

**ECO 407**

**Competing Views in  
Macroeconomic Theory and Policy**

---

**Lecture 11**

**Should Financial Flows Be  
Regulated?**

# The Breaking-Up of Macroeconomic Consensuses

- Subbarao (2014) reminds us that important macroeconomic *consensuses* were broken as a result of the Great Recession
  - The movement towards a fully open *capital account* came to a stop
  - Intervention in *foreign exchange* markets came to be seen as desirable
  - It became acceptable the use of *capital controls* as a short-run stabilization tool

# Traditional Arguments in Favour of Unrestricted Capital Flows

- Advocates of financial liberalization have *faith* in the *efficiency* of markets
  - They believe government regulations would introduce *inefficiencies*
- Regarding capital movements, orthodox economists make a *leap* from the *national* to the *international* economy
  - But there are differences between purely *domestic* financial transactions and *international* ones
  - Arguments are based on *microeconomic* logic and do not take into account *macroeconomic* concerns
- Advocates associate *free* capital mobility with
  - Greater economic *growth*
  - Better *allocation* of financial resources

# Benefits and Costs of Financial Liberalization (*Santor & Schembri*)

- There appears to be a weak relationship between capital account liberalization and ***economic growth***
  - Investment should increase in countries where savings are too low through ***capital inflows***
    - But savings are high in emerging market economies
  - Opening the capital account too early can result in ***negative*** economic outcomes
- Evidence suggests that capital account liberalization can be beneficial when conducted in the ***proper sequence***
- Nonetheless, the authors conclude that financial liberalization is a ***key determinant*** of ***long-run*** economic growth

# Orthodox View of Domestic and Foreign Savings

- Orthodox economists see *investment* as an almost *automatic outcome* of the social decision to *save*
- Therefore, they believe *foreign savings* would also contribute to increasing *investment*
  - They implicitly assume that *foreign savings* complement *domestic savings*
- They associate *free* capital mobility with a better *allocation* of financial resources and greater economic *growth*
- This view justifies the adoption of *growth cum foreign savings* policy
  - Rich countries should transfer *capital* to capital-poor developing countries

# Orthodox View of Foreign Savings and Investment

- Consider an economy with no government sector:

$$Y = C + I + NX$$

$$NX = -S_f$$

where  $Y$  is GDP,  $C$  is consumption,  $I$  is investment,  $NX$  is net exports, and  $S_f$  is the balance in the *capital account* (i.e., the so-called *foreign savings*)

- Since  $Y = C + S_d$  where  $S_d$  is domestic savings, then

$$C + S_d = C + I - S_f$$

$$S_d + S_f = I$$

- But these are *ex-post* concepts, expressing mere *accounting identities* and not *economic relationships*

# Arguments for Capital Account Regulations: The “Trilemma”

- It is difficult for a country to maintain the following three goals simultaneously:
  - Free capital mobility
  - Fixed exchange rates
  - An autonomous monetary policy
- The “*Trilemma*” or “*Impossible Trinity*”: Countries can achieve at most only two of these three goals simultaneously
- If a country wants to keep a *stable* and *competitive exchange rate* and have an *independent monetary policy*, then it must *control capital mobility*

# Arguments for Capital Account Regulations (*Ocampo*)

- ***Pro-cyclical*** capital flows are one of the major determinants of business cycles in emerging economies
    - Capital inflows are entirely delinked from their ***need for capital***
    - They have strong effects on major ***macroeconomic variables***
  - Developing countries also have the disadvantage of having more ***“incomplete”*** domestic financial markets
    - Their capital markets are small relative to magnitude of the speculative pressure they face
- Capital flows exacerbate major macroeconomic trade-offs, reducing the space for ***counter-cyclical macroeconomic policies***



# Arguments for Capital Account Regulations (cont'd)

- Capital account regulations can be ***justified*** during ***boom*** periods
  - To avoid ***currency appreciation***, risk of rising ***current account deficits***, and useless accumulation of ***foreign exchange reserve***
- Capital account regulations can also be ***justified*** during ***crises*** to avoid the opposite macroeconomic impacts
- Opponents argue that capital market regulations ***segment*** domestic market from international markets
  - But this only recognizes the fact that markets are already segmented

# Objectives and Types of Capital Account Regulations

- The **objectives** of capital account regulations include:
  - To promote financial stability
  - To encourage desirable investment and financing arrangements
  - To enhance policy autonomy, including the maintenance of a stable and competitive exchange rate
- **Quantity-based** capital account regulations:
  - Prohibition of certain capital flows
  - Minimum stay periods
  - Restrictions on foreign investors
- **Price-based** capital account regulations:
  - Unremunerated reserve requirements on capital inflows
  - Taxes on flows
  - Larger reserve requirements for external liabilities

# The Empirical Evidence

- Regulation on both *inflows* and *outflows* can work, but most particularly on the former
    - But authorities must have *administrative capacity* to manage them
  - Regulations help generate a mix of greater monetary autonomy, lower exchange rate pressure, lower magnitudes of flows, better composition of flows
    - Some of these effects may be *temporary* due to greater circumvention of regulations as time passes by
  - There is not one capital account regulation that works *best for all* countries
- Countries with capital account regulations fared better during the *2008 financial crisis*

# IFM's New View on Capital Controls

- Significant *ideological* shift → No longer telling developing countries to *liberalize* their capital accounts
- Recognizes that capital flows carry *risks*, particularly when financial markets and institutions are not sufficiently developed
- Acknowledges that capital flows should be *regulated* to avoid effects of flow surges and sudden stops
- Points out that nations that are the source of excessive capital flows should pay attention to their *negative spillover effects*
- Notes that its new view on capital flow management may be *at odds* with other international commitments (e.g., FTAs)
- Liberalization should be *sequenced, gradual*, and *not the same* for all countries at all times

# Shortcomings of the IFM View

- Continues to insist on long-run benefits of **capital market liberalization** despite the lack of evidence supporting it
  - No strong correlation between **capital account liberalization** and **economic growth**
- Wrong to call for the use of regulations only once all other **macroeconomic policy-options** have been exhausted
- On the contrary, regulations should be used to avoid:
  - Excessive **exchange rate** appreciation
  - Excessive **foreign exchange** accumulation
  - **Fiscal policy** becoming hostage of private capital flows
- Wrong to stress that capital account regulations should be **temporary** and **not discriminatory**