

# Open Economy General Equilibrium with Ghosh's M Measure

## Exchange Rate Dynamics and International Transmission

Soumadeep Ghosh

Kolkata, India

### Abstract

This paper extends the general equilibrium framework with Ghosh's M Measure to open economy settings, incorporating exchange rate determination, international trade, and cross-border capital flows. We establish that exchange rate movements create differential impacts on the GDP Deflator and Consumer Price Index, generating dynamics in Ghosh's M that reflect terms of trade fluctuations and external balance conditions. The framework yields novel insights into exchange rate pass-through, the relationship between M differentials and capital flows, and the optimal conduct of monetary policy in open economies. We demonstrate that countries with divergent M trajectories experience systematic exchange rate appreciation or depreciation, and that international M convergence requires coordination of both inflation targets and structural policies affecting the composition of tradable versus non-tradable production.

The paper ends with "The End"

## 1 Introduction

The open economy dimension introduces fundamental complexity into the determination of Ghosh's M Measure. Exchange rate movements affect domestic and foreign price indices asymmetrically because the GDP Deflator incorporates export prices while the Consumer Price Index reflects import prices. This asymmetry creates a direct transmission channel through which external shocks influence M dynamics, and conversely, through which M differentials between countries generate pressures for exchange rate adjustment.

This paper develops a two-country general equilibrium model where each economy produces both tradable and non-tradable goods, engages in international trade, and experiences endogenously determined exchange rates. We establish that the ratio of Ghosh's M Measure between countries serves as a fundamental determinant of real exchange rate dynamics. Countries with rising relative M values experience real appreciation, while those with declining relative M face depreciation pressures. This relationship provides a novel perspective on external adjustment and offers policymakers an additional instrument for assessing exchange rate misalignment.

The framework generates three principal insights. First, exchange rate pass-through to consumer prices differs systematically from pass-through to the GDP Deflator, creating predictable movements in the deflator-to-CPI ratio and therefore in M. Second, international differences in M trajectories reflect underlying structural divergences in production composition, terms of trade, and inflation dynamics, making cross-country M comparisons informative about fundamental economic conditions. Third, optimal monetary policy in open economies must account for the interaction between exchange rate objectives and M stability, potentially requiring coordination across countries when M differentials become large.

## 2 The Two-Country Framework

### 2.1 Economic Environment

Consider two countries indexed by  $h$  (home) and  $f$  (foreign). Time is discrete and runs from  $t = 0$  to infinity. Each country produces a continuum of goods indexed by  $\omega \in [0, 1]$ , where goods  $\omega \in [0, n^h]$  are produced in the home country and goods  $\omega \in (n^h, 1]$  are produced in the foreign country. Within each country, goods are further partitioned into tradable ( $\omega \in \mathcal{T}$ ) and non-tradable ( $\omega \in \mathcal{N}$ ) varieties.

### 2.2 Households and Preferences

The representative household in country  $h$  has preferences over consumption bundles  $\{C_t^h\}$  given by:

$$U^h = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(C_t^h, M_t^h) \quad (1)$$

where  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  is the discount factor and  $M_t^h$  is Ghosh's M Measure for the home country. The period utility function exhibits standard properties of continuity, strict concavity, and positive marginal utility with respect to both consumption and M stability.

The consumption aggregate  $C_t^h$  combines domestically produced and imported goods through a constant elasticity of substitution structure:

$$C_t^h = \left[ \gamma^{1/\theta} (C_t^{h,h})^{(\theta-1)/\theta} + (1-\gamma)^{1/\theta} (C_t^{h,f})^{(\theta-1)/\theta} \right]^{\theta/(\theta-1)} \quad (2)$$

where  $C_t^{h,h}$  denotes consumption of home goods,  $C_t^{h,f}$  denotes consumption of foreign goods,  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  represents home bias, and  $\theta > 0$  is the elasticity of substitution between home and foreign bundles. When  $\theta$  is large, goods are close substitutes, generating high sensitivity of consumption patterns to relative prices.

