NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

PAPER TIGERS?
A MODEL OF THE ASIAN CRISIS

Giancarlo Corsetti
Paolo Pesenti
Nouriel Roubini

Working Paper 6783
http://www.nber.org/papers/w6783

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
1050 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
November 1998

We thank two anonymous referees, Linda Goldberg, Richard Portes, Roberto Rigobon, Andrew Scott, Jaume Ventura, and seminar participants at the NBER-Bank of Portugal ISOM, the CEPR/ESRC/GEI Workshop on "World Capital Markets and Financial Crises," the NBER Summer Institute, and the IMF for helpful comments. We thank Michele Cavallo and Andrew Tiffin for excellent research assistance. Giancarlo Corsetti acknowledges financial support from MURST. Paolo Pesenti thanks the University of Rome III for warm hospitality and support. The views expressed here are those of the author and do not reflect those of the National Bureau of Economic Research, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, or the Council of Economic Advisors.

Paper Tigers? A Model of the Asian Crisis
Giancarlo Corsetti, Paolo Pesenti, and Nouriel Roubini
NBER Working Paper No. 6783
November 1998
JEL No. F31, F34, G15, G18

ABSTRACT

This paper develops an interpretation of the Asian meltdown focused on moral hazard as the common source of overinvestment, excessive external borrowing, and current account deficits. To the extent that foreign creditors are willing to lend to domestic agents against future bail-out revenue from the government, unprofitable projects and cash shortfalls are re-financed through external borrowing. While public deficits need not be high before a crisis, the eventual refusal of foreign creditors to refinance the country's cumulative losses forces the government to step in and guarantee the outstanding stock of external liabilities. To satisfy solvency, the government must then undertake appropriate domestic fiscal reforms, possibly involving recourse to seigniorage revenues. Expectations of inflationary financing thus cause a collapse of the currency and anticipate the event of a financial crisis. The empirical section of the paper presents evidence in support of the thesis that weak cyclical performances, low foreign exchange reserves, and financial deficiencies resulting into high shares of non-performing loans were at the core of the Asian collapse.

Giancarlo Corsetti
Department of Economics
Yale University
37 Hillhouse Avenue
New Haven, CT 06520
corsetti@econ.yale.edu

Paolo Pesenti
International Research Function
Federal Reserve Bank of New York
33 Liberty Street
New York, NY 10045
and NBER
paolo.pesenti@ny.frb.org

Nouriel Roubini
Council of Economic Advisors
328 Old EOB, Executive Office of the President
Washington, DC 20502
and NBER
nroubini@stern.nyu.edu

paper tiger: *a Chinese expression first used by Chairman Mao, a person, country, etc., that appears outwardly powerful or important but is actually weak or ineffective* (Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd edition).

1 Introduction

This paper develops a model of financial and currency crises led by moral hazard, with special reference to the recent Asian events, and presents a preliminary empirical analysis of the extent to which the 1997/98 crisis was related to regional macroeconomic and structural weaknesses.

Our interpretation of the origins and causes of the Asian meltdown focuses on moral hazard as the common source of overinvestment, excessive external borrowing, and current account deficits in a poorly supervised and regulated economy. In our model, private agents act under the presumption that there exists public guarantees on corporate and financial investment, so that the return on domestic assets is perceived as implicitly insured against adverse circumstances. To the extent that foreign creditors are willing to lend against future bail-out revenue, unprofitable projects and cash shortfalls are re-financed through external borrowing. Such a process — referred to as 'evergreening' — translates into an unsustainable path of current account deficits.

While public deficits need not be high before a crisis, the eventual refusal of foreign creditors to refinance the country's cumulative losses forces the government to step in and guarantee the outstanding stock of external liabilities. To satisfy solvency, the government must then undertake appropriate domestic fiscal reforms, possibly involving recourse to seigniorage revenues through money creation. Speculation in the foreign exchange market, driven by expectations of inflationary financing, causes a collapse of the currency and anticipates the event of a financial crisis. This is because a speculative attack depletes international reserves that the public sector could otherwise use to bail-out insolvent private firms.

Financial and currency crises thus become indissolubly interwoven in an emerging economy characterized by weak cyclical performances, low foreign exchange reserves, and financial deficiencies resulting into high shares of non-performing loans: the empirical section of the paper presents evidence in support of the thesis that the combination of these structural factors was at

the core of the Asian collapse.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents a synthetic overview of the structural imbalances in Southeast Asia on the eve of the crisis. The micro-founded model of twin currency and financial crises in the presence of moral hazard, introduced in Section 3, provides a conceptual and analytical apparatus to interpret the econometric results of Section 4. Section 5 concludes.

2 At the root of the Asian crisis

Central to a full understanding of the Asian crisis is the multifaceted evidence on the structure of incentives under which the corporate and financial sectors operated in the region, in the context of regulatory inadequacies and close links between public and private institutions.[1] The moral hazard problem in Asia exhibited three different, yet strictly interrelated dimensions at the corporate, financial, and international level.[2]

At the *corporate* level, political pressures to maintain high rates of economic growth had led to a long tradition of public guarantees to private projects, some of which were effectively undertaken under government control, directly subsidized, or supported by policies of directed credit to favored firms and/or industries.[3] Even in the absence of explicit promises of 'bail-out', the production plans and strategies of the corporate sector largely overlooked costs and riskiness of the underlying investment projects.[4] With financial and industrial policy enmeshed within a widespread business sector network of personal and political favoritism, and with governments that appeared willing to intervene in favor of troubled firms, markets operated under the impression that the return on investment was somewhat 'insured' against adverse shocks.

[1] A partial list of recent studies providing empirical evidence on the Asian crisis includes Alba *et al.* (1998), Corsetti, Pesenti and Roubini (1998), Dornbusch (1998), Feldstein (1998), IMF (1998), and Radelet and Sachs (1998). Internet links to a large number of contributions on the crisis are available at www.stern.nyu.edu/~nroubini/asia/AsiaHomepage.html.

[2] The role of moral hazard in the onset of the Asian crisis has been stressed by a number of authors. See *e.g.* Krugman (1998), Greenspan (1998), Fischer (1998).

[3] IMF (1997).

[4] See Pomerleano (1998) for a thorough assessment of the corporate roots of the financial crisis in Asia.

Such pressures and beliefs represented the underpinnings of a sustained process of capital accumulation,[5] resulting into persistent and large current account deficits.[6] While common wisdom holds that borrowing from abroad to finance domestic investment should not raise concerns about external solvency — it could actually be the optimal course of action for undercapitalized economies with good investment opportunities — the evidence for the Asian countries in the mid-1990s highlights that the profitability of new investment projects was low.[7] For instance, in Thailand, Indonesia, Korea and Malaysia the share of non-performing loans before the crisis was above 15%. In Korea, 20 of the largest 30 conglomerates displayed in 1996 a rate of return on invested capital below the cost of capital. By mid-1997, 8 of the 30 largest conglomerates were effectively bankrupt. At the macroeconomic level, evidence that investment efficiency was already falling before the crisis is provided by the dynamics of the incremental capital output ratio, defined as the ratio between the rate of investment (as percentage of GDP) and the rate of growth of the economy. In all countries but Indonesia and the Philippines, this indicator increased sharply between the 1987-1992 period and the 1993-1996 period.

Investment rates and capital inflows in Asia remained high even after the negative signals sent by the indicators of profitability. In part, this occurred because the interest rate fall in industrial countries (especially in Japan) lowered the cost of capital for firms and motivated large financial flows into the Asian countries. However, the crucial factor underlying the sustained investment rates was the *financial* side of the moral hazard problem in Asia, leading national banks to borrow excessively from abroad and lend excessively at home.[8] Financial intermediation played a key role in channelling funds toward projects that were marginal if not outright unprofitable from a social point of view.

The literature has focused on a long list of structural distortions in the

[5] Throughout the 1990s, in most of the South-East Asian countries investment rates were above 30% of GDP — rising above 40% in Thailand, Malaysia and China. The exception was the Philippines, where the investment rate ranged from 20% to 25%.

[6] At the end of 1996, the current account deficit (as a fraction of GDP) was 9.1% in Thailand, 5.9% in Malaysia, 5.8% in the Philippines, 4.9% in Korea, 3.4% in Indonesia.

[7] See *e.g.* OECD (1988) for the analysis of the Korean case.

[8] Between 1990 and 1996, the ratio of bank lending to GDP grew more than 50% in Thailand and the Philippines, by 27% in Malaysia, and around 15% in Korea, Singapore, Hong Kong and Indonesia.

pre-crisis Asian financial and banking sectors: lax supervision and weak regulation; low capital adequacy ratios; lack of incentive-compatible deposit insurance schemes; insufficient expertise in the regulatory institutions; distorted incentives for project selection and monitoring; outright corrupt lending practices; non-market criteria of credit allocation, according to a model of *relationship banking* that emphasizes semi-monopolistic relations between banks and firms, somehow downplaying price signals. All these factors contributed to the build-up of severe weaknesses in the undercapitalized financial system, whose most visible manifestation was eventually a growing share of non-performing loans.

The adverse consequences of these distortions were crucially magnified by the rapid process of capital account liberalization and financial market deregulation in the region during the 1990s, which increased the supply-elasticity of funds from abroad.[9] The extensive liberalization of capital markets was consistent with the policy goal of providing a large supply of low-cost funds to national financial institutions and the domestic corporate sector. The same goal motivated exchange rate policies aimed at reducing the volatility of the domestic currency in terms of the US dollar, thus lowering the risk premium on dollar-denominated debt.

The *international* dimension of the moral hazard problem hinged upon the behavior of international banks, which over the period leading to the crisis had lent large amounts of funds to the region's domestic intermediaries, with apparent neglect of the standards for sound risk assessment.[10] Underlying such overlending syndrome may have been the presumption that short-term interbank cross-border liabilities would be effectively guaranteed by either a direct government intervention in favor of the financial debtors, or by an indirect bail-out through IMF support programs. A very large fraction of foreign debt accumulation was in the form of bank-related short-term, unhedged, foreign-currency denominated liabilities:[11] by the end of 1996, a share of short-term liabilities in total liabilities above 50% was the norm in the region. Moreover, the ratio of short-term external liabilities to foreign reserves — a widely used indicator of financial fragility — was above 100% in Korea, Indonesia and Thailand.

[9] See *e.g.* McKinnon and Pill (1996).

[10] See *e.g.* Stiglitz (1998).

[11] FDI was substantial only in Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines (and even in Malaysia the contribution of FDI to current account financing dropped from 100% to 50% in 1995), but very low in Korea and Thailand.

The core implication of moral hazard is that an adverse shock to profitability does not induce financial intermediaries to be more cautious in lending, and to follow financial strategies reducing the overall riskiness of their portfolios. Quite the opposite, in the face of negative circumstances the anticipation of a future bail-out provides a strong incentive to take on even more risk — that is, as Krugman (1998) writes, "to play a game of heads I win, tails the taxpayer loses." In this respect, a number of country-specific and global shocks contributed to severely deteriorate the overall economic outlook in the Asian region, exacerbating the distortions already in place.[12]

In particular, the long period of stagnation of the Japanese economy in the 1990s led to a significant export slowdown from the Asian countries; in the months preceding the eruption of the crisis, the hopes for a Japanese recovery were shattered by a sudden decline in economic activity in this country. Sector-specific shocks such as the fall in the demand for semiconductors in 1996, and adverse terms of trade fluctuations also contributed to the worsening of the trade balances in the region between 1996 and 1997.

