Comments on Mitchener and

Voth's "Trading Silver for Gold"

Andrew K. Rose

UC Berkeley CEPR and NBER

Quick Summary

- Examination of pre-WWI exports using gravity model
 - a. Finding: Gold (not silver) boosts exports a lot
 - i. Claim: monetary regimes plausibly exogenous for colonies
 - ii. Why then delay adopting gold?
- 2. Political Economy Explanation
 - a. Exporters engineered "lock-in"

Three Issues

- 1. Is gravity model mis-specified?
 - a. Yes, but doesn't matter
- 2. Is there a "delay" issue?
 - a. Yes, but not explained here
- 3. Is silver standard a currency union?
 - a. No, but result still interesting

Issue #1: Gravity Model

- Problem: don't have GDP data (serious?!)
 - Solution: control only for population
 - oReasonable? Yes!
- Consider post-WWII data
 - Standard gravity model for log bilateral exports
 1950-2006, 196 countries, .5 million observations
 - Controls: log(distance); log(population product);
 common language/RTA/border; islands; land area;
 colonial history, time effects
 - Olnterest: currency union dummy

Currency Union Coefficient, Bilateral Export Model

	With GDP	Without GDP
Pooled	.45	.42
	(.11)	(.14)
Dyadic (Pair)	.61	.79
	(.09)	(.09)
Country-Specific	.81	.82
	(.10)	(.09)

Dropping real GDP product makes no difference!

Issue #2: Should we worry about why countries delayed adopting gold?

- Gold stimulated exports (trade?) more than silver
- Why didn't Asians adopt gold faster: a serious issue
 - Answer given is "lock-in" effects from political influence of exporters
 - oReally? Big possible trade gains!
 - Table 2: both GS effects>both silver effects
 - Ditto Tables 3,4, (all 4 silver effects negative!)
 - Table 5: GS>Silver for ¾ (and both FE)

Evidence seems Unconvincing

• Ex: Eiichi Shibusawa:

".. the price of exports has fallen while the price of imports has risen. This has promoted the development of industries, technical progress, and growth ... these benefits exceed the costs of being a silver standard country."

• Induced terms of trade decline described favorably!

Why don't potential exporters count?
 Especially if silver effects actually negative!

Issue #3: Is the Silver Standard a Currency Union?

- If gold standard is a fixed exchange rate, why isn't silver standard?
 - Might make results more interesting (but less relevant for this conference/project)
- Authors argue "coins from different countries circulated freely side-by-side through East Asia."
 Seems to be a stretch!

