



OXONIA Newsletter

David Walton appointed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the Bank of England's Monetary Policy Committee



David Walton, Member of the Academic and Policy Board

OXONIA is delighted to announce that David Walton, Member of the Academic and Policy Board, has been appointed by Chancellor Gordon Brown to the Monetary Policy Committee of the Bank of England. David is an accomplished economist who in his career has constantly worked to bridge the gap between economics and policymaking, in line with the Institute's mission. He joins the Committee from Goldman Sachs where he has been Chief European Economist. David has also been an advisor on UK monetary and fiscal policy issues to the House of Commons Treasury Committee, Chairman of the Society of Business Economists and a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts. On behalf of OXONIA, we wish him the best of luck for his new challenging appointment.

Domenico Lombardi
President

In this issue:

David Walton appointed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the Bank of England's Monetary Policy Committee p. 1

Jeffrey Sachs joins OXONIA as Honorary Fellow p. 1

Sir Nicholas Stern discusses his preliminary thoughts on the Stern Review of the Economics of Climate Change p. 2

ECONOMIC FOCUS Government Aid and Growth – Is There a Link? p. 8

Jeffrey Sachs joins OXONIA as Honorary Fellow

Jeffrey Sachs has been awarded an OXONIA Honorary Fellowship. An Honorary Fellow is typically an individual outside the Institute from the academic, non-profit, or public sector, who, by virtue of his or her endeavors, is acknowledged as an outstanding contributor to society, and has earned distinction for activities associated more widely with education, culture, or academia. An Honorary Fellow should reflect and support the mission of the Institute. Jeffrey Sachs is a world-renowned academic who has vigorously engaged the policy-making community urging a greater effort in the fight against poverty.



Jeffrey D. Sachs, Director, Earth Institute at Columbia University

Sir Nicholas Stern discusses his preliminary thoughts on the Stern Review of the Economics of Climate Change

Sir Nicholas Stern, Head of the Government Economic Service, is conducting a major review on the economics of climate change, which will report to the Prime Minister and Chancellor in Autumn 2006. Sir Nicholas delivered his preliminary views on the question "What is the economics of climate change?" at the OXONIA Distinguished Lecture on 31 January.

The science of climate change

Climate change is a serious and urgent issue. The key elements of the role of greenhouse gases (GHGs) in the science of climate were set out in the 19th century by Fourier (1827), Tyndall (1860) and Arrhenius (1896). There is now an overwhelming body of scientific evidence that human activity is causing warming. The climate is already changing, and we are already seeing significant impacts. The main driver of the increase in GHGs is the rise in carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels – essentially we take the carbon out of the ground and put it up in the atmosphere. The main sources of GHGs, in order of global importance are electricity generation, land-use changes (particularly deforestation) agriculture and transport. Those GHG emissions growing the fastest are from transport and electricity. There remain uncertainties about the nature and scale of impacts in the longer term. We have to look at a number of scenarios. It is clear that anything like business-as-usual takes us into dangerous territory. And the most recent science indicates that some of the risks are more serious than had first appeared. Some of the potential impacts could be irreversible and accelerate the process of global warming. Melting of permafrost could lead to the release of huge quantities of methane. Dieback of the Amazon

rainforest could mean that that the region starts to emit, rather than absorb, greenhouse gases. These feedbacks could lead to warming that is at least twice as fast as current projections, leading to temperatures higher than seen in the past 50 million years. The nature of the scientific evidence from climate models is different from that common in empirical economic models, with their focus on parameter estimation and curve fitting: the science models (covering a broad range of phenomena, not just temperature) are essentially based on the laws of physics and chemistry. While some of their parameters are uncertain, 'goodness of fit' is only one of the criteria used to select their values.

The problem is global in its cause.

Greenhouse gases have broadly the same impact on the climate wherever in the world they are emitted. Some of them, including carbon dioxide, stay in the atmosphere for more than a century. And it is global in its consequences: no region will be left untouched.