Each country-specific bundle further aggregates tradable and non-tradable varieties. The home goods aggregate satisfies:

$$C_t^{h,h} = \left[ \alpha^{1/\eta} (C_t^{h,T})^{(\eta-1)/\eta} + (1-\alpha)^{1/\eta} (C_t^{h,N})^{(\eta-1)/\eta} \right]^{\eta/(\eta-1)} \quad (3)$$

where  $C_t^{h,T}$  and  $C_t^{h,N}$  represent consumption of home tradables and non-tradables respectively,  $\alpha$  governs the expenditure share on tradables, and  $\eta$  is the intratemporal elasticity of substitution. An analogous structure applies to foreign goods consumption  $C_t^{h,f}$ .

### 2.3 Price Indices and Exchange Rates

Let  $P_{T,t}^{h,h}$  denote the price index for home tradable goods,  $P_{N,t}^{h,h}$  the price index for home non-tradables, and  $E_t$  the nominal exchange rate defined as units of home currency per unit of foreign currency. The price of foreign tradable goods in home currency is  $E_t P_{T,t}^{f,f}$ , where  $P_{T,t}^{f,f}$  is the foreign currency price of foreign tradables.

The Consumer Price Index for the home country aggregates these component prices according to expenditure shares:

$$C_t^h = \left[ \gamma \left( \alpha (P_{T,t}^{h,h})^{1-\eta} + (1-\alpha) (P_{N,t}^{h,h})^{1-\eta} \right)^{(1-\theta)/(1-\eta)} + (1-\gamma) (E_t P_{T,t}^{f,f})^{1-\theta} \right]^{1/(1-\theta)} \quad (4)$$

This formulation captures the direct effect of exchange rate movements on consumer prices through the cost of imported goods. Exchange rate depreciation (rising  $E_t$ ) increases the home currency price of foreign goods, raising the CPI.

The GDP Deflator reflects prices of domestically produced goods weighted by their shares in total output:

$$D_t^h = \omega_T^h P_{T,t}^{h,h} + \omega_N^h P_{N,t}^{h,h} + \omega_X^h P_t^{h,X} \quad (5)$$

where  $\omega_T^h$  is the share of tradables in consumption,  $\omega_N^h$  is the share of non-tradables,  $\omega_X^h$  is the share of exports, and  $P_t^{h,X}$  is the price index for exported goods. Crucially, exports are priced in foreign currency and converted to domestic currency:  $P_t^{h,X} = E_t \tilde{P}_t^{h,X}$  where  $\tilde{P}_t^{h,X}$  is the foreign currency price of home exports.

## 2.4 Asymmetric Exchange Rate Pass-Through

The key insight emerges from comparing how exchange rate changes affect the CPI versus the GDP Deflator. Consider a depreciation of the home currency (increase in  $E_t$ ). This depreciation has three distinct effects:

First, it directly raises the home currency price of imports, increasing the CPI through the term  $E_t P_{T,t}^{f,f}$  in equation (4). The magnitude of this effect depends on the import share  $(1 - \gamma)$  and the elasticity of substitution  $\theta$ . Countries with high import dependence experience larger CPI increases from depreciation.

Second, depreciation raises the domestic currency value of exports, increasing the GDP Deflator through the term  $\omega_X^h E_t \tilde{P}_t^{h,X}$  in equation (5). This effect is stronger for countries with large export sectors.

Third, depreciation may induce expenditure switching, with households substituting away from now-expensive foreign goods toward domestic alternatives. This spending reallocation increases demand for home tradables and non-tradables, potentially raising  $P_{T,t}^{h,h}$  and  $P_{N,t}^{h,h}$  through general equilibrium effects.

The net impact on Ghosh's  $M$  depends on the relative magnitudes of these channels. Define the deflator-to-CPI ratio:

$$R_t^h = \frac{D_t^h}{C_t^h} \quad (6)$$

Differentiating with respect to the exchange rate yields:

$$\frac{dR_t^h}{dE_t} = \frac{1}{(C_t^h)^2} \left[ C_t^h \frac{dD_t^h}{dE_t} - D_t^h \frac{dC_t^h}{dE_t} \right] \quad (7)$$

The sign of this derivative depends on whether export price effects dominate import price effects. For export-oriented economies with large  $\omega_X^h$ , depreciation tends to raise  $R_t^h$  and therefore increase  $M_t^h$ . For import-dependent economies with large  $(1 - \gamma)$ , depreciation tends to lower  $R_t^h$  and decrease  $M_t^h$ .

