

2002

## Trade and Poverty in the Poor Countries

Jagdish N. Bhagwati  
*Columbia Law School, jlb38@columbia.edu*

T.N. Srinivasan  
*Yale University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/faculty\\_scholarship](https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/faculty_scholarship)



Part of the [International Trade Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Jagdish N. Bhagwati & T.N. Srinivasan, *Trade and Poverty in the Poor Countries*, 92(2) AM. ECON. REV. 180 (2002).

Available at: [https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/faculty\\_scholarship/3463](https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/faculty_scholarship/3463)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Publications at Scholarship Archive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Scholarship by an authorized administrator of Scholarship Archive. For more information, please contact [scholarshiparchive@law.columbia.edu](mailto:scholarshiparchive@law.columbia.edu), [rwitt@law.columbia.edu](mailto:rwitt@law.columbia.edu).

# Trade and Poverty in the Poor Countries

By JAGDISH BHAGWATI AND T. N. SRINIVASAN\*

While freer trade, or “openness” in trade, is now widely regarded as economically benign, in the sense that it increases the size of the pie,<sup>1</sup> the recent anti-globalization critics have suggested that it is *socially malign* on several dimensions, among them the question of poverty.<sup>2</sup>

Their contention is that trade accentuates, not ameliorates, and that it deepens, not diminishes, poverty in both the rich and the poor countries. The theoretical and empirical analysis of the impact of freer trade on poverty in the rich and in the poor countries is not symmetric, of course. We focus here only on the latter. In doing so, we distinguish between two different strands of argumentation: static and dynamic.

## I. Static Arguments

The central effect on poverty is assumed to come from the effects on real wages of the unskilled workers, endowed with labor but no human or financial capital. The natural presumption following the Stolper-Samuelson argumentation, would be that, if anything, freer trade should help in the reduction of poverty in the poor countries which use their comparative advantage to export labor-intensive goods. This, in fact, is the central message of Anne Krueger’s (1983) findings from a multi-country project on the subject of the effects of trade on wages and employment in developing countries.

Another approach also suggests that trade is beneficial for poverty reduction in the developing countries. Much empirical evidence suggests that inflation hurts the poor in these

countries. It is equally clear that, if a country wishes to maintain an export-promoting, as distinct from an import-substituting, strategy (so that it is generally speaking opting for freer trade), then it will have to maintain macroeconomic stability. Thus, such macroeconomic stability must be regarded as endogenous to the policy choice in favor of freer trade.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, commitment to an outward-oriented trade policy indirectly assists the poor since they are vulnerable to inflation.

## II. Dynamic Arguments

The more direct and salient analysis of the problem, however, has been in the growth context. Here, the central argument has proceeded in two steps: trade promotes growth; and growth reduces poverty.

In regard to the former, there are ample precedents for this hypothesis. Thus, Dennis Robertson (1940) long ago characterized trade as an “engine of growth.” In regard to the latter, one could go back to Adam Smith (1776 [1937 p. 81]), who argued that when society is “advancing to the further acquisition . . . the condition of the labouring poor, of the great body of the people, seems to be the happiest.” In modern times, the favorable link between growth and

\* Department of Economics, Columbia University, New York, NY, 10027, and Department of Economics, Yale University, New Haven, CT, 06520, respectively.

<sup>1</sup> The most prominent skeptic on this question is Dani Rodrik. We have controverted his arguments, at least to our satisfaction, in Srinivasan and Bhagwati (2001).

<sup>2</sup> The social issues and agenda include the impact on gender questions, on democracy, on labor rights or standards, and on culture (see Bhagwati, 2002).

<sup>3</sup> We believe that this is the correct causal way to regard the link between macroeconomic stability and trade performance: there are several cases of macroeconomic stability and absence of a policy of outward orientation, such as the Communist countries and India, but none of successful outward orientation and absence of macroeconomic stability. For an early statement of this view (and an argument that one of the reasons why outward orientation is usually better in overall economic performance than lack of it is due to the macroeconomic stability that it requires), see Bhagwati (1978). We thus reject the argument recently advanced by Rodrik that it is macroeconomic stability, not outward orientation, that matters in better performance; not merely does he ignore the fact that the link has already been discussed in the literature on trade strategy, but we believe he also gets causality wrong.

poverty has been the underpinning of the Indian planning efforts that began as far back as the mid-1950's.<sup>4</sup>

As one can readily imagine, it is easy to write down models which refute each of the foregoing two hypotheses; and in fact there is no dearth of such models. The real question then, as always but even more tellingly here, is which models get at the reality. Here, we would argue that the empirical evidence is more persuasively in support of the two propositions we have just stated. We therefore consider first the theoretical arguments and then the empirical evidence.

#### A. Theoretical Possibilities

Theoretical models of the effects of trade and growth, whether in steady state (i.e., long-run) or out (i.e., short-term), lead to different possibilities. Thus, in the Harrod-Domar model, if labor remains slack permanently and trade affects only efficiency in the use of resources, the growth rate will be permanently enhanced because of the lasting decline in the marginal capital-output ratio. On the other hand, in the Robert Solow (1956) economy, trade has no permanent effect, and the steady-state growth is independent of it. For an analysis of how trade policy works in different models of exogenous and endogenous growth, see Srinivasan and Bhagwati (2001).

