

Current Account Reversals: Always a Problem?¹

Muge Adalet and Barry Eichengreen

Victoria University, Wellington; and University of California, Berkeley

May 2005

1. Introduction

Sharp reductions in current account deficits can be disruptive. Milesi-Ferretti and Razin (2000) in their seminal study of the phenomenon, known as “current account reversals,” emphasize the dangers of large current account deficits that must be compressed suddenly when external financing dries up. Their study, written in the aftermath of the Asian crisis, presumably had countries like Thailand in mind. The authors cite other disruptive reversals, such as Uruguay’s at the beginning of the Latin American debt crisis, when financing for the current account deficit collapsed and growth fell from +5 per cent to -7 per cent.² Looking forward there is the question of what would happen to growth in the United States if financing for the country’s 5 per cent plus current account deficit evaporated abruptly. Will the dollar fall sharply, fanning import price inflation and forcing the Fed to raise interest rates? How would the stock market and housing prices react? Sharp reductions in consumption and investment might have to be brought about by this rise in interest rates and fall in asset valuations, since the current account is the difference between investment and saving as a matter of definition.

But not all current account reversals are disruptive. In Milesi-Ferretti and Razin’s own sample, the median change in growth between the periods before and after such reversals is zero. The output response, in their words, is very heterogeneous. For every

¹ For the NBER Conference on G7 Current Account Imbalances, Newport, Rhode Island, June 1-2, 2005. We thank Gian Maria Milesi-Ferretti and Alan Taylor for help with data and participants in the preconference for comments.

² Between 1979-81 and 1982-84.

Uruguay there is a Nigeria, where growth went from -5.5 per cent in 1981-83 to +3 per cent in 1984-86 despite sharp compression of the current account.

From an analytical standpoint, this is not surprising. Deficits develop for a variety of reasons. A deficit reflecting a temporary surge in investment owing to unusually rapid productivity growth and high profitability will have different implications than a deficit reflecting a temporary surge in consumption produced by the growth of public consumption or overvaluation of the currency. Equally, current account deficits can be eliminated for any one of a number of very different reasons which are likely to have very different output effects.

Nor is it clear that current account reversals were always as disruptive as in recent years. The obvious contrast is the period before World War I, when very large deficits were allowed to develop and persist. Bayoumi (1989) considers average current account deficits over periods as long as 1870-1913 and finds that these reached high levels in countries like Australia and Canada. Taylor (1996) and Obstfeld and Taylor (2004) do the same over successive decades starting in the late 19th century and show that current account balances were larger in that period than anytime in the 20th century. To be sure, some of these deficits were compressed abruptly with interruptions to the flow of external finance, reflecting some combination of rising interest rates in the capital-exporting countries and economic and political problems in the capital importers. Instances springing to mind where current account deficits fell sharply and precipitated banking or currency crises include Denmark in 1885-6, Argentina in 1889-90, Canada in 1890-91, Australia in 1891-2, Brazil in 1896-7, Japan in 1899-1900, and Finland in 1900-1.³

³ These are all years of or adjoining banking and currency crises as independently dated by Bordo and Eichengreen (2003).

At the same time, crises (currency crises in particular) were lower in frequency under the gold standard than in recent years.⁴ Although crises can occur for reasons other than those associated with current account reversals, the connections between the two phenomena are clear. Recall for example Fischer's (1988) caution that the "primary indicator [of a looming crisis] is the current account deficit."⁵

These observations suggest a series of questions. Were large current account deficits less frequent under the gold standard? Were chronic imbalances shorter or smaller in magnitude? Were their growth effects less disruptive? And if there are differences across epochs, what is their explanation?

Indeed, another reading of gold standard experience is that the economic and political environment made current account reversals less of a problem. Greater wage and price flexibility in an era of unstructured labor markets facilitated the adjustment of relative prices necessary when the current account balance had to be compressed abruptly (Bayoumi and Eichengreen 1996). With government budgets close to balance in peacetime, the twin deficits problem that gives rise to "bad current account deficits," financing for which dries up suddenly when concerns arise about the sustainability of public debts, was less prevalent. Because large current account deficits reflected unusually high levels of investment in export-supporting infrastructure, those deficits could be smoothly reduced by increased savings out of progressively higher domestic incomes and increases in the supply of goods and services exports (Feis 1930, Fishlow 1986).⁶ Since the credibility of the commitment to exchange rate stability was beyond

⁴ This is the finding of Bordo and Eichengreen (2003).

⁵ Also cited in Edwards (2004b).

⁶ We can think of this as a somewhat refined version of the Lawson Doctrine as applied to the gold standard.

reproach, events that might have interrupted capital inflows and forced disruptive compression of the current account elicited capital inflows that allowed that deficit to be wound down smoothly rather than precipitating a crisis. Some of these tales are consistent with fewer or smaller current account reversals, while others are consistent with smaller output losses (smoother adjustment to equally frequent or large current account shocks).

Bracketed by the gold standard and the post-1970 float were the 1920s and 1930s, when capital flow volatility, economic instability, and financial crises were pervasive, and the Bretton Woods quarter century, when capital flows were limited, recessions were rare, and banking crises were essentially nonexistent. Given the contingent nature of the connection between economic volatility on the one hand and current account reversals on the other, it would be illuminating to know whether reversals were larger, more frequent, and more disruptive in the interwar period – and smaller, less common, and less disruptive under Bretton Woods.

In what follows we take a first cut at measuring the frequency, magnitude and effects of current account reversals in the gold standard era (1880-1914), the interwar period (1919-39), Bretton Woods (1945-70), and the post-Bretton Woods float (1972-1997). We use regression analysis to see how far we can get in ascribing the cross-period differences we detect to observable characteristics of countries and the international economic environment.

The results confirm that the gold standard era and the years since 1970 differed strikingly from one another: reversals were smaller, less frequent and less disruptive in the gold standard period. Controlling for, inter alia, the size of the initial current account

imbalance, the movement in the real exchange rate and the state of the global economy does not make this difference go away. Evidently, there was something else about the gold standard years that rendered current accounts more stable and their reversal less disruptive. This prompts us to consider a set of case studies in an effort to shed more light on the issue.

The intervening period from the 1920s through the 1960s is more difficult to characterize. The two interwar decades emerge here, as elsewhere, as years of high instability: reversals were frequent and large and had major output costs. Under Bretton Woods, in contrast, reversals were few and small; in both respects this period resembles the gold standard years. These facts are presumably explicable in part by the prevalence of capital controls and the tight regulation of domestic financial systems. But in terms of the output costs of reversals, the Bretton Woods years resemble the interwar period more than the gold standard era; this is in contrast to where Bretton Woods is placed when we group periods by the frequency and magnitude of reversals. It remains the case when we control for country characteristics and global conditions. Again this suggests that there was something special about the gold standard period that merits closer consideration.

Finally, the years since 1972 are second only to the gold standard years in terms of ease of adjustment to reversals. The output losses from current account reversals appear to be significantly smaller not just compared to the interwar years (which is not surprising) but also compared to Bretton Woods. In the conclusion we speculate about what changes in markets and institutions might help to account for this fact.

2. The Country Sample

Our empirical analysis utilizes data from Bordo and Eichengreen (2003) extended to incorporate additional variables and countries.⁷ The principal sources are compendia and monographs containing national historical statistics for the period prior to 1913, publications of the League of Nations for the interwar period, and standard World Bank and International Monetary Fund sources after World War II. The resulting data set has been checked and adjusted for compatibility.⁸

A problem for any study that aspires to provide historical comparisons over long periods is the country sample. Reasonably complete macroeconomic statistics including not only GDP and trade but also financial variables are available back to the late 19th century only for a subset of Western European countries, overseas regions of recent European settlement (the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand), and a few of the larger Latin American countries (Argentina and Brazil). The question is whether to follow this same group of countries over time (as in for example Taylor 1996 and Obstfeld and Taylor 2004) or to add additional countries as more data become available (as in inter alia Bayoumi 1989).

⁷ For a more extensive discussion of data sources see that publication.

⁸ Several limitations of these data are worth noting. The current account estimates for the period before 1945 build on reported figures for imports and exports of goods and services, following inter alia Bayoumi (1990), Taylor (1996), and Obstfeld and Taylor (2004). This leaves open the possibility that some service items are under- or unreported (imports and exports of shipping, insurance and financial services, for example). In addition, there is the possibility of spurious volatility in earlier (specifically, pre-1914) output data (Romer 1986). To the extent that this bias exists, it will presumably exaggerate the difference between growth rates during expansions and contractions and therefore the magnitude of the output effects of current account reversals. Finally, some variables that have proven popular in recent analyses of the causes and consequences of current account reversals (measures of the composition of the public debt, for instance) are not readily available for this earlier period and are therefore excluded from the analysis. In particular, information on the capital account, as distinct from the current account, is not readily available for earlier periods. (For an idea of what kind of distinct data on international capital flows exist for the period prior to 1913, see Bloomfield 1963, 1968 and Stone 1999.) Data on reserves and imports and exports of goods and services capture capital flows imperfectly to the extent that they do not measure trade in certain services – see above – and to the extent that information on foreign exchange reserves is incomplete. The analysis here follows Milesi-Ferretti and Razin (2000) – hereinafter MFR – who similarly focus on the current account reversals but do not look separately at sudden stops in capital flows, unlike Edwards (2004a, b) who looks at both.

Both approaches have drawbacks. Following the same 10 to 15 European countries and offshoots over the entire 120 years maximizes the intertemporal comparability of the country sample at the cost of representativeness. If we are interested in the determinants and consequences of current account reversals in modern-day emerging markets and how these compare with such reversals in their historical antecedents, then a sample that includes at most a couple of modern-day emerging markets is not likely to be representative of their experience. If, on the other hand, one freely adds more countries as data on these become available, then one ends up with better representation of modern emerging markets but problems of intertemporal comparability. At the beginning of the period the sample will then be mainly comprised of a small number of relatively advanced industrial economies, while at the end of the period it will be numerically dominated by a large number of low income countries, where the causes, consequences, and incidence of current account reversals may be significantly different. Assume, for example, that current account reversals are more frequent in low-income countries. Adding more low-income countries to the sample as data on them become available over time will then bias the analysis toward the conclusion that reversals have been growing more frequent purely as a result of sample composition.

