

Petrucci, Alberto

Working Paper

Devaluation (levels versus rates) and balance of payments in a cash-in-advance economy

Nota di Lavoro, No. 17.2002

Provided in Cooperation with:

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM)

Suggested Citation: Petrucci, Alberto (2002) : Devaluation (levels versus rates) and balance of payments in a cash-in-advance economy, Nota di Lavoro, No. 17.2002, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM), Milano

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/119628>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei

**Devaluation (Levels versus Rates)
and Balance of Payments in a
Cash-in-Advance Economy**

Alberto Petrucci

NOTA DI LAVORO 17.2002

JANUARY 2002

ETA – Economic Theory and Applications
--

Alberto Petrucci *Università del Molise and LUISS G. Carli*

This paper can be downloaded without charge at:

The Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Note di Lavoro Series Index:
http://www.feem.it/web/attiv/_attiv.html

Social Science Research Network Electronic Paper Collection:
http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract_id=XXXXXX

The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position of
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei

Devaluation (Levels versus Rates) and Balance of Payments in a Cash-in-Advance Economy

Summary

This paper investigates the consequences of the currency devaluation, both in levels and rates, on the balance of payments in a cash-in-advance economy with finite horizons, endogenous capital accumulation and international capital immobility. In this context, a once and for all currency devaluation induces a balance of payments surplus, whereas a sustained increase in the rate of devaluation produces, in principle, an ambiguous effect on the balance of payments. If however non-restrictive assumptions on some structural parameters are made, an increase in the devaluation rate leads to a balance of payments surplus, the exact opposite of Calvo's result (1981).

JEL: E21, E62

Keywords: Devaluation, balance of payments, cash-in-advance constraint, overlapping generations

Address for correspondence:

Alberto Petrucci
Department of Economics
LUISS G. Carli
Via O. Tomassini, 1
00162 Rome
Italy
Phone: +39 06 85-22-5770
Fax: +39 06 86-50-6513
E-mail: alpetru@luiss.it

This paper was written while the author was visiting Columbia University and revised during his visit to Stanford University. The author would like to thank Richard Clarida, Ned Phelps and Nate Rosenberg for the hospitality, and, without implicating them for errors and omissions, Giancarlo Marini, Ned Phelps, Lucio Sarno and an anonymous referee for helpful comments and suggestions on an earlier version of the paper. Financial support was provided by CNR.

1. Introduction

In a monetary small open economy operating under international capital immobility and a predetermined exchange rate regime, a once and for all currency devaluation leads to a balance of payments surplus while a sustained increase in the rate of devaluation induces a balance of payments deficit. These results have been demonstrated by Calvo (1981) in a very simple macroeconomic setup, characterized by an immortal representative agent with a fixed endowment, real money balances -the only asset of the system that varies according to current account imbalances- inserted into the utility function, consumers that receive lump-sum compensation for the inflation tax and purchasing power parity.

The effect of the simple exchange rate devaluation on the balance of payments relies upon the "monetary approach" mechanism, while the effect of the increase in the devaluation rate depends on the current account determination of the money supply and the long-run reduction of money holdings determined by higher inflation.

Despite the simplified framework considered, Calvo's findings are very general and robust, in the sense that they are not qualitatively affected by other ways of introducing money into the economy and/or by the consideration of an endogenous capital stock, as an alternative asset to real money balances (see, for example, Dornbusch-Giovannini, 1990, Obstfeld-Rogoff, 1996, and Turnovsky, 1997).¹

This paper investigates the consequences of the currency devaluation, both in levels and rates, on the balance of payments in a cash-in-advance economy with

¹Neither is the introduction of an endogenous labor-leisure choice capable of altering these results, as can be easily deduced from the dual characterization of the present economic context represented by monetary growth models (see Wang-Yip, 1992).

finite horizons and endogenous capital accumulation. We focus on the case of a Clower constraint imposed on consumption spending alone.

We discover that, for the simple devaluation, the effect shown by Calvo is confirmed, whereas for a sustained increase in the rate of devaluation the effect on the balance of payments is, in principle, ambiguous, reflecting a possible departure from Calvo's findings. However, if non-restrictive assumptions on some structural parameters of the model are made and/or the role of government money transfers in financing consumption expenditure is relatively modest, an increase in the rate of devaluation induces a balance of payments improvement, the exact opposite of Calvo's result.

The rationale for the consequence of the rate of devaluation on the balance of payments obtained in our model is due to the endogeneity of capital stock and the OLG demographics without intergenerational altruism, on the one side, and to the cash-in-advance constraint on consumption spending, on the other. In fact, the first two assumptions assure that an increase in the rate of devaluation -equivalent to a rise in inflation since purchasing power parity holds- augments long-run capital stock and consumption because the lump-sum distribution of seignorage increases saving through intergenerational redistribution of income. The latter assumption -ensuring that money demand is a quasi-fixed proportion of consumption as the money-consumption ratio can solely respond to long-run inflation- may imply, as a consequence of the Tobin effect on capital stock, a steady-state increase in real money holdings, namely money balances accumulation along the transition path through a balance of payments surplus.

2. The model

Consider a small open economy operating under a predetermined exchange rate regime and international capital immobility. There are only two assets in the economy, money and real capital, which cannot be traded at world level.

Domestic output is perfectly substitutable with foreign output, i.e. purchasing power parity holds. The monetary authority depreciates the nominal exchange rate at a constant rate. Therefore, the currency devaluation rate coincides with domestic inflation assuming foreign inflation as being zero. Money supply is determined by the balance of payments, since it adjusts to balance the supply of and the demand for foreign exchange. Money is inserted into the economy through a cash-in-advance constraint imposed on consumption spending. The model is specified in continuous time and perfect foresight is assumed throughout.

The demand-side of the economy is based on the uncertain lifetimes approach of Blanchard-Yaari (see Yaari, 1965, and Blanchard, 1985) with no intergenerational bequest motive extended to a cash-in-advance monetary economy.

Identical individuals face uncertainty about the duration of their lives, since they face a constant probability of death, $\lambda \geq 0$, when they are alive. In every instant of time, a large new cohort is born. The size of each cohort is normalized to one. The population, composed of the cohorts of all ages, remains constant over time, since the birth rate is assumed to equal the death rate.²

A logarithmic instantaneous utility function is assumed. The consumer seeks to maximize the following time-separable intertemporal utility function

²The same results can be obtained when overlapping infinitely-lived families, which are not altruistically linked to older cohorts, enter the economy continuously (see Weil, 1991).

$$\int_t^\infty \ln \tilde{c}(s, v) e^{(\theta+\lambda)(t-v)} dv \quad (1)$$

subject to the instantaneous budget constraint

$$\tilde{c}(s, t) + \frac{d\tilde{a}(s, t)}{dt} = [r(t) + \lambda] \tilde{a}(s, t) + w(t) + \tilde{q}(s, t) - [r(t) + \varepsilon] \tilde{m}(s, t) \quad (2)$$

the cash-in-advance constraint on consumption spending

$$\tilde{c}(s, t) \leq \gamma \tilde{m}(s, t) + \sigma \tilde{q}(s, t), \quad 0 < \sigma \leq \gamma \quad (3)$$

and the condition precluding "Ponzi games"

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{a}(s, v) e^{-\int_t^v [r(u) + \lambda] du} = 0 \quad (4)$$

where $\tilde{c}(s, t)$, $\tilde{a}(s, t)$, $\tilde{q}(s, t)$, $\tilde{m}(s, t)$ denote at time t consumption of goods, non-human wealth, lump-sum cash transfers and real money balances of a consumer born at time $s \leq t$, respectively; $r(t)$ and $w(t)$ denote the interest rate and non-interest income at time t , respectively; θ , ε , γ and σ are the exogenous rate of time preference, the constant rate of currency depreciation and two positive parameters of the cash-in-advance constraint, respectively. Labor supply is exogenous and hence normalized to one.