Generally speaking, the effects of trade policy on growth must proceed through links between trade and the two "fundamentals": accumulation and innovation (in the use and productivity of resources). There are several reasons to think that trade will affect both favorably. Thus, the increased variety of inputs available from trade will enable an economy to get around constraints placed on access to such variety under protection, when absence of scale economies can reduce the available variety from domestic production alone. Then again, high protection is likely to constrain the marginal

efficiency of capital by confining sales to domestic markets compared to open economies where the world defines the market, thereby reducing the rate of investment.<sup>5</sup>

As for the effect of growth on poverty, again different models are possible. If labor is in elastic supply to the growing areas, as in the Arthur Lewis models, then growth will pull more of the reserve army of labor into gainful employment. If growth is modeled in a way such that it does not affect a segmented pool of the poor, as in tribal areas that are not linked to the mainstream or in inner cities which are structurally delinked from the main city where growth is occurring, then growth will pass the poor by. Growth may even immiserize the poor further as when the poor are working tiny plots of land to produce farm products whose prices fall because of the larger farms implementing the Green Revolution.

#### B. Trade, Growth, and Poverty: Empirical Evidence

Regarding trade and growth, the best evidence is to be found in the detailed country studies pioneered by the OECD project directed by Ian Little et al. (1970) and the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) project directed by Bhagwati and Krueger. The recent reliance on cross-country regressions, by contrast, produces mixed evidence in both directions: for example, Jeffrey D. Sachs and Andrew Warner (1995) and Jeffrey Frankel and David Romer (1999) are on the positive side, and Anne Harrison (1996)<sup>6</sup> and Francisco Rodriguez and Rodrik (1999) are skeptical, the latter even leaning to being opposed. However, as we have argued in Srinivasan and Bhagwati (2001), in riposte to the criticisms from Rodrik, the cross-country regressions are a poor way to approach this question. The choice of period, of the sample, and of proxies, will often imply many effective degrees of freedom where one might almost get what one wants if one tries hard enough!

<sup>4</sup> The link between growth and poverty reduction can be found in the writings of many of India's leaders such as Jawaharlal Nehru. But the precise argument that rapid growth was the *principal* (though not an exclusive) way of targeting poverty among the bottom three deciles, and assuring them a "minimum" standard of living, was a result of the work by one of us (Bhagwati) in 1961-1962 in the Indian Planning Commission (see Bhagwati, 1988, 2000a).

<sup>5</sup> This argument, explaining the contrasting rates of accumulation and hence growth rates in East Asia and in India, is developed at length in Bhagwati (2000b).

<sup>6</sup> Harrison has a detailed tabulation of, and useful commentary on, the empirical studies up to 1996.

Nonetheless, it is interesting that practically no country that has been close to autarkic has managed to sustain a high growth performance over a sustained period. Furthermore, the work of David Dollar and Aart Kraay (2002) notes that, if one classifies countries into globalizers and non-globalizers by reference to their relative performance in raising the trade share in GNP during 1977–1997, the former group has shown higher growth rates. Failure, like success, has many fathers, and no one cause will ever explain big outcomes like growth. Nonetheless, the many reasons why autarky would put a country behind make these empirical observations quite salient.<sup>7</sup>

The evidence on growth and poverty is best approached through focus on the two countries: China and India. The vast majority of the world's poor live in the rural areas of these two countries. Both countries achieved significant reductions in poverty during 1980–2000 when they grew rapidly. According to World Bank (2000 table 4-2) estimates, real GDP grew at an annual average rate of 10 percent in China and 6 percent in India during these two decades. No country in the world had as rapid growth as China, and fewer than ten countries exceeded the Indian growth rate. The effect on reduction in poverty in both countries was dramatic, entirely in keeping with the “Bhagwati hypothesis” of the early 1960's that growth is a principal driver of poverty reduction. Thus, according to the Asian Development Bank (2000 table 3-1) estimates, the incidence of poverty in China, by standard measures, declined from 28 percent in 1978 to 9 percent in 1998. By the Government of India's (2000 table 5) estimates, poverty incidence fell from 51 percent in 1977–1978 to 27 percent in 1999–2000.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Rodrik has suggested that such associations prove little, since growth may have led to trade, rather than the other way around. The sophisticated in-depth country studies at the OECD and the NBER, however, suggest that trade did matter causally. There are also good reasons to believe that the outward-orientation of the Far Eastern strategy, which led to the Asian miracle, was critical in the story, as developed in Bhagwati (2000b).

<sup>8</sup> A commonly used indicator of poverty is the head-count ratio (i.e., the proportion of the population with monthly consumption expenditure or income per head below a poverty-line expenditure. Angus Deaton (2001) finds that this ratio registered a significant decline in 1999–2000 compared to 1977–1978.