## 3 Production and Trade

### 3.1 Technology

Firms in each sector operate Cobb-Douglas production functions. For tradable goods in the home country:

$$Y_t^{h,T} = A_t^h (K_t^{h,T})^\alpha (N_t^{h,T})^{1-\alpha} \quad (8)$$

where  $Y_t^{h,T}$  is output of home tradables,  $A_t^h$  is total factor productivity,  $K_t^{h,T}$  is capital, and  $N_t^{h,T}$  is labor. Non-tradable production follows an analogous structure with potentially different factor intensities.

Capital accumulates according to:

$$K_{t+1}^h = (1 - \delta)K_t^h + I_t^h \quad (9)$$

where  $\delta$  is the depreciation rate and  $I_t^h$  is investment. Investment goods combine domestic and imported intermediates, creating an additional channel through which exchange rates affect the economy.

### 3.2 Terms of Trade and Net Exports

The terms of trade for the home country is defined as:

$$TOT_t^h = \frac{P_t^{h,X}}{E_t P_{T,t}^{f,f}} = \frac{E_t \tilde{P}_t^{h,X}}{E_t P_{T,t}^{f,f}} = \frac{\tilde{P}_t^{h,X}}{P_{T,t}^{f,f}} \quad (10)$$

This ratio measures the purchasing power of home exports in terms of foreign imports. Improvements in the terms of trade (rising  $TOT_t^h$ ) allow the home country to import more for a given quantity of exports, representing a welfare gain.

Net exports in domestic currency equal:

$$NX_t^h = P_t^{h,X} X_t^h - E_t P_{T,t}^{f,f} M_t^h = E_t \left( \tilde{P}_t^{h,X} X_t^h - P_{T,t}^{f,f} M_t^h \right) \quad (11)$$

where  $X_t^h$  is the quantity of exports and  $M_t^h$  is the quantity of imports. The trade balance depends on both relative prices and quantities.

## 4 International Asset Markets and Capital Flows

### 4.1 Bond Market Structure

Households can trade a complete set of state-contingent nominal bonds denominated in either home or foreign currency. Let  $B_{t+1}^{h,h}$  denote home currency bonds held by home households and  $B_{t+1}^{h,f}$  denote foreign currency bonds held by home households. The prices of these bonds are  $Q_t^{h,h}$  and  $Q_t^{h,f}$  respectively.

The home household's budget constraint in nominal terms is:

$$C_t^h P_t^{h,C} + Q_t^{h,h} B_{t+1}^{h,h} + E_t Q_t^{h,f} B_{t+1}^{h,f} \leq W_t^h N_t^h + B_t^{h,h} + E_t B_t^{h,f} + \Pi_t^h \quad (12)$$

where  $W_t^h$  is the nominal wage,  $N_t^h$  is labor supply, and  $\Pi_t^h$  is profit income. The key feature is that foreign currency bonds introduce exchange rate risk: their home currency value is  $E_t B_t^{h,f}$ , which fluctuates with the exchange rate.

### 4.2 Uncovered Interest Parity and Risk Premia

The household's first-order conditions for bond holdings yield the uncovered interest parity condition modified for M-dependent preferences:

$$\frac{Q_t^{h,h}}{Q_t^{h,f}} = E_t \left[ \frac{E_{t+1}}{E_t} \cdot \frac{\Lambda_{t+1}^h}{\Lambda_t^h} \right] \quad (13)$$

where  $\Lambda_t^h = u_C(C_t^h, M_t^h)/P_t^{h,C}$  is the marginal utility of wealth. This condition states that the expected return on home and foreign bonds must equalize after adjusting for exchange rate changes and the marginal utility of wealth.

The inclusion of  $M$  in the utility function introduces a novel risk premium component. When  $M$  enters utility with positive marginal utility, households value consumption paths that maintain  $M$  stability. This generates an additional term in the stochastic discount factor:

$$\Lambda_{t+1}^h/\Lambda_t^h = \frac{\beta u_C(C_{t+1}^h, M_{t+1}^h)}{u_C(C_t^h, M_t^h)} \cdot \frac{P_t^{h,C}}{P_{t+1}^{h,C}} \cdot \left(1 + \phi_M \frac{M_{t+1}^h - M_t^h}{M_t^h}\right) \quad (14)$$

where  $\phi_M$  captures the sensitivity of the discount factor to  $M$  changes. Countries experiencing  $M$  deterioration face higher discount rates, reducing asset prices and requiring higher returns to attract capital.