The budget constraint (2) asserts that savings, i.e. non-human wealth accumulation, plus consumption of goods must be equal to the disposable income. The disposable income incorporates the hypothesis that consumers receive an actuarially fair premium $\lambda \tilde{a}(s, t)$ from the competitive life insurance company and give all their wealth to the life insurance company contingent on their death.

In addition, income available for consumption and savings includes government lump-sum transfers and takes into account the inflation tax (due to the sustained currency devaluation) on money holdings.

Equation (3) represents the cash-in-advance constraint according to which private money holdings and government lump-sum cash transfers are jointly used to purchase consumption goods.³ The case $\sigma < \gamma$ is aimed at capturing the circumstance in which the role of government money transfers in financing consumption is relatively modest.⁴

As long as the cost of holding money, i.e. the nominal interest rate, is positive, the cash-in-advance constraint (3) binds since people will not hold money in excess of the amount required for consumption.

In order to simplify the derivation of the optimal conditions for the individual maximization problem, define total or comprehensive consumption, $\tilde{x}(s, t)$, as consumption of goods plus the implicit consumption of money services (given by the nominal interest foregone by holding real balances and spending government cash transfers instead of investing them in other assets)

$$\tilde{x}(s, t) = \tilde{c}(s, t) + [r(t) + \varepsilon] \left[\tilde{m}(s, t) + \frac{\sigma}{\gamma} \tilde{q}(s, t) \right] \quad (5a)$$

³See, for a similar formulation of the cash-in-advance constraint, Stockman (1981), Gomme (1993) and Walsh (1998). The insertion of money balances into the economy through equation (3) is qualitatively similar to the "money in the utility function" approach when instantaneous preferences are of the type $\ln \left\{ U \left[\tilde{c}(s, t), \tilde{m}(s, t) \right] \right\}$, where U is homothetic. See Feenstra (1986) and Marini-Van der Ploeg (1988).

⁴The extreme case $\sigma = 0$ -i.e. a cash-in-advance constraint formulated as in Lucas (1981), Feenstra (1984) and Calvo (1991)- is ruled out, since in such a circumstance, due to the economic environment considered, the aggregate dynamic setup exhibits analytical problems.

Hence by using the cash-in-advance constraint (3) along with the definition of $\tilde{x}(s, t)$ in equation (5a), we can express physical consumption as a function of comprehensive consumption

$$\tilde{c}(s, t) = \frac{\gamma \tilde{x}(s, t)}{\gamma + r(t) + \varepsilon} \quad (5b)$$

Equation (5b) can be used to re-formulate the optimal program (1)-(4) in terms of $\tilde{x}(s, t)$ instead of $\tilde{c}(s, t)$. By substituting out individual consumption of physical goods from the instantaneous utility function and the flow budget constraint through equation (5b), we can express the present value Hamiltonian for the individual optimization problem as

$$\begin{aligned} H(s, t) = & \ln\left[\frac{\gamma \tilde{x}(s, t)}{\gamma + r(t) + \varepsilon}\right] + \tilde{\eta}(s, t)\{[r(t) + \lambda] \tilde{a}(s, t) + w(t) + \\ & + \tilde{q}(s, t) + \frac{\sigma[r(t) + \varepsilon]}{\gamma} \tilde{q}(s, t) - \tilde{x}(s, t)\} \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\eta}(s, t)$ is the marginal utility of non-human wealth at time t of an individual born at time s .

The optimal choice over total consumption yields the usual Euler equation

$$\frac{d\tilde{x}(s, t)}{dt} = [r(t) - \theta] \tilde{x}(s, t) \quad (6a)$$

whereas money demand expressed in terms of total consumption is given by the cash-in-advance constraint combined with equation (5b)

$$\tilde{m}(s, t) = \frac{\tilde{x}(s, t)}{[\gamma + r(t) + \varepsilon]} - \frac{\sigma}{\gamma} \tilde{q}(s, t) \quad (6b)$$

By integrating the budget constraint (2) forward, using definition (5a) and the condition precluding "Ponzi games", we obtain the consumer's intertemporal budget constraint

$$\int_t^\infty \tilde{x}(s, v) e^{-\int_t^v [r(u) + \lambda] du} dv = \tilde{a}(s, t) + \tilde{h}(s, t) \quad (7)$$

where $\tilde{h}(s, t)$ represents consumer's human wealth.⁵

The integration of equation (6a) along with the intertemporal budget constraint yields the following total consumption function

$$\tilde{x}(s, t) = (\theta + \lambda) [\tilde{a}(s, t) + \tilde{h}(s, t)] \quad (8)$$

As the instantaneous utility function is logarithmic, comprehensive consumption is a linear function of both non-human and human wealth.

After having aggregated the solution of the individual maximization program over all the consumers' cohorts,⁶ omitting the time index and substituting out the stock of human wealth, the demand-side of the economy can be described by the following equations

$$\dot{x} = (r - \theta)x - \lambda(\lambda + \theta)a \quad (9a)$$

⁵Human wealth is the present discounted value of expected future labour income gross of lump-sum transfers, whose discount rate equals the real interest rate plus the probability of death.

⁶Aggregate variables are defined as

$$p(t) = \int_{-\infty}^t \tilde{p}(s, t) \lambda e^{\lambda(s-t)} ds$$

where $\tilde{p}(s, t)$ indicates the corresponding individual variable.

$$c = \frac{\gamma x}{\gamma + r + \varepsilon} \quad (9b)$$

$$m = \frac{c}{\gamma} - \frac{\sigma}{\gamma} q \quad (9c)$$

$$\dot{a} = ra + w + \frac{[\gamma + \sigma(r + \varepsilon)]}{\gamma} q - x \quad (9d)$$

Non-human wealth of the consumers consists of aggregate physical capital, k , and aggregate real money balances:

$$a = k + m \quad (10)$$

On the production side perfect competition is assumed. The representative firm employs capital and labor, l , to produce output, y , using a neoclassical production function $y = F(k, l)$ having the conventional neoclassical properties of positive, but diminishing, marginal physical products and constant returns to scale. The first order conditions for the optimum of the firm are

$$F_k(k, l) = r \quad (11a)$$

$$F_l(k, l) = w \quad (11b)$$

The monetary authority pursues a policy of leaving the nominal exchange rate to depreciate at a constant rate, given by ε . In addition, the government returns the inflation tax to the public as a lump-sum transfer

$$q = \varepsilon m \quad (12)$$

Finally, we have the balance of payments equation

$$\dot{m} = F(k, l) - c - \dot{k} \quad (13)$$

Equation (13) states that changes in official reserves are equal to the balance of payments, namely domestic output less absorption (consumption plus investment).⁷

The complete macroeconomic equilibrium for the economy is obtained by combining the optimal conditions for households and firms, together with the relevant accumulation equations and the equilibrium condition on the labor market ($l=1$).