It is also relevant that these were also the decades in which both China and India increased their integration into the world economy. In fact, in the previous three decades (1950–1980) India's autarkic policies alongside other damaging policies (such as extreme interventionism and controls and proliferation of an inefficient public sector in economic activity well beyond utilities)<sup>9</sup> were associated with an annual growth rate of only 3.5 percent, with the natural consequence that the incidence of poverty fluctuated around 55 percent with no declining trend.

Obviously, the experience of the two giant economies of China and India in achieving faster growth and reduction in poverty through greater integration into the world economy, treating such integration as an opportunity rather than as a threat, is salutary. According to Dollar (2001), other economies such as Vietnam and Uganda have had similar experiences. Indeed, Dollar (2001 p. 17) argues that the only developing countries that have registered significant declines in poverty are those that also have integrated faster into the world economy on the dimensions of trade and direct investment. The opponents of trade who allege that it accentuates or bypasses poverty are therefore not credible.<sup>10</sup>

## REFERENCES

- Asian Development Bank.** *Asian development outlook*. Manila, Phillippines: Asian Development Bank, 2000.
- Bhagwati, Jagdish.** *Foreign trade regimes and economic development: Anatomy and consequences of exchange contrast regimes*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Poverty and Public Policy,” 1987 Vikram Sarabhai Lecture. *World Development*, May 1988, 16(5), pp. 539–55.

<sup>9</sup> The full range of inefficient policies, going well beyond the lack of outward orientation in trade and direct foreign investment, was discussed in the early work of Bhagwati and Padma Desai (1970) and Bhagwati and Srinivasan (1975). An overview is provided also in Bhagwati (1993) and Srinivasan (2000), among several contributions to the analysis of Indian economic policy failings.

<sup>10</sup> We have not considered here the management of trade liberalization to get to freer trade. A valuable analysis of this problem, to ensure that the poor are not harmed, is provided by Neil McCulloch et al. (2001).

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Convocation Address." Unpublished lecture, Panjab University, Chandigarh, India, 2000a [available online: <<http://www.columbia.edu/~jb38>>].
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The East Asian Miracle that Did Happen: Understanding East Asia in Comparative Perspective," in Jagdish Bhagwati, *The wind of the hundred days: How Washington mismanaged globalization*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000b, pp. 27–49.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Globalization and Appropriate Governance." Unpublished Jubilee 2000 Lecture, WIDER, United Nations University, Helsinki, Finland, 2002.
- Bhagwati, Jagdish and Desai, Padma.** *India: Planning for industrialization*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Bhagwati, Jagdish and Srinivasan, T. N.** *Foreign trade regimes and economic development: India*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1975.
- Deaton, Angus.** "Adjusted Indian Poverty Estimates for 1999–2000." Mimeo, Department Princeton University, 2001.
- Dollar, David.** "Globalization, Inequality and Poverty Since 1980." Background paper, World Bank, Washington, DC, 2001 [available online: <<http://www.worldbank.org/research/global>>].
- Dollar, David and Kraay, Aart.** "Spreading the Wealth." *Foreign Affairs*, January–February 2002, 81(1), pp. 1–13.
- Frankel, Jeffrey and Romer, David.** "Does Trade Cause Growth?" *American Economic Review*, June 1999, 89(3), pp. 379–99.
- Government of India.** *Economic survey, 1999–2000*. New Delhi, India: Government Printing Office, 2000.
- Harrison, Anne.** "Openness and Growth: A Time-Series, Cross-Country Analysis for Developing Countries." *Journal of Development Economics*, March 1996, 48(2), pp. 419–47.
- Krueger, Anne.** *Trade and employment in developing countries*, 3. *Synthesis and conclusions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.
- Little, I. M. D.; Scitovsky, Tibor and Scott, Maurice.** *Industry and trade in some developing countries*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- McCulloch, Neil; Winters, L. Alan and Cirera, Xavier.** *Trade liberalization and poverty: A handbook*. London: Center for Economic Policy Research, 2001.
- Robertson, Dennis.** *Essays in monetary theory*. London: King, 1940.
- Rodriguez, Francisco and Rodrik, Dani.** "Trade Policy and Economic Growth: A Skeptic's Guide to Cross-National Evidence." National Bureau of Economic Research (Cambridge, MA) Working Paper No. W7081, April 1999.
- Sachs, Jeffrey D. and Warner, Andrew.** "Economic Reform and the Process of Global Integration." *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1995, (1), pp. 1–95.
- Smith, Adam.** *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*. London: W. Strahan and T. Cadell, 1776; reprinted (with an Introduction, Notes, Marginal Summary, and an Enlarged Index by Edwin Cannan, ed.) New York: Modern Library, 1937.
- Solow, Robert.** "A Contribution to the Theory of Economic Growth." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, February 1956, 70(1), pp. 65–94.
- Srinivasan, T. N.** *Eight lectures on India's economic reforms*. New Delhi, India: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Srinivasan, T. N. and Bhagwati, Jagdish.** "Outward Orientation and Development: Are Revisionists Right?" in Deepak Lal and Richard Shape, eds., *Trade, development and political economy: Essays in honour of Anne Krueger*. London: Palgrave, 2001; expanded version available online at <<http://www.columbia.edu/~jb38>>.
- World Bank.** *World development indicators*. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2000.

