

Quality of Knowledge Technology, Returns to Production Technology and Economic Development^α

Cuong L. EVAN^γ and H. ÇAGLAR SAMIZ^z

November 2, 2001

Abstract

Presenting a discrete time version of the Romer (1986) model, this paper analyzes optimal paths in a one sector growth model when the technology is not convex. We prove that for a given quality of knowledge technology, the countries could take off if their initial stock of capital are above a critical level; otherwise they could face a poverty trap. We show that for an economy which wants to take off by means of knowledge technology requires three factors: large amount of initial knowledge, small fixed costs and a good quality of knowledge technology.

Keywords: Optimal growth, optimal path, value function, poverty trap, increasing returns.

Journal of Economic Literature: C61, O12, O32, O41.

^αWe thank Raouf Boucekine for comments and suggestions. The second author has been supported by a grant "Actions de Recherches Concertées" of the Ministry of the Belgian French Speaking Community.

^γCERMSEM, UMR 8095 CIREA, University of Paris I, Maison des Sciences Economiques, 106112 Boulevard de l'Hôpital, 75647 Paris Cedex 13, France. E-mail: CuongL.evan@univ-paris1.fr

^zIRES, Université Catholique de Louvain, Place Montesquieu 3, 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium. E-mail: saglam@ires.ud.ac.be

1 Introduction

Convex structures of the technology and preferences have played an important role in economic analysis of optimal one sector growth models. They guarantee that the sequence of optimal stocks moves monotonically towards a unique steady state (as in Cass (1965) and Koopmans (1965)). In these models, per-capita output should converge to a steady state due to the assumption of diminishing returns to per-capita capital in the production of per-capita output. However these studies were unable to explain the non-convergence of countries whose potential causes could be the different time preferences, technologies, demographics, market structures or economic policies.

In a model of endogenous technological change in which the knowledge accumulated by the agents is the basic form of capital, Romer (1986) relaxing this usual assumption of diminishing returns showed that per-capita output can grow without bound and the level of per-capita output across different countries need not converge. In this analysis, new technology created by a single firm which has a positive external effect on the other firms is assumed to be the product of a research technology that exhibits diminishing returns. Thus, whereas production as a function of the firm exhibits diminishing returns, production as a function of the stock of knowledge in the economy is assumed to exhibit increasing returns.

On the other hand, Majumdar and Mitra (1982), Dechert and Mishimura (1983) analyzed an optimal growth model with a non-convex technology. Their key result was that the sequence of capital stocks is necessarily monotonic and under some assumptions they exhibit a poverty trap. Extending the analysis to an open country, Aleskazy and LeVan (1999) in a continuous time framework and Dimaria and LeVan (2001) in a discrete time framework also showed that if the debt constraint is hard, it could be optimal for a poor country to collapse while a rich country to converge to a high level of steady state.

In this paper, following LeVan, Morchaim and Dimaria (2001), we present a discrete time version of the Romer (1986) model and relax a fundamental hypothesis: nonconcavity of the production function. We analyze the case of a developing country with a production technology that exhibits linear production-capital ratio at the early stages of industrialization. Then for higher capital stocks, the production function becomes concave as in the case of a developed country. We prove the existence of solutions to the social-planner problem and characterize the properties of the optimal paths. We show that for a given quality of knowledge technology, the countries could

take σ if their initial stock of capital are above a critical level; otherwise they could face a poverty trap. We show that even a developed country may face a poverty trap if endowed with a low quality of knowledge technology. Between two countries with the same production function and the same level of initial capital stock, when one faces a poverty trap, the other could take σ if it is endowed with a higher quality of knowledge technology. We show that the differences in the quality of knowledge technology between countries can provide an explanation for the non-convergence of the countries.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, presenting the model and its assumptions, we study the existence of solutions to the social-planner problem and analyze the properties and the convergence of optimal paths. Finally, Section 3 concludes.

2 The Infinite Horizon Growth Model

We consider a closed economy in which the preferences of the S identical consumers are globally represented by a strictly concave utility function of consumption, $u(c)$. The assumption is that

(U 1) $u(c)$ is twice continuously differentiable, $u'(c) > 0$; $u''(c) < 0$; $\lim_{c \rightarrow 0} u'(c) = +\infty$ and $u(0) = 0$; $u'(\infty) = 0$.