The full short-run model can be expressed in compact form as:

$$\dot{x} = [F_k(k) - \theta]x - \lambda(\lambda + \theta)(k + m) \quad (14a)$$

$$c = \frac{\gamma x}{[\gamma + F_k(k) + \varepsilon]} \quad (14b)$$

$$m = \frac{c}{(\gamma + \sigma\varepsilon)} \quad (14c)$$

$$\dot{m} = F(k) - c - \dot{k} \quad (14d)$$

Seignorage, q , and the wage rate, w , are solved residually. Equation (14c) represents the aggregate demand for money, which states that planned money holdings depend positively on consumption and negatively on the long-run inflation

⁷We assume there is no banking sector and that no sterilization policies are implemented by the monetary authority.

rate.⁸ The rationale for this latter influence is as follows. A higher devaluation rate, by increasing the amount of seignorage transferred from the government to the public, requires lower private money holdings to finance a given level of consumption.

Equations (14b) and (14c) may be solved for c and k in terms of the endogenous dynamic variables (x and m) as follows:

$$c = c(m, \varepsilon), \quad c_m = \gamma + \sigma\varepsilon > 0; \quad c_\varepsilon = \bar{m} \varepsilon > 0; \quad (15a)$$

$$k = k(x, m, \varepsilon), \quad k_x = \frac{\gamma}{\bar{c} F_{kk}} < 0; \quad k_m = -\frac{(\gamma + \sigma\varepsilon)(\gamma + F_k + \varepsilon)}{\bar{c} F_{kk}} > 0;$$

$$k_\varepsilon = -\frac{[\bar{c} + \bar{m} \sigma(\gamma + F_k + \varepsilon)]}{\bar{c} F_{kk}} > 0; \quad (15b)$$

where overbar variables denote long-run equilibrium values.

By using the above short-run solutions for c and k , the model can be easily reduced to the following pair of differential equations linearized around the steady state⁹

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x} \\ \dot{m} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \omega_{11} & \omega_{12} \\ \omega_{21} & \omega_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x - \bar{x} \\ m - \bar{m} \end{bmatrix} \quad (16)$$

where

$$\omega_{11} = \frac{\{\bar{c} F_{kk}(F_k - \theta) + \gamma [\bar{x} F_{kk} - \lambda(\theta + \lambda)]\}}{\bar{c} F_{kk}} > 0;$$

⁸In the "money in the utility function" approach, when the intratemporal elasticity of substitution between money and consumption is positive, the demand for real balances would depend on consumption and the nominal interest rate.

⁹Equation (15b) is employed, once linearized, to eliminate both \dot{k} and k from equations (14a) and (14d)

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_{12} &= -\frac{\{\lambda(\theta + \lambda) \bar{c} F_{kk} + (\gamma + F_k + \varepsilon)(\gamma + \sigma\varepsilon) [\bar{x} F_{kk} - \lambda(\theta + \lambda)]\}}{\bar{c} F_{kk}} < 0; \\ \omega_{21} &= \frac{\gamma \bar{m} (F_k - \omega_{11})}{(\bar{m}\bar{c} F_{kk} - \gamma \bar{x})} \geq 0; \\ \omega_{22} &= -\frac{[\gamma \bar{x} F_k + \bar{c}^2 F_{kk} + \gamma \bar{m} \omega_{12}]}{(\bar{m}\bar{c} F_{kk} - \gamma \bar{x})} \geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

The sign of the determinant of the coefficient matrix in (16) can be shown to depend on the sign of the following expression

$$\Delta = \bar{c} (\bar{k} + \bar{m})[\gamma \bar{x} + (F_k - \theta) \bar{c}]F_{kk} - \gamma \bar{x} (F_k - \theta)(\bar{c} - F_k \bar{k}) < 0 \quad (17)$$

Since inequality (17) is always satisfied as $\bar{c} - \bar{k} F_k = \bar{y} - \bar{k} F_k = \bar{w} > 0$ (by the assumption of liner homogeneity of the production function) and $F_k > \theta$ (as the economy is dynamically efficient), the long-run equilibrium is a saddle-point stable, since m evolves continuously -i.e. $m(0)=m_0$ -, while x is a jump variable -i.e. $x(0)$ is free.¹⁰

The stable solution to the system (16) is given by

$$m = \bar{m} + (m_0 - \bar{m})e^{\eta_1 t} \quad (18a)$$

$$x = \bar{x} + \frac{\omega_{12}}{(\eta_1 - \omega_{11})}(m - \bar{m}) \quad (18b)$$

¹⁰If a simple cash-in-advance constraint was considered, i.e. $\sigma = 0$ in equation (3) and hence $c \leq \gamma m$, it would imply the restrictive feature that consumption only evolves continuously as real money balances are a state variable; this is a clear analytical inconsistency of the setup. Therefore the assumption $\sigma > 0$ is necessary to guarantee that consumption, which is a jump variable, is separated from money balances, which are a predetermined variable.

where $\eta_1 < 0$ denotes the stable eigenvalue of the coefficient matrix in (16).¹¹ The saddle-path (18b) is positively-sloped in the m - x space.

The long-run equilibrium model, obtained when $\dot{x}=\dot{m}=\dot{k}=0$, is

$$[F_k(\bar{k}) - \theta] \bar{x} = \lambda(\theta + \lambda)(\bar{k} + \bar{m}) \quad (19a)$$

$$\bar{c} = \frac{\gamma \bar{x}}{[\gamma + F_k(\bar{k}) + \varepsilon]} \quad (19b)$$

$$\bar{m} = \frac{\bar{c}}{(\gamma + \sigma\varepsilon)} \quad (19c)$$

$$F(\bar{k}) = \bar{c} \quad (19d)$$

3. Devaluations and balance of payments

Firstly, consider a once and for all devaluation. Since the level of the nominal exchange rate does not appear in the long-run equilibrium model (19), a currency devaluation exerts no effects on the steady-state endogenous variables. Therefore, long-run real money balances, i.e. $m = \frac{\bar{M}}{E}$ -where \bar{M} is the stock of the nominal money supply and E represents the nominal exchange rate-, remain unaffected by a parametric change in E . However, an unexpected permanent devaluation reduces real money holdings on impact -as M is a predetermined variable that

¹¹The solution for capital stock is

$$k = \bar{k} + \frac{[\gamma\omega_{12}/(\eta_1 - \omega_{11}) - (\gamma + \sigma\varepsilon)(\gamma + F_k + \varepsilon)]}{\bar{c} F_{kk}} (m_0 - \bar{m}) e^{\eta_1 t} \quad (18c)$$

evolves gradually- and consumption, tied to money balances. Comprehensive consumption is reduced as well. Since output does not change, the reduction of consumption implies that a short-run balance of payments surplus occurs since the trade balance improves. The current account surplus is matched, for the whole convergence along the transition path, by an increase of m aimed at restoring the initial level of real money holdings accompanied by an increase in consumption along the transition path that brings the system back to the *ante*-shock equilibrium.