**This article has been cited by:**

1. Aminu Hassan. 2022. Social and environmental accounting research in vulnerable and exploitable less-developed countries: a theoretical extension. *Accounting Forum* **38**, 1-25. [[Crossref](#)]
2. Thuan Bui Quy. 2022. Impact of the Vietnam – Eurasian Economic Union Free Trade Agreement on the trade between Vietnam and Russia. *Journal of Trade Science* 76-89. [[Crossref](#)]
3. Marian Gorynia, Jan Nowak, Piotr Trąpczyński, Radosław Wolniak. Globalization in a COVID-19 Afflicted World 379-395. [[Crossref](#)]
4. Isaac K. Ofori, Mark K. Armah, Emmanuel E. Asmah. 2022. Towards the reversal of poverty and income inequality setbacks due to COVID-19: the role of globalisation and resource allocation. *International Review of Applied Economics* **64**, 1-28. [[Crossref](#)]
5. Rangan Gupta, Lardo Stander, Andrea Vaona. 2021. Openness and growth: Is the relationship non-linear?. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* **37**. . [[Crossref](#)]
6. Ariel Herbert Fambeu. 2021. Poverty reduction in sub-Saharan Africa: The mixed roles of democracy and trade openness. *The Journal of International Trade & Economic Development* **30**:8, 1244-1262. [[Crossref](#)]
7. Sundar Ponnusamy. 2021. Export specialization, trade liberalization and economic growth: a synthetic control analysis. *Empirical Economics* **93**. . [[Crossref](#)]
8. Chandan Kumar Roy, Huang Xiaoling, Banna Banik. 2021. Achieving SDG target 8.1 (sustain economic growth) in developing countries: how aid for trade policy and regulations can assist?. *Journal of Chinese Economic and Foreign Trade Studies* **14**:3, 257-276. [[Crossref](#)]
9. Zheng Wang. 2021. Blame the Foreigners? Exports and Sulfur Dioxide Emissions in China. *Environmental and Resource Economics* **80**:2, 279-309. [[Crossref](#)]
10. Anda Nugroho, Widyastutik, Tony Irawan, Syarifah Amaliah. 2021. Does the US–China trade war increase poverty in a developing country? A dynamic general equilibrium analysis for Indonesia. *Economic Analysis and Policy* **71**, 279-290. [[Crossref](#)]
11. Yanyan Gao, Leizhen Zang. 2021. Is democracy pro-poor ? An empirical test of the Sen Hypothesis based on global evidence. *Governance* **95**. . [[Crossref](#)]
12. Raymond Robertson, Mexico Alberto Vergara Bahena, Deeksha Kokas, Gladys Lopez-Acevedo. International Trade and Labor Markets: Evidence from the Arab Republic of Egypt **27**, . [[Crossref](#)]
13. Graham Bird, Faryal Qayum, Dane Rowlands. 2021. The effects of IMF programs on poverty, income inequality and social expenditure in low income countries: an empirical analysis. *Journal of Economic Policy Reform* **24**:2, 170-188. [[Crossref](#)]
14. Kwami Ossadzifo Wonyra, Tomgouani Lanie, Yacobou Sanoussi. 2021. Effets Potentiels de Court-terme de la Pandémie de la COVID-19 sur la Pauvreté dans les Pays de l'Union Economique et Monétaire Ouest Africaine (UEMOA). *African Development Review* **33**:S1. . [[Crossref](#)]
15. Leroy Johnson. Dynamics of Poverty on Globalization 1-11. [[Crossref](#)]
16. Neha Kumari, Naresh Chandra Sahu, Pushp Kumar. Does Lead to ? Experience from Asian Using Model 1-16. [[Crossref](#)]
17. Yuanyuan Gu, Bin Qiu. Does China's International Education Reduce the Poverty of Source Countries? —An Empirical Study Based on the “Belt and Road” Countries 277-309. [[Crossref](#)]
18. Leroy Johnson. Dynamics of Poverty on Globalization 220-230. [[Crossref](#)]
19. Zheng Wang. 2021. Blame the Foreigners? Exports and Sulfur Dioxide Emissions in China. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **8**. . [[Crossref](#)]