The instantaneous production of output for a firm is given by $F(k_t; K_t; x_t)$, which depends on the firm specific knowledge (k_t), the aggregate knowledge (K_t), and the level of all other factors such as physical capital, labour, etc. To simplify and to have per-firm and per-capita values coincide, we restrict our attention to an equilibrium in which the number of firms and the number of consumers are equal by assuming that $S = N = 1$. Following Romer (1986) and LeVan, Morhaim and Dimaria (2001), we assume that the additional factors are fixed in supply so that the optimal solution for x is \bar{x} . Dropping \bar{x} from the production function, let f , h and F be

$$F(k; K; \bar{x}) = f(k) h(K)$$

$$F(k) := F(k; k; \bar{x}) = f(k) h(k)$$

We consider two cases:

i) a developed country where the production function is concave

$$f(k) = k^\alpha; \quad 0 < \alpha < 1$$

$$h(k) = k^\beta; \quad \beta > 0$$

ii) a developing country where the production function is a linear function in an initial phase and concave afterwards:

$$f(k) = f_A + k; \quad k \cdot \bar{k} \quad \text{and}$$

$$h(k) = k^{1/2}; \quad 1/2 > 0$$

with $\pm j^{-1} \bar{k}^{1-i} < 0$; $0 < \pm < 1$; $0 < 1 \leq 1$ and $1 < 1 + 1/2$. Note that $A < 0$ as $A = \pm k; \bar{k} = \bar{k} \pm j^{-1} \bar{k}^{1-i} < \bar{k}^{-1} \bar{k}^{1-i}; \bar{k}^{1-i} = \bar{k}^{-1} (1 + 1) < 0$:

The influence of the fixed costs on the output can be measured through two indicators which are \bar{k} and \pm : The fixed costs are more important if \bar{k} increases or/and if \pm decreases.

Investing an amount I_t of forgoing consumption, a firm with a current stock of private knowledge k_t produces additional knowledge which induces a rate of growth

$$k_{t+1} - k_t = G(I_t; k_t)$$

Assume that

(G 1) G is concave and homogenous of degree one. Then:

$$\frac{k_{t+1} - k_t}{k_t} = G\left(\frac{I_t}{k_t}; 1\right) = g\left(\frac{I_t}{k_t}\right)$$

(G 2) $g(0) = 0$; $g'(0) = 1 < +1$

(G 3) $0 < g(y) < y$:

For an arbitrary path K , the social optimization problem maximizes the utility of a representative consumer subject to the technology implied by the path K .

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Maximize } \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(c_t) \\ \text{s.t. } & 0 < \frac{k_{t+1} - k_t}{k_t} < g\left(\frac{F(k_t) - c_t}{k_t}\right) \\ & k_0 > 0; \text{ given} \end{aligned}$$

Note that in social optimization problem, the production function exhibits an initial phase of increasing returns and a second phase with de

creasing returns. Note also that this problem is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Maximize } & \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(F(k_t) - k_t^\alpha (\frac{k_{t+1} - k_t}{k_t})) \\ \text{s.t. } & k_{t+1} = k_t g(\frac{F(k_t)}{k_t}) + k_t \\ & k_0 > 0; \text{ given} \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha := g^{-1}$:

Following from (6.3), note that $k_{t+1} = k_t(1 + \theta)$. Then we have $k_t = k_0(1 + \theta)^t$ including that $F(k_t) = F(k_0(1 + \theta)^t) = k_0^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}(1 + \theta)^{t/\alpha}$. In what follows we assume that

$$(P1) \quad 0 < \beta < 1 \text{ and } \beta(1 + \theta)^{1/\alpha} < 1;$$

Denoting $g(\frac{F(k)}{k})$ by $\bar{g} < \theta$; we also assume that

$$(P2) \quad \bar{g}(x) = \beta x; \text{ when } x \in [0; \bar{g}].$$

Note that at zero an increase of one percent in the amount of investment induces an increase of $1 = \beta$ percent in the stock of private knowledge which enables us to interpret that $1 = \beta$ reflects the quality of the knowledge technology.