We therefore take a third approach to sample selection. Our strategy is to define a consistent criterion in terms of relative per capita income – that is, a threshold value of per capita income relative to the highest-income country in the first period, 1880-1913 – and to add additional countries as data on them become available only if they satisfy this

criterion.⁹ We calculate for the period 1880-1914 the ratio of per capita income in the lowest income country in the sample for that period (Brazil) to the highest income country (the United States), which turns out to be 0.6. As data for more countries become available, we then add all countries whose per capita incomes are at least 60 per cent of the per capita incomes of the lead country. In 1919-39, for example, the lead country is again the United States, so we add all countries whose per capita incomes are at least 60 per cent of U.S. levels for which we have comprehensive data. We again do the same for the Bretton Woods period, and again once more for the post-Bretton Woods years.

The resulting country sample is shown in Appendix Table A1. One can see there how sample size increases over time, while sample composition is not unduly dominated by low-income countries which are necessarily omitted at the beginning of our long historical period. Thus, our analysis of current account reversals should be thought of as characterizing their incidence and consequences in middle- and high-income countries (also referred to in the literature as “emerging” and “advanced” markets) but not also in the poorest (“developing”) countries. Insofar as the economic volatility tends to be higher and dependence on capital flows is generally less in the poorest countries, separate analysis of such countries would seem appropriate. In some of the analysis that follows we compare what we find using this limited sample for the post-1970 period with results obtained using the somewhat larger country sample employed by Milesi-Ferretti-and-Razin-style as a way of gauging the consequences of our sampling strategy.

⁹ Observations for very low income economies are also limited toward the beginning of the sample period because many such economies were not then independent countries.

3. A Brief History of Current Accounts

We set the stage for the analysis that follows by first summarizing the historical behavior of current accounts.

Two traditional ways of doing so are to calculate the mean absolute value of the current account over some period of time (say, five years), and to run Feldstein-Horioka (1980) regressions of the two components of the current account (investment and savings) on one another. Obstfeld and Taylor (2004) have done this for 15 countries similar to own pre-1914 sample. They report that the average absolute value of the current account balance as a share of GDP was between 3 and 4 per cent prior to 1914. The (absolute) current account remains at a relatively high 3.9 per cent in the immediate post-World War I years 1919-1926, reflecting the exceptional investment demands associated with postwar reconstruction (the largest value is for France), but then falls to 2.7 in 1927-31 and 1.5 in 1932-39, as capital controls are imposed and international financial markets shut down. The average absolute value of current accounts was small in the Bretton Woods years, when capital flows were still heavily controlled (1.8 per cent of GDP in 1947-59 and 1.3 per cent in 1960-73), before rising in 1974-89 and 1989-2000 (to 2.2 per cent and 2.3 per cent, respectively), higher than under Bretton Woods but not the same levels witnessed before 1914.¹⁰

Obstfeld and Taylor also run a succession of cross section regressions using five-year averaged data of investment on savings and a constant term. The results are consistent with the hypothesis that capital mobility and hence the average magnitude of current account balances traced out a u-shaped pattern over time. The “savings-retention coefficient” (the estimated effect of savings on investment) is 0.5 until 1914, 0.6-0.7 in

¹⁰ Obstfeld and Taylor also look at wartime current account balances, which we do not consider here.

the 1920s, 0.8-0.9 in the 1930s, 0.9 in the Bretton Woods years, and 0.7-0.8 in the post-Bretton Woods sample. Like the summary statistics in the previous paragraph, this regression analysis suggests that while capital mobility is higher today than in the third quarter of the 20th century, it has yet to rescale the peak reached before 1914.¹¹

While these results provide a summary measure of ex post capital mobility in a constant sample of countries, it is not clear that they adequately summarize capital mobility in the world as a whole, since the number of independent countries – and the number of middle- as well as high-income countries potentially connected to international capital markets in particular – is changing over the 12 decades considered here. Bear in mind that, as emphasized above, we are concerned in this paper with middle- and high-income countries and systematically omit from our sample low-income countries that are plausibly less connected to international capital markets (and for which data are relatively scarce). To the extent that our country sample corrects for this, we may paint a somewhat different picture. A further problem with these estimates is that for almost all of these cross section estimates of the savings-retention coefficient the confidence levels overlap.¹² While the tendency for this coefficient to be larger toward the middle of the sample period suggests a u-shaped time profile for capital mobility (high toward the beginning and end of the period), it is not clear whether the intertemporal differences are significant – and thus whether the null of a random fluctuations around the average level of capital mobility can be rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis of a u-shaped profile. We may be able to do better insofar as our

¹¹ Or even to match the levels reached in the 1920s.

¹² In part, this is presumably a function of the small samples of 12 countries for each point in time.

criterion for selecting countries allows the sample to expand over time, while still applying consistent conditions for an observation's inclusion in the sample.

The first column of Table 1 shows the mean absolute value of current accounts for various subperiods for our sample; column 2 is the comparison with Obstfeld and Taylor. We still observe a u-shaped pattern, with the magnitude of current account balances dipping down in 1927-31 and 1932-39. Our numbers are essentially the same as Obstfeld and Taylor's through 1939 but are larger for the recent period. Contrary to Obstfeld and Taylor, this suggests that international capital markets are more integrated than before 1913, not less.¹³ This reflects our sampling strategy and our addition of additional relatively small countries with relatively large current account balances, especially in the last subperiod. Figure 1 provides visual confirmation of these patterns. Table 2 then shows estimates of the associated savings-retention coefficients. In the comparisons of successive five-year periods, the confidence intervals continue to overlap. (See Figure 2.) However, when we take averages for the four longer periods (pre-1914, 1919-39, 1945-71 and 1972-99) this is no longer case except when we compare the interwar and Bretton Woods periods. Now the savings-retention coefficients are 0.58 for the prewar period, 0.88 for interwar period, 0.86 for the Bretton Woods period, and 0.73 for the post-1971 sample. Again, contrary to earlier studies using a different sampling strategy, this suggests that capital markets today are somewhat more integrated than a century ago.

Thus, our new sample, intended to facilitate summary characterizations of differences in the extent of global capital mobility over time (rather than simply following an unchanging country sample) broadly confirms the standard historical

¹³ That capital markets are more integrated today than before 1914 is also the conclusion of Bordo, Eichengreen and Irwin (1999), who use a very different approach.

interpretation but also provides some new nuances. It confirms the existence of a u-shaped pattern in ex post capital mobility over time but also suggests a somewhat earlier and more robust post-World War II recovery of capital mobility, so measured, than earlier studies.

4. From Current Accounts to Current Account Reversals

We now move from current account balances to current account reversals, defined as episodes in which the current account strengthens sharply, generally moving from deficit to surplus, in three or fewer years. It is useful at this point to reiterate what was said in the introduction about why we focus on these episodes. Current account balances have a number of positive functions that appear in textbooks under the heading of “the intertemporal approach to the current account” (see for example Obstfeld and Rogoff 1996). If the current account strengthens when output is high and weakens when it is low, its fluctuation is indicative of a country’s ability to smooth its consumption relative to its output. An ongoing current account deficit in a rapidly growing country may also be an indication that investment and growth are not unduly constrained by domestic savings capacity, facilitating the country’s convergence to steady state levels of output and its capital/labor ratio. In practice, however, these advantages may be neutralized or dominated if large or persistent current account deficits increase the likelihood of the need for disruptive adjustments that produce large output losses.¹⁴ Everyone can recall episodes when large current account deficits ended in the sudden curtailment of

¹⁴ This is the warning in the quote from Fischer above to the effect that large current account deficits are leading indicators of impending problems. His intuition that large current account deficits are leading indicators of currency and banking crises gains further support from the literature on early warning systems for emerging markets (Goldstein, Kaminsky and Reinhart 2000).

financing, sharp compression of the current account, and a drop in economic growth. Yet, as we have also noted, post-1970 experience suggests that not all current account reversals end this way. And it is not obvious a priori that large current account deficits bore the same association with instability in earlier periods, such as the pre-1914 gold standard years.

Thus, we wish to determine whether current account reversals were always a problem – whether they have always been frequent and disruptive. If current account reversals were not always a problem, then it will be important to establish why. Hopefully the answer will point to policy measures that can be taken at the national or international levels to tilt the balance of costs and benefits of international capital mobility in socially desirable directions.

To identify current account reversals we use the same criteria as MFR. We construct two variants of their measure (denoted *Rev1* and *Rev2*). *Rev1* (and *Rev2*) must satisfy three criteria: the average current account deficit must fall by 2 (3) per cent of GDP between the first three and second three years; the maximum deficit in second three years must be no larger than minimum deficit in first three years; and the average deficit must fall by at least a third (as a percentage of GDP) between the first three and second three years. Obviously, the two per cent cutoff generates more reversals than the three per cent cutoff.

A list of the individual reversals for the pre-1970 period, excluding reversals occurring in consecutive years and reversals occurring in wartime, appears as Appendix Table A2.

5. Statistical Findings

Table 3 summarizes frequency of reversals under the gold standard, the interwar period, Bretton Woods, and the post-Bretton Woods years. *RevI* (based on two per cent reductions in the current account deficit relative to the three preceding years) shows that a lower frequency of reversals under the gold standard than under any of the three subsequent regimes. There are 59 reversal episodes (11 per cent of the period sample of years) in 1880-1914, 102 episodes (27 per cent of the sample) in 1918-1939, 62 episodes (12 per cent of the sample) in 1945-72, and 361 episodes (26 per cent of the sample) in 1972-1997. So measured, reversals were relatively infrequent under the gold standard and Bretton Woods but much more frequent during the interwar period and since the collapse of Bretton Woods. If one excludes reversals occurring in consecutive years, their number falls to 30, 35, 28 and 101, but the ranking of frequencies (6, 10, 5 and 10 per cent) remains basically unchanged, the main difference being that Bretton Woods period looks slightly better than the gold standard years. From the perspective of the historical literature, these contrasts are not surprising; the interwar years and recent decades are both periods when there was much commentary about capital flow volatility, unusually severe recessions and financial crises, all of which may be correlates of current account reversals.