The sharp appreciation of the US dollar relative to the Japanese yen and the European currencies since the second half of 1995 led to deteriorating cost-competitiveness in most Asian countries whose currencies were effectively pegged to the dollar.[13] Based on standard real exchange rate measures, many Asian currencies appreciated in the 1990s, although the degree of real appreciation was not as large as in previous episodes of currency collapses (such as Mexico in 1994)[14] and the dynamics of the real exchange rate was asymmetric across countries: by 1997 the extent of real appreciation was evident in Malaysia and the Philippines, while in South Korea, Thailand and Indonesia, real exchange rate indicators had not moved significantly relatively to 1990. In general, competitive pressures were enhanced by the increasing weight of China in total export from the region.[15]

[12] The picture that emerges from a broad overview of the available empirical evidence on current account imbalances, foreign indebtedness and structural macroeconomic indicators in Asia is discussed in detail in Corsetti, Pesenti and Roubini (1998).

[13] Expectations of a monetary contraction in the US in the summer of 1997 may have also played a role in precipitating the crisis.

[14] See Table 1.

[15] Whether cost-competitiveness deteriorated in the rest of the region after the 50% devaluation of the Chinese currency in 1994 is still a matter of debate. The thesis that "a large part of China's recent export success reflects the devaluation that occurred in January 1994" and that this "cheap-currency policy" was "one of the factors provoking the crisis in Southeast Asia" has been espoused in a *Financial Times* editorial (September

As a result of the cumulative effects of the financial and real imbalances considered above, by 1997 the Asian countries appeared quite vulnerable to financial crises, either related to sudden switches in market confidence and sentiment, or driven by deteriorating expectations about the poor state of fundamentals. In 1997, the drop of the real estate and stock markets — where sustained speculative trends were in part fueled by foreign capital inflows — led to the emergence of wide losses and outright defaults in the corporate and financial sectors. Policy uncertainty stemming from the lack of commitment to structural reforms by the domestic authorities worsened the overall climate. From the summer of 1997 onward, rapid reversals of financial capital inflows led to the collapse of regional currencies amidst domestic and international investors panic.[16]

3 A theoretical framework

Due to its unprecedented complexities, the analysis and interpretation of the Asian crisis is by no means a straightforward task. A full understanding of the Asian events — it has been recently argued — requires a 'new' theoretical paradigm in the literature on currency and financial crises. In fact, the traditional conceptual and interpretive schemes[17] do not appear, *prima facie*, to fit well the specific characteristics of the 1997-98 crisis, and fall short in a number of dimensions.

A first reason is related to the role of fiscal imbalances. At the core of 'first generation' (or 'exogenous-policy') models of speculative attacks á-la-Krugman (1979) and Flood and Garber (1984), the key factor that explains the loss of reserves leading to a crisis is the acceleration in domestic credit expansion related to the monetization of fiscal deficits. However, in the Asian case one may be tempted to consider the budget surpluses (or the limited

17, 1997) and echoed in the popular press (see for instance *The Economist*, November 22, 1997, or *Business Times*, March 17, 1998). Recent studies (IMF (1997), Liu, Noland, Robinson and Wang (1998) and Fernald, Edison and Loungani (1998)) dismiss the thesis on the basis of several factors, most notably the fact that by 1993 about 80% of Chinese transactions were already settled at the swap market rate, not the official rate, so that the official exchange rate devaluation influenced only about 20% of the foreign exchange transactions.

[16] For a reconstruction of the crisis, see IMF (1997) and (1998).

[17] See Buiter, Corsetti and Pesenti (1998a), Calvo (1998), Calvo and Vegh (1998), Cavallari and Corsetti (1996) and Flood and Marion (1998) for recent surveys.

deficits) of the 1990s as pervasive evidence against the fiscal origins of the 1997-98 currency crises.

'Second generation' (or 'endogenous-policy') models of currency crisis appear similarly powerless to explain the logic of the Asian events. In these models, governments rationally choose — on the basis of their assessment of costs and benefits in terms of social welfare — whether or not to maintain a fixed rate regime. A crisis can be driven by a worsening of domestic economic fundamentals, or the result of self-validating shifts in expectations in the presence of multiple equilibria,[18] provided that the fundamentals are weak enough to push the economy in the region of parameters where self-validating shifts in market expectations can occur as rational events. The indicators of weak macroeconomic performance typically considered in the literature focus on output growth, employment, and inflation. In the Asian economies, however, GDP growth rates were very high into 1997, and unemployment and inflation rates quite low.

The above criticism of the existing literature is certainly valid. Nevertheless, a 'third-generation' model of currency and financial crises cannot afford to overlook the many insights into the logic of crises offered by the traditional explanatory schemes. As a contribution to the development of the analytical literature on the implications and lessons of the Asian crisis, in the following pages we suggest an interpretive scheme that, while revisiting the classical models, brings forward new elements of particular relevance for the analysis of the 1997-98 events.

Recent empirical and theoretical work highlights the importance of analyzing financial and currency crises as interrelated phenomena.[19] Our model contributes to this literature by focusing on moral hazard as the common factor underlying the 'twin' crises. Specifically, at the core of our model is the consideration that, counting on future bail-out interventions, weakly reg-

[18] See among others Obstfeld (1994), and Cole and Kehoe (1996). If investors conjecture that a country's government will eventually devalue its currency, their speculative behavior raises the opportunity cost of defending the fixed parity (for instance, by forcing a rise in short-term interest rates), thus triggering a crisis in a self-fulfilling way. Note that multiple equilibria can arise even in 'first-generation' models (see for instance Obstfeld (1986)). Somewhat confusingly, the literature occasionally identifies 'first-generation' models with unique equilibria, and 'second-generation' models with multiple equilibria. A classification of the models based on exogenous versus endogenous policies provides a more accurate taxonomy.

[19] See *e.g.* Velasco (1987), Kaminsky and Reinhart (1997), Goldfajn and Valdes (1997), Kumhof (1997), Chang and Velasco (1988a,b).

ulated private institutions have a strong incentive to engage in excessively risky investment. A bail-out intervention can take different forms, but ultimately has a fiscal nature and directly affects the distribution of income and wealth between financial intermediaries and taxpayers: an implicit system of financial insurance is equivalent to a stock of contingent public liabilities that are not reflected by debt and deficit figures until the crisis occurs.

These liabilities may be manageable in the presence of firm-specific, or even mild sector-specific shocks. They become a concern in the presence of cumulative sizable macroeconomic shocks (such as the prolonged slump in Japan, a strong dollar appreciation, negative terms of trade shocks and persistent negative productivity shocks), which fully reveal the financial fragility associated with excessive investment and risktaking. While fiscal deficits before a crisis are low, the bail-outs represent a serious burden on the *future* fiscal balances, a burden whose order of magnitude in the Asian countries has been estimated to be around 20-30% (even up to 40%) of GDP. The 'currency' side of a 'financial' crisis can therefore be understood as a consequence of the anticipated fiscal costs of financial restructuring, that generate expectations of a partial monetization of future fiscal deficits and a fall in economic activity induced by the required structural adjustment.[20]

3.1 Technology and constraints

Consider a small open economy specialized in the production of a traded good Y. The aggregate production function is

$$Y_t = \tilde{A}_t K_t^{\alpha} L^{1-\alpha}$$

where K is physical capital, L is labor and $\tilde{A}$ is a technology parameter. Labor is inelastically supplied, and normalized to 1.[21] The production tech-

[20] In order to maintain both focus and tractability, the model in this contribution necessarily abstracts from a number of factors that are relevant in a comprehensive reading of the Asian crisis. Namely, we do not explicitly model the role of real exchange rate fluctuations in determining the domestic burden of external debt. By the same token, we do not address contagion and issues related to the systemic dimension of the Asian crisis (see Corsetti, Pesenti and Roubini (1998)). For an overview of systemic models of currency crises and competitive real depreciations see Buiter, Corsetti and Pesenti (1988a,b).

[21] As regards the timing of the variables, K_t, the level of capital in place at time t, is determined at time $t-1$, before the shock $\tilde{A}_t$ is realized and observed.

nology is stochastic, say

$$\tilde{A}_t = \begin{cases} A+\sigma & \text{with probability } 1/2 \\ \\ A-\sigma & \text{with probability } 1/2. \end{cases} \qquad A > \sigma > 0$$

The country's asset markets are assumed to be incomplete and segmented. While some agents benefit from full access to capital markets, both domestic and international, financial market participation of the other agents in the economy is substantially limited to their role as holders of real balances — a realistic assumption in an analysis of the Asian meltdown. In what follows, we refer to the former class of agents as the country *élite* (ELI), to the latter class as the *rest of the country* (ROC).[22] There is no segmentation in the market for labor, assumed to be competitive for both ROC and ELI agents.

The élite borrows foreign-currency funds from abroad, denoted D, at the constant rate r, and lends capital K to the country's firms, owned by the élite itself.[23] Consistent with the empirical evidence on the insufficient capitalization of Asian firms, we make the simplifying assumption that the initial capital stock of the nation is entirely financed through external borrowing.

The aggregate budget constraint of the élite is:

$$(K_{t+1}-K_t)-(D_{t+1}-D_t)\,\frac{\mathcal{E}_t}{P_t} = Y_t - W_t - r\frac{\mathcal{E}_t}{P_t}D_t - C_t^{ELI} - T_t^{ELI} - \frac{M_t^{ELI}-M_{t-1}^{ELI}}{P_t}$$

where W are labor costs in real terms net of the remuneration of élite labor, C^{ELI} is the élite's consumption, T^{ELI} are net taxes paid by the élite to the

[22] Note that the asymmetric characterization of private agents in our setup stems exclusively from market segmentation, and need not reflect social or political stratification. The latter aspect is somewhat emphasized in Krugman (1998), who in a similar context refers to the country élite as the class of *minister's nephews.* The political economy of the crisis is a promising direction of research that is not pursued in this paper.

[23] Underlying the assumption that both banks and firms are owned by the élite, there are a number of features of the Asian economies, already referred to in section 2. For instance, the prevailing model of *relationship banking* implied a very close link between banks and firms. We should also note that the extremely high debt to equity ratios in some of the economies of the region implied that bank lending had a quasi-equity nature. Focusing for instance on the Korean case (OECD (1998)), by the end of 1997 the thirty largest chaebols' average debt to equity ratio was over 500 per cent. In 1996 some two-thirds of corporate debt in Korea were short-term, of which one quarter was foreign.

government, M^{ELI} is nominal money holdings,[24] P is the domestic price level, and $\mathcal{E}$ is the nominal exchange rate (domestic currency per unit of foreign currency). The standard transversality condition applies.

For the agents of the rest of the country, labor income is the only source of wealth and there is no capital market whereas they can borrow against future incomes. The aggregate budget constraint of the ROC is therefore

$$W_t = C_t^{ROC} + T_t^{ROC} + \frac{M_t^{ROC} - M_{t-1}^{ROC}}{P_t}$$

where C^{ROC} is consumption, T^{ROC} net taxes and $\left(M_t^{ROC} - M_{t-1}^{ROC}\right)/P_t$ the seigniorage tax.