2.1 Existence of a Solution

A sequence $\mathbf{k} = (k_t)_t$ is called feasible from k_0 if it satisfies the constraints of the social optimization problem:

$$\forall t; k_0 \cdot k_{t+1} = k_t g(\frac{F(k_t)}{k_t}) + k_t$$

In this section, we first prove that every feasible sequence from k_0 belongs to a compact set for the product topology; second we show that the objective function is continuous for this topology. Existence of solutions follows from these results.

2.1.1 Compactness

Let \mathbf{k} be a feasible path from k_0 . Then by assumption (6.3), for every t

$$k_{t+1} = k_t g(\frac{F(k_t)}{k_t}) + k_t \cdot (1 + \theta)k_t$$

so $k_t = (1 + \theta)^t k_0$; that is

$$\mathbb{R}^2 = \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t F(k_t) \mid k_t = (1 + \theta)^t k_0 \right\}$$

Thus, \mathbb{R} belongs to a compact set for the topology. Since g and F are continuous, the feasible set from k_0 is compact for the product topology.

2.1.2 Continuity of the objective function

The objective function is

$$U: \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(F(k_t)) \mid k_t = (1 + \theta)^t k_0$$

By means of the proof available in Levhari and Mirman (2001), we know that U is continuous for the product topology.

Thus, with the objective function being continuous and the feasible path set being compact for the product topology, the problem has a solution.

2.2 Value function, Bellman equation

Let $V(k_0)$ denote the value function of the social optimization problem. It is clear that the value function verifies the Bellman equation:

$$V(k_0) = \max_{y \in [k_0 g \frac{F(k_0)}{k_0} + k_0, k_0]} \left[\beta u(F(k_0)) + \frac{y - k_0}{k_0} V(y) \right]$$

V is the unique continuous solution to Bellman equation. Let

$$\bar{v}(k_0) = \operatorname{argmax}_{y \in [k_0 g \frac{F(k_0)}{k_0} + k_0, k_0]} \left[\beta u(F(k_0)) + \frac{y - k_0}{k_0} V(y) \right]$$

By the maximum theorem, \bar{v} is upper semi-continuous.

2.3 Properties and convergence of optimal paths

In this section we derive some properties of optimal paths. First, we show the non-nullity of optimal consumption and capital. Second, we prove that there exists a critical value k_c which may be interpreted as the "top" of the poverty trap.

Lemma 1 $\frac{F(k)}{k}$ and $F'(k)$ are increasing functions in $[0; \bar{k}]$ and $[\bar{k}; +\infty[$:

Proof. i) $\frac{F(k)}{k} = \frac{1}{k^2} [F'(k)k + F(k)]$: What follows from the definition of $F(k)$ is that

$$F'(k)k + F(k) = \begin{cases} A(\frac{1}{2}i + 1)k^{\frac{1}{2} + 1} + (\frac{1}{2}i + 1)k^{1 + \frac{1}{2}}; & k \in [0; \bar{k}] \\ A(\frac{1}{2}i + 1)k^{\frac{1}{2} + 1} + (\frac{1}{2}i + 1)k^{1 + \frac{1}{2}}; & k \in [\bar{k}; +\infty[\end{cases}$$

There are two cases to be checked when $k \in [\bar{k}; +\infty[$:

$\frac{1}{2} < 1$) $F'(k)k + F(k) = k^{\frac{1}{2}} [A(\frac{1}{2}i + 1) + (\frac{1}{2}i + 1)k^{\frac{1}{2}}] > 0$ as $A = \pm \bar{k}^{\frac{1}{2}} < 0$ and

$\frac{1}{2} > 1$) $F'(k)k + F(k) = k^{\frac{1}{2}} [k^{\frac{1}{2}} + (\frac{1}{2}i + 1)(k^{\frac{1}{2}} + A)] > 0$ as $k^{\frac{1}{2}} + A > \bar{k}^{\frac{1}{2}} + A = \pm \bar{k}$. Thus $\frac{F(k)}{k}$ is an increasing function in $[0; \bar{k}]$ and $[\bar{k}; +\infty[$:

$$F'(k) = \begin{cases} \pm(\frac{1}{2} + 1)\frac{1}{2}k^{\frac{1}{2} - 1}; & k \in [0; \bar{k}] \\ A\frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2}i + 1)k^{\frac{1}{2} - 2} + (\frac{1}{2}i + 1)(\frac{1}{2} + 1)k^{1 + \frac{1}{2} - 2}; & k \in [\bar{k}; +\infty[\end{cases}$$

