs is governed by a stable, transparent technology. In reality, that conversion is mediated by the institutional environment at every stage. Property rights determine whether the returns to investment accrue to the investor or to a predatory state. Contract enforcement determines whether agreements between buyers and sellers are credible. Rule of law determines the risk of expropriation. These are not peripheral considerations; they are the conditions under which the production function operates. North's framework allows us to see that institutions do not simply affect output — they affect the *functional relationship* between inputs and outputs.

North (1991) further introduces the concept of path dependence: once a set of institutions is established, the organisations and individuals that benefit from those institutions — including extractive elites — have strong incentives to maintain them. Institutional change is therefore slow, non-linear, and frequently blocked by vested interests. This path dependence is not incidental to the Korea–DRC comparison; it is central to it. Korea's post-war institutional trajectory was shaped

by the US-backed developmental state of Park Chung-hee and by the availability of Japanese colonial administrative infrastructure. The DRC's post-independence trajectory was shaped by the deliberate destruction of Congolese administrative capacity under Belgian rule, leaving a state apparatus that was inherited by Mobutu and converted into an instrument of personal extraction.

4.2 Acemoglu, Johnson and Robinson: Colonial Origins and Persistent Divergence

The most rigorous empirical treatment of how institutional differences originate and persist is Acemoglu, Johnson and Robinson (2001). Their identification strategy exploits variation in European settler mortality during the colonial period. Where mortality from tropical disease was low — as in temperate colonies such as North America and parts of southern Africa — Europeans settled in large numbers and established inclusive institutions: secure property rights, functioning courts, constraints on executive power. Where mortality was high (here tropical West Africa and the Congo basin), Europeans established minimal settler populations and instead built extractive institutions designed to maximise resource extraction with minimal long-run investment in local capacity. These colonial institutions persisted long after independence, shaping contemporary income levels through their effect on the investment climate.

The DRC is AJR's paradigmatic extractive case. The Congo Free State under Leopold II, later the Belgian Congo, was designed as a resource extraction operation of exceptional brutality. The Force Publique enforced rubber quotas through violence. The administrative infrastructure that Belgium developed served extraction, not production — railways ran from mines to ports, not between population centres. There were no secondary schools in the entire Congo until 1954, and fewer than thirty Congolese university graduates at independence in 1960 (Easterly, 2001). This was not a coincidence or a failure of vision; it was the logical consequence of an institution designed to extract, not to invest.

Korea's colonial experience under Japan was different in character, though not in intent. Japanese colonialism was extractive, but it left behind a different institutional residue: a centralised bureaucratic apparatus, a land cadastre, a railway network oriented toward extraction from Korea to Japan but usable for domestic commerce, and a suppressed but real tradition of Confucian state administration. After 1945 and especially after 1960, Korean policymakers — drawing on this

bureaucratic inheritance and on the US security umbrella — were able to build a developmental state from institutional materials that the DRC simply did not have. Acemoglu and Robinson (2002) generalise this point: colonial institutions that were extractive in high-mortality environments became the least suited to post-independence development precisely because they had no tradition of investing in the productive capacity of the local population.

4.3 Re-Embedding Blanchard: Institutions Inside the Production Function

The analytical core of this paper is the reformulation of Blanchard's production function to incorporate institutional quality. The standard Cobb-Douglas function is:

$$Y = K\alpha\ (AN)^{1-}\alpha$$

The institutional extension replaces the scalar parameters with institution-dependent functions. Let I denote an index of institutional quality, increasing in property rights security, rule of law, and state capacity. Then the reformulated production function is:

$$Y = A(I) \cdot F(K(I), N(I))$$

Each element of the original function is now conditioned on I. Consider the three components in turn.

Technology, A(I). In Blanchard's standard framework, A grows at exogenous rate g. In the institutional extension, A is endogenous: A(I) is increasing in I because secure property rights, enforcement of intellectual property, and functioning capital markets raise the return to R&D and technology adoption. This is the Romer (1990) mechanism made institution-dependent. For the DRC, where intellectual property is unenforced and capital markets are dysfunctional, A(I) grows slowly or contracts. For Korea, where the developmental state explicitly subsidised technology licensing from Japan and directed corporate R&D investment, A(I) grew rapidly.

Capital, K(I). Physical capital accumulation depends on the effective savings rate, which is itself a function of institutional quality. Define the effective savings rate as:

$$s\_eff(I) = s \cdot (1 - \rho(I))$$

where ρ(I) is the probability of capital expropriation or destruction, decreasing in I. Under Mobutu, ρ was high — Zaïrianisation in 1973-74 nationalised all foreign-owned firms without compensation, effectively setting expropriation probability near one for a class of investments. The effective savings rate collapsed to near zero for productive investment, even when nominal savings existed; they were held as currency abroad or in unproductive assets. Under Korea's developmental state, ρ was deliberately kept low through a system of clearly enforced investment guarantees, and s was amplified by directed credit policies.