To be sure, simple tabulations do not tell us *why* reversals were more frequent in some periods than others. Candidate explanations include, inter alia, volatile policies, volatile financial markets, and a volatile global economic environment. We will consider these possibilities more directly below.

Figure 3 shows the number of reversals by year. In the first panel of Figure 3 for the gold standard, the largest cluster is in the first half of the 1890s following the Baring-Argentina crisis and the collapse of international lending. In the interwar period, reversals are spread fairly evenly over the immediate postwar years, the 1920s, and the early 1930s, reflecting macroeconomic turbulence, shocks to international financial markets (associated with failed stabilization efforts, reparations disputes and so forth), the rise in U.S. interest rates in 1928 (which led to the sharp curtailment of foreign lending) and then onset of the Great Depression and widespread debt default starting in 1931. Reversals are relatively few in the mid-to-late 1930s, reflecting the widespread adoption of trade and capital controls through which countries balanced their current accounts and limited their dependence on capital flows. Under Bretton Woods, reversals are concentrated in the first postwar quinquennium and centered in Europe. This was the period when postwar foreign aid that had financed current account deficits was drawing to a close and foreign reserves have been run down, forcing countries to balance their trade accounts.

Next we calculated the magnitude of reversals in each period, measured as the change in the current account/GDP ratio between the three pre-reversal and three post-reversal years. The magnitude of reversals so measured was 3.13 per cent of GDP under the gold standard, 6.43 in the interwar years, 3.51 under Bretton Woods, and 5.46 since the breakdown of that system. Evidently, reversals were largest in the interwar years but only slightly smaller after 1970. They were smallest under the gold standard, but only slightly smaller than under Bretton Woods when international capital flows and the magnitude of feasible current account balances were tightly constrained. The special

nature of gold standard experience compared to the two other periods of high capital mobility comes through clearly from this comparison.¹⁵

Table 4 shows summary statistics for GDP growth and the change in growth in the year of the reversal and windows ranging from one to four years following its occurrence. Growth is uniformly slower in reversal than nonreversal years, and it generally remains depressed for one or two additional years before bouncing back. Subsequently, growth in the reversal cases generally exceeds growth in the nonreversal cases, as output lost in the reversal episodes is made up. Gauged in terms of the difference in growth rates between reversal and nonreversal years, reversals were less costly – as well as smaller and less frequent – prior to 1914. Growth was not significantly slower in reversal than nonreversal years before 1914 (the difference in growth rates, of -0.03 per cent, is not significantly different from zero at standard confidence levels), 2.68 percentage points slower in the interwar years, and 3.75 percentage points slower in the Bretton Woods years (*Rev1* definition). The difference then falls to 1.32 percentage points after 1972 (although the difference between reversal and nonreversal years is still statistically significant at the 99 per cent confidence level).

¹⁵ As an alternative, we also scaled the change in the current account/GDP ratio by the initial current account balance (as a share of GDP, where initial is defined as the average over the three years preceding the event). Since the magnitude of the scaling factor varied across periods, this can be thought of as a period-specific measure of the magnitude of reversals (one that controls for differences across periods in, inter alia, the extent of international capital mobility and therefore the size of current account deficits in the typical pre-reversal period). The change in the current account/GDP ratio in (the three) subsequent years as a percentage of the initial (three year) current account ratio is 79 per cent, 210 per cent and 190 per cent and 112 per cent in our four chronologically successive periods. The main difference here is that Bretton Woods appears as a period of relatively large reversals, so scaled. Of course, the reason reversals appear so large under Bretton Woods when expressed as a percentage of the initial current account ratio is that those initial current account deficits were so small, reflecting the prevalence of controls on capital inflows and the demoralized state of international financial markets. Indeed, there are no very large current account deficits in the Bretton Woods years comparable to those evident in other periods, and the largest current account deficits in the Bretton Woods years tend to be concentrated in 1945-50, when there were still reserves and foreign aid to finance them (see above). The unweighted average of the current account deficit in the three years preceding the reversal episodes is 3.8 under Bretton Woods, compared to 5.2 in the interwar period and 5.7 in the post-Bretton Woods years (and 4.9 under the gold standard).

Table 5 reports probit regressions designed to shed light on the incidence of reversals. All independent variables are lagged. Following MFR, most of the explanatory variables are averaged over the first three years of the six year window in question to maintain consistency with the definition of reversals themselves.¹⁶ Given our limited degrees of freedom and interest in intertemporal comparisons, we pool the data for the four periods and include period fixed effects.¹⁷ Since certain countries are especially prone to reversals in certain periods, we use the cluster option in Stata to adjust for the fact that the error terms for a particular country in a particular period may not be independent of one another.¹⁸ The regressions come in trios. Within each trio, the first column reports robust standard errors. The second clusters the observations by countries. The third then drops the observations for the UK, which we classify as the center country for part of the period, on the grounds that reversals in a country that either is or recently was the financial center are a qualitatively different phenomenon.¹⁹

MFR found that reversals are more likely in countries with large current account deficits, real exchange rates suggesting growing overvaluation, large government deficits, low per capita incomes, low reserves, high interest rates at the center, high growth at the center, and high ratios of concessional to total debt. They consider U.S. interest rates and OECD growth; for the period before 1914, we consider British interest rates and British growth, while for the interwar period we consider U.S. interest rates and U.S. growth. Like them, we find some evidence that reversals are more likely in countries with large

¹⁶ See the footnote to the relevant table for details.

¹⁷ We also discuss some period-specific results below.

¹⁸ To be clear, we do not allow for clustering of the error terms for all reversals for, say, Argentina, but for all reversals for Argentina in a particular period, say, 1880-1913 or 1972-98.

¹⁹ In contrast, we have no reversals for the United States except in the first period, when we take Britain and not the U.S. as the center country.

current account deficits and large budget deficits, in countries with low per capita GDPs relative to the lead country (proxying, presumably, for relatively weak institutions and markets), and in periods when growth rates in the center country are high. We also find that reversals are more likely in more open economies, where here openness may be proxying for economic size. Edwards (2005), in another analysis of middle- and high-income countries, similarly finds that reversals are more likely in relatively small, relatively open economies.

It is important to mention some of the variables that do not show up as consistently significant. For example, some studies of recent decades have found that reversals are significantly more likely when the exchange rate is pegged, presumably making it more difficult to smoothly adjust relative prices prior to the event (Edwards 2004b). Here the coefficient estimates for whether or not the exchange rate is pegged display never approach statistical significance at standard confidence levels.²⁰ Similarly, the last three columns of the table add a dummy variable for capital controls. There is some evidence that the maintenance of controls limits the risk of reversals, although this variable again is not statistically significant at conventional confidence levels.²¹

²⁰ We replicated MFR's result when we used our sample of countries but limited the observations to the post-1972 period, but not otherwise.

²¹ We found essentially the same thing for the four subperiods estimated separately (in results not reported here), although significance levels vary. For the gold standard period, large prior current account deficits, large prior budget deficits, and low GDP per capita are the most robust and statistically significant determinants of reversal incidence. For the interwar period, reversals are more likely in countries with lower GDP per capita, large prior current account deficits and budget deficits and no capital controls. For the Bretton Woods period, countries with terms of trade improvement and large current account deficits are more likely to experience reversals. For the post 1970 sample, large prior current account deficit and having a peg are the main determinants of reversals. We also ran our specification using the MFR sample of countries in the post-1970 period. The main difference is that the GDP per capita changes sign such that countries with relatively high per capita incomes are more likely to experience reversals. (Note that the MFR sample does not include the advanced-industrial countries, so this result is telling us – consistent with intuition – that within the sample of emerging markets the higher-income EMs more integrated into international capital markets are more subject to reversals). The main difference between these two pooled

Another noteworthy feature of Table 5 is that the dummy variables for the gold standard and Bretton Woods periods are negative and significant (the post-1972 years are the omitted alternative). Recall that we found above that reversals were less frequent under the gold standard and Bretton Woods than in the interwar and post-1972 periods. The results in Table 5 are telling us that this difference is not fully explained by differences in observable country characteristics (the size of the initial imbalances, the fiscal stance, the global growth environment etc.) but that it is at least partially explicable in terms of other factors that we are not capturing here.

Table 6 turns to the consequences of current account reversals. The dependent variable is growth over three years, starting with the year of the reversal, as a deviation from the world average for that same three-year period following the reversal onset.²² The explanatory variables include the size of the reversal and a vector of controls (except where indicated otherwise, averaged over the 3 years preceding the event).²³ Again, the data are pooled and estimated with period fixed effects. The first two columns show ordinary least squares regressions with robust standard errors. Columns 3 through 6 then cluster the observations by country within each period.

The results suggest that reversals were relatively costly when a large current account deficit had been allowed to emerge and the real exchange rate was allowed to become significantly overvalued in the preceding period. In addition, we consider a dummy variable for whether the current account was in deficit or surplus in the pre-

regressions is that the one using the MFR countries for the post-1970 period shows a positive sign on the interwar dummy (although one that varies in significance across specifications).

²² It makes little difference if we instead define the dependent variable as the growth rate in the subject country over the three year period and include the global growth rate over the same period as another independent variable on the right hand side. In this case the main difference is that the dummy variable for Bretton Woods becomes positive (although it remains insignificant).

²³ With a few exceptions. See the note to the relevant table.

reversal period, since in some of our cases the event in question is one in which a small current account surplus becomes much larger, and it can be argued that in this case the output effects may be easier to accommodate. The results are consistent with this hypothesis. Finally, we added a dummy variable for the presence of controls on capital account transactions on the grounds that such controls may limit capital flight in the wake of the reversal, again limiting the output effects. The results are consistent with this intuition: output losses are smaller when the current account is already in surplus in the pre-reversal period and capital controls are present. But again the addition of these variables does not alter our earlier findings.