It is clear that $F'(k) > 0$ for $k \in [0; \bar{k}]$: There are two cases to be checked when $k \in [\bar{k}; +\infty[$:

$\frac{1}{2} < 1$) $F'(k) = k^{1 + \frac{1}{2} - 2} [(1 + \frac{1}{2})(\frac{1}{2}i + 1) + A\frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2}i + 1)k^{-1}] > 0$ and

$\frac{1}{2} > 1$) $F'(k) = k^{\frac{1}{2}i - 2} [(k^{\frac{1}{2}} + A)(\frac{1}{2}i + 1)\frac{1}{2} + (\frac{1}{2}i + 1)k^{\frac{1}{2} + 1}(\frac{1}{2}i + 1)k^{-1}] > 0$: Thus, $F'(k)$ is an increasing function in $[0; \bar{k}]$ and $[\bar{k}; +\infty[$. ■

Lemma 2 $\frac{\partial^2 W(k; y)}{\partial k \partial y} > 0$ where $W(k; y) = u(F(k); k^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{y}{k})$.

Proof. See Le Van and Meraim and Dimaria (2001). ■

Let $B(x) = xg(\frac{F(x)}{x}) + x$:

Lemma 3 Our optimal growth model can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{t=0}^{\infty} & \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t W(x_t; x_{t+1}) \\ \text{s.t.} & x_t = x_{t+1} \cdot B(x_t) \\ & x_0 > 0 \text{ is given} \end{aligned}$$

which leads to the value function verifying the Bellman equation given as

$$V(x_0) = \max_{x_1 \in B(x_0)} [W(x_0; x_1) + \beta V(x_1)]$$

where B is an increasing function. Let $\{x_t\}$ and $\{x_t^0\}$ be optimal paths starting from x_0 and x_0^0 respectively. If $x_0 < x_0^0$ then $x_1 < x_1^0$:

Proof. The result comes from the fact that $\frac{\partial^2 W(k; y)}{\partial k^2} > 0$: See Benhabib and Mishimura (1985). ■

Proposition 1 If $\{k_t, c_t\}$ is an optimal path from $k_0 > 0$; then $\exists t_0 > 0$ such that $k_t > 0$; $c_t > 0$: Similarly if $k_0 < k^*$ then $F(k_0) > F(k^*) = \frac{k_0}{k^*} > 0$:

Proof. The proof is based on Inada condition of the utility function. See Le Van, Meraim and Dimaria (2001). ■

Proposition 2 Let $\bar{c} > 0$ be given. There exists $k^* > 0$ such that $\exists k_0 < k^*$; $k_0 > 0$; $\exists k_t$ optimal from k_0 then $k_t = k_0$; $\exists t_0$:

Proof. Choose k^* such that $g \circ \frac{F(k^*)}{k^*} = \bar{c}$ and $F'(k^*) > 1 + \bar{c}$.

Since $\frac{F(k)}{k}$ is increasing by Lemma 1 and $\lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \frac{F(k)}{k} = 0$; such a k^* exists. Let for $k_0 < k^*$, there exists a strictly increasing optimal path. We have Euler equation given as:

$$u'(c_t) \frac{k_{t+1}}{k_t} = u'(c_{t+1}) [F'(k_{t+1}) k_{t+1} + 1 - \delta] + \beta \frac{k_{t+2}}{k_{t+1}}$$

Our claim is that there exists t such that $k_{t+1} < k^*$ and $k_{t+2} > k^*$: If not, we have always $k_t < k^*$; $\exists t_0$. Then $k_t < k^*$ and $c_t < \bar{c}$ with $F'(k_t) > 1 + \bar{c}$ due to Euler equation. Note that we have $\frac{k_{t+1}}{k_t} = \frac{F(k_t)}{k_t} < \bar{c}$; $\exists t_0$ as $\frac{k_{t+1}}{k_t} < \bar{c} < \frac{F(k_t)}{k_t} < \frac{F(k^*)}{k^*} = \bar{c}$.

and $\phi(x) = \bar{c}x$ for $x \in [0; \bar{c}]$ according to Assumption (P2).

