BANCO CENTRAL DE COSTA RICA

DOCUMENTO DE TRABAJO
N.º 03 | 2022

Multinationals, Monopsony, and Local Development: Evidence from the United Fruit Company

Esteban Méndez
Diana Van Patten

Fotografía de portada: “Presentes”, conjunto escultórico en bronce, año 1983, del artista costarricense Fernando Calvo Sánchez. Colección del Banco Central de Costa Rica.

Multinacionales, Monopsonio y Desarrollo Local: Evidencia de la United Fruit Company*

Esteban Méndez†
Diana Van Patten§

Resumen

Este artículo estudia el papel de las grandes empresas privadas en el desarrollo de servicios locales. Utilizamos evidencia de una de las multinacionales más grandes del siglo XX: la United Fruit Company (UFCo). La firma recibió una gran concesión de tierras en Costa Rica, una de las llamadas "Repúblicas bananeras"—de 1899 a 1984. A partir de datos censales georreferenciados de 1973 a 2011, implementamos un diseño de regresión discontinua geográfica, que explota una asignación de terreno que es ortogonal a nuestros resultados de interés. Encontramos que la empresa tuvo un efecto positivo y persistente en los niveles de vida. Los documentos de la compañía explican que una preocupación clave en el momento era atraer y mantener una fuerza laboral, lo que indujo a la empresa a invertir fuertemente en servicios locales, como el desarrollo de la educación e infraestructura de salud, que pueden explicar nuestro resultado. Consistente con este mecanismo, mostramos, empíricamente y a través de un modelo propuesto, que los esfuerzos de inversión de la empresa aumentan con la movilidad de los trabajadores.

Palabras clave: desarrollo de largo plazo, poder monopsónico, servicios locales.

Clasificación JEL: F23, N16, O43

*Agradecemos a Treb Allen, David Argente, David Atkin, Peggy Barrantes Pereira, Levon Barseghyan, Marco Battaglini, Ariel Burstein, Dora Costa, Giorgio Chiovelli, Melissa Dell, Ellora Derenoncourt, Eric Edmonds, Sebastian Edwards, Pablo Fajgelbaum, Martin Fiszbein, Simon Fuchs, Michela Giorcelli, Edward Glaeser, Walker Hanlon, Douglas Irwin, Keith Jenkins, Adriana Lleras-Muney, Jorge León Sáenz, Sara Lowes, Róger Madrigal López, Eduardo Montero, Evelyn Muñoz Salas, Paul Novosad, Nathan Nunn, Ted O'Donoghue, Lee Ohanian, Nina Pavcnik, Stephen Redding, Todd Schoellman, Armand Sim, Felipe Valencia, Ronny Viales Hurtado, y participantes en seminarios de UCLA, Columbia Business School, NYU, NYU Stern, Dartmouth College, Tuck School of Business, Yale University, Yale SOM, University of Michigan, University of Pennsylvania, University of Minnesota, Boston University, Duke University, Fuqua School of Business, Hoover Institute at Stanford, Congreso de la Asociación de Historia Económica del Caribe, Quantitative Spatial Economics Workshop, NBER Summer Institute, Latin American Network in Economic History and Political Economy, Pennsylvania State University, Virtual Economic History Seminar, UC San Diego, UC Berkeley, Brown University, North East Universities Development Consortium, Stanford University, Congreso Centroamericano de Historia, y the Harvard Cities and Development Workshop por sus comentarios y sugerencias.

†Departamento de Investigación Económica. División Económica, BCCR. mendezce@bccr.fi.cr.
§Yale University y NBER. diana.vanpatten@yale.edu.

Multinationals, Monopsony, and Local Development: Evidence from the United Fruit Company*

Esteban Méndez†
Diana Van Patten§

The ideas expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the Central Bank of Costa Rica.

Abstract

This paper studies the role of large private sector companies in the development of local amenities. We use evidence from one of the largest multinationals of the 20th century: the United Fruit Company (UFCo). The firm was given a large land concession in Costa Rica—one of the so-called “Banana Republics"—from 1899 to 1984. Using administrative census data with census-block geo-references from 1973 to 2011, we implement a geographic regression discontinuity design that exploits a land assignment that is orthogonal to our outcomes of interest. We find that the firm had a positive and persistent effect on living standards. Company documents explain that a key concern at the time was to attract and maintain a sizable workforce, which induced the firm to invest heavily in local amenities—like the development of education and health infrastructure—that can account for our result. Consistent with this mechanism, we show, empirically and through a proposed model, that the firm’s investment efforts increase with worker mobility.

Key words: long-run development, monopsony power, local amenities.

JEL Codes: F23, N16, O43

*We thank Treb Allen, David Argente, David Atkin, Peggy Barrantes Pereira, Levon Barseghyan, Marco Battaglini, Ariel Burstein, Dora Costa, Giorgio Chiovelli, Melissa Dell, Ellora Derenoncourt, Eric Edmonds, Sebastian Edwards, Pablo Fajgelbaum, Martin Fiszbein, Simon Fuchs, Michela Giorcelli, Edward Glaeser, Walker Hanlon, Douglas Irwin, Keith Jenkins, Adriana Lleras-Muney, Jorge León Sáenz, Sara Lowes, Róger Madrigal López, Eduardo Montero, Evelyn Muñoz Salas, Paul Novosad, Nathan Nunn, Ted O’Donoghue, Lee Ohanian, Nina Pavcnik, Stephen Redding, Todd Schoellman, Armand Sim, Felipe Valencia, Ronny Viales Hurtado, and seminar participants at UCLA, Columbia Business School, NYU, NYU Stern, Dartmouth College, Tuck School of Business, Yale University, Yale SOM, University of Michigan, University of Pennsylvania, University of Minnesota, Boston University, Duke University, Fuqua School of Business, Hoover Institute at Stanford, Caribbean Economic History Association Conference, Quantitative Spatial Economics Workshop, NBER Summer Institute, Latin American Network in Economic History and Political Economy, Pennsylvania State University, Virtual Economic History Seminar, UC San Diego, UC Berkeley, Brown University, North East Universities Development Consortium, Stanford University, Central American Congress of History, and the Harvard Cities and Development Workshop for helpful comments and discussion. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Central Bank of Costa Rica.

†Department of Economic Research. Economic Division, BCCR. mendezce@bccr.fi.cr.

§Yale University and NBER. diana.vanpatten@yale.edu.

Contents

Multinationals, Monopsony, and Local Development: Evidence from the United Fruit Company

1 Introduction

Nowadays, we take it for granted that public goods, such as education and health infrastructure, are to be provided by the government. In fact, historically, what are now high-income countries once relied on private sector companies as providers of these services. For instance, large corporations such as Unilever built villages with schools and hospitals in rural England to keep a stable workforce during the 19th century (Watkins and Dalton, 2019). This paper sheds light on these dynamics as a novel dimension of structural change; workers moved not just from agriculture to industry, but also from family farms to large corporations. For the latter to occur, a large group of workers had to be attracted to the same location. We provide detailed historical evidence on the methods that corporations use to make sure that this happens, and on key determinants of the short- and long-run effects of a large private investment project on local economic development. We also explore the role of monopsony power and of the spatial structure of the labor market in determining the direction and persistence of these effects.

The study uses evidence from one of the largest multinationals of the 20th century: the United Fruit Company (UFCo), the infamous firm hosted by the so-called "Banana Republics." This American firm was given a large land concession in Costa Rica, and was the only employer in this region—where it required workers to live—from 1899 to 1984. In this sense, the firm appeared to function as a *local* monopsonist.[1] The concession had a well-defined boundary, and we identify a segment of this boundary that was redrawn, and leads to variation that is orthogonal to our outcomes of interest.[2] This variation, along with detailed census microdata geo-referenced at the census-block level, allows us to use a geographic regression discontinuity design (RD) to identify the effect of being under the company's *direct* influence. Specifically, we compare units located within a close distance from, but on different sides of, the UFCo boundary. Our data

[1] This concession's extension was 455,800 hectares (ha), approximately 9% of the national territory. For reference, since 2000, over 30 land acquisitions by transnational companies in Africa, Central and Southeast Asia, Eastern Europe, and Latin America have been *larger* than the UFCo's concession in Costa Rica, accounting for over 26 million ha (Cotula and Vermeulen, 2009).

[2] This segment of the boundary was redrawn in 1904 and jointly shaped by a river and how this river intersected preexisting land plots, leading to a border with balanced geographic attributes and uncorrelated with ex-ante determinants of growth.

spans over a decade before the company stops operating, and almost three decades after its closure (1973-2011), which allows us to document how the UFCo's local impact evolves.

We find that households living within the former UFCo regions have had better economic outcomes (housing, health and sanitation, education, and consumption capacity), and were 33% less likely to be poor than households living outside. This effect is persistent over time: Since 1973 the treated and untreated regions have converged slowly, with only 59% of the income gap closing over the following four decades.[3]

The results along this redrawn boundary segment are consistent with findings of an RD using the entirety of the concession's border. In fact, we run the RD along the UFCo's entire boundary at many different distances from the border.[4] The results are very similar—and often statistically equal—to those of our main specification where land was randomly allocated, and which is more restricted and well-identified.

Historical data, collected and hand-digitized from primary sources, suggests that investments in local amenities carried out by the UFCo—hospitals, schools, roads—are the main drivers of our results. For instance, we document that investments per student and per patient in UFCo-operated schools and hospitals were significantly larger than in local schools and hospitals run by the government, and sometimes even twice as large. Access to these investments was restricted, for the most part, to UFCo workers who were required to live within the plantation. This might explain the sharp discontinuity in outcomes right at the boundary. We do not find evidence of other channels, such as selective migration or negative spillovers on the control region (just outside the UFCo), being the main mechanisms behind our results. In fact, our analysis—using census microdata dating as far back as 1927—actually suggests that migrants to the UFCo were consistently *negatively* selected.[5]

Why were these investments in local amenities higher than in the rest of the country? While the company might have invested in hospitals to have healthier workers, it is less clear why it would incur in other investments such as schooling. Evidence from archival company annual reports suggests that these investments were induced by the need to attract and maintain a sizable

[3] Robustness checks include: a falsification test, in which we draw placebo borders and re-run our analysis; estimations using different bandwidths and considering different sub-samples of the population, such as only non-migrants; and estimations using the entire boundary, among others.

[4] We run the RD regression with bandwidths ranging from 5 km up to spanning the entire interior of the UFCo region (20 km on each side of the border). These 61 regressions per outcome—each with a bandwidth 250 m larger on each side than the previous one—are plotted in Figures 3 and 4.

[5] These and other alternative mechanisms are discussed in depth in Section 5.2.

workforce, given the initially high levels of worker turnover.[6] For instance, a 1922 Annual Report highlights the constant overturn of labor and describes that "[the workers'] migratory habits do not permit them to remain on one plantation from year to year, but *as soon as they become physically efficient and acquire a little money they either return to their homes or migrate elsewhere and must be replaced by new laborers* [emphasis added]" (UFCo, 1923, p. 74). As a solution to retain workers, the UFCo increased its investments in local amenities beyond medical measures. A 1925 Annual Report pointed out that "an endeavor should be made to stabilize the population.... We must not only build and maintain attractive and comfortable camps, but we must also provide measures for taking care of the families of married men, by furnishing them with *garden facilities, schools and some forms of entertainment. In other words, we must take an interest in our people if we may hope to retain their services indefinitely* [emphasis added]" (UFCo, 1926, p. 185).

Quantitative evidence is consistent with the qualitative evidence from the company reports. Empirically, there is a causal relationship between the intensity of UFCo's investments in a location and the degree of competition for labor faced by the company. Using suitability to grow coffee (the main outside option for agricultural workers at the time) to instrument for wages, we find that locations where workers had higher outside options in 1973 also experienced more investment in amenities while the UFCo operated, and higher living standards in 2000 and 2011. This is true after controlling for outside options in 2000 and 2011. For instance, a one percent increase in the average outside option of an UFCo region in 1973 is associated with a 3.7% in the number of children per school in this region, and with a 0.72% lower likelihood of households being poor in this location in 2000 and 2011. Moreover, we document that during periods when world coffee prices were higher, the UFCo invested more in amenities; for instance, a 1% increase in coffee prices is associated with 0.4 percentage points higher probability that the UFCo opened a school within its lands. We also find that expenditures in medical care, education, and total amenities are positively correlated with world coffee prices, and that the correlation between coffee prices and expenditures in amenities as a share of total worker compensation is 0.9. This aligns with the idea that it is competition with coffee that explains why UFCo provides schooling and amenities rather than higher wages.

Second, we build a model to have a better understanding of how the company's welfare effect changes in scenarios with less worker mobility or with a more competitive labor market. To incorporate the investment patterns that we documented empirically, we assume that the local monop-

[6] High turnover was a result of the workers' main outside option: coffee. Unlike bananas, coffee is a seasonal crop, and workers could earn relatively high wages during the coffee harvesting season.

sonist can choose workers' compensation bundle: a combination of wages and local amenities. We find that despite its market power, the firm's presence can be beneficial for the country unless labor mobility is too low. The intuition behind this result is that, if workers are less mobile, their outside option decreases, and the company can reduce their compensation. In the extreme case of immobile workers, the company could potentially not pay for the labor input, thereby negatively affecting worker's welfare.[7]

The evidence on the key role played by labor mobility and outside options allows us to reconcile our results with findings from a growing body of literature that analyzes the long-run impact of colonial and historical institutions on economic development. Most prior literature has considered settings in which labor was coerced and relatively immobile, such as the slave trade (Nunn, 2008), the *mita* system in Peru (Dell, 2010), forced coffee cultivation in Puerto Rico (Bobonis and Morrow, 2013), forced rubber cultivation in what is today the Democratic Republic of Congo (Lowes and Montero, 2021a), or the Dutch Cultivation System (Dell and Olken, 2019). This literature consistently finds that companies tend to underprovide public goods within their concessions and that exposure to these regimes can lead to negative and persistent effects on development.[8] We thereby complement these studies by shedding light on the importance of workers' outside options in determining the direction of this effect, and the incentives of a private firm to invest in infrastructure.

Our work also contributes to the literature on the consequences of firms exercising market power. We document how local monopsony power affects a firm's incentive to invest in local amenities, and consider a compensation that does not focus only on wages as in Gutiérrez and Philippon (2017) and Autor et al. (2020), who document an increase in market power associated with declines in the labor share across many industries. Further, we study long-run outcomes and how persistent the effects of such an arrangement can be.

Further, our findings relate to the literature on structural transformation.[9] We provide evidence on how the competing demands for labor and the seasonality of agriculture make it difficult for an industry to have a stable labor force. The former is related to work by Khandker and Mahmud (2012) and Bryan et al. (2014), and it sheds light on an advantage of monopsony power in this setting, as it allows the firm to internalize the benefits of making the workforce stable through the

[7] This extreme case with immobile workers is historically relevant, as colonial and quasi-colonial arrangements featuring large firms often had high levels of labor coercion.

[8] An exception being Dell and Olken (2019), who find that villages forced to grow sugar cane have better long-run outcomes as a result of sugar factories and industrial structures promoting economic activity, with locations close to former factories in the mid-19th century being more industrialized today.

[9] See Herrendorf et al. (2014) for a survey of the literature on structural transformation.

provision of local amenities, while firms in a competitive market would not find that individually optimal.

Finally, the paper is related to the literature on the effects and spillovers of foreign direct investment (FDI). Our paper contributes to this literature by providing micro-evidence of the local benefits of large-scale FDI through private investments in the development of education and health infrastructure. Empirical studies on the effects of FDI have produced mixed evidence. While some studies find evidence of FDI being beneficial using macro- and micro-data (e.g., Blomstrom 1986; Blomstrom and Wolff 1989; Smarzynska Javorcik 2004; Lipsey 2006; Harrison and Rodríguez-Clare 2009; Alfaro-Ureña et al. 2022), others are not so optimistic about these benefits, especially for developing countries (e.g., Aitken and Harrison 1999; Borensztein et al. 1995; Xu 2000; Alfaro et al. 2003; Alfaro and Charlton 2007). We show how in a context with high labor mobility, FDI can lead to investments in local infrastructure and amenities due to the need to compete for labor.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides an overview of the historical background. Section 3 includes details of the data used in our analysis. We describe our estimation framework and empirical results in Section 4. Section 5 discusses the mechanisms behind our findings, both empirically and structurally, and Section 6 concludes.

2 Historical Background

2.1 Historical Overview

The history of banana plantations in Costa Rica dates back to the construction of a railroad from the capital city to the Caribbean Coast. In 1884, in exchange for completing the railroad, the government gave Minor C. Keith—an American contractor—a large concession of undeveloped land, which was virtually unpopulated at the time.[10] After completing the railroad's construction, Keith experimented with exporting the bananas he had planted along the railroad tracks to feed workers (Bucheli, 2005). The experiment was successful, and the UFCo was founded in 1899.

With its headquarters in Boston, the company eventually had operations in Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Nicaragua, and Panama (May and Lasso, 1958). According to the UFCo's Annual Reports to the Shareholders, by 1930, the company landholdings in Latin America reached 1,333,912 ha.

[10]This was the case for most Costa Rican rural areas at the time, as the expansion of the agricultural frontier outside of the Central Valley began in the late 19th century (León Sáenz, 2012).

The UFCo transformed the acquired lowlands into plantations and towns, where it provided healthcare, housing, schooling, and sanitation to its workers and their families. The UFCo also invested in infrastructure, such as wireless communication systems to coordinate the whole production process, and railroads to carry the bananas from the plantations to the ports where the bananas were shipped to the United States and Europe in company vessels. However, the firm was also infamous for its extractive practices in many of the "Banana Republics" where it operated. In fact, the UFCo was one of the most controversial multinationals in history, and inspired an extensive body of literature, including several fiction masterpieces.[11]

In Costa Rica, the UFCo significantly transformed the local economy. The UFCo's landholdings in the country represented roughly 8.92% of the national territory (as shown in Figure 1). By 1950, it was responsible for 58% of the country's total exports. Moreover, the UFCo employed approximately 7% of the country's total labor force and 12% of its agricultural labor force, on average throughout its tenure.

In 1984 the UFCo began a general corporate strategy to stabilize profits that divested in the production process to focus on marketing. The corporate strategy was the consequence of challenges faced by the UFCo during the 1970s, which caused severe losses. These challenges included an exportation tax on bananas levied by a cartel formed by the host countries, the Hurricane Fifi that destroyed 70% of the company's plantations in Honduras, and scandals of corruption that significantly affected the firm's stock price. As a consequence, the UFCo abandoned banana production in Costa Rica. More historical details are discussed in Appendix A.

2.2 Land Assignment

Understanding why some land was assigned to the company is key in identifying its long-run impact. It is documented that the firm took into consideration geographic characteristics when negotiating which areas were going to be part of their land concession (Casey, 1979; Cerdas Albertazzi, 1993). Thus, it is not surprising that geographical features change discretely along many segments of the UFCo boundary, as shown in Figure 1.

[11] Some examples of novels inspired by the UFCo are: "Mamita Yunai" by Carlos Luis Fallas, the "Banana Republic Trilogy" ("Strong Wind," "Green Pope," and "The Eyes of the Interred") by Miguel Ángel Asturias, and "One Hundred Years of Solitude" by Gabriel García Márquez. In terms of nonfiction and academic work, virtually all studies that rely on quantitative data consider the impact of the UFCo at the aggregate level, analyzing national or local trends in productivity, land use, and export levels (e.g., Casey 1979; Ellis 1983; Viales 1998; Royo 2009). To the best of our knowledge, our paper is the first analysis of the legacy of the UFCo using microeconomic data to estimate the firm's causal impact.

Figure 1: Costa Rica and the UFCo's boundary



Notes: The UFCo's land concession appears in black in this map of Costa Rica. Elevation is shown in the background. The concession area represents 8.92% of the national territory, and predominantly consists of flatlands near coastal areas.

One approach followed by the literature on geographic RDs, starting with Dell (2010), would be to focus on boundary segments where geographic characteristics balance. This, however, could be contaminated by unobservable characteristics that might be changing at the boundary. That is: if the land was the same quality on both sides of the border, why didn't the UFCo use it as well? To overcome this issue, we focus on a border segment where we identify an area where the land assignment was as good as random. Initially, due to ambiguities in the concession's contract, the UFCo and the government had some discrepancies regarding the limits of the concession. In 1904, a legislative decree resolved these differences in criterion. The modification declared some land—that the UFCo considered as part of the original concessions—as state property. Officially, this area was called Astúa-Pirie (Soley, 1940), and the decree specified that the property rights over these lands could not be sold back to the company (Viales, 2012).[12]

The boundaries of the Astúa-Pirie region were chosen using features of the landscape as a reference. The legislative decree declared that the southern boundary of the Astúa-Pirie region would "follow the Reventazón River, from La Junta to the Caribbean Sea;" its eastern boundary

[12]This is another benefit of focusing on this border segment: we are certain that it remained constant throughout the 85 years of the UFCo's tenure.

adjoins the Atlantic Ocean; its northern boundary would "follow an imaginary line drawn from the intersection between Toro Amarillo River with the old railroad up to a point on the coast located five miles northeast from the mouth of Tortuguero River;" finally, the western boundary would "follow the main railroad, from La Junta to the point where the railroad crosses Toro Amarillo River"(ANCR, 1904, p. 44).[13]

This southern boundary—that defines the limit between the Astúa-Pirie region and the UFCo—ended up following the Reventazón River *closely but not exactly*. The reason being that expropriation was a very costly process, and preexisting plots of land that overlapped with the river were not broken apart.[14] Instead, plots were allocated either as UFCo property or government property to follow the river as closely as possible. Figure 10 in Appendix C shows an example of how the boundary follows this natural landmark (the river)—closely but not exactly—as it was jointly determined by the river and the preexisting plots. In 1904 the government also forbid, by law, to sell the plots within the Astúa-Pirie region to the company (or any foreigner); therefore, this boundary was kept constant during the company's tenure.

In terms of preexisting demographic characteristics, note that these are trivially balanced at the start of the company's tenure, given the area remained unpopulated. This means that migrants' characteristics might be particularly relevant to understand differences in outcomes. In Section 5.2, we conduct a thorough analysis of how migrants to the UFCo compare to migrants to other comparable regions in the country, and find that migrants to the UFCo were consistently negatively selected throughout the firm's tenure, which points to our estimates being a lower bound of the firm's effect.

2.3 Commuting Between Regions

People who lived in regions near UFCo plantations, in general, did not commute and work for the company or used its services. Unlike other types of agricultural activities with seasonal demand for labor, the UFCo needed a permanent labor supply of around 150 workers per 324-ha farm, and there were several incentives to keep people from commuting in and out of the plantation.

First, due to the extension of the plantations and to reduce transportation costs, the UFCo created camps within their farms for its workers (Cerdas Albertazzi, 1993). The typical farm con-

[13] La Junta was the point where the railroad from the capital intersected the railroad from Limón. The "old railroad" was the name given to the railroad to Guápiles because it was the remains of an unsuccessful previous attempt to build a railroad to the Central Valley.

[14] The expansion of the Costa Rican agricultural frontier started in the late 19th century.

sisted of a campsite, buildings, and pasture land (Jones and Morrison, 1952). Besides houses and administrative buildings, special facilities were also present, such as commissaries, schools, electric plants, sewage systems, and recreational facilities (Wiley, 2008). The wide range of services and facilities provided by the company converted plantations into communities that allowed people to live and work full time within them.[15] Second, given concerns about malaria spreading from outside the plantation, only workers were allowed to live within the UFCo, and flows of people were discouraged. Finally, people living in areas around the UFCo had restricted access to services provided by the company. For example, as we describe in Section 5.1.1, data on patients at UFCo hospitals suggests that most of them were workers or part of a workers' family. For the few non-workers in the hospitals' records, we observe average spending per patient was lower relative to workers and their families, suggesting that commuters could not enjoy the amenities the company provided in the same way as locals.

2.4 Other Historical Examples

Historically, it has been relatively common for one or a few large companies—often foreign ones—to dominate the local economy in a developing region. In colonial and quasi-colonial arrangements, labor was sometimes coerced into working for a major producer; examples like the *mita* mining system in Peru (Dell, 2010), coffee farms in Puerto Rico (Bobonis and Morrow, 2013), or rubber cultivation in what is today the Democratic Republic of Congo (Lowes and Montero, 2021a) have been studied in detail. Another example is the Dutch East India Company, which used both coerced and paid labor while being a monopsony in many of the regions where it operated (Lucassen, 2004). Other case which involved coerced labor is the 1891 charters from the Portuguese to the Mozambique Company and the British Nyassa Company to administer the southern part of Mozambique for 50 years and the northern part of the country for 35 years, respectively (Vail, 1976). A more current example is the entrance of Firestone into Liberia in 1928, when rubber became crucial to the local economy. For instance, in 1972, Firestone produced 57% of the Liberian agricultural output and 6% of its GDP (McCoskey, 2011).