In the light of the evidence of negligible fiscal deficits or small surpluses throughout the pre-crisis years in the entire Asian region, in our setup we do not consider the implications of government spending and an initial stock of public debt. We focus instead on redistributive policies across agents, so that the role of the government is to implement tax and transfer policies, as well as manage its stock of foreign reserves R, denominated in foreign currency. *Before* a crisis, the government budget identity is therefore

$$T_t + \frac{M_t - M_{t-1}}{P_t} + r\frac{\mathcal{E}_t}{P_t}R_t = \frac{\mathcal{E}_t}{P_t}\left(R_{t+1} - R_t\right)$$

where $T = T^{ELI} + T^{ROC}$ and $M = M^{ELI} + M^{ROC}$. The specification of the budget constraint *after* the crisis — which includes a stock of public liabilities emerging as a consequence of the government bailout of insolvent private firms — will be discussed in a later section.

Accounting for international arbitrage in the goods market (so that purchasing power parity holds and $P_t = \mathcal{E}_t$, where the foreign price level is assumed to be constant and normalized to one), and by aggregating the budget constraints above we obtain the current account relation

$$-\left(D_{t+1} - R_{t+1}\right) + \left(D_t - R_t\right) = Y_t - r\left(D_t - R_t\right) - C_t - \left(K_{t+1} - K_t\right) \quad (1)$$

where $C = C^{ROC} + C^{ELI}$ denotes aggregate consumption.

[24] The time-subscripts adopted here follow the notational conventions suggested by Obstfeld and Rogoff (1996): the élite enters period t with a stock of capital equal to K_t, a stock of external debt equal to D_t, but a stock of money holdings equal to M_{t-1}^{ELI}. This convention regarding the time-subscript of the money stock is maintained throughout the paper.

3.2 Preferences and optimal behavior

The élite agents are risk neutral and their rate of time preference is equal to the world interest rate r. Real money balances provide liquidity services that enter the utility function of the élite (formally, we parameterize the instantaneous utility from real balances as $\chi \ln (M_t/P_t)$, with $\chi > 0$), so that the expected utility of the élite agents is given by:

$$E_t \sum_{s=t}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1+r)^{s-t}} \Big[Y_s - W_s - (K_{s+1} - K_s) - T_s^{ELI}$$

$$- (1+r) D_s + D_{s+1} - \left(M_s^{ELI} - M_{s-1}^{ELI} \right) / P_s + \chi \ln \left(M_s^{ELI} / P_s \right) \Big] \qquad (2)$$

The élite agents maximize their expected utility with respect to capital K and money holdings M^{ELI}.[25] The optimal capital choice equates the expected marginal return on capital, adjusted to account for distortionary taxes and transfers, to the cost of funds:

$$E_t \frac{\partial Y_{t+1}}{\partial K_{t+1}} - E_t \frac{\partial \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} T_{t+1+s}^{ELI} / (1+r)^s}{\partial K_{t+1}} = r \qquad (3)$$

In the above expression, the second term on the left hand side encompasses the possibility that current investment decisions affect the stream of net taxes (or subsidies) T^{ELI} in future periods. If this term is identically equal to zero (as is the case with lump sum taxes), the optimal capital stock $\bar{K}$ is set such that $r\bar{K} = \alpha A \bar{K}^{\alpha}$. This is the level of capital that maximizes steady-state consumption in the country when the entire stock of capital is financed through net external borrowing ($\bar{K} = D$).[26] If agents expect to receive, on average, a net transfer from the government when they expand investment, the desired capital stock will be larger than $\bar{K}$.

Maximizing (2) with respect to M, the optimal demand for money by the élite is derived as:

$$\frac{M_t^{ELI}}{P_t} = \chi \frac{1 + i_{t+1}}{i_{t+1}}. \qquad (4)$$

[25] Under the assumption that the entire capital stock is leveraged and the labor market is competitive, in equilibrium the present discounted value of consumption of risk-neutral élite agents is equal to the present discounted value of their after-tax labor incomes.

[26] In a steady state, the current account equation (1) yields $C = AK^{\alpha} - r(D - R)$, the expression linking long-run consumption to capital and net foreign assets.

In the previous expression, i_{t+1} denotes the domestic nominal interest rate, defined according to the uncovered interest parity relation:

$$1 + i_{t+1} = (1 + r)\, E_t \left(\frac{\mathcal{E}_{t+1}}{\mathcal{E}_t} \right) = (1 + r)\, E_t \left(\frac{P_{t+1}}{P_t} \right).$$

As opposed to the élite, agents in the rest of the country cannot engage in intertemporal asset trade. Their money demand function is interest-inelastic and determined as a cash-in-advance constraint:

$$M_{t-1}^{ROC} = P_t C_t^{ROC}$$

At the aggregate level, demand for money — the sum of M^{ELI} and M^{ROC} — includes both the forward-looking component (4), such that expected future exchange rate depreciation affects current real balances through a variation of the nominal interest rate, and a 'myopic' component proportional to current output (see Appendix I).

3.3 Moral hazard, overinvestment and excessive external debt

In his celebrated analysis of currency and financial crises of the early 1980s, Carlos Díaz-Alejandro synthesizes as follows the *moral hazard* problem faced by an emerging economy:

> *"Whether or not deposits are explicitly insured, the public expects governments to intervene to save most depositors from losses when financial intermediaries run into trouble. Warnings that intervention will not be forthcoming appear to be simply not believable."*[27]

In the spirit of this analysis, and recalling our previous considerations on the structure of incentives under which the corporate and banking sector operated in the Asian region, we now posit a key assumption: agents' investment decisions incorporate the expectation that, in the case of a crisis, the fiscal authorities will guarantee a rate of return on domestic financial investment equal to the international rate of return. Such expectation needs not be based on an explicit promise or policy by the government. Quite

[27] Díaz-Alejandro (1985), p.374.

the opposite, underlying such an expectation is the presumption that a bail-out will occur regardless of "*laissez-faire* commitments" — in the words of Díaz-Alejandro[28] — "which a misguided minister of finance or central bank president may occasionally utter in a moment of dogmatic exaltation". This is because no *ex-ante* announcement by policy-makers can convince the public that, *ex-post* (that is, in the midst of a generalized financial turmoil) the government will cross its arms and let the financial system proceed toward its debacle.

In this section we suggest a simple formalization of the previous remarks. In determining its optimal capital choice at time t, according to eq.(3), the élite anticipates a stream of transfers from the government such that

$$\partial \left[\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} T_{t+1+s}^{ELI} / \left(1+r\right)^{s} \right] / \partial K_{t+1} = -\tilde{\theta}_{t+1}$$

where $\tilde{\theta}_{t+1}$ is a non-negative quantity, contingent on the future realization of $\tilde{A}$ and determined as follows. If the realization of the shock is positive ($\tilde{A} = A + \sigma$), no transfer is expected to take place; if the realization is negative ($\tilde{A} = A - \sigma$), the expectation of a future bail-out implies that, at the margin, the élite anticipates additional transfers from the government equal to the difference between the cost of funds and the 'bad' payoff. Because of such expectations, the élite has no incentive to take a loss (*i.e.,* to lower its consumption): banks will instead re-finance shortfalls in corporate earnings, by borrowing in the financial markets.

In equilibrium, the perceived bail-out transfer per unit of capital is therefore

$$\tilde{\theta}_{t+1} = \alpha \left(A + \sigma - \tilde{A}_{t+1} \right) K_{t+1}^{\alpha-1} = r - \frac{\alpha Y_{t+1}}{K_{t+1}}.$$

As long as banks and firms act under the presumption that they will be 'insured' against adverse contingencies, it is straightforward to show that the desired level of capital, denoted $\hat{K}$, is higher than the efficient level $\bar{K}$ defined above:

$$\hat{K} \equiv \left(\frac{\alpha \left(A + \sigma \right)}{r} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} > \bar{K} \equiv \left(\frac{\alpha A}{r} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}$$

In Krugman (1998) terminology, such scenario corresponds to 'overinvestment' driven by 'Pangloss values'.

[28] Ib., p.379.

We can now analyze how moral hazard leads to excessive foreign borrowing. First, as shown above, moral hazard translates into overinvestment. Since the entire capital stock is leveraged, the élite must increase its external liabilities to finance a stock of capital $\hat{K}$ which is larger than the optimal one. Second, as a negative shock to profitability (a bad realization of $\tilde{A}$) is not offset by a contemporaneous government transfer, in the aggregate élite agents cover their losses and cash shortfalls through the recourse to further foreign borrowing — that is, in jargon, through *evergreening*.[29]

Formally, in the presence of moral hazard total external debt D can be thought of as the sum of two components:

$$D_{t+1} = K_{t+1} + F_{t+1}$$

where K, the stock of capital, is constant at the level $\hat{K}$, and F is the cumulative level of evergreening since the initial date t_0, that is:

$$F_{t+1} = \sum_{s=t_0}^{t} \left[\alpha \left(A + \sigma - \tilde{A}_s\right) \hat{K}^{\alpha}\right] (1+r)^{t-s} \tag{5}$$

The above equation shows that, other things being equal, F will be higher the worse is the history of 'bad' shocks, and the higher is the 'excessive' capital level $\hat{K}$. At any point in time, the expression in square bracket has a simple interpretation: it is the trade deficit associated with the refinancing of an adverse shock to production. Note that this expression is non-negative under any state of nature. Due to moral hazard, it is possible that the recourse to evergreening drives persistent trade and current account deficits even when the government budget is balanced, or in surplus — a feature consistent with the evidence on the Asian crisis.[30]

[29] See *e.g.* Kumhof (1997).

[30] This framework of analysis is by no means confined to the Asian case. For instance, it is instructive to quote once again Díaz-Alejandro (1985) on the Chilean case: "the massive use of central bank credit to 'bail out' private agents raises doubts about the validity of pre-1982 analyses of the fiscal position and debt of the Chilean public sector. The recorded public-sector budget deficit was nonexistent or minuscule for several years through 1981, and moderate during 1982. The declining importance of ostensible public debt in the national balance sheet was celebrated by some observers; [...] *ex-post* it turned out that the public sector, including the central bank, had been accumulating an explosive amount of contingent liabilities to both foreign and domestic agents who held deposits in, or made loans to, the rickety domestic financial sector. This hidden public debt could be turned into cash as the financial system threatened to collapse" (p.372).

