Discussion of: Globalization and Risk Sharing by Fernando Broner and Jaume Ventura

Fabrizio Perri NYU and CEPR

ESSIM, 2006

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ● ● ● ●

The Question

How does globalization - an increase in international trading opportunities - affect risk sharing?

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

The Question

How does globalization - an increase in international trading opportunities - affect risk sharing?

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

Empirical relevance

The Question

How does globalization - an increase in international trading opportunities - affect risk sharing?

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆ □ ▶ ◆ □ ▶ ● ● ● ● ●

- Empirical relevance
- Theoretical issues

Empirical Relevance, I



▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ ● のへで

Empirical Relevance, I



Related finding in Prasad, Rogoff, Wei and Kose (2002)

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ● ● ● ●

Empirical Relevance, I



- Related finding in Prasad, Rogoff, Wei and Kose (2002)
- Globalization coincides with lower inter-national risk sharing! (caveat)

Empirical Relevance, II

- Latin America during financial crises large increases in inequality/poverty (Nora Lustig 02)
- During globalization period many more financial crises

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

Empirical Relevance, II

- Latin America during financial crises large increases in inequality/poverty (Nora Lustig 02)
- During globalization period many more financial crises

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Globalization coincides with lower intra-national risk sharing!

Empirical Relevance, II

- Latin America during financial crises large increases in inequality/poverty (Nora Lustig 02)
- During globalization period many more financial crises
- Globalization coincides with lower intra-national risk sharing!
- The theoretical link between globalization and risk sharing seems worth thinking of (not much besides McLaren and Newman, 2002)

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

An ultra-simplified BV model

1 period

- Two countries, 2 domestic cons., 2 foreign, 2 states
- At the beginning of t consumers trade complete set of AS, to insure against

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ● ● ● ●

Aggregate risk α , Idiosyncratic risk ι

An ultra-simplified BV model

1 period

- Two countries, 2 domestic cons., 2 foreign, 2 states
- At the beginning of t consumers trade complete set of AS, to insure against
- Aggregate risk α , Idiosyncratic risk ι



An ultra-simplified BV model

1 period

- Two countries, 2 domestic cons., 2 foreign, 2 states
- At the beginning of t consumers trade complete set of AS, to insure against
- Aggregate risk α , Idiosyncratic risk ι

$$\begin{array}{cccc} & {\rm Home} & {\rm Foreign} \\ {\rm C1} & {\rm C2} & {\rm C1} & {\rm C2} \\ {\rm S1} & (1+\alpha)(1+\iota) & (1+\alpha)(1-\iota) & (1-\alpha)(1-\iota) & (1-\alpha)(1+\iota) \\ {\rm S2} & (1-\alpha)(1-\iota) & (1-\alpha)(1+\iota) & (1-\alpha)(1+\iota) & (1-\alpha)(1-\iota) \end{array}$$

・ロト・日本・日本・日本・日本

Non discriminatory enforcement: default on all AS payments iff it increases welfare of each consumer



If $(1 + \alpha)(1 - \iota) \le 1$, govts never defaults \rightarrow First best

- If $(1 + \alpha)(1 \iota) \le 1$, govts never defaults \rightarrow First best
- If $(1 + \alpha)(1 \iota) > 1$ govts would default in high state \rightarrow Autarky
- Key tradeoff is between idiosyncratic risk (high in default) and transfers from abroad (also high in default)

< □ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < 三 > < ○ < ○ </p>

- If $(1 + \alpha)(1 \iota) \le 1$, govts never defaults \rightarrow First best
- If $(1 + \alpha)(1 \iota) > 1$ govts would default in high state \rightarrow Autarky
- Key tradeoff is between idiosyncratic risk (high in default) and transfers from abroad (also high in default)

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

- \blacksquare Model globalization as an increase in α
- Globalization leads from FB to autarky (in a sudden stoppish way)

Key assumptions

Non discriminatory enforcement



Key assumptions

Non discriminatory enforcement

Pesification in Argentina 2002?

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

Key assumptions

Non discriminatory enforcement Pesification in Argentina 2002? Static set-up

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

- Non discriminatory enforcement
 - Pesification in Argentina 2002?
- Static set-up
 - In a dynamic set-up in which punishment is exclusion, globalization increases current incentives to default but also future costs. Net effect is unclear

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ - 三 - のへで

Globalization and the value of default, case I



Globalization and the value of default, case II



Conclusions

Relation between globalization and risk sharing needs to be explored

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Conclusions

 Relation between globalization and risk sharing needs to be explored

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

This paper makes an important step in that direction!