These arrangements are not limited to the developing world, for instance, in rural England, Unilever built villages with schools and hospitals during the 19th century, in order to attract and

[15] For people within the plantation, the company was omnipresent in their lives. Harpelle (2001, p. 67) mentions that typical residents "were likely born in the company hospital, educated in the company school, lived in company housing, obtained household supplies and clothing from the company commissaries, and, if they could afford it, looked forward to being carried to their final resting places in the Northern Railway's [a subsidiary of the UFCo] funeral car."

keep workers near the corporation (Watkins and Dalton, 2019). In the U.S., company towns of Michigan's Upper Peninsula provided a range of services to "attract and maintain workers in remote, resource-rich locations," including housing, medical services, and stores (Holmes, 2015, p. 12). For example, Holmes (2015) describes how Shelldrake, a town founded by a lumber company in 1895, was provided with a hospital, a school, a boardwalk, and a boardinghouse. Another example, discussed by the same author, is the company town founded by Ford in Pequaming, which also provided services like boardinghouses and subsidized the construction of schools.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that these large investment projects are not only in the past. A recent wave of large-scale land acquisitions in developing countries—the so-called "land grabs"—has been a subject of great debate. Driven mostly by a concern over food security and the biofuels boom, these projects consist of large leases (of up to 99 years) or purchases of farmland for agricultural investment in Africa, Central and Southeast Asia, Eastern Europe, and Latin America; some of them involving hundreds of thousands of acres (Cotula et al., 2009; Cotula and Vermeulen, 2009). In fact, since 2006, over 64 million acres of land were assigned to foreigners to develop agricultural activities in developing countries, and more than 30 of these concessions were larger than the UFCo's concession in Costa Rica.

3 Data

3.1 Historical Data

To understand which census-blocks were directly affected by the UFCo, we collected and digitized maps of the company's properties, which were published by the UFCo Engineering Department and are available in the Costa Rican National Archive (*Archivo Nacional de Costa Rica*).[16] We also collected, digitized and geo-referenced maps of the administrative divisions of Costa Rica in order to geo-reference censuses from 1927-2011.

For a better understanding of living standards and investments during UFCo's tenure, we collected and digitized documents published by the company. From 1912 to 1931, the Medical Department of the UFCo issued an annual report describing the sanitation and health programs carried out by the company as well as the living conditions within the UFCo plantations. Moreover, the

[16] Although the Map Library of the National University of Costa Rica (*Mapoteca Virtual de la Universidad Nacional de Costa Rica*) has digitized part of the collection, collecting all available maps required in-person visits to the archives, taking high-quality pictures of the original maps, and digitizing them. Figure 11 in Appendix C provides an example of a map showing the UFCo landholdings in the Costa Rican Pacific Coast.

company regularly circulated reports with information about the number of employees, production, and investments in areas such as education, housing, and health. We obtained primary print copies of these documents from collections held by Cornell University, the University of Kansas, and the Center for Central American Historical Studies at the University of Costa Rica (*Centro de Investigaciones Históricas de América Central de la Universidad de Costa Rica*). The print quality of the historical documents makes automatic character recognition difficult, so the data had to be digitized by hand.

We also use data from 1864, 1892, 1927, 1950, and 1963 Costa Rican Population Censuses. Although these censuses do not contain enough spatial detail to be considered in our regression discontinuity design, the information allows us to analyze aggregated population patterns, such as migration before and during the UFCo apogee, or the size and occupation of the country's labor force.

We also collected, and hand-digitized, data on expenditures, by municipality and by type, for all localities from 1955 to 1984 from official annual reports of the Comptroller General of the Republic of Costa Rica (*Contraloría General de la República de Costa Rica*). Further, we hand-digitized data from Costa Rican Statistic Yearbooks containing information on the number of patients and health expenses carried out by hospitals in Costa Rica from 1907 to 1917, including the ones ran by the UFCo. We obtained export data from Costa Rican Statistic Yearbooks as well as Export Bulletins. We collected data from 19 agricultural censuses, which between 1900 and 1984 provide information to track changes in land use in the country and agricultural output. Finally, we collected geo-references of all the schools that operated in the country between 1899 and 1984, along with data on their exact opening date from records of the Costa Rican Ministry of Education.

3.2 Outcome Data

We examine the UFCo's long-run impact on economic development by testing whether it affects living standards today. To measure living standards, we obtained restricted-access microdata from Costa Rican Population and Housing Censuses collected by the National Institute of Statistics and Census (*Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos*) for years 1973, 1984, 2000, and 2011. As the UFCo stopped operations in 1984, the range covered by these censuses allows us to analyze the outcomes during and after the company's tenure. For ease of exposition, Figure 2 shows how the available data fits into a time line of main events.

The data is recorded at the census-block level, the smallest territorial division of the country.

Both the size and borders of a census-block change across censuses. For the 1973, 1984, and 2000 censuses, each census-block contains approximately 60 dwellings in urban areas and 40 dwellings in rural areas. They also tend to coincide with one or two city blocks in urban areas (Bonilla and Rosero, 2008). For the 2011 census, in most cases, the census-block coincides with a city-block (Fallas-Paniagua, 2013). For all years, the data include each census-block centroid's coordinates. The level of spatial disaggregation provided by the census-block data allows us to compare observations within close proximity of each other.

Figure 2: Main Events and Data Availability



Except for the 1973 census, which includes information on wages, later censuses do not contain direct measures of income or consumption.[17] Further, household surveys required to construct measures as in Elbers et al. (2003) are not available in Costa Rica before 2000. Therefore, we follow the "Unsatisfied Basic Needs" (UBN) method to generate variables that measure economic outcomes. The UBN method was introduced by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, to identify households in poverty without relying on income data (Feres and Mancero, 2001), and has the advantage of generating measures that are comparable across time, as it relies only on questions that are consistent and available across censuses. The method requires specifying a set of basic needs and a threshold to consider those needs as "satisfied" (Armendáriz and Larraín B., 2017). This methodology defines four basic needs dimensions: housing, health and sanitation, education, and consumption. Each dimension consists of components selected by their explanatory power for income in Costa Rican household surveys, once these were available in 2000. In this sense, the methodology is similar to that in Elbers et al. (2003), but constrained by

[17] Moreover, as will become clear later, wages alone are not a good proxy for real income within UFCo's landholdings, as a significant share of the workers' compensation package consisted of local amenities.

the availability of data given the setting's historical nature.

Appendix B includes details on the components that constitute each of our dimensions, and the specific variables from the censuses that we use, which as mentioned earlier, were chosen based on their power to predict income based on the available household surveys. A general description of each dimension is the following: (i) housing: refers to the quality of the household dwelling's material and household overcrowding; (ii) health and sanitation: refers to the method for disposal of human excreta that the household uses; (iii) education: refers to school attendance and academic achievement for household members from 7 to 17 years old; (iv) consumption: refers to the relationship between the number of income recipients (employed, pensioned, or renter), their years of schooling, and the total number of household members. We construct each dimension as an indicator variable equal to one if the household does not meet the threshold to attain a need in some component, and zero otherwise.

We consider a household as poor if it has at least one unsatisfied need. Moreover, we estimate the severity of poverty through the total number of UBN. Namely, the total number of UBN is an index that ranges from 0 to 4, where each unsatisfied basic need adds one point to the index.

To provide complementary robustness, Appendix G discusses how results with the UBN method are also consistent with findings using nighttime lights data as a proxy for real income. Further, Appendix T shows that our findings using the UBN method align with results under the small area estimation methodology of Elbers et al. (2003), using the 2000 and 2011 censuses and the 2000 and 2011 National Household Survey. Finally, Section 5.1.3 discusses how results using the UBN method align well with individual outcomes, like years of schooling.

4 Impact of the Company

4.1 Empirical Strategy

To estimate the causal effect of the UFCo, we use well-defined boundaries based on historical records and compare observations located just inside former UFCo plantations to observations located just outside them. Our estimation of the *average* UFCo effect uses the following regression discontinuity specification:

$$y_{igt} = \gamma \mathit{UFCo}_g + f(\text{geographic location}_g) + \mathbf{X}_{igt}\beta + \mathbf{X}_g\Gamma + \alpha_t + \varepsilon_{igt}, \tag{1}$$

where y_{igt} is an outcome of individual or household i in census-block g and year t; and $UFCo_g$ is an indicator variable equal to one if the census-block g's centroid was inside a UFCo plantation, and equal to zero otherwise. $f(\text{geographic location}_g)$ is a RD polynomial, which is a smooth function on latitude and longitude that controls for the geographic location of census-block g. This multidimensional discontinuity in a longitude-latitude space allows us to compare units, not only on different sides of the boundary, but in a comparable position. Following Gelman and Imbens (2017), and in line with recent work whose estimation framework relies on a geographical RD design (Dell et al., 2015; Lowes and Montero, 2021a; Dell and Olken, 2019), we use a linear polynomial in longitude–latitude and test for robustness to a variety of specifications.[18] $\mathbf{X}_{igt}$ is a vector of covariates for individual or household i. $\mathbf{X}_g$ is a vector of geographic characteristics for census-block g, and α_t is a year fixed effect.[19]

Furthermore, to analyze a *time-varying* UFCo effect, we allow for a different UFCo coefficient in every census, by estimating the following RD specification:

$$\begin{aligned} y_{igt} =& \gamma_{1973} UFCo_{g,1973} + \gamma_{1984} UFCo_{g,1984} + \gamma_{2000} UFCo_{g,2000} + \gamma_{2011} UFCo_{g,2011} + \\ & f(\text{geographic location}_g) + \mathbf{X}_{igt}\beta + \mathbf{X}_g\Gamma + \alpha_t + \varepsilon_{igt}, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where the indicator variable $UFCo_{g,t}$ is equal to one if at time t individual or household unit i is in census-block g, whose centroid was inside a UFCo plantation; and equal to zero otherwise.

4.2 Naive Approach Considering UFCo's Entire Boundary

As a naive first approach, we run geographic RD designs along the UFCo's *entire* boundary in Costa Rica. To do so in the most general way possible, we run the RD multiple times at different distances from the border, ranging from 5 km to up to 20 km. A bandwidth of 20 km on each side of the border already spans the *entire* interior of the UFCo region. We then plot these 61 regressions per outcome—each with a bandwidth 250 m larger on each side than the previous one—for two cases: the average UFCo effect (equation (1)) and the dynamic UFCo effect by year (equation (2)).

[18] Panel A in Figures 5, 14, and 15 shows that our results are robust to alternative specifications of the RD polynomial.

[19] Panels B1 and B2 in Figures 5, 14, and 15 show that our main message is robust to alternative choices of control variables.

4.2.1 Average Effect Pooling Across Years

Figure 3 explores whether households living in areas that were directly exposed to the UFCo are on average better-off than those living just across the border. The figure includes the results of estimating equation (1), using as dependent variables the probability of being poor, the probability of an unsatisfied basic need (UBN) in each dimension (housing, health and sanitation, education, and consumption), and the total number of UBNs. All regressions include geographic controls, demographic controls for the number of household members aged 0-4 (infants), 5-14 (children), and 15 and older (adults), census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. Following Conley (1999), we allow for spatial dependence of an unknown form. For comparison, we also report robust standard errors.[20] Results are robust to using no controls, only a subset of controls, or different specifications for the polynomial, instead of the proposed baseline.[21]

Figure 3 strongly suggests that the UFCo's effect does not vary significantly depending on how close to the border we run our RD estimation, and that households living in census-blocks within UFCo borders have better living standards, on average, than their counterparts outside the UFCo. For instance Panel (a) shows how the probability of being poor is on average 4 percentage points (pp) lower for households within UFCo borders than for households outside. The effect is flat and does not seem to depend on the bandwidth we choose when running our regression, as shown by the horizontal axis of each panel.

4.2.2 Time-Varying Effect

The company stopped operations in 1984, and we examine census data from 1973-2011. Therefore, we can disentangle the differentiated effects of the company's presence during its tenure, and also at different points in time after it stopped operating. Figure 4 shows how the UFCo effect changed over time using this first naive approach. Consistently with the previous figure, this time-varying effect also changes only slightly depending on the distance from the border (horizontal axis) for all outcomes. The figure also documents how the gap between UFCo and non-UFCo regions is largest in 1973, and then slowly narrows over time. For instance, Panel (a) shows how the probability of being poor was approximately 10 pp lower for households within the UFCo in 1973 (regardless of

[20] We compute Conley standard errors for all regressions at the cutoff distance of 2 km. We choose 2 km because it is the distance that *maximizes* standard errors for all outcomes, as shown in Figure 13. Results are robust to alternative cutoffs (up to the maximum one allowed by the plantation's size), and to the placebo tests reported in Table 12.

[21] Figure 5 shows robustness tests for our main specification. Robustness tests for this naive regression using the entire boundary deliver similar results, and are available upon request.

Figure 3: Average UFCo Effect Considering the Entire Concession's Border



(a) Probability of Being Poor



(b) Total Number of UBN



(c) Housing Dimension



(d) Health Dimension



(e) Education Dimension



(f) Consumption Dimension

Notes: The figure shows how the UFCo effect varies depending on the maximum distance from the border that we allow in each regression (61 regressions per outcome). The effect is robust to varying distances. 95% confidence intervals in gray are based on robust standard errors clustered at the census-block level, while dotted lines denote Conley 95% confidence intervals.

the bandwidth chosen to run the RD), and that the effect had decreased to approximately 2 pp by 2011.

4.3 Balance of Pre-Existing Characteristics and Random Land Assignment

After the previous section's naive RD, we proceed with two more sophisticated approaches. First, we restrict the analysis to areas where characteristics balance before UFCo's arrival. This is in line with the strategy most of the literature on geographic RD designs follows, starting with the seminal paper by Dell (2010), and including more recent work like Lowes and Montero (2021b). The idea behind this approach is to account for pre-existing differences that might affect outcomes independently of whether the UFCo was present or not.

In terms of pre-existing social and economic characteristics, the study area was close to being uninhabited before the UFCo's arrival. According to the 1864 Costa Rican Census, only 545 people lived in the entire Caribbean Coast—a 0.45% of the Costa Rican population at that time (Oficina Central de Estadística, 1868). Company officials wrote that when they first arrived "with the exception of the little village of Matina, which contained fifty or sixty inhabitants, not one individual was settled anywhere on the line [in 1883, just before the contract with the government was signed (see Figure 2)]"(Keith, 1886, p. 8). This was not "special" about this region, in fact, it was the case for most Costa Rican rural areas at the time, as the expansion of the Costa Rican agricultural frontier did not start until the late 19th century. This means that *demographic* characteristics (trivially) balance on both sides of the concession's border at the start of the firm's tenure. Thus, we begin by examining results in areas where *geographic* characteristics balance on both sides of the UFCo border.[22] Estimations corresponding with equations (1) and (2) are shown on Tables 10 and 11. Overall, our results are quite similar to those presented in the previous section: we consistently find that households within the UFCo have higher living standards than their neighbors outside, even after limiting the sample to areas with comparable pre-existing observable characteristics.

While this is the standard approach, potentially there could still be unobservable elements changing right at the border, which are not captured by measures of pre-existing characteristics. In other words: if the land right outside the UFCo border was just as good to produce as the one inside the concession, why didn't the company try to include this land in the concession as well? Thus, for our preferred specifications, *we take a step forward with respect to the standard in the*

[22] Table 8 shows the results of the balance test in these areas.

Figure 4: Dynamic UFCo Effect Considering the Entire Concession's Border



(a) Probability of Being Poor

(b) Total Number of UBN

(c) Housing Dimension

(d) Health Dimension

(e) Education Dimension

(f) Consumption Dimension

Notes: The figure shows the evolution of the UFCo effect across years for several outcome variables. The absolute effect is decreasing over time in all cases. 95% Confidence intervals (in gray) are based on robust standard errors clustered at the census-block level. While it is unfeasible to show Conley standard errors for all regressions graphically, they are available upon request.

literature, and exploit exogenous variation in the land assignment to address this potential issue.

To do so, we exploit the redrawing of the boundary that was described in Section 2.2, and conduct the RD analysis only in segments *of the redrawn border* where geographic characteristics are balanced. In line with the latter, we test a null hypothesis of no geographical differences on both sides of this segment of the UFCo boundary, and we fail to reject this null in the segment shown in Figure 9. In this area, two things are true: (i) geographic characteristics on both sides of the border balance, *and* (ii) the border was redrawn arbitrarily, depending on how a river intersected pre-existing plots of land.[23] *This is our preferred specification.*

Table 9 shows that elevation, slope, and temperature do not change discretely across this segment of the UFCo boundary.[24] As in the previous section, we allow for spatial dependence of an unknown form (reported in brackets), and report robust standard errors (in parentheses).[25] This table also shows that as we move away from this segment of the boundary, the differences in elevation, slope, and temperature become significant.

Therefore, exploiting the level of disaggregation of our data—which includes more than 9,000 households even within this specific subregion—and not to contaminate the analysis that might be very sensitive to changes in the landscape (most economic activities were related to agriculture), our main results will include only observations whose census-block's centroid is located within 5 km from this segment of the UFCo boundary; where we know the border was arbitrary and observable geographic features are balanced. Consistent with the very stable coefficients that we documented in Section 4.2, results change very little as we increase our bandwidth beyond 5 km. In fact, as shown in Figures 3 and 4, within this redrawn segment, when we re-run the estimates increasing the distance from the border from 5 km to 20 km (250 m at a time) regressions deliver

[23] Figure 10 shows an example of how the study boundary follows a natural landmark (the river) closely, but not exactly, as it was jointly determined by the river and preexisting plots. In 1904 the government forbid, by law, to sell the plots in orange back to the company (or any foreigner), therefore this boundary was kept constant during the company's tenure.

[24] The unit of analysis to examine the geographic characteristics is a 1x1 km grid cell. Results are statistically equal if we use census-blocks as the unit of analysis. Elevation and temperature data were obtained from the Global Climate Database created by Hijmans et al. (2005). The spatial resolution is 30 arc-seconds. Elevation above sea level is in meters and was constructed using NASA's Shuttle Radar Topography Mission data. From the elevation information, we calculate the slope (in degrees). Hijmans et al. also compiled monthly averages of temperature measured by weather stations from 1960 to 1990. We measure temperature in Celsius and take an annual average.

[25] Conley standard errors are computed using a cutoff distance of 2 km, and this distance *maximizes* standard errors for all outcomes, as shown in Figure 13. Results are robust to alternative cutoffs ranging from 2 to 10 km (the maximum allowed by the plantation's size), and to the placebo tests reported in Table 12.

extremely similar coefficients.[26] That is, our results are not driven by the fact that we focus on this area, although restricting the analysis to this area allows us to have a clean regression and exploit exogenous variation in the land assignment.

4.3.1 Average Effect Pooling Across Years

Table 1 explores whether households living in areas that were directly exposed to the UFCo are on average better off than those living just across the border. The table includes the results of estimating equation (1) using the probability of having an unsatisfied basic need (UBN) in each dimension (housing, health and sanitation, education, and consumption), the probability of being poor, and the total number of UBNs as dependent variables. All regressions include geographic and demographic controls, census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We report standard errors clustered at the census-block level and Conley standard errors.

Table 1: Average UFCo Effect

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UFCo	-0.102	-0.022	-0.054	-0.066	-0.133	-0.244
	(0.026)***	(0.017)	(0.022)**	(0.024)***	(0.030)***	(0.056)***
	[0.031]***	[0.015]	[0.016]***	[0.025]***	[0.026]***	[0.054]***
Adjusted R^2	0.101	0.169	0.238	0.015	0.115	0.198
Observations	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179
Clusters	206	206	206	206	206	206
Mean	0.171	0.058	0.232	0.199	0.475	0.658
% Variation w.r.t. Mean	**-60.0**	**-39.0**	**-23.2**	**-33.0**	**-27.9**	**-37.1**

Notes: UBN=Unsatisfied Basic Need. The last row shows the percentage variation in each coefficient with respect to the sample's mean. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

The estimates suggest that the households located in the former UFCo region are in general better off. Columns (1) to (4) of Table 1 show that UFCo households have had higher living standards. Note that, although some coefficients might seem somewhat small, the percentage variation of these probabilities with respect to their sample mean (last row) is sizable. For instance, the first coefficient of column (1) implies that households within former UFCo areas had 10.2

[26] We stop at a bandwidth of 20 km on each side of the border, as with this distance the RD already spans the entire interior of the UFCo's concession.

pp lower probability of having an unsatisfied housing need than their neighbors outside UFCo lands between 1973 and 2011; a 60 percent decrease with respect to the sample's mean. These households also had 2.2 pp, 5.4 pp, and 6.6 pp lower probability of having an unsatisfied need in health, education, and consumption, respectively.

Households in former UFCo areas also had a 13.3 pp lower probability of being poor (column (5)); a 28 percent variation with respect to the sample's mean. Column (6)—the number of UBN—should be read differently than other columns, as it takes values that range from 0 to 4, and implies that the severity of poverty was lower within former UFCo areas, where the households had, on average, 0.244 fewer unsatisfied needs than the households in the non-UFCo control region.

Figure 12 in Appendix D summarizes these results in three-dimensional plots. The figure shows the spatial distribution of the centroids of the census-blocks and the study boundary across space. The sharp discontinuity at the UFCo boundary is noticeable for each of our outcomes, with better outcomes coinciding with former UFCo regions in every case.

Importantly, *these results in the border segment where the random assignment happened are very similar—and in many cases statistically equal—to those presented in Section 4.2*, where we considered the entire boundary and different bandwidths. Thus, they do not seem to be specific to this border segment, but valid for the broader UFCo area.

4.3.2 Time-Varying Effect

We now study how the company's effect evolved across time, between 1973 and 2011, both during the firm's tenure (before 1984), and also after it stopped operating (from 1984 onwards). Table 2 documents how the UFCo effect changed over time. The magnitudes of the UFCo effect are particularly high given the mean probabilities for the entire region (bottom panel). The probability of being poor and the total number of UBN are quite persistent over time. The probability of an unsatisfied housing need is also very persistent across years; column (1) shows how, in 2011, approximately 30 years after the UFCo left, households within UFCo former lands are 8.9 percentage points less likely of having a UBN in housing relative to households outside. The effect on health and sanitation rapidly vanishes and is insignificant after 1973.[27] Finally, education and consumption are always worse outside the UFCo, but the significance of the coefficients disappears after 2000.

[27] After 1980, there was significant investment in sanitation infrastructure throughout the country, which connected most households to the sanitation system both inside and outside UFCo areas. This aligns with the low mean registered in the censuses starting in 1984.

Table 2 also shows how, since 1973, the treated and untreated regions have converged slowly, with only 59% of the poverty gap closing over the following four decades. More generally, the *severity* of poverty—measured by the number of UBN—has decreased over time: while in 1973 a household within the UFCo landholdings had 0.704 less UBN than a household outside, in 2011 this difference was, albeit significant, down to 0.127.

Table 2: Contemporary Household Outcomes: Dynamics Across Years

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
$UFCo_{1973}$	-0.224	-0.288	-0.056	-0.135	-0.254	-0.704
	(0.062)***	(0.079)***	(0.045)	(0.045)***	(0.067)***	(0.157)***
	[0.065]***	[0.077]***	[0.035]	[0.047]***	[0.053]***	[0.145]***
$UFCo_{1984}$	-0.068	0.010	-0.084	-0.076	-0.094	-0.218
	(0.047)	(0.028)	(0.028)***	(0.035)**	(0.047)**	(0.092)**
	[0.033]**	[0.013]	[0.023]***	[0.031]**	[0.034]***	[0.068]***
$UFCo_{2000}$	-0.089	0.017	-0.055	-0.090	-0.143	-0.217
	(0.031)***	(0.017)	(0.022)**	(0.027)***	(0.037)***	(0.059)***
	[0.031]***	[0.015]	[0.015]***	[0.026]***	[0.032]***	[0.055]***
$UFCo_{2011}$	-0.089	0.019	-0.038	-0.019	-0.103	-0.127
	(0.031)***	(0.016)	(0.029)	(0.035)	(0.038)***	(0.063)**
	[0.030]***	[0.018]	[0.029]	[0.053]	[0.051]**	[0.092]
Adjusted R^2	0.103	0.198	0.238	0.017	0.117	0.206
Observations	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179
Clusters	206	206	206	206	206	206
$Mean_{1973}$	0.462	0.353	0.393	0.208	0.777	1.416
$Mean_{1984}$	0.209	0.060	0.362	0.201	0.579	0.832
$Mean_{2000}$	0.145	0.031	0.230	0.178	0.452	0.584
$Mean_{2011}$	0.118	0.016	0.156	0.211	0.396	0.501

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

These time-varying results in the border segment where the random assignment happened are very similar—and in many cases statistically equal—to those presented in Section 4.2, where we considered both the entire boundary and many different bandwidths. They are also consistent with estimates that, instead of focusing on the segment where the border was redrawn, consider *all* the border segments where geographic characteristics balance. Thus, they do not seem to be specific to this border segment, but valid for the broader UFCo area.