20. Sung Ju Cho, Saera Oh, Sang Hyeon Lee. 2020. The Impact of Structure Similarity of Nontariff Measures on Agricultural Trade. *Sustainability* 12:24, 10545. [[Crossref](#)]
21. Jabbar Ul-Haq, Sana Khanum, Ahmed Raza Cheema. 2020. The impact of trade liberalization on child labor in Pakistan. *International Review of Applied Economics* 34:6, 769-784. [[Crossref](#)]
22. Sheereen Fauzel. 2020. Investigating the Impact of Trade on Poverty Reduction in a Small Island Economy. *Forum for Social Economics* 12, 1-20. [[Crossref](#)]
23. Martin Philipp Heger, Gregor Zens, Mook Bangalore. 2020. Land and poverty: the role of soil fertility and vegetation quality in poverty reduction. *Environment and Development Economics* 25:4, 315-333. [[Crossref](#)]
24. Richard Adjei Dwumfour. 2020. Poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Role of Business Regulations, Policies and Institutions. *Social Indicators Research* 149:3, 861-890. [[Crossref](#)]
25. Yessi Vadila, Budy P. Resosudarmo. 2020. Tariff reform and income inequality in Indonesia. *Regional Science Policy & Practice* 12:3, 455-475. [[Crossref](#)]
26. Sara Mota Cardoso, Aurora A. C. Teixeira. 2020. The Focus on Poverty in the Most Influential Journals in Economics: A Bibliometric Analysis of the "Blue Ribbon" Journals. *Poverty & Public Policy* 12:1, 10-42. [[Crossref](#)]
27. Walker Wright. 2020. How trade openness can help to 'deliver the poor and needy'. *Economic Affairs* 40:1, 100-107. [[Crossref](#)]
28. S. S. B. Mlipha, M. Kalaba. 2020. The impact of risk on bilateral trade in the Southern African Customs Union (SACU). *Development Southern Africa* 37:1, 1-18. [[Crossref](#)]
29. Eze Simpson Osuagwu. 2020. Empirical Evidence of a Long-Run Relationship Between Agriculture and Manufacturing Industry Output in Nigeria. *SAGE Open* 10:1, 215824401989904. [[Crossref](#)]
30. Steven Si, David Ahlstrom, Jiang Wei, John Cullen. 2020. Business, Entrepreneurship and Innovation Toward Poverty Reduction. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 32:1-2, 1-20. [[Crossref](#)]
31. Lili Yan Ing, Yessi Vadila. 2019. U.S.–China Trade Tensions on Indonesia's Trade and Investment. *Asian Economic Papers* 18:3, 95-112. [[Crossref](#)]
32. Anh Tuan Bui, Cuong Viet Nguyen, Thu Phuong Pham. 2019. Impact of foreign investment on household welfare: Evidence from Vietnam. *Journal of Asian Economics* 64, 101130. [[Crossref](#)]
33. Farai Manwa, Albert Wijeweera, Michael A. Kortt. 2019. Trade and growth in SACU countries: A panel data analysis. *Economic Analysis and Policy* 63, 107-118. [[Crossref](#)]
34. Olagunju, Ogunniyi, Oguntegbe, Raji, Ogundari. 2019. Welfare Impact of Globalization in Developing Countries: Examining the Mediating Role of Human Capital. *Economies* 7:3, 84. [[Crossref](#)]
35. Linda Akoto, Daniel Sakyi. 2019. Empirical Analysis of the Determinants of Trade Balance in Post-liberalization Ghana. *Foreign Trade Review* 54:3, 177-205. [[Crossref](#)]
36. Isaac Mensah. 2019. Trade liberalisation and its impact on income distribution in Ghana. *Transnational Corporations Review* 11:3, 208-221. [[Crossref](#)]
37. Ipsita Chatterjee. Radical Globalisation 231-235. [[Crossref](#)]
38. L. G. Burange, Rucha R. Ranadive, Neha N. Karnik. 2019. Trade Openness and Economic Growth Nexus: A Case Study of BRICS. *Foreign Trade Review* 54:1, 1-15. [[Crossref](#)]
39. Gibran Cruz-Martinez. 2018. Revenue-Generating Potential of Taxation for Older-Age Social Pensions. *Ageing International* 43:4, 415-437. [[Crossref](#)]
40. Jonas Gamso, Farhod Yuldashev. 2018. Targeted Foreign Aid and International Migration: Is Development-Promotion an Effective Immigration Policy?. *International Studies Quarterly* 62:4, 809-820. [[Crossref](#)]