But impacts will be unevenly felt throughout the world. Some of the most severe impacts on people will be felt at lower latitudes, often in the poorest countries that are least able to adapt to the changes. International bodies, particularly the IPCC, have been building a basis of scientific understanding to underpin international collaboration for around two decades. Scientists have been refining their assessment of the probable degree of warming for a given level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere: for example, stabilisation at 450 or 550 ppm CO₂ equivalent. It can be shown that (i) the upper limits of the temperature ranges (corresponding to 90% confidence intervals) for all stabilisation concentrations exceed 2 deg C, (ii) the ranges from 2004 estimates are substantially above those from 2001 – science is telling us that the warming effect is greater than we had

"Some of the potential impacts could be irreversible and accelerate the process of global warming"

previously thought, and (iii) equilibrium temperatures are a good deal higher than temperatures at 2100, showing that we are committed to still greater warming if we look beyond this century. These numbers point clearly to the magnitude of the challenge: any of these stabilisation levels would require global emissions to peak in the next decade or two and then fall sharply.

The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol provide a strong basis for developing an international response. However, it is clear that we will have to go beyond the action that has already been agreed at international level in terms of both the ambitions of rich countries and the participation of developing countries, if we are to stabilise GHGs at any acceptable level.

The nature of the economics

Climate change, in common with other environmental problems, embodies an externality: the emission of GHGs damages others. But these costs are felt over a long period and over the entire globe, and their exact nature is uncertain.

These and other complexities imply that the application of the theory of externalities, in simple standard form, poses many problems and questions. That standard theory, under certainty and with a single government in the community in question which represents all those involved, points to one of: taxation on the emitter equivalent to marginal social cost (Pigou); the allocation of property rights in conjunction with trading (Coase)⁴; and direct regulation. However, we have uncertainty, interaction with other externalities and market imperfections, global involvement, and weak representation of those most affected (future inter-temporal international collective action generations). Thus we have instead a complex inter-temporal international collective action problem under uncertainty.

This dictates the structure of the relevant economics. It is clear it must cover a very

broad range, including the economics of: growth and development; industry; innovation and technological change; institutions; the international economy; demography and migration; public finance; information and uncertainty; and environmental and public economics generally.

We know from basic game theory that we have to promote a collaborative solution to games with 'free-rider problems': we must find a collective, global way forward. The objective must be to build clear long-term international agreements within which markets and entrepreneurs can work effectively.

Building such agreements will generally require that all parties share an understanding of the consequences to them and to others of the relevant arrangements. It will also require finding incentive structures to promote 'tie in' and fostering economic, social and political processes and perspectives that can make collaboration more likely. And getting agreement will require not only a shared understanding of the issues and mechanisms but also careful attention to the complex equity issues involved.

In their interactions, international participants should take a broad view of ethical perspectives. The relevant ethical perspectives include consequentialism, equity, fairness, justice, freedom, rights-based approaches, sustainability and stewardship. Whilst these perspectives have some fundamental ethical differences, their application would, nevertheless, generally point to a focus on similar measurable outcomes such as incomes, forms of capital and wealth, including the environment, health, way of life and so on.

There is much learning to be done about both the science and the economics. But, the risks of severe outcomes and destabilising dynamics from the physical processes involved generate a powerful argument for strong and urgent action. All this discussion of the nature of the economics is a consequence of the basic science of GHGs and shapes the more detailed economic analysis that follows.



Sir Nicholas Stern at the OXONIA Distinguished Speaker Event "What Is the Economics of Climate Change?"

The economics of climate change

The economics of climate change hitherto has been focused on modelling the implications of growth for emissions, examining and modelling the economics of technological options, calculating 'social costs of carbon', and exploring tax, market and other structures. Many elements of the foundations have been established. We now, from the essential perspective of the international collective action problem, must focus on the analysis that individual countries will need to assess their own policy position, together with an analysis of how to generate strong international action.

In coming to a view on their own role, governments have an understandable focus on the growth of their economies and the health, environment and way of living of their populations. The growth story has many strands: how growth will drive the sources of greenhouse gas emissions, how climate change impacts will affect growth, both in the short run and the long run, how growth processes involve and affect people in different circumstances, and how the mitigation of greenhouse gases could affect growth.

Economic growth is a key factor in determining greenhouse gas emissions from energy and other uses. Current emissions are on an unsustainable path: energy-related emissions are forecast to grow, if we follow business-as-usual, by more than 2% per year over the next 30 years, compared with a requirement to start falling within 10-20 years if GHG levels are to be stabilised at 450 or 550 ppm.