Additional Robustness Checks While we postpone the discussion on the role of migration and spillovers to Section 5.2, which studies potential mechanisms that could have led to the gap in outcomes between regions that we documented, we discuss additional robustness checks for our RD in Appendix E, including falsification tests, different bandwidth and polynomials, different control variables and distance to a railroad and the river. We also recompute our RD using alternative income measures (nighttime lights data and the small area estimation methodology of Elbers et al. (2003)). Figure 5 summarizes these results.

5 Mechanisms

The results documented so far can be somewhat surprising. In fact, they go against the narrative that surrounds the UFCo in many Latin American countries. To understand the channels that led to the difference between regions that we found with our empirical strategy, we collected data on a variety of outcomes from primary sources spanning the firm's 85 years of tenure, and digitized it.[28] In Section 5.1, we document the mechanism for which we find more evidence: investments in local amenities (such as schools and hospitals) being much larger within the UFCo landholdings than in nearby regions throughout the firm's tenure. What are the economics that led to these investments in the first place? Studying company reports, in Section 5.1.4, we show how the bulk of these investments arose from the need to attract and maintain a sizable workforce. Section 5.2 studies and rules-out, one by one, other plausible mechanisms that might have led to our results, including selective migration and negative spillovers from the company to neighboring regions. Finally, having established what the relevant mechanism is, Section 5.4 proposes a model that incorporates this mechanism, and where we allow the firm to invest in local amenities as a way to attract workers. This framework allows us to have a better understanding of the company's aggregate effect, and to run counterfactual exercises to shed light on how the firm's impact changes in scenarios with dramatically less worker mobility. The latter is a word of warning of how a setting with a larger degree of coercion—like what might have occurred in other Latin American countries—can lead to worse economic outcomes, and highlights the key role of labor mobility in determining local outcomes.

[28] Almost all of this data had to be scanned, was not machine-readable, and had to be imputed by hand and double-checked.

Figure 5: Robustness checks for the Main Specification: Average UFCo Effect



Notes: In the bottom panel, black dots indicate the controls added in each regression that is vertically aligned with these dots. Figures 14 and 15 show similar checks for the effect **by year** (1973-2011). Individual tables with these regressions are reported in the supplementary Online Appendix for the authors' websites.

5.1 Investments in Local Amenities

5.1.1 Investment in Healthcare and Sanitation

Approximately five thousand workers died constructing the railroad to the Caribbean Coast in Costa Rica, due to the unhealthy and dangerous conditions of the tropical forest (Bucheli, 2005). This experience, along with lessons from the Panama Canal's construction, taught managers about the importance of sanitation and healthcare to sustain a large workforce in an environment threatened by tropical diseases. As a consequence, the UFCo invested in sanitation infrastructure, launched health programs, and provided medical attention to its employees.

Infrastructure investments included pipes, drinking water systems, sewage systems, street lighting, macadamized roads, and dikes (Sanou and Quesada, 1998). In 1905 the UFCo established a Medical Department in Costa Rica to carry out sanitation programs and medical research on tropical diseases. By 1942 three company hospitals operated in the country. Their staff included doctors, sanitary inspectors, and nurses from the United States and other Central American countries (Morgan, 1993). Each hospital had up-to-date surgical and X-ray equipment, laboratory, outpatient department, and steam laundry (Deeks, 1924).

Employees and their dependents had access to medical and surgical treatment, including medicines in the case of employees, without any additional charge (UFCo, 1917).[29] Moreover, neighbors from non-UFCo regions could not commute and get access to the same quality of healthcare. As Figure 6b shows, between 1907 and 1917, workers or their families who were classified as payroll and attended a UFCo hospital (dashed line) received more than twice the spending per patient than people who attended UFCo hospitals but were *not* in its the payroll (dotted line). Although a higher level of spending does not necessarily imply a higher quality of health care, UFCo's medical services were known of being among the best in the country (Casey, 1979). For reference, we also show expenditure per patient in the most modern *public* hospital at the time (San Juan de Dios); which suggests a non-worker would have been on average better-off attending this government-run hospital than commuting to the UFCo's hospital.[30]

Despite the positive impact of the UFCo programs, its benefits were restricted to employees and their immediate families (Kepner, 1936; Chomsky, 1996). The general manager of the Medical Department explained that given the size of the UFCo landholdings, it was impossible from a

[29] To cover healthcare for employees and their dependents, the UFCo deducted a mandatory fee equivalent to 2% from their salary.

[30] Moreover, although non-employees could receive medical attention in the UFCo healthcare network, they had to pay high fees.

commercial standpoint to sanitate completely all areas and therefore their efforts were "mainly directed to protecting the larger communities and camps where our employees are located" (UFCo, 1922, p. 6). In fact, to increase sanitary benefits, company doctors suggested preventing workers from traveling between plantations and surrounding villages, which were unscreened.

5.1.2 Investments in Housing Infrastructure

Given the remoteness of the plantations and to reduce transportation costs, the UFCo provided the majority of its workers with free housing *within* the company's land. This was partially motivated by concerns with diseases like malaria and yellow fever, which spread easily if the population is constantly commuting from outside the plantation. Each of the UFCo's divisions consisted of farms, and each farm had a camp where workers lived.

Usually, houses for plantation laborers were laid out around a soccer field. By 1958 the majority of laborers lived in barracks-type structures. Single families occupied the majority of barracks, and there were buildings for unmarried workers (May and Lasso, 1958). These barrack structures exceeded the standards of many surrounding communities (Wiley, 2008).

Related to the sanitary programs impulsed by the UFCo, a squad cleaned the grounds, collected trash, systematically sprayed with DDT to control for mosquitos and insects, and scrubbed out public toilets and bathing facilities. Moreover, the water supplied to the taps was safe for drinking. Besides housing, the UFCo provided basic services *for its employees* within each camp, such as schools, commissaries, dispensaries, and recreational facilities. May and Lasso (1958, p. 209) claim that "the places of worship, recreational facilities, and athletic fields and equipment provided for United's workers are upon a scale matched by few, if any, locally owned agricultural enterprises."

5.1.3 Investments in Human Capital

One of the services that the company provided within its camps was primary education to the children of its employees. The curriculum in the schools included vocational training and before the 1940s, was taught mostly in English. The emphasis on primary education was significant, and child labor became uncommon in the banana regions (Viales, 1998). By 1955, the company had constructed 62 primary schools within its landholdings in Costa Rica (May and Lasso, 1958). As shown in Figure 6a,[31] spending per student in schools operated by the UFCo was consistently

[31] In Figure 6a, the amounts were converted to constant 2015 Costa Rican Colones (CRC) by splicing four price indexes: (i) Cost of Living Index Base 1936 = 100 (*Índice de costo de la vida Base 1936 =100*) ; (ii)

higher than public spending in primary education between 1947 and 1963.[32] On average, the company's yearly spending was 23% higher than the government's spending during this period.

Figure 6: Differences in Spending UFCo vs Government



(a) Spending per Student

(b) Spending per Patient

Notes: Panel (a) shows data on spending per student (in 2015 Costa Rican Colones) in UFCo schools vs local schools run by the government, between 1947-1963. Data results from authors' calculations based on company reports "*Compañia Bananera de Costa Rica. Algunos datos sobre sus actividades*" and Molina (2017). Panel (b) shows data on spending per patient (in Costa Rican Colones), between 1907-1917 in UFCo hospitals, and compares it with spending per patient in the San Juan de Dios Hospital; the largest Costa Rican hospital at the time. Data was calculated based on 1907-1917 Costa Rican Statistic Yearbooks.

By the time children completed primary education, they were old enough to work. Although the UFCo did not provide directly secondary education, it subsidized it in some cases.[33] Despite this subsidy, however, secondary and tertiary education were costly and out of reach for most children.

To assess the impact of UFCo's educational investments on current human capital accumulation, we estimate equation (1) using educational attainment as the outcome variable. Table 13 finds a positive and statistically significant UFCo effect on human capital accumulation and primary education attainment: we document that individuals within the former UFCo landholdings had 0.223 more years of schooling and were 4.8 pp more likely to have completed primary edu-

Consumer Price Index for Middle Income and Low-Income Citizens in the Metropolitan Area Base 1964 = 100 (*Índice de precios al consumidor de ingresos medios y bajos del Área Metropolitana Base 1964=100*) ; (iii) Consumer Price Index Base January 1995 = 100 (*Índice de precios al consumidor Base Enero 1995 = 100*) ; (iv) Consumer Price Index Base June 2015 = 100 (*Índice de precios al consumidor Base Junio 2015 = 100*).

[32]Data is only available for this subset of years.

[33]If the parents could afford the first two years of secondary education of their children in the United States, the UFCo paid for the last two years and provided free transportation to and from the United States. Moreover, if the parents organized secondary schools by themselves and paid a private tuition fee for the teachers, the UFCo provided a building and furniture (May and Lasso, 1958).

cation, while—consistent with the narrative in the last paragraph—the effect on secondary is not significant.

Investment in Human Capital and Persistence of the Effect The answer to why the impact of the UFCo is so long-lasting may be linked to its investments in human capital. The reason being that individuals who were exposed to company schools may have higher human capital for the rest of their lives, regardless of whether the company is still there or not. That is, this investment in amenities is embodied in the individuals who were exposed to schools as children. To explore this, we leverage information about the place of birth of each individual in the censuses. Then, we look at individuals who were born inside the UFCo *while the UFCo was operating*, and were at least 12 years old when the company left in 1984—so that they had a chance to finish primary at a company school—and compare them to their non-UFCo counterparts. Table 48 shows how individuals who were exposed to UFCo schools as children have higher human capital than their counterparts outside the firm; they have both significantly higher average years of schooling and a higher probability of finishing primary school. Moreover, this gap is statistically equal across censuses. The latter would explain why results are so persistent and decreasing over time: UFCo investment is embodied in people who attended UFCo schools, and while these people represent a smaller share of the population across time, they do exhibit higher human capital throughout their lives.

5.1.4 Why So Much Investment? Outside Options and Worker Turnover

While it is easier to conceive the benefits that the company could derive from investing in hospitals and having healthy workers, it is less clear why it would benefit from more educated children or from other local amenities it provided, such as churches and recreational facilities. In general, the UFCo gave prominent consideration to its employee's family life and leisure time. An article describing the activities of the company states:

> "The welfare work of the Company in the Tropics has assumed large proportions and has a direct bearing on the health and contentment of the employees. The Company has built and maintains churches and schools ..., and has erected and equipped club houses and amusement halls to provide entertainment for employees. It has also provided baseball grounds, and tennis courts" (Deeks, 1924, p. 1008).

A series of company publications suggest that the firm's welfare program was motivated by the need to attract and maintain a sizable workforce. High turnover was common, given the workers' outside option, which was coffee. While bananas, grow year-round, coffee is a seasonal crop and offered high wages during its harvesting season. During and before the 1920s, United Fruit Company's Annual Reports consistently recognized worker turnover as being an important problem to address. For instance, the 1923 Annual Report states:

> "The greatest difficulty encountered in our work among employees is attributable to the fact that a large percentage of the labor, particularly in new land-cultivations, is migratory. The Superintendent of Agriculture in one of the divisions estimates that a laborer's length of stay in that division averages less than two months." (UFCo, 1924, p. 45)

The 1922 Annual Report also states:

> "The inhabitants in stable communities can be kept under more strict control, and can be educated to take better care of themselves and to observe more closely the necessary precautions for maintaining health than is possible with the mixed and fluctuating populations on our plantations. ...There is a constant overturn of labor and we are periodically importing new laborers ...Their innate migratory habits do not permit them to remain on one plantation from year to year, but *as soon as they become physically efficient and acquire a little money they either return to their homes or migrate elsewhere and must be replaced* [emphasis added]." (UFCo, 1923, pp. 74-75)

As a solution to the high turnover rates, the reports recommended to increase investments in local amenities beyond medical measures. According to the 1925 Annual Report:

> "An endeavor should be made to stabilize the population...We must not only build and maintain attractive and comfortable camps, but we must also provide measures for taking care of the families of married men, by furnishing them with *garden facilities, schools and some forms of entertainment. In other words, we must take an interest in our people if we may hope to retain their services indefinitely* [emphasis added]." (UFCo, 1926, p. 185)

Consequently, the company intensified investments in local amenities in the mid-1920s. These investments proved to be successful in decreasing turnover. In 1929 a farm superintendent wrote:

"sanitary measures have helped to stabilize labor and increase their ability to perform work [...] during recent years with little or no influx of labor we have not experienced the recurrent shortages of labor that used to occur in previous years" (UFCo, 1930, p. 10). Although the Great Depression temporarily constrained the investments, the UFCo continued them in the late 1930s.

This sheds new light on a potential mechanism behind our positive results: Given the workers' outside options and initially high levels of turnover, there was a need to retain employees, which led to an increase in investments in "welfare" (local amenities), which could explain the positive effect on development we previously documented. We explore the mechanism described in these reports empirically and quantitatively. Namely, we test the existence of a positive relationship between better long-term outcomes and workers' outside options during the UFCo times. Intuitively, higher outside options while the UFCo was still operating would have lead to higher UFCo investments to retain workers, and consequently, to more favorable economic outcomes in the long term.[34]

To proxy for the outside option of workers *within* an UFCo district j *during* UFCo times, we propose to use the sum of the average agricultural real wage in each district k *outside* the UFCo region, weighted by the inverse of the distance between j and k. We consider data on real agricultural wages from the population census that dates back to 1973, while the UFCo was still operating. Further, as outside options in 1973 might be correlated with outside options today, we control for *current* real agricultural wages, which are measured using matched employer-employee data from the Costa Rican Social Security Fund (*Caja Costarricense del Seguro Social*).[35] Specifically, we consider the following specification:

$$\begin{aligned} y_{ijt} =& \beta \ln \sum_{k \notin \text{UFCo}} \frac{wage_{k,1973}}{price_{k,1973}} \frac{(dist_{jk})^{-1}}{\sum_n (dist_{jn})^{-1}} + \gamma \ln \sum_{k \neq i} \frac{wage_{k,t}}{price_{k,t}} \frac{(dist_{jk})^{-1}}{\sum_n (dist_{jn})^{-1}} \\ &+ f(\text{geographic location}_g) + \mathbf{X}_{igt}\psi + \mathbf{X}_g\Gamma + \alpha_t + \varepsilon_{ijt}, \text{ for } j \in \text{UFCo}; \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $y^i_{j,t}$ denotes the outcome of household i in district j (within the UFCo region) and t will stand for outcomes years after the UFCo stoppped operations; in particular, we will consider $t \in \{2000, 2011\}$. Other controls—in the equation's second row—have the same definitions as in our main specification (equation (1)).

The results of this first approach are reported in Table 3. Indeed, we find that areas where

[34] We take this indirect approach, instead of comparing outside options with investments, as data on UFCo investments is too aggregated to exploit spatial variation.

[35] This data includes the occupation, wage, and location of the universe of formal workers in the country. The earliest year in which this data is available is 2006. Thus, we use 2006 as a proxy of the distribution of wages in 2000. For 2011, we consider 2011 wages. All results hold if we only consider 2011.

UFCo workers had better outside options in 1973, exhibit disproportionately better outcomes in recent years. For instance, from column (5), we see that a one percent increase in the outside option of workers in an UFCo region in 1973 is associated with 2.25 pp lower probability of being poor for households in that region in 2011 and 2000.

Table 3: Outside Option in 1973 for UFCo Workers and Outcomes in 2000 and 2011 within the UFCo

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
ln Outside	-2.388	-0.635	-1.093	-0.318	-2.263	-4.434
Option in 1973	(0.759)***	(0.218)***	(0.675)	(0.666)	(1.135)*	(2.097)**
	[1.027]**	[0.250]**	[0.893]	[0.861]	[1.831]	[2.826]
Adjusted R^2	0.033	0.011	0.152	0.013	0.055	0.084
Observations	341,665	341,665	341,665	341,665	341,665	341,665
Clusters	114	114	114	114	114	114
Mean	0.151	0.034	0.154	0.178	0.391	0.518

Notes: UBN = Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the individual. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by district-year, are in parentheses. All regressions control for current outside options, and controls for contemporaneous outside options; the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

A potential endogeneity concern given these results, however, is that UFCo investments might have increased real wages in relatively close regions. To address this, we use an instrumental variables (IV) strategy. In our first stage, we propose a region's suitability to grow coffee as an instrument for its real agricultural wages. Along with banana production, coffee was the main economic activity in Costa Rica, and the main alternative source of employment for agricultural workers. Moreover, coffee and bananas grow optimally under different geographic and climatic conditions: While coffee is grown in highlands because higher elevation increases coffee's acidity and its commercial value, bananas slow down their growth rate as the elevation increases (Viales and Montero, 2015).

The idea behind this instrument is that regions more suitable to grow coffee in 1973—which grows in a different climate and altitude than banana—should offer higher wages for agricultural workers. Thus, the closest an UFCo region is to a place suitable to grow coffee, the higher the outside option will be for UFCo workers in this area, which in turn, would have led to more UFCo

investments and hence better outcomes in 2000 and 2011.[36]

To measure an area's suitability to grow coffee, we regress coffee intensity in district j—defined as the fraction of agricultural land used for cultivating coffee in district j—in 1973, during UFCo times, on geographic characteristics (slope, temperature, elevation) and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. Data on cultivated area is consistent with FAO's statistics, however, FAO coffee suitability data for Costa Rica is too spatially aggregated and not available for 1973, which led us to create this similar measure ourselves, using yields and area from the agricultural census that is geo-referenced at higher spatial frequencies.[37] Data on agricultural wages comes from the 1973 Population Census, while data on coffee production is obtained from the 1973 Agricultural Census. The first panel of Table 4 shows the result of this first stage. A one percent increase in the coffee intensity of (distance-weighted) neighboring regions is associated with 0.178 percent higher wages in 1973. The effect is statistically significant at the 5% level.[38]

For our second stage, we regress economic outcomes in 2000 and 2011 for household i in region j on our distance-weighted measure of the coffee-intensity of nearby regions in 1973, along with all the controls present in equation (3). The second panel of Table 4 displays the results of our IV strategy. All coefficients are consistent with, albeit smaller than, the ones of the OLS regression in Table 3. We find that a higher outside option in 1973 is associated with better contemporary outcomes in all cases. For instance, according to the coefficient in column (5), an increase in one percent in the average outside option of an UFCo region in 1973 is associated with a 0.717 pp lower probability of being poor in the long term (2000 and 2011). These results are shown graphically in Figure 17, in which locations where workers had better outside options during the UFCo's tenure are consistently associated with higher living standards in 2000 and 2011.

[36]Note that we are already controlling for agricultural wages in non-UFCo coffee-suitable areas in 2000 and 2011.

[37]FAO data is *only* available as a 30-year average, that considers many years after the UFCo stopped operations.

[38]Moreover, the first-stage F-statistic is in the order of 32, reducing concerns that coffee suitability is a weak instrument at predicting variation in agricultural wages (Stock et al., 2002).

Table 4: IV Strategy: Outside Options in 1973 for UFCo Workers and Outcomes in 2000 and 2011 within the UFCo

First Stage (*Dependent Variable:* ln *1973 Real Wages)*						
ln Distance-Weighted	Coefficient	Clustered SE	Clusters	F-Statistic	Adj-R^2	Observations
Coffee Intensity	0.178	(0.071)**	356	31.751	0.265	86,946

Second Stage (*Dependent Variables: 2000-2011 Outcomes)*						
	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
ln Outside	-0.720	-0.247	-0.277	-0.124	-0.691	-1.368
Option in 1973	(0.191)***	(0.069)***	(0.166)*	(0.176)	(0.360)*	(0.549)**
	[0.256]***	[0.082]***	[0.220]	[0.215]	[0.481]	[0.729]*
Adjusted R^2	0.033	0.011	0.152	0.013	0.055	0.085
Observations	341,665	341,665	341,665	341,665	341,665	341,665
Clusters	114	114	114	114	114	114
Mean	0.151	0.034	0.154	0.178	0.391	0.518

Notes: First stage: coffee intensity and wages are measured at district level. Second stage: UBN = Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the individual. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by district-year, are in parentheses. All regressions (both stages) include controls for contemporaneous outside options; the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

We can use a similar approach to the one above, but this time with *investment in local amenities during UFCo times* as our dependent variable. To do so, we geo-referenced the location of every school in the country and collected data on the date when each of them was founded. This allowed us to identify the exact location of UFCo schools and their opening date. Again, using the suitability to grow coffee as an IV, we run equation (3) by census block. This time, our dependent variable is the *number of primary school-aged children per school in an UFCo census block*.[39] We document that a higher outside option leads to more schools in a given location. In particular, we find that a 1% increase in the outside option of an UFCo region reduces the number of students per school in that location by 3.7% (see Table 5).[40] An alternative measure using density of schools by census-block as a dependent variable delivers qualitatively the same results.

[39] If a given census-block has no school, we assigned the children living in that location to the closest school.

[40] The first stage of this table corresponds with the top panel of Table 4.

Table 5: Students per School, Number of Schools in a Location, and Its Outside Option

	ln Students per school	Number of schools per census block
	(1)	(2)
ln Outside Option in 1973	-3.702	5.720
	$(0.473)^{***}$	$(1.332)^{***}$
Adjusted R^2	0.507	-
Observations	380	380

Notes: Column (1) shows results using an OLS model on the number of students per school within the UFCo (in logs), while column (2) uses a PPML on the number of schools within the census block. The independent variable is UFCo workers' outside options instrumented with coffee suitability by district. We approximate the number of students with the number of primary school-aged children. Robust standard errors (in parenthesis) clustered by census-block. The regression includes geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); the census block area; the number of people living in the census block, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Why Local Amenities Instead of Simply Higher Wages? As described above, turnover was seasonal, and workers dropped out during the coffee harvest season because there were short-term opportunities to earn more. As bananas need to be attended all year round, the seasonal disappearance of workers was very costly. This problem is particularly serious for coffee, whose prices are determined in the world market. This relates to why UFCo provides schooling and amenities rather than higher wages: short of matching the peak season coffee wage, which would be disastrously expensive and hard to guess, a way to prevent workers from leaving during the peak season is to provide amenities for them and their families. To explore this idea further, we use the data we collected on the foundation date of schools located within UFCo landholdings. With this information, we then use variation of the world coffee price across time. We document that during periods when coffee prices were higher, the UFCo invested more in amenities. In particular, as shown in column (1) of Table 6, a 1% increase in coffee prices is associated with an increase in the probability that the UFCo opened a school within its lands of 0.413 pp. The result is consistent with estimates that use the number of schools opened as the dependent variable, as shown in column (2) of Table 6.[41]

Further, we leverage newly digitized special reports that, between 1946 and 1956, include detailed breakdowns of UFCo's expenditures in amenities and payroll (LaBarge, 1959). We find that expenditures in medical care, education, and total amenities are positively correlated with world coffee prices (with correlations of 0.88, 0.93, and 0.91, respectively). Moreover, the correlation between coffee prices and expenditures in amenities *as a share of total worker compensation* is 0.87. This aligns with the idea that it is competition with coffee that explains why UFCo provides schooling and amenities rather than higher wages.

[41] This result holds regardless of whether we use OLS, a negative binomial regression model, or PPML.

Table 6: Schools Opened per Year and Coffee Prices (1899-1984)

	Prob(Opening a school)	Number of schools opened
	(1)	(2)
ln World Coffee Prices	0.413	1.636
	(0.111)***	(0.328)***
Adjusted R^2	0.077	-
Observations	86	86

Notes: Column (1) shows results using an OLS model on the probability that a school opened within UFCo lands as the dependent variable, while column (2) uses a negative binomial regression model for the number of schools opened in a given year. Robust standard errors (in parenthesis) clustered by year. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

The Caribbean Coast, the Pacific Coast, and the Role of Race In the previous section, we causally documented how locations within the UFCo where workers had better outside options while the company was operating—i.e., locations where workers were closer to areas that were highly suitable to grow coffee—are associated with higher living standards in 2000 and 2011. We can also ask whether outside options differ for workers near the Costa Rican Caribbean Coast and the Pacific Coast. Table 20 documents how, indeed, UFCo households near the Pacific Coast have better living standards than their neighbors. Although these differences are not significant for all outcomes, the size of the interacted coefficients is not negligible when compared to the sign of the UFCo dummy, and differences are significant for housing and health. There are a few reasons why differences between households living on both coasts might emerge. First, consistent with Table 4, households near the Pacific are relatively closer to areas that are highly suitable to grow coffee, which increases their outside option and would lead to better living standards through the lens of our mechanism. In fact, on average UFCo households in the Pacific had a 7.42% higher outside option than their Caribbean counterparts and this difference is significant at 1% (10%) when clustering standard errors by census block (when using Conley standard errors).[42] Second, Afro-Costa Rican communities resided mainly near the Caribbean area, and faced mobility restrictions that prevented them to work at UFCo plantations on the Pacific Coast between 1934 and 1949.[43] Although Afro-Costaricans represented a minority in the area—12% of company workers

[42] We measure the outside option of an UFCo region depending on how close this region was to areas that grew coffee. In particular, for region $j \in$UFCo, we calculate the $\sum_{k \notin UFCo} \frac{(dist_{jk})^{-1}}{\sum_n (dist_{jn})^{-1}} CoffeeIntensity_k$, that is, the (distance-weighted) coffee suitability of non-UFCo regions near region j.