The Effective Depreciation Rate, δ_eff(I). Physical depreciation δ is supplemented by institutional destruction. When governments nationalise firms, armies destroy infrastructure, or civil conflict interrupts production, the effective depreciation rate exceeds the physical rate:

$$\delta\_eff(I) = \delta + \varepsilon(I)$$

where ε(I) is the institutional destruction rate, decreasing in I. For the DRC during civil conflict periods (1996–2003 especially), ε was substantial: roads, mines, and factories were destroyed as instruments of war. The capital stock contracted in absolute terms. In Blanchard's steady-state formula, a higher δ_eff lowers k* and y* proportionately — this is not a temporary shock but a structural shift in the steady-state the economy converges toward. A country can be *converging to a very low steady state* even as it technically displays positive growth in some years.

The reformulated steady-state condition becomes:

$$y^*(I) = (s\_eff(I) / (\delta\_eff(I) + g + n))^{(\alpha/(1-\alpha))}$$

This expression captures all three institutional effects simultaneously. High institutional quality raises s_eff, lowers δ_eff, and raises the effective growth rate of A through endogenous innovation. The compound effect on y* is large. For the DRC, every term moved in the wrong direction. For Korea, every term moved in the right direction and moved more rapidly than any purely neoclassical account can explain, because the movement was itself institutionally engineered.

4.4 Hall & Jones and Rodrik: Empirical Validation of the Synthesis

Hall and Jones (1999, pp. 86-90) provide the econometric foundation for the claim that institutions — their "social infrastructure" — are the dominant determinant of cross-country variation in output

per worker. Their instrumental variable approach uses European language fractions and distance from the equator as instruments for social infrastructure, arguing that these are historically determined and therefore exogenous to contemporary income levels. The first-stage results are strong: European-language prevalence predicts better institutions because colonial powers transferred their own institutional frameworks to settler colonies. The second-stage results confirm that social infrastructure accounts for the bulk of cross-country variation in output per worker, with a one-unit improvement in the social infrastructure index associated with roughly a fivefold increase in output per worker.

Rodrik, Subramanian and Trebbi (2004, pp. 135-136) extend this analysis by separating institutions from geography and trade integration. Using settler mortality (following AJR) and constructed trade shares (following Frankel & Romer) as instruments, they find that institutions explain virtually all of the cross-country income variation attributable to the three candidate variables. The estimated coefficient on institutional quality is large and robust across multiple specifications. Importantly, when institutions are controlled for, neither geography nor trade openness has a statistically significant direct effect on income. This result does not imply that geography and trade are irrelevant — it implies that their effects operate primarily through their influence on institutional development. For the Korea–DRC pair, this means that the DRC's tropical geography and commodity dependence are real burdens, but they explain the income gap only insofar as they shaped the institutional environment that Mobutu's government inherited and amplified.

4.5 The Developmental State: An Institutionally-Engineered Takeoff

The institutional synthesis requires one further element to be complete: an account of how inclusive institutions are actively constructed, not merely inherited. Wade (1990) and Amsden (1989) provide this account for the East Asian case through the concept of the developmental state. Korea's growth miracle after 1960 was not the spontaneous consequence of market liberalisation — in fact, Korea's industrial policy was deeply interventionist. The state directed credit through government-controlled banks toward priority sectors (steel, chemicals, electronics), set and enforced export performance targets for chaebol conglomerates, and subsidised education and R&D at rates that no purely market-based calculation would have justified.

What made this intervention growth-promoting rather than growth-retarding — unlike similar interventions in Latin America or the DRC — was its institutional character. The Korean bureaucracy had sufficient autonomy from private interests to design coherent industrial policy, sufficient state capacity to implement it, and a system of performance- based conditionality that made subsidies contingent on firms achieving export targets. Amsden (1989, Preface) calls this "getting relative prices wrong" deliberately — distorting factor prices away from market equilibrium to accelerate structural transformation — but doing so through an institutional framework that preserved accountability and imposed discipline. This is the developmental state as an institution-generating mechanism, not merely an institution-using one. Chapter 5 traces how each element of this mechanism raised Korea's effective savings rate, reduced effective depreciation, and accelerated TFP growth through the channels identified in Section 4.3.

5. South Korea: The Synthesis in Action, 1960–2020

South Korea's economic transformation between 1960 and 2020 is the most documented and debated case of rapid development convergence in the post-war literature. The numbers are not in dispute. What is in dispute is their theoretical interpretation: whether Korea's growth is best understood as a straightforward validation of Blanchard's neoclassical model — high initial savings, rapid capital accumulation, conditional convergence — or whether it requires the institutional synthesis developed in Chapter 4. This chapter argues for the latter. Korea validates the Blanchard model's mechanics; the model's mechanics were themselves institutionally activated.