Existing stocks of GHGs are largely the result of past emissions from rich countries. Much of the potential emissions growth in future will be in developing countries: if they are to play their part in international action we must find a way of tackling climate change that does not undermine growth and poverty reduction in these countries.

We also need to understand how growth may

be affected adversely by the deterioration in the environment that will occur in the absence of GHG control. Climate change has profound implications for the environment in which social and economic activity takes place, and therefore can have significant effects on prosperity and human development. In human terms, developing countries are likely to be most badly affected by climate change. They will be hit not only by increasing variability (for example suffering potentially a greater incidence of both drought and flood) but also by a more adverse overall environment as temperatures rise. They will have to deal with this on despite low income levels and slim margins for adjustment. This combination presents a very serious challenge.

The importance of adaptation

Adaptation has the potential to reduce the impacts of climate change. Substantial climate change is already inevitable over the next 30 years – mitigation will have a limited effect on stocks of GHGs in this time frame – and thus adaptation is an essential policy response. As noted above, some of the most severe and early consequences will be on developing countries; indeed, these are already occurring.

The international community must find ways of supporting adaptation in the most vulnerable countries, including considering the role of technology and financing the costs of adaptation. The origins and impacts of climate change make the arguments for strong development assistance still more compelling.

There are limits to the ability to adapt to fundamental and rapid climate change, in the sense that the human and economic costs become very large. Adaptation is particularly difficult when the precise nature and incidence of impacts is uncertain. Adaptation and mitigation are not alternatives; we must pursue both. But the costs of each will influence the choice of policies for both.

“In human terms, developing countries are likely to be most badly affected by climate change”

Options for mitigation

Climate change is driven by greenhouse gas emissions from energy use, agriculture and deforestation. Effective action on mitigation is likely to require action including all three areas and in all sub-sectors of them.

Agriculture and deforestation are significant sources of GHG emissions. Currently together they account for around 30% of total emissions: thus reduction in GHGs is possible by changes in agriculture and reversing deforestation.

Energy accounts for around 2/3 of emissions. Reductions in emissions depend largely on changes in the links from economic activity to energy intensity, and from energy intensity to carbon intensity. Measures to reduce the energy required per unit of output and income include both altering the mix of economic activities and promoting energy efficiency. Reducing carbon per unit of energy will largely be down to technologies, including their mix: many are already available, and more are being developed. They are nearer in power generation than transport, and the demand for transport is growing still more rapidly than the demand for power.

The policy framework to manage demand and pull new technologies through to the marketplace is crucial. For the development and deployment of many or most of the relevant technologies, the private sector will play a central role. It will require market structures and incentives that are clear, long-term and credible. Innovation will be essential. The design of policy will require an understanding of the way in which fossil fuel markets work: many of them are oligopolistic and the rent from the ownership of exhaustible natural resources is a central element. Thus assessing the impact of tax and market measures is complex.

Key policy instruments shaping incentives include taxes, property rights and regulation. Where aggregate targets are used, they will determine the sum of property rights.

Property rights can be allocated over different time horizons and in different ways. There will be different resulting distributions of wealth and income. But, if they are to be effective, they must provide the foundations for credible markets. Currently all three of these instruments play a role in most advanced countries. We will examine how these instruments should be combined. Institutional structures will be of great importance. But we must go beyond incentives and the institutions that can support them and examine the possibilities for changing preferences and the behaviour they generate. This can happen through information, discussion and education. It has been a key element in a number of policy packages involving externalities, including recycling, alcohol and smoking.

There are market failures in the development of new clean technologies by the private sector and a challenge for government will be to design policy instruments capable of tackling these. The development and deployment of new technologies will require clear, long-term and credible signals to guide private action.

We must ask how quickly current patterns of energy production and use can or should be shifted – and whether this can be done in a way that strengthens, rather than weakens, economic growth. The potential effects of mitigation on growth are central to the concerns of policymakers in both rich and poor countries and thus are key concerns for those involved in international negotiations. Thus we must examine potential adjustment costs of moving towards low-carbon economies, including impacts on the competitiveness of particular industries and the overall economy along the various possible paths. We must also investigate how far a focus on energy saving and clean technologies could both cut through the many inefficiencies in the supply and use of energy and promote an era of discovery and innovation where leaders may reap advantages in the future.

