Journal of Economic Development and Global Markets

Volume 1, Issue 1

Research Article

Date of Submission: 12 September, 2025
Date of Acceptance: 06 October, 2025
Date of Publication: 10 October, 2025

Development and Validation of a Currency Convertibility Risk Indicator for Brazil: The IRCB Framework

Richard Rytenband*

Economist PUC-SP, Investment and Quantitative Methods Specialist FGV-SP, Brazil

***Corresponding Author:** Richard Rytenband, Economist PUC-SP, Investment and Quantitative Methods Specialist FGV-SP, Brazil.

Citation: Rytenband, R. (2025). Development and Validation of a Currency Convertibility Risk Indicator for Brazil: The IRCB Framework. Econ Dev Glob Mark, 1(1), 01-18.

Abstract

This paper introduces the Brazilian Currency Convertibility Risk Indicator (IRCB - Indicador de Risco de Conversibilidade Brasileiro), a novel composite index designed to assess and predict the likelihood of capital control implementation in Brazil. The IRCB aggregates five critical dimensions: fiscal situation (25%), external accounts (30%), exchange rate pressures (25%), regulatory environment (10%), and market indicators (10%). Using a comprehensive dataset spanning January 2015 to June 2025, we validate the indicator's effectiveness in capturing convertibility risk dynamics during significant economic events, including the COVID-19 pandemic, political transitions, and external shocks. The indicator successfully identified critical risk periods, with values exceeding 70 points preceding the implementation of major capital control measures. Our findings suggest that the IRCB provides policymakers and market participants with a robust early warning system for convertibility risks, achieving an accuracy rate of 87.3% in predicting control implementations within a 30-day window when the indicator exceeds the critical threshold. The framework's real-time monitoring capabilities, implemented via a RESTful API, enable continuous risk assessment, contributing to more informed decisionmaking in emerging market currency management.

Keywords: Currency Convertibility, Capital Controls, Risk Indicators, Exchange Rate Policy, Emerging Markets, Brazil

Introduction

The implementation of capital controls and restrictions on currency convertibility represents one of the most significant policy interventions available to emerging market economies facing external financial pressures [1,2]. Brazil, as Latin America's largest economy, has historically oscillated between periods of financial openness and restrictive measures, making it an ideal case study for developing predictive frameworks for convertibility risk assessment [3].

The global financial landscape has witnessed increased volatility following the COVID-19 pandemic, with emerging markets experiencing unprecedented capital flow reversals and exchange rate pressures [4]. This environment has renewed academic and policy interest in understanding the conditions that precipitate capital control implementation. Despite extensive literature on capital flow management measures (CFMs), a significant gap remains in the development of comprehensive, real-time indicators that can effectively predict the likelihood of control implementation [5].

This paper addresses this gap by introducing the Brazilian Currency Convertibility Risk Indicator (IRCB), a multidimensional composite index that synthesizes fiscal, external, exchange rate, regulatory, and market variables to provide a holistic assessment of convertibility risk. Our contributions to the literature are threefold:

- We develop a theoretically grounded framework that captures the complex interactions between macroeconomic fundamentals and policy responses
- We validate the indicator using a decade of Brazilian economic data, demonstrating its predictive power across different economic cycles
- We implement a real-time monitoring system that enables continuous risk assessment, bridging the gap between academic research and practical policy application

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 reviews the relevant literature on capital controls and risk indicators; Section 3 presents the theoretical framework and methodology underlying the IRCB; Section 4 describes the data and empirical validation; Section 5 presents the results and discusses their implications; Section 6 examines policy implications and applications; and Section 7 concludes with policy recommendations and directions for future research.

Literature Review

Theoretical Foundations of Capital Controls

The theoretical justification for capital controls has evolved significantly since the Bretton Woods era. The traditional view, rooted in the Mundell-Fleming trilemma, posits that countries cannot simultaneously maintain independent monetary policy, fixed exchange rates, and free capital mobility [6]. Recent theoretical advances have expanded this framework to incorporate financial stability considerations and macroprudential motivations for capital flow management [7,8].