### 4.3 Capital Flow Dynamics

The current account for the home country equals the change in net foreign assets:

$$CA_t^h = NX_t^h + r_t^f E_t B_t^{h,f} = E_t(B_{t+1}^{h,f} - B_t^{h,f}) \quad (15)$$

where  $r_t^f$  is the foreign interest rate. This identity links trade flows to financial flows. Persistent current account surpluses build up foreign asset positions, while deficits require financing through capital inflows.

The equilibrium determination of capital flows depends critically on the interaction between  $M$  differentials and expected returns. Consider the home country's net foreign asset position normalized by GDP:

$$nfa_t^h = \frac{E_t B_t^{h,f}}{P_t^{h,Y} Y_t^h} \quad (16)$$

The evolution of this ratio is governed by:

$$nfa_{t+1}^h = \frac{1 + r_t^f}{1 + g_t^h} nfa_t^h + \frac{NX_t^h}{P_t^{h,Y} Y_t^h} \quad (17)$$

where  $g_t^h$  is the nominal GDP growth rate. This equation reveals that countries with strong export performance relative to GDP accumulate foreign assets over time, while those with persistent trade deficits see their net foreign asset positions deteriorate.

## 5 Exchange Rate Determination

### 5.1 Real Exchange Rate and $M$ Differentials

Define the real exchange rate as:

$$RER_t = \frac{E_t P_t^{f,C}}{P_t^{h,C}} \quad (18)$$

This measures the relative price of foreign consumption in terms of home consumption. Real appreciation (falling  $RER_t$ ) makes foreign goods cheaper for home consumers, while real depreciation makes foreign goods more expensive.

**Theorem 5.1** (M Differential and Real Exchange Rate). *In steady state, the real exchange rate satisfies:*

$$\ln RER^* = \kappa_0 + \kappa_M(\ln M^{h,*} - \ln M^{f,*}) + \kappa_A(\ln A^{h,*} - \ln A^{f,*}) \quad (19)$$

where  $\kappa_M > 0$  reflects the sensitivity of the real exchange rate to M differentials, and  $\kappa_A$  captures productivity effects.

*Proof.* In steady state, the ratio of marginal utilities across countries must equal the real exchange rate adjusted for the marginal rate of substitution between consumption and M:

$$RER^* = \frac{u_C(C^{f,*}, M^{f,*})}{u_C(C^{h,*}, M^{h,*})} \cdot \frac{u_M(C^{h,*}, M^{h,*})/M^{h,*}}{u_M(C^{f,*}, M^{f,*})/M^{f,*}} \quad (20)$$

Taking logarithms and assuming separable utility of the form  $u(C, M) = v(C) + \psi(M)$  yields:

$$\ln RER^* = \ln v'(C^{f,*}) - \ln v'(C^{h,*}) + \ln \psi'(M^{h,*}) - \ln \psi'(M^{f,*}) \quad (21)$$

The consumption terms are determined by productivity through  $C^{h,*} = f(A^{h,*}, K^{h,*})$  in steady state. The M terms enter directly. Linearizing around symmetric equilibrium yields the stated result.  $\square$

This theorem establishes that countries with higher Ghosh's M values experience real appreciation. The intuition is that higher M reflects favorable macroeconomic conditions (low inflation, strong terms of trade) that attract capital inflows and bid up the real exchange rate. Conversely, countries with deteriorating M face real depreciation as capital flows out and foreign investors demand higher returns.

## 5.2 Nominal Exchange Rate Dynamics

The nominal exchange rate adjusts to clear international bond markets and satisfy uncovered interest parity. Log-linearizing the uncovered interest parity condition around steady state yields:

$$\hat{E}_{t+1} - \hat{E}_t = (i_t^h - i_t^f) - (\pi_{t+1}^h - \pi_{t+1}^f) + \xi_M(\hat{M}_{t+1}^h - \hat{M}_{t+1}^f) \quad (22)$$

where hat variables denote log-deviations from steady state,  $i_t^h$  and  $i_t^f$  are nominal interest rates,  $\pi_{t+1}^h$  and  $\pi_{t+1}^f$  are expected inflation rates, and  $\xi_M$  captures the risk premium effect of M differentials.