5.1 Initial Conditions, 1960: Calibrating Blanchard's Variables

In 1960, Korea was one of the poorest countries in the world. Per-capita income (PPP, 2017 USD) stood near $1,100, roughly comparable to many sub-Saharan African economies at the time. The savings rate was approximately three percent of GDP — far below the investment rate required to achieve even a modest steady-state capital stock. Physical infrastructure was devastated by the 1950–53 Korean War. Human capital was limited: primary school enrolment was around 72 percent, and secondary enrolment was far lower. The country's principal export was labour.

Calibrating Blanchard's steady-state formula with these initial parameters is instructive. Set s = 0.03, α = 1/3, δ = 0.05, g = 0.02, n = 0.025. Then:

$$y^*(1960) = (0.03 / (0.05 + 0.02 + 0.025))^{(0.5)} \approx (0.03 / 0.095)^{(0.5)} \approx 0.562$$

This is the normalised steady-state output per effective worker — extremely low. The model predicts that at such a saving rate, Korea's long-run income would be a fraction of what was already a very poor standard. Any growth above this steady state would be purely transitional. For Korea to converge toward OECD income levels, something had to shift the steady state itself — not just the economy's position relative to it. That something was the savings rate, and the savings rate was shifted by institutions.

5.2 The Savings Takeoff: Institutional Engineering of Capital Accumulation

Between 1960 and 1988, Korea's gross domestic savings rate rose from approximately three percent of GDP to thirty-five percent — a more than tenfold increase within a single generation. This is not a figure that any neoclassical model can explain endogenously; it requires an account of what changed the incentives and mechanisms through which Korean households and firms chose to save. The institutional synthesis provides that account.

Three institutional mechanisms drove the savings takeoff. First, financial sector reform under Park Chung-hee in the early 1960s brought informal savings into the formal banking system through a combination of high real interest rates and deposit insurance — institutional guarantees that made formal saving credible. Second, the system of directed credit channelled those deposits toward industrial investment, giving savers a stake in the economy's growth trajectory. Third, land reform in 1950 had eliminated the landlord class and redistributed assets broadly, removing a class of rentiers whose income was extracted rather than productively invested. Savings that would have been consumed by rents were instead mobilised for investment.

The quantitative implication for Blanchard's model is dramatic. Re-calibrating the steady-state formula with the 1988 savings rate:

$$y^*(1988) = (0.35 / (0.05 + 0.02 + 0.025))^{(0.5)} \approx (0.35 / 0.095)^{(0.5)} \approx 1.92$$

The steady-state output per effective worker increased more than threefold from the savings rate change alone, holding technology, depreciation, and population growth constant. In practice, technology was not constant; TFP grew rapidly. The savings takeoff was not an automatic response to growth opportunities. It was institutionally engineered.

5.3 TFP Growth: The Developmental State as a Productivity Engine

The empirical debate over the sources of Korea's growth centres on a disagreement between Young (1995) and Klenow and Rodríguez-Clare (1997). Young (1995), applying growth accounting to Korea and other East Asian tigers, found that growth was primarily driven by factor accumulation — rising capital and rising labour inputs — rather than by TFP. He estimated that TFP growth contributed only modestly to Korean output growth in the high-growth era, suggesting that the miracle was more perspiration than inspiration. Klenow and Rodríguez-Clare (1997) contested Young's methodology and data, finding a substantially larger TFP contribution once human capital accumulation is properly accounted for and the growth accounting framework is corrected for intrasectoral heterogeneity.

The most recent Penn World Tables data (version 10.0) support an intermediate position. Korea's TFP grew at approximately 2.8 percent annually between 1966 and 2000, substantial, though lower than its rate of capital accumulation in the same period. From 2000 onward, as Korea exhausted the easy gains from technology imitation and moved toward the innovation frontier, TFP growth slowed but remained positive. This pattern is exactly what the institutional synthesis predicts: in the imitation phase, the developmental state's directed technology licensing accelerated TFP growth above what free markets would have achieved; in the innovation phase, Korea's strong intellectual property regime and R&D investment — consistent with Romer's (1990) endogenous growth model — sustained productivity growth through domestic knowledge creation.

The critical institutional mechanism was the government's deliberate policy of technology acquisition through licensing agreements with Japanese and American firms, enforced performance standards for technology adaptation, and the construction of institutions — including the Korea Institute of Science and Technology (KIST, established 1966) — that created a public R&D

infrastructure. This is not captured in Blanchard's exogenous g; it is precisely what Romer's endogenous model predicts when the institutional incentives for R&D investment are in place.

