#### The Growth of Emerging Economies and Global Macroeconomic Stability

Vincenzo Quadrini

Discussion by Yongseok Shin Washington Univ. and FRB St. Louis

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

# Paper's Contribution

- Novel modeling elements
  - 1. Entrepreneurs as net lenders to banks
  - Banks default because of non-fundamental shocks (sun spots)

- 3. Impact of emerging economies on a large economy
- Finds that high leverage comes with more aggregate volatility

# Role of Rising External Demand

With Simple Worker Debt Constraint

• No default regime (low leverage)

$$\widetilde{B_t} = B_t \le \bar{\xi}\eta$$

Multiple equilibria regime (high leverage)

 $\widetilde{B_t} \geq \bar{\xi}\eta$ 

- Output is linear in  $B_t$ : Not the typical mean-variance tradeoff.
- Model may not generate enough movement in leverage as it is.

## Role of Rising External Demand

- Bank liability  $B_t = B_t^D + B_t^F$
- With a (deterministically) rising  $B_t^F$  series, on average,  $B_t$  increases but  $B_t^D$  decreases.

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

- Higher volatility (left skewed)
- Suggestion: Isolating the impact coming from the B<sup>F</sup><sub>t</sub> series?

## **Two Motivating Facts**





▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三三 のへで

# Net Financial Asset Position and Credit Constraint

Non-financial Corporate Sector

#### A1 Financial asset

- 1. Misc. (0.46 to 0.50)
- 2. Trade receivables (0.24 to 0.18)
- 3. FDI (0.14 to 0.20)
- A2 Real asset

#### L Financial liability

- Credit market inst. (0.50 to 0.48)<sup>a</sup>
- 2. Misc. (0.26 to 0.23)
- 3. Trade payable (0.13 to 0.14)

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のので

- 4. FDI (0.11 to 0.14)
- E Equity

<sup>a</sup>All changes between 1993 and 2005

# Net Financial Asset Position and Credit Constraint

Non-financial Corporate Sector

#### A1 Financial asset

- 1. Misc. (0.46 to 0.50)
- 2. Trade receivables (0.24 to 0.18)
- 3. FDI (0.14 to 0.20)
- A2 Real asset

#### L Financial liability

- Credit market inst. (0.50 to 0.48)<sup>a</sup>
- 2. Misc. (0.26 to 0.23)
- 3. Trade payable (0.13 to 0.14)

- 4. FDI (0.11 to 0.14)
- E Equity

<sup>a</sup>All changes between 1993 and 2005

 Change in A1-L seems to reflect what firms do, rather than the severity of credit constraints

## Firms as Net Lenders

 Not essential for the theory—one could use the Evans-Jovanovic (1989) or Quadrini (2000) constraint:

$$k_i \le \lambda b_i$$

• Would be interesting to consider entrepreneurial portfolio choice—some assets are more collateralizable.

### **External Demand**

 One compelling explanation for foreign demand for US debt securities: Safe asset (Mendoza, Quadrini and Rios-Rull, JPE 2009)

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

### **External Demand**



・ロト・西ト・西ト・西ト・日・

## **External Demand**



(Not necessarily a problem, if one can generate spillover across asset classes.)

# **Concluding Remark**

- Very interesting, thought-provoking paper!
- Much needed new modeling elements (i.e., banks)
- Incorporating capital flows into US-centric models.

• Difficult choices: why net debt only?

# **Concluding Remark**

- Very interesting, thought-provoking paper!
- Much needed new modeling elements (i.e., banks)
- Incorporating capital flows into US-centric models.
  - Difficult choices: why net debt only?
- Maybe limited quantitative mileage?
  - 1. Very elastic labor supply
  - 2.  $\frac{B^F}{Y}$  targeted, but unclear what is the right  $\frac{B}{Y}$  counterpart in the data ( $B^D$  is negative in the data).