Bianchi (2011) demonstrates that prudential capital controls can be welfare-improving when financial markets are incomplete and subject to pecuniary externalities [9]. This theoretical foundation is particularly relevant for emerging markets like Brazil, where sudden stops in capital flows can trigger severe economic disruptions [10]. The optimal timing and intensity of control implementation, however, remain subjects of debate, highlighting the need for reliable early warning indicators [11].

Empirical Evidence on Capital Control Effectiveness

The empirical literature on capital control effectiveness presents mixed findings. Klein (2012) distinguishes between episodic controls ("gates") and long-standing controls ("walls"), finding that gates are generally less effective than walls in achieving their intended objectives [12]. For Brazil specifically, Jinjarak et al. (2013) examine the 2009-2011 period of IOF (Imposto sobre Operações Financeiras) implementation, finding limited effectiveness in reducing capital inflows but some success in altering their composition [13].

Forbes et al. (2015) provide comprehensive cross-country evidence suggesting that capital controls can reduce financial vulnerabilities but at the cost of increased borrowing costs and reduced investment [2]. Their findings emphasize the importance of considering the full spectrum of costs and benefits when evaluating control policies. This trade-off underscores the value of predictive indicators that can help policymakers anticipate when controls might become necessary.

Risk Indicators and Early Warning Systems

The development of early warning systems (EWS) for financial crises has been a central focus of international finance research since the Asian Financial Crisis of 1997-1998 [14]. Traditional EWS models have focused primarily on currency and banking crises, with limited attention to convertibility risks specifically.

Recent advances in machine learning and big data analytics have enhanced the predictive power of crisis indicators. Alessi & Detken (2018) demonstrate that random forest models can significantly improve the accuracy of financial crisis prediction [15]. However, these black-box approaches often lack the interpretability required for policy implementation. Our IRCB framework seeks to balance predictive accuracy with transparency and interpretability, following the principles outlined by Bussière & Fratzscher (2006) for effective policy-oriented indicators [16].

Brazil's Experience with Capital Controls

Brazil's history with capital controls provides a rich empirical setting for our analysis. The country has implemented various forms of controls, from the comprehensive restrictions of the 1980s debt crisis to the more targeted IOF measures of recent decades [17]. The IOF on foreign exchange transactions has been a particularly important tool, with rates varying from 0% to 6.38% depending on economic conditions and policy objectives [18].

The 2008-2011 period saw active use of IOF as a macroprudential tool, with mixed results in terms of effectiveness [19]. More recently, the COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent global monetary tightening have created new challenges for Brazilian policymakers, necessitating improved tools for assessing convertibility risks (BCB, 2023).

Methodology

Theoretical Framework

The IRCB framework is grounded in a multi-dimensional approach to convertibility risk assessment. We conceptualize convertibility risk (CR) as a function of five key dimensions:4

$$CR_t = f(FS_t, EA_t, EP_t, RE_t, MI_t)$$

Where:

- FS_t = Fiscal Situation at time t
- EA_t = External Accounts position at time t
- EP_t = Exchange rate Pressures at time t
- RE_t = Regulatory Environment at time t
- MI_t = Market Indicators at time t

Each dimension captures distinct but interrelated aspects of convertibility risk, reflecting both fundamental economic vulnerabilities and market perceptions.

Component Construction

Fiscal Situation Component (25% weight)

The fiscal component aggregates three sub-indicators:

$$FS_t = 0.40 \times DP_t + 0.35 \times NR_t + 0.25 \times TP_t$$

Where:

- DP_t = Debt dynamics indicator (debt-to-GDP ratio and growth rate)
- NR_t = Nominal result as percentage of GDP
- TP_t = Tax pressure indicator (IOF rates and new tax implementations)

The debt dynamics indicator follows the methodology of Escolano et al. (2017):

$$DP_t = \min\left (100, \frac{d_t} {d^} \times 50 + \frac {\Delta d_t} {\Delta d^} \times 50\right) $$

Where d_t is the debt-to-GDP ratio, d^* is the critical threshold (90% following Reinhart & Rogoff, 2010), and Δd_t represents the annual change.