Secondly, consider a sustained increase in the rate of devaluation. The comparative statics effects of this shock are given by the following multipliers

$$\frac{d \bar{k}}{d\varepsilon} = -\frac{\bar{m}\bar{c} (F_k - \theta) \left[(\bar{k} + \bar{m})(\gamma + \sigma\varepsilon) + \sigma \bar{m} (\gamma + F_k + \varepsilon) \right]}{\Delta} > 0 \quad (20a)$$

$$\frac{d \bar{x}}{d\varepsilon} = -\frac{\bar{m} [\lambda(\theta + \lambda)(\gamma + F_k) - \gamma \bar{x} F_{kk}]}{\Delta} > 0 \quad (20b)$$

$$\frac{d \bar{c}}{d\varepsilon} = F_k \frac{d \bar{k}}{d\varepsilon} > 0 \quad (20c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d \bar{m}}{d\varepsilon} = & -\frac{\bar{m} (F_k - \theta) \left[\bar{c} (\bar{k} + \bar{m})(F_k + \sigma \bar{m} F_{kk}) + \sigma \bar{m} (\gamma + F_k + \varepsilon)(F_k \bar{m} - F_l) \right]}{\Delta} + \\ & -\frac{\sigma \bar{c} (\bar{k} + \bar{m}) F_{kk} \gamma \bar{x}}{\Delta} \leq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (20d)$$

where $\Delta < 0$ has been defined in (17).

In the long-run, an increase in the rate of devaluation raises capital stock and therefore physical as well as comprehensive consumption. The Tobin effect on

capital stock derives from the fact that a higher devaluation rate, which corresponds to greater long-run inflation, implies greater lump-sum transfers, namely seignorage, distributed by the government to consumers. A redistribution of income from those who consume more and save less (the "older", in the sense that they were born earlier) to those who consume less and save more (the "younger", in the sense that they are born later) occurs, leading to higher aggregate saving and therefore spurring capital formation.

The overall consequence of the higher rate of devaluation on money demand is, in principle, ambiguous, since the positive effect of the increased consumption may be outweighed by the negative effect of the higher inflation rate on the money-consumption ratio. Therefore, the final sign of the money demand multiplier (20d) depends on which of the two contrasting effects prevails.

However, if non-restrictive assumptions on some structural parameters of the model are made, the positive effect of the higher consumption on the volume of transactions that people want to make unambiguously outweighs the negative effect of the higher devaluation rate on the money-consumption ratio. These non-restrictive assumptions are: i) a money demand that is a quasi-fixed proportion of consumption, i.e. $\sigma < \gamma$ (in this case government lump-sum cash transfers play a minor role in acquiring consumption goods); and /or ii) a production function that is moderately concave in capital stock, i.e. $-F_{kk} < \frac{F_k(\gamma + \sigma\varepsilon)}{\sigma \bar{c}}$; and/or iii) a highly liquid economy, i.e. $F_k \bar{m} > F_l$.

Both steady state nonhuman wealth and long-run real interest rate are increased by the higher steady state inflation. Moreover, as the higher rate of devaluation involves greater consumption, more inflation is welfare-improving.¹²

¹²This result is also obtained in the monetary growth analysis with an OLG demographics

In the short-run, soon after the unexpected and permanent increase in the rate of devaluation takes place, the positively-sloped saddle-path defined in the x - m space shifts upward¹³ and comprehensive consumption rises on impact (for a given level of money balances) to bring the economy onto the new saddle-path, undershooting its new long-run equilibrium value if money holdings are increased in the long-run.

The undershooting of comprehensive consumption causes a balance of payments surplus after the shock, since real money balances and capital stock, being constrained to adjust continuously, are fixed at their initial values. This is the exact opposite of Calvo's finding. Soon after the impact adjustment, real money balances and capital stock begin to accumulate. Consumption, money holdings and physical capital increase monotonically along the transition path towards the final equilibrium.¹⁴

In the case of the devaluation rate, we may depart from Calvo's result (1981) because the Tobin effect (due to the OLG demographics) is combined with a

(see Drazen, 1981, and Van der Ploeg-Marini, 1988).

¹³The vertical shift of the saddle-path is given by

$$\frac{dx(0)}{d\varepsilon} = \frac{d\bar{x}}{d\varepsilon} - \frac{\omega_{12}}{(\eta_1 - \omega_{11})} \frac{d\bar{m}}{d\varepsilon}$$

This expression is always positive either if $\sigma < \gamma$ and $\frac{d\bar{m}}{d\varepsilon} > 0$ or if $\frac{d\bar{m}}{d\varepsilon} < 0$.

¹⁴In the less likely case of a steady state reduction of money balances (i.e. when the non-restrictive assumptions mentioned above are not considered and the negative effect of long-run inflation on money holdings prevails over the Tobin effect), consumption overshoots its new long-run equilibrium value on impact; the overadjustment of consumption induces a balance of payments deficit after the shock has occurred. After the system has been placed on the new stable arm, money balances decumulate, while capital formation is deepened along the convergent path.

sort of "quantity theory" money demand, i.e. a money demand dependent on consumption and a money-consumption ratio independent of the nominal interest rate but moderately dependent on long-run inflation (due to the cash-in-advance constraint).

References

- Blanchard, O.J. (1985), "Debt, Deficits and Finite Horizons", *Journal of Political Economy*, 93, 223-247.
- Calvo, G.A. (1981), "Devaluation: Levels versus Rates", *Journal of International Economics*, 11, 165-172.
- Calvo, G.A. (1991), "Temporary Stabilization Policy. The Case of Flexible Prices and Exchange Rates", *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 15, 197-213.
- Dornbusch, R. - Giovannini, A. (1990), "Monetary Policy in the Open Economy", in B.M. Friedman - F.H. Hahn (eds.), *Handbook of Monetary Economics*, Vol. II, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1231-1298.
- Drazen, A. (1981), "Inflation and Capital Accumulation under Finite Horizon", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 8, 247-260.
- Feenstra, R.C. (1984), "Anticipated Devaluations, Currency Flight and Trade Policy in a Monetary Economy", *American Economic Review*, 74, 386-401.
- Feenstra, R.C. (1986), "Functional Equivalence between Liquidity Costs and the Utility of Money", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 17, 271-291.
- Gomme, P. (1993) "Money and Growth Revisited", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 32, 51-77.
- Lucas, R. E. (1980), "Equilibrium in a Pure Currency Economy", *Economic Inquiry*, 18, 203-220.
- Marini, G. - Van der Ploeg, F. (1988), "Monetary and Fiscal Policy in an Optimising Model with Capital Accumulation and Finite Lives", *Economic Journal*, 98, 772-786.