5.4 Human Capital: The Bridge Between Lucas and Blanchard

Korea's education investment was extraordinary in both speed and breadth. In 1945, literacy was approximately 22 percent. By 1970, primary school enrolment was near universal. By 1980, secondary enrolment exceeded 80 percent. By 1990, Korea ranked among the top countries globally in tertiary education participation. This was not organic; it was the product of sustained public investment and compulsory education laws enforced by a state with sufficient administrative capacity to implement them.

In Lucas's (1988) framework, this human capital accumulation raised the effective quality of the labour force, augmenting the AN term in the production function and raising the return to physical capital investment. Schultz's (1961) earlier insight is confirmed: investment in human beings is economically productive in the same sense as investment in machines, and the two are complements. Korea's rising human capital stock therefore provided part of the explanation for the Lucas Paradox in reverse: physical capital flowed *to* Korea, despite its initial poverty, because the human capital environment made that capital productive. The complementarity was real, and it was institutionally created.

Mankiw, Romer and Weil (1992) show that augmenting Blanchard's production function with human capital significantly improves the model's empirical fit. Applying their augmented model to Korea, with human capital measured by secondary school enrolment rates and physical capital accumulation rates from the national accounts, yields a predicted income trajectory that comes substantially closer to the observed data than the basic Solow specification. But even the augmented Mankiw-Romer-Weil model does not explain *why* Korea chose to invest in human capital so rapidly. The institutional synthesis does: the developmental state made education investment individually rational by creating an economy where credentials were rewarded, and collectively efficient by financing universal access.

5.5 Conditional Convergence Achieved: Validating the Synthesis

Korea's per-capita income grew at an average annual rate of approximately 6.5 percent between 1965 and 1990, and at around four percent between 1990 and 2020 — a sustained growth performance that qualifies, by any measure, as one of the most rapid convergences in economic history. By the late 1990s, Korea had closed approximately 70 percent of the income gap with the OECD average. By 2020, it was an upper-middle-income-to-high-income economy by any metric.

Does this validate Blanchard's conditional convergence prediction? Formally, yes — but the conditioning variable is crucial. Korea converged because it shifted its steady state k* upward through institutionally-driven increases in the savings rate and institutionally-enabled TFP growth, while simultaneously moving toward that steady state through the transitional dynamics Blanchard's model describes. The model's convergence mechanics are entirely applicable. What the model cannot supply is the explanation for why the steady state shifted so dramatically, and why the economy was able to maintain the institutional conditions for sustained growth across political transitions — from Park's autocratic developmental state to Chun's military government to the democratisation of the late 1980s and 1990s.

The answer lies in what North (1990) would call a positive feedback in institutional change: as Korea's growth produced a middle class, that middle class demanded — and eventually obtained — political institutions (democracy, rule of law, free press) that further secured property rights and reduced political risk. Growth generated the constituency for the inclusive institutions that sustained further growth. This virtuous cycle — institutional improvement driving growth, growth enabling institutional deepening — is the Korea miracle properly understood. Blanchard provides the mechanics. North, AJR, and Romer provide the engine.

6. The Democratic Republic of Congo: The Synthesis in Reverse, 1960-2020

If Korea demonstrates the institutional synthesis operating in its growth-enabling mode, the DRC demonstrates it operating in reverse. Every mechanism that drove Korea's savings rate up, its TFP higher, and its human capital accumulation faster operated in the opposite direction in the DRC. The result was not merely slow growth, it was, in several periods and by several metrics, negative development: a shrinking capital stock, contracting TFP, and a population that grew rapidly while

the economy did not. Understanding the DRC's failure requires no separate theory from the one applied to Korea. It requires applying the same theory with different institutional parameters.

6.1 Initial Conditions and the Resource Curse Setup

At independence in 1960, the DRC — then Zaire — possessed extraordinary natural wealth. The Katanga region held some of the world's largest deposits of copper and cobalt. The Kasai region was rich in diamonds. The Congo River system offered potential for hydroelectric generation that has never been fully exploited. Per-capita GDP was modest, roughly $900 in PPP terms, but comparable to Korea's and the resource endowment looked, superficially, like a development asset.

Sachs and Warner (1997) document the resource curse: natural resource abundance is correlated with slower, not faster, economic growth across a broad cross-section of countries. The mechanisms are multiple. Resource rents create incentives for rent-seeking rather than productive investment — it is easier to capture existing wealth than to create new wealth. Resource revenues insulate governments from the need to tax citizens productively, weakening the fiscal contract that historically has driven state-building and accountability. And resource wealth attracts coups: controlling the state becomes more valuable when the state controls mineral revenues, creating a political economy of violent capture rather than productive governance.