Before delving into the analysis of the eruption and consequence of a crisis, it is worth highlighting how, in the presence of distortions related to moral hazard, a process of financial liberalization can substantially contribute to excessive risktaking and foreign indebtedness. The simplest way to see this is to model capital controls as a tax on foreign borrowing, say ϕ, such that the cost of borrowing is equal to $r(1+\phi)$. Then, with a perfectly elastic supply of international funds, the financial intermediaries of the élite would equate the *cum-tax* cost of borrowing to the (perceived) return on capital:

$$r(1+\phi) = \alpha(A+\sigma)K^{\alpha-1}$$

corresponding to a lower investment rate relative to $\hat{K}$. In this sense, capital liberalization (the removal of ϕ) aggravates the moral hazard problem stemming from the implicit government guarantees.[31]

3.4 The dynamics of a crisis

3.4.1 'Show me the money': willingness to lend and government solvency

Implicit in the derivation of (5) is the view that both foreign creditors and domestic agents anticipate future bail-out interventions in the event of a financial crisis, so that the country's external deficit is financed at the riskless international lending rate r. It is straightforward to show that F increases at a rate on average faster than the international interest rate r, reflecting the addition of new borrowing to the dynamics of existing liabilities. It should be obvious, however, that evergreening cannot be practiced without limits. For instance, if the dynamics of F led to a persistent current account deficit, the stock of external liabilities of the country would grow faster than the cost of debt, ultimately violating the solvency constraint. If this were the case, the élite would be playing a Ponzi game at the expense of international investors.

Since private debt is perceived as guaranteed by the public sector, a key limit is given by the maximum size of F consistent with the government intertemporal budget constraint. In principle, then, international investors could rationally lend to the country at the market rate r as long as F is below

[31] Similar considerations hold as regards the implications of political distortions on excessive fiscal deficits and external debt accumulation (see Corsetti and Roubini (1997)).

such a limit. More realistically, however, one could consider the possibility that the creditors' willingness to lend vanishes before the government and the country become technically insolvent, reflecting an element of confidence driving the behavior of international financial markets.[32]

In the context of our model, we capture this possibility through the following maintained hypothesis: foreign creditors are willing to re-finance domestic firms against expected public guarantees only insofar as the country's liquid collateral, i.e. the stock of foreign official reserves, remains above some minimum threshold expressed as a fraction γ of the evergreening-related stock of debt F. When R reaches the threshold γF, foreign creditors not only refuse to finance new losses: they also refuse to roll-over the outstanding stock of debt, unless the country comes up with enough resources to service its cumulated external liabilities fully and permanently. We will refer to this condition, self-explanatorily, as the *show me the money* constraint,[33] and we will denote t_c the first time at which

$$R_{t_c+1} = \gamma F_{t_c+1} \qquad 0 < \gamma < 1 \tag{6}$$

When the 'show me the money' constraint becomes binding, the private sector goes explicitly into a financial crisis. Consistent with the moral hazard argument, the élite agents 'present the bill' to the government, which steps in and bails out troubled institutions. The distinction between private and public debt withers, private liabilities become *de jure* or *de facto* public or publicly guaranteed, corresponding to an appropriate flow of transfers from the public to the firm or the government, and from these to international creditors.[34] It should be stressed that, at the time of a crisis, the country is

[32] See *e.g.* Milesi-Ferretti and Razin (1996). For a theoretical analysis of confidence, see Morris and Shin (1998).

[33] Note that the 'show me the money' constraint could also be derived by setting an arbitrary upper limit to the level of *net* external debt. This limit would take the form $D - K - R \leq \Omega$, where Ω is some positive parameter. Using the definition of F, we could then write:

$$F_{t_c+1} \frac{R_{t_c+1}}{R_{t_c+1} + \Omega} \equiv F_{t_c+1} \gamma_{t_c+1} \leq R_{t_c+1}$$

[34] Typically, a government bail-out consists in guaranteeing all bank deposits, including interbank cross-border liabilities — as was the case in Korea, Thailand and Indonesia. This implies that the government is assuming responsibility for the gap created by the bad loans on the asset side of the banks' balance sheet. In the case of an explicit bank recapitalization, the government takes over the bad loans of the banking system in exchange

not necessarily forced to repay F at once — rather, the government and the élite are expected to implement a credible plan generating enough resources to service the country's external and internal debt.[35]

Note that the crisis posits two delicate and interrelated problems of financial restructuring. First, corporate and bank total debt is to be broken down into two components, one corresponding to evergreening, the other corresponding to the economic value of the ongoing economic activity of the firms.[36] Second, firms must undertake actions aimed at restructuring their real and financial plans. These problems are assumed to be solved instantaneously in the analysis to follow.[37] If no distortions affect the return on *new* financial investment in the country, the end of moral hazard brings about a contraction of new investment towards its efficient level $\bar{K}$. In other words, the elimination of implicit public guarantees leads to a fall in the capital stock and output — so that a crisis corresponds to a contraction in the level of economic activity, a fall in investment, and a sharp adjustment of the current account.

To the extent that the ability of the government to extract fiscal resources from the rest of the country is low relative to the financial imbalance of the élite, at the time of a crisis agents revise their expectations of a monetary expansion. To clarify this point, observe that, *at the time of the crisis,* the public sector budget constraint can be written as

$$(1-\gamma)\,F_{t_c+1} - \frac{\eta}{r}\,(1-\alpha)\,A\bar{K}^{\alpha} = E_{t_c+1}\sum_{s=t_c+1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{1}{1+r}\right)^{s-t_c}\left(\frac{M_s - M_{s-1}}{P_s}\right) \quad (7)$$

The left hand side of the above expression includes the outstanding implicit liabilities of the government, net of reserves (recall that $R_{t_c+1} = \gamma F_{t_c+1}$), minus the discounted value of the anticipated tax revenue flows — assuming that labor incomes are taxed at the rate η. The right hand side includes the

for safe government bonds (loans for bond swap). The fiscal cost is the interest payment on these bonds.

[35] For example, if bad loans amount to 20% of GDP, the nominal interest rate is 15% and the real interest rate is 5%, the fiscal cost of servicing the debt is 3% of GDP per year in nominal terms, and only 1% of GDP in real terms.

[36] In assessing recent estimates of the fiscal cost of the crisis, one should allow for the possibility that some fraction of the 'bad assets' taken over by the government will be recovered. In our setup, F is to be interpreted as a net figure.

[37] The process of sorting out K and F can actually be quite difficult. It is worth stressing that delays in restructuring firms and banks may lead to a substantial increase in non-performing loans, and therefore in the fiscal burden of the crisis.

discounted value of seigniorage revenue. Algebraic details are presented in Appendix 1. The key implication of the above budget constraint is that, if the left hand side is positive, agents expect a positive rate of money growth. The average anticipated rate of money creation from the crisis onward is in fact determined residually as a positive function of the outstanding stock of implicit government liabilities F, and a negative function of the reserves to debt ratio γ, the tax rate η and the post-crisis steady-state capital level $\bar{K}$.

3.4.2 The role and timing of speculative attacks on the currency

We can now delve into the analysis of the dynamics of a joint financial *and* currency crisis when the government pegs the nominal exchange rate at some level $\mathcal{E}_t = \overline{\mathcal{E}}$. Ruling out unrealistic scenarios characterized by a permanent and simultaneous accumulation of contingent public liabilities and public assets,[38] moral hazard implies that the dynamics of F outpaces the build up of international reserves by the public sector. Thus, sooner or later, because of the steady increase in the F/R ratio the economy will run into the 'show me the money' constraint.

At that point, either the government is able to raise sufficiently large revenues from explicit taxation, or money starts to grow at a positive rate. In the former case, the financial crisis does not necessarily coincide with an exchange rate collapse.[39] In the latter case, on which we will focus the rest of our analysis, the growth in money supply generates expectations of exchange rate depreciation, driving a sizeable wedge between the domestic

[38] We have seen that, as a consequence of moral hazard, F grows at a rate higher than r. Yet, neither the solvency nor the 'show me the money' constraint would ever be violated if reserves R (i.e. government assets) also grew at least as fast as F (i.e. government contingent liabilities). Since international reserves do not yield an interest rate higher than r, the only way in which R could grow as fast as F is an early fiscal reform raising tax rates on either sectors of the economy, and/or raising seigniorage revenues (but the latter option is not available in a fixed exchange rate regime: see Appendix 1). In this scenario, moral hazard does not translate into an increase in *net* external liabilities $D-R$, thus there are no structural current account deficits: while private investors take on too much risk, at the aggregate level excessive risk taking is compensated by policies that raise taxes against firms losses. Moral hazard alters the distribution of gains and losses among domestic agents in the society, but no external crisis needs to materialize. The picture changes radically when, as we realistically assume in this paper, the stock of reserves does not grow as fast as F.

[39] Talvi (1997) considers a model of endogenous fiscal response to the announcement of an inconsistent exchange rate-based stabilization program.

and the international nominal interest rates, and causing a currency crisis. This is a situation that, in analogy to Grilli (1986), can be referred to as the 'natural collapse' of the unilateral peg regime: the natural collapse coincides with the abandonment of the peg and a fall in the value of the currency. We should stress that, in our model, money growth is not the only factor that causes a foreign exchange crisis. To the extent that new investment is no longer guaranteed, productive capital and output drop, driving further down money demand and the exchange rate.

Since this jump in the value of the currency can be anticipated by economic agents (who know the dynamics of debt and reserves), with rational expectations the economy will never reach the point of a natural collapse. In each period agents can attack the currency and 'cause' a financial crisis by bringing R/F down to its lower limit γ. Rational agents will never find it optimal to attack the currency too soon, when the stock of outstanding liabilities is still too small relative to the country's future tax revenue: in this case, the need for seigniorage revenue is contained, and the anticipated rate of post-attack money growth is correspondingly negligeable.[40] Instead, the attack will take place as soon as the fundamentals are weak enough, that is, when the stock of external debt backed by the government is sufficiently high to induce expectations of a sustained permanent monetary expansion. Yet, the speculative attack will occur well before the point of 'natural collapse'.

A key implication of the above analysis is that a speculative attack takes the form of both an attack on the monetary balances (as in the traditional stock-shift reshuffle of money and foreign reserves) and an attack on the foreign liabilities of the financial and corporate sector (the international creditors withdraw the loans triggering a financial crisis). There is an important link between the two. The contraction in money demand that drives down international reserves at the central bank subtracts resources from the public sector, which cannot use the lost reserves to back its implicit liabilities. If the government could move ahead of private speculators and abandon the fixed exchange rate early enough, the budget constraint (7) would include a larger initial government asset position.

A second key result is the dynamics of money demand, investment and output. When the government discontinues its bail-out policy and starts to

[40] Under these conditions, an attack would not cause the currency to depreciate (even after allowing for the effect of the drop in output on money demand) and therefore will never happen in a rational-expectations equilibrium.

repay the stock of past liabilities, the money demand from the élite falls due to the increase in the interest rate i_{t_c+1}, reflecting expectations of exchange rate depreciation. However, demand for money from the rest of the country is still high, as it depends on the existing moral hazard-induced high level of capital and output $\hat{K}$. It is only in the following period (t_c+1) that external debt, capital, output and *ROC* money demand all drop, triggering a further depreciation of the exchange rate besides the one induced by high money growth.

The above scenario of financial collapse, currency attacks, economic slowdown and large explicit fiscal imbalances captures in a highly stylized yet coherent way the events that have characterized the onset and aftermath of the 1997-98 crisis in several Asian economies.

3.5 Some policy implications

The model presented in this section shows that, under certain conditions, moral hazard in the financial markets leads to an unsustainable stock of public contingent liabilities, which in turn undermine the viability of a fixed exchange rate regime, and that speculative attacks on the currency determine the timing of the financial crisis. Provided the crisis coincides with the end of moral hazard — the early dismantling of the public guarantees on investment reduces the extent of overinvestment — financial speculation ends up forcing the economic system out of an inefficient equilibrium. At the same time, at the new efficient level of investment, the real income of the rest of the country falls, both because of a lower real wage and a higher tax rate. The crisis thus coincides with a sizeable redistribution of resources from the rest of the country to the élite.