SILVER MONEY

By
Dickson H. Leavens



Principia Press, Inc. Bloomington, Indiana 1939

S	PREWAR COUNTRY	COIN	S	RATIO	S	POSTWAR COUNTRY COIN	S' CENT
						GERMANY MARK, ETC	$\overline{}$
					├─		
					-130-		
130-			280-		7130-		-280
			200			ESTONIA 2-KROON-	
					ļ	HTALY 20-LIRE-	┪
_					├	L-UNITED KINGDOM SHILLING, ETC H-RUMANIA 100-LEU-	₹
120-			260-		-120-	TO MANAGEMENT	-260
						1	
							\perp
!							<u> </u>
110-			240-		110-	SWITZERLAND 5-FRANC-	-24
					 		Έ.
\dashv						LITHUANIA LITAS. ETC	┧
						BULGARIA 100-LEV. ETC	
100			-220-		100-		-220
						! 1	ļ
-			<u> </u>			L~POLAND 10-ZLOTY. ETC.~ ↑~ STRAITS SETTLEMENTS DOLLAR~	
[-10-		T STRAITS SETTLEMENTS DOLLAR	·
			-200-		<u> </u>		-200
-90-					-90-	- ITALY 10-LIRE, ETC	┨
			<u> </u>				
			<u> </u>				
			-180-			FRANCE 20-FRANCH F-IRISH FREE STATE SHILLING, ETC	<u>√</u> –180
-30					-80-	NETHERLANDS FLORIN, ETC.	<u>_</u> ا_
i			<u> </u>			LINETHERLANDS INDIES FLORIN, EIC.	⁄⊹—
			<u> </u>			HUNGARY PENGÖ, ETC.	´
			-160-				-160
-70-					70-		
	- GERMANY	MARK. ETC.	┝			LATVIA LAT. ETC.	,
	j-united kingdom s France, etc.	HILLING, ETC. — SUBSIDIARY —	ļ		├	CALBANIA SUBSIDIARY - L-GREECE 20-DRACHMA-	
	- UNITED STATES	SUBSIDIARY ~	140	15	\vdash	UNITED STATES SUBSIDIARY-	
	- FRANCE, ETC.	5-FRANC			<u> </u>	/ ALBANIA 5-FRANC -	<u> </u>
-60-	NETHERLANDS	FLORIN. ETC.			-60-	CZECHOSLOVAKIA 10-KORUNA, ETC	7-
	NETHERLANDS INDIES UNITED STATES	FLORIN, ETC.	-			UNITED STATES DOLLAR- MEXICO PESO-	
	- UNITED STATES	DOLLAR *	-120-				-120
		_				AUSTRIA SCHILLING, ETC	╁╼
~~ .	STRAITS SETTLEMENTS	SUBSIDIARY ~_			50-	STRAITS SETTLEMENTS SUBSIDIARY— RUPEE— RUPEE—	ֈ—
	PHILIPPINES PHILIPPINES	SUBSIDIARY— PESO n		-20		-PHILIPPINES SUBSIDIARY-]
	STRAITS SETTLEMENTS	DOLLAR J	-100-			SIAM BAHT-	<u> </u>
	-JAPAN	SUBSIDIARY 7				PHILIPPINES PESO-	-
-40- [[]	-BRITISH INDIA	RUPEE			-40-		-
<u> </u>	-SIAM	TICAL-		-25-			\vdash
<u> </u> ,	- MEXICO	SUBSIDIARY ~	-80-				-80
		EFORE 1907~					—
		SEFORE 1907 -				INDO-CHINA PIASTRE	ֈ
		EFORE 1907			-30-	· mane	\vdash
	MEXICO PESO E	BEFORE 1907	-60				-60-
			-				\vdash
				-	\longrightarrow		-
-20				-50-	-20-		\vdash
\dashv		ł	-40-	-50-	{		40
		Ì			\dashv		\vdash
		ŀ	\dashv				
-10		j			-10-		-
		ļ	-20-	100-			-20-
\dashv		ļ					-
		ŀ		200	\dashv		-
		ŀ		1		•	1