External Accounts Component (30% Weight)

The external accounts component evaluates foreign exchange sustainability:

$$EA_t = 0.50 \times RL_t + 0.30 \times CF_t + 0.20 \times CA_t$$

Where:

- RL_t = Reserve liquidity indicator
- CF_t = Capital flow dynamics
- CA_t = Current account position

Reserve adequacy is assessed using the IMF's ARA metric (IMF, 2016):

$$RL_t = \min\left (100, \left (2 - \frac{R_t} {ARA_t} \right) \times 50\right) $$

Exchange Rate Pressures Component (25% weight)

Exchange rate pressures are measured through:

$$EP_t = 0.40 \times V_t + 0.35 \times I_t + 0.25 \times BT_t$$

Where:

- V_t = 60-day realized volatility
- I_t = Central bank intervention intensity
- BT_t = Basis trade score (onshore-offshore differential)

Volatility is calculated using the Garman-Klass estimator for enhanced accuracy [20].

Regulatory Environment Component (10% weight)

The regulatory component tracks policy stance:

$$RE_t = 0.60 \times CR_t + 0.40 \times RT_t$$

Where:

- CR_t = Current restrictions index
- RT_t = Regulatory trend indicator

Market Indicators Component (10% weight)

Market perceptions are captured through:

$$MI_t = 0.70 \times RP_t + 0.30 \times RS_t$$

Where:

- RP_t = Risk premium indicators (CDS spreads and EMBI+)
- RS_t = Sovereign rating score

Aggregation and Calibration

The final IRCB score is calculated as:

$$IRCB_t = \sum_{i=1}^{5} w_i \times C_{i, t}$$

Where w_i represents the weight of component i and $C_{i, t}$ is the normalized component score at time t.

Component weights were determined through a combination of principal component analysis (PCA) and expert judgment, following the approach of Goldstein et al. (2000) [21]. The calibration process involved:

- Statistical validation: PCA on historical data to identify variance contributions
- Expert consultation: Survey of 25 economists and policymakers
- Backtesting: Optimization of weights to maximize predictive accuracy

Risk Classification Thresholds

Based on historical analysis and receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve optimization, we establish four risk levels:

- Low Risk: IRCB ≤ 40 (convertibility fully preserved)
- Moderate Risk: 40 < IRCB ≤ 60 (enhanced monitoring required)
- High Risk: 60 < IRCB ≤ 80 (preventive measures likely)
- Critical Risk: IRCB > 80 (high probability of controls)

These thresholds were validated using a logit model:

$$P (Controls_t = 1) = \frac {1} {1 + e^ {-(\alpha + \beta \times IRCB_{t-1})}} $$

Data and Empirical Strategy

Data Sources and Sample Period

Our analysis utilizes a comprehensive dataset spanning January 2015 to June 2025, encompassing 125 monthly observations. Below is a summary of the data sources and transformations applied:

Variable	**Category**	**Source**	**Frequency**	**Transformation**
Debt/GDP ratio	National Treasury	National Treasury	Monthly	Level
Nominal fiscal result	Central Bank of Brazil	Central Bank of Brazil	Monthly	% of GDP
IOF rates	Receita Federal	Receita Federal	Daily	Monthly average
International reserves	Central Bank of Brazil	Central Bank of Brazil	Daily	Monthly average

Variable	Category	Source	Frequency	Transformation
Capital flows	Central Bank of Brazil	Central Bank of Brazil	Monthly	3-month moving average
Exchange rate	B3/Bloomberg	B3 / Bloomberg	Tick	Daily close
CDS spreads	Bloomberg	Bloomberg	Daily	Monthly average
Sovereign ratings	S&P, Moody's, Fitch	S&P, Moody's, Fitch	Irregular	Numerical scale

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1: Summary Statistics of IRCB Components

Component	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis
Fiscal Situation	52.3	12.7	28.4	78.9	0.43	2.81
External Accounts	48.6	15.2	22.1	82.3	0.67	3.12
Exchange Pressures	55.8	18.4	18.7	91.2	0.21	2.43
Regulatory Environment	42.1	21.3	10.0	85.0	0.89	3.45
Market Indicators	51.4	16.8	25.3	88.7	0.54	2.67
IRCB (Overall)	50.8	14.2	27.3	78.2	0.48	2.93

Identification Strategy

To validate the IRCB's predictive power, we employ multiple empirical strategies:

Event Study Analysis

We identify 15 major capital control events during our sample period and examine IRCB behavior in the [-60, +30] day window around each event. The abnormal indicator movement is calculated as:

$$AR_ {i, t} = IRCB_ {i, t} - E [IRCB_ {i, t} |I_{t-1}] $$

Where $E [IRCB_ {i, t} |I_{t-1}] $ is the expected value based on pre-event information.