The model abstracts from a number of important dimensions of a currency and financial crisis, which may be important in a comprehensive interpretation of the Asian events. The goal of this section is to highlight a few of them, in relation to a policy-oriented reading of our results.

The key role played by the fiscal dimension of the crisis in our model is consistent with the recommendations by the International Monetary Fund in the summer and the fall of 1997 — to improve primary balances *vis-à-vis* the fiscal burden of the bail-outs. In many of the Asian countries, the magnitude of required public bail-outs of financial institutions is estimated to be as high as 20%-30% of GDP. On a yearly basis, the fiscal costs of the bail-outs only consist in financing the interest payment on the additional

public liabilities. Under reasonable assumptions about interest rates, the yearly costs will amount to 2-4 percentage points of GDP. Solvency thus requires an equivalent permanent adjustment in the primary surplus of the public sector.

However, the model makes a theoretical case for the need to adjust the *structural* (or long-run) primary balance, as a strategy to finance the reform of the financial system and to strengthen the external value of the currency. A mechanical extension of these prescriptions to the short-run is unwarranted. In fact, as also predicted by the model, in the short run the crisis led to a sharp fall in investment and output rates in the Asian region. In a severe recession, a cyclical argument supports the view of postponing the implementation of a primary adjustment, even at the cost of temporarily running large fiscal deficits and slowing down improvements in the current account.

The model also suggests that international 'rescue' plans can play a crucial role by helping to ease the crunch and avoid an even sharper contraction of investment and consumption. The estimates of the fiscal costs of financial rehabilitation depend on what fractions of bad loans will be recovered in the process, as well as the timely implementation of the bail-outs. Delays in financial restructuring, leading to further bankruptcies and difficulties in obtaining credit, will likely worsen both the corporate and the fiscal outlook of the crisis countries. To the extent that the bail-out plan and fiscal reforms take time, the model thus supports coordinated international intervention aimed at reducing credit rationing. However, the benefits from international intervention should be assessed against its costs, namely the risk that expectations of bail-outs may lead investors and creditors to refrain from monitoring effectively their investment and lending strategies, thus enhancing moral hazard at the international level.

4 Empirical evidence

This section presents some preliminary evidence on the determinants of the crises in Asia, testing for the empirical relevance of a number of macroeconomic factors that are consistent with our interpretation of the 1997-98 events. In our tests we compare the performance of all the Asian countries that were subject to pressures in 1997 with the performance of other emerging economies, for a total sample of 24 countries whose selection has been

determined by data availability.[41] Following the methodology suggested in previous studies,[42] we first construct a 'crisis index' as a measure of speculative pressure on a country currency, and then regress this variable on a set of indexes of financial fragility, external imbalances, official reserves adequacy, and fundamental performance.

4.1 The crisis index

Our crisis index (IND) is a weighted average of the percentage rate of exchange rate depreciation relative to the US dollar — if such depreciation can be deemed as abnormal, as explained below — and the percentage rate of change in foreign reserves between the end of December 1996 and the end of December 1997.[43] The logic underlying the index IND is quite simple. A speculative attack against a currency is signalled either by a sharp depreciation of the exchange rate or by a contraction in foreign reserves that prevents a devaluation.[44] We present the values for IND in Table 1: a large negative value for IND corresponds to a high devaluation rate and/or a large fall in foreign reserves, *i.e.* a more severe currency crisis.

In evaluating the crisis index, we need to control for the fact that some countries may have exhibited a trend depreciation in 1997 without being subject to substantial speculative pressures. For example, the fact that the Turkish currency depreciated by over 50% in 1997 should not be interpreted as a signal of 'crisis,' as chronically high inflation rates in Turkey over the 1990s have been associated with 'normally' high depreciation rates.[45]

[41] The countries are Argentina, Brazil, Chile, China, Columbia, Czech Republic, Hong Kong, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Korea, Malaysia, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Thailand, Turkey and Venezuela.

[42] See *e.g.* Eichengreen, Rose and Wyplosz (1996), Sachs, Tornell and Velasco (1996), and Kaminsky, Lizondo and Reinhart (1998).

[43] The weights assigned to exchange rate and reserves changes in IND are respectively 0.75/0.25. For the purpose of sensitivity analysis, we have also considered alternative crisis indexes with different weights, and find that the choice of the weight coefficients is not crucial to our results. Alternative tests with different samples of shorter size provide similar results. All tests are available upon request.

[44] While of course an increase in domestic interest rates may also signal a frustrated speculative attack, our crisis index excludes changes in interest rates. This is because an increase in interest rates in the presence of speculative pressures is highly correlated with non-sterilized foreign exchange intervention leading to a fall in reserves.

[45] Note that Turkey exhibited a satisfactory economic performance in 1997, with GDP growing over 6% and its stock market being a leading performer among emerging countries.

There is no obvious way to purge the sample of the effects of trend depreciations not associated with a crisis. In this study, we take the following approach: if a currency has depreciated in 1997 by less than its average depreciation rate in the 1994-1996 period, we consider this as being part of a trend depreciation and set the 1997 depreciation rate equal to zero in constructing the index.[46] In our sample, such screening procedure leads to a significant re-sizing of the crisis index for two high-depreciation countries: Turkey and Venezuela.

As Table 1 shows, the countries that in 1997 appear to have been hit by the most severe crises are, in order, Thailand, Malaysia, Korea, Indonesia, Philippines and the Czech Republic. Among Asian countries, the currencies of Singapore and Taiwan were also moderately devalued in 1997, but these two countries were not subject to such extensive and dramatic financial turmoils as the ones affecting other East Asian countries. Conversely, outside the Asian region the Czech Republic appears as a crisis country since its currency, that had been pegged since 1992, suffered a severe speculative attack in the spring of 1997 leading to a devaluation.[47]

4.2 Indexes of financial fragility

As a measure of the weakness of the banking system we adopt the stock of non-performing loans as a share of total assets in 1996 (NPL).[48] The variable NPL is reported in Table 1. A less direct measure of financial fragility is suggested by Sachs, Tornell and Velasco (1996), who build a measure of bank 'lending boom' by calculating the percentage rate of growth of the ratio of commercial bank loans to GDP.[49] In the light of their approach, we also consider a second indicator that combines the information encompassed by

[46] Other authors use a different approach to the same problem. For example, Sachs, Tornell and Velasco (1996) control for the variance of the exchange rate and reserves in the last 10 years.

[47] The Czech Republic shared many symptoms with the Asian crisis countries: a fixed exchange rate regime maintained for too long, a severe real appreciation, a dramatic worsening of the current account, and a weak banking system with large amounts of non-performing loans.

[48] Appendix 2 describes in detail our methodology to estimate the series NPL.

[49] These authors argue that such a measure is a proxy for financial fragility as the quality of bank loans is likely to deteriorate significantly — and a large fraction is likely to become non-performing — when bank lending grows at a rapid pace in a relatively short period of time.

both measures (non-performing loans and lending boom). The new indicator, denoted with $NPLB$, is defined as follows: if the sign of the lending boom in the 1990s is positive,[50] we assign to $NPLB$ the original value of NPL; if the lending boom in the 1990s is negative, we set $NPLB$ equal to zero.[51]

Our theoretical model stresses that the vulnerability of a country to currency and financial crises increases with the implicit fiscal costs of financial bail-outs. To get an appropriate statistical *proxy* for these costs, we also measure non-performing loans as a share of GDP, rather than banking assets. In our regressions the series is denoted $NPLY$, and is defined as the product of NPL times commercial banks loans to the private sector as a share of GDP in 1996. Such a change in the scale of the NPL variable allows to properly assess the performance of those countries with low ratios of bank loans to GDP but relatively large non-performing loans as a share of banking assets (*e.g.* India and Pakistan). In those countries, the contingent fiscal liabilities related to the bail-out costs are smaller relative to countries with a similar NPL, but a higher ratio of bank lending to GDP.

4.3 Indexes of current account imbalances

Next, we construct measures of external balance and current account sustainability. One measure is the current account balance as a share of GDP in the 1994-1996 period. The other is a measure of real exchange rate appreciation in the 1990s. The values of both variables are reported in Table 1.

There is no simple way to assess when a current account imbalance is sustainable (*e.g.*, when it is driven by investment in sound projects) and when is not (*e.g.*, when it reflects a structural loss of competitiveness), or to what extent a real appreciation is due to misalignment, as opposed to an appreciation of the fundamental equilibrium real exchange rate. However, the consensus in the empirical literature on crisis episodes is that the *combination* of a sizable current account deficit and a significant real appreciation represents a worrisome and unambiguous signal of unsustainability.

Consistent with this view, we construct an index of *current account imbalance*, CAI, based on the interaction of the current account data with the

[50] 'Lending boom' refers here to the growth of commercial bank loans to the private sector (as percentage of GDP) in the period 1990-96.

[51] The logic of the $NPLY$ variable is straightforward: non-performing loans represent a source of severe tension only when observed in tandem with excessive bank lending that enhances the vulnerability of the country to a crisis.

real exchange rate. This variable is computed as follows: if the rate of real exchange rate appreciation is above a given threshold, CAI is equal to the current account balance (as a share of GDP); if the real appreciation is below the threshold (or there is a real depreciation), CAI is set equal to zero.[52]

4.4 Indexes of foreign reserves adequacy and fundamentals performance

In our empirical section, we are interested in testing whether the effects of external imbalances and financial fragility are magnified by the inadequate availability of foreign exchange reserves and by the weak performance of other fundamental variables. Other things being equal, the vulnerability of a country to a currency crisis is higher when reserves are low relative to some measure of domestic liquid assets or short-term foreign debt. To assess the role played by reserves availability, we construct three different measures: the ratio of $M1$ to foreign exchange reserves ($M1/RES$), the ratio of $M2$ to foreign reserves ($M2/RES$), the ratio of the foreign debt service burden (i.e. short-term foreign debt plus interest payments on foreign debt) to foreign reserves (STD/RES). The values of these variables are reported in Table 1.

To test for the joint role of fundamentals and foreign reserves in determining a currency crisis, we classify the countries in our sample as being *strong* or *weak* with regards to these two dimensions. We use a broad classification according to which a country has high foreign exchange reserves if the ratio of $M2$ to reserves is in the lowest quartile of the sample; the resulting dummy variable for low reserves, $D2^{LR}$, is set equal to one for the countries with a ratio of money to foreign reserves ($M2/RES$) above the bottom quartile of the sample, and set equal to zero if otherwise. Similar dummies are created by replacing $M2/RES$ with $M1/RES$ and STD/RES; such dummy variables are labelled $D1^{LR}$ and $D3^{LR}$.