Obstfeld, M. - Rogoff, K. (1996), *Foundations of International Economics*, The MIT Press, Cambridge (MA).

Stockman, A.C. (1981), "Anticipated Inflation and the Capital Stock in a Cash-in-Advance Economy", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 8, 387-393.

Turnovsky, S.J. (1997), *International Macroeconomic Dynamics*, The MIT Press, Cambridge (MA).

Van der Ploeg, F.- Marini, G. (1988), "Finite Horizons and the Non-Neutrality of Money", *Economic Letters*, 26, 57-61.

Walsh, C.E. (1998), *Monetary Theory and Policy*, The MIT Press, Cambridge (MA).

Wang, P.-Yip, C. K. (1992), "Alternative Approaches to Money and Growth", *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 24, 553-562.

Weil, P. (1991), "Is Money Net Wealth?", *International Economic Review*, 32, 37-53.

Yaari, M.E. (1965), "Uncertain Lifetime, Life Insurance and the Theory of the Consumer", *Review of Economic Studies*, 32, 137-150.

NOTE DI LAVORO DELLA FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Working Papers Series

Our working papers are available on the Internet at the following addresses:

Server WWW: WWW.FEEM.IT

Anonymous FTP: FTP.FEEM.IT

To order any of these papers, please fill out the form at the end of the list.

SUST	1.2001	Inge MAYERES and Stef PROOST: <u>Should Diesel Cars in Europe be Discouraged?</u>
SUST	2.2001	Paola DORIA and Davide PETTENELLA: <u>The Decision Making Process in Defining and Protecting Critical Natural Capital</u>
CLIM	3.2001	Alberto PENCH: <u>Green Tax Reforms in a Computable General Equilibrium Model for Italy</u>
CLIM	4.2001	Maurizio BUSSOLO and Dino PINELLI: <u>Green Taxes: Environment, Employment and Growth</u>
CLIM	5.2001	Marco STAMPINI: <u>Tax Reforms and Environmental Policies for Italy</u>
ETA	6.2001	Walid OUESLATI: <u>Environmental Fiscal Policy in an Endogenous Growth Model with Human Capital</u>
CLIM	7.2001	Umberto CIORBA, Alessandro LANZA and Francesco PAULI: <u>Kyoto Commitment and Emission Trading: a European Union Perspective</u>
MGMT	8.2001	Brian SLACK (xlv): <u>Globalisation in Maritime Transportation: Competition, uncertainty and implications for port development strategy</u>
VOL	9.2001	Giulia PESARO: <u>Environmental Voluntary Agreements: A New Model of Co-operation Between Public and Economic Actors</u>
VOL	10.2001	Cathrine HAGEM: <u>Climate Policy, Asymmetric Information and Firm Survival</u>
ETA	11.2001	Sergio CURRARINI and Marco MARINI: <u>A Sequential Approach to the Characteristic Function and the Core in Games with Externalities</u>
ETA	12.2001	Gaetano BLOISE, Sergio CURRARINI and Nicholas KIKIDIS: <u>Inflation and Welfare in an OLG Economy with a Privately Provided Public Good</u>
KNOW	13.2001	Paolo SURICO: <u>Globalisation and Trade: A "New Economic Geography" Perspective</u>
ETA	14.2001	Valentina BOSETTI and Vincenzina MESSINA: <u>Quasi Option Value and Irreversible Choices</u>
CLIM	15.2001	Guy ENGELN (xlii): <u>Desertification and Land Degradation in Mediterranean Areas: from Science to Integrated Policy Making</u>
SUST	16.2001	Julie Catherine SORS: <u>Measuring Progress Towards Sustainable Development in Venice: A Comparative Assessment of Methods and Approaches</u>
SUST	17.2001	Julie Catherine SORS: <u>Public Participation in Local Agenda 21: A Review of Traditional and Innovative Tools</u>
CLIM	18.2001	Johan ALBRECHT and Niko GOBBIN: <u>Schumpeter and the Rise of Modern Environmentalism</u>
VOL	19.2001	Rinaldo BRAU, Carlo CARRARO and Giulio GOLFETTO (xliii): <u>Participation Incentives and the Design of Voluntary Agreements</u>
ETA	20.2001	Paola ROTA: <u>Dynamic Labour Demand with Lumpy and Kinked Adjustment Costs</u>
ETA	21.2001	Paola ROTA: <u>Empirical Representation of Firms' Employment Decisions by an (S_s) Rule</u>
ETA	22.2001	Paola ROTA: <u>What Do We Gain by Being Discrete? An Introduction to the Econometrics of Discrete Decision Processes</u>
PRIV	23.2001	Stefano BOSI, Guillaume GIRMANS and Michel GUILLARD: <u>Optimal Privatisation Design and Financial Markets</u>
KNOW	24.2001	Giorgio BRUNELLO, Claudio LUPI, Patrizia ORDINE, and Maria Luisa PARISI: <u>Beyond National Institutions: Labour Taxes and Regional Unemployment in Italy</u>
ETA	25.2001	Klaus CONRAD: <u>Locational Competition under Environmental Regulation when Input Prices and Productivity Differ</u>
PRIV	26.2001	Bernardo BORTOLOTTI, Juliet D'SOUZA, Marcella FANTINI and William L. MEGGINSON: <u>Sources of Performance Improvement in Privatised Firms: A Clinical Study of the Global Telecommunications Industry</u>
CLIM	27.2001	Frédéric BROCHIER and Emiliano RAMIERI: <u>Climate Change Impacts on the Mediterranean Coastal Zones</u>
ETA	28.2001	Nunzio CAPPUCCIO and Michele MORETTO: <u>Comments on the Investment-Uncertainty Relationship in a Real Option Model</u>
KNOW	29.2001	Giorgio BRUNELLO: <u>Absolute Risk Aversion and the Returns to Education</u>
CLIM	30.2001	ZhongXiang ZHANG: <u>Meeting the Kyoto Targets: The Importance of Developing Country Participation</u>
ETA	31.2001	Jonathan D. KAPLAN, Richard E. HOWITT and Y. Hossein FARZIN: <u>An Information-Theoretical Analysis of Budget-Constrained Nonpoint Source Pollution Control</u>
MGMT	32.2001	Roberta SALOMONE and Giulia GALLUCCIO: <u>Environmental Issues and Financial Reporting Trends</u>