An additional result is that a number of the period dummies show up as statistically significant. A negative (positive) sign means that growth was slower and output losses were larger (growth was faster and output losses were smaller) in the period in question: thus we find smaller output losses under the gold standard but larger output losses in the interwar and Bretton Woods periods than in the omitted post-1972 alternative after controlling for other observed characteristics of countries and the global environment (that is, after controlling for the values of the independent variables). Recall that the simple tabulation of output losses in different periods showed the same thing. That we see the same pattern here suggests that the other explanatory variables such as the size of the initial current account imbalance, the overvaluation of the real exchange rate or the presence or absence of capital controls do not explain why the typical output loss from reversals was smaller in some periods than in others.

We considered a number of sensitivity analyses. For example, we added a vector of country fixed effects, and the basic results continue to hold. We also experimented

with a number of additional explanatory variables. For instance, a potential explanation for why the output effects of reversals were smaller in some periods than others is that the reversals themselves were smaller. We therefore added the size of the reversal (measured here as the change in the current account ratio between time t-3 and time t) as an additional explanatory variable. This has plausible effects; for example, it lowers the significance level on the gold standard dummy, suggesting that one reason that the output losses associated with current account reversals were smaller under the gold standard is that the magnitude of the reversals themselves were smaller. However, the new coefficient is not statistically different from zero, and the other results are little affected by its addition. Finally, we followed Edwards (2004a) in estimating treatment regressions, estimating first an equation for current account reversals and then a second stage regression that treats the reversal variable as endogenous.²⁴ The results, in Table 7, are consistent with their predecessors. Reversals are more likely in countries that had been running large external deficits in the immediately preceding period and where growth was slow. They continue to cause significant output losses, although output begins bouncing back relatively quickly.

In sum, the results here suggest that the gold-standard period was different: current account reversals were less frequent, smaller in magnitude and less disruptive to output than they have become subsequently. The years since 1972 do not compare unfavorably in these respects with the 1920s and 1930s; if anything the opposite is true. But reversals today are more frequent, larger and more disruptive to growth than they were before 1914. Obvious measures of country characteristics and global economic

²⁴ In the first stage, probit estimates of the treatment equation are obtained. From these estimates a hazard is then computed. In the second stage, the hazard is included in the estimation of the outcome equation. This augmented outcome equation lets us get consistent estimates of the regression disturbance term.

conditions do not seem to account for this difference. This motivates us to look more closely at a number of episodes of sharp current account reversals before 1913 to see whether this can help us to understand better what is going on.

6. Case Studies

In this section we consider three prominent pre-1914 current account reversals: Argentina in 1889-90, Australia in 1891-2, Brazil in 1896-7.

A. Argentina 1889-90. The 1880s was a golden decade for Argentina. The wool and wheat producers of the pampas were integrated into world markets by the construction of ports and railways.²⁵ Argentina already had 2,500 kilometers of railroad track in 1880, and its ample endowment of productive land promised the traffic to support many more. Labor arrived in abundance; slow growth in Europe, depressed conditions in that continent's agrarian economies, and cheap international passenger rates combined to encourage more than one million immigrant arrivals between 1880 and 1890. (Argentine government propaganda and subsidies for travel costs did not hurt.) While only some two thirds of these immigrants settled permanently, this was a very large increase in labor supply for a country with an 1880 population of only two million.

Britons in particular were galvanized by the attractions of investment in this economy: new capital calls in London on behalf of the country rose from little more than L½ million a year between 1875 and 1880 to nearly L5 million a year between 1881 and 1885 and then a remarkable L17.5 million annually between 1886 and 1890.²⁶ The British lent for railway construction, for the improvement of port facilities, for the

²⁵ Wheat was first exported in 1878.

²⁶ Stone (1999), Table 3. British investment accounted for the majority but certainly not the entirety of European investment in Argentina in this period; see Ford (1962).

development of urban infrastructure (most of the immigrants of the 1880s settling in the cities), and for the system of ranches and meatpacking plants that allowed the exportation of canned and, eventually, chilled beef. They were active participants in the real estate, securities market, and banking booms of the period, and they lent extensively to politically-connected provisional mortgage banks.

While domestic and foreign economic events go some way toward explaining these developments, their timing cannot be understood without reference to the political consolidation that occurred in Argentina in the 1880s. This was the period when the central state, bolstered by recent military victories, asserted its authority over the provinces and the economy. The rebellion of the province of Buenos Aires was defeated in 1880, and the city was transformed into the federal capital. The state then established dominion over the regions inhabited by indigenous peoples. The territorial limits of the nation were, for the first time, clearly defined. Starting in 1880 a new institutional framework was created based on strong presidential power, checks and balances exercised by the congress, and a prohibition of presidential reelection. A uniform national money was finally established. Basic fiscal, administrative and judicial powers were defined (Botana 1997). Although Romero (2002) remarks that some of these powers were more notional than real, it is clear that this picture did much to enhance investor confidence in the administrative capacity of the state. And this in turn facilitated foreign finance for Argentina's twin deficits.

Thus, the growth of the current account deficit in the 1880s resulted from a combination of domestic economic and political factors. Investment was encouraged by the exceptional commercial opportunities afforded by a period of geographical

expansion, integration into world markets, large-scale immigration, and political consolidation; meanwhile the working-age population was increasing dominated by recent immigrants as yet in no position to support high savings rates. The central government reinforced the disparity by undertaking public investment projects itself while running deficits. For better or worse, the consolidation of the state in the 1880s and the extensive guarantees provided by the government for private investment (investments in railways in particular) encouraged foreigners to help finance the difference.²⁷ Not least among the beneficiaries was the government itself, which could borrow abroad in order to finance public spending on projects that benefited its clients. Cronyism similarly prevailed in the provinces, whose governments used provincial banks to contract foreign loans and use the proceeds to extend credit to the provincial government.

Maintenance of this fragile equilibrium depended on two conditions. First, there was a considerable gestation period between the initial investment in export-oriented infrastructure and the coming on line of exports. Keeping current in the interim on short-run debt-service obligations hinged therefore on the willingness of foreign investors to provide a steady stream of bridge finance. Between 1885 and 1890, as Ford (1962, p.87) observes, “to some considerable extent foreign borrowings were employed in paying service charges on previous foreign loans...” One potential explanation for why current account reversals were smaller, less frequent, and less disruptive than in subsequent periods is that current account deficits reflected high levels of export-oriented infrastructure investment – that is, foreign capital was devoted to uses that generated additional export revenues that could be used to make debt service payments in the normal course of events (see Feis 1930, Fishlow 1986, and the discussion above).

²⁷ Money finance contributed also, Argentina having gone off the gold standard in 1884.

Analysis of the Argentine case suggests that this factor may be subject to exaggeration. Natural complementarities there may have been, but gestation periods were long.

Second, this happy equilibrium hinged on the credibility of the government's commitments. Paying out on its guarantees required a healthy rise in public-sector revenues; here the gestation period between the initial investment projects and the induced rise in economic activity again posed a problem. Insofar as some of the projects that the government guaranteed were of low quality – they were likely to neither pay for themselves nor to induce an increase in revenues through other channels – the authorities might find themselves unable to uphold their part of the bargain. At that point, capital inflows might dry up, forcing the current account deficit to be compressed.

Thus, the Argentine episode displays many of the characteristics identified in the preceding analyses as raising the likelihood of current account reversals and heightening their output effects, prominent among them large budget and current account deficits in the run-up to the event. In addition, explanations for the Argentine crisis in this period invoke two factors also emphasized in modern studies that do not show up in other gold-standard era reversals: tight credit conditions and slowing growth in the center. The importing country on which Argentina depended most heavily, Great Britain, experienced a cyclical peak in 1885, and its economy remained officially in recession through 1889 (the latter being the conventionally-dated business cycle trough). This made growing Argentine exports more difficult. At the same time, the stability of British savings rates and hence the inverse fluctuation of home and foreign investment (Cairncross 1953) meant that ample British capital was made available to Argentina and other contemporary emerging markets from the middle of the decade.

But these same relationships rendered Argentina vulnerable to a decline in the availability of finance when British growth began to accelerate and investment picked up starting in 1889, and when the Bank of England began raising rates. Overall, the 1880s was a decade of low interest rates, reflecting relatively weak investment demand in Europe. Goshen's 1888 debt conversion took advantage of this fact and put further downward pressure on yields. Low interest rates encouraged investors to look abroad for higher yields. As Bailey (1959, p.272) put it, London and Edinburgh were soon "honeycombed with agencies" for collecting money for overseas investments. But in 1889, the cyclical trough had passed, and British activity began to accelerate. The Bank of England ratcheted up its discount rate sharply, from 2 ½ to 6 per cent over the second half of the year. It is not surprising that this led to a decline in new issues in London on behalf of Argentina and made it difficult for Barings to place the Buenos Aires Water Supply and Drainage Loan. Foreign financial factors clearly played a role in this current account reversal, although it can perhaps be argued that it would have occurred sooner or later, with or without sharp changes in the Bank of England's discount rate.²⁸

With the failure of the Buenos Aires waterworks loan and news of the distress experienced by Barings, lending to Argentina ground to a halt. Reversing the current account balance was painful when the prior deficit was so large and the government budget was in deficit as well. Successive governments struggled, with little success, to balance the budget through a combination of tax increases and expenditure reductions, and thereby limit the need for monetization and inflation. The need to compress imports in order to facilitate current account adjustment further complicated this task, since

²⁸ Given its prominence in this case, just why the British discount rate does not show up more generally in our regressions explaining the incidence of current account reversals remains a something of a mystery.

import duties were the single most import source of revenues for the federal government. Moreover, compressing imports by 50 per cent in 1891 and then boosting exports required sharp depreciation of the real exchange rate, which further eroded domestic living standards and depressed consumption. Real GDP contracted by 4 per cent in 1890 and a further 11 per cent in 1891 before bouncing back to plus 9 per cent in 1892 and 5 per cent in 1893. Thus, by the end of 1893 output was roughly back up to where it had been in 1889 (although living standards and imports in particular remained below earlier levels).²⁹ Still, this was a large output drop by the standards of contemporary current account reversals, reflecting the unfavorable initial conditions.

