

Back to Sovereign Debt

Roberto Chang

Rutgers

April 2013

- A lot of work in the 1980s, following Eaton and Gersovitz (1980) and the Latin American debt crisis.

- A lot of work in the 1980s, following Eaton and Gersovitz (1980) and the Latin American debt crisis.
- Focus: why do governments repay their debts?

- A lot of work in the 1980s, following Eaton and Gersovitz (1980) and the Latin American debt crisis.
- Focus: why do governments repay their debts?
- Debate: reputation versus direct sanctions

- A lot of work in the 1980s, following Eaton and Gersovitz (1980) and the Latin American debt crisis.
- Focus: why do governments repay their debts?
- Debate: reputation versus direct sanctions
- Also: renegotiation, debt overhang and restructuring

- A lot of work in the 1980s, following Eaton and Gersovitz (1980) and the Latin American debt crisis.
- Focus: why do governments repay their debts?
- Debate: reputation versus direct sanctions
- Also: renegotiation, debt overhang and restructuring
- Much work in the last decade, starting with Arellano (2008) and Aguiar and Gopinath (2006) have instead focused on the ability of sovereign debt models to rationalize stylized business cycle facts.

The Role of Reputation in Enforcing Debt Agreements

- Eaton-Gersovitz: reputation can *by itself* provide sufficient incentives for repayment

The Role of Reputation in Enforcing Debt Agreements

- Eaton-Gersovitz: reputation can *by itself* provide sufficient incentives for repayment
- Illustration: OR ch 6 (a very good reference)

The Role of Reputation in Enforcing Debt Agreements

- Eaton-Gersovitz: reputation can *by itself* provide sufficient incentives for repayment
- Illustration: OR ch 6 (a very good reference)
- Small country has output

$$Y_t = \bar{Y} + \varepsilon_t$$

where ε_t is i.i.d. with $E(\varepsilon) = 0$

The Role of Reputation in Enforcing Debt Agreements

- Eaton-Gersovitz: reputation can *by itself* provide sufficient incentives for repayment
- Illustration: OR ch 6 (a very good reference)
- Small country has output

$$Y_t = \bar{Y} + \varepsilon_t$$

where ε_t is i.i.d. with $E(\varepsilon) = 0$

- The representative agent has preferences

$$E \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(C_t)$$

Feasible Allocations

- Right before each period t , and as long as the country is in good standing, it can purchase insurance contracts to pay $P_t(\varepsilon)$ if $\varepsilon_t = \varepsilon$ (or, if negative, to receive $-P_t(\varepsilon)$)

Feasible Allocations

- Right before each period t , and as long as the country is in good standing, it can purchase insurance contracts to pay $P_t(\varepsilon)$ if $\varepsilon_t = \varepsilon$ (or, if negative, to receive $-P_t(\varepsilon)$)
- Zero profit:

$$E_{t-1}P_t(\varepsilon) = 0$$

Feasible Allocations

- Right before each period t , and as long as the country is in good standing, it can purchase insurance contracts to pay $P_t(\varepsilon)$ if $\varepsilon_t = \varepsilon$ (or, if negative, to receive $-P_t(\varepsilon)$)
- Zero profit:

$$E_{t-1}P_t(\varepsilon) = 0$$

- The country's budget constraint is

$$B_{t+1} = (1 + r)B_t + Y_t - C_t - P_t(\varepsilon_t)$$

where $\beta(1 + r) = 1$

Feasible Allocations

- Right before each period t , and as long as the country is in good standing, it can purchase insurance contracts to pay $P_t(\varepsilon)$ if $\varepsilon_t = \varepsilon$ (or, if negative, to receive $-P_t(\varepsilon)$)
- Zero profit:

$$E_{t-1}P_t(\varepsilon) = 0$$

- The country's budget constraint is

$$B_{t+1} = (1 + r)B_t + Y_t - C_t - P_t(\varepsilon_t)$$

where $\beta(1 + r) = 1$

- If the country reneges on its debt, it is *permanently excluded* from the world market

Optimal Strategy

- Intuitively, the best that the country can do is to consume its mean endowment every period:

$$C_t = \bar{Y}$$

- Intuitively, the best that the country can do is to consume its mean endowment every period:

$$C_t = \bar{Y}$$

- To do this, the country must choose a sequence of contracts such that:

$$P_t = \varepsilon_t$$

- Intuitively, the best that the country can do is to consume its mean endowment every period:

$$C_t = \bar{Y}$$

- To do this, the country must choose a sequence of contracts such that:

$$P_t = \varepsilon_t$$

- The question: is this self enforcing?