However, since F' is increasing in $[0; k^*]$ and $k_{t+1} < k^*$ by Lemma 1 and $k_t < k^*$; $F'(k_t) > F'(k^*) > 1 + \bar{c}$ leads to a contradiction.

Hence there exists t such that $k_{t+1} < k^*$ and $k_{t+2} > k^*$. In what follows, consider a path $\{k_t^0, c_t^0\}$ converging to zero and let $T_n(k_0^0)$ be the point such that

$$k_{T_n(k_0^0)+1} < k^* \text{ and } k_{T_n(k_0^0)+2} > k^*:$$

$\delta t > 1$; we have $k_t \cdot k_{t-1} \cdot k_t g \frac{F(k_t)}{k_t} + k_t$ and $k_1 \cdot k_1 \cdot k_1 g \frac{F(k_1)}{k_1} + k_1$
 that is $k_t \cdot k_{t-1} \cdot k_t g \frac{F(k_t)}{k_t} + k_t$. Thus there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that \mathbb{R}_1 is
 feasible from k_0 . Now we will show that such a path increases the value of
 U :

$$\begin{aligned}
 U(\mathbb{R}_1) &= u(F(k_0)) + \frac{\mu}{k_0} + \frac{\mu}{1+i} u(F(k_0 + \epsilon)) \\
 &= u(F(k_0)) + \frac{\mu}{k_0} + \frac{\mu}{1+i} u(F(k_0 + \epsilon)) \\
 U(\mathbb{R}_0) &= u(F(k_0)) + \frac{\mu}{1+i} u(F(k_0))
 \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
 U(\mathbb{R}_1) - U(\mathbb{R}_0) &= u(F(k_0)) + \frac{\mu}{k_0} - \frac{\mu}{1+i} u(F(k_0)) \\
 &\quad + \frac{\mu}{1+i} [u(F(k_0 + \epsilon)) - u(F(k_0))]
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= u^0(F(k_0)) + \frac{\mu}{k_0} - \frac{\mu}{1+i} u^0(F(k_0)) \\
 &\quad + \frac{\mu}{1+i} [u^0(F(k_0 + \epsilon)) - u^0(F(k_0))] \\
 &= \frac{\mu}{k_0} u^0(F(k_0)) + \frac{\mu}{1+i} u^0(F(k_0 + \epsilon)) - \frac{\mu}{1+i} u^0(F(k_0)) \\
 &\quad + \frac{\mu}{1+i} [u^0(F(k_0 + \epsilon)) - u^0(F(k_0))]
 \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \frac{k}{k} = 1$, F^0 is increasing and $k_0 > k^{\max}$, we have
 $F^0(k_0) > \frac{1}{1+i}$. Thus, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $U(\mathbb{R}_1) - U(\mathbb{R}_0) > 0$
 concluding that \mathbb{R}_0 is not optimal.

ii) If there were an optimal path such that $k_1 = k_0$ then as the value
 function verifies the Bellman equation:

$$k_0 = k_1 \cdot 2 \cdot \operatorname{argmax}_{k_0 \cdot y \cdot k_0 g \frac{F(k_0)}{k_0} + k_0} \left[u(F(k_0)) + \frac{\mu}{k_0} \frac{y \cdot k_0}{k_0} + -V(y) \right]$$

the path $\mathbb{R}_0 = (k_0; k_0; \dots; k_0; \dots)$ would then be optimal which is impossible.
 So necessarily, $k_1 > k_0$. Similarly what follows is that $\delta t \cdot k_{t-1} > k_t$.

iii) Writing the Euler equation:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & u^0 \frac{\mu_{k_{t+1}|k_t}}{k_t} - u^0 F(k_t) \frac{\mu_{k_{t+1}|k_t}}{k_t} + \\
 & - F^0(k_{t+1}) \frac{\mu_{k_{t+2}|k_{t+1}}}{k_{t+1}} + u^0 F(k_{t+1}) \frac{\mu_{k_{t+2}|k_{t+1}}}{k_{t+1}} = 0:
 \end{aligned}$$

Since k_t is strictly increasing $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} k_t$ exists. Suppose on the contrary that k_t converges to $k_s < +1$: Then we would have

$$F^0(k_s) \frac{\mu_{k_{t+1}|k_t}}{k_t} = 0:$$

But $F^0(k_s) \frac{\mu_{k_{t+1}|k_t}}{k_t} = 0$ and $k_s > k^{max}$: a contradiction since F^0 is increasing so k_t diverges to $+1$ indicating that per capita output grows without bound.