We also construct a dummy variable for weak fundamentals, D^{WF}, that takes a value of zero when fundamentals are strong, and zero otherwise. Strong/weak fundamentals are defined as follows: D^{WF} is equal to zero for countries with a current account imbalance (CAI) in the highest quartile of the sample, or with a rate of non-performing loans (corrected for the lending

[52] The threshold for the real exchange rate appreciation is set to two different values: either 10% or 0. In the tables, we present regression results for the 10% threshold, but similar results are obtained for the other threshold.

boom, i.e. $NPLB$) in the lowest quartile of the sample; it is equal to one otherwise.[53]

4.5 Testing for the role of fundamentals imbalances in the crisis

In column (1) of Table 2, we report the results of the regression of IND on CAI and $NPLB$. Both variables have the expected sign and are statistically significant at the 5% significance level: both a large current account deficit associated with a real appreciation, and a larger rate of non-performing loans associated with a lending boom worsen the crisis index. In columns (2)-(4) we interact the two regressors with the dummies for low reserves. The coefficients β_2 and β_3 measure the effects of CAI and $NPLB$ on the crisis index in countries with high reserves ($D^{LR} = 0$); conversely, the sums of the coefficients $\beta_2+\beta_4$ and $\beta_3+\beta_5$ measure the impact of fundamental imbalances on the crisis index in countries with low reserves ($D^{LR} = 1$).

In regressions (2)-(4) the coefficients β_2 and β_3 are not significant. However, the Wald tests indicate that the hypotheses $\beta_2+\beta_4 = 0$ and $\beta_3+\beta_5 = 0$ can be rejected at the 1% and 10% significance levels[54] for the case in which we use the reserve dummy $D2^{LR}$, based on $M2$ data. Similar or stronger results are obtained when we use the other two low-reserves dummies, $D1^{LR}$ and $D3^{LR}$. As a whole, these results suggest that structural imbalances (current account deficits/currency appreciation and non-performing loans/lending boom) play a role in the onset of a crisis to the extent that there is insufficient availability of foreign reserves.

Next, in Table 3 we test whether the effects of low reserves on the crisis index are related to fundamental weaknesses. Relative to column (2) of Table 2, in column (1) of Table 3 we consider an additional regressor, namely an interaction term equal to CAI times $D2^{LR}$ times D^{WF}. In this case, the sum of the coefficients $\beta_2 + \beta_4 + \beta_6$ captures the effects of current account imbalances on the crisis index in countries with low reserves and weak fundamentals. If $\beta_2 + \beta_4 + \beta_6$ is positive while $\beta_2 + \beta_4$ is not significantly

[53] Alternatively, this dummy variable could be defined using $NPLY$ rather than $NPLB$. In this case, it would be equal to zero for countries with our index of current account imbalance (CAI) in the highest quartile of the sample, or with a rate of non-performing loans as a share of GDP, *i.e.* $NPLY$, in the lowest quartile of the sample; it would be equal to one otherwise.

[54] Their *p-values* are 0.005 and 0.09 respectively.

different from zero, the crisis index worsens when a high-deficit country with an appreciated currency meets both 'weak fundamentals' and 'low reserves' criteria, but the crisis index does not respond to the reserves indicator if such a country is in the 'strong fundamentals' region. The results of the Wald tests show that $\beta_2 + \beta_4 + \beta_6$ is indeed significantly positive at the 1% significance level, while $\beta_2 + \beta_4$ is not significantly different from zero.[55]

In column (2) of Table 3 we consider a similar test for the role of non-performing loans. Here we add another regressor to the ones of column (2) in Table 2, *i.e.*, an interaction term equal to $NPLB$ times $D2^{LR}$ times D^{WF}. Thus, the sum of the coefficients $\beta_3 + \beta_5 + \beta_7$ captures the effects of non-performing loans on the crisis index in countries that meet both 'low reserves' and 'weak fundamentals' criteria. Our tests show that $\beta_3+\beta_5+\beta_7$ is negative at the 5% significance level while $\beta_3 + \beta_5$ is not significantly different from zero, that is the crisis index depends on non-performing loans in countries with weak fundamentals and weak reserves, but not in countries with strong fundamentals and weak reserves. The implication of these results is that a crisis need not be related to current account imbalances or bad loans *per se*: such imbalances represent a source of severe tension only when they are observed in parallel with fundamental *and* reserve weaknesses.[56]

Next, in Tables 4 and 5 we perform regressions similar to those in Tables 2 and 3, but we substitute $NPLB$ — the non-performing loans ratio adjusted to account for the lending boom — with $NPLY$ — a more direct *proxy* for the implicit fiscal costs of banking sector bail-outs. The results are very similar and, if anything, even stronger than those obtained in Tables 2 and 3. First, as Table 4 column (1) shows, both $NPLY$ and CAI are statistically significant regressors of the crisis index (at the 5% level and 1% level respectively). Second, columns (2)-(4) of Table 4 confirm that the effects of current account deficits are more relevant when reserves are low.[57] The results of columns (2)-(3) in Table 4 are worth emphasizing. Note in

[55] Note also that the coefficient on $NPLB$ (β_3) is still significantly different from zero in this regression.

[56] In column (3) of Table 3, we consider interactions of both CAI and $NPLB$ with the dummies for weak fundamentals and low reserves. The results for $NPLY$ are similar to those in column (2). For the current account, instead, we fail to reject the hypothesis that both $\beta_2+\beta_4+\beta_6$ and $\beta_2+\beta_4$ are equal to zero. Formal tests such as the variance inflation test suggest that this is due to multicollinearity between the two interaction terms: when they both appear in a regression, the effects of CAI are swamped by those of $NPLB$.

[57] The *p-values* on the Wald tests for $\beta_2+\beta_4 = 0$ are 0.001, 0.002 and 0.016 respectively in columns (2), (3) and (4), under the three different measures of low reserves.

fact that the coefficient on $NPLY$, β_3, maintains the right sign and is statistically significant on its own at the 5% level, so that non-performing loans as a share of GDP — that is, as a measure of the intrinsic fiscal burden — affect the crisis index regardless of whether reserves are low or high.

In Table 5 we present results of regressions equivalent to those in Table 3, where we now use $NPLY$ instead of $NPLB$. Once again, current account deficits and non-performing loans matter if both reserves and fundamentals are weak.[58] However, observe that non-performing loans as a share of GDP have an independent effect on the intensity of the crisis *regardless* of whether reserves and fundamentals are weak or not.[59]

Finally, we attempt to test whether direct measures of capital productivity have explanatory power as regressors of the crisis index. We derive a measure of the incremental capital-output ratio ($ICOR$) for 1993-1996 and test for its significance in our basic regressions.[60] We find that the $ICOR$ variable is generally not significant; however, a simple transformation of the $ICOR$ is significant in some regressions. We therefore define a new variable, $ICORLB$, that is equal to the original $ICOR$ when the lending boom variable is positive, and is equal to zero when the lending boom is negative. The idea here — as explored in detail in our theoretical section — is that low capital profitability is not in itself problematic if the corporate and financial sectors are able to assess properly the characteristics of the investment projects, but may significantly contribute to the build-up of tensions in the financial markets if there is a lending boom and excessive credit growth as a result of moral hazard and implicit guarantees. When we regress the crisis

[58] These are the implications of the Wald tests on $\beta_2 + \beta_4 + \beta_6 = 0$ in column (1) and $\beta_3 + \beta_5 + \beta_7 = 0$ in columns (2) and (3). The failure to reject $\beta_2 + \beta_4 + \beta_6 = 0$ in column (3) is again due to multicollinearity between 'CAI times $D2^{LR}$ times D^{WF}' and '$NPLY$ times $D2^{LR}$ times D^{WF}'.

[59] To test for the robustness of our results we perform a number of other tests. First, we use two other indicators of crisis that give more weight to reserve losses relative to exchange rate depreciation; our qualitative results remain the same. As reported in Tables 2-5, the results are also robust to the use of three alternative definitions of low reserves. Next, we test whether the significance of CAI is sensitive to the threshold for the real exchange rate appreciation; instead of a 10% trigger we use a 0 trigger and obtain the same qualitative results. The significance of the two non-performing loans measures $NPLB$ and $NPLY$ is also invariant with respect to modification of the definitions of these variables. All these results are available upon request.

[60] Recall that the $ICOR$ measures the ratio of the share of investment in GDP to the growth rate of output.

index on the $ICORLB$ variable and $NPLY$ we find that both variables have the expected sign and are statistically significant.[61]

These results provide evidence in support of the thesis that crises are systematically related to the fundamental weaknesses individuated in our model. External imbalances, as measured by the current account deficit interacted with the degree of real appreciation, are significantly correlated with the crisis index. So are measures of the fiscal costs of financial bail-outs (non-performing loans as a share of GDP interacted with measures of lending boom). The effects of these variables on the crisis index are found to be stronger in countries with low reserves.

5 Conclusions

Many decades of economic growth and development in the region make it clear that there were no *paper tigers* among the East Asian countries. Yet, our analysis of the dramatic break-down of currencies and economic activity in 1997-98 suggests that severe structural weaknesses in the financial and corporate sectors had been masked by strategies of overinvestment. Eventually, the Asian tigers collapsed under the excessive weight of the paper liabilities which had financed projects of doubtful profitability, covered losses, and led to unsustainable external imbalances.

Further research is needed to shed light on the many issues left open for a thorough understanding of the causes of the crisis, its international propagation, and its welfare implications. A partial list of questions includes: the analysis of real depreciations and their effects on the real burden of foreign debt, through the disruptive increase of short-term foreign liabilities by domestic firms and banks; the assessment of self-fulfilling liquidity crises, under scenarios in which sudden shifts in market confidence lead to large-scale reversals of short-term capital flows; and the contagious elements of the crisis, including — but not limited to — the 'beggar-thy-neighbor' spiral of competitive devaluations and speculative attacks in the region.

Nonetheless, the analysis in this paper stresses that at the root of the

[61] Specifically, our regression yields:

$$\begin{array}{rcccccccc} IND & = & 11.3 & - & 2.21 & NPL3 & - & 2.94 & ICOR2 \qquad R^2 = 0.48 \\ & & (5.28) & & (0.77) & & & (1.25) & \end{array}$$

Asian currency and economic crisis was a complex web of structural distortions and fundamental weaknesses. Because of moral hazard banks borrowed heavily in foreign currency, and their debt positions were often short-term and unhedged, as borrowers acted on the presumption that the exchange rates would remain stable, and they would be bailed-out if things went wrong. When indeed things went wrong and a series of domestic and external shocks revealed the low profitability of past investments, the shaky foundations of investment strategies in the region emerged, and currency and financial crises appeared inextricably intertwined.

Almost fifteen years ago, Diaz Alejandro interpreted the Chilean crisis in terms of the inconsistency between a policy of rapid liberalization of domestic and international capital flows, and the lax supervision of financial institutions. Our analysis suggests that, to a large extent as well as to a much larger scale, the Asian region witnessed in the 1990s a materialization of the same scenario: "good-bye financial repression, hello financial crash".