Coalition Theory Network	33.2001	<i>Shlomo WEBER and Hans WIESMETH: <u>From Autarky to Free Trade: The Impact on Environment</u></i>
ETA	34.2001	<i>Margarita GENIUS and Elisabetta STRAZZERA: <u>Model Selection and Tests for Non Nested Contingent Valuation Models: An Assessment of Methods</u></i>
NRM	35.2001	<i>Carlo GIUPPONI: <u>The Substitution of Hazardous Molecules in Production Processes: The Atrazine Case Study in Italian Agriculture</u></i>
KNOW	36.2001	<i>Raffaele PACI and Francesco PIGLIARU: <u>Technological Diffusion, Spatial Spillovers and Regional Convergence in Europe</u></i>
PRIV	37.2001	<i>Bernardo BORTOLOTTI: <u>Privatisation, Large Shareholders, and Sequential Auctions of Shares</u></i>
CLIM	38.2001	<i>Barbara BUCHNER: <u>What Really Happened in The Hague? Report on the COP6, Part I, 13-25 November 2000, The Hague, The Netherlands</u></i>
PRIV	39.2001	<i>Giacomo CALZOLARI and Carlo SCARPA: <u>Regulation at Home, Competition Abroad: A Theoretical Framework</u></i>
KNOW	40.2001	<i>Giorgio BRUNELLO: <u>On the Complementarity between Education and Training in Europe</u></i>
Coalition Theory Network	41.2001	<i>Alain DESDOIGTS and Fabien MOIZEAU (xlv): <u>Multiple Politico-Economic Regimes, Inequality and Growth</u></i>
Coalition Theory Network	42.2001	<i>Parkash CHANDER and Henry TULKENS (xlvi): <u>Limits to Climate Change</u></i>
Coalition Theory Network	43.2001	<i>Michael FINUS and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN (xlvi): <u>Endogenous Coalition Formation in Global Pollution Control</u></i>
Coalition Theory Network	44.2001	<i>Wietze LISE, Richard S.J. TOL and Bob van der ZWAAN (xlvi): <u>Negotiating Climate Change as a Social Situation</u></i>
NRM	45.2001	<i>Mohamad R. KHAWLIE (xlvii): <u>The Impacts of Climate Change on Water Resources of Lebanon-Eastern Mediterranean</u></i>
NRM	46.2001	<i>Mutasem EL-FADEL and E. BOU-ZEID (xlvii): <u>Climate Change and Water Resources in the Middle East: Vulnerability, Socio-Economic Impacts and Adaptation</u></i>
NRM	47.2001	<i>Eva IGLESIAS, Alberto GARRIDO and Almudena GOMEZ (xlvii): <u>An Economic Drought Management Index to Evaluate Water Institutions' Performance Under Uncertainty and Climate Change</u></i>
CLIM	48.2001	<i>Wietze LISE and Richard S.J. TOL (xlvii): <u>Impact of Climate on Tourist Demand</u></i>
CLIM	49.2001	<i>Francesco BOSELLO, Barbara BUCHNER, Carlo CARRARO and Davide RAGGI: <u>Can Equity Enhance Efficiency? Lessons from the Kyoto Protocol</u></i>
SUST	50.2001	<i>Roberto ROSON (xlviii): <u>Carbon Leakage in a Small Open Economy with Capital Mobility</u></i>
SUST	51.2001	<i>Edwin WOERDMAN (xlviii): <u>Developing a European Carbon Trading Market: Will Permit Allocation Distort Competition and Lead to State Aid?</u></i>
SUST	52.2001	<i>Richard N. COOPER (xlviii): <u>The Kyoto Protocol: A Flawed Concept</u></i>
SUST	53.2001	<i>Kari KANGAS (xlviii): <u>Trade Liberalisation, Changing Forest Management and Roundwood Trade in Europe</u></i>
SUST	54.2001	<i>Xueqin ZHU and Ekko VAN IERLAND (xlviii): <u>Effects of the Enlargement of EU on Trade and the Environment</u></i>
SUST	55.2001	<i>M. Ozgur KAYALICA and Sajal LAHIRI (xlviii): <u>Strategic Environmental Policies in the Presence of Foreign Direct Investment</u></i>
SUST	56.2001	<i>Savas ALPAY (xlviii): <u>Can Environmental Regulations be Compatible with Higher International Competitiveness? Some New Theoretical Insights</u></i>
SUST	57.2001	<i>Roldan MURADIAN, Martin O'CONNOR, Joan MARTINEZ-ALER (xlviii): <u>Embodied Pollution in Trade: Estimating the "Environmental Load Displacement" of Industrialised Countries</u></i>
SUST	58.2001	<i>Matthew R. AUER and Rafael REUVENY (xlviii): <u>Foreign Aid and Direct Investment: Key Players in the Environmental Restoration of Central and Eastern Europe</u></i>
SUST	59.2001	<i>Onno J. KUIK and Frans H. OOSTERHUIS (xlviii): <u>Lessons from the Southern Enlargement of the EU for the Environmental Dimensions of Eastern Enlargement, in particular for Poland</u></i>
ETA	60.2001	<i>Carlo CARRARO, Alessandra POME and Domenico SINISCALCO (xlix): <u>Science vs. Profit in Research: Lessons from the Human Genome Project</u></i>
CLIM	61.2001	<i>Efrem CASTELNUOVO, Michele MORETTO and Sergio VERGALLI: <u>Global Warming, Uncertainty and Endogenous Technical Change: Implications for Kyoto</u></i>
PRIV	62.2001	<i>Gian Luigi ALBANO, Fabrizio GERMANO and Stefano LOVO: <u>On Some Collusive and Signaling Equilibria in Ascending Auctions for Multiple Objects</u></i>
CLIM	63.2001	<i>Elbert DIJKGRAAF and Herman R.J. VOLLEBERGH: <u>A Note on Testing for Environmental Kuznets Curves with Panel Data</u></i>