On the other hand, this was not an exceptionally long recession; that growth was again positive little more than two years after the reversal was not atypical by international standards.³⁰ Historians point to a number of factors helping to avert a more extended recession. Argentina avoided having to compress demand still more sharply and to move the current account into surplus even further by restructuring its debt, first suspending payments, then obtaining a bridge loan through the Rothschild Committee sufficient to finance the federal government's debt service obligations for three years, securing a reduction of debt service and holiday on amortization payments, and finally assuming the provincial debt at less than 60 per cent of its face value.³¹ As a region of overseas European settlement dominated by recent immigrant arrivals, labor exhibited an unusual degree of intersectoral mobility, moving smoothly from the production of

²⁹ As Fishlow (1989a) notes, Argentine imports did not again reach 1889 levels until 1904.

³⁰ Fishlow (1989b) observes that "the data on railway receipts are suggestive of a less severe and prolonged downturn than other peripheral economies experienced during the 1890s."

³¹ Perhaps not too much should be claimed of this factor, for these negotiations took many years to complete and were a pervasive source of demoralizing financial uncertainty while still underway.

nontraded to traded goods in response to the depreciation of the real exchange rate.³²

World demand conditions were favorable; export prices rose over much of the 1890s, and there was a positive technology shock with the coming on line of large scale exports of chilled beef.³³ Some of these factors are policies that governments might attempt to pursue in order to cope with current account reversals. But others reflect factors having to do with the structure of markets and the development of technology over which they have little control.

B. Brazil 1896-7. Brazil's reversal took place a bit later than Argentina's, although it was affected by the same global economic and financial developments. Between 1886 and 1890 Brazil imported only about 40 per cent as much British capital as Argentina, despite benefiting from the same low global interest rates. In part this reflected the prevailing commitment to fiscal orthodoxy and the desire to restore the milreis to its official 1846 par; this more conservative fiscal stance limited the magnitude of the subsequent twin deficits. In part the difference reflected the fact that Brazilian publicity and propaganda were less effective. It took the abolition of slavery in 1888 and the end of the monarchy in 1889 to really put the country on the "radar screen" of international investors.³⁴

As in Argentina, the government then used fiscal largess to buy and seek to maintain the political support of the military and the provinces. In the Brazilian case there was also the fact that the abolition of slavery imposed financial losses on powerful agricultural interests. The latter sought preferential access to cheap credit to compensate

³² Fishlow (1989a,b) emphasizes labor market flexibility as a factor in adjustment.

³³ While Cardoso (1989) emphasizes this factor in explaining Argentina's recovery from the 1890-92 crisis, in reality it comes a bit late to explain the questions at hand here (Argentina exports of chilled beef rise to significant levels only in the second half of the 1890s).

³⁴ To be sure, British investors had preferred Brazil earlier in the 19th century, but not in the 1880s.

for the capital losses suffered as a result of emancipation.³⁵ Thus, following the proclamation of the republic in 1889, domestic interest rates were kept low and the exchange rate was allowed to depreciate. Sauce for the goose being sauce for the gander, financial preferences were extended to industry as well. The speculative boom which resulted from the ample provision of credit, financed partly by domestic money creation and partly by foreign borrowing, is known in the Brazilian literature as the *Encilhamento*. So soon after the abolition of slavery, and with continuing political uncertainty, domestic conditions were not conducive to high domestic savings rates. The investment encouraged by the ample availability of credit thus bequeathed chronic current account deficits.

It is striking, given the recent literature on contagion, that Brazil did not experience a current account reversal, as we measure the phenomenon, at this time. As Cardoso and Dornbusch (1989) note, evidence of negative financial spillovers from Argentina to Brazil is limited. Part of the explanation, for this as for many things Brazilian, is coffee prices, which strengthened from 1890. But another part may lie in the fact that Brazil satisfies less well the leading indicators of vulnerability to a current account reversal. While current account deficits were chronic, they were not allowed to widen to the same extent as in Argentina; Brazil was never the darling of foreign investors to the same extent. Although the commitment to fiscal orthodoxy weakened after the 1880s, the legacy lived on; budget deficits were never allowed to explode as they did in Argentina. Less pressure of demand meant less tendency toward overvaluation, which further slowed the development of a patently unsustainable external position. As a result the country retained limited capital market access: Brazil was able

³⁵ See Fishlow (1989a), pp.22-23.

to contract new loans in London, most prominently in 1893 and 1895 but also a short-term advance in 1896.

In this manner Brazil staggered into the second half of the 1890s. Limited capital market access to finance ongoing deficits allowed the debt to continue rising, which inevitably contributed to growing unease on the part of foreign investors. After 1893, coffee prices began to weaken, bringing the situation to a head. By 1896 funding for the current account deficit had dried up. The trade balance swung from a deficit of a bit less than one per cent of GDP to a surplus of more than five percent, reflecting the magnitude of ongoing debt service obligations. Like Argentina, at this point Brazil secured a funding loan from its London bankers, in this case sufficient to cover the central government's interest payments for three years. In addition amortization obligations were suspended for 13 years. Fishlow (1989a) notes that since the effective debt write-down was less than in Argentina (where the issue had been forced by the government's unilateral suspension of payments), reliance on internal adjustment measures was necessarily greater. The budgetary problem was addressed by raising tax rates and extending them to new products, imposing surcharges on customs duties, and renting the federal railways to private enterprises. The exchange rate was stabilized by withdrawing Treasury notes from circulation, as required by the conditions attached to the funding loan.

This sharp deflation, presided over by Finance Minister Joaquim Murinho, sharply compressed domestic demand. Imports fell, partly owing to depressed demand conditions but also due to the import surcharges, while more domestic production was freed up for export. Chronic trade deficits gave way to ongoing surpluses, which grew

even larger after 1900. But the greater reliance in Brazil on deflationary adjustment measures also meant that the output effects of the reversal were severe compared to Argentina, notwithstanding the fact that prior conditions would have indicated a less severe recession, rather than an equally serious one. Adjustment took place mainly through the collapse of investment; the trade statistics show a sharp decline in imports of industrial equipment. National income estimates suggest that GDP declined by 10 per cent in 1897 and 5 per cent in 1898, mirroring the 1890-1 contraction in Argentina, before stabilizing in 1899, and then beginning to grow again quite sharply starting in 1900, aided by strengthening coffee prices and the coming on line of rubber exports (although not soon enough to prevent a crisis in a banking system severely weakened by preceding events).

Thus, the Brazilian case is a reminder that the output effects of a current account reversal depend not just on inherited macroeconomic and financial conditions but also on how that reversal is managed.

C. Australia 1891-2. Australia, whose reversal was bracketed temporally by those of Argentina and Brazil, reinforces this point: there the government resorted to neither currency depreciation nor default in an effort to ameliorate the consequences. While many of the other circumstances surrounding this episode were similar to those in Argentina and Brazil, imperial identity meant that default and depreciation were essentially inconceivable. Even more than in Brazil, then, the burden of adjustment fell on the domestic economy. In Australia, GDP fell for four years running, from 1890 through 1893, not “just” two. The cumulative fall was on the order of 25 per cent, not “just” 15. Unemployment rose sharply. Immigration slowed and tentative reversed

direction. Social disorder spread, led by protesting sheep shearers, dock workers, and miners. Post-1893 recovery, if it may be called that, was slow and uneven. A summary measure of the severity of the consequent recession is the comparison with Argentina: whereas Argentine real GDP doubled between 1890 and 1905 according to the conventional national income statistics, Australian GDP in 1905 was a mere 20 per cent above what it had been a decade and a half before. All this is especially impressive given that the absolute swing in the trade balance ratio, from -2.0 per cent of GDP in the three pre-reversal years to +0.4 per cent of GDP in the year of the event, was small by the standards of the other countries we are considering.

Australia had been experiencing an investment boom, based in substantial part on investment by nonresidents, off and on since the gold rushes of 1851. Much of this overseas finance was devoted to speculative investment in assets, including pastoral and urban land. Like the government of Argentina, the governments of Queensland and New South Wales subsidized the fares of immigrants. Self-reinforcing capital and labor inflows fanned a speculative building boom. The urban land boom came to a head in the 1880s, fueled by rapid increases in mortgage lending by savings banks. As a share of GDP, bank credit (much of which was backed by foreign liabilities) doubled between 1880 and 1890. The majority of the increase went into residential construction, since the rate of return on pastoral activities was declining and the 'eighties was a decade of urbanization. Land and housing prices shot up in Melbourne in particular.

As in Argentina and Brazil, these developments were not unrelated to the activities of government, the individual colonial governments in particular. The Australian colonies competed with one another to attract both labor and capital,

borrowing to build railways into the interior and providing urban amenities to appeal to recent settlers. As McLean (1996) puts it, many of these investment projects were based on overly optimistic assessments of the agricultural potential of the semi-arid regions of the interior (reflecting temporarily favorable climatic conditions).³⁶ In the second half of the 1880s, they reflected the tendency for low interest rates in Britain to encourage relatively indiscriminate overseas borrowing and lending. So long as growth prospects were rosy, government guarantees for the bonds underwriting the investments were credible. And, of course, these projects were associated with large current account deficits reflecting the propensity to import locomotives, steel rail, and a wide range of other investment goods.

The stop to lending that followed the Baring Crisis was more pronounced in Australia than in Brazil. Capital inflows fell from L20 million in 1888 to a mere L1 million in 1893. It is tempting to speculate that British investors were impressed by the similar resource endowments of the two pastoral economies and revised their expectations accordingly – although the fact that the curtailment of lending and current account reversal took place fully a year after the Baring Crisis is difficult to reconcile with this hypothesis. Given that “the imperial and Commonwealth tie” (in the language of Lindert and Morton 1989) closed off other options, harsh deflationary policies became the order of the day. There was no depreciation of the currency. Rather, relative prices had to adjust through a grinding downward movement of wages and costs. Demand was compressed by tight credit, which discouraged consumption and, in particular, investment. Capital formation fell from L34 million in 1888 to L16 million in 1892 and

³⁶ Very much the same syndrome, reflecting the same climatic conditions, was evident in the United States at this time.