[43] Article 5 of a contract signed in 1934 between the Costa Rican government and the UFCo prohibited the company from employing "coloured people" on the Pacific Coast between 1934 and 1949. This law was seen as a "legitimate means of protecting the racial composition of the country." Several authors have confused this regulation with a law that prohibited people of African descent from going into the Central Valley. The latter is a misunderstanding, as such a law did not exist (Harpelle, 2001).

on the Caribbean Coast in 1940 (ANCR, 1940)—this lower mobility might affect their outcomes.[44] Indeed, Table 21 shows that the gap between UFCo and non-UFCo regions is smaller conditional on the household members being classified as black or of African descent in the censuses.

Institutions and Labor Mobility Why didn't the UFCo take the approach of destroying workers' outside options? Work by Acemoglu and Wolitzky (2011) on labor coercion suggests an alternative approach to retain workers: preventing them from leaving or reducing their mobility. Several reasons prevented this from happening in our setting. First, throughout the 20th century, democratic institutions in Costa Rica were much stronger than in other developing countries, which possibly played a role in protecting workers' rights.[45] Second, the Costa Rican elite included many coffee producers who needed labor during the coffee harvesting season, which gave them an incentive to protect workers' mobility. Third, given the larger political competition in Costa Rica, there was an effort by particular political groups to enlarge their winning coalition by protecting UFCo workers (Bucheli and Kim, 2012). These circumstances were not present in other Latin American countries where the UFCo operated, like Colombia, where armed forces prevented workers from forming unions and leaving the plantations in Santa Marta and Ciénaga.[46] Today, these cities are among the poorest in the country, which does not contradict our findings: as our mechanism—labor market dynamics as an incentive for the company to invest—did not seem to be present in these cases. Finally, as discussed in more detail in Appendix L, it is worth mentioning that unions did not play a major role for most of our sample period.

This section analyzed both qualitative and quantitative evidence on the key role of labor mobility, market power, and investments in explaining better the short- and long-run outcomes within the UFCo. Later on, in Section 5.4—after ruling out other potential mechanisms in the next section—we will assess the potential of this mechanism to generate our results on economic outcomes through the lens of a model, and examine its implications via a counterfactual analysis.

[44] In terms of more recent statistics, according to the 2011 census, 8.7% of households in former UFCo plantations on the Caribbean identify themselves as of African descent, while the percentage of such households in former Pacific UFCo landholdings is 2.4%.

[45] See Bucheli and Kim (2012) for a detailed comparison of political institutions between countries in Central America.

[46] See Bucheli (2005) for more details on this coercion and the "Banana Massacre." Bucheli refers to the Colombian authorities as a "business-friendly government." The Costa Rican army, on its part, was abolished in 1948.

5.2 Ruling-Out Other Plausible Mechanisms as Main Drivers

Positively Selected Migration During UFCo's Tenure It might have been the case that outcomes are better within the UFCo because it attracted positively selected migrants. To consider if selective migration is generating the differences in living standards between the two regions, we take four different approaches. In our first approach, we re-estimate equations (1) and (2) using a restricted sample, in which we drop all migrant households. We classify a household as non-migrant in two alternative ways: (i) if all members lived in the same location five years before the census took place, and (ii) if the head of household lived in the same location five years before the census took place. Panels C3 and C4 in Figures 14 and 15 show that our results remain statistically equal in all cases, and in particular, for year 1973—while the UFCo is still operating.

In our second approach, we look at observables of migrants to the UFCo sub-region where we ran our regressions, and compare them to observables of migrants to our control region in 1973 (while the UFCo was still operating). That is, we are looking exactly at migrants on both sides of the border segment where we run all our main results. As documented in Table 14, we find that, on average, migrants to the UFCo have lower years of schooling and a lower probability of completing primary school than migrants to the control group.

The previous results suggest that, if anything, migrants to the UFCo were negatively selected, which would make our estimates a lower bound of the overall effect. There could be, however, other unobservables that differ between the types of people attracted to areas with and without the UFCo. In this sense, our estimate is akin to a LATE, because it measures the effect of, for instance, offering amenities on the people that are attracted by such amenities.

While the 1973 Population Census data is detailed and geo-referenced at the census-block level, it captures migrant patterns many years after the company began operations. To explore earlier waves of migration, our third approach resorts to earlier census data. Namely, we compare observable characteristics of migrants to UFCo regions with those of migrants to other Costa Rican regions in 1927, the earliest census for which microdata is available.[47] Consistent with the results from 1973, we find that migrants to the UFCo were negatively selected in terms of schooling. Compared to migrants to other Costa Rican regions, migrants to the UFCo were on average 6.8 pp less likely of having primary education, 1.6 pp less likely of having secondary education, and 4.7 pp less likely of being able to read and write. Moreover, the results from the 1927 Population Census also show that migrants to the UFCo regions were on average 10.3 pp less likely to own real

[47] For 1927, the census microdata is a representative sample geo-referenced at the canton level.

estate than migrants that moved to other Costa Rican regions. This negative selection aligns with more recent findings like those of Lagakos et al. (2018), and is robust to restricting our sample and comparing migrants to UFCo cantons with migrants to neighboring cantons around UFCo plantations only. The results of this analysis are available in Appendix H.

Our fourth approach complements the second and third ones by ruling-out that, maybe, although migrants to the UFCo accumulated less human capital than other migrants at the time, they might have been exceptional farmers (a measure that is not captured by education attainment). To explore this, we compare the UFCo effect for households engaged in the agricultural sector versus other economic sectors.[48] If ability in agriculture production is highly inheritable and selection in these abilities is driving our results, then the UFCo effect should be stronger for households engaged in the agricultural sector relative to households in other economic activities. Nevertheless, Panels D6, D7, D8, and D9 in Figure 5 show that this is not the case: For each outcome we consider, we cannot reject at the 10% level that the estimates are the same across both groups (further, the coefficients themselves are extremely similar).[49]

In summary, all four approaches suggest that selective migration is unlikely to generate the observed differences between regions, and if anything, it appears that migrants to the UFCo were negatively selected.

Positively Selected Migration at the Time of Each Census Each census contains information about individuals' place of residence five years before the census took place. Table 39 shows that the migration rates in census blocks in the UFCo and the control region (just outside) are statistically equal at every point in time. Further, Panels D4 and D5 in Figure 5, and Panels C3 and C4 in Figures 14 and 15 show that all our results remain unchanged when considering only households that are not composed by migrants. This holds regardless of how we define migration: whether we consider only households where no member is a migrant, or where only the head of household is not a migrant.

Negative Spillovers from the UFCo to Neighboring Regions Another possible concern is that negative spillovers from the UFCo to our control group generate the gap in outcomes

[48] We consider a household as an agricultural household if any of its members works in agriculture. Our results remain unchanged if we instead consider a household as an agricultural household if its head works in agriculture.

[49] Individual tables with details about each regression are available in the supplementary Online Appendix for the authors' websites.

between the regions. However, it is unlikely to be the case. First, in Appendix I, we document that in 1973, while the company was still operating, the economic outcomes for the control region (right outside the UFCo) were better than in other rural Costa Rican regions outside the UFCo. As Table 17 shows, households in the counterfactual region had a lower probability of a UBN in housing, health, education, and consumption; and a lower probability of being poor.

Second, in the right panel of Table 18, we show that in 1973, the accumulation of human capital was higher for individuals in the control group than in individuals in other nearby regions outside the UFCo. Individuals in the counterfactual region had 1.453 more years of schooling, were 25.9 pp more likely of completing primary education, and 2.9 pp more likely of completing secondary education. Further, the left panel of the same table documents that migrants to the control region—right outside the UFCo—were *positively* selected in terms of human capital with respect to migrants to other non-UFCo rural regions. If anything, this selection would work *against* our findings.

Third, in Appendix J, we document how public investment per capita in the region outside the UFCo boundary during the company's tenure was not significantly different from that on average Costa Rican rural areas. In particular, we gathered data on government spending per municipality from annual reports from the Comptroller General of the Republic of Costa Rica, and we compare the spending per capita between UFCo municipalities and other rural municipalities.

Thus, our control region seems like an average location—if anything, a relatively strong one within the country. Finally, given Costa Rica was considered a poster child of good governance at the time, and income per capita was among the highest in the area, in this sense the control region is particularly strong within Latin America.

5.3 Discussion

In summary, levels of investment in local amenities such as hospitals and schools inside the UFCo were significantly higher than public investments undertaken by the government in comparable regions. Company reports suggest that these strong investments were at least partially driven by the need to attract and maintain a sizable workforce. The latter is supported by a positive correlation between the intensity of company investments and the levels of outside options for workers in regions near the UFCo. We also document that amenities represent a larger share of a worker's compensation whenever the worker's outside option is higher. We show that these investments are likely to be the main drivers behind the gaps in living standards that we documented empirically.

It is worth mentioning that this mechanism would allow us to reconcile our results with findings on the effects of colonial concessions, like Nunn (2008), Dell (2010), and Lowes and Montero (2021a). In these cases, labor was coerced, highly immobile, and with a very low outside option. Thus, potentially, the producer extracting resources had little or no incentive to invest in local amenities or "public goods" to retain workers, and this under-provision might be partially explaining the persistent negative effects found by these studies. We also find no evidence in support of selective migration or negative spillovers from the company to neighboring regions being the main channels behind the observed difference in outcomes.

Importantly, although we document the positive effects of the UFCo in Costa Rica, one must be cautious and not overly-optimistic. Given the company's welfare effect is increasing in worker mobility, it may be *negative* if worker mobility and outside options are too low. The latter is a word of warning of how even the same company in a different setting—for instance, one with a larger degree of coercion, like what might have occurred in other Latin American countries—can lead to worse economic outcomes, and highlights how labor mobility is key in determining local outcomes.

5.4 Model

The evidence on the mechanism behind our results suggests a relationship between labor mobility, monopsony, and investments that was crucial in determining the firm's effect. In light of this evidence, Appendix V lays out the framework and calibration of a model that incorporates these new channels, and in which labor market power relates to worker mobility. In the model, the company is a local monopsony in one location, while workers are mobile across locations.[50] Thus, *the less mobile workers are, the more inelastic the labor supply that the firm faces is*. In other words, the degree of monopsony power of the firm *within* its region depends on how mobile workers are *across* locations. To incorporate the investment patterns that we documented empirically, we assume that the local monopsonist can choose workers' compensation bundle: a combination of wages and local amenities. These local amenities are costly for the firm, but increase workers' utility and make them more productive.

The model is consistent with local estimates from our empirical analysis and moments of the historical data, and captures observable spatial frictions. We also use a migration gravity equation,

[50] By local monopsonist, we mean that the UFCo is a profit maximizer and the sole employer within its location. Thus, our model departs from standard spatial models where firms are price-takers.

along with an instrumental variables strategy, to obtain an estimate of the migration elasticity.

In our empirical analysis, we determined the UFCo's effect on several local economic outcomes. One of the most useful exercises that our proposed model allows us to do is to estimate the firm's aggregate impact on welfare, where we account for general equilibrium effects, and conduct a counterfactual exercise to understand how this aggregate welfare effect depends on workers' outside options and the firm's degree of monopsony power.

Under our baseline calibration, we find that the UFCo increases aggregate welfare by 3.77%, as compared with a scenario where the UFCo region looks exactly like any other location.[51] We find it informative to compare steady states, as otherwise, our results would depend crucially on the initial labor allocation.[52]

In line with the mechanism we documented in Section 4, and in particular in Figure 17, in our model, the UFCo's effect on welfare is increasing in labor mobility, which in turn is directly related to workers' outside options. If the elasticity of labor mobility is low (high), workers are relatively insensitive (sensitive) to differences in utility across regions, perceiving their outside option as relatively low (high). In fact, Section V.3 shows how UFCo's effect can, in theory, be negative if labor is sufficiently immobile. As discussed in Section 5.1.4, this might have been the case in other Latin American countries where the company operated that are very poor today and where mobility seems to have been extremely low, or in cases documented by the literature where labor was coerced (e.g., Nunn 2008, Dell 2010, Lowes and Montero 2021a).[53] This exercise highlights the importance of the local labor market dynamics in determining how much the domestic economy might benefit (or be hurt) by large investment projects like this one.

6 Concluding Remarks

This paper provides new evidence on the role of private sector companies in the development of education and health infrastructure. Understanding the implications of these large-scale projects is particularly relevant today. In the last 20 years, private investors have acquired more than 64 mil-

[51] It produces a domestic good using the same technology as the locals, and the government is the provider of amenities. Note that this means we have a conservative estimate as (i) the UFCo's land required a lot of investment before becoming productive (initially swampy and prone to mosquitoes and diseases), but we assume it is as productive as coffee regions, and (ii) in the scenario where the UFCo's region starts producing a local good, there is a new variety entering the CES utility function.

[52] This is possible given the model's structure, which is similar in spirit to an OLG model.

[53] In line with this narrative, as workers' outside option increases (i.e., with larger values of the labor mobility elasticity), their compensation represents a larger share of the UFCo's total profits.

lion acres of land in over 80 countries of Africa, Central and Southeast Asia, Eastern Europe, and Latin America via leases (of up to 99 years) or purchases of farmland for agricultural investment (Cotula et al., 2009; Cotula and Vermeulen, 2009). More than 30 of these concessions have been *larger* than the UFCo's concession in Costa Rica.[54]

We study the impact of large private investment projects on local economic development, while analyzing how these effects interact with conditions in the local economy using evidence from the United Fruit Company in Costa Rica. In particular, we use a regression discontinuity design and find a positive and persistent effect on economic outcomes in areas where the company operated. Households in the former UFCo areas have a better satisfaction of basic needs (housing, sanitation, education, and consumption capacity) and are less likely to be poor than households in comparable locations that were not under the firm's direct influence.

Data that we collected from primary sources allowed us to test different potential mechanisms, and to find evidence that investments in physical and human capital carried out by the UFCo were likely the drivers of the positive "UFCo effect." Studying company reports, we documented that these high levels of investment were motivated by the need to attract and maintain a sizable workforce. An estimated general equilibrium model highlights how labor mobility is key in determining the sign and magnitude of the company's effect. Indeed, for relatively low elasticities, the aggregate effect of the company becomes negative, which is in line with the negative effects found by the literature studying arrangements where labor was coerced (and relatively immobile).

The economic forces we study apply to a broader set of arrangements beyond multinational corporations. There are examples of local firms, like Unilever in Britain or Ford in the U.S., using strategies similar to the ones of the UFCo (Watkins and Dalton, 2019; Holmes, 2015), and examples of multinationals that do not use the same strategy, like Chinese multinationals in Africa that do not rely on locals and therefore do not need to provide them with incentives to stay in the region (Fei, 2020). This has important policy implications. For instance, policies that require multinationals to hire local workers will have the benefit of incentivizing the firms to provide local amenities. In contrast, policies that prevent or penalize large firms reduce this incentive to invest, as each individual small firm may free-ride on the others.

References

Acemoglu, D. and Wolitzky, A. (2011). The Economics of Labor Coercion. *Econometrica*, 79(2):555–600.

[54]This recent wave of large-scale land acquisitions in developing countries—known as "land grabs"—is devoted to growing food crops and mainly driven by concerns about food security and by the biofuels boom.

Aitken, B. J. and Harrison, A. E. (1999). Do Domestic Firms Benefit from Direct Foreign Investment? Evidence from Venezuela. *American Economic Review*, 89(3):605–618.

Alfaro, L., Chanda, A., Kalemli-Ozcan, S., and Sayek, S. (2003). FDI Spillovers, Financial Markets, and Economic Development.

Alfaro, L. and Charlton, A. (2007). Growth and the Quality of Foreign Direct Investment: Is All FDI Equal?

Alfaro-Ureña, A., Manelici, I., and Vasquez, J. P. (2022). The Effects of Joining Multinational Supply Chains: New Evidence from Firm-to-Firm Linkages. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. qjac006.

ANCR (1904). National Archives of Costa Rica (*Archivo Nacional de Costa Rica*). *Serie Congreso, No. 3068, f.1*.

ANCR (1940). National Archives of Costa Rica (*Archivo Nacional de Costa Rica*). *Serie Fomento, No. 3387*.

Armendáriz, B. and Larraín B., F. (2017). *The Economics of Contemporary Latin America*. Economics/Latin American Studies. MIT Press.

Autor, D., Dorn, D., Katz, L. F., Patterson, C., and Van Reenen, J. (2020). The Fall of the Labor Share and the Rise of Superstar Firms. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 135(2):645–709.

Blomstrom, M. (1986). Foreign Investment and Productive Efficiency: The Case of Mexico. *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 35(1):97–110.

Blomstrom, M. and Wolff, E. N. (1989). Multinational Corporations and Productivity Convergence in Mexico. Working Paper 3141, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Bobonis, G. and Morrow, P. (2013). Labor Coercion and the Accumulation of Human Capital .

Bonilla, R. and Rosero, L. (2008). Rasterización de los censos de población y vivienda de 1973, 1984 y 2000. In Rodríguez, A. and Saborío, M., editors, *Lo rural es diverso: evidencia para el caso de Costa Rica*, pages 135–151. San José, Costa Rica.

Borensztein, E., De Gregorio, J., and Lee, J.-W. (1995). How Does Foreign Direct Investment Affect Economic Growth? Working Paper 5057, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Bryan, G., Chowdhury, S., and Mobarak, A. M. (2014). Underinvestment in a Profitable Technology: The Case of Seasonal Migration in Bangladesh. *Econometrica*, 82(5):1671–1748.

Bucheli, M. (2005). *Bananas and Business: The United Fruit Company in Colombia, 1899-2000*. New York University Press.

Bucheli, M. and Kim, M.-Y. (2012). Political Institutional Change, Obsolescing Legitimacy, and Multinational Corporations: The Case of the Central American Banana Industry. *MIR: Management International Review*, 52(6):847–877.

Casey, J. (1979). *Limón 1880-1940*. Editorial Costa Rica, San José.

Cerdas Albertazzi, A. L. (1993). El surgimiento del enclave bananero en el Pacífico Sur. *Revista de Historia*, (28):117–159.

Chomsky, A. (1996). *West Indian Workers and the United Fruit Company in Costa Rica, 1870-1940*. Louisiana State University Press.

Conley, T. (1999). GMM Estimation with Cross Sectional Dependence. *Journal of Econometrics*, 92(1):1–45.

Cotula and Vermeulen (2009). Land grabs' in Africa: can the deals work for development? 17069iied, IIED Briefing Papers.

Cotula, Vermeulen, and Keeley (2009). Land Grab or Development Opportunity? Agricultural Investment and International Land Deals in Africa. Isbn: 978-1-84369-741-1., IIED/FAO/IFAD, London/Rome.

Deeks, W. E. (1924). Activities of the Medical Department of the United Fruit Company. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Health Problems in Tropical America Held at Kingston, Jamaica, B.W.I., July 22 to August 1, 1924: By Invitation of the Medical Department, United Fruit Company*, Boston, pages 1006–1010.

Dell, M. (2010). The Persistent Effects of Peru's Mining Mita. *Econometrica*, 78(6):1863–1903.

Dell, M., Lane, N., and Querubin, P. (2015). State Capacity, Local Governance, and Economic Development in Vietnam.

Dell, M. and Olken, B. A. (2019). The Development Effects of the Extractive Colonial Economy: The Dutch Cultivation System in Java. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 87(1):164–203.

Donaldson, D. (2018). Railroads of the Raj: Estimating the Impact of Transportation Infrastructure. *American Economic Review*, 108(4-5):899–934.

Elbers, C., Lanjouw, J. O., and Lanjouw, P. (2003). Micro–Level Estimation of Poverty and Inequality. *Econometrica*, 71(1):355–364.

Ellis, F. (1983). *Las transnacionales del banano en Centroamérica*. Editorial Universitaria Centroamericana (EDUCA).

Fallas-Paniagua, M. (2013). Cartografía censal en Costa Rica: de lo análogo a lo digital. *Revista Geográfica de América Central*, 1(50):113–140.

Fei, D. (2020). Variegated work regimes of Chinese investment in Ethiopia. *World Development*, 135:105049.

Feres, J. C. and Mancero, X. (2001). El método de las necesidades básicas insatisfechas (NBI) y sus aplicaciones en América Latina. Series Estudios Estadísticos y Prospectivos, CEPAL, UN.

Gelman, A. and Imbens, G. (2017). Why High-Order Polynomials Should Not Be Used in Regression Discontinuity Designs. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*.

Gutiérrez, G. and Philippon, T. (2017). Declining Competition and Investment in the U.S. Working Paper 23583, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Harpelle, R. (2001). *West Indians of Costa Rica: Race, Class, and the Integration of an Ethnic Minority*. Mcgill-Queen's Studies in Ethnic History. McGill-Queen's University Press.

Harrison, A. and Rodríguez-Clare, A. (2009). Trade, Foreign Investment, and Industrial Policy for Developing Countries. Working Paper 15261, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Henderson, J. V., Storeygard, A., and Weil, D. N. (2012). Measuring Economic Growth from Outer Space. *American Economic Review*, 102(2):994–1028.

Herrendorf, B., Rogerson, R., and Valentinyi, A. (2014). Growth and Structural Transformation. In Aghion, P. and Durlauf, S., editors, *Handbook of Economic Growth*, volume 2, chapter 6, pages 855–941. Elsevier.

Hijmans, R. J., Cameron, S. E., Parra, J. L., Jones, P. G., and Jarvis, A. (2005). Very High Resolution Interpolated Climate Surfaces For Global Land Areas. *International Journal of Climatology*, 25(15):1965–1978.

Hodler, R. and Raschky, P. A. (2014). Regional Favoritism. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 129(2):995–1033.

Holmes, C. (2015). *Company Towns of Michigan's Upper Peninsula*. Arcadia Publishing Incorporated.

Jones, C. F. and Morrison, P. C. (1952). Evolution of the Banana Industry of Costa Rica. *Economic Geography*, 28(1):1–19.

Keith, M. C. (1886). *Mr. Keith's letter to the Costa Rica bondholders. June, 1886*. London.

Kelly, M. (2019). The Standard Errors of Persistence. CEPR Discussion Papers 13783, C.E.P.R. Discussion Papers.

Kepner, C. D. (1936). *Social Aspects of the Banana Industry*. Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law. Columbia University Press.

Khandker, S. and Mahmud, W. (2012). *Seasonal Hunger and Public Policies: Evidence from Northwest Bangladesh*. Directions in Development. World Bank Publications.

LaBarge, R. A. (1959). A Study of United Fruit Company Operations in Isthmian America, 1946-1956. *Duke University Ph.D. Thesis*.

Lagakos, D., Mobarak, A. M., and Waugh, M. E. (2018). The Welfare Effects of Encouraging Rural-Urban Migration. NBER Working Papers 24193, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

León Sáenz, J. (2012). *La economía rural*. Historia económica de Costa Rica en el siglo XX. Universidad de Costa Rica, Instituto de Investigaciones en Ciencias Económicas, IICE, Centro de Investigaciones Históricas de América Central, CIHAC.

Lipsey, R. E. (2006). Measuring the Impacts of FDI in Central and Eastern Europe. Working Paper 12808, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Lowes, S. and Montero, E. (2021a). Concessions, Violence, and Indirect Rule: Evidence from the Congo Free State. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 136(4):2047–2091.

Lowes, S. and Montero, E. (2021b). The Legacy of Colonial Medicine in Central Africa. *American Economic Review*, 111(4):1284–1314.

Lucassen, J. (2004). A Multinational and Its Labor Force: The Dutch East India Company, 1595-1795. *International Labor and Working-Class History*, (66):12–39.

May, S. and Lasso, G. (1958). *The United Fruit Company in Latin America*. Number no. 7 in American business abroad. National Planning Association.

McCoskey, S. K. (2011). Foreign Direct Investment and Entrepreneurial Capture in Pre-Conflict Liberia. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 24(2):197–216.