CLIM	64.2001	Paolo BUONANNO, Carlo CARRARO and Marzio GALEOTTI: <u>Endogenous Induced Technical Change and the Costs of Kyoto</u>
CLIM	65.2001	Guido CAZZAVILLAN and Ignazio MUSU (I): <u>Transitional Dynamics and Uniqueness of the Balanced-Growth Path in a Simple Model of Endogenous Growth with an Environmental Asset</u>
CLIM	66.2001	Giovanni BAIOCCHI and Salvatore DI FALCO (I): <u>Investigating the Shape of the EKC: A Nonparametric Approach</u>
CLIM	67.2001	Marzio GALEOTTI, Alessandro LANZA and Francesco PAULI (I): <u>Desperately Seeking (Environmental) Kuznets: A New Look at the Evidence</u>
CLIM	68.2001	Alexey VIKHLYAEV (xlviii): <u>The Use of Trade Measures for Environmental Purposes – Globally and in the EU Context</u>
NRM	69.2001	Gary D. LIBECAP and Zeynep K. HANSEN (li): <u>U.S. Land Policy, Property Rights, and the Dust Bowl of the 1930s</u>
NRM	70.2001	Lee J. ALSTON, Gary D. LIBECAP and Bernardo MUELLER (li): <u>Land Reform Policies, The Sources of Violent Conflict and Implications for Deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon</u>
CLIM	71.2001	Claudia KEMFERT: <u>Economy-Energy-Climate Interaction – The Model WIAGEM -</u>
SUST	72.2001	Paulo A.L.D. NUNES and Yohanes E. RIYANTO: <u>Policy Instruments for Creating Markets for Biodiversity: Certification and Ecolabeling</u>
SUST	73.2001	Paulo A.L.D. NUNES and Erik SCHOKKAERT (lii): <u>Warm Glow and Embedding in Contingent Valuation</u>
SUST	74.2001	Paulo A.L.D. NUNES, Jeroen C.J.M. van den BERGH and Peter NIJKAMP (lii): <u>Ecological-Economic Analysis and Valuation of Biodiversity</u>
VOL	75.2001	Johan EYCKMANS and Henry TULKENS (li): <u>Simulating Coalitionally Stable Burden Sharing Agreements for the Climate Change Problem</u>
PRIV	76.2001	Axel GAUTIER and Florian HEIDER: <u>What Do Internal Capital Markets Do? Redistribution vs. Incentives</u>
PRIV	77.2001	Bernardo BORTOLOTTI, Marcella FANTINI and Domenico SINISCALCO: <u>Privatisation around the World: New Evidence from Panel Data</u>
ETA	78.2001	Toke S. AIDT and Jayasri DUTTA (li): <u>Transitional Politics. Emerging Incentive-based Instruments in Environmental Regulation</u>
ETA	79.2001	Alberto PETRUCCI: <u>Consumption Taxation and Endogenous Growth in a Model with New Generations</u>
ETA	80.2001	Pierre LASSERRE and Antoine SOUBEYRAN (li): <u>A Ricardian Model of the Tragedy of the Commons</u>
ETA	81.2001	Pierre COURTOIS, Jean Christophe PÉREAU and Tarik TAZDAÏT: <u>An Evolutionary Approach to the Climate Change Negotiation Game</u>
NRM	82.2001	Christophe BONTEMPS, Stéphane COUTURE and Pascal FAVARD: <u>Is the Irrigation Water Demand Really Convex?</u>
NRM	83.2001	Unai PASCUAL and Edward BARBIER: <u>A Model of Optimal Labour and Soil Use with Shifting Cultivation</u>
CLIM	84.2001	Jesper JENSEN and Martin Hvidt THELLE: <u>What are the Gains from a Multi-Gas Strategy?</u>
CLIM	85.2001	Maurizio MICHELINI (liii): IPCC “Summary for Policymakers” in TAR. Do its results give a scientific support always adequate to the urgencies of Kyoto negotiations?
CLIM	86.2001	Claudia KEMFERT (liii): <u>Economic Impact Assessment of Alternative Climate Policy Strategies</u>
CLIM	87.2001	Cesare DOSI and Michele MORETTO: <u>Global Warming and Financial Umbrellas</u>
ETA	88.2001	Elena BONTEMPI, Alessandra DEL BOCA, Alessandra FRANZOSI, Marzio GALEOTTI and Paola ROTA: <u>Capital Heterogeneity: Does it Matter? Fundamental Q and Investment on a Panel of Italian Firms</u>
ETA	89.2001	Efrem CASTELNUOVO and Paolo SURICO: <u>Model Uncertainty, Optimal Monetary Policy and the Preferences of the Fed</u>
CLIM	90.2001	Umberto CIORBA, Alessandro LANZA and Francesco PAULI: <u>Kyoto Protocol and Emission Trading: Does the US Make a Difference?</u>
CLIM	91.2001	ZhongXiang ZHANG and Lucas ASSUNCAO: <u>Domestic Climate Policies and the WTO</u>
SUST	92.2001	Anna ALBERINI, Alan KRUPNICK, Maureen CROPPER, Nathalie SIMON and Joseph COOK (lii): <u>The Willingness to Pay for Mortality Risk Reductions: A Comparison of the United States and Canada</u>
SUST	93.2001	Riccardo SCARPA, Guy D. GARROD and Kenneth G. WILLIS (lii): <u>Valuing Local Public Goods with Advanced Stated Preference Models: Traffic Calming Schemes in Northern England</u>
CLIM	94.2001	Ming CHEN and Larry KARP: <u>Environmental Indices for the Chinese Grain Sector</u>
CLIM	95.2001	Larry KARP and Jiangfeng ZHANG: <u>Controlling a Stock Pollutant with Endogenous Investment and Asymmetric Information</u>
ETA	96.2001	Michele MORETTO and Gianpaolo ROSSINI: <u>On the Opportunity Cost of Nontradable Stock Options</u>
SUST	97.2001	Elisabetta STRAZZERA, Margarita GENIUS, Riccardo SCARPA and George HUTCHINSON: <u>The Effect of Protest Votes on the Estimates of Willingness to Pay for Use Values of Recreational Sites</u>
NRM	98.2001	Frédéric BROCHIER, Carlo GIUPPONI and Alberto LONGO: <u>Integrated Coastal Zone Management in the Venice Area – Perspectives of Development for the Rural Island of Sant’Erasmo</u>