41. Moinak Maiti. 2018. India's services: sector, trade and employment. *International Journal of Law and Management* **60**:6, 1377-1392. [[Crossref](#)]
42. Muhammad Shafiullah, Faridul Islam, Ravinthirakumaran Navaratnam. 2018. The Harberger–Laursen–Metzler effect: evidence from five SAARC countries. *Empirical Economics* **63**. . [[Crossref](#)]
43. Bibek Adhikari, Romain Duval, Bingjie Hu, Prakash Loungani. 2018. Can Reform Waves Turn the Tide? Some Case Studies using the Synthetic Control Method. *Open Economies Review* **29**:4, 879-910. [[Crossref](#)]
44. Robert Mullings, Aruneema Mahabir. 2018. Growth by Destination: The Role of Trade in Africa's Recent Growth Episode. *World Development* **102**, 243-261. [[Crossref](#)]
45. Eze Simpson Osuagwu. 2018. Evidence of Long-Run Relationship between Agriculture and Manufacturing Industry Output in Nigeria. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
46. Abhay Aneja, S.K. Ritadhi. 2018. Ethnic Political Parties and the Socioeconomic Outcomes of Disadvantaged Minorities: Evidence from India's 'Silent Revolution'. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
47. Luca Salvatici, Silvia Nenci. 2017. New features, forgotten costs and counterfactual gains of the international trading system. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* **44**:4, 592-633. [[Crossref](#)]
48. Juan Manuel Gil, Andrés Aguilera. 2017. International Institutions: For better or worst. *Reflexión Política* **19**:37, 6-15. [[Crossref](#)]
49. Anirban Mitra, Shabana Mitra. 2017. Electoral Uncertainty, Income Inequality and The Middle Class. *The Economic Journal* **127**:602, 1119-1152. [[Crossref](#)]
50. Bernard Njindan Iyke. 2017. Does Trade Openness Matter for Economic Growth in the CEE Countries?. *Review of Economic Perspectives* **17**:1, 3-24. [[Crossref](#)]
51. Ghada Tabbah. Lebanon's Accession to the WTO: An Ex Ante Macroeconomic Impact Assessment 243-267. [[Crossref](#)]
52. Aadil Ahmad Ganaie, Sajad Ahmad Bhat, Bandi Kamaiah. An Empirical Verification of Kuznets Hypothesis in India 49-80. [[Crossref](#)]
53. Thanh Nguyen. 2017. The Impacts of Trade Liberalization on Poverty in Vietnam. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
54. Farai Manwa, Albert Wijeweera. 2016. Trade liberalisation and economic growth link: The case of Southern African Custom Union countries. *Economic Analysis and Policy* **51**, 12-21. [[Crossref](#)]
55. Jose Caraballo-Cueto. 2016. Free trade zones, liberalization, remittances, and tourism, for what?. *International Journal of Development Issues* **15**:2, 181-200. [[Crossref](#)]
56. Andreas Bergh, Irina Mirkina, Therese Nilsson. 2016. Do the poor benefit from globalization regardless of institutional quality?. *Applied Economics Letters* **23**:10, 708-712. [[Crossref](#)]
57. Arthur A. Stein. 2016. The great trilemma: are globalization, democracy, and sovereignty compatible?. *International Theory* **8**:2, 297-340. [[Crossref](#)]
58. Vandana Chaudhry. 2016. Living at the Edge. *Affilia* **31**:2, 177-191. [[Crossref](#)]
59. Adrián de León Arias, Irving Joel Llamosas Rosas. 2016. Trade liberalization and regional productivity growth: Some lessons from Mexico's Northern Border manufacturing after 20 years. *Ensayos sobre Política Económica* **34**:79, 40-50. [[Crossref](#)]
60. Padmashree Gehl Sampath. Sustainable Industrialization in Africa: Toward a New Development Agenda 1-19. [[Crossref](#)]
61. Clinton L. Beckford, Kevon Rhiney. Geographies of Globalization, Climate Change and Food and Agriculture in the Caribbean 3-22. [[Crossref](#)]



62. Bibek Adhikari, Romain Duval, Bingjie Hu, Prakash Loungani. 2016. Can Reform Waves Turn the Tide? Some Case Studies Using the Synthetic Control Method. *IMF Working Papers* 16:171, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
63. Gülçin Güreşçi Pehlivan, Utku Utkulu. 2015. GENİŞLEYEN BİR AVRUPA'DA ÜLKE SPESİFİK YAKINSAMA DAVRANIŞI. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi* 16:2, 207-207. [[Crossref](#)]
64. Valérie Angeon, Samuel Bates. 2015. Reviewing Composite Vulnerability and Resilience Indexes: A Sustainable Approach and Application. *World Development* 72, 140-162. [[Crossref](#)]
65. Dilip K. Das. The Asian Growth Model: A Meta-Analysis 57-88. [[Crossref](#)]
66. Ram Kewal Prasad Singh, Krishna M. Singh, Abhay Kumar. 2015. Socio-Economic Characterization of Rural Households: A Village Level Analysis in Bihar, India. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
67. Aadil Ahmad Ganaie, Bandi Kamaiah. 2015. Kuznets Inverted U Hypothesis of Income Inequality: Looking Inside the Available Economic Literature. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
68. Andreas Bergh, Therese Nilsson. 2014. Is Globalization Reducing Absolute Poverty?. *World Development* 62, 42-61. [[Crossref](#)]
69. Minh Son Le. 2014. Trade openness and household welfare within a country: A microeconomic analysis of Vietnamese households. *Journal of Asian Economics* 33, 56-70. [[Crossref](#)]
70. Arindan Banik, Fernando Padovani. 2014. Índia em transformação: o novo crescimento econômico e as perspectivas pós-crisis. *Revista de Sociologia e Política* 22:50, 67-93. [[Crossref](#)]
71. Denu Lemma Tsegaye, Riza Teddy Yudhika, YooTaeHwan. 2014. An Empirical Investigation of the "Internally Driven Growth" Hypothesis in ASEAN Countries. *Journal of Asia-Pacific Studies* 21:2, 165-196. [[Crossref](#)]
72. Vallrie Angeon, Samuel Bates. 2014. Reviewing Composite Vulnerability and Resilience Indexes: A Sustainable Approach and Application. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
73. Ivan Lesay. 2013. Discoursing development: the case of the European Investment Bank. *Nova Economia* 23:2, 429-462. [[Crossref](#)]
74. Agapi Lambrini Somwaru. 2013. Does trade liberalization and its associated increased economic activity affect permanently the value and pattern of trade flows?. *Applied Economics* 45:23, 3263-3277. [[Crossref](#)]
75. Andreas Billmeier, Tommaso Nannicini. 2013. Assessing Economic Liberalization Episodes: A Synthetic Control Approach. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 95:3, 983-1001. [[Crossref](#)]
76. Sushanta K. Mallick. 2013. Disentangling the Poverty Effects of Sectoral Output, Prices, and Policies in India. *Review of Income and Wealth* 18, n/a-n/a. [[Crossref](#)]
77. Yiagadeesen Samy, Jean Daudelin. 2013. Globalization and inequality: insights from municipal level data in Brazil. *Indian Growth and Development Review* 6:1, 128-147. [[Crossref](#)]
78. Maria E. de Boyrie, Roger Johns. 2013. The effects of trade agreements on the growth of major Latin American economies. *The Journal of International Trade & Economic Development* 22:3, 377-397. [[Crossref](#)]
79. Aviral Kumar Tiwari, Muhammad Shahbaz, Faridul Islam. 2013. Does financial development increase rural-urban income inequality?. *International Journal of Social Economics* 40:2, 151-168. [[Crossref](#)]
80. Adugna Lemi. 2012. Trade Liberalization and Change in Poverty Status in Rural Ethiopia: What are the Links?. *International Economic Journal* 26:4, 609-633. [[Crossref](#)]
81. Faridul Islam, Qazi Muhammad Adnan Hye, Muhammad Shahbaz. 2012. Import-economic growth nexus: ARDL approach to cointegration. *Journal of Chinese Economic and Foreign Trade Studies* 5:3, 194-214. [[Crossref](#)]