Méndez, F. and Trejos, J. D. (2004). Costa Rica: Un mapa de carencias críticas para el año 2000. In Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos (INEC), editor, *Costa Rica a la luz del Censo 2000*, page 205–233.

Molina, I. (2017). *Estadísticas de financiamiento, salarios docentes, matrícula, cobertura y graduación en la educación costarricense: Una contribución documental (1827-2016).* Vicerrectoría de Investigación : Centro de Investigaciones Históricas de América Central, San José, Costa Rica.

Morgan, L. (1993). *Community Participation in Health: The Politics of Primary Care in Costa Rica*. Cambridge Studies in Medical Anthropology. Cambridge University Press.

Nunn, N. (2008). The Long-term Effects of Africa's Slave Trades. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 123(1):139–176.

Oficina Central de Estadística (1868). *Censo de Población 1864*. Imprenta Nacional.

Royo, A. (2009). *Crisis de dependencia en la Zona Sur: Desarrollo agrario y migraciones internas en el Cantón de Osa 1973-2000*. Editorial UCR, Universidad de Costa Rica, San José.

Sanou, O. and Quesada, F. (1998). Orden, progreso y civilización (1871-1914). Transformaciones urbanas y arquitectónicas. In Fonseca, E. and Garnier, J., editors, *Historia de la Arquitectura en Costa Rica*, pages 219–317. San José, Fundación Museos del Banco Central de Costa Rica.

Smarzynska Javorcik, B. (2004). Does Foreign Direct Investment Increase the Productivity of Domestic Firms? In Search of Spillovers Through Backward Linkages. *American Economic Review*, 94(3):605–627.

Soley, T. (1940). *Compendio de historia económica y hacendaria de Costa Rica*. Serie Escolar "Costa Rica" N^{o} 2. Editorial Soley y Valverde.

Stock, J. H., Wright, J. H., and Yogo, M. (2002). A Survey of Weak Instruments and Weak Identification in Generalized Method of Moments. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 20(4):518–529.

UFCo (1917). *United Fruit Company. Medical Department Annual Report. 1916*. Boston.

UFCo (1922). *United Fruit Company. Medical Department Tenth Annual Report. 1921*. Boston.

UFCo (1923). *United Fruit Company. Medical Department Eleventh Annual Report. 1922*. Boston.

UFCo (1924). *United Fruit Company. Medical Department Twelfth Annual Report. 1923*. Boston.

UFCo (1926). *United Fruit Company. Medical Department Fourteenth Annual Report. 1925*. Boston.

UFCo (1930). *United Fruit Company. Medical Department Eighteenth Annual Report. 1929*. Boston.

Vail, L. (1976). Mozambique's Chartered Companies: The Rule of the Feeble. *The Journal of African History*, 17(3):389–416.

Viales, R. (1998). *Después del enclave 1927-1950: Un estudio de la región atlántica costarricense*. Colección Nueva historia. Editorial de la Universidad de Costa Rica.

Viales, R. (2012). La colonización agrícola del Atlántico (Caribe) costarricense entre 1870 y 1930. El peso de la política agraria Liberal y de las diversas formas de apropiación territorial. *Anuario de Estudios Centroamericanos*, 27(2):57–100.

Viales, R. J. and Montero, A. (2015). La construcción de la calidad del café y del banano en Costa Rica. Una perspectiva histórica (1890-1950). *Historia Agraria. Revista de Agricultura e Historia Rural*, (66):147–176.

Watkins, A. and Dalton, N. (2019). *The HR (R)Evolution: Change the Workplace, Change the World*. Taylor and Francis, 1 edition.

Wiley, J. (2008). *The Banana: Empires, Trade Wars, and Globalization*. At Table. University of Nebraska Press.

Xu, B. (2000). Multinational Enterprises, Technology Diffusion, and Host Country Productivity Growth. *Journal of Development Economics*, 62(2):477 – 493.

Appendix

A Historical Details

A.1 The UFCo in Costa Rica

This section provides more details on the role and decay of the UFCo in Costa Rica and complements the historical background presented in Section 2.

Figure 7 shows how, after 1880, banana production in Costa Rica increased in volume and importance. By 1905 bananas had reached the same place in Costa Rica's exporting value than coffee (Costa Rica's main export product at the time).

Figure 7: Banana and Coffee (Percentage of Total Costa Rican Exports), 1883-1918



Source: Authors' calculations based on the "Statistical Summary, years 1883 to 1910: trade, agriculture, industry" (*"Resúmenes estadísticos, años 1883 a 1910: comercio, agricultura, industria"*), and 1911 to 1918 Costa Rican Statistic Yearbooks.

Figure 8 illustrates the evolution of UFCo employment in Costa Rica. On average, between 1912 and 1931 the UFCo employee around 7.96% of the total agricultural workers in the country and 4.82% of the entire labor force. Between 1946 and 1976, the numbers were 6.93% and 3.50% respectively. However, due to a series of hurricanes that destroyed the plantations in several countries along with expropriations and scandals of corruption that lowered the price of the UFCo's stock (none of these natural disasters or scandals in Costa Rica, but in other Latin American countries), the company went bankrupt. Further, as its successor, today known as Chiquita,

followed a corporate strategy that divested in the production process to focus on marketing, the UFCo abandoned banana production in Costa Rica in 1984.

Figure 8: UFCo Employees as Percentage of Costa Rican Labor Force, 1912-1976



Source: Authors' calculations based on United Fruit Company Medical Department Annual Report for 1912-1931, Ellis (1983) for 1946-1976, and 1892, 1927, 1950, 1963, 1973, and 1984 Costa Rican Population Censuses.

B Unsatisfied Basic Needs (UBN) Index

To specify the set of basic needs that we consider in the paper and the threshold for attaining those needs, we follow the methodology proposed by Méndez and Trejos (2004) for Costa Rica, who constructed the index based on information from the 2000 Population Census and household surveys that included data on income. The method can be applied straightforwardly to the 2011 Census, given the similarity of the questions between the 2000 and 2011 censuses (Méndez and Bravo, 2014). To adapt the method to the 1973 and 1984 censuses, we maintain the 2000 structure and use only the subset of the components for which similar variables are available in all four censuses.[55] Table B shows which census variables constitute each basic need, and describes the standards under which the need is considered unsatisfied.

Appendix N shows that the main results of the paper are preserved if we use the index only for the 2000 and 2011 censuses, including all its original components.

[55]For earlier years, surveys with income and household data do not exist, however, we ensure that questions from the census remain perfectly comparable across time.

Table 7: Definition and Classification of Basic Needs

Dimension	Component	Variable from Census
Housing	House Quality	Household living in a temporary shelter or slum. Household living in a dwelling with waste material in wall, roof or dirt floor. Household living in a dwelling with bad conditions in roof, wall, and floor simultaneously.
	Overcrowding	Household with more than two persons per room.
Health		Urban household where the sanitary service is connected to ditch, trench, river, estuary, cesspit, or latrine, or without sanitary service. Rural household where the sanitary service is connected to direct connection to ditch, trench, river, estuary, or without sanitary service.
Education	School Attendance School Achievement	Household with at least one member from 7 to 17 years old not attending school. Household with at least one member from 7 to 17 years old attending school regularly, but with a school backwardness higher than 2 years.
Consumption	Consumption Capacity	Household without regular income recipients (employed, pensioners or rentiers) and whose head is 50 years old or older and with: • 3.59 years of schooling or less for 1973 census. • 5 years of schooling or less for 1984 census. • 6 years of schooling or less for 2000 census. • 6.39 years of schooling or less for 2011 census. Urban household with three or more dependents and one income recipient with less than: • 3.59 years of schooling for 1973 census. • 5 years of schooling for 1984 census. • 6 years of schooling for 2000 census. • 6.39 years of schooling for 2011 census. Urban household with three or more dependents and two income recipients whose on average have less than: • 2.59 years of schooling for 1973 census. • 4 years of schooling for 1984 census. • 5 years of schooling for 2000 census. • 5.39 years of schooling for 2011 census.

Continued on next page

Table 7 – continued from previous page

Dimension	Component	Variable from Census
		Urban household with three or more dependents and three or more income recipients whose on average have less than: • 1.59 years of schooling for 1973 census. • 3 years of schooling for 1984 census. • 4 years of schooling for 2000 census. • 4.39 years of schooling for 2011 census. Rural household with three or more dependents and one income recipient with less than: • 1.59 years of schooling for 1973 census. • 3 years of schooling for 1984 census. • 4 years of schooling for 2000 census. • 4.39 years of schooling for 2011 census. Rural household with three or more dependents and two income recipients whose on average have less than: • 0.59 years of schooling for 1973 census. • 2 years of schooling for 1984 census. • 3 years of schooling for 2000 census. • 3.39 years of schooling for 2011 census. Rural household with three or more dependents and three or more income recipients whose on average have: • 0 years of schooling for 1973 census. • Less than 1 years of schooling for 1984 census. • Less than 2 years of schooling for 2000 census. • Less than 2.39 years of schooling for 2011 census.

C Additional Figures

Figure 10 shows an example of how the study boundary follows a natural landmark (the river) closely, but not exactly, as it was jointly determined by the river and preexisting plots. In 1904

the government forbid, by law, to sell the plots in orange back to the company (or any foreigner), therefore this boundary was kept constant during the company's tenure.

Figure 9: Study Boundary



Notes: Elevation is shown in the background. The figure shows the boundary segment along which (i) there is evidence of a land assignment that is as good as random., and (ii) geographic characteristics balance. Further details are discussed in Section 2.2.

Figure 10: The UFCo Boundary Follows the River Closely but not Exactly



(a) River and Pre-existing Plots in 1904



(b) Final Boundary

Notes: The figure shows an example of how the boundary follows a natural landmark (the river) closely, but not exactly, as it was jointly determined by the river and preexisting plots.

Figure 11: One of the Original Maps from the Costa Rican National Archive

Notes: The figure provides an example of one of the original maps from the Costa Rican National Archive (*Archivo Nacional de Costa Rica*) that we collected, scanned, and digitized. (*Source:* Fondo: Mapa. Signatura: 17849).

D Additional Results

Table 8: Segments along All the Border where Geographic Characteristics Balance

	Sample falls within					
	<4 km of UFCo boundary			<10 km of UFCo boundary		
	Inside	Outside	s.e	Inside	Outside	s.e
Elevation	31.273	45.636	(10.144)	33.108	58.949	(9.173)***
			[17.430]			[21.474]
Slope	0.098	0.434	(0.249)	0.339	0.511	(0.158)
			[0.345]			[0.251]
Temperature	26.121	26.061	(0.050)	26.117	25.991	(0.046)***
			[0.083]			[0.108]
Observations	101	104		190	234	

Notes: The table corresponds to areas along the entire border where features balance. The unit of observation is 1x1 km grid cells. Robust standard errors for the difference in means between UFCo and non-UFCo observations are in parentheses, and Conley standard errors in brackets. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 9: Balance on Geographic Characteristics for Redrawn Border

	Sample falls within					
	<5 km of UFCo boundary			<10 km of UFCo boundary		
	Inside	Outside	s.e	Inside	Outside	s.e
Elevation	38.552	38.235	(1.330)	50.893	37.759	(2.273)***
			[3.530]			[6.514]**
Slope	0.256	0.312	(0.072)	0.493	0.328	(0.063)***
			[0.140]			[0.154]
Temperature	26.087	26.097	(0.006)	26.028	26.097	(0.011)***
			[0.014]			[0.031]**
Observations	96	85		168	141	

Notes: The table corresponds to areas along the exogenously redrawn border segment. The unit of observation is 1x1 km grid cells. Robust standard errors for the difference in means between UFCo and non-UFCo observations are in parentheses. Conley standard errors for the difference in means are in brackets. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 10: Average UFCo Effect Along All Border Segments where Characteristics Balance

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UFCo	-0.052	-0.009	-0.030	-0.065	-0.103	-0.157
	(0.016)***	(0.011)	(0.013)**	(0.015)***	(0.020)***	(0.035)***
	[0.017]***	[0.007]	[0.013]**	[0.015]***	[0.017]***	[0.032]***
Adjusted R^2	0.082	0.093	0.261	0.017	0.113	0.170
Observations	13,850	13,850	13,850	13,850	13,850	13,850
Clusters	348	348	348	348	348	348
Mean	0.152	0.048	0.221	0.179	0.449	0.599

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 11: UFCo-Effect Across Years Along All Border Segments where Characteristics Balance

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
$UFCo_{1973}$	-0.057	0.011	-0.056	-0.069	-0.102	-0.171
	(0.055)	(0.077)	(0.028)**	(0.039)*	(0.051)**	(0.154)
	[0.048]	[0.083]	[0.020]***	[0.042]	[0.045]**	[0.154]
$UFCo_{1984}$	-0.052	-0.003	-0.041	-0.067	-0.091	-0.163
	(0.032)	(0.018)	(0.021)*	(0.025)***	(0.031)***	(0.060)***
	[0.028]*	[0.016]	[0.022]*	[0.023]***	[0.027]***	[0.048]***
$UFCo_{2000}$	-0.053	-0.016	-0.047	-0.073	-0.122	-0.189
	(0.021)**	(0.012)	(0.018)**	(0.019)***	(0.027)***	(0.043)***
	[0.023]**	[0.012]	[0.013]***	[0.019]***	[0.023]***	[0.036]***
$UFCo_{2011}$	-0.049	-0.012	-0.008	-0.058	-0.095	-0.127
	(0.019)***	(0.008)	(0.016)	(0.021)***	(0.026)***	(0.038)***
	[0.018]***	[0.008]	[0.021]	[0.034]*	[0.031]***	[0.050]**
Adjusted R^2	0.081	0.093	0.262	0.016	0.113	0.170
Observations	13,850	13,850	13,850	13,850	13,850	13,850
Clusters	348	348	348	348	348	348
$Mean_{1973}$	0.393	0.234	0.399	0.154	0.713	1.179
$Mean_{1984}$	0.176	0.058	0.370	0.173	0.571	0.776
$Mean_{2000}$	0.140	0.036	0.218	0.159	0.429	0.551
$Mean_{2011}$	0.100	0.014	0.124	0.202	0.359	0.440

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Figure 12: Plots of the UFCo Effect on Contemporary Household Outcomes



(a) Probability of Being Poor (b) Total Number of UBN (c) Housing Dimensions



(d) Health Dimension (e) Education Dimension (f) Consumption Dimension

Notes: The figure shows the study boundary, with UFCo territories being south. Each dot represents a census-block's centroid. Dot-size represents the number of households in each census-block. The background in each subfigure shows predicted values, for a finely spaced grid of longitude-latitude coordinates, from a regression of the outcome variable under consideration on the UFCo dummy and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. The predicted jump across the UFCo boundary is clear in all the subfigures, and lighter areas (better outcomes) coincide with former UFCo regions.

Figure 13: Alternative Cutoffs for Conley Standard Errors and Main Results



(a) Probability of Being Poor



(b) Total Number of Unsatisfied Needs



(c) Housing Dimension



(d) Health Dimension



(e) Education Dimension



(f) Consumption Dimension

Notes: We compute Conley standard errors at alternative cutoff distances. For our main results, we choose 2 km as the cutoff because it is the distance that *maximizes* standard errors for all outcomes, as shown in this figure. In general, all results are robust to alternative cutoffs ranging from 2 to 10 km (the maximum allowed by the plantation's size), and to the placebo tests reported in Table 12.

Figure 14: Robustness checks, Main Specification, Dynamic UFCo Effect (Part 1/2)



Notes: For each outcome, we plot two series corresponding with 1973 and 2011 differences between UFCo and non-UFCo regions. In the bottom panel, black dots indicate the controls added in each regression that is vertically aligned with these dots. Figure 5 shows similar checks for UFCo's *average* effect. Individual tables with these regressions are reported in the supplementary Online Appendix for the authors' websites.

E Details on Robustness Checks

Falsification Test: As a falsification test, we re-run the analysis using placebo borders. In particular, we draw fake borders at a distance of 2 km and 4 km both inwards and outwards of the actual UFCo border, so the analysis compares households on the same side of the boundary.[56]

[56]More precisely, for instance, we shift the border 4 km North, and rerun our RD within 4 km of the placebo border—such that all observations are on one side of the true border. We show four of these shifts

Figure 15: Robustness checks, Main Specification, Dynamic UFCo Effect (Part 2/2)



Notes: For each outcome, we plot two series corresponding with 1973 and 2011 differences between UFCo and non-UFCo regions. In the bottom panel, black dots indicate the controls added in each regression that is vertically aligned with these dots. Figure 5 shows similar checks for UFCo's *average* effect. Individual tables with these regressions are reported in the supplementary Online Appendix for the authors' websites.

Table 12 presents the results, showing that our placebo tests deliver insignificant coefficients in every case, both economically and statistically. Hence, our main regression is capturing an effect that only appears as we cross the actual UFCo boundary, and not just spatial autocorrelation, as warned by Kelly (2019).

Effect of the River: A possible concern is that the presence of a river close to our boundary is driving our result. To address this issue, we run our main specification restricting the sample to units "on the wrong side" of the river (1,937 units), that is, units that are North of the river and belonged to the UFCo, and units that are South the river and did not belong to the company (see Figure 10), Panel D1 in Figure 5 presents the results. In this limited sample, we are comparing only households located very close to each other (1 km from the boundary, at most), and we still find estimates that are consistent with our main results. As with the falsification test results, this finding is also reassuring that what we are capturing is an effect that shows up precisely as we cross the boundary and not spatial autocorrelation.

Different Bandwidth and Polynomials: As an additional robustness check, we eliminate observations close to the boundary in case there might have been some negative spillover from the company to the area outside. Note that, when exploring the river's effect, we do the opposite, we limit the analysis to observations close to the boundary. Results are presented in Panel D2 and D3 in Figure 5, and Panels C1 and C2 in Figures 14 and 15. Overall, the coefficients are very similar to the ones of our main regression.

Similarly, although in Tables 1 and 2 we use a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude, our results are robust to alternative specifications of the RD polynomial. Panel A in Figures 5, 14, and 15 shows how our results are robust to different specifications of $f(location)$.

Different Control Variables and Distance to a Railroad: Besides the specification of the RD polynomial, we also analyze how the results change to varying the control variables. Panels B1 and B2 in Figures 5, 14, and 15 show that the results are robust to excluding demographic controls, geographic controls, or both. Our results are also robust to controlling for distance to a railroad, which we do in Panel B3 in the same figures.[57]

North and South, and in magnitudes of 2 and 4 km.

[57] Distance to a railroad is an important control to check, as access to railroads might itself increase real income (Donaldson, 2018).

Alternative Income Measures: Nighttime Lights Data and Small Area Estimation Methodology of Elbers et al. (2003): We use nighttime lights data as a proxy of income to confirm our findings through an alternative measure of economic development. Figure 16 in Appendix G shows a satellite image in which areas inside the former UFCo landholdings display higher luminosity. Results in Table 15 in Appendix G confirms this difference in luminosity, by showing that nighttime light intensity is 21% higher in the former UFCo plantations (statistically significant at the 1% level). Assuming an elasticity between nighttime light intensity and GDP of 0.3 (consistent with the findings in Henderson et al. (2012) and Hodler and Raschky (2014)), the 21% difference in nighttime light intensity implies that the output in the former UFCo plantations is about 6.37% higher.

Similarly, Appendix T computes income through a small area estimation methodology. This method imputes income and consumption for each household in the population census, using a prediction model obtained from household surveys. We show that the per capita net income is 9.6% higher for households within the UFCo borders, which is consistent with the estimate using luminosity data, and that their probability of having earnings below the poverty line is 10.7 pp lower, which is in line with our main results.

Alternative Index of UBN: Our Unsatisfied Basic Needs (UBN) are a modified version of the ones proposed by Méndez and Trejos (2004). Because Méndez and Trejos constructed the index using information from the 2000 and 2011 censuses, our modification consists of selecting the variables whose information is available in each of the 1973, 1984, 2000, and 2011 censuses. Therefore, as a robustness test, we re-run the estimation restricting the analysis to the 2000 and 2011 censuses and using the Unsatisfied Basic Needs (UBN) as proposed by Méndez and Trejos. Table 35 in Appendix N shows that our main message is robust to this alternative definition of UBN.

F Falsification Tests

Table 12: Average UFCo Effect: Placebo Tests 2 km and 4 km

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
			Panel A: Placebo at +2 km			
UFCo	0.013	-0.011	0.022	-0.010	-0.002	0.014
	(0.035)	(0.019)	(0.017)	(0.030)	(0.038)	(0.064)
	[0.041]	[0.017]	[0.019]	[0.022]	[0.030]	[0.065]
Adjusted R^2	0.097	0.168	0.237	0.013	0.111	0.193
			Panel B: Placebo at -2 km			
UFCo	-0.040	0.003	-0.003	-0.002	-0.016	-0.042
	(0.026)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.024)	(0.029)	(0.055)
	[0.031]	[0.019]	[0.019]	[0.029]	[0.029]	[0.055]
Adjusted R^2	0.098	0.168	0.237	0.013	0.111	0.193
			Panel C: Placebo at +4 km			
UFCo	0.007	-0.011	-0.003	-0.010	-0.019	-0.017
	(0.033)	(0.028)	(0.017)	(0.025)	(0.032)	(0.060)
	[0.041]	[0.018]	[0.011]	[0.021]	[0.027]	[0.053]
Adjusted R^2	0.097	0.168	0.237	0.013	0.111	0.193
			Panel D: Placebo at -4 km			
UFCo	-0.017	-0.006	-0.011	0.009	0.006	-0.025
	(0.020)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.021)	(0.023)	(0.045)
	[0.017]	[0.008]	[0.010]	[0.019]	[0.020]	[0.038]
Adjusted R^2	0.097	0.168	0.237	0.013	0.111	0.193

Notes: All regressions include 9,179 observations and 206 clusters. +2 km and +4 km refer to shifting the boundary 2 km and 4 km North, respectively; while -2 km and -4 km refer to shifting the boundary 2 km and 4 km South. UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 13: Human Capital Accumulation: Non-Migrants 1973-2011

	Years of schooling	Primary	Secondary
	(1)	(2)	(3)
UFCo	0.223	0.048	0.001
	(0.124)*	(0.017)***	(0.008)
	[0.146]	[0.018]***	[0.006]
Adjusted R^2	0.244	0.210	0.043
Mean	4.587	0.461	0.056

Notes: Observations: 26,179; clusters: 206. The unit of observation is the individual. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic and individual controls, census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude.

Table 14: Human Capital Accumulation: 1973 Migrants

	Years of schooling	Primary	Secondary
	(1)	(2)	(3)
UFCo	-0.117	0.017	-0.015
	(1.103)	(0.175)	(0.021)
	[0.655]	[0.114]	[0.016]
Adjusted R^2	0.099	0.063	0.015
Mean	2.928	0.195	0.016

Notes: Observations: 1,551; clusters: 14. We follow Cameron and Miller (2015) using the bias-adjusted cluster-robust standard errors, and the degrees of freedom adjustment in Imbens and Kolesár (2016). The unit of observation is the individual. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic and individual controls; and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

G Luminosity Data

We use satellite-recorded data on nighttime lights as a proxy for income and economic activity (e.g., Chen and Nordhaus, 2011; Henderson et al., 2012; Michalopoulos and Papaioannou, 2014; Hodler and Raschky, 2014).[58] The data spans 1992 to 2013 at a spatial resolution of 30 arc-seconds. For each grid cell, an integer between 0 (no light) and 63 represents its light intensity.

[58]The data on nighttime light is collected by the US Air Force Defense Meteorological Satellite Program's Operational Linescan System, and is processed by the National Geophysical Data Center.

Figure 16 shows the satellite image near the study boundary in 1992 and 2012, and suggests higher luminosity in areas inside the former UFCo area. Column (1) in Table 15 confirms this difference in luminosity: nighttime light intensity is 21% (exp(0.193)-1=0.212) higher in the former UFCo. If we assume an elasticity between nighttime light intensity and GDP of 0.3 (Henderson et al. 2012, Hodler and Raschky 2014), the 21% difference implies that output in the former UFCo areas is about 6.37% higher. Column (2) shows that luminosity per capita is 18% (exp(0.165)-1=0.18) higher in the former UFCo plantations. Column (3) shows that the annual growth rate of luminosity per capita is 2.064 percentage points higher in former UFCo areas. In Columns (4) and (5) we account for 9.2% of observations that are zero by adding 0.01 to the luminosity data (or luminosity per capita) before taking the logarithm. In general, the results are consistent with our main estimates, providing evidence that suggests significantly higher levels of income and economic activity in the former UFCo areas.

Figure 16: Nighttime Lights and the Study Boundary



Notes: The figure shows the UFCo's concession's boundary and how satellite nighttime lights data shows a much higher luminosity inside the former UFCo, both in 1992 and 2012.