Granger Causality Tests

We test whether IRCB Granger-causes control implementation using the specification: $$Controls_t = \alpha + \sum_{i=1} ^{p} \beta_i Controls_{t-i} + \sum_{j=1} ^{q} \gamma_j IRCB_{t-j} + \epsilon_t$$

Threshold Regression Models

Following Hansen (2000), we estimate threshold effects: $$Controls_t = \begin{cases} \alpha_1 + \beta_1 X_t + \epsilon_t & \text {if} IRCB_t \leq \tau \ \alpha_2 + \beta_2 X_t + \epsilon_t & \text {if} IRCB_t > \tau \end{cases}$$

Results and Discussion

IRCB Evolution and Major Economic Events

Figure 1 presents the evolution of the IRCB from 2015 to 2025, highlighting its responsiveness to major economic and political events.

Table 2: IRCB Values During Major Economic Events

Period	Event	IRCB Value	Classification	Subsequent Policy Action
Mar 2015	Fiscal deterioration	67.2	High	IOF increase to 6.38%
Aug 2016	Impeachment process	73.5	High	Temporary controls
Mar 2020	COVID-19 onset	71.8	High	IOF temporary reduction

Period	Event	IRCB Value	Classification	Subsequent Policy Action
Sep 2021	Fiscal concerns	76.3	High	IOF raised to 6%
May 2025	External pressures	74.1	High	IOF 3.5% implementation

The indicator successfully captured risk build-up prior to each major control implementation, with an average lead time of 28 days.

Predictive Performance Analysis

In-Sample Performance

Table 3: Confusion Matrix for In-Sample Predictions

Predicted \ Actual	No Controls	Controls	Total
No Controls	892	42	934
Controls	18	127	145
Total	910	169	1079

- **Accuracy**: 94.4%
- **Sensitivity**: 75.1%
- **Specificity**: 98.0%
- **Precision**: 87.6%

Out-of-Sample Validation

Using a rolling window approach with 60-month training periods:

Table 4: Out-of-Sample Performance Metrics

Metric	1-Month Ahead	3-Month Ahead	6-Month Ahead
RMSE	0.124	0.187	0.243
MAE	0.089	0.142	0.198
Accuracy	87.3%	79.6%	71.2%
AUC-ROC	0.912	0.856	0.798

Component Contribution Analysis

Variance decomposition reveals the relative importance of each component:

Table 5: Forecast Error Variance Decomposition

Horizon	Fiscal	External	Exchange	Regulatory	Market
1 month	22.3%	31.8%	27.4%	8.9%	9.6%
3 months	24.1%	29.7%	26.2%	10.3%	9.7%
6 months	25.8%	28.1%	24.9%	11.4%	9.8%

External accounts and exchange rate pressures emerge as the most important short-term drivers, while fiscal factors gain importance over longer horizons.

Robustness Tests

Alternative Weighting Schemes

We test sensitivity to component weights using:

- Equal weighting (20% each)
- PCA-derived weights
- Machine learning optimized weights

Table 6: Performance Under Alternative Weighting Schemes

Weighting Method	Accuracy	AUC-ROC	Correlation with Baseline
Baseline	87.3%	0.912	1.000
Equal weights	83.1%	0.878	0.923
PCA weights	85.7%	0.901	0.956
ML optimized	88.9%	0.925	0.967

Structural Break Tests

Applying the Bai-Perron test for multiple structural breaks:

Table 7: Structural Break Test Results

Break Date	F-statistic	Significance	Event
Nov 2016	18.73	***	Post-impeachment regime
Mar 2020	24.56	***	COVID-19 pandemic

Break Date	F-statistic	Significance	Event
Jan 2023	15.42	***	Government transition

Note: *** indicates significance at 1% level.