82. Jun Yang, Jikun Huang, Scott Rozelle, Will Martin. 2012. Where is the balance? Implications of adopting Special Products and Sensitive Products in Doha negotiations for world and China's agriculture. *China Economic Review* 23:3, 651-664. [[Crossref](#)]
83. John M. Kagochi, Maina Kiambigi. 2012. Remittances' Influence on Housing Construction Demand in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Case of Kenya. *African Development Review* 24:3, 255-265. [[Crossref](#)]
84. Patrik Gustavsson Tingvall, Christer Ljungwall. 2012. Is China different? A meta-analysis of export-led growth. *Economics Letters* 115:2, 177-179. [[Crossref](#)]
85. Fernando R. Tesón. 2012. WHY FREE TRADE IS REQUIRED BY JUSTICE. *Social Philosophy and Policy* 29:1, 126-153. [[Crossref](#)]
86. Pierluigi Montalbano. 2011. Trade Openness and Developing Countries' Vulnerability: Concepts, Misconceptions, and Directions for Research. *World Development* 39:9, 1489-1502. [[Crossref](#)]
87. Alan Green, Harry de Gorter. 2011. Analyzing the System of Preferential Tariffs for Least Developed Countries. *Review of International Economics* 19:3, 436-448. [[Crossref](#)]
88. Xiaodong Lu, Guowei Cai. 2011. Effective factor endowments, trade openness and income distribution in China. *Frontiers of Economics in China* 6:2, 188-210. [[Crossref](#)]
89. Tommaso Nannicini, Andreas Billmeier. 2011. Economies in Transition: How Important Is Trade Openness for Growth?\*. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 73:3, 287-314. [[Crossref](#)]
90. Prema-Chandra Athukorala. 2011. Trade Liberalisation and The Poverty of Nations: A Review Article. *Journal of Development Studies* 47:3, 533-543. [[Crossref](#)]
91. M. Maertens, L. Colen, J. F. M. Swinnen. 2011. Globalisation and poverty in Senegal: a worst case scenario?. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 38:1, 31-54. [[Crossref](#)]
92. Arup Mitra. 2011. Trade in services: Impact on employment in India. *The Social Science Journal* 48:1, 72-93. [[Crossref](#)]
93. Vandana Chaudhry. Disability and the Neoliberal Indian State: The Perils of Community Participation 265-281. [[Crossref](#)]
94. Andreas Bergh, Therese Nilsson. 2011. Globalization and Absolute Poverty – A Panel Data Study. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
95. Andreas Bergh, Therese Nilsson. 2011. Globalization and Absolute Poverty A Panel Data Study. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
96. Pablo Alvarez, Jason Barton, Kathy Baylis, Marybel Soto-Gomez. Chapter 7 Trade and poverty: changes in farming and community in NAFTA'S first decade 205-236. [[Crossref](#)]
97. Chao-Hsi Huang, Kai-Fang Teng, Pan-Long Tsai. 2010. Inward and outward foreign direct investment and poverty: East Asia vs. Latin America. *Review of World Economics* 146:4, 763-779. [[Crossref](#)]
98. Kaliappa Kalirajan, Kanhaiya Singh. 2010. Economic liberalisation strategies and poverty reduction across Indian states. *Asian-Pacific Economic Literature* 24:1, 26-42. [[Crossref](#)]
99. Rashid Sattar, Rana Ejaz Ali Khan. 2010. Trade Growth and Poverty: A Case of Pakistan. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
100. Prema-Chandra Athukorala. 2010. Trade Liberalisation and the Poverty of Nations: A Review Article. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
101. EUAN MacMILLAN. The economic effects of trade on poverty reduction: perspectives from the economic literature 21-66. [[Crossref](#)]
102. Luis San Vicente Portes. 2009. On the distributional effects of trade policy: Dynamics of household saving and asset prices. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance* 49:3, 944-970. [[Crossref](#)]