Management of the issues of growth, pace of



Dr Domenico Lombardi, OXONIA President, and Sir Nicholas Stern at the OXONIA Distinguished Speaker Event "What Is the Economics of Climate Change?"

“We must also investigate how far a focus on energy saving and clean technologies could both cut through the many inefficiencies in the supply and use of energy and promote an era of discovery and innovation where leaders may reap advantages in the future”

adjustment, and competitiveness is likely to be more successful if groups of countries act together so that their economies adjust to changes in relative prices over a similar time period; and similarly for sectors in some industries subject to global competition. In deciding on their position both on how to participate in international action and on how to implement their own responsibilities, countries will bring in criteria beyond implications for growth and competitiveness. These include, in the case of energy policy, security of supply and access to energy in developing countries. Decisions are likely to vary across countries, since, inter alia, objectives, natural resource endowments and technologies may differ, as will market structures, institutions and political pressures. Both for equity reasons (and see the legal principle of “common but differentiated responsibilities” in the UNFCCC) and from domestic financial pressures, developing countries are likely to seek external finance for the investments involved in their contribution to mitigation. The magnitude of the challenge and limits to overseas aid indicate that scaling up market mechanisms for promoting such investments is likely to play a central role. These will be likely to involve a broad range, including not only power generation but also transport, agriculture and deforestation. Rights to technology will also be an important issue.

The role of uncertainty

Uncertainty and risk are key elements of most aspects of climate change. The criteria by which decisions are assessed must take careful account of the degree of uncertainty, the long time horizons and the range of possible outcomes. Such outcomes, which include major irreversible change to the climate, are likely to involve possibilities considerably beyond human experience hitherto. Given the uncertainty over the scientific,

economic and social consequences of climate change, it is a challenge for international collective action to agree on GHG emission targets.

The pervasiveness of uncertainty will influence the choice of instruments (whether ‘prices’ or ‘quantities’ are more appropriate policy instruments in face of uncertainty and asymmetric information) in terms of taxes, markets, property rights and regulation. It will influence an understanding of the pace and degree of action in the face of learning, irreversibility of some effects and the ‘sunk costs’ of some infrastructure investments. And it will influence approaches to the promotion of technological discovery and development.

Responding to the global challenges: the basis for international action

Any effective response to the challenge of climate change must be based on an international understanding that its origins, impact, scale and urgency require global collective action.

In order to make sensible choices in building international agreement, all countries will need to understand the implications for them of adaptation to and mitigation of climate change in terms of their growth, competitiveness, security, public finances and environment. Most countries will, and should be, concerned also about the implications for others. The UK is no exception.

Thus analysis of these implications is crucial to providing a basis to inform and underpin international negotiations and agreements. It must offer a clear and, where possible, quantitative understanding of the likely impacts on different countries, regions and generations arising from different courses of action. Whilst it will take some time to produce a strong body of research on some of these issues given their complexity, some broad directions and ‘orders of magnitude’ are already emerging. It is important for this economic and social analysis to proceed side-

WORLD ECONOMICS
The Journal of Current Economic Analysis and Policy
 Volume 7, Number 1 (January-March 2006)

CONTENT**Can Iraq Overcome the Oil Curse?***Robert Looney***Making Capitalism Work for Everyone***Raghuram G. Rajan & Luigi Zingales***Two British Initiatives for IMF Lending to its Members, 1960–1962***Jacques J. Polak***Trade Policy 2006: A Tour D'horizon***Razeen Sally***Global Income Inequality: What It Is And Why It Matters?***Branko Milanovic***Are We Heading for a Dollar Crisis?***Graham Bird***Do the Young British Artists Rule?**

Evidence from the auction market

*David W. Galenson***INTERVIEW****The Enduring Elixir of Economic Growth: Xavier Sala-i-Martin on the wealth and poverty of nations***An Interview with Introduction by Brian Snowdon.***BOOK REVIEW****Helping the Poor? The IMF and Low-Income Countries, edited by J. J. Teunissen and A. Akkerman, FONDAD, The Hague, 2005.***David Bevan***COMMENT ON TWO PAPERS PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED IN WORLD ECONOMICS****Natural Resource-Based Economic Development In History***Phillip Crowson*

by-side with the science.