All three mechanisms operated in the DRC with particular force. Mobutu Sese Seko, who seized power in 1965 and held it until 1997, built his regime on the control of mineral revenues. Mining concessions were instruments of patronage, not productivity. The state's fiscal base depended on resource extraction, not on taxing a productive economy, which removed any incentive to build the administrative capacity required for a developmental state. In Blanchard's terms, the resource endowment reduced the effective savings rate by making unproductive rent-seeking more attractive than capital accumulation, and it did so through a political economy mechanism that the standard model has no language to capture.

6.2 Institutional Extraction and the Collapse of the Effective Savings Rate

Mobutu's *Zaïrianisation* policy of 1973-74 was the most consequential single institutional event in the DRC's post-independence history. At a stroke, all foreign-owned enterprises — mines, plantations, factories, retail businesses — were expropriated and transferred to Congolese citizens, predominantly Mobutu's political allies. The economic consequences were immediate and catastrophic. Firms stripped of their experienced management defaulted rapidly. Agricultural output from expropriated plantations collapsed. Mining productivity fell. Foreign direct investment essentially ceased.

Applying Blanchard's framework with the institutional parameters introduced in Chapter 4, the effect is precisely modelled. With ρ (expropriation probability) spiking near one for a class of productive investments, the effective savings rate collapsed:

$$s\_eff = s \cdot (1 - \rho) \approx s \cdot 0 \approx 0$$

Nominal savings (particularly foreign savings) did not disappear, but they were redirected toward unproductive assets: capital flight (the DRC became one of the world's highest capital-flight economies relative to GDP), currency speculation, and asset hoarding outside the productive economy. This is not a failure of the saving function; it is the rational response of economic agents to an institutional environment in which the return to productive investment was made negative by policy. The economy's effective k* fell toward subsistence, and the transitional dynamics of Blanchard's model then predict convergence *downward*, which is exactly what the data show.

6.3 Effective Depreciation and the Physical Destruction of Capital

The DRC's institutional environment did not merely suppress new investment; it actively destroyed existing capital. The civil conflicts of 1996-2003, involving armies from nine African countries and dozens of armed factions, caused damage to infrastructure estimated by the World Bank at tens of billions of dollars. Roads that had existed at independence deteriorated to impassable tracks. The Kinshasa-Katanga railway, essential for extracting mineral wealth, became non-functional in sections. Electricity infrastructure was looted. The physical capital stock contracted in absolute terms.

In Blanchard's steady-state formula, effective depreciation rates matter quadratically: a doubling of δ_eff halves the steady-state capital-to-output ratio for given savings rates. The formula

$$y^* = (s_{eff} / \delta_{eff} + g + n)^{(\alpha/1-\alpha)}$$

shows that high effective depreciation pushes the steady state toward zero independently of savings behaviour. For the DRC, where physical destruction was substantial, the implied steady state was structurally (not accidentally) low. And because much of the destruction was politically motivated (infrastructure in opposition regions was deliberately neglected), it was not an exogenous shock but an endogenous institutional outcome.

6.4 TFP Collapse: Negative Productivity as Institutional Destruction

The most theoretically striking aspect of the DRC's growth record is its negative TFP growth across multiple decades. Growth accounting for the DRC using the Solow residual decomposition ($g_A = g_Y - \alpha g_K - (1-\alpha) g_N$) yields negative values for g_A in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. This is analytically impossible within Blanchard's standard framework, which assumes $g_A \geq 0$ as an exogenous given. Technology is assumed to be a free public good that never deteriorates. Yet deterioration is precisely what the data show.

Easterly and Levine (2001, p. 178-179) document this pattern across sub-Saharan Africa: the region's slow growth is overwhelmingly a TFP story. Factor accumulation in Africa was low but not negligible; it is the productivity of those factors that collapsed. For the DRC, the mechanisms of TFP contraction are specific and identifiable. *Zaïrianisation* eliminated experienced management in a single year, destroying organisational capital that had taken decades to accumulate. The collapse of formal employment opportunities removed the economic return to education, depressing human capital accumulation across a generation. The destruction of physical infrastructure raised the effective cost of economic activity — road transport distances increased as roads deteriorated, raising logistics costs for all production. And the political environment destroyed the institutions — contract law, professional associations, technical standards — through which knowledge is codified and transmitted in a modern economy.

These mechanisms represent a form of *institutional depreciation*: the erosion of the social and organisational infrastructure through which production knowledge is applied. Blanchard's formula has no term for this. The institutional synthesis does: when I falls, A(I) falls with it, because the mechanisms through which knowledge is turned into productivity — credible contracts, stable organisations, functioning markets — deteriorate. Negative TFP is not a paradox within the synthesis; it is the expected consequence of severe and sustained institutional degradation.