L9 million in 1893. State budgets were brought into rapid balance, further compressing demand. Despite the virtual stop to borrowing, government debt as a share of GDP rose sharply with declining nominal income through the middle of the 1890s. Meanwhile, there was no relief from the interest burden like that obtained by Argentina (and no delay of amortization like that enjoyed by Brazil): debt service continued to account for nearly 10 per cent of GDP. This meant that imports had to be compressed sharply. In contrast, exports were maintained at previous levels (unlike Argentina and Brazil, they did not rise significantly in the wake of the reversal, presumably reflecting the stagnation of the economy). Reflecting the impact of deflation, the export share rose from 20 to 28 per cent of GDP in the first half of the 1890s.

The story would not be complete without reference to the drought that started in 1895, which nipped the economy's nascent recovery in the bud. What coffee was to Brazil, wool was to Australia, and the unprecedented drought of the mid-1890s had a devastating impact on the pastoral economy. Thus, climate and not simply policy may explain why recovery in Australia was so difficult and long in coming. However, drought was not an exclusively Australian phenomenon in the 1890s, so the decline in pastoral production was offset to an extent by strong prices. In addition, drought in 1895 cannot explain why the economy contracted so persistently and severely between 1890 and 1893, despite the relatively limited size of the current account reversal.³⁷ Here the fact that the domestic economy was forced to shoulder the entire burden of adjustment to the current account reversal cannot be denied.

³⁷ As measured by the absolute change in the deficit/GDP ratio between the average of the three pre-reversal years and the year of the reversal itself.

7. Conclusion

In this paper we have presented some new facts and a mystery. The new facts concern the pre-1970s history of international capital flows and current account reversals. Analyzing a consistent sample of countries (those with per capita GDPs at least 60 per cent those of the lead country) and measuring reversals in a consistent way, we find that the incidence of reversals has been unusually great in recent years. The only prior period that matched the last three decades in terms of frequency was the 1920s and 1930s, two decades notorious for the instability of capital flows. In contrast, reversals were less common in the Bretton Woods and pre-World War I gold standard eras. They were smaller in magnitude, and their output costs were less.

That the Bretton Woods years were different is no surprise: capital controls were widespread and financial flows across borders were suppressed. Current account reversals were fewer and their effects were smaller because current account balances were smaller, reflecting this limited finance. On the other hand, that reversals were relatively few, small and undisruptive under the gold standard is striking, given the absence of impediments to capital flows and the large size of current account balances.

This characteristic of reversals is clearly related to the much commented upon “smooth operation” of the prewar gold standard. But its sources remain mysterious. Both cross-country regressions and case studies suggest that the same observable characteristics of countries (large current account and budget deficits in the prior period, negative shocks to growth at home and abroad) explain the incidence of reversals both before 1914 and after 1971. Basically the same variables (large prior deficits, real overvaluation, open capital markets) explain the magnitude of the output effects in both

periods. Controlling for differences in these characteristics of countries and reversal periods does not make the contrast between the gold standard and recent years go away. Detailed analysis of particular cases points to subtler characteristics of economies (the degree of market flexibility, for example) and to how reversals were managed as part of the explanation for these patterns. But, ultimately, the mystery of why reversals were not more frequent and disruptive in the period of open capital markets a century ago remains a mystery. The smooth operation of the classical gold standard has yet to be adequately explained.

References

- Bailey, J.D. (1959), "Australian Borrowing in Scotland in the Nineteenth Century," *Economic History Review* (sec. ser) 9, pp.268-279.
- Bayoumi, Tamim (1989), "Savings-Investment Correlations: Immobile Capital, Government Policy, or Endogenous Behavior?" IMF Working Paper 98/66 (December).
- Bayoumi, Tamim and Barry Eichengreen (1996), "The Stability of the Gold Standard and the Evolution of the International Monetary System," in Tamim Bayoumi, Barry Eichengreen and Mark Taylor (eds), *Modern Perspectives on the Gold Standard*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.165-188.
- Bloomfield, Arthur (1963), "Short Term Capital Movements under the Pre-1914 Gold Standard," *Princeton Studies in International Finance* no. 14, International Finance Section, Department of Economics, Princeton University.
- Bloomfield, Arthur (1968), "Patterns of Fluctuation in International Investment Before 1914," *Princeton Studies in International Finance*, International Finance Section, Department of Economics, Princeton University.
- Bordo, Michael and Barry Eichengreen (2003), "Crises Now and Then: What Lessons from the Last Era of Financial Globalization?" in Paul Mizen (ed), *Monetary History, Exchange Rates and Financial Markets*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, vol. 2, pp.52-91.
- Bordo, Michael, Barry Eichengreen and Douglas Irwin (1999), "Is Globalization Today Really Different than Globalization a Hundred Years Ago?" *Brookings Trade Forum*, pp.1-72.
- Bordo, Michael and Marc Flandreau (2003), "Core, Periphery, Exchange Rate Regimes, and Globalization," in Michael Bordo, Alan Taylor and Jeffrey Williamson (eds), *Globalization in Historical Perspective*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp.417-472.
- Botana, Natalio (1997), *De la republica posible a la republica verdadera*, Buenos Aires: Espasa Calpe Argentina.
- Brewer, John (1990), *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Cairncross, A.K. (1953), *Home and Foreign Investment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cardoso, Eliana A. (1989), "Comment on Fishlow," in Guillermo Calvo, Ronald Findlay, Pentti Kouri and Jorge de Macedo (eds), *Debt, Stabilization and Development*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp.48-53.

Cardoso, Eliana A. and Rudiger Dornbusch (1989), "Brazilian Debt Crises: Past and Present," in Barry Eichengreen and Peter Lindert (eds), *The International Debt Crisis in Historical Perspective*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, pp.106-139.

Edwards, Sebastian (2004a), "Thirty Years of Current Account Imbalances, Current Account Reversals, and Sudden Stops," NBER Working Paper no.10276 (January).

Edwards, Sebastian (2004b), "Financial Openness: Sudden Stops and Current Account Reversals," NBER Working Paper no.10277 (January).

Edwards, Sebastian (2005), "Is the U.S. Current Account Deficit Sustainable? And if Not, How Costly is Adjustment Likely to Be?" unpublished manuscript, UCLA (March).

Eichengreen, Barry (1992), *Golden Fetters: The Gold Standard and the Great Depression 1919-1939*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Eichengreen, Barry and Michael Bordo (2002), "Crises Now and Then: What Lessons from the Last Era of Financial Globalization?" NBER Working Paper no.8716.

Feis, Herbert (1930), *Europe: The World's Banker*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Feldstein, Martin and Charles Horioka (1980), "Domestic Saving and International Capital Flows," *Economic Journal* 90, pp.314-329.

Fischer, Stanley (1988), "Real Balances, the Exchange Rate and Indexation: Real Variables in Disinflation," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 103, pp.27-50.

Fishlow, Albert (1986), "Lessons from the Past, Capital Markets and International Lending in the 19th Century and the Interwar Years," in Miles Kahler (ed.), *The Politics of International Debt*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Fishlow, Albert (1989a), "Lessons of the 1890s for the 1980s," in Guillermo Calvo, Ronald Findlay, Pentti Kouri and Jorge de Macedo (eds), *Debt, Stabilization and Development*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp.19-47.

Fishlow, Albert (1989b), "Conditionality and Willingness to Pay: Some Parallels from the 1890s," in Barry Eichengreen and Peter Lindert (eds), *The International Debt Crisis in Historical Perspective*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, pp.86-105.

Goldstein, Morris, Graciela Kaminsky and Carmen Reinhart (2000), *Assessing Financial Vulnerability: An Early Warning System for Emerging Markets*, Washington, D.C.: Institute for International Economics.

Ford, Alec (1962), *The Gold Standard: Britain and Argentina*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Lindert, Peter (1969), "Key Currencies and Gold, 1900-1913," *Princeton Studies in International Finance* no. 24, International Finance Section, Department of Economics, Princeton University.
- Lindert, Peter and Peter Morton (1989), "How Sovereign Debt has Worked," in Jeffrey Sachs (ed.), *Developing Country Debt and Economic Performance*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, vol. 1, pp.39-106.
- McLean, Ian W. (1996), "Recovery from the 1890s Depression: Australia in an Argentine Mirror," unpublished manuscript, University of Adelaide.
- Milesi-Ferretti, Gian Maria and Assaf Razin (1997), "Sharp Reductions in Current Account Deficits: An Empirical Investigation," NBER Working Paper no.6310.
- North, Douglass and Barry Weingast (1989), "Constitutions and Commitment," *Journal of Economic History* 49, pp.803-852.
- Obstfeld, Maurice and Kenneth Rogoff (1996), "The Intertemporal Approach to the Current Account," NBER Working Paper no.4893 (April).
- Obstfeld, Maurice and Alan Taylor (2004), *Global Capital Markets*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Romer, Christina (1986), "Spurious Volatility in Historical Unemployment Data," *Journal of Political Economy* 94, pp.1-37.
- Romero, Luis Alberto (2002), *A History of Argentina in the 20th Century*, University Park, Penn.: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Stone, Irving (1999), *The Global Export of Capital from Great Britain, 1865-1914*, New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Taylor, Alan (1996), "International Capital Mobility in History: The Saving-Investment Relationship," NBER Working Paper no.5743.

**Table 1. Mean Absolute Value of Current Accounts, Percent of GDP
(Unweighted Averages)**

Time	Present Sample	Obstfeld-Taylor
1880-1889	4.3	3.9 ^a
1890-1913	3.6	3.7
1919-1926	3.9	3.9
1927-1931	2.7	2.7
1932-1939	1.5	1.5
1947-1959	2.4	1.8
1960-1973	1.9	1.3
1974-1989	4.8	2.2
1990-2000	4.7	2.3

a This figure is from Taylor (1996); Obstfeld and Taylor (1994) provide a statistic for the longer period 1870-1889.

Source: see text.