It will be important to find ways to sustain agreements, given the potential damage free riding can inflict on mitigation by others. A combination of methods is likely to be appropriate, including: international standards; treaty obligations supported by emissions quotas and/or taxes; technological lock-ins via infrastructure and other investments; making climate change a central element in the whole set of international engagements; public pressure nationally and

internationally; and the education of current and future generations.

The Review will consider these issues, and will also look at how individual countries and regions, particularly the UK and EU, can play an effective role in fostering and promoting cooperation within this wider international context. International action requires both leadership and a collaborative spirit.

In conclusion, a response to the great challenge of climate change must, given the scientific structure of the problem, be based

WORLD ECONOMICS**The Journal of Current Economic Analysis and Policy****EXECUTIVE EDITORS**

Alan Budd

(The Queen's College, Oxford)

Domenico Lombardi

(OXONIA)

David Miles

*(Imperial College, London)***INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD**

Charles Bean

(London School of Economics)

Alan Blinder

(Princeton University)

Andrew Crockett

(JP Morgan Chase International)

David Currie

(City University Business School)

Gavyn Davies

(Fulcrum Asset Management)

Paul Geroski

(London Business School)

David Henderson

(Westminster Business School)

David Hendry

(OXONIA)

Mervyn King

(The Bank of England)

Allan H. Meltzer

(Carnegie Mellon University)

Gus O'Donnell

(Cabinet Office)

Kenneth S. Rogoff

(Harvard University)

Robert M. Solow

*(Massachusetts Institute of**Technology)*

Nick Stern

(HM Treasury)

on international collective action. Building on the science, the economic analysis must, therefore, provide shared understanding of the nature of the economic problems it generates, inform the international participants of the implications for them, and other parties, of different arrangements and find ways of sustaining a collaborative response to the challenge.

Sir Nicholas Stern

NEW ARRIVALS

OXONIA is delighted to announce the arrival of a new member:

Fabian Eser



Fabian Eser is Seminar Coordinator of the Programme *Strengthening Economic Cooperation*. His main research interests lie in Macroeconomics and Financial Crises. Mr. Eser was educated in Philosophy, Politics and Economics at Balliol College, Oxford. He has visited the Max Planck Institute for Economics, worked briefly for McKinsey & Company and is currently a member of Nuffield College.

E-mail: feser@oxonia.org

More information on the Stern Review can be found at www.sternreview.org.uk, including a paper setting out this analysis in more detail. Responses to the issues raised here are welcome at: oxonia.responses@sternreview.org.uk.

ECONOMIC FOCUS

Government Aid and Growth – Is There a Link?

“A substantial increase in official development assistance, in addition to other resources, is required in order to achieve the internationally agreed development goals and objectives, including those contained in the Millennium Declaration by 2015. (...) Fulfilling this commitment is needed in order to consolidate and build on recent progress in Africa, to stimulate the growth that will increase other resources and to enable African and other poor countries over time to reduce their aid dependency.”

Signed by the G8 in Gleneagles in July 2005, an increase in aid is considered both a necessary and sufficient condition for getting Africa on the growth track and out of poverty. This in turn is based on the assumption of a positive effect of aid on economic growth. Yet exactly the existence of a positive relation between aid and growth is questioned by the IMF’s Raghuram Rajan and Arvind Subramanian in their recent paper “Aid and Growth: What Does the Cross-Country Evidence Really Show?” (Available at www.nber.org/papers/w11513). Intuitively one might consider it straightforward that aid payments to developing countries increase

growth. We would imagine the aid is either consumed or invested. If it is consumed, the increase in demand should lead to growth via increased production.

The investment of aid should lead to further growth via the accumulation of human and physical capital. So the notion that aid would not lead to growth seems odd at first. “No evidence of a positive (or negative) relationship between aid inflows into a country and its economic growth” is, however, the central finding by Rajan and Subramanian. Their analysis is only the most recent addition to an extensive literature on aid effectiveness mired in controversy. Two innovations, however, make this study particularly interesting. First, Rajan and Subramanian focus on exogenous components of aid which flow not in response to the recipient’s growth rate. To illustrate two cases of endogenous aid, if aid flows to a country in response to natural disaster, the relation between aid and growth may well be negative. By contrast, if aid is paid to reward a country’s reforms, aid and growth should be positively related. Rajan and Subramanian argue persuasively that to detect the fundamental relationship between aid and

growth one should focus on exogenous components of aid.