6.5 The Washington Consensus and the Limits of Blanchard-Consistent Policy

The international community's response to the DRC's economic difficulties included multiple rounds of IMF structural adjustment and World Bank conditionality, particularly in the 1980s and early 2000s. These programmes followed the Washington Consensus template described by Williamson (1990): fiscal discipline, trade liberalisation, deregulation, privatisation, and currency stabilisation. Each of these prescriptions is internally consistent with Blanchard's framework — they are designed to improve the macroeconomic parameters (s, δ, n, g) that determine the steady state. They failed.

Stiglitz (2002) provides the most cogent critique: structural adjustment programmes imposed macroeconomic constraints without addressing the institutional environment that determined whether those constraints could be productively met. Fiscal austerity in a country with no functioning revenue administration merely cuts public services without building the tax base. Trade liberalisation in a country with no contract enforcement opens markets to imports without enabling competitive exports. Privatisation transfers state assets to politically connected buyers without creating competitive private enterprise. The prescriptions were not wrong in the abstract — they would have been appropriate in an institutionally functional economy. They were wrong for the DRC because they were institutionally naive.

Rodrik, Subramanian and Trebbi's (2004) result is directly applicable here: in a horse race between institutions, geography, and integration, institutions win. Trade integration — one of the Washington Consensus's central instruments — has no significant direct effect on income once institutions are controlled for. The DRC's failure to benefit from trade liberalisation is not a refutation of comparative advantage; it is a confirmation that comparative advantage can only be

realised through an institutional environment that makes productive specialisation feasible. Sachs (2005) adds geography and disease burden as compounding factors — the DRC's tropical disease environment raises mortality and depresses productivity independently of institutions. But geography, too, operates through institutions: it shaped the colonial settlement patterns that AJR (2001) identify as the source of the DRC's extractive institutional inheritance.

The conclusion is sobering and specific. No combination of macroeconomic stabilisation — however technically correct in Blanchard's terms — can substitute for the foundational institutional reforms that make capital accumulation credible, technology adoption profitable, and human capital investment individually rational. The DRC's poverty is not primarily a macroeconomic problem; it is an institutional one. Blanchard's model, applied without the institutional extension, diagnoses the wrong disease.

7. Conclusion

7.1 Answering the Research Question

The research question asked which combination of development theories best explains how less developed countries achieve economic growth. The answer is precise. Development theories achieve their greatest explanatory power when Blanchard's neoclassical mechanics (the production function, the capital accumulation equation, the steady-state formula, the convergence prediction) are embedded within an institutional meta-framework drawn from North (1990, 1991), Acemoglu, Johnson and Robinson (2001, 2002), and Rodrik, Subramanian and Trebbi (2004), and extended through the endogenous technology mechanisms of Romer (1990) and Lucas (1988).

No single theory in isolation provides adequate explanatory power. Blanchard's framework offers rigorous mechanics but treats institutions and technology as exogenous — an assumption that is reasonable for OECD economies and systematically violated in LDC contexts. Endogenous growth theory corrects the technology assumption but cannot explain why investment in human capital and R&D takes place in some countries and not others. Institutional economics identifies the root cause of investment variation but requires Blanchard's quantitative apparatus to translate institutional variation into predicted income trajectories. The synthesis is genuinely more powerful

than its parts: it explains the Lucas Paradox (capital does not flow to institutionally unsafe environments), the TFP gap (technology is generated and sustained by institutions, not freely diffused), and the divergence of growth trajectories from similar starting points (different institutional quality → different effective s, different δ_eff, different gA).

7.2 The Korea–DRC Dyad as Analytical Proof

The comparison functions as a near-perfect natural experiment. At the initial date, both countries were poor, capital-scarce, and institutionally marked by colonial extraction. Blanchard's model, calibrated identically, would predict similar trajectories. Instead, it predicted identically and delivered radically different outcomes.

South Korea demonstrates the synthesis operating in its growth-enabling mode. Institutional engineering — the developmental state — shifted s from three to thirty-five percent of GDP, kept effective δ low through property rights enforcement and political stability, and accelerated gA through directed technology acquisition and human capital investment. The result was sustained convergence at six-plus percent per year across three decades, ending in OECD membership. The DRC demonstrates the synthesis operating in reverse. Institutional extraction — Zaïrianisation, kleptocracy, civil conflict — drove effective s toward zero, raised effective δ through capital destruction, and produced negative TFP growth through the erosion of organisational and knowledge capital. The result was stagnation and regression.

The reformulated production function $Y = A(I) \cdot F(K(I), N(I))$ captures this dynamic. It is not a departure from Blanchard's framework; it is its natural extension into institutional territory. The Cobb-Douglas mechanics, the steady-state formula $y^* = (s_{eff}(I) / (\delta_{eff}(I) + g + n))^{(\alpha/1-\alpha)}$, and the convergence equation remain fully operative — they simply operate with institution-conditioned parameters.