Incentive Constraints (the one shot no deviation principle)

- Consider *any* period t , after having observed ε_t

Incentive Constraints (the one shot no deviation principle)

- Consider *any* period t , after having observed ε_t
- The value of continuation is

$$\sum_{s=t}^{\infty} \beta^{s-t} u(\bar{Y}) = \frac{1}{1-\beta} u(\bar{Y})$$

Incentive Constraints (the one shot no deviation principle)

- Consider *any* period t , after having observed ε_t
- The value of continuation is

$$\sum_{s=t}^{\infty} \beta^{s-t} u(\bar{Y}) = \frac{1}{1-\beta} u(\bar{Y})$$

- If the country defaults,

$$u(Y_t) + E \sum_{s=t+1}^{\infty} \beta^{s-t} u(Y_s) = u(Y_t) + \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} E u(\bar{Y} + \varepsilon_s)$$

Incentive Constraints (the one shot no deviation principle)

- Consider *any* period t , after having observed ε_t
- The value of continuation is

$$\sum_{s=t}^{\infty} \beta^{s-t} u(\bar{Y}) = \frac{1}{1-\beta} u(\bar{Y})$$

- If the country defaults,

$$u(Y_t) + E \sum_{s=t+1}^{\infty} \beta^{s-t} u(Y_s) = u(Y_t) + \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} E u(\bar{Y} + \varepsilon_s)$$

- The country will never default if the former is always greater than the latter

- So the critical condition is

$$\frac{1}{1-\beta} u(\bar{Y}) \geq u(Y_t) + \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} E u(\bar{Y} + \varepsilon_s)$$

- So the critical condition is

$$\frac{1}{1-\beta} u(\bar{Y}) \geq u(Y_t) + \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} Eu(\bar{Y} + \varepsilon_s)$$

- Rewrite it as

$$u(Y_t) - u(\bar{Y}) \leq \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} [u(\bar{Y}) - Eu(\bar{Y} + \varepsilon_s)]$$

- So the critical condition is

$$\frac{1}{1-\beta} u(\bar{Y}) \geq u(Y_t) + \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} Eu(\bar{Y} + \varepsilon_s)$$

- Rewrite it as

$$u(Y_t) - u(\bar{Y}) \leq \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} [u(\bar{Y}) - Eu(\bar{Y} + \varepsilon_s)]$$

- This says that the short run gain from default must be more than compensated with the long run gain from consumption smoothing

- 1 An infinite horizon is essential

- ① An infinite horizon is essential
- ② The temptation is highest when Y_t is highest. This seems counterfactual

- ① An infinite horizon is essential
- ② The temptation is highest when Y_t is highest. This seems counterfactual
- ③ The gains from consumption smoothing are bound to be small

- ① An infinite horizon is essential
- ② The temptation is highest when Y_t is highest. This seems counterfactual
- ③ The gains from consumption smoothing are bound to be small
- ④ Default is never observed

Is Reputation Really Enough?

- Bulow-Rogoff: The reputation argument is based on strong implicit assumptions about creditor rights and incentives

Is Reputation Really Enough?

- Bulow-Rogoff: The reputation argument is based on strong implicit assumptions about creditor rights and incentives
- For instance, it is assumed that a country in default cannot *save* abroad

Is Reputation Really Enough?

- Bulow-Rogoff: The reputation argument is based on strong implicit assumptions about creditor rights and incentives
- For instance, it is assumed that a country in default cannot *save* abroad
- Suppose that this fails: that is, the country can hold assets abroad and use foreign assets to *fully collateralize* insurance contracts

Is Reputation Really Enough?

- Bulow-Rogoff: The reputation argument is based on strong implicit assumptions about creditor rights and incentives
- For instance, it is assumed that a country in default cannot *save* abroad
- Suppose that this fails: that is, the country can hold assets abroad and use foreign assets to *fully collateralize* insurance contracts
- Then Bulow-Rogoff show that no positive lending is possible in this context

Is Reputation Really Enough?