NRM	99.2001	<i>Frédéric BROCHIER, Carlo GIUPPONI and Julie SORS: <u>Integrated Coastal Management in the Venice Area – Potentials of the Integrated Participatory Management Approach</u></i>
NRM	100.2001	<i>Frédéric BROCHIER and Carlo GIUPPONI: <u>Integrated Coastal Zone Management in the Venice Area – A Methodological Framework</u></i>
PRIV	101.2001	<i>Enrico C. PEROTTI and Luc LAEVEN: <u>Confidence Building in Emerging Stock Markets</u></i>
CLIM	102.2001	<i>Barbara BUCHNER, Carlo CARRARO and Igor CERSOSIMO: <u>On the Consequences of the U.S. Withdrawal from the Kyoto/Bonn Protocol</u></i>
SUST	103.2001	<i>Riccardo SCARPA, Adam DRUCKER, Simon ANDERSON, Nancy FERRAES-EHUAN, Veronica GOMEZ, Carlos R. RISOPATRON and Olga RUBIO-LEONEL: <u>Valuing Animal Genetic Resources in Peasant Economies: The Case of the Box Keken Creole Pig in Yucatan</u></i>
SUST	104.2001	<i>R. SCARPA, P. KRISTJANSON, A. DRUCKER, M. RADENY, E.S.K. RUTO, and J.E.O. REGE: <u>Valuing Indigenous Cattle Breeds in Kenya: An Empirical Comparison of Stated and Revealed Preference Value Estimates</u></i>
SUST	105.2001	<i>Clemens B.A. WOLLNY: <u>The Need to Conserve Farm Animal Genetic Resources Through Community-Based Management in Africa: Should Policy Makers be Concerned?</u></i>
SUST	106.2001	<i>J.T. KARUGIA, O.A. MWAI, R. KAITHO, Adam G. DRUCKER, C.B.A. WOLLNY and J.E.O. REGE: <u>Economic Analysis of Crossbreeding Programmes in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Conceptual Framework and Kenyan Case Study</u></i>
SUST	107.2001	<i>W. AYALEW, J.M. KING, E. BRUNS and B. RISCHKOWSKY: <u>Economic Evaluation of Smallholder Subsistence Livestock Production: Lessons from an Ethiopian Goat Development Program</u></i>
SUST	108.2001	<i>Gianni CICIA, Elisabetta D'ERCOLE and Davide MARINO: <u>Valuing Farm Animal Genetic Resources by Means of Contingent Valuation and a Bio-Economic Model: The Case of the Pentro Horse</u></i>
SUST	109.2001	<i>Clem TISDELL: <u>Socioeconomic Causes of Loss of Animal Genetic Diversity: Analysis and Assessment</u></i>
SUST	110.2001	<i>M.A. JABBAR and M.L. DIEDHOU: <u>Does Breed Matter to Cattle Farmers and Buyers? Evidence from West Africa</u></i>
SUST	1.2002	<i>K. TANO, M.D. FAMINOW, M. KAMUANGA and B. SWALLOW: <u>Using Conjoint Analysis to Estimate Farmers' Preferences for Cattle Traits in West Africa</u></i>
ETA	2.2002	<i>Efrem CASTELNUOVO and Paolo SURICO: <u>What Does Monetary Policy Reveal about Central Bank's Preferences?</u></i>
WAT	3.2002	<i>Duncan KNOWLER and Edward BARBIER: <u>The Economics of a "Mixed Blessing" Effect: A Case Study of the Black Sea</u></i>
CLIM	4.2002	<i>Andreas LÖSCHEL: <u>Technological Change in Economic Models of Environmental Policy: A Survey</u></i>
VOL	5.2002	<i>Carlo CARRARO and Carmen MARCHIORI: <u>Stable Coalitions</u></i>
CLIM	6.2002	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI, Alessandro LANZA and Matteo MANERA: <u>Rockets and Feathers Revisited: An International Comparison on European Gasoline Markets</u></i>
ETA	7.2002	<i>Effrosyni DIAMANTOUDI and Eftichios S. SARTZETAKIS: <u>Stable International Environmental Agreements: An Analytical Approach</u></i>
KNOW	8.2002	<i>Alain DESDOIGTS: <u>Neoclassical Convergence Versus Technological Catch-up: A Contribution for Reaching a Consensus</u></i>
NRM	9.2002	<i>Giuseppe DI VITA: <u>Renewable Resources and Waste Recycling</u></i>
KNOW	10.2002	<i>Giorgio BRUNELLO: <u>Is Training More Frequent when Wage Compression is Higher? Evidence from 11 European Countries</u></i>
ETA	11.2002	<i>Mordecai KURZ, Hehui JIN and Maurizio MOTOLESE: <u>Endogenous Fluctuations and the Role of Monetary Policy</u></i>
KNOW	12.2002	<i>Reyer GERLAGH and Marjan W. HOFKES: <u>Escaping Lock-in: The Scope for a Transition towards Sustainable Growth?</u></i>
NRM	13.2002	<i>Michele MORETTO and Paolo ROSATO: <u>The Use of Common Property Resources: A Dynamic Model</u></i>
CLIM	14.2002	<i>Philippe QUIRION: <u>Macroeconomic Effects of an Energy Saving Policy in the Public Sector</u></i>
CLIM	15.2002	<i>Roberto ROSON: <u>Dynamic and Distributional Effects of Environmental Revenue Recycling Schemes: Simulations with a General Equilibrium Model of the Italian Economy</u></i>
CLIM	16.2002	<i>Francesco RICCI (I): <u>Environmental Policy Growth when Inputs are Differentiated in Pollution Intensity</u></i>
ETA	17.2002	<i>Alberto PETRUCCI: <u>Devaluation (Levels versus Rates) and Balance of Payments in a Cash-in-Advance Economy</u></i>

- (xlii) This paper was presented at the International Workshop on "Climate Change and Mediterranean Coastal Systems: Regional Scenarios and Vulnerability Assessment" organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei in co-operation with the Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, Venice, December 9-10, 1999.
- (xliii) This paper was presented at the International Workshop on "Voluntary Approaches, Competition and Competitiveness" organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei within the research activities of the CAVA Network, Milan, May 25-26, 2000.
- (xliv) This paper was presented at the International Workshop on "Green National Accounting in Europe: Comparison of Methods and Experiences" organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei within the Concerted Action of Environmental Valuation in Europe (EVE), Milan, March 4-7, 2000
- (xlv) This paper was presented at the International Workshop on "New Ports and Urban and Regional Development. The Dynamics of Sustainability" organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice, May 5-6, 2000.
- (xlvii) This paper was presented at the Sixth Meeting of the Coalition Theory Network organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and the CORE, Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium, January 26-27, 2001
- (xlviii) This paper was presented at the RICAMARE Workshop "Socioeconomic Assessments of Climate Change in the Mediterranean: Impact, Adaptation and Mitigation Co-benefits", organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan, February 9-10, 2001
- (xlviii) This paper was presented at the International Workshop "Trade and the Environment in the Perspective of the EU Enlargement", organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan, May 17-18, 2001
- (xlix) This paper was presented at the International Conference "Knowledge as an Economic Good", organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and The Beijer International Institute of Environmental Economics, Palermo, April 20-21, 2001
- (l) This paper was presented at the Workshop "Growth, Environmental Policies and Sustainability" organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice, June 1, 2001
- (li) This paper was presented at the Fourth Toulouse Conference on Environment and Resource Economics on "Property Rights, Institutions and Management of Environmental and Natural Resources", organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, IDEI and INRA and sponsored by MATE, Toulouse, May 3-4, 2001
- (lii) This paper was presented at the International Conference on "Economic Valuation of Environmental Goods", organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei in cooperation with CORILA, Venice, May 11, 2001
- (liii) This paper was circulated at the International Conference on "Climate Policy – Do We Need a New Approach?", jointly organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Stanford University and Venice International University, Isola di San Servolo, Venice, September 6-8, 2001

2002 SERIES

MGMT	<i>Corporate Sustainable Management</i> (Editor: Andrea Marsanich)
CLIM	<i>Climate Change Modelling and Policy</i> (Editor: Marzio Galeotti)
PRIV	<i>Privatisation, Antitrust, Regulation</i> (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)
KNOW	<i>Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital</i> (Editor: Dino Pinelli)
NRM	<i>Natural Resources Management</i> (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)
SUST	<i>Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Evaluation</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
VOL	<i>Voluntary and International Agreements</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
ETA	<i>Economic Theory and Applications</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)