7.3 Policy Implications

The policy implications of the synthesis are direct and uncomfortable for mainstream development practice. First, institutional reform must precede standard macroeconomic stabilisation, not merely

accompany it. Williamson's (1990) Washington Consensus prescriptions are not wrong for an institutionally functional economy; they are sequentially misapplied when delivered to economies where the foundational institutions are absent. Rodrik et al. (2004) demonstrate that institutions are the meta-determinant of income. Policy must start there.

Second, the developmental state is a viable growth model — but it is not replicable everywhere. Korea's developmental state worked because it inherited a degree of bureaucratic capacity from the Japanese colonial period, because US strategic interests provided both financial support and a security umbrella that reduced the political risk premium on investment, and because the chaebols' export orientation created a mechanism for disciplining industrial subsidies through market performance. None of these conditions are present in the DRC. Sachs (2005) argues for a "big push" of aid and investment to overcome poverty traps; the institutional analysis suggests that such a push, without accompanying institutional reform, will face the same fate as Washington Consensus prescriptions. Aid flows into extractive institutional environments are captured by extractive actors.

Third, the comparison suggests that the most important development intervention is one that changes the political economy of institutional choice — not simply the technical quality of economic policy. Easterly (2001) documents the failure of repeated expert-driven reform programmes that ignored political economy constraints. The Korean case suggests that growth-enabling institutions can be built even from unpromising starting points, but only when political actors have both the incentive and the capacity to build them. Creating those incentives requires an understanding of the specific political and historical context — something that no universal growth model can substitute for.

7.4 Limitations and Directions for Future Research

This paper carries several limitations that bear explicit acknowledgement. A two-country comparison, however analytically sharp, does not support broad generalisation. Korea and the DRC were chosen for maximum contrast; they do not represent the full range of LDC experiences. Middle-income countries that have partially converged — Brazil, South Africa, Indonesia — would

offer a more demanding test of the synthesis, because they exhibit mixed institutional trajectories that cannot be characterised simply as inclusive or extractive.

The institutional quality index I used throughout the paper is a conceptual device, not a precisely measured variable. The World Governance Indicators and the AJR settler mortality instrument provide useful proxies, but institutional quality is multidimensional: property rights, rule of law, bureaucratic capacity, democratic accountability, and social trust are related but distinct. Future research should disaggregate the institutional variable and test which dimensions matter most for which specific growth mechanisms: does property rights security matter more for savings and investment, while rule of law matters more for technology adoption? The synthesis suggests these are related but distinct causal pathways.

Finally, the paper's time horizon ends at 2020. The DRC's institutional situation has shown modest signs of improvement under recent governments, and Korea's growth trajectory has shifted as it transitions from imitation to innovation-led growth. Both transitions, from extractive to inclusive institutions in the DRC, if they continue, and from catch-up to frontier growth in Korea, would offer further tests of the synthesis. The framework predicts that the DRC's trajectory can improve if and only if institutional quality I rises sustainably. That is not a prediction the neoclassical model alone is equipped to make.

Development economics has sometimes suffered from the temptation of monocausal explanation: geography, culture, capital, trade, or institutions, each advanced by its proponents as the sufficient explanation for the global income distribution. The Korea–DRC comparison resists this temptation. It is analytically productive precisely because it shows that no single variable suffices. Capital accumulation matters — Korea's savings rate mattered enormously. Technology matters, Korea's TFP growth was real and substantial. Institutions matter, they determined whether the other two could operate. The synthesis is not a compromise between competing theories; it is the conclusion to which a rigorous application of Blanchard's analytical framework, confronted with the full range of LDC experience, inevitably leads.

Bibliography

Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., & Robinson, J. A. (2001). The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development: An Empirical Investigation. *American Economic Review*, *91*(5), 1369–1401. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.91.5.1369

Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., & Robinson, J. A. (2002). Reversal of Fortune: Geography and Institutions in the Making of the Modern World Income Distribution. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *117*(4), 1231–1294.

Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2010). WHY IS AFRICA POOR? *Economic History of Developing Regions*, *25*(1), 21–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/20780389.2010.505010

Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty. *ASEAN ECONOMIC BULLETIN*, *29*(2), 168. https://doi.org/10.1355/ae29-2j

Aghion, P., & Howitt, P. (1992). A Model of Growth Through Creative Destruction. *Econometrica*, *60*(2), 323–351. https://doi.org/10.2307/2951599

Amsden, A. H. (1992). *Asia's Next Giant*. https://doi.org/10.1093/0195076036.001.0001

Barro, R. J. (1991). Economic Growth in a Cross Section of Countries. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *106*(2), 407–443.

Barro, R., & Sala, X. (2004). *Economic growth* (2nd ed.). The Mit Press.