Table 2. Estimates of Savings-Retention Coefficient for Successive Five-Year Periods, Current Sample

Period	Coef.	Std. Err.	95% Conf.	Interval
<i>1880-1884</i>	0.534	0.198	0.099	0.970
<i>1885-1889</i>	0.311	0.145	-0.003	0.625
<i>1890-1894</i>	0.536	0.141	0.231	0.840
<i>1895-1899</i>	0.668	0.114	0.421	0.915
<i>1900-1904</i>	0.548	0.132	0.262	0.833
<i>1905-1909</i>	0.567	0.207	0.119	1.014
<i>1910-1914</i>	0.581	0.206	0.135	1.027
<i>1920-1924</i>	0.590	0.219	0.107	1.073
<i>1925-1929</i>	0.613	0.196	0.185	1.041
<i>1930-1934</i>	0.767	0.071	0.614	0.920
<i>1935-1939</i>	0.927	0.068	0.780	1.075
<i>1945-1949</i>	0.667	0.128	0.395	0.939
<i>1950-1954</i>	0.637	0.065	0.501	0.773
<i>1955-1959</i>	0.741	0.057	0.623	0.859
<i>1960-1964</i>	0.762	0.077	0.602	0.921
<i>1965-1969</i>	0.896	0.068	0.755	1.036
<i>1970-1974</i>	0.876	0.059	0.753	0.998
<i>1975-1979</i>	0.735	0.091	0.546	0.924
<i>1980-1984</i>	0.799	0.105	0.581	1.016
<i>1985-1989</i>	0.732	0.121	0.482	0.981
<i>1990-1994</i>	0.764	0.070	0.620	0.907
<i>1995-1999</i>	0.843	0.059	0.719	0.964

Source: see text.

Table 3. Time Distribution of Reversals

	Pre-1885	1885-1889	1890-1894	1895-1899	1900-1904	1905-1909	1910-1914	Total
REV1								
<i>No Reversal</i>	26	77	67	76	79	93	66	484
<i>Reversal</i>	2	5	18	9	13	2	10	59
REV2								
<i>No Reversal</i>	28	81	76	83	86	94	73	521
<i>Reversal</i>		1	9	2	6	1	3	22
	1918-1922	1923-1927	1928-1932	1933-1937	1938			
REV1								
<i>No Reversal</i>	40	66	67	83	18			274
<i>Reversal</i>	28	27	32	14	1			102
REV2								
<i>No Reversal</i>	45	74	76	88	19			302
<i>Reversal</i>	23	19	23	9				74
	1945-1949	1950-1954	1955-1959	1960-1964	1965-1969	1970-1972		
REV1								
<i>No Reversal</i>	52	79	94	97	94	57		473
<i>Reversal</i>	20	21	6	3	6	6		62
REV2								
<i>No Reversal</i>	54	89	98	100	100	63		504
<i>Reversal</i>	18	11	2					31
	1970-1974	1975-1979	1980-1984	1985-1989	1990-1994	1995-1998		
REV1								
<i>No Reversal</i>	96	179	179	198	213	104		969
<i>Reversal</i>	24	58	97	88	74	20		361
REV2								
<i>No Reversal</i>	17	193	209	221	242	114		996
<i>Reversal</i>	13	44	67	65	45	10		244

Notes: REV1 and REV2 refer to a fall in the current account deficit of at least 2 per cent or three per cent over three years with respect to the preceding three years.

Source: see text.

Table 4. Summary Statistics For GDP Growth (Reversal and No-Reversal Episodes)

		<i>GDP Growth</i>			<i>Change in GDP Growth</i>		
		Mean	St. Dev	<i>t-stat</i>	Mean	St. Dev	<i>t-stat</i>
<i>Gold Standard</i>							
Year of	Reversal	2.79	5.08	-0.03	-0.19	1.80	-0.46
	No Rev	2.81	0.95		0.01	1.11	
1	Reversal	1.15	4.70	-0.80	-2.49	7.13	-1.44
	No Rev	1.95	1.31		-0.42	1.16	
2	Reversal	3.59	6.28	0.95	-5.16	31.28	-0.71
	No Rev	2.38	1.59		-0.49	0.98	
3	Reversal	6.22	4.14	4.51	-1.34	2.25	0.44
	No Rev	2.45	1.36		-2.05	7.89	
4	Reversal	3.47	5.35	0.26	0.07	1.46	1.49
	No Rev	3.10	1.43		-3.25	8.58	
<i>Interwar</i>							
Year of	Reversal	0.60	6.83	-2.57	-0.83	2.09	-0.75
	No Rev	3.28	4.77		-0.42	1.56	
1	Reversal	3.28	14.28	-0.33	-2.63	9.20	-1.27
	No Rev	4.03	4.81		-0.59	1.88	
2	Reversal	3.96	11.18	-0.41	-0.05	4.23	1.70
	No Rev	4.66	4.19		-1.14	1.74	
3	Reversal	3.32	6.60	-1.44	-15.57	68.35	-1.34
	No Rev	4.63	4.41		-0.89	1.73	
4	Reversal	5.61	5.16	1.43	-1.10	4.64	-1.61
	No Rev	4.31	3.87		0.25	2.00	

Notes: *t*-statistics reported for two-sided null hypothesis of no difference between reversals and non-reversals. *t*-statistics in bold indicate rejection of the null hypothesis.

Table 4. Summary Statistics (Continued)

		<i>GDP Growth</i>			<i>Change in GDP Growth</i>		
		Mean	St. Dev	<i>t-stat</i>	Mean	St. Dev	<i>t-stat</i>
<i>Bretton Woods</i>							
Year of	Reversal	5.39	3.91	-2.50	-0.04	1.10	-1.46
	No Rev	9.14	5.69		3.52	10.64	
1	Reversal	6.94	6.03	-1.89	-1.25	7.92	-1.43
	No Rev	9.94	6.34		1.45	8.31	
2	Reversal	6.15	5.19	-1.30	0.32	4.58	-0.24
	No Rev	8.05	5.39		0.56	2.23	
3	Reversal	4.74	4.72	-1.28	-0.16	1.09	-1.39
	No Rev	6.19	3.14		1.21	4.54	
4	Reversal	5.21	5.03	-0.95	3.36	15.18	0.67
	No Rev	6.37	2.77		1.03	4.90	
<i>Post 1970</i>							
Year of	Reversal	1.85	5.53	-3.30	-0.53	5.36	0.83
	No Rev	3.57	1.42		-1.04	3.63	
1	Reversal	2.73	5.82	-1.44	-0.01	8.15	1.36
	No Rev	3.45	1.13		-1.06	3.82	
2	Reversal	3.85	4.64	1.09	-0.16	3.31	0.44
	No Rev	3.40	1.11		-0.35	3.68	
3	Reversal	4.12	6.01	1.42	0.01	18.49	0.86
	No Rev	3.36	1.34		-1.40	5.38	
4	Reversal	4.00	5.78	1.86	1.06	12.60	1.70
	No Rev	2.88	1.15		-1.18	3.51	

Notes: *t*-statistics reported for two-sided null hypothesis of no difference between reversals and non-reversals. *t*-statistics in bold represent a rejection of the null hypothesis.

Source: see text.

Table 5. Indicators of Reversals

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
GDP per capita	-0.205** (0.099)	-0.205 (0.154)	-0.177 (0.152)	-0.300*** (0.108)	-0.300 (0.184)	-0.272 (0.183)
Fiscal balance/GDP	-0.014** (0.007)	-0.014 (0.009)	-0.013 (0.009)	-0.016** (0.007)	-0.016* (0.009)	-0.014 (0.009)
Trade balance/GDP	-0.033*** (0.005)	-0.033*** (0.011)	-0.035*** (0.012)	-0.032*** (0.005)	-0.032*** (0.011)	-0.034*** (0.012)
UK/US interest rate	0.011 (0.009)	0.011 (0.011)	0.016 (0.012)	0.009 (0.010)	0.009 (0.012)	0.017 (0.012)
Lagged UK/US growth	-0.024*** (0.007)	-0.024*** (0.007)	-0.019*** (0.007)	-0.024*** (0.008)	-0.024*** (0.008)	-0.020*** (0.007)
UK/US growth	0.004 (0.008)	0.004 (0.008)	0.006 (0.009)	0.007 (0.009)	0.007 (0.009)	0.007 (0.010)
Peg	-0.063 (0.075)	-0.063 (0.100)	-0.044 (0.101)	-0.091 (0.078)	-0.091 (0.100)	-0.073 (0.101)
Gold Standard Dummy	-0.389*** (0.115)	-0.389** (0.178)	-0.372** (0.177)	-0.434*** (0.132)	-0.434** (0.192)	-0.439** (0.193)
Interwar Dummy	0.142 (0.102)	0.142 (0.135)	0.137 (0.139)	0.092 (0.121)	0.092 (0.148)	0.067 (0.154)
BW Dummy	-0.338*** (0.107)	-0.338** (0.153)	-0.349** (0.156)	-0.330*** (0.112)	-0.330** (0.165)	-0.329* (0.169)
Deficit	0.164** (0.069)	0.164** (0.069)	0.165** (0.071)	0.134* (0.072)	0.134* (0.071)	0.135* (0.073)
Openness	0.004*** (0.001)	0.004** (0.002)	0.004** (0.002)	0.004*** (0.001)	0.004** (0.002)	0.003** (0.002)
Capital Controls				-0.102 (0.091)	-0.102 (0.134)	-0.127 (0.135)
Constant	-1.030*** (0.110)	-1.030*** (0.147)	-1.062*** (0.148)	-0.879*** (0.135)	-0.879*** (0.177)	-0.891*** (0.180)
Observations	1978	1978	1895	1869	1869	1793
Log-likelihood:	-894.13	-894.13	-864.97	-836.52	-836.52	-810.56
pseudo-R²:	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08

Note: Dependent variable takes the value 1 if a reversal of at least 2 % takes place and 0 otherwise. Standard errors in parentheses, * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. All the explanatory variables are lagged once. The variable trade balance to GDP ratio is averaged over the three years before the event to maintain consistency with the definition of reversals. Government surplus to GDP, world interest rate and growth rates are levels.

Source: see text.