Proposition 4 Let k^{max} be defined by $F^0(k^{max}) \frac{\mu_{k_{t+1}|k_t}}{k_t} = 0$. Let $k_0 > 0$: No optimal path from $k_0 \notin k^{max}$ converges to k^{max} :

Proof: If $k_0 > k^{max}$, from proposition 3, any optimal path from k_0 will converge to $+1$: Consider the case where $k_0 < k^{max}$: Let $\{k_t\}$ be an optimal path from k_0 and assume it converges to k^{max} : This optimal path must be increasing and bounded above by k^{max} : There exists T_0 such that $\forall t \geq T_0; \frac{k_{t+1}|k_t}{k_t} > \bar{g}$ and hence $\frac{k_{t+1}|k_t}{k_t} = \frac{k_{t+1}|k_t}{k_t}$: The optimal consumption for $t \geq T_0$ will be $c_t = F(k_t) + \mu_{k_{t+1}|k_t} k_{t+1}$: We also have $\forall t \geq T_0; F(k_t) \frac{\mu_{k_{t+1}|k_t}}{k_t} > F(k_{t+1}) \frac{\mu_{k_{t+2}|k_{t+1}}}{k_{t+1}}$; because the function $F(k) \frac{\mu_{k_{t+1}|k_t}}{k_t}$ is decreasing when k is close to k^{max} and $k < k^{max}$: The following inequality holds:

$$\forall t \geq T_0 \quad \frac{\mu_{k_{t+1}|k_t}}{k_t} F(k_t) < \frac{\mu_{k_{t+2}|k_{t+1}}}{k_{t+1}} F(k_{t+1})$$

But

$$\forall t \geq T_0 \quad \frac{\mu_{k_{t+1}|k_t}}{k_t} F(k_t) = \frac{\mu_{k_{t+1}|k_t}}{k_t} (F(k_t) + \mu_{k_{t+1}|k_t} k_{t+1}) \stackrel{\Delta}{=} k_{t+1}$$

and

$$\sum_{t=T_0}^{\infty} \beta^{-t} F(k_{T_0}) = \frac{F(k_{T_0})}{1-\beta} = F(k_{T_0})$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{t=T_0}^{\infty} \beta^{-t} (F(k_t) - F(k_{T_0})) < 0$$

i.e.

$$\sum_{t=T_0}^{\infty} \beta^{-t} G_t < 0$$

By Jensen's inequality, we have

$$\sum_{t=T_0}^{\infty} \beta^{-t} u(G_t) < \sum_{t=T_0}^{\infty} \beta^{-t} u(F(k_{T_0}))$$

or

$$\sum_{t=T_0}^{\infty} \beta^{-t} u(G_t) < \sum_{t=T_0}^{\infty} \beta^{-t} u(F(k_{T_0}))$$

This means that the utility of the stationary path $k_t = k_{T_0}$ for $t \geq T_0$ is better than the utility from T_0 of the optimal path: a contradiction. ■

Theorem 1 Let $\beta > 0$ be given. Then there exists k_c such that $k_0 < k_c$; any optimal path $\{k_t\}$ from k_0 will satisfy $k_t = k_0$ for $t \geq T_0$ and $k_0 > k_c$; any optimal path $\{k_t\}$ from k_0 will satisfy $k_t < k_{t+1}$ for $t \geq T_0$ and $k_t \rightarrow k^*$:

Proof. Let k^* be the supremum of the k_c such that if $k_0 < k_c$ then any optimal path $\{k_t\}$ from k_0 will satisfy $k_t = k_0$ for $t \geq T_0$; let k^* be the infimum of the k_c such that if $k_0 > k_c$ then any optimal path $\{k_t\}$ from k_0 will converge to k^* . It is obvious that $k^* = k^*$. Suppose $k^* < k^*$. Take k_0 and k_0^* such that $k^* < k_0 < k_0^* < k^*$. From the very definition of k^* and k^* ; there exists an optimal path $\{k_t\}$ from k_0 which is strictly increasing and an optimal path $\{k_t^*\}$ from k_0^* which is stationary, i.e. $k_t^* = k_0^*$. By the increasingness property of the optimal policy, we have $k_t < k_0^*$. Hence $k_t \rightarrow k^*$. It is easy to check that $F(k^*) = k^*$ and this contradicts proposition 4. Therefore $k^* = k^*$. Posing $k_c = k^* = k^*$ ends the proof. ■