Table 15: UFCo Effect using Luminosity Data

	ln Light	ln Light/Pop	Gr. Rate Light/Pop	ln(.01+Light)	ln (.01+Light/Pop)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
UFCo	0.193	0.165	2.064	0.342	0.215
	(0.006)***	(0.051)***	(0.781)***	(0.035)***	(0.046)***
	[0.017]***	[0.065]**	[0.953]**	[0.072]***	[0.059]***
Adjusted R^2	0.377	0.036	0.282	0.463	0.122
Observations	5,588	2,061	1,679	6,154	2,210

Notes: The unit of observation is 1x1 km grid cells located within 5 km of UFCo boundary. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. Regressions include year fixed effects. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

H Migrant Comparison, 1927 Population Census

We use the 1927 Population Census microdata to analyze early waves of migration to the UFCo. The microdata is available for a representative sample. The cantons are the strata, and households are the primary sample unit. Within a household, the data record all members. We estimate a variant of equation (1). Considering that the extension of a canton might be relatively large compared to the UFCo's concession in that canton, we proxy the company's presence as the fraction of canton's land that was part of the UFCo. As outcome variables, we consider the probability of owning private property (real estate), of having any primary education, of having any secondary education, and of being able to read and write.

Table 16 shows that migrants to the UFCo were negatively selected in education and property ownership, as compared with migrants to other Costa Rican regions. The left panel of Table 16 shows the difference in outcomes for migrants to UFCo cantons compared to migrants in all the remaining Costa Rican cantons. To gauge their magnitude, consider the average UFCo landholding fraction in a canton where the company was present (0.27). The migrants in the UFCo regions were on average 10.3 percentage points (pp) less likely to own real estate, 6.8 pp less likely of having any primary education, 1.6 pp less likely of having any secondary education, and 4.7 pp less likely of being able to read and write. All the estimates are significant at the 1% level. The right panel of Table 16 shows that the results are robust after comparing outcomes of migrants to UFCo cantons with outcomes of migrants to cantons neighboring UFCo locations (meaning they share at least one boundary).

Table 16: Negatively Selected Migrants to UFCo Regions: 1927 Population Census

	Probability of				Probability of			
	Owning property	Primary education	Secondary education	Literacy	Owning property	Primary education	Secondary education	Literacy
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	Migrants to UFCo cantons compared with migrants to							
	non-UFCo cantons				neighboring non-UFCo cantons			
UFCo	-0.381	-0.253	-0.061	-0.174	-0.489	-0.252	0.008	-0.119
	(0.033)***	(0.044)***	(0.022)***	(0.047)***	(0.033)***	(0.048)***	(0.026)	(0.052)**
R^2	0.303	0.078	0.024	0.056	0.358	0.134	0.014	0.083
Obs.	6,431	18,851	18,851	26,048	2,939	6,087	6,087	9,762
Mean	0.369	0.946	0.074	0.682	0.251	0.936	0.057	0.706

Notes: The unit of observation is the individual. Regressions are weighted using sample weights. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by PSUs and stratification at the canton level, in parentheses. UFCo corresponds to the fraction of canton's area that belonged to the UFCo landholdings. All regressions include individual controls (age, age squared, gender), and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

I Control Region vs. Other Rural Regions

In this section, we study the control region outside the UFCo in 2 ways, asking: i) was there a negative spillover from the company to this region?, and related, ii) were migrants to the control ex-ante better in some dimension than migrants to the UFCo? First, we compare the control group with other non-UFCo regions on a belt around it in 1973, while the company was still operating, considering households that are beyond 20 km from the UFCo's border.[59] We consider:

$$y_{ig1973} = \gamma \textit{control}_g + f(\text{geographic location}_g) + \mathbf{X}_{ig1973}\beta + \mathbf{X}_g\Gamma + \varepsilon_{ig1973}, \tag{4}$$

where y_{ig1973} is an outcome of individual or household i in census-block g in 1973; and $\textit{control}_g$ is a dummy that is equal to 1 if census-block g's centroid lies within the counterfactual region (within 5 km from the boundary shown in Figure 9). Other variables follow a the same notation as in equation (1). Table 17 displays the results. Given concerns about having few clusters that also are unbalanced, we follow Cameron and Miller (2015) using the bias-adjusted cluster-robust standard errors, and the data determined degrees of freedom adjustment in Imbens and Kolesár (2016). The effects suggest that direct negative spillovers from the UFCo to the control group are unlikely.

Comparing Migrants' Human Capital Accumulation in Control Region vs. in Other Non-UFCo Rural Regions We compare the human capital accumulation of migrants

[59] Results using larger distances are also robust and available upon request.

Table 17: Main Outcomes: Control Region Outside UFCo vs. Other Rural Regions

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Control Region	-0.514	-0.612	0.124	-0.221	-0.420	-1.222
	(0.026)***	(0.029)***	(0.029)**	(0.029)**	(0.006)***	(0.056)***
	[0.025]***	[0.026]***	[0.028]***	[0.027]***	[0.006]***	[0.054]***
Adjusted R^2	0.082	0.183	0.404	0.055	0.058	0.150
Observations	494	494	494	494	494	494
Clusters	7	7	7	7	7	7
Mean	0.672	0.656	0.437	0.235	0.923	2.000

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Due to number of unbalanced clusters, we follow Cameron and Miller (2015) using the bias-adjusted cluster-robust standard errors, and the data determined degrees of freedom adjustment in Imbens and Kolesár (2016). Conley standard errors in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

to our control region with the migrants to other nearby rural regions. We estimate equation (4) using educational attainment as the outcome variable restricting the sample to migrants. The left panel of Table 18 shows that the control group attracted relatively high skilled migrants, compared with migrants to other nearby regions. Considering the entire population in the control region vs all other non-UFCo rural regions (right panel of Table 18), we find households within the control group have more years of schooling and a higher probability of completing primary and secondary education.

Table 18: Human Capital: Control Region Outside UFCo vs. Other Non-UFCo Rural Regions

	Migrants			All population		
	Years of schooling	Primary	Secondary	Years of schooling	Primary	Secondary
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Control Region	1.208	0.171	0.016	1.453	0.259	0.029
	(1.530)	(0.090)	(0.022)	(0.667)	(0.099)*	(0.015)
	[0.022]***	[0.003]***	[0.000]***	[0.033]***	[0.003]***	[0.000]***
Adjusted R^2	0.073	0.014	0.004	0.078	0.029	0.008
Observations	1,091	1,091	1,091	2,067	2,067	2,067
Clusters	7	7	7	7	7	7
Mean	2.448	0.111	0.007	2.425	0.107	0.006

Notes: The unit of observation is the individual. Robust standard errors clustered by census block, are in parentheses. Due to number of unbalanced clusters, we follow Cameron and Miller (2015) using the bias-adjusted cluster-robust standard errors, and the data determined degrees of freedom adjustment in Imbens and Kolesár (2016). Conley standard errors in brackets. All regressions include geographic and individual controls, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

J Details on Government Expenditures

This section discusses how government spending in regions around the UFCo was not different from the spending in the rest of the country. We gathered data on government spending per municipality from annual reports from the Comptroller General of the Republic of Costa Rica (*Contraloría General de la República de Costa Rica*) published between 1955 and 1984,[60] and estimate spending per capita. Table 19 compares government spending per capita between UFCo municipalities and all other rural municipalities in the country, and do not find significant differences.

[60] Although the publication was annual, the records on government spending per municipality appear for 15 years between 1951 (the first publication year) and 1984 (when the UFCo ended operations).

Table 19: Comparison of Government Spending per Capita across Municipalities

	ln Government Spending per Capita	
	(1)	(2)
UFCo	0.007	-0.008
	(0.078)	(0.082)
Year FE	No	Yes
Adjusted R^2	-0.001	0.316

Notes: Observations: 690. Clusters: 50. The unit of observation is the municipality. Robust standard errors clustered by municipality, in parentheses. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

K The Caribbean Coast, the Pacific Coast, and the Role of Race

This section explores whether outside options differ for workers near the Costa Rican Caribbean Coast and the Pacific Coast. Table 20 documents how, indeed, UFCo households near the Pacific Coast have better living standards than their neighbors, although these differences are not significant for most outcomes. There are a few reasons why differences between households living on both coasts might emerge. First, consistent with Table 4, households near the Pacific are closer to areas that are highly suitable to grow coffee, which increases their outside option and would lead to better living standards through the lens of our mechanism.

Second, Afro-Costa Rican communities were mainly near the Caribbean area and faced mobility restrictions that prevented them from moving to the Pacific Coast. Although Afro-Costaricans represented a minority in the area, this lower mobility might have affected their outcomes. To explore this, we run regressions that include an interaction term between the UFCo dummy and a dummy variable equal to one if the household is classified as black, and zero otherwise. Table 21 shows that the gap between UFCo and non-UFCo households is smaller conditional on a household member being classified as black or of African descent in the censuses. It is worth noting that ethnicity is available only in the 2000 and 2011 censuses and not before that. Thus, results in this table consider only these two years.

Table 20: Average UFCo Effect-Comparison Between Households on the Pacific Coast and the Caribbean Coast

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UFCo×Pacific	-0.049	-0.018	-0.001	-0.010	-0.013	-0.078
	(0.009)***	(0.008)**	(0.005)	(0.005)*	(0.009)	(0.020)***
	[0.021]**	[0.016]	[0.015]	[0.014]	[0.029]	[0.056]
UFCo	-0.027	-0.013	-0.009	-0.013	-0.031	-0.062
	(0.004)***	(0.004)***	(0.003)***	(0.003)***	(0.005)***	(0.010)***
Pacific	-0.047	-0.015	-0.040	-0.008	-0.060	-0.110
	(0.027)*	(0.023)	(0.016)**	(0.016)	(0.028)**	(0.066)*
Adjusted R^2	0.088	0.084	0.217	0.015	0.101	0.170
Observations	377,099	377,099	377,099	377,099	377,099	377,099
Clusters	9,928	9,928	9,928	9,928	9,928	9,928

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 21: Average UFCo Effect-Households Where Any Member is Classified as Black or of African Descent, for Years 2000 and 2011

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UFCo×Black	0.084	0.020	0.067	-0.006	0.071	0.165
	(0.047)*	(0.017)	(0.039)*	(0.045)	(0.068)	(0.080)**
	[0.031]***	[0.015]	[0.038]*	[0.037]	[0.055]	[0.054]***
UFCo	-0.096	-0.006	-0.046	-0.058	-0.140	-0.206
	(0.026)***	(0.009)	(0.024)*	(0.029)**	(0.033)***	(0.047)***
Black	-0.052	0.001	-0.039	0.015	-0.025	-0.075
	(0.033)	(0.011)	(0.032)	(0.039)	(0.055)	(0.055)
Adjusted R^2	0.018	0.010	0.141	0.010	0.055	0.071
Observations	6,673	6,673	6,673	6,673	6,673	6,673
Clusters	166	166	166	166	166	166

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

L Labor Movements in Costa Rica during the UFCo's Tenure

According to LaBarge (1959), before 1943, labor organization in Costa Rica was centered around the Costa Rican Communist Party (*Partido Comunista de Costa Rica*), which was founded in the 1930s. The party had several successes, which led to higher minimum wages and better living conditions for workers across industries (including both banana and coffee). After 1944, a Labor Code which gave legal status to unions, and gave them the right to negotiate collective contracts was created. Regardless, little attention was devoted to the creation of unions between 1945 and 1949. Up until this period, "there was no effective organization of workers in the banana zones (LaBarge, 1959, p. 310)."[61]

[61]The Labor Union of Workers from Quepos, "Rerum Novarum," was founded in 1944, but it was small and inactive until the 1950s, while other unions established were even smaller. While some labor agitation took place in the late 1940s, formal requests were presented and there were no strikes.

On December 3rd, 1949, the Labor Union of Workers of the Banana Industry from Quepos was formed, but it led only to minor concessions by the UFCo, and it had only 104 members by 1952. After this year, the labor union managed settlements of individual minor grievances only. In the Pacific area, two relatively important strikes occurred. The first one (1953) collapsed without concessions from the UFCo. During the second one (1955), minor concessions were given to the workers, mostly related to improved housing conditions. Compared with the activities staged on the Pacific Coast, there were almost no organized labor movements on the Caribbean side of the country. The area did not witness major strikes after the 1940s and labor relations "revolved almost entirely about the presentation and settlement of highly individualized complaints" (LaBarge, 1959, p. 324).

M Additional Robustness Checks

Our additional robustness checks presented in this section include: running our regressions at different distances from the boundary, changing the specifications of the latitude-longitude polynomial, and varying the control variables.

M.1 The River vs. the Boundary

In this subsection we present our average and yearly results restricting our observations to units on the "wrong side" of the river that closely follows our boundary. Our results hold even within these narrower neighborhoods.

Table 22: Average UFCo Effect–River Test: Restricted 1 km

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UFCo	-0.100	-0.014	-0.085	-0.084	-0.149	-0.284
	(0.034)***	(0.030)	(0.030)***	(0.024)***	(0.046)***	(0.074)***
	[0.022]***	[0.010]	[0.018]***	[0.019]***	[0.024]***	[0.027]***
Adjusted R^2	0.144	0.224	0.274	0.031	0.157	0.269
Observations	1,937	1,937	1,937	1,937	1,937	1,937
Clusters	44	44	44	44	44	44
Mean	0.176	0.060	0.235	0.200	0.481	0.670

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. The sample is restricted to census block located within 1 km of the UFCo boundary. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude.

Table 23: Dynamics of the UFCo-Effect Across Years-River Test (Restricted 1 km)

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
$UFCo_{1973}$	-0.140	-0.271	-0.090	-0.117	-0.202	-0.619
	(0.041)***	(0.061)***	(0.049)*	(0.047)**	(0.072)***	(0.126)***
	[0.031]***	[0.065]***	[0.064]	[0.046]**	[0.093]**	[0.148]***
$UFCo_{1984}$	0.017	0.034	-0.126	-0.130	-0.123	-0.273
	(0.065)	(0.027)	(0.047)***	(0.043)***	(0.050)**	(0.132)**
	[0.060]	[0.018]	[0.048]***	[0.045]***	[0.044]	[0.133]**
$UFCo_{2000}$	-0.083	0.010	-0.084	0.001	-0.104	-0.156
	(0.039)**	(0.027)	(0.021)***	(0.029)	(0.056)*	(0.088)*
	[0.044]*	[0.028]	[0.018]***	[0.039]	[0.069]	[0.112]
$UFCo_{2011}$	-0.073	-0.015	-0.104	-0.093	-0.181	-0.285
	(0.037)*	(0.022)	(0.041)**	(0.043)**	(0.047)***	(0.093)***
	[0.026]***	[0.015]	[0.050]**	[0.039]**	[0.110]***	[0.061]***
Adjusted R^2	0.146	0.239	0.273	0.025	0.156	0.267
Observations	1,937	1,937	1,937	1,937	1,937	1,937
Clusters	44	44	44	44	44	44
$Mean_{1973}$	0.491	0.396	0.455	0.252	0.829	1.595
$Mean_{1984}$	0.265	0.053	0.357	0.186	0.563	0.861
$Mean_{2000}$	0.150	0.037	0.255	0.208	0.497	0.650
$Mean_{2011}$	0.134	0.018	0.164	0.197	0.405	0.513

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. The sample is restricted to census block located within 1 km of the UFCo boundary. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

M.2 Eliminating Observations Close to the Boundary

We present our main results after eliminating the top 5% and 10% of households that are closest to the border on each side.

Table 24: Average UFCo Effect– Eliminating Observations Close to the Boundary

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
			Omitting the Top 5%			
UFCo	-0.105	-0.025	-0.049	-0.067	-0.131	-0.247
	(0.030)***	(0.020)	(0.026)**	(0.029)**	(0.034)***	(0.063)***
	[0.039]***	[0.018]	[0.017]***	[0.027]**	[0.028]***	[0.064]***
Adjusted R^2	0.105	0.181	0.240	0.015	0.117	0.205
Observations	8,654	8,654	8,654	8,654	8,654	8,654
Clusters	191	191	191	191	191	191
Mean	0.172	0.059	0.231	0.198	0.475	0.659
			Omitting the Top 10%			
UFCo	-0.101	-0.012	-0.052	-0.060	-0.122	-0.225
	(0.033)***	(0.022)	(0.029)*	(0.029)**	(0.036)***	(0.067)***
	[0.039]***	[0.024]	[0.0218]***	[0.021]***	[0.053]***	[0.050]***
Adjusted R^2	0.136	0.186	0.235	0.015	0.111	0.200
Observations	8,147	8,147	8,147	8,147	8,147	8,147
Clusters	181	181	181	181	181	181
Mean	0.170	0.059	0.231	0.199	0.476	0.660

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. The sample omits the top 5% and 10% observations closest to the study boundary on each side, respectively. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

M.3 Varying Specifications for the Latitude-Longitude Polynomial

In our original results, we used a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. In this section, we test the robustness of our results to different specifications for the RD polynomial. In particular, we use a quadratic polynomial and a linear polynomial in latitude, longitude, and distance to the boundary.

M.3.1 Quadratic Latitude-Longitude Polynomial

Table 25: Average UFCo Effect-Quadratic Latitude-Longitude Polynomial

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UFCo	-0.107	-0.022	-0.058	-0.070	-0.138	-0.257
	(0.027)***	(0.018)	(0.022)***	(0.026)***	(0.030)***	(0.057)***
	[0.034]***	[0.015]	[0.009]***	[0.025]***	[0.025]***	[0.055]***
Adjusted R^2	0.102	0.169	0.239	0.015	0.116	0.200
Observations	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179
Clusters	206	206	206	206	206	206
Mean	0.171	0.058	0.232	0.199	0.475	0.670

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a quadratic polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 26: Dynamics Across Years-Quadratic Latitude-Longitude Polynomial

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
$UFCo_{1973}$	-0.230	-0.292	-0.057	-0.139	-0.258	-0.718
	(0.065)***	(0.077)***	(0.042)***	(0.046)***	(0.068)***	(0.154)***
	[0.070]***	[0.076]***	[0.030]*	[0.049]***	[0.055]***	[0.148]***
$UFCo_{1984}$	-0.073	0.009	-0.088	-0.081	-0.101	-0.233
	(0.049)	(0.028)	(0.027)***	(0.035)**	(0.048)**	(0.093)**
	[0.035]**	[0.012]	[0.019]***	[0.029]***	[0.032]***	[0.061]***
$UFCo_{2000}$	-0.097	0.017	-0.062	-0.152	-0.136	-0.239
	(0.032)***	(0.018)	(0.022)***	(0.028)***	(0.038)***	(0.061)***
	[0.033]***	[0.016]	[0.009]***	[0.025]***	[0.032]***	[0.054]***
$UFCo_{2011}$	-0.093	0.015	-0.040	-0.024	-0.108	-0.142
	(0.031)***	(0.017)	(0.029)	(0.035)	(0.038)***	(0.062)**
	[0.034]***	[0.018]	[0.025]	[0.051]	[0.049]**	[0.087]
Adjusted R^2	0.104	0.199	0.239	0.017	0.117	0.207
Observations	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179
Clusters	206	206	206	206	206	206
$Mean_{1973}$	0.462	0.353	0.393	0.208	0.777	1.416
$Mean_{1984}$	0.209	0.060	0.362	0.201	0.579	0.832
$Mean_{2000}$	0.145	0.031	0.230	0.178	0.452	0.584
$Mean_{2011}$	0.118	0.016	0.156	0.211	0.396	0.501

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a quadratic polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

M.3.2 Linear Polynomial in Latitude, Longitude and Distance to the Boundary

Table 27: Contemporary Household Outcomes: Average UFCo Effect-Linear Polynomial in Latitude, Longitude and Distance to the Boundary

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UFCo	-0.101	-0.022	-0.053	-0.065	-0.132	-0.242
	(0.026)***	(0.017)	(0.022)**	(0.024)***	(0.030)***	(0.055)***
	[0.031]***	[0.015]	[0.016]***	[0.025]***	[0.026]***	[0.053]***
Adjusted R^2	0.102	0.169	0.238	0.015	0.115	0.199
Observations	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179
Clusters	206	206	206	206	206	206
Mean	0.171	0.058	0.232	0.199	0.475	0.658

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude, longitude, and distance to the UFCo boundary.We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 28: Contemporary Household Outcomes: Dynamics Across Years-Linear Polynomial in Latitude, Longitude and Distance to the Boundary

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
$UFCo_{1973}$	-0.220	-0.279	-0.064	-0.134	-0.250	-0.670
	(0.065)***	(0.078)***	(0.045)***	(0.048)***	(0.068)***	(0.159)***
	[0.066]***	[0.077]***	[0.034]	[0.047]***	[0.054]***	[0.147]***
$UFCo_{1984}$	-0.066	0.009	-0.084	-0.075	-0.093	-0.214
	(0.047)	(0.028)	(0.028)***	(0.035)**	(0.047)**	(0.091)**
	[0.031]**	[0.014]	[0.022]***	[0.031]**	[0.032]***	[0.064]***
$UFCo_{2000}$	-0.090	0.017	-0.057	-0.090	-0.144	-0.219
	(0.031)**	(0.017)	(0.058)***	(0.027)***	(0.036)***	(0.058)***
	[0.031]***	[0.015]	[0.014]***	[0.025]***	[0.032]***	[0.055]***
$UFCo_{2011}$	-0.088	0.019	-0.038	-0.018	-0.102	-0.125
	(0.031)***	(0.016)	(0.030)	(0.035)	(0.038)***	(0.063)**
	[0.031]***	[0.019]	[0.029]	[0.052]	[0.050]**	[0.091]
Adjusted R^2	0.104	0.198	0.238	0.017	0.117	0.206
Observations	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179
Clusters	206	206	206	206	206	206
$Mean_{1973}$	0.462	0.353	0.393	0.208	0.777	1.416
$Mean_{1984}$	0.209	0.060	0.362	0.201	0.579	0.832
$Mean_{2000}$	0.145	0.031	0.230	0.178	0.452	0.584
$Mean_{2011}$	0.118	0.016	0.156	0.211	0.396	0.501

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude, longitude, and distance to the UFCo boundary.