Table 6. Consequences of Reversals

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Trade balance/GDP	0.077*** (0.026)	0.115*** (0.034)	0.077 (0.069)	0.115 (0.082)	0.085*** (0.028)	0.129* (0.075)
RER overvaluation	-0.166*** (0.021)	-0.180*** (0.023)	-0.166*** (0.044)	-0.180*** (0.031)	-0.156*** (0.021)	-0.169*** (0.032)
UK/US interest rate	0.055 (0.069)	0.092 (0.065)	0.055 (0.064)	0.092 (0.061)	0.046 (0.071)	0.075 (0.073)
UK/US interest rate(+1)	0.051 (0.077)	0.031 (0.073)	0.051 (0.072)	0.031 (0.066)	0.082 (0.079)	0.073 (0.070)
Gold Standard Dummy	0.913** (0.445)	0.445 (0.556)	0.913 (0.918)	0.445 (1.056)	0.668 (0.503)	0.013 (1.426)
Interwar Dummy	-2.788*** (0.477)	-3.257*** (0.568)	-2.788*** (0.863)	-3.257*** (0.967)	-3.959*** (0.533)	-4.702*** (1.379)
BW Dummy	-2.708** (1.359)	-3.394** (1.398)	-2.708 (3.100)	-3.394 (3.045)	-2.707* (1.482)	-2.806 (3.279)
Size of Reversal		-0.097** (0.042)		-0.097* (0.051)		-0.679 (0.414)
Capital Controls					-0.391 (0.405)	-0.068 (0.048)
External Def. Dum.					-0.749* (0.395)	-0.828 (1.251)
Constant	0.267 (0.297)	1.060** (0.513)	0.267 (0.685)	1.060 (0.955)	0.889* (0.462)	1.749 (1.383)
Observations	318	222	318	222	288	199
R-squared	0.21	0.28	0.21	0.28	0.26	0.33

Notes: Estimated using OLS with White's correction for heteroscedasticity. Standard errors in parentheses, * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. Reversal defined according to *rev1*. The dependent variable is output growth defined as 3 year averages, expressed as deviations from world averages. The explanatory variables trade balance, the real exchange rate and the UK/US interest rates are averaged over the three years before the event.


Source: see text.

Table 7. Causes and Effects of Current Account Reversals: Two-Step Estimates,
(top panel shows growth regression, bottom panel determinants of reversals)

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Initial Log GDP per capita	-0.459*** (0.136)	-0.483*** (0.136)	-0.535*** (0.135)
Pop. Growth	0.564*** (0.100)	0.539*** (0.101)	0.450*** (0.100)
Fiscal Surplus/GDP	0.114*** (0.024)	0.112*** (0.024)	0.113*** (0.024)
Peg	0.313 (0.243)	0.329 (0.244)	0.305 (0.242)
Capital Controls	0.702*** (0.237)	0.653*** (0.237)	0.654*** (0.235)
Reversal	-4.825*** (1.095)	-5.700*** (1.139)	-6.022*** (1.137)
Lagged Rev.		1.147*** (0.335)	0.562 (0.391)
Lagged (2) Rev.			0.878*** (0.335)
Trade Balance/GDP	-0.033*** (0.005)	-0.032*** (0.005)	-0.031*** (0.005)
Growth	-0.022*** (0.009)	-0.024*** (0.009)	-0.023*** (0.009)
Money/Reserves	-0.009* (0.005)	-0.009* (0.005)	-0.009* (0.005)
Prewar Dummy	-0.591*** (0.118)	-0.572*** (0.119)	-0.566*** (0.120)
Interwar Dummy	-0.053 (0.115)	-0.046 (0.115)	-0.052 (0.115)
BW Dummy	-0.726*** (0.107)	-0.717*** (0.108)	-0.741*** (0.109)
Lambda	2.164*** (0.649)	2.282*** (0.666)	2.490*** (0.665)
Observations	1919	1890	1855

Source: see text.


Figure 1. Mean Absolute Value of Current Account as a Percent of GDP, by Decade



Note: War years are excluded from the sample.

Source: see text.



Figure 2. Plot of Savings-Retention Coefficients and Confidence Intervals, Successive 5-Year Periods (1 = 1880-4,...22 =1995-1999)



Note: war years are excluded from the sample.

Source: see text.

Figure 3. Number of Reversals by Year






Table A1. Countries in the Sample

1880-1914	1918-1939	1945-1971	1972-1998
Argentina	Argentina	Argentina	Algeria
Australia	Australia	Australia	Argentina
Austria	Belgium	Austria	Australia
Brazil	Brazil	Belgium	Austria
Canada	Canada	Brazil	Belgium
Denmark	Denmark	Canada	Belize
Finland	Finland	Denmark	Brazil
France	France	Egypt	Barbados
Germany	Germany	Finland	Canada
Italy	Greece	France	Chile
Japan	Italy	Germany	Colombia
Netherlands	Japan	Greece	Cost Rica
Norway	Netherlands	India	Denmark
Portugal	Norway	Italy	Djibouti
Spain	Portugal	Japan	Egypt
Sweden	Spain	Mexico	Finland
Switzerland	Sweden	New Zealand	Fiji
UK	Switzerland	Netherlands	France
United States	UK	Norway	Gabon
	United States	Portugal	Germany
		South Africa	Grenada
		Spain	Greece
		Sweden	Hungary
		Switzerland	Iceland
		Turkey	Ireland
		Uruguay	Iran
		USSR	Israel
		UK	Italy
		United States	Jamaica
			Japan
			Jordan
			Korea
			Lebanon
			Malaysia
			Mexico
			Malta
			Myanmar
			Mauritius
			Netherlands
			New Zealand
			Nicaragua
			Norway
			Oman
			Panama
			Portugal
			Romania
			Russia
			Seychelles
			Singapore
			South Africa
			Spain
			Sweden
			Switzerland
			Thailand
			Trinidad&Tobago
			Turkey
			UK
			United States
			Uruguay
			Venezuela
			Yemen
			Yugoslavia

Source: see text.

Table A2. Incidence of Reversals: Gold Standard and Interwar Periods

Country	Year	Country	Year
Argentina	1885	Argentina	1924
Argentina	1889	Argentina	1926
Argentina	1898	Argentina	1931
Australia	1891	Australia	1931
Australia	1903	Belgium	1927
Brazil	1884	Brazil	1923
Brazil	1886	Brazil	1929
Brazil	1897	Canada	1923
Brazil	1899	Canada	1932
Canada	1891	Denmark	1921
Canada	1913	Denmark	1925
Denmark	1886	Finland	1918
Denmark	1890	Finland	1929
Denmark	1901	France	1919
Denmark	1908	Germany	1928
Finland	1884	Greece	1930
Finland	1892	Italy	1919
Finland	1901	Italy	1931
Finland	1913	Japan	1927
Germany	1913	Netherlands	1921
Japan	1899	Netherlands	1932
Japan	1901	Norway	1922
Netherlands	1911	Norway	1931
Norway	1901	Portugal	1924
Sweden	1887	Spain	1925
Sweden	1891	Sweden	1922
Sweden	1910	Switzerland	1921
Switzerland	1892	Switzerland	1933
Switzerland	1899	UK	1919
USA	1896	UK	1932

Note: These episodes list only the first year of successive-year reversals and exclude wartime reversals, using the REV1 definition.

Source: see text.

Table A3. Incidence of Reversals: Bretton Woods and Post-Bretton Woods Periods

Country	Year	Country	Year
Australia	1946	Algeria	1978
Australia	1962	Algeria	1989
Australia	1970	Argentina	1976
Belgium	1950	Argentina	1982
Denmark	1948	Austria	1981
Denmark	1954	Barbados	1973
Finland	1949	Barbados	1982
Finland	1951	Barbados	1991
France	1948	Belgium	1983
France	1959	Belgium	1992
Germany	1952	Belize	1984
Germany	1967	Belize	1995
Italy	1950	Brazil	1977
Italy	1964	Brazil	1981
Japan	1954	Canada	1982
Netherlands	1949	Canada	1994
Netherlands	1958	Chile	1974
Netherlands	1967	Chile	1982
Norway	1950	Colombia	1973
Norway	1964	Colombia	1975
Portugal	1950	Colombia	1984
Sweden	1949	Costa Rica	1982
Switzerland	1949	Costa Rica	1990
Switzerland	1953	Costa Rica	1994
Switzerland	1965	Denmark	1991
UK	1948	Djibouti	1993

Table A3. Incidence of Reversals: Post-Bretton Woods Periods, Continued

Country	Year	Country	Year
Egypt	1982	Netherlands	1989
Egypt	1987	New Zealand	1976
Egypt	1989	New Zealand	1986
Fiji	1973	Nicaragua	1976
Fiji	1982	Nicaragua	1991
Finland	1976	Nicaragua	1995
Finland	1983	Norway	1972
Finland	1991	Norway	1977
Gabon	1973	Norway	1989
Gabon	1978	Norway	1996
Gabon	1988	Oman	1978
Gabon	1993	Oman	1987
Germany	1985	Panama	1976
Greece	1986	Panama	1981
Grenada	1983	Portugal	1983
Grenada	1990	Portugal	1993
Grenada	1994	Romania	1993
Hungary	1988	Singapore	1973
Iceland	1983	Singapore	1975
Iceland	1992	Singapore	1982
Ireland	1975	Singapore	1992
Ireland	1982	Singapore	1994
Ireland	1991	South Africa	1977
Israel	1976	South Africa	1983
Israel	1984	Spain	1977
Italy	1976	Spain	1984
Italy	1992	Sweden	1982
Jamaica	1977	Sweden	1992
Jamaica	1984	Switzerland	1973
Jamaica	1992	Switzerland	1991
Japan	1976	Sychelles	1973
Japan	1982	Sychelles	1983
Jordan	1984	Sychelles	1988
Jordan	1992	Sychelles	1994
Korea	1982	Thailand	1978
Lebanon	1993	Thailand	1986
Malaysia	1975	Trinidad & Tobago	1973
Malaysia	1984	Trinidad & Tobago	1985
Malta	1973	Trinidad & Tobago	1987
Malta	1986	Trinidad & Tobago	1994
Mauritius	1981	United Kingdom	1976
Mauritius	1995	United Kingdom	1980
Mexico	1981	United Kingdom	1991
Mexico	1994	Uruguay	1982

Mexico	1982	Uruguay	1988
Mexico	1995	Venezuela	1973
Myanmar	1983	Venezuela	1979
Myanmar	1987	Venezuela	1988
Netherlands	1980	Venezuela	1994

Note: These episodes list only the first year of successive-year reversals and exclude wartime reversals, using the REV1 definition.

Source: see text.