Second, most of the existing literature on aid and growth singles out just one of its aspects, such as the impact of aid conditional on policy. Their study, however, tests the validity of the aid-growth relationship at a more general level.

Both these innovations are linked to the use of so-called “instrumental-variables” in the estimation process.

Rajan and Subramanian assume that non-economically-motivated aid is unaffected by economic outcomes and are the first ones to use to exploit this for testing. Non-economically-motivated aid is paid for instance due to joint membership of an alliance, (post-) colonial or lingual relations. Hence aid payments are independent of the recipient’s contemporaneous growth. Applying this instrumentation to cross-sectional data, they do not find a robust positive impact of aid on growth.

More than that, this result also applies to those developing countries implementing “good policies” which the G8 explicitly wants to reward with further aid. Testing for different categories of aid by sector, timing of impact as well as distinct types of donors, none of these sub-categories has any significant impact on growth.

Numerous studies have found that geography has significant impact on growth, with countries close to the equator being at a disadvantage. Conditioning on geography, however, aid inflows do not exhibit a significant impact on growth.

In a panel data context they find both positive and negative aid-growth relationships. However, these are very fragile and do not survive small specification changes so that the panel study points in the same direction as the cross-sectional.

How can we explain this contradiction of our intuition that aid helps growth? We may question the validity of the result itself. Perhaps non-economically-motivated is, after all, related to growth and not exogenous. For instance, alliances may be more likely to be

formed with countries which are not complete growth disasters. In economic terms this would mean their instrumentation is invalid. However, the authors explicitly test for this and reject this criticism.

A companion paper “What Undermines Aid’s Impact on Growth?” (Available at www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/wp/2005/wp05126.pdf) helps to move the aid-growth discussion from the “whether” to “why not”. The positive effect of aid on growth, Rajan and Subramanian suggest, would come from providing resources, e.g. for blackboards, textbooks and better roads. However, resources may not be everything. A blackboard is useless without a teacher turning up each morning and qualified to teach. Monetary aid and resources may be ineffective if such less tangible issues remain unresolved and incentives underprovided. Still, in this story resources would be a good thing.

More to the point is Rajan and Subramanian’s suggestion that aid may have detrimental long-term effects. Initially, aid may add to the budget, but in the medium-run it reduces the incentive for countries to raise their own resources, which can lead to dependency and a negative shock once withdrawn.

The most important problem with aid, however, is due to what has been termed the “Dutch Disease”. This is a macroeconomic effect of a loss in a country’s competitiveness resulting from the aggregation of all individual aid payments to large windfall inflows which appreciate the recipient’s real exchange rate. If the recipient country operates a flexible exchange-rate aid inflows may raise the nominal exchange rate, reducing its competitiveness of traded goods unless wages adjust downwards, which is rarely the case.

In a fixed-exchange rate regime the result is the same, though through a different channel: If aid is spent on domestic goods their demand and prices rises, and with them the prices of their inputs for production. The problem is that resources in limited supply in the developing country also become more

“Initially, aid may add to the budget, but in the medium-run it reduces the incentive for countries to raise their own resources, which can lead to dependency and a negative shock once withdrawn”

“The challenge for the G8 and other concerned actors is not simply to deliver a maximal aid flow, but rather delivering any aid in a way that the above detrimental macroeconomic effects do not arise”

expensive for producers of tradable goods which lose competitiveness. Not only would this explain theoretically why we do not find a positive aid-growth relationship, but Rajan and Subramanian verify this effect empirically.

This point is an important one for researchers and politicians alike: As such, more aid is not necessarily better than less aid. Does this mean, less aid is better than more aid? No, it is indisputable that aid can be helpful in the provision of resources for growth, in other words funding a blackboard, medicine and road is important. So the challenge for the G8 and other concerned actors is not simply to deliver a maximal aid flow, but rather delivering any aid in a way that the above detrimental macroeconomic effects do not arise. As Rajan and Subramanian conclude themselves, we need to better understand and improve aid effectiveness.