3 Concluding Remarks

i) Let $k_0 > 0$ be given. By proposition 3, if α is small enough then any optimal path from k_0 will converge to $\alpha = 1$. In particular, the Romer model formalized in discrete time horizon by LeVan, Morchaim and Dimaria (2001) is the limit case of our model by letting $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, consider two countries with the same production technology and the same level of initial capital stock. By proposition 3, when one faces a poverty trap, the other could take α if it is endowed with a higher quality of knowledge technology. That is to mention that the differences in the quality of knowledge technology between countries can provide an explanation for the non-convergence of the countries.

ii) Consider the equality $F^0(k^{\alpha\alpha}) = \alpha$ and assume that $k^{\alpha\alpha} > \bar{k}$. We have

$$A(\pm) \frac{1}{2} k^{\alpha(\frac{1}{2} \pm 1)} + (\frac{1}{2} + 1) k^{\alpha(\frac{1}{2} \pm 1)} = \frac{\alpha(1 - \alpha)}{\alpha}$$

where $A(\pm) = \pm \bar{k}_j \bar{k}^{-1}$. By differentiating with respect to \pm , we obtain that

$$\frac{dk^{\alpha\alpha}}{d\pm} = \frac{\bar{k} \frac{1}{2} k^{\alpha(\frac{1}{2} \pm 1)}}{A(\pm) \frac{1}{2} (\frac{1}{2} \pm 1) k^{\alpha(\frac{1}{2} \pm 2)} + (\frac{1}{2} + 1) (\frac{1}{2} \pm 1) k^{\alpha(\frac{1}{2} \pm 1)}} < 0$$

because, since $k^{\alpha\alpha} > \bar{k}$, the denominator is positive. One can conclude that, given k_0 ; if the influence of the fixed costs diminishes (i.e. \pm increases), the economy can take α .

Furthermore, by differentiating the given equality $F^0(k^{\alpha\alpha}) = \alpha$ with respect to \bar{k} ; under the assumption of $k^{\alpha\alpha} > \bar{k}$, we obtain that $\frac{dk^{\alpha\alpha}}{d\bar{k}} > 0$: That is to conclude that, given k_0 ; if the amount of fixed costs diminishes (i.e. \bar{k} decreases), the economy can take α .

iii) To sum up, an economy which wants to take α by using knowledge technology requires three factors:

- 1 Large amount of initial knowledge
- 2 Small fixed costs
- 3 Good quality of knowledge technology

References

- [1] Aleskazy, Ph., and C. LeVan, 1999, A model of optimal growth strategy, Journal of Economic Theory 85(1), 24-51.

- [2] Benhabib, J., and K. Nishimura, 1985, Competitive equilibrium cycles, *Journal of Economic Theory* 35, 284-306
- [3] Cass, D., 1965, Optimal growth in an aggregative model of capital accumulation, *Review of Economic Studies* 32, 233-240.
- [4] Dechert, W.D., and K. Nishimura, 1983, A complete characterization of optimal growth paths in an aggregated model with non-concave production function, *Journal of Economic Theory* 31, 332-354.
- [5] Dimaria, C-H., and C. LeVan, 2001, Debt, corruption, R & D and growth in developing countries, *Macroeconomic Dynamics*, forthcoming
- [6] Koopmans, T.C., 1965, On the concept of optimal economic growth, *The Econometric Approach to Development Planning* edited by North H. and
- [7] LeVan, C., Morhaim, L., and C-H. Dimaria, 2001, The discrete time version of the Romer model, *Economic Theory*, forthcoming
- [8] Majumdar, M., and T. Mitra, 1982, Intertemporal Allocation with a non-convex technology: The aggregative framework, *Journal of Economic Theory* 27, 101-136
- [9] Romer, P., 1986 Increasing returns and long run growth, *Journal of Political Economy* 94, 1002-1037.