We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

M.4 Varying the Controls

M.4.1 No Demographic Controls

Table 29: Average UFCo Effect-No Demographic Controls

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UFCo	-0.108	-0.020	-0.082	-0.068	-0.150	-0.278
	(0.027)***	(0.017)	(0.025)***	(0.025)***	(0.033)***	(0.063)***
	[0.033]***	[0.014]	[0.010]***	[0.023]***	[0.025]***	[0.056]***
Adjusted R^2	0.071	0.162	0.044	0.003	0.058	0.111
Observations	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179
Clusters	206	206	206	206	206	206
Mean	0.171	0.058	0.232	0.199	0.475	0.658

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 30: Contemporary Household Outcomes: Dynamics Across Years-No Demographic Controls

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
$UFCo_{1973}$	-0.229	-0.286	-0.082	-0.136	-0.270	-0.732
	(0.064)***	(0.079)***	(0.058)	(0.049)**	(0.069)***	(0.166)***
	[0.066]***	[0.077]***	[0.049]*	[0.050]***	[0.056]***	[0.154]***
$UFCo_{1984}$	-0.067	0.010	-0.086	-0.075	-0.095	-0.219
	(0.050)	(0.027)	(0.035)**	(0.036)**	(0.055)	(0.107)**
	[0.040]*	[0.015]	[0.025]***	[0.031]**	[0.037]***	[0.077]***
$UFCo_{2000}$	-0.098	0.020	-0.091	-0.092	-0.166	-0.262
	(0.030)***	(0.017)	(0.027)***	(0.027)***	(0.039)***	(0.062)***
	[0.033]***	[0.015]	[0.015]***	[0.024]***	[0.034]***	[0.058]***
$UFCo_{2011}$	-0.095	0.021	-0.072	-0.022	-0.124	-0.168
	(0.031)***	(0.016)	(0.029)**	(0.034)	(0.038)***	(0.063)***
	[0.032]***	[0.018]	[0.019]***	[0.050]	[0.044]***	[0.078]**
Adjusted R^2	0.073	0.192	0.044	0.005	0.059	0.118
Observations	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179
Clusters	206	206	206	206	206	206
$Mean_{1973}$	0.462	0.353	0.393	0.208	0.777	1.416
$Mean_{1984}$	0.209	0.060	0.362	0.201	0.579	0.832
$Mean_{2000}$	0.145	0.031	0.230	0.178	0.452	0.584
$Mean_{2011}$	0.118	0.016	0.156	0.211	0.396	0.501

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

M.4.2 No Geographic Controls

Table 31: Average UFCo Effect-No Geographic Controls

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UFCo	-0.105	-0.021	-0.054	-0.067	-0.137	-0.247
	(0.026)***	(0.017)	(0.022)**	(0.024)***	(0.030)***	(0.057)***
	[0.031]***	[0.016]	[0.018]***	[0.023]***	[0.025]***	[0.052]***
Adjusted R^2	0.101	0.169	0.238	0.015	0.115	0.199
Observations	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179
Clusters	206	206	206	206	206	206
Mean	0.171	0.058	0.232	0.199	0.475	0.658

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 32: Contemporary Household Outcomes: Dynamics Across Years-No Geographic Controls

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
$UFCo_{1973}$	-0.227	-0.289	-0.055	-0.136	-0.255	-0.708
	(0.062)***	(0.079)***	(0.045)	(0.046)***	(0.067)***	(0.158)***
	[0.064]***	[0.078]***	[0.035]	[0.048]***	[0.053]***	[0.146]***
$UFCo_{1984}$	-0.072	0.009	-0.084	-0.077	-0.098	-0.225
	(0.047)	(0.028)	(0.027)***	(0.035)**	(0.046)**	(0.092)**
	[0.036]**	[0.016]	[0.023]***	[0.031]**	[0.034]***	[0.069]***
$UFCo_{2000}$	-0.094	0.017	-0.057	-0.089	-0.147	-0.224
	(0.031)***	(0.017)	(0.023)**	(0.026)***	(0.037)***	(0.059)***
	[0.029]***	[0.017]	[0.018]***	[0.024]***	[0.030]***	[0.050]***
$UFCo_{2011}$	-0.092	0.017	-0.037	-0.020	-0.110	-0.137
	(0.030)***	(0.017)	(0.029)	(0.035)	(0.037)***	(0.062)**
	[0.029]***	[0.019]	[0.030]	[0.046]	[0.047]**	[0.085]
Adjusted R^2	0.103	0.199	0.238	0.017	0.117	0.206
Observations	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179
Clusters	206	206	206	206	206	206
$Mean_{1973}$	0.462	0.353	0.393	0.208	0.777	1.416
$Mean_{1984}$	0.209	0.060	0.362	0.201	0.579	0.832
$Mean_{2000}$	0.145	0.031	0.230	0.178	0.452	0.584
$Mean_{2011}$	0.118	0.016	0.156	0.211	0.396	0.501

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

M.4.3 No Demographic or Geographic Controls

Table 33: Average UFCo Effect-No Demographic or Geographic Controls

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UFCo	-0.111	-0.019	-0.083	-0.069	-0.154	-0.281
	(0.027)***	(0.017)	(0.025)***	(0.025)***	(0.034)***	(0.064)***
	[0.034]***	[0.016]	[0.011]***	[0.022]***	[0.025]***	[0.057]***
Adjusted R^2	0.071	0.162	0.044	0.003	0.058	0.111
Observations	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179
Clusters	206	206	206	206	206	206
Mean	0.171	0.058	0.232	0.199	0.475	0.658

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 34: Dynamics Across Years-No Demographic or Geographic Controls

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
$UFCo_{1973}$	-0.232	-0.293	-0.055	-0.134	-0.251	-0.709
	(0.064)***	(0.077)***	(0.045)	(0.046)***	(0.067)***	(0.155)***
	[0.066]***	[0.076]***	[0.034]	[0.049]***	[0.054]***	[0.145]***
$UFCo_{1984}$	-0.071	0.009	-0.084	-0.076	-0.094	-0.218
	(0.050)	(0.027)	(0.028)***	(0.035)**	(0.047)	(0.092)**
	[0.033]	[0.013]	[0.024]***	[0.031]**	[0.035]***	[0.066]***
$UFCo_{2000}$	-0.102	0.017	-0.055	-0.090	-0.143	-0.217
	(0.030)***	(0.017)	(0.022)**	(0.027)***	(0.037)***	(0.059)***
	[0.031]***	[0.016]	[0.014]***	[0.026]***	[0.032]***	[0.054]***
$UFCo_{2011}$	-0.099	0.017	-0.038	-0.019	-0.102	-0.128
	(0.030)***	(0.017)	(0.029)	(0.035)	(0.038)***	(0.064)***
	[0.030]***	[0.019]	[0.029]	[0.053]	[0.051]***	[0.093]
Adjusted R^2	0.073	0.199	0.238	0.017	0.058	0.206
Observations	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179
Clusters	206	206	206	206	206	206
$Mean_{1973}$	0.462	0.353	0.393	0.208	0.777	1.416
$Mean_{1984}$	0.209	0.060	0.362	0.201	0.579	0.832
$Mean_{2000}$	0.145	0.031	0.230	0.178	0.452	0.584
$Mean_{2011}$	0.118	0.016	0.156	0.211	0.396	0.501

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

N Méndez & Trejos Index

In this section, we re-estimate equations (1) and (2) using the Unsatisfied Basic Needs (UBN) originally proposed by Méndez and Trejos (2004) for the 2000 and 2011 censuses. We find that our main message is unchanged.

Table 35: Average UFCo Effect-Méndez & Trejos Index

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UFCo	-0.086	-0.023	-0.054	-0.020	-0.103	-0.184
	(0.030)***	(0.050)	(0.026)**	(0.018)	(0.043)**	(0.077)**
	[0.034]**	[0.031]	[0.025]**	[0.014]	[0.035]***	[0.069]***
Adjusted R^2	0.018	0.025	0.147	0.025	0.075	0.091
Observations	7,016	7,016	7,016	7,016	7,016	7,016
Clusters	166	166	166	166	166	166
Mean	0.129	0.023	0.188	0.197	0.420	0.536

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 36: Dynamics Across Years-Méndez & Trejos Index

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
$UFCo_{2000}$	-0.085	-0.012	-0.062	-0.038	-0.104	-0.196
	(0.036)**	(0.066)	(0.023)***	(0.019)***	(0.052)**	(0.102)*
	[0.037]**	[0.051]	[0.025]***	[0.016]**	[0.042]**	[0.083]**
$UFCo_{2011}$	-0.087	-0.032	-0.048	-0.006	-0.103	-0.104
	(0.033)***	(0.049)	(0.031)	(0.020)	(0.045)**	(0.075)**
	[0.037]**	[0.030]	[0.032]	[0.019]	[0.041]**	[0.077]**
Adjusted R^2	0.018	0.025	0.147	0.025	0.075	0.091
Observations	7,016	7,016	7,016	7,016	7,016	7,016
Clusters	166	166	166	166	166	166
$Mean_{2000}$	0.145	0.031	0.230	0.178	0.452	0.584
$Mean_{2011}$	0.118	0.016	0.156	0.211	0.396	0.501

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

O Distance to a Railroad

In this section, we include as a control variable the nearest distance of each census block centroid to a railroad. Our results suggest that the UFCo effect is not exclusively a product of the provision of railroads.

Table 37: Average UFCo Effect-Distance to a Railroad

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UFCo	-0.103	-0.023	-0.053	-0.065	-0.132	-0.244
	(0.026)***	(0.017)	(0.022)**	(0.025)***	(0.030)***	(0.057)***
	[0.031]***	[0.017]	[0.016]***	[0.025]***	[0.027]***	[0.055]***
Adjusted R^2	0.101	0.169	0.238	0.015	0.115	0.199
Observations	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179
Clusters	206	206	206	206	206	206
Mean	0.171	0.058	0.232	0.199	0.475	0.658

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include a control for distance to a railroad; geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 38: Dynamics Across Years-Distance to a Railroad

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
$UFCo_{1973}$	-0.228	-0.297	-0.055	-0.134	-0.252	-0.709
	(0.062)***	(0.077)***	(0.045)	(0.046)***	(0.067)***	(0.155)***
	[0.066]***	[0.076]***	[0.034]**	[0.049]***	[0.054]***	[0.145]***
$UFCo_{1984}$	-0.068	0.009	-0.084	-0.076	-0.094	-0.218
	(0.048)	(0.027)	(0.028)***	(0.035)**	(0.047)**	(0.092)**
	[0.033]**	[0.013]	[0.024]***	[0.031]**	[0.035]***	[0.066]***
$UFCo_{2000}$	-0.089	0.017	-0.055	-0.090	-0.143	-0.217
	(0.031)***	(0.017)	(0.022)**	(0.027)***	(0.037)***	(0.059)***
	[0.031]***	[0.016]	[0.014]***	[0.026]***	[0.032]***	[0.054]***
$UFCo_{2011}$	-0.090	0.018	-0.038	-0.019	-0.102	-0.128
	(0.031)***	(0.017)	(0.029)	(0.035)	(0.038)***	(0.064)**
	[0.030]***	[0.019]	[0.029]	[0.053]	[0.051]**	[0.093]
Adjusted R^2	0.104	0.199	0.238	0.017	0.117	0.206
Observations	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179	9,179
Clusters	206	206	206	206	206	206
$Mean_{1973}$	0.462	0.353	0.393	0.208	0.777	1.416
$Mean_{1984}$	0.209	0.060	0.362	0.201	0.579	0.832
$Mean_{2000}$	0.145	0.031	0.230	0.178	0.452	0.584
$Mean_{2011}$	0.118	0.016	0.156	0.211	0.396	0.501

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include a control for distance to a railroad; geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

P Assessing the Impact of Migration

In this section we run our regressions on subsamples of households where (i) nobody migrated, and (ii) the head of household did not migrate; both within 5 years of each census. Our results persist, indicating that migration is not driving our estimations. It is also worth noting that migration rates between UFCo and non-UFCo census-blocks are balanced; in particular, Table 39 compares migration rates in UFCo and non-UFCo locations.

Table 39: Difference in Migration Rates in UFCo and Non-UFCo Census-Blocks

	(1)
UFCo	-0.006
	(0.014)
Adjusted R^2	0.072
Observations	206
Clusters	206
Mean	0.092

Notes: Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. The regression includes census fixed effects. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

P.0.1 No member migrated within 5 years of the census.

Table 40: Average UFCo Effect-Any Migrant

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UFCo	-0.114	-0.018	-0.066	-0.074	-0.151	-0.272
	(0.027)***	(0.017)	(0.024)***	(0.026)***	(0.030)***	(0.061)***
	[0.034]***	[0.017]	[0.015]***	[0.020]***	[0.021]***	[0.044]***
Adjusted R^2	0.091	0.171	0.232	0.012	0.109	0.188
Observations	6,855	6,855	6,855	6,855	6,855	6,855
Clusters	206	206	206	206	206	206
Mean	0.160	0.054	0.221	0.206	0.467	0.641

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. The sample is restricted to households whose members are all non-migrants. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 41: Dynamics of the UFCo-Effect Across Years-Any Migrant

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
$UFCo_{1973}$	-0.273	-0.271	-0.096	-0.189	-0.292	-0.829
	(0.055)***	(0.077)***	(0.049)*	(0.040)***	(0.073)***	(0.169)***
	[0.062]***	[0.078]***	[0.030]***	[0.041]***	[0.065]***	[0.156]***
$UFCo_{1984}$	-0.087	-0.000	-0.107	-0.093	-0.139	-0.288
	(0.046)*	(0.028)	(0.033)***	(0.042)**	(0.049)***	(0.092)***
	[0.043]**	[0.016]	[0.024]***	[0.038]**	[0.032]***	[0.067]***
$UFCo_{2000}$	-0.090	0.011	-0.051	-0.105	-0.150	-0.235
	(0.030)***	(0.017)	(0.026)**	(0.031)***	(0.036)***	(0.059)***
	[0.029]***	[0.018]	[0.020]***	[0.029]***	[0.027]***	[0.046]***
$UFCo_{2011}$	-0.103	0.018	-0.055	0.013	-0.119	-0.153
	(0.031)***	(0.016)	(0.033)	(0.035)	(0.036)***	(0.061)**
	[0.032]***	[0.018]	[0.029]	[0.044]	[0.041]**	[0.072]**
Adjusted R^2	0.094	0.193	0.232	0.016	0.110	0.197
Observations	6,855	6,855	6,855	6,855	6,855	6,855
Clusters	206	206	206	206	206	206
$Mean_{1973}$	0.457	0.376	0.371	0.227	0.777	1.431
$Mean_{1984}$	0.212	0.061	0.369	0.232	0.604	0.875
$Mean_{2000}$	0.135	0.033	0.224	0.179	0.446	0.571
$Mean_{2011}$	0.116	0.017	0.154	0.213	0.395	0.500

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. The sample is restricted to households whose members are all non-migrants. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

P.0.2 Head-of-household did not migrate within 5 years of the census

Table 42: Average UFCo Effect-Head Migrant

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UFCo	-0.115	-0.018	-0.070	-0.080	-0.157	-0.282
	(0.026)***	(0.015)	(0.025)***	(0.025)***	(0.029)***	(0.056)***
	[0.031]***	[0.015]	[0.018]***	[0.023]***	[0.023]***	[0.045]***
Adjusted R^2	0.096	0.174	0.230	0.013	0.112	0.188
Observations	7,555	7,555	7,555	7,555	7,555	7,555
Clusters	206	206	206	206	206	206
Mean	0.165	0.054	0.229	0.201	0.473	0.649

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. The sample is restricted to households whose head of household is non-migrant. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 43: Dynamics of the UFCo-Effect Across Years-Head Migrant

	Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
	Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
$UFCo_{1973}$	-0.253	-0.277	-0.101	-0.178	-0.307	-0.809
	(0.061)***	(0.078)***	(0.047)**	(0.036)***	(0.069)***	(0.158)***
	[0.067]***	[0.081]***	[0.031]***	[0.040]***	[0.060]***	[0.149]***
$UFCo_{1984}$	-0.091	-0.000	-0.106	-0.105	-0.143	-0.302
	(0.047)*	(0.026)	(0.033)***	(0.040)***	(0.045)***	(0.089)***
	[0.037]**	[0.014]	[0.021]***	[0.039]***	[0.033]***	[0.065]***
$UFCo_{2000}$	-0.094	0.014	-0.058	-0.113	-0.157	-0.251
	(0.030)***	(0.017)	(0.024)**	(0.029)***	(0.035)***	(0.056)***
	[0.028]***	[0.019]	[0.020]**	[0.027]***	[0.028]***	[0.052]***
$UFCo_{2011}$	-0.104	0.019	-0.056	-0.019	-0.123	-0.159
	(0.031)***	(0.015)	(0.032)*	(0.033)	(0.036)***	(0.061)***
	[0.029]***	[0.018]	[0.032]	[0.048]	[0.046]***	[0.081]*
Adjusted R^2	0.099	0.199	0.230	0.016	0.114	0.198
Observations	7,555	7,555	7,555	7,555	7,555	7,555
Clusters	206	206	206	206	206	206
$Mean_{1973}$	0.464	0.367	0.377	0.210	0.787	1.418
$Mean_{1984}$	0.213	0.057	0.379	0.219	0.603	0.868
$Mean_{2000}$	0.141	0.031	0.231	0.176	0.451	0.579
$Mean_{2011}$	0.118	0.017	0.159	0.212	0.398	0.505

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. The sample is restricted to households whose head of household is non-migrant. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Q Verifying that Results are not Driven by Persistence of Better Agricultural Abilities

A concern might be that the higher productivity and better infrastructure in the UFCo attracted people who were ex-ante better at growing crops; and that what we are capturing is the persistence of these abilities across generations. Therefore, in this section, we compare the UFCo effect in households that worked in agricultural activities with the effect on households devoted to other non-agricultural enterprises, and find no significant difference in the UFCo effect.

Table 44 compares our results for households where a member is employed in agricultural activities against all other households. Table 45 shows how households whose head works in agricultural activities deliver equivalent estimates to households where the head is employed in other activities.

Table 44: Average UFCo Effect-Comparison of Households Where Any Member is Engaged in the Agriculture Sector Versus Other Economic Sectors

		Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
		Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Agricultural Sector	UFCo	-0.102	-0.030	-0.046	-0.063	-0.134	-0.242
		(0.027)***	(0.178)*	(0.024)*	(0.026)**	(0.032)***	(0.057)***
		[0.027]***	[0.014]	[0.0203]**	[0.023]***	[0.020]***	[0.045]***
	Adjusted R^2	0.123	0.187	0.246	0.044	0.152	0.245
	Observations	6,449	6,449	6,449	6,449	6,449	6,449
	Clusters	206	206	206	206	206	206
	Mean	0.180	0.067	0.263	0.187	0.489	0.697
Non-Agricultural Sector	UFCo	-0.093	0.002	-0.077	-0.061	-0.118	-0.230
		(0.039)**	(0.024)	(0.032)**	(0.049)	(0.051)**	(0.094)**
		[0.047]**	[0.025]	[0.025]***	[0.025]**	[0.039]***	[0.080]***
	Adjusted R^2	0.048	0.089	0.169	0.018	0.045	0.068
	Observations	2,730	2,730	2,730	2,730	2,730	2,730
	Clusters	199	199	199	199	199	199
	Mean	0.148	0.035	0.157	0.226	0.442	0.567
P-value for difference		0.798	0.170	0.376	0.971	0.774	0.899

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. The p-values in the last row are for the test of the hypothesis that the UFCo coefficient is the same between the two groups, and are clustered at the census-block level. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 45: Average UFCo Effect-Comparison of Households Where Head of Household is Engaged in the Agriculture Sector Versus Other Economic Sectors

		Probability of UBN in				Probability	Total number
		Housing	Health	Education	Consumption	of being poor	of UBN
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Agricultural Sector	UFCo	-0.092	-0.033	-0.038	-0.048	-0.115	-0.212
		(0.029)***	(0.020)	(0.026)	(0.028)*	(0.035)***	(0.063)***
		[0.025]***	[0.014]**	[0.026]	[0.022]**	[0.026]***	[0.057]***
	Adjusted R^2	0.128	0.195	0.252	0.044	0.155	0.253
	Observations	5,574	5,574	5,574	5,574	5,574	5,574
	Clusters	206	206	206	206	206	206
	Mean	0.177	0.071	0.254	0.194	0.484	0.695
Non-Agricultural Sector	UFCo	-0.118	0.002	-0.085	-0.090	-0.160	-0.296
		(0.033)***	(0.017)	(0.030)***	(0.039)**	(0.039)***	(0.066)***
		[0.045]***	[0.021]	[0.020]***	[0.027]***	[0.025]***	[0.062]***
	Adjusted R^2	0.064	0.089	0.209	0.012	0.067	0.103
	Observations	3,605	3,605	3,605	3,605	5,574	3,605
	Clusters	203	203	203	203	203	203
	Mean	0.166	0.039	0.200	0.208	0.467	0.612
P-value for difference		0.473	0.098	0.188	0.366	0.334	0.248

Notes: UBN= Unsatisfied Basic Need. The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. The p-values in the last row are for the test of the hypothesis that the UFCo coefficient is the same between the two groups, and are clustered at the census-block level. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

R Outside Options in 1973 and Current Outcomes

Figure 17: Outside Options during UFCo's Tenure and Current Outcomes



(a) Probability of Being Poor



(b) Total Number of Unsatisfied Needs



(c) Housing Dimension



(d) Health Dimension



(e) Education Dimension



(f) Consumption Dimension

Notes: Figure 17 shows results from Table 4 graphically. In every case, higher outside options in 1973 within the UFCo are associated with better current outcomes.

S Historical Details to Support the Assumptions in the General Equilibrium Model

Monopsony in the UFCo Region: Between 1912 and 1976, the UFCo employed, on average, 7% of the Costa Rican total agricultural labor force. The UFCo was also the only employer within its landholdings. To measure the degree of monopsony of the UFCo, we analyze how changes in the company's employment correlate with changes in world banana prices during the period 1912 to 1976. Namely, we consider the following regression

$$\ln(\textit{UFCo employment}_t) = \alpha + \beta \ln(P_{Bt}^W) + \varepsilon_t, \tag{5}$$

where P_{Bt}^W stands for the world banana price at year t. The coefficient β measures the degree of monopsony. Assuming decreasing returns to scale, under perfect competition $\beta > 1$, while under monopsony $\beta < 1$.[62]

We estimate β = 0.397 with a robust standard error of 0.089 (thus, the coefficient is significant at the 1% level). The result implies that the company indeed faced an upward-sloping labor supply, i.e., the firm could influence the price of labor. Therefore, it provides support to the assumption that the UFCo was a monopolist, the sole employer within its concession.

Perfect Competition in the Rest of the Country: Aside from bananas, most of the agricultural production during the 20th century in Costa Rica consisted of coffee. Coffee was produced predominantly in small farms, owned by many producers. According to the 1935 Coffee Census, there were 25,477 farms producing coffee and 21,731 producers, on average, 1.17 farms per owner. The coffee plantations were mostly small: 93.81% had an extension below five hectares. We use the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI) to measure coffee production concentration. The HHI is 39.03, suggesting a competitive industry (HHI below 100). Moreover, the 1935 Coffee Census reported 25,472 persons permanently employed in coffee production (on average, one worker per farm), approximately 23% of the Costa Rican total agricultural labor force. This historical evidence sup-

[62] For the intuition behind this result, consider the case of an increase in the price of the final product. The increase in the price of the final product increases the value of the marginal product of labor. Therefore, the optimal response for the firm is to adjust by increasing employment. Under perfect competition, the firm cannot influence wages, and because of the decreasing returns to scale, the change in employment must be more than proportional to the change in the price of the final product. Under monopsony, the firm influences wages, then the increase in labor demand will increase wages, which offsets the initial increase in prices. Therefore, the change in labor is less than proportional to the change in price. The result holds regardless if the firm has market power in the final product market or does not.

ports our assumption of perfect competition in the rest of the country.

Local Government Budget Constraints: The Costa Rican government during the first half of the 20th century had very limited access to capital markets. In the 1870s, the government entered into $15 million of external debt with an 18% interest rate (sovereign bonds sold in England and France). At the time, the service of this external debt represented between 20% and 50% of the value of exports (Marichal, 1988). This burden proved to be too large, and in 1874 the first default on payments occurred. At this time, debt was restructured with a longer maturity and a higher interest rate. A similar story repeated itself in 1901 and 1933. By this time, the debt had increased to $21 million of external debt, as new debt emitted to cover delayed interest payments. The country then entered a moratorium that lasted more than a decade (1935-1946), with payments being defaulted throughout the period. Therefore, the very high loan in the late 1800s and the local inability to serve the interest of this debt, incurred a penalty on the interest rates and borrowing ability.

According to data from Reinhart and Rogoff (2009), between 1899 and 1984 (UFCo tenure), Costa Rica had four episodes of external and domestic debt default or restructuring.[63] The country was in a state of default or restructuring during 37 of the 86 years that cover the period. In particular, for the period that we calibrate our model (1950 to 1973), the country went through two episodes of default, being in a state of default during four of the 24 years. Therefore, we assume that the government has to finance local amenities using collected taxes and is intertemporally constrained.

T Small Area Estimation Methodology

In this section, we use the small area estimation methodology of Elbers et al. (2003) as an alternative to compute household income and poverty status. The methodology imputes income or consumption for each household in the population census, using a prediction model obtained from a household survey. A series of studies employ the method to generate measures of consumption, income, or poverty when is not directly surveyed at a more disaggregated level (e.g., Baird et al. 2013; Enamorado et al. 2016; Asher and Novosad 2020).

To apply the small area estimation methodology, we use the 2000 and 2011 censuses, the 2000 Multipurpose Household Survey (*Encuesta de Hogares de Propósitos Múltiples (EHPM)*), and the 2011 National Household Survey (*Encuesta Nacional de Hogares (ENAHO)*). The EHPM and the

[63] The year when each episode began is 1901, 1932, 1962, and 1981.

ENAHO are nationally representative surveys that share some questions with the corresponding population census and, in addition, contain information on household per capita income. We cannot apply the small area estimation methodology for all the census waves used through the paper because the household survey program began in 1976, and information that might be relevant to predict income, such as dwelling characteristics or asset ownership, was not collected before 1989.

As a first step to implement the methodology, we identified the set of explanatory variables in the EHPM and the ENAHO that are also found in, and strictly comparable to, the corresponding population census. Through a lasso regression, we selected the variables that improved the accuracy of the model. We then use the obtained coefficients to predict household-level real per capita net income (in 2015 Costa Rican Colones) in the census microdata. We iterate the model 1000 times and take the median value for income for each household. A household is considered poor if its median imputed income falls below the poverty line defined by the National Institute of Statistics and Census (*Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos*).[64]

Then, using as dependent variables the values for real income and poverty generated by the small area estimation method, we estimate equation (1). Although we use imputed variables, their use as a dependent variable does not require additional regression adjustments (Elbers et al., 2005). For the case of real income, we use its logarithm. All regressions include geographic and demographic controls, census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude.

Table 46 reports the results for all border segments where the characteristics balance, while Table 47 presents the results for the census blocks in the land that was randomly assigned to the company. Overall, the results obtained through the small area estimation methodology reinforce our main message: in the households located within the former UFCo plantations, the real per capita net income is higher, and the probability of being poor measured using the poverty line is lower.