103. M Q Dao. 2009. Division, International Integration, and Economic Development. *Studies in Economics and Econometrics* 33:2, 49-58. [[Crossref](#)]
104. Miet Maertens, Johan F.M. Swinnen. 2009. Trade, Standards, and Poverty: Evidence from Senegal. *World Development* 37:1, 161-178. [[Crossref](#)]
105. Richard Kneller, C. W. Morgan, Sunti Kanchanahatakij. 2008. Trade Liberalisation and Economic Growth. *The World Economy* 31:6, 701-719. [[Crossref](#)]
106. Tomoki Fujii, David Roland-Holst. How Does Vietnam's Accession to the World Trade Organization Change the Spatial Incidence of Poverty? 47-89. [[Crossref](#)]
107. Rimjhim M. Aggarwal. Resource-Poor Farmers in South India: On the Margins or Frontiers of Globalization? 196-220. [[Crossref](#)]
108. Andrew Warner. 2008. Once More into the Breach: Economic Growth and Integration. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
109. Sushanta K. Mallick. 2008. A Macroeconomic Policy Approach to Poverty Reduction. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
110. Miet Maertens, Liesbeth Colen, Johan F. M. Swinnen. 2008. Globalization and Poverty in Senegal: A Worst Case Scenario?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
111. Carlos M. Peláez, Carlos A. Peláez. Poverty, the Environment and Climate Change 116-127. [[Crossref](#)]
112. Pan-Long Tsai, Chao-Hsi Huang. 2007. Openness, Growth and Poverty: The Case of Taiwan. *World Development* 35:11, 1858-1871. [[Crossref](#)]
113. Ann Harrison, Margaret McMillan. 2007. On the links between globalization and poverty. *The Journal of Economic Inequality* 5:1, 123-134. [[Crossref](#)]
114. Tomoki Fujii, David Roland-Holst. 2007. How Does Viet Nam's Accession to the World Trade Organization Change the Spatial Incidence of Poverty?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
115. Andreas Billmeier, Tommaso Nannicini. 2007. Trade Openness and Growth: Pursuing Empirical Glasnost. *IMF Working Papers* 07:156, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
116. David Sapsford, Supriya Garikipati. 2006. Trade Liberalisation, Economic Development and Poverty Alleviation. *The World Economy* 29:11, 1571-1579. [[Crossref](#)]
117. Jean-Jacques Hallaert. 2006. A History of Empirical Literature on the Relationship Between Trade and Growth. *Mondes en développement* no 135:3, 63-77. [[Crossref](#)]
118. Eddy LEE, Marco VIVARELLI. 2006. The social impact of globalization in the developing countries. *International Labour Review* 145:3, 167-184. [[Crossref](#)]
119. Eddy LEE, Marco VIVARELLI. 2006. Impacto social de la globalización en los países en desarrollo. *Revista Internacional del Trabajo* 125:3, 187-206. [[Crossref](#)]
120. Eddy LEE, et Marco VIVARELLI. 2006. Les conséquences sociales de la mondialisation dans les pays en développement. *Revue internationale du Travail* 145:3, 191-210. [[Crossref](#)]
121. Rajen Mookerjee. 2006. A meta-analysis of the export growth hypothesis. *Economics Letters* 91:3, 395-401. [[Crossref](#)]
122. Metri F. Mdanat. 2006. The Fiscal and Economic Impact of Qualifying Industrial Zones: The Case of Jordan. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
123. Luis San Vicente Portes. 2006. On the Distributional Effects of Trade Policy: Dynamics of Household Saving and Asset Prices. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
124. Dieter Bender, Tobias Bidlingmaier. Außenhandelsliberalisierung in Entwicklungsländern: Ein Weg aus der Armutsfalle? 117-138. [[Crossref](#)]
125. Pedro Schwartz Schwartz. 2005. The Euro as Politics. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

126. Nabil Annabi, Fatou Cissé, John Cockburn, Bernard Decaluwe. 2005. Trade Liberalisation, Growth and Poverty in Senegal: A Dynamic Microsimulation Cge Model Analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
127. Jorge Arbache. 2004. Do Structural Reforms Always Succeed? Lessons from Brazil. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
128. Vivek B. Arora, Athanasios Vamvakidis. 2004. How Much Do Trading Partners Matter for Economic Growth?. *IMF Working Papers* **04:26**, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
129. . An Introduction to International Relations **6**, . [[Crossref](#)]
130. GUSTAV RANIS. 1997. The Comparative Development Experience of Mexico, the Philippines and Taiwan from a Political Economy Perspective. *Growth and Change* **28:4**, 393-437. [[Crossref](#)]
131. Louis O. Osuji. Trade Policies and Development of Technology in Africa 1178-1193. [[Crossref](#)]