This is particularly important as Masood Ahmed, DFID Director General, estimated at the OXONIA Roundtable “Towards a New Aid Architecture” that volumes of aid will increase by at least 30% over the next ten years.

The key question then becomes how we can improve aid effectiveness. All Rajan and Subramanian say about this is that one should pay careful attention to macroeconomic management and issues like “absorptive capacity” for aid, in order not to negate its beneficial effects. One might achieve this by spreading aid flows over time so that they do not have negative competitiveness effects, as well as spending the aid on resources which do not harm the tradable sectors. A clear relationship between geography and growth, but little of a relation between aid and growth conditioning on geography was found.

Note that this ties in with the main points Jeffrey Sachs made in his OXONIA Inaugural Lecture 2004. Sachs’s argument was that the poorest countries are less hampered by weak institutions and poor governance but by the “impacts of physical geography; endemic disease; vulnerability to climatic changes; barriers to transportation”. He went on to suggest that concerted and straightforward

investment by the richest countries could address this. In the presence of malaria, simply pouring aid into a country may not have any impact on growth if this aid does not tackle the malaria preventing growth. Sachs suggests that bed-nets cost 5-6 USD per household and can break 90% of malaria transmission, while investment in effective drugs would go even further.

Two things are particularly notable about Sach’s argument. First, the upshot of Sachs’s argument is that while pouring aid into a country in the form money may be ineffective, monetary aid targeted on things such as drugs or mosquito-nets may not just help growth but be necessary. Second, investing in this type of aid, i.e. the development and delivery of necessary goods does not have negative effects on the aid recipient’s terms of trade. Aid can flow in a way so as not to negate their very purpose.

All in all, aid and investment can help, but you need to deliver it the right way. Rajan and Subramanian’s inability to find a robust positive effect of aid on growth must not lead to the conclusion that aid should be cut back. Aid is important, so more attention needs to be paid that it is not delivered in a way that its positive effects are crowded out.

Beyond this it should not be forgotten that while here we have discussed the relation between aid and growth, we should not forget, that regardless of this, aid is instrumental to relieve the most urgent human suffering as recent studies document the positive effect of aid on the human development index (Cf. Nadia Masud/Boriana Yontcheva “Does Foreign Aid Reduce Poverty? Empirical Evidence from Nongovernmental and Bilateral Aid”, available at www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/wp/2005/wp05100.pdf).

Fabian Eser
Seminar Coordinator
feser@oxonia.org

**Newsletter Editor**

Maria Fabiana Viola
Executive Director
mfviola@oxonia.org

President

Domenico Lombardi

Academic and Policy Board

David Hendry — Chairman
Stephen Bond
Robert Chote
Paul Klemperer
Colin Mayer
John Muellbauer
Dennis Snower
David Vines
David Walton
Ngaire Woods

Secretary General

Sherry Forbes

Seminar Coordinators

Fabian Eser
Joe Perkins

OXONIA, The Oxford Institute for Economic Policy

OXONIA, The Oxford Institute for Economic Policy, provides a global forum for engaging a broad consortium of those in the public policy community into the analysis, discussion, and dissemination of policy issues, with the aim of encompassing innovative academic research into the broad public policy framework.

Recognising that global interdependences influence nearly all of today's policy debates, OXONIA's membership reflects an internationally-renowned group of academics and policy experts with diverse background and expertise. Such a diversity constitutes the unique feature that distinguishes OXONIA from other international think-tanks.

Indeed, by building on such a diversity, OXONIA aims to be a catalyst in the policy debate globally.

To this end, OXONIA coordinates its own research programs supported by the Institute's members, promotes a series of publications, and hosts a variety of seminars, workshops and conferences. Based in Oxford, OXONIA enjoys the support of an internationally distinguished academic community that provides constant input into all the Institute's activities.

OXONIA is an independent and non-profit organisation. Subscription to the Institute is free and open to everyone, and entitles subscribers to get regular updates on activities and publications.

OXONIA**The Oxford Institute for Economic Policy**

Economics Department Building
Manor Road
Oxford, OX1 3UQ
United Kingdom

<http://www.oxonia.org>
E-mail: oxonia@oxonia.org