Collier, P., & Gunning, J. W. (1999). Why Has Africa Grown Slowly? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *13*(3), 3–22. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.13.3.3

Easterly, W. (2001a). *The Elusive Quest for Growth : economists' Adventures and Misadventures in the Tropics*. Mit Press.

Easterly, W. (2001b). What have we learned from a decade of empirical research on growth? It's Not Factor Accumulation: Stylized Facts and Growth Models. *The World Bank Economic Review*, *15*(2), 177–219. https://doi.org/10.1093/wber/15.2.177

Eichengreen, B., Park, D., & Shin, K. (2012). When Fast-Growing Economies Slow Down: International Evidence and Implications for China. *Asian Economic Papers*, *11*(1), 42–87. https://doi.org/10.1162/asep_a_00118

Hall, R. E., & Jones, C. I. (1999). Why do Some Countries Produce So Much More Output Per Worker than Others? *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *114*(1), 83–116. https://doi.org/10.1162/003355399555954

Hausmann, R., Pritchett, L., & Rodrik, D. (2005). Growth Accelerations. *Journal of Economic Growth*, *10*(4), 303–329. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10887-005-4712-0

J. D., S. (2005). *The end of poverty: Economic possibilities for our time*. Https://Www.penguinrandomhouse.com/Books/292315/The-End-of-Poverty-By-Jeffrey-d-Sachs/; Penguin Press. https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/292315/the-end-of-poverty-by-jeffrey-d-sachs/

J. E., S. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents*. W. W. Norton & Company. https://wwnorton.com/books/Globalization-and-Its-Discontents/

Klenow, P. J., & Rodríguez-Clare, A. (1997). The Neoclassical Revival in Growth Economics: Has It Gone Too Far? *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, *12*, 73–103. https://doi.org/10.1086/654324

Kuznets, S. (1955). Economic Growth and Income Inequality. *The American Economic Review*, *45*(1), 1–28. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1811581

L.,Kim,Chang-Shik,Corden, E. (2025). *The East Asian miracle : economic growth and public policy (Vol. 1 of 2) : Main report*. World Bank. https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/975081468244550798

Lucas, R. E. (1988). On the Mechanics of Economic Development. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, *22*(1), 3–42.

Lucas, R. E. (1990). Why Doesn't Capital Flow from Rich to Poor Countries? *The American Economic Review*, *80*(2), 92–96.

Mankiw, N. G., Romer, D., & Weil, D. N. (1992). A Contribution to the Empirics of Economic Growth. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *107*(2), 407–437.

North, D. C. (1990). Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance. *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511808678

North, D. C. (1991). Institutions. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *5*(1), 97–112. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.5.1.97

Ocampo, J. A. (2004). Latin America's Growth and Equity Frustrations During Structural Reforms. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *18*(2), 67–88. https://doi.org/10.1257/0895330041371349

Prebisch, R. (1950). The economic development of Latin America and its principal problems. *Repositorio.cepal.org*. https://repositorio.cepal.org/handle/11362/29973

Pritchett, L. (1997). Divergence, Big Time. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *11*(3), 3–17. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.11.3.3

R, W. (1990). *Governing the market: Economic theory and the role of government in East Asian industrialization*. Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv346sp4

Rodrik, D. (1999). Where Did All the Growth Go? External Shocks, Social Conflict, and Growth Collapses. *Journal of Economic Growth*, *4*(4), 385–412. https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1009863208706

Rodrik, D., Subramanian, A., & Trebbi, F. (2004). Institutions Rule: The Primacy of Institutions Over Geography and Integration in Economic Development. *Journal of Economic Growth*, *9*(2), 131–165. https://doi.org/10.1023/b:joeg.0000031425.72248.85

Romer, P. M. (1986). Increasing returns and long-run growth. *Journal of Political Economy*, *94*(5), 1002–1037. https://doi.org/10.1086/261420

Romer, P. M. (1990). Endogenous Technological Change. *Journal of Political Economy*, *98*(5, Part 2), S71–S102. https://doi.org/10.1086/261725

Sachs, J. D., & Warner, A. M. (1997). Sources of Slow Growth in African Economies. *Journal of African Economies*, *6*(3), 335–376. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jae.a020932

Schultz, T. W. (1961). Investment in Human Capital. *The American Economic Review*, *51*(1), 1–17. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1818907

Solow, R. M. (1956). A Contribution to the Theory of Economic Growth. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *70*(1), 65–94. https://doi.org/10.2307/1884513

Solow, R. M. (1957). Technical Change and the Aggregate Production Function. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, *39*(3), 312–320.

W. W. , R. (1960). *The stages of economic growth: A non-communist manifesto*. University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139839723

Young, A. (1995). The Tyranny of Numbers: Confronting the Statistical Realities of the East Asian Growth Experience. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *110*(3), 641–680. https://doi.org/10.2307/2946695