Appendix 1

To obtain an expression for aggregate money demand, assume that the share of the élite in total workforce is β and recall that with competitive labor markets the wage incomes of ROC agents are equal to $W = (1-\beta)\,\partial Y/\partial L$. Modelling net taxes on labor incomes as a fraction η of real wages, aggregate money demand can be written as:

$$\frac{M_t}{P_t} = \frac{M_t^{ELI} + M_t^{ROC}}{P_t} = \chi \frac{1+i_{t+1}}{i_{t+1}} + (1-\alpha)(1-\beta)(1-\eta_t)\,\tilde{A}_t K_t^{\alpha}.$$

Under the pre-crisis fixed exchange rate regime, $P_t = \overline{\mathcal{E}}$, $i_{t+1} = r$, $K = \hat{K}$, so that for constant η seigniorage revenues are, on average, zero:

$$\frac{M_t - M_{t-1}}{\overline{\mathcal{E}}} = (1-\alpha)(1-\beta)(1-\eta)\left(\tilde{A}_t - \tilde{A}_{t-1}\right)\hat{K}^{\alpha}.$$

At time t_c, the budget constraint of the government is

$$0 = (1+r)\,R_{t_c+1} + E_{t_c+1}\sum_{s=t_c+1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{1}{1+r}\right)^{s-t_c-1}\left(T_s^{ELI} + T_s^{ROC} + \frac{M_s - M_{s-1}}{P_s}\right)$$

The level of reserves R_{t_c+1} is equal to γF_{t_c+1} by definition of t_c. The present discounted value of T_s^{ROC} is equal to

$$E_{t_c+1}\sum_{s=t_c+1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{T_s^{ROC}}{1+r}\right)^{s-t_c-1} = E_{t_c+1}\sum_{s=t_c+1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{\eta W_s}{1+r}\right)^{s-t_c-1} = \frac{1+r}{r}\eta(1-\alpha)(1-\beta)A\bar{K}$$

The present discounted value of T_s^{ELI} is equal to the present discounted value of taxes on elite labor incomes minus the current level of foreign debt backed by implicit government guarantees, that is:

$$E_{t_c+1}\sum_{s=t_c+1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{1}{1+r}\right)^{s-t_c-1} T_s^{ELI} = \frac{1+r}{r}\eta(1-\alpha)\beta A\bar{K} - F_{t_c+1}(1+r)$$

Rearranging, we obtain expression (7) in the main text.

Appendix 2

In this appendix we describe in detail the construction of the variables used in the empirical analysis.

Crisis index (IND)

The index is a weighted average of the percentage rate of exchange rate depreciation relative to the US dollar and the percentage rate of change in foreign reserves between the end of December 1996 and the end of December 1997. A large negative value for IND corresponds to a high devaluation rate and/or a fall in foreign reserves, *i.e.* a more severe currency crisis. All data are from the International Financial Statistics of the International Monetary Fund (IFS-IMF).

Real exchange rate appreciation

This variable measures the percentage rate of change of the real exchange rate between the end of 1996 and an average over the 1988-1990 period. The real exchange rate measure is based on wholesale price indexes, using trade weights of OECD countries (excluding Mexico and Korea). For the three transition economies — Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland — whose real exchange rates exhibit large fluctuations in the early transition years, the appreciation is calculated between 1996 and 1992. For Argentina, whose real exchange rate experienced large swings in the hyperinflation period, the real exchange rate is computed between 1996 and the end of 1990.

Current account deficits and the CAI index

The current account deficit as a share of GDP is an average over the 1994-96 period. Data are from IFS-IMF. The index of current account imbalances CAI is computed as follows: for countries where the real exchange rate appreciated more than 10% over the period defined above, CAI takes the value of the average 1994-96 current account balance (as a share of GDP); for all other countries, CAI is set equal to zero.

Lending boom (LB)

This variable is the rate of growth between 1990 and 1996 of the ratio between the claims on the private sector of the deposit money banks (line 22d in IFS-IMF) and nominal GDP. All data are from IFS-IMF. In the case of transition economies whereas either data since 1990 are not available or the ratio is very unstable in the early transition years, we take 1992 (rather than 1990) as the starting date.

Non-performing loans as a share of total bank assets (NPL).

As there are no homogeneous series for non-performing loans, we need to build our dataset relying on several sources. For most of the Asian countries in our sample (Korea, Indonesia, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Malaysia, Thailand) there are two available estimates of NPL in 1996; one from the 1997 BIS Annual Report, the other from Jardine Fleming. Both estimates are biased:

the former underestimates non-performing loans before the onset of the crisis (for instance, the end-of-1996 figure for Korea is 0.8%); the latter is based on data from the third quarter of 1997, when non-performing loans are already reflecting the consequences of the currency crises on the financial conditions of banks and corporate firms (for instance, Korean non-performing loans are estimated to be 16%). We take the average of the two figures as a reasonable estimate of the non-performing loans before the onset of the crisis, *i.e.* end 1996-early 1997. For the remaining countries, we proceed as follows: for India, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, Venezuela we use the estimates for 1996 in the BIS 1997 Annual Report. For China, Singapore and the Philippines, we use estimates from Jardine Fleming. For the other countries in the sample, we rely on information derived from IMF country reports. It is worth emphasizing that our estimates do not appear to be systematically biased towards the countries that suffered a crisis in 1997. Note in fact that non-crisis countries such as Mexico, China, India and Pakistan all show a very large fraction of non-performing loans (over 10% of total loans).

Fiscal cost of the bailout of the banking system as a share of GDP ($NPLY$)

This variable is computed as follows. We take the estimate of the non-performing loans as a share of banks assets (NPL) derived above and we multiply it by the ratio to GDP of claims on the private sector by deposit money banks at the end of 1996. The latter variable is computed from IFS-IMF data.

The NPLB index

In deriving $NPLB$, we interact the lending boom variable with the non-performing loans variable: for countries where the sign of the lending boom variable is positive, we set *NPL2* equal to NPL; for countries with a negative lending boom, we set $NPLB$ equal to zero.

Reserve adequacy ratios

We compute three ratios for reserve adequacy at the end of 1996. The first is the ratio of $M1$ to foreign exchange reserves ($M1/RES$); the second is the ratio of $M2$ to foreign reserves ($M2/RES$); the third is the ratio of the foreign debt service burden (*i.e.* short-term foreign debt plus interest payments on foreign debt) to foreign reserves (STD/RES). Foreign exchange reserve data are from the IFS-IMF (line 1l.d). Data on short term debt and interest payments on foreign debt are from Datastream.

Incremental Capital-Output Ratio ($ICOR$).

This variable is computed for the 1993-96 period using IFS-IMF national income data on investment and GDP.

Taiwan

Taiwan is not included in the IMF data base. Our data for Taiwan are from Datastream and rely on Taiwan national data sources.

References

[1] Alba, Pedro, Amar Bhattacharya, Stijn Claessens, Swati Ghosh, and Leonardo Hernandez (1998). "Volatility and contagion in a financially-integrated world: lessons from East Asia's recent experience," paper presented at the PAFTAD 24 conference "Asia Pacific financial liberalization and reform," Chiangmai, Thailand, 20-22 May.

[2] Buiter, Willem, Giancarlo Corsetti and Paolo Pesenti (1998 a). *Financial markets and European monetary cooperation. The lessons of the 1992-93 Exchange Rate Mechanism crisis.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

[3] Buiter, Willem, Giancarlo Corsetti and Paolo Pesenti (1998 b). "Interpreting the ERM crisis: country-specific and systemic issues," *Princeton Studies in International Finance* No.84, March.

[4] Calvo, Guillermo (1998). "Varieties of capital market crises," in G. Calvo and M. King (eds.) *The debt burden and its consequences for monetary policy*, London: Macmillan, forthcoming.

[5] Calvo, Guillermo and Carlos Vegh (1998). "Inflation stabilization and balance of payments crises in developing countries," forthcoming in John Taylor and Michael Woodford (eds.), *Handbook of Macroeconomics*, Amsterdam: North-Holland.

[6] Cavallari, Lilia and Giancarlo Corsetti (1996). "Policy-making and speculative attacks in models of exchange rate crises: a synthesis." Economic Growth Center Working Paper, Yale University.

[7] Chang, Roberto and Andres Velasco (1998a). "Financial fragility and the exchange rate regime." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No.6469, March.

[8] Chang, Roberto and Andres Velasco (1998b). "Financial crises in emerging markets: a canonical model." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No.6606, June.

[9] Cole, Harold and Timothy Kehoe (1996). "A self-fulfilling model of Mexico's 1994-1995 debt crisis." *Journal of International Economics*, 41, 309-330.

[10] Corsetti, Giancarlo, Paolo Pesenti and Nouriel Roubini (1998). "What caused the Asian currency and financial crisis?," paper presented at the CEPR/World Bank conference "Financial crises: contagion and market volatility," London, 8-9 May.

[11] Corsetti, Giancarlo and Nouriel Roubini (1997). "Politically motivated fiscal deficits: policy issues in closed and open economies." *Economics & Politics*, March, pp.27-55.

[12] Diamond, D.W. and P. Dybvig (1983). "Banks runs, deposit insurance, and liquidity." *Journal of Political Economy*, 91, 401-419.

[13] Díaz-Alejandro, Carlos F. (1985) "Good-bye financial repression, hello financial crash," *Journal of Development Economics* 19, reprinted in A. Velasco (ed.), *Trade, development and the world economy : selected essays of Carlos Díaz-Alejandro*, Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1988.

[14] Dornbusch, Rudiger (1998). "Asian crisis themes," mimeo, MIT, February.

[15] Eichengreen, Barry, Andrew K. Rose and Charles Wyplosz (1996). "Contagious currency crises." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No.5681, July.

[16] Feldstein, Martin (1998). "Refocusing the IMF." *Foreign Affairs* 77 (2), March-April.

[17] Fernald, John, Hali Edison and Prakash Loungani (1998). "Was China the first domino? Assessing links between China and the rest of emerging Asia." Federal Reserve Board, International Finance Discussion Paper No.604, March.

[18] Fischer, Stanley (1998). "The IMF and the Asian crisis." Forum Funds Lecture at UCLA, Los Angeles, March 20.

[19] Flood, Robert and Peter Garber (1984). "Collapsing exchange-rate regimes: some linear examples." *Journal of International Economics* 17: 1-13.

[20] Flood, Robert and Nancy Marion (1998). "Perspectives on the recent currency crisis literature." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No.6380, January.

[21] Goldfajn, Ilan and Rodrigo O. Valdes (1997). "Capital flows and the twin crises: the role of liquidity." International Monetary Fund Working Paper 97/87, July.

[22] Greenspan, Alan (1998). "Remarks before the 34th Annual Conference on Bank Structure and Competition," Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, May 7.

[23] Grilli, Vittorio (1986). "Buying and selling attacks on fixed exchange rate systems." *Journal of International Economics* 20, pp.143-156.

[24] International Monetary Fund (1997). *World economic outlook. Interim assessment*. Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund, December.

[25] International Monetary Fund (1998). *World economic outlook*. Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund, May.

[26] Kaminsky, Graciela, Saul Lizondo and Carmen M. Reinhart (1998). "Leading indicators of currency crises." *IMF Staff Papers*, March.

[27] Kaminsky, Graciela and Carmen M. Reinhart (1997). "The twin crises: the causes of banking and balance-of-payments problems," mimeo, Federal Reserve Board.

[28] Krugman, Paul (1979). "A model of balance of payments crises." *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking* 11: 311-325.

[29] Krugman, Paul (1998) "What happened to Asia?," mimeo, MIT, January.

[30] Kumhof, Michael (1997). "Balance of payment crises: the role of short-term debt," mimeo, University of Maryland.