[64] The National Institute of Statistics and Census constructs the poverty line as the cost of a basic food basket and expands it to non-food components using the Orshansky coefficient. In constant 2015 Costa Rican Colones (CRC), for 2000, the poverty line for urban and rural areas per person per month was 67,188 CRC and 46,251 CRC, respectively. On the other hand, for 2011, the poverty line for urban and rural areas per person per month was 106,697 CRC and 82,198 CRC, respectively.

Table 46: Average UFCo Effect-Small Area Estimation Methodology Along All Border Segments where Characteristics Balance

	ln Household Real per Capita Net Income	Probability of being poor
	(1)	(2)
UFCo	0.044	-0.099
	(0.028)	(0.021)***
	[0.038]	[0.020]***
Adjusted R^2	0.444	0.173
Observations	10,220	10,220
Clusters	274	274
Mean	11.537	0.226

Notes: The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 47: Average UFCo Effect-Small Area Estimation Methodology

	ln Household Real per Capita Net Income	Probability of being poor
	(1)	(2)
UFCo	0.096	-0.107
	(0.037)***	(0.032)***
	[0.043]**	[0.019]***
Adjusted R^2	0.471	0.186
Observations	7,016	7,016
Clusters	166	166
Mean	11.531	0.208

Notes: The unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include geographic controls (slope, elevation, temperature); demographic controls for the number of adults, children, and infants in the household; census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

U Persistence of the UFCo Effect and Education

Table 48: Average UFCo Effect Across Time for Individuals Who Were Born during UFCo Times, and Were Old Enough to Attend an UFCo School

	Years of Schooling	Primary School
	(1)	(2)
UFCo_{1973}	0.495	0.092
	$(0.133)^{***}$	$(0.017)^{***}$
	$[0.067]^{***}$	$[0.027]^{***}$
UFCo_{1984}	0.654	0.088
	$(0.099)^{***}$	$(0.011)^{***}$
	$[0.206]^{***}$	$[0.022]^{***}$
UFCo_{2000}	0.771	0.096
	$(0.089)^{***}$	$(0.008)^{***}$
	$[0.253]^{***}$	$[0.020]^{***}$
UFCo_{2011}	0.615	0.075
	$(0.085)^{***}$	$(0.007)^{***}$
	$[0.314]^{**}$	$[0.018]^{***}$
Adjusted R^2	0.172	0.174
Observations	281,363	281,363
Clusters	9,570	9,570
Mean_{1973}	4.236	0.375
Mean_{1984}	5.366	0.554
Mean_{2000}	5.959	0.618
Mean_{2011}	6.635	0.664

Notes: The unit of observation is the individual. The sample is restricted to individuals who were at least 12 years old at the time of UFCo's closure, such that they might have been directly exposed to UFCo schools. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by census block, are in parentheses. Conley standard errors are in brackets. All regressions include include geographic and individual controls, census fixed effects, and a linear polynomial in latitude and longitude. We denote: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

V Model's Framework and Estimation

V.1 Theoretical Framework

There are $j \in \{1, ..., N\}$ locations, and time is discrete. Throughout, we use a prime to denote next-period values. Each individual lives for one period. First, each agent is born in the location where her parent lives. Then, she chooses whether to live and work in this location, or to move to a different location. Once the location is chosen, the individual supplies a unit of labor inelastically to produce a differentiated variety in the location she lives, and she consumes. The period ends with the agent having one offspring.[65] The total number of workers is normalized in each period and the initial population is exogenous.

Household Preferences and Consumption After endogenously choosing their location, agents consume and derive utility. In particular, workers living in region j have constant elasticity of substitution (CES) preference with elasticity σ across differentiated domestic goods (c). Additionally, they derive utility from the per capita local amenities of the region where they live. The deterministic component of welfare—defined as welfare up to an idiosyncratic shock that we will introduce below—of a worker residing in location j is given by $\mathcal{U}(c_{jk},\, \tilde{a}_j) = \tilde{a}_j[\sum_{k=1}^{N} c_{jk}^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}}]^{\frac{\alpha\sigma}{\sigma-1}}$, where $\tilde{a}_j = (A_j/L_j)^{1-\alpha}$ captures the utility derived from per capita local amenities.[66] Each worker supplies one unit of labor inelastically and earns a nominal wage (w_j). Let P_j be the CES price index.[67] The *equilibrium* deterministic utility of a worker in location j can be expressed as $W_j = \tilde{a}_j \left(\frac{w_j}{P_j}\right)^{\alpha}$.

Migration, Shocks and Location Choice As previously stated, the utility of a worker in region j has a deterministic component given by W_j in equilibrium. Further, we allow for bilateral moving costs $\lambda_{jk} \geq 1$, where any value larger than one implies there are migration frictions. Thus, the deterministic utility of a worker who migrates from location j to location k is given by $\frac{W_k}{\lambda_{jk}}$.

[65] This OLG structure, which follows Allen and Donaldson (2018), will allow us to compute steady states which are independent of the initial allocation of individuals across space. This will matter for our counterfactual analysis.

[66] We assume there is perfect congestion in local amenities (i.e., $\tilde{a}_i = \bar{a_j}(A_j/L_j^{\rho})^{1-\alpha}$ with $\rho = 1$). As will become clear in the next subsection, a model with imperfect congestion ($\rho < 1$), would lead to larger investments in local amenities from the UFCo (given the increasing returns to investment) and stronger welfare effects. However, to abstract from this additional agglomeration force and focus on mobility frictions and productivity spillovers, we set $\rho = 1$ and, in this sense, take the effects we find as a lower bound.

[67] As is standard, the CES price index is given by $P_j = \left(\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} (\tau_{nj} p_n)^{1-\sigma}\right)^{1/(1+\sigma)}$, where p_n denotes the price of the variety produced in region $n \neq U$ and τ_{nj} represents bilateral iceberg trade costs (as described below).

Finally, the last component of the utility function is given by idiosyncratic taste differences, denoted by vector $\vec{\omega}$. Therefore, the ultimate utility of a worker living in location j who is *not moving* will depend on the idiosyncratic shock ω_k, and is given by $W_j\omega_j$, while the utility of a resident of location j *moving* to location k is denoted as $W_{jk}(\vec{\omega}) = \frac{W_k\omega_k}{\lambda_{jk}}$. Thus, each period, a worker in location j chooses his location solving $\max_k \left\{ W_{jk}(\vec{\omega}) \right\} = \max_k \left\{ \frac{W_k\omega_k}{\lambda_{jk}} \right\}$.

We further assume that the idiosyncratic utility shifter, $\vec{\omega}$, follows a Frechet extreme value distribution with shape parameter θ. Letting L_j denote the number of workers who live in location j at time t, it follows that the outflow of individuals born in region j who will choose to work in region k (L'_{jk}) can be described as $\frac{L'_{jk}}{L_j} = \frac{\left(\frac{W'_k}{\lambda'_{jk}}\right)^\theta}{\sum_{n=1}^{N}\left(\frac{W'_n}{\lambda'_{jn}}\right)^\theta}$. Finally, we can derive the gravity equation describing bilateral migration flows from location j as a function of its current population, expected utility in j and utility in other locations, as follows:

$$L'_{jk} = (\lambda'_{jk}\Omega'_j)^{-\theta}(W'_k)^\theta L_j, \tag{6}$$

where $\Omega'_j = \left[\sum_{n=1}^{N}\left(\frac{W'_n}{\lambda'_{jn}}\right)^\theta\right]^{\frac{1}{\theta}}$ denotes the expected utility of an individual born in location j.

Trade Local bilateral trade flows from region j to region k incur an iceberg trade cost, $\tau_{jk} \geq 1$, where $\tau_{jk} = 1$ corresponds to frictionless trade. Thus, the bilateral trade flows of domestic goods are governed by a standard gravity equation: $X_{jk} = \tau_{jk}^{1-\sigma}\left(\frac{w_j}{A_j^X}\right)^{1-\sigma}\frac{w_k L_k}{P_k^{1-\sigma}}$.

Producers The country has N regions: one producing "bananas," where only the UFCo operates (denoted 'U'), and other $N-1$ locations ($j \in \{1, 2, ..., N-1\}$) which produce a domestic homogeneous good. We assume bananas are a pure export good, while domestic goods are consumed locally. We proceed by describing these regions and their production schemes.

The UFCo's Region (U) The UFCo is a profit maximizer and the sole employer within its location, departing from standard spatial models where firms are price-takers. Besides wage, the firm may also provide local amenities as part of the worker's compensation bundle, and solves the following problem

$$\max_{\{A_U, L_U\}} \Pi_U = \max_{\{A_U, L_U\}} P_U\left(\frac{A_U}{L_U}\right)^\chi L_U^\phi - w_U(L_U)L_U - P_A A_U$$

such that

$$L_U = L_{U,-1} - \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} L_{Uj} + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} L_{jU} \tag{7}$$

where L_{Uj} and L_{jU} satisfy equation (6), and χ measures the strength with which the level of amenities (like hospitals or schools) increases productivity.[68]

This means that the firm will provide workers with utility as compared with their "outside option" to attract enough people to meet their optimal labor demand, given bilateral migration flows. *In this sense, the firm is a local monopsonist, whose degree of monopsony power will depend on workers' mobility, which is governed by* θ. High values of θ imply higher worker mobility and less monopsony power for the firm; thus, attracting the same number of workers ($'_U$) would be more costly: The firm would have to provide workers with a higher utility level, either through higher wages or more local amenities. Conversely, in a hypothetic case where workers are immobile ($L' = L = L_{-1}$) would lead to a perfectly inelastic labor supply and a case of pure monopsony within this region.[69]

Firms in the Rest of the Country Each of the $N-1$ regions in the rest of the country produce domestic tradable goods.[70] Producers in location $j \in \{1, ..., N-1\}$ maximize profits in a competitive market and pay taxes to the government, solving

$$\max_{\{L_j\}} \Pi_j(L_j) = \max_{\{L_j\}} p_j \left(\frac{A_j}{L_j}\right)^{\chi} L_j^{\gamma} - w_j L_j - T_j.$$

Local Amenities For simplicity, we assume that local amenities can be purchased at an exogenous price P_A in all regions.

Government The government collects taxes T from firms in the "Rest of the Country," and provides local amenities to this region so that $P_A A_j = \frac{L_j}{L-L_U} \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} T_j = \frac{L_j}{L-L_U} \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} t P_j (A_j)^{\chi} L_j^{\gamma}$,

[68] Costa Rican banana production represented, on average, less than two percent of the total world banana production from 1956-1984 (sample used in our calibration), which is why we are not considering p_U—the world banana price—as a function of q_U—bananas produced in Costa Rica. This also allows us to focus on monopsony forces that seemed to have been key, as explained in our empirical analysis.

[69] The curvature of workers' utility function, which is concave in amenities and consumption will guarantee that the compensation bundle chosen by the company will be a combination of both amenities and wages. A previous version of the model was dynamic, in that amenities did not fully depreciating from one period to the next. This more complicated version, available upon request, delivered qualitatively similar results, but could explain why there is persistence after UFCo's exit. In particular, a depreciation rate of amenities of 3% allowed us to match the observed rate of convergence across UFCo and non-UFCo regions.

[70] Note that these goods are homogeneous in the sense that they have the same production function, however, they will be traded given the CES structure of the utility function.

where $\bar{L}$ is the total adult population in the country. As shown, we assume the government has no access to borrowing in foreign capital markets, and is therefore its provision of amenities is constrained at every point in time by $\sum_{j=1}^{N-1} T_j$, where each T_j is a fixed proportion t of the sales in region j, which is consistent with severe historical borrowing constraints. We also assume that revenue is spent on local amenities according to the labor share in each region, which is consistent with the observed public spending shares in our data: From 1955 to 1984, public spending on local amenities per capita across cantons was very similar, so much so that the dispersion index of this data is only 0.008.[71]

Equilibrium A competitive equilibrium in this economy consists of prices $\{w_j, p_j\}_{j=1}^{N}$, and $\{P_A\}$; company decisions $\{A_U, L_U\}$; and labor supply $\{L_j\}_{j=1}^{N}$ such that: All firms and households optimize; trade is balanced; labor flows are consistent across regions $L'_j = \sum_k L'_{kj}$ and $L_j = \sum_k L'_{jk}$; and the labor, domestic good, and UFCo fruit market clear. The solution of the system of equations implied by this equilibrium, and the proof of its uniqueness closely follows Allen and Donaldson (2018), who in turn use techniques derived from Allen et al. (2015).

V.2 Estimation

We calibrate the model to the historical reference equilibrium corresponding to the observed annual levels of economic activity at the canton-level, with 59 locations in total, for years 1950-1973, in which all the data required for the estimation is available. Our strategy to recover the parameters in the model has several steps. Our first step assumes migration costs of the standard form $\ln(\lambda_{jk}) = \mu \ln(dist_{jk})$.[72] We substitute these into equation (6), and obtain

$$\ln\left(L_{jkt}\right) = -\theta\mu \ln(dist_{jk}) + \theta\alpha \ln(w_{jt}) + \theta(1-\alpha) \ln\left(\frac{A_{jt}}{L_{jt}}\right) + \rho_j + \pi_k + \varepsilon_{jkt}, \tag{8}$$

where $j \in R$, $k \in U$ and ρ_j, π_k are origin and destination fixed-effects. We can then estimate θ, μ, and α using data on distances and migration of individuals working in the agricultural sector across locations using PPML.[73] Moreover, as endogeneity is a concern, we use an IV strategy, where we focus on agricultural workers who migrate from any region to a non-UFCo location. For them,

[71] The dispersion index is a normalized measure of the dispersion of a probability distribution, and it is defined as the ratio of the variance to the mean. A constant random variable would have a dispersion index of zero. An under-dispersed random variable would have dispersion between zero and 1 (for example, points spread uniformly), while if the dispersion index is larger than 1, a dataset is considered over-dispersed.

[72] We approximate intra-unit trade costs based on the average distance traveled to the center of a circular unit of the same area from evenly-distributed points within it (e.g., Redding and Venables (2004)).

[73] Results using OLS and a gamma are statistically equal to those using PPML.

their main outside option at the time was working in coffee plantations. Thus, as in Section 5.1.4, we use the suitability to grow coffee in a location to instrument for wages. For amenities, while still focusing on migration to non-UFCo locations only, we use a "Bartik"-type instrument (Bartik, 1991). Along the lines of Nakamura and Steinsson (2014), the instrument is constructed using national changes in population interacted with the population share in each location according to the 1927 Population Census (more than two decades before the data to calibrate our model begins).[74] Table 49 shows both stages of this estimation.

We find that $\{\mu, \alpha, \theta\} = \{0.17, 0.75, 5.49\}$. These values are reassuring. While μ is in line with standard elasticities found in the literature (Redding and Rossi-Hansberg, 2017), α aligns with values of the income share spent on consumption goods obtained after collecting data from household income and expenditure surveys conducted in Costa Rica between 1949 and 1961, which imply a value of $\alpha = 0.8$.[75] Finally, our migration elasticity for agricultural workers of mid-20th century Costa Rica, θ, is in line with findings from Allen and Donaldson (2018), who estimate a migration elasticity of 8.45 for the United States in 1850, which decreased consistently over time (5.58 in 1950) until reaching a value of 4.5 in 2000.[76] Given the importance of this elasticity, in the next section, we show how our results change for a wide range of values of θ.

Based on data we collected from the Annual Report of the Ministry of Economy and Finance (*Memoria Anual del Ministerio de Economía y Hacienda*), we set the share of tax revenues over non-UFCo-related GDP, T, equal to 0.1318. We assume costless trade and set $\sigma = 5$ as in Allen and Donaldson (2018), while conducting a sensitivity analysis. We recover other parameters using a simulated method of moments (SMM). The targets for the SMM mainly exploit variation between the UFCo region and the rest of the country. Table 50 reports the results of our SMM and its targets. We proceed by explaining these targets and data sources in more detail.

We hand-collected data on the number of employees hired by the UFCo from company re-

[74] Note that, given the historical setting, both of these instruments only make sense when the destination of a migrant is *outside* the UFCo.

[75] These are the "Family Income and Expenditure for San José. Survey 1949" (*"Ingresos y gastos de las familias de la ciudad de San José. Encuesta 1949"*) and the "Survey of Family Income and Expenditures 1961" (*"Encuesta de ingresos y gastos familiares 1961"*). The surveys asked a representative sample of Costa Rican households about the share of their income spent on different goods and services, including food, clothes, housing, education, and healthcare. The data record the goods and services with a high level of detail, consisting of 144 categories in 1949 and 153 in 1961. We classify each good and service as an amenity if, according to the company's reports, the UFCo provided them to its workers at no extra cost. With this, we can calculate the share of income spent on amenities and "consumption" and found that the share of income spent in non-UFCo provided goods and services had a value of 0.80.

[76] This elasticity might have been larger for agricultural workers in Costa Rica, as compared with modern-day estimates, due to the aggressive expansion of the agricultural frontier at the time.

Table 49: Estimation of Model Elasticities

First Stage		
	ln Wages (1)	ln Amenities per Capita (2)
Coffee Intensity	0.227	
	(0.089)**	
ln Population share		1.114
		(0.104)***
Adjusted R^2	0.580	0.600
F-statistic (excluded instruments)	21.197	113.777
Second Stage (Dependent variable: L_{kj})		
	Coefficient	Standard Error
ln Distance between Locations k and j	-0.925	(0.054)***
ln Wages in Location j	4.139	(0.679)***
ln Amenities per Capita in Location j	1.352	(0.354)***

Notes: First Stage: the unit of observation is the individual in column (1) and the canton in column (2). Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by canton, are in parentheses. Second Stage: the unit of observation is the migration flow between location k (origin) and j (destiny). We consider only flows of agricultural workers from any location to agriculture-intensive locations, as our instruments are only valid for this type of flows. Estimation is performed using PPML. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by each k and j pair, are in parentheses.

ports. The number of workers in coffee production comes from the 1950 and 1963 Agricultural Censuses. We digitized data on coffee and banana prices from Costa Rican Statistic Yearbooks, while data on spending per capita on amenities by the UFCo and the government corresponds with the one described in Section 5.1.3. Finally, we create a model-based version of the RD design we conducted empirically. To obtain the RD estimate, we first construct a projection of the probability of being poor—an index that does not have a model-equivalent—on real wages and investments in amenities per capita in each location—which are observable both in the data and in the model. To do so, we use real wages of agricultural workers from the 1973 Population Census and data we collected on government spending per municipality, while controlling for the geographic and demographic characteristics of each location.[77]

[77] In particular, we restrict attention to households with at least one member in the agricultural sector and estimate the following specification:

$$P(poor_j) = \beta_1 \ln(w_j) + \beta_2 \ln\left(\frac{P_A A_j}{L_j}\right) + \mathbf{X}_j\Gamma + \varepsilon_j,$$

where $P(poor_j)$ is the probability of being poor in location j, $\ln(w_j)$ is the logarithm of the average wage for members in households working in the agricultural sector in location j, $\ln\left(\frac{P_A A_j}{L_n}\right)$ is the logarithm of the government spending per capita in location j. We find that β_1=-0.077, and β_2=-0.055, with standard errors of 0.033 and 0.024, respectively.

Table 50: Jointly Calibrated Values in Steady State (SMM)

Target	Data	Model
Local effect (RD)	-0.06	-0.06
Agricultural labor share UFCo	0.09	0.09
Price per ton UFCo/RoC	0.13	0.13
Investment per cap UFCo/government	1.27	1.27

Figure 18: Aggregate Welfare and Labor Mobility



Notes: The figure shows how the aggregate welfare of the UFCo changes as labor mobility changes. The company's aggregate welfare effect is computed by comparing the scenario with UFCo with a one where the UFCo's location has exactly the same characteristics as the rest of the country.

We estimate that the average fitted probability of being poor for the UFCo region (U) is $\widehat{P(poor_{UFCo})}$ = 0.721, and for the rest of the country (R) is $\widehat{P(poor_R)}$=0.776. Therefore, $\gamma = \widehat{P(poor_{UFCo})} - \widehat{P(poor_R)}$=-0.056 (robust standard error adjusted for clustering by location: 0.015). We then run the SMM to minimize the difference between the empirical and model-based γ.

The SMM targeted moments from the model closely match the data. Our calibrated parameters are, first, the price of amenities (P_A) with a value of 5.91, then, we obtain a value of χ, which measures the effect of amenities in productivity, of 0.06. In general, it is extremely difficult to measure the effect that amenities like schools have on productivity, as the decision to provide them is disconnected from the decisions of firms. In our case, the UFCo was, in some sense, a "profit-maximizing public goods producer," which internalized the effect of amenities on productivity. Thus, the setting provides a rare opportunity to estimate a value of χ from the levels of investment that the company chose. The SMM results in a value of 0.18 and 0.07 for the labor share of output in the UFCo (ϕ) and the rest of the country (γ), respectively.[78]

[78]Historically, the coffee plantations suffered from low productivity (León Sáenz, 2012).

V.3 Counterfactual

Figure 18 displays a counterfactual exercise where we change the value of the labor mobility elasticity (θ). The UFCo's effect is sensitive to the value of the labor mobility elasticity, and low values of this elasticity can flip the sign of the UFCo's effect, such that the firm's presence might harm locals.[79]

[79] This would be impossible in a case with perfect mobility across regions, where the country's labor market would feature perfect competition. However, with low labor mobility, workers within the UFCo region can be negatively affected by the firm's market power.

Supplementary References

Allen, T., Arkolakis, C., and Li, X. (2015). On the Existence and Uniqueness of Trade Equilibria. *mimeo, Dartmouth and Yale Universities.*

Allen, T. and Donaldson, D. (2018). The Geography of Path Dependence. *mimeo*.

Asher, S. and Novosad, P. (2020). Rural Roads and Local Economic Development. *American Economic Review*, 110(3):797–823.

Baird, S., McIntosh, C., and Özler, B. (2013). The Regressive Demands of Demand-Driven Development. *Journal of Public Economics*, 106:27–41.

Bartik, T. J. (1991). *Who Benefits from State and Local Economic Development Policies?* W.E. Upjohn Institute.

Cameron, A. C. and Miller, D. L. (2015). A Practitioner's Guide to Cluster-Robust Inference. *Journal of Human Resources*, 50(2):317–372.

Chen, X. and Nordhaus, W. D. (2011). Using Luminosity Data as a Proxy for Economic Statistics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.

Elbers, C., Lanjouw, J. O., and Lanjouw, P. (2003). Micro–Level Estimation of Poverty and Inequality. *Econometrica*, 71(1):355–364.

Elbers, C., Lanjouw, J. O., and Lanjouw, P. (2005). Imputed Welfare Estimates in Regression Analysis. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 5(1):101–118.

Ellis, F. (1983). *Las transnacionales del banano en Centroamérica*. Editorial Universitaria Centroamericana (EDUCA).

Enamorado, T., López-Calva, L. F., Rodríguez-Castelán, C., and Winkler, H. (2016). Income Inequality and Violent Crime: Evidence from Mexico's Drug War. *Journal of Development Economics*, 120:128–143.

Henderson, J. V., Storeygard, A., and Weil, D. N. (2012). Measuring Economic Growth from Outer Space. *American Economic Review*, 102(2):994–1028.

Hodler, R. and Raschky, P. A. (2014). Regional Favoritism. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 129(2):995–1033.

Imbens, G. W. and Kolesár, M. (2016). Robust Standard Errors in Small Samples: Some Practical Advice. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 98(4):701–712.

LaBarge, R. A. (1959). A Study of United Fruit Company Operations in Isthmian America, 1946-1956. *Duke University Ph.D. Thesis*.

Michalopoulos, S. and Papaioannou, E. (2014). National Institutions and Subnational Development in Africa. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 129(1):151–213.

Méndez, F. and Bravo, O. (2014). Costa Rica: Mapas de pobreza 2011. In Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos (INEC), editor, *Costa Rica a la luz del Censo 2011*, page 9–39.

Méndez, F. and Trejos, J. D. (2004). Costa Rica: Un mapa de carencias críticas para el año 2000. In Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos (INEC), editor, *Costa Rica a la luz del Censo 2000*, page 205–233.

Nakamura, E. and Steinsson, J. (2014). Fiscal Stimulus in a Monetary Union: Evidence from US Regions. *American Economic Review*, 104(3):753–92.

Redding, S. and Venables, A. (2004). *Geography and Export Performance: External Market Access and Internal Supply Capacity*, pages 95–130. University of Chicago Press.

Redding, S. J. and Rossi-Hansberg, E. (2017). Quantitative Spatial Economics. *Annual Review of Economics*, 9(1):21–58.

Reinhart, C. M. and Rogoff, K. S. (2009). *This Time Is Different: Eight Centuries of Financial Folly*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.