CHART 3.—COINAGE RATIOS AND BULLION PARITIES OF SILVER COINS

SILVER MONEY

TABLE G—(continued)
PREWAR COINAGE RATIOS AND BULLION PARITIES OF SILVER COINS

	MONETARY	UNIT	BASIS OF SILVER COINAGE		
	Par value		l 	Bullion	Parity
COUNTRY	Name	in pre-1934 U.S. cents 0.2322 grains fine gold	Coinage Ratio	Cents per oz., 0.999 fine	Pence per oz., 0.925 fine
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Denmark Norway Sweden Finland	Crown Crown Crown Markka	} 26.798¢ 19.295	14.88 14.40 14.38* 15.50	138.8¢ 143.4 143.6 133.2	63.4 <i>d</i> . 65.5 65.6 60.8
Germany Netherlands	Mark Florin (guilder)	23.82 40.1 95	13.17 13.95 15.62 15.13*	156.8 148.0 132.2 136.5	71.6 67.6 60.4 62.3
Portugal Russia	Escudo Ruble	108.05 51.455	14.81* 12.84 23.24 11.62	139.4 160.8 88.9 177.7	63.7 73.4 40.6 81.1
United Kingdom	Pound	486.65	14.29	144.5	66.0
Asia India Japan Netherlands Indies	Rupee Yen Florin (guilder)	32.443 49.845 40.20	21.90 21.60 15.62 15.13 14.81	94.3 95.6 132.2 136.5	43.1 43.7 60.4 62.8
Philippine Islands Siam	Peso Tical	50. 37.085	21.27* 19.94* 24.19	139.4 97.1 103.6 85.4	63.7 44.3 47.3 39.0
Straits Set- tlements	Dollar	56.78	21.50 21.30 19.07	96,1 97.0 108.3	43.9 44.3 49.4
Africa and Australasia Australia New Zealand South Africa Egypt Coins in certain countries prior to recoinage in	Pound Pound Pound Pound	486.65 494.30	14.29* 15.69*	144.5 131.6	66.0 60.1
Japan Philippine	Yen	49.845	28.75	71.8	32.8
Islands Straits Set-	Peso	50.	32.25	64.0	29.2
tlements	Dollar	56.78	28.40	72.7	33.2

^{*}Coinage ratio unchanged after World War.

SOURCE

Computed by the writer from weights and finenesses of gold and silver coins given in U. S. Bureau of the Mint, Monetary Systems of the Principal Countries of the World, Washington, 1917.

Is this a Currency Union?

Country	Monetary	In pre-1934	Coinage
	Unit	US cents	Ratio
India	Rupee	32.443	21.90
Japan	Yen	49.845	21.60
Netherlands	Florin	40.20	15.13
Indies			
Philippine	Peso	50.	21.27
Islands			
Siam	Tical	37.085	24.19
Straits	Dollar	56.78	21.30
Settlements			

More from Leavens:

- At least three national Chinese taels existed (Shanghai, Kuping, Haikwan), varying by >10%
 OMany more local currencies!
- pp99-100: "The currency system of China ... if it could be called a system at all, was most complex, and made the country a paradise for the money changer. Leaving out entirely the question of foreign exchange, the exchange of the different domestic currencies was a science in itself. The traveler found that the coins ... of one city were taken only at a discount in the next. Even within a city there were one or more local taels ..."

Currency Unions Did Exist

- In 1863, Mexican silver dollars made legal tender in Hong Kong!
 - Hong Kong dollar created by British to compete
 with Mexican dollar in 1895

Five Suggestions for Future Work

- Exogeneity: even if monetary regime decided by metropole (not colony), does that really enhance exogeneity? Trade is bilateral! Colonizers endogenize colonial preferences.
 - Also, not all ex-colonies dropped currency unionsAlso, non-colonies joined currency unions
- Extensive Margin: handle "zeros" issue of trade creation associated with monetary regime
- "Tetradic" method: alternative to handle "gravitas" problems (Head, Mayer and Ries 2008)

- Trade Diversion vs. Trade Creation
 - OLiterature to date finds currency union members more open to both CU and non-CU members
 - True pre-WWI?
 - oNote: not same as traditional issue, since no foregone tariff revenue (traditional source of welfare loss from asymmetric liberalization)
- Sensitivity: ensure robustness of results (change sample of countries; cross-sectional results, timeaveraged data, ... I did 56 estimates in 1M1M)

Smaller Points

- Figure 1 hard to follow: who's in constant sample?
- Year effects should always be included (Tables 2, 3)
- Robust standard errors?
- Why the PPI as a deflator? (Doesn't matter with year effects)
- Handle measurement error associated with internal transport costs
- Add language/border/land area/island/Metropole-Colony variables to gravity equation

- Table 2 are not usual gravity results: low R², small coefficients on economic mass
- Table 3: is Empire really time-varying?
- Table 4: are country-specific FE exporter/importer/both?
- Tables 4, 5: no Asia-only columns why?
- How many country-pairs are there?
- More information on actual currency arrangements and how they changed over time
- More information on decline in price of silver