- Bulow-Rogoff: The reputation argument is based on strong implicit assumptions about creditor rights and incentives
- For instance, it is assumed that a country in default cannot *save* abroad
- Suppose that this fails: that is, the country can hold assets abroad and use foreign assets to *fully collateralize* insurance contracts
- Then Bulow-Rogoff show that no positive lending is possible in this context
- "Proof ": suppose $\varepsilon_t = \bar{\varepsilon}$. Then the country can default, deposit $P_t(\bar{\varepsilon})$ abroad, and initiate a series of fully collateralized contracts that replicate the reputational contract.

Is Reputation Really Enough?

- Bulow-Rogoff: The reputation argument is based on strong implicit assumptions about creditor rights and incentives
- For instance, it is assumed that a country in default cannot *save* abroad
- Suppose that this fails: that is, the country can hold assets abroad and use foreign assets to *fully collateralize* insurance contracts
- Then Bulow-Rogoff show that no positive lending is possible in this context
- "Proof ": suppose $\varepsilon_t = \bar{\varepsilon}$. Then the country can default, deposit $P_t(\bar{\varepsilon})$ abroad, and initiate a series of fully collateralized contracts that replicate the reputational contract.
- The country then gets to realize at least the reputational outcome *plus* r times $P_t(\bar{\varepsilon})$

Recent lit: Eaton-Gersovitz and Cycles in Emerging Economies

Stylized facts to explain quantitatively:

- 1 Frequency of default (about 3 every 100 years)

Recent lit: Eaton-Gersovitz and Cycles in Emerging Economies

Stylized facts to explain quantitatively:

- 1 Frequency of default (about 3 every 100 years)
- 2 Size of debt (70 percent)

Recent lit: Eaton-Gersovitz and Cycles in Emerging Economies

Stylized facts to explain quantitatively:

- 1 Frequency of default (about 3 every 100 years)
- 2 Size of debt (70 percent)
- 3 Business cycle facts, especially the positive relation between the interest rate (inclusive of spread) and the trade balance

- $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

- $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$
- One nonstorable good

- $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$
- One nonstorable good
- Small country with a representative agent with preferences

$$E \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(c_t)$$

- $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$
- One nonstorable good
- Small country with a representative agent with preferences

$$E \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(c_t)$$

- Agent receives a stochastic, nonstorable endowment y_t , $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

- $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$
- One nonstorable good
- Small country with a representative agent with preferences

$$E \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(c_t)$$

- Agent receives a stochastic, nonstorable endowment y_t , $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$
- Endowment follows

$$y_t = Ae^{z_t}\Gamma_t$$

where z_t is a *transitory* process and $\log \Gamma_t$ is $I(1)$.

Recursive Formulation of Country's Problem

Let d_t = debt at the beginning of period t .

The state at t is given by (y_t, d_t) . The value function is denoted by

$V(y_t, d_t)$

Let $V^B(y_t)$ be the value of ending the period in default. Then it must be that:

$$V^B(y_t) = u((1 - \delta)y_t) + \beta E_t \left\{ \lambda V(y_{t+1}, 0) + (1 - \lambda) V^B(y_{t+1}) \right\}$$

Let $V^G(y_t, d_t)$ be the value of ending the period in good standing, so:

$$V(y_t, d_t) = \text{Max} \{ V^G(y_t, d_t), V^B(y_t) \}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} V^G(y_t, d_t) &= \text{Max} \quad u(c_t) + \beta E_t V(y_{t+1}, d_{t+1}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad c_t &= y_t + q_t d_{t+1} - d_t \end{aligned}$$

where q_t is the price at which the country can sell debt in period t .

The Price of the Debt

- Let $\chi(y_t, d_t) = 1$ if the country defaults in period t (this is part of the policy function)

The Price of the Debt

- Let $\chi(y_t, d_t) = 1$ if the country defaults in period t (this is part of the policy function)
- Risk neutrality then implies:

$$q_t = \frac{1}{1 + r^*} E_t [1 - \chi(y_{t+1}, d_{t+1})]$$

The Price of the Debt

- Let $\chi(y_t, d_t) = 1$ if the country defaults in period t (this is part of the policy function)
- Risk neutrality then implies:

$$q_t = \frac{1}{1 + r^*} E_t [1 - \chi(y_{t+1}, d_{t+1})]$$

- Hence $q_t = q(y_t, d_{t+1})$