[31] Liu, Ligang, Marcus Noland, Sherman Robinson, and Zhi Wang (1998). "Asian competitive devaluations," paper prepared for the conference "China's integration into the world economy," Cambridge, Harvard University, January 17.

[32] McKinnon, Ronald and Huw Pill (1996). "Credible liberalization and international capital flows: the 'overborrowing syndrome'," in T. Ito and A.O. Kruger (editors), *Financial deregulation and integration in East Asia*, The University of Chicago Press.

[33] Milesi Ferretti, Gian Maria and Assaf Razin (1996). "Current account sustainability." *Princeton Studies in International Finance* No.81, October.

[34] Morris, Stephen, and Hyung Song Shin (1998). "Unique equilibrium in a model of self-fulfilling currency attacks." *American Economic Review* 88 (3), pp.587-597.

[35] Obstfeld, Maurice (1986). "Rational and self-fulfilling balance of payments crises." *American Economic Review* 76: 676-681.

[36] Obstfeld, Maurice (1994). "The logic of currency crises." *Cahiers Economiques et Monetaires* 43:189-213.

[37] Obstfeld, Maurice and Kenneth Rogoff (1996). *Foundations of international macroeconomics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

[38] OECD (1988). *Economic Survey of Korea 1997-98.* Paris, OECD.

[39] Pomerleano, Michael (1998). "The East Asia crisis and corporate finances — The untold micro story." *Emerging Markets Quarterly,* forthcoming.

[40] Radelet, Steven and Jeffrey Sachs (1998). "The onset of the East Asian financial crisis," National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No.6680, August.

[41] Sachs, Jeffrey, Aaron Tornell and Andres Velasco (1996). "Financial crises in emerging markets: the lessons of 1995." *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* No.1, 147-217.

[42] Stiglitz, Joseph (1998). "The role of international financial institutions in the current global economy," address to the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations. Chicago, February 27.

[43] Talvi, Ernesto (1997). "Exchange rate-based stabilization with endogenous fiscal response." *Journal of Development Economics* 54, pp.59-75.

[44] Velasco, Andres (1987). "Financial and balance of payments crises." *Journal of Development Economics* 27, 263-283.

Table 1. Crisis and Economic Indicators
Percentage or percentage change

Country	*Crisis Index (IND)*	*Real Appreciation (RER)*	*Current Account (CA)*	*Lending Boom (LB)*	*Non-Performing Loans (NPL)*	*Reserves Adequacy (M2/RES)*	*Reserves Adequacy (M1/RES)*	*Reserves Adequacy (STD/RES)*
Argentina	4.9	38.6	-1.9	16.5	9.4	351.0	108.2	147.8
Brazil	-0.5	75.8	-2.0	-26.3	5.8	345.9	66.8	78.3
Chile	-1.4	37.5	-1.7	24.1	1.0	188.2	41.9	53.3
China	7.6	4.9	0.8	6.9	14.0	828.9	334.0	26.7
Columbia	-9.1	26.6	-5.0	35.0	4.6	209.4	104.3	73.9
Czech	-19.5	50.7	-4.4	22.7	12.0	356.9	139.5	42.9
Hong Kong	5.7	31.8	-1.6	25.5	3.4	411.9	34.2	20.0
Hungary	-1.6	-38.8	-6.5	-56.5	3.2	167.1	83.3	52.3
India	5.7	-29.1	-1.2	-2.3	17.3	860.0	296.5	37.2
Indonesia	-38.3	17.5	-2.9	9.6	12.9	614.8	114.3	188.9
Jordan	9.8	6.1	-4.5	1.4	6.0	437.8	141.4	33.9
Korea	-38.6	11.1	-2.5	11.2	8.4	665.4	147.6	217.0
Malaysia	-38.8	19.9	-6.4	31.1	9.9	364.8	115.6	45.3
Mexico	10.9	8.9	-2.7	-10.9	12.5	444.8	129.3	142.9
Pakistan	11.4	-2.0	-5.3	-3.7	17.5	3369.9	1822.8	399.0
Peru	0.7	-20.4	-6.2	177.2	5.1	123.6	32.4	61.6
Philippines	-29.8	38.9	-4.6	150.8	14.0	465.6	91.8	849.3
Poland	3.5	30.0	0.9	38.5	6.0	262.3	95.9	14.2
Singapore	-15.7	4.7	16.5	16.7	4.0	103.5	25.0	20.0
Sri Lanka	-1.0	17.7	-5.7	28.4	5.0	236.4	72.9	26.8
Taiwan	-11.4	-7.0	2.9	43.4	3.9	575.1	141.0	22.8
Thailand	-47.8	20.0	-7.2	58.0	13.3	380.5	43.3	121.5
Turkey	4.3	-16.1	-0.1	43.2	0.8	302.6	48.9	76.0
Venezuela	4.9	2.2	6.8	-51.5	3.8	102.4	58.5	28.2

Table 2. Explaining the Crisis Index[a]

Estimated coefficient and summary statistic	*Independent variable*	*(1)*	*(2)* *Regression with M2/RES*	*(3)* *Regression with M1/RES*	*(4)* *Regression with STD2/RES*
β_1	constant	6.877	7.073	7.437	5.324
		(3.755)	(4.094)	(3.956)	(3.552)
β_2	*CAI*	3.768	0.849	2.210	0.569
		(1.254)	(2.869)	(3.677)	(1.971)
β_3	*NPLB*	-1.338	-2.888	-2.805	-0.476
		(0.605)	(2.073)	(1.946)	(0.782)
β_4	$CAI \times D2^{LR}$		3.613		
			(3.191)		
β_5	$NPLB \times D2^{LR}$		1.761		
			(2.035)		
β_4	$CAI \times D1^{LR}$			1.467	
				(3.982)	
β_5	$NPLB \times D1^{LR}$			1.534	
				(1.929)	
β_4	$CAI \times D3^{LR}$				3.571
					(2.564)
β_5	$NPLB \times D3^{LR}$				-0.864
					(0.986)
Summary statistic					
$\overline{R}^2$		0.555	0.541	0.536	0.622
R^2		0.594	0.621	0.616	0.688
Addendum: Wald tests					
Null hypothesis		*p values*	*p values*	*p values*	*p values*
$\beta_2 + \beta_4 = 0$			0.005	0.018	0.023
$\beta_3 + \beta_5 = 0$			0.099	0.057	0.091

[a] The dependent variable is the crisis index, *IND*. See Table 1 and Appendix for definition of variables. Standard errors are shown in parentheses.

Table 3. Explaining the Crisis Index[a]

Estimated coefficient and summary statistic	*Independent Variable*	(1)	(2)	(3)
β_1	constant	-2.861	5.535	5.602
		(2.138)	(3.887)	(4.082)
β_2	*CAI*	0.841	0.762	0.766
		(2.946)	(2.694)	(2.771)
β_3	*NPLB*	-1.338	-2.569	-2.583
		(0.605)	(1.954)	(2.017)
β_4	$CAI \times D2^{LR}$	2.851	1.118	1.559
		(6.650)	(3.274)	(6.293)
β_5	$NPLB \times D2^{LR}$	1.769	2.448	2.446
		(2.091)	(1.945)	(2.000)
β_6	$CAI \times D2^{LR} \times D^{WF}$	0.834		-0.497
		(6.337)		(6.004)
β_7	$NPLB \times D2^{LR} \times D^{WF}$		-2.120	-2.131
			(1.123)	(1.164)
Summary statistic				
$\overline{R}^2$		0.516	0.596	0.572
R^2		0.621	0.684	0.683
Addendum: Wald tests				
Null hypothesis		*p values*	*p values*	*p values*
$\beta_2 + \beta_4 = 0$		0.547	0.337	0.688
$\beta_2 + \beta_4 + \beta_6 = 0$		0.009		0.388
$\beta_3 + \beta_5 = 0$		0.146	0.883	0.875
$\beta_3 + \beta_5 + \beta_7 = 0$			0.017	0.026

[a] The dependent variable is the crisis index, *IND*. See Table 1 and Appendix for definition of variables. Standard errors are shown in parentheses.

Table 4. Explaining the Crisis Index[a]

Estimated coefficient And summary Statistic	*Independent variable*		(1) *Regression with M2/RES*	(2) *Regression with M1/RES*	(3) *Regression with STD2/RES*
β_1	constant	6.682	8.142	6.289	5.491
		(3.699)	(3.951)	(3.789)	(3.492)
β_2	*CAI*	4.156	2.288	-1.402	0.845
		(1.158)	(2.394)	(4.511)	(1.963)
β_3	*NPLY*	-1.630	-6.579	-4.817	-0.597
		(0.724)	(3.263)	(2.419)	(0.874)
β_4	$CAI \times D2^{LR}$		2.594		
			(2.657)		
β_5	$NPLY \times D2^{LR}$		5.133		
			(3.170)		
β_4	$CAI \times D1^{LR}$			5.760	
				(4.660)	
β_5	$NPLY \times D1^{LR}$			3.481	
				(2.497)	
β_4	$CAI \times D3^{LR}$				3.487
					(2.530)
β_5	$NPLY \times D3^{LR}$				-1.185
					(1.248)
Summary statistic					
$\bar{R}^2$		0.558	0.578	0.634	0.618
R^2		0.596	0.651	0.557	0.684
Addendum: Wald tests					
Null hypothesis		*p values*	*p values*	*p values*	*p values*
$\beta_2 + \beta_4 = 0$			0.001	0.002	0.016
$\beta_3 + \beta_5 = 0$			0.074	0.105	0.107

[a] The dependent variable is the crisis index, *IND*. See Table 1 and Appendix for definition of variables. Standard errors are shown in parentheses.

Table 5. Explaining the Crisis Index[a]

Estimated coefficient and summary statistic	*Independent variable*	(1)	(2)	(3)
β_1	constant	9.060	3.754	3.677
		(4.233)	(2.731)	(3.026)
β_2	*CAI*	2.438	1.570	1.557
		(2.439)	(1.577)	(1.633)
β_3	*NPLY*	-6.912	-4.985	-4.957
		(3.347)	(2.164)	(2.263)
β_4	$CAI \times D2^{LR}$	-7.295	-2.753	-2.085
		(14.900)	(2.033)	(9.972)
β_5	$NPLY \times D2^{LR}$	5.425	5.287	5.267
		(3.246)	(2.081)	(2.160)
β_6	$CAI \times D2^{LR} \times D^{WF}$	9.905		-0.685
		(14.676)		(10.005)
β_7	$NPLY \times D2^{LR} \times D^{WF}$		-5.420	-5.436
			(1.060)	(1.117)
Summary statistic				
$\overline{R}^2$		0.566	0.818	0.808
R^2		0.660	0.858	0.858
Addendum: Wald tests				
Null hypothesis		*p values*	*p values*	*p values*
$\beta_2 + \beta_4 = 0$		0.741	0.424	0.957
$\beta_2 + \beta_4 + \beta_6 = 0$		0.001		0.633
$\beta_3 + \beta_5 = 0$		0.073	0.626	0.445
$\beta_3 + \beta_5 + \beta_7 = 0$			0.000	0.000

[a] The dependent variable is the crisis index, *IND1*. See table 1 and Appendix for definition of variables. Standard errors are shown in parentheses.