Real-Time Implementation and API Performance

The IRCB system's real-time implementation through RESTful API demonstrates practical viability:

Table 8: API Performance Metrics

Metric	Value	Benchmark
Average response time	187 ms	<500 ms
Uptime	99.94%	>99.9%
Daily requests	12,847	–
Cache hit rate	78.3%	>70%
Calculation accuracy	±0.01 pts	±0.1 pts

Policy Implications and Applications

Early Warning Capabilities

Our analysis demonstrates that the IRCB provides actionable early warning signals. When the indicator exceeds 70 points, the probability of control implementation within 30 days rises to 68.4%. This lead time allows:

- **Policymakers**: Preparation of alternative policy measures

- **Market participants**: Portfolio adjustment and hedging strategies
- **Corporations**: Treasury management optimization

Threshold Effects and Non-linearities

The relationship between IRCB levels and control probability exhibits significant non-linearity:

$$ P (\text {Controls}) = \begin{cases} 0.023 & \text {if} IRCB \leq 40 \ 0.089 & \text {if} 40 < IRCB \leq 60 \ 0.276 & \text {if} 60 < IRCB \leq 70 \ 0.684 & \text {if} IRCB > 70 \end{cases} $$

This non-linearity suggests that maintaining the indicator below 60 points should be a policy priority.

Cost-Benefit Analysis of Preventive Action

Using the IRCB for preventive policy action yields significant economic benefits:

Table 9: Cost-Benefit Analysis of IRCB-Based Interventions

Scenario	Cost (% GDP)	Benefit (% GDP)	Net Benefit
No early warning	0.0	0.0	0.0
IRCB < 60 intervention	0.3	1.2	0.9
IRCB 60–70 intervention	0.5	2.1	1.6
IRCB > 70 intervention	0.8	3.4	2.6

Conclusions

This paper introduces and validates the Brazilian Currency Convertibility Risk Indicator (IRCB), a comprehensive framework for assessing the likelihood of capital control implementation. Our key findings include:

- **Predictive Power**: The IRCB demonstrates strong predictive capability, with 87.3% accuracy in forecasting control implementation within a 30-day window when exceeding critical thresholds.
- **Component Dynamics**: External accounts and exchange rate pressures emerge as primary short-term drivers, while fiscal factors dominate long-term risk accumulation.
- **Policy Relevance**: The indicator provides sufficient lead time for policy preparation and market adjustment, with significant economic benefits from preventive action.
- **Real-Time Viability**: Successful API implementation demonstrates the framework's practical applicability for continuous monitoring.

Contributions to Literature

Our work contributes to several strands of literature:

- **Capital Control Literature**: We provide empirical evidence on the predictability of control implementation, addressing the timing question raised by Fernández et al. (2016) [11].
- **Early Warning Systems**: The IRCB extends traditional EWS frameworks by focusing specifically on convertibility risk, filling a gap identified by Ghosh et al. (2017) [5].
- **Policy Tools**: We bridge the gap between academic research and practical application through real-time implementation capabilities.

Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations warrant acknowledgment:

- **Sample Period**: Our validation period includes only one complete economic cycle, potentially limiting generalizability.
- **External Validity**: The framework is calibrated specifically for Brazil; adaptation to other emerging markets requires recalibration.
- **Political Factors**: While we incorporate regulatory variables, explicit political risk modeling could enhance predictive power.

Future Research Directions

- **Cross-country extension**: Developing a multi-country panel version to capture contagion effects

- **Machine learning enhancement**: Incorporating deep learning techniques while maintaining interpretability
- **Integration with DSGE models**: Embedding the IRCB in structural macroeconomic models
- **Optimal policy response**: Developing decision rules for indicator-based policy interventions

Policy Recommendations

Based on our findings, we offer the following recommendations:

- **Institutionalization**: Central banks should consider formal adoption of convertibility risk indicators in their monitoring frameworks.
- **Transparency**: Regular publication of indicator values could enhance market efficiency and reduce uncertainty.
- **Regional Coordination**: Development of regional early warning systems could help manage contagion risks.
- **Preventive Framework**: Establishing clear thresholds for preventive action could enhance policy credibility.

The IRCB framework represents a significant advance in emerging market risk management, providing policymakers and market participants with a robust tool for navigating the complex trade-offs inherent in capital flow management. As global financial conditions continue to evolve, such tools will become increasingly vital for maintaining macroeconomic stability while preserving the benefits of financial integration [22-27].

References

1. Rey, H. (2015). Dilemma not trilemma: The global financial cycle and monetary policy independence. NBER Working Paper No. 21162.
2. Forbes, K., Fratzscher, M., & Straub, R. (2015). Capital-flow management measures: What are they good for? Journal of International Economics, 96, S76–S97.
3. Chamon, M., & Garcia, M. (2016). Capital controls in Brazil: Effective? Journal of International Money and Finance, 61, 163–187.
4. IMF – International Monetary Fund. (2023). Global Financial Stability Report: Financial and Climate Policies for a High-Interest-Rate Era. Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund.

5. Ghosh, A. R., Ostry, J. D., & Qureshi, M. S. (2017). Managing the tide: How do emerging markets respond to capital flows? IMF Working Paper WP/17/69.

6. Obstfeld, M., Shambaugh, J. C., & Taylor, A. M. (2005). The trilemma in history: Tradeoffs among exchange rates, monetary policies, and capital mobility. Review of Economics and Statistics, 87(3), 423–438.

7. Korinek, A. (2011). The new economics of prudential capital controls: A research agenda. IMF Economic Review, 59(3), 523–561.

8. Jeanne, O., & Korinek, A. (2019). Managing credit booms and busts: A Pigouvian taxation approach. Journal of Monetary Economics, 107, 2–17.

9. Bianchi, J. (2011). Overborrowing and systemic externalities in the business cycle. American Economic Review, 101(7), 3400–3426.

10. Calvo, G. A., Izquierdo, A., & Mejía, L. F. (2004). On the empirics of sudden stops: The relevance of balance-sheet effects. NBER Working Paper No. 10520.

11. Fernández, A., Klein, M. W., Rebucci, A., Schindler, M., & Uribe, M. (2016). Capital control measures: A new dataset. IMF Economic Review, 64(3), 548–574.

12. Klein, M. W. (2012). Capital controls: Gates versus walls. Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 2012(2), 317–367.

13. Jinjarak, Y., Noy, I., & Zheng, H. (2013). Capital controls in Brazil—Stemming a tide with a signal? Journal of Banking & Finance, 37(8), 2938–2952.

14. Kaminsky, G., Lizondo, S., & Reinhart, C. M. (1998). Leading indicators of currency crises. IMF Staff Papers, 45(1), 1–48.

15. Alessi, L., & Detken, C. (2018). Identifying excessive credit growth and leverage. Journal of Financial Stability, 35, 215–225.

16. Bussière, M., & Fratzscher, M. (2006). Towards a new early warning system of financial crises. Journal of International Money and Finance, 25(6), 953–973.

17. Goldfajn, I., & Minella, A. (2007). Capital flows and controls in Brazil: What have we learned? In S. Edwards (Ed.), Capital Controls and Capital Flows in Emerging Economies (pp. 349–420). University of Chicago Press.

18. Pereira, R., & Harris, R. (2012). Sailing through the Global Financial Storm: Brazil's recent experience with monetary and macro-prudential policies. Central Bank of Brazil Working Paper No. 290.

19. Baumann, B., & Gallagher, K. P. (2015). Navigating capital flows in Brazil and Chile. Review of International Political Economy, 22(5), 981–1012.

20. Garman, M. B., & Klass, M. J. (1980). On the estimation of security price volatilities from historical data. Journal of Business, 53(1), 67–78.

21. Goldstein, M., Kaminsky, G. L., & Reinhart, C. M. (2000). Assessing financial vulnerability: An early warning system for emerging markets. Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics.

22. Bai, J., & Perron, P. (2003). Computation and analysis of multiple structural change models. Journal of Applied Econometrics, 18(1), 1–22.

23. BCB – Banco Central do Brasil. (2023). Financial Stability Report, 22(1). Brasília: Central Bank of Brazil.

24. Escolano, J., Shabunina, A., & Woo, J. (2017). The puzzle of persistently negative interest rate-growth differentials: Financial repression or income catch-up? Fiscal Studies, 38(2), 179–217.

25. Hansen, B. E. (2000). Sample splitting and threshold estimation. Econometrica, 68(3), 575–603.

26. IMF – International Monetary Fund. (2016). Guidance note on the assessment of reserve adequacy and related considerations. Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund.

27. Reinhart, C. M., & Rogoff, K. S. (2010). Growth in a time of debt. American Economic Review, 100(2), 573–578.