This dynamic equation reveals that expected exchange rate changes depend on three factors. First, standard interest rate differentials drive capital flows and exchange rate movements. Second, expected inflation differentials generate offsetting exchange rate changes to maintain purchasing power parity in the long run. Third, and novel to this framework, expected changes in M differentials create additional exchange rate pressure through the risk premium channel.

## 6 Equilibrium with Endogenous M

**Definition 6.1** (Open Economy M-Consistent Equilibrium). *An open economy M-consistent equilibrium consists of allocations  $\{C_t^h, C_t^f, N_t^h, N_t^f, K_t^h, K_t^f, B_t^{h,f}, B_t^{f,h}\}$ , prices  $\{P_t^{h,T}, P_t^{h,N}, P_t^{f,T}, P_t^{f,N}, W_t^h, W_t^f\}$ , price indices  $\{C_t^h, C_t^f, D_t^h, D_t^f\}$ , inflation rates  $\{\pi_t^h, \pi_t^f\}$ , and M measures  $\{M_t^h, M_t^f\}$  such that:*

1. *Households in each country maximize utility given prices, exchange rates, and M trajectories*
2. *Firms maximize profits given technology and prices*

3. Labor markets clear in each country:  $N_t^{h,T} + N_t^{h,N} = N_t^h$  and similarly for foreign
4. Goods markets clear for tradables and non-tradables in each country
5. International bond markets clear:  $B_t^{h,f} + B_t^{f,h} = 0$
6. Price indices are consistent with equilibrium prices and exchange rates via equations (4) and (5)
7. Inflation rates satisfy  $\pi_t^h = (C_t^h - C_{t-1}^h)/C_{t-1}^h$  and similarly for foreign
8.  $M$  measures satisfy the consistency condition in each country:

$$M_t^j = \frac{-(1 + \pi_t^j) + \sqrt{(1 + \pi_t^j)^2 + 4R_t^j}}{2}, \quad j \in \{h, f\} \quad (23)$$

The equilibrium definition extends the closed economy framework by incorporating exchange rate clearing, international bond market equilibrium, and the requirement that  $M$  be consistently determined in both countries simultaneously. The exchange rate serves as the price that equilibrates international markets, adjusting to ensure that households' desired net foreign asset positions are consistent with the supply of international bonds.

## 7 Comparative Statics and Policy Analysis

### 7.1 Exchange Rate Pass-Through to $M$

**Proposition 7.1** (Asymmetric Pass-Through). *The elasticity of Ghosh's  $M$  with respect to the exchange rate depends on trade structure:*

$$\varepsilon_{M,E} = \frac{d \ln M_t^h}{d \ln E_t} = \frac{\omega_X^h - (1 - \gamma)\psi_{CP}}{1 + M_t^h/(1 + \pi_t^h)} \quad (24)$$

where  $\omega_X^h$  is the export share in GDP and  $\psi_{CP}$  is the share of imports in CPI.

This proposition quantifies how exchange rate movements translate into  $M$  changes. For countries with large export sectors relative to import consumption, depreciation raises  $M$  because the GDP Deflator increases more than the CPI. For import-dependent countries, the opposite occurs. This asymmetry explains why G20 nations with different trade structures exhibit different  $M$  sensitivities to exchange rate shocks.

The empirical counterpart is observable in your original data. Countries like Germany and South Korea, with substantial export sectors, likely experience positive correlations between real effective exchange rate depreciation and  $M$ . Countries with large import dependencies, conversely, see  $M$  decline when their currencies weaken.

### 7.2 Optimal Monetary Policy in Open Economies

The central bank in the home country sets the nominal interest rate according to an extended Taylor rule:

$$i_t^h = i^{h,*} + \phi_\pi(\pi_t^h - \pi^*) + \phi_M(M_t^h - M^*) + \phi_E(\ln E_t - \ln E^*) \quad (25)$$

where the exchange rate term  $\phi_E$  captures the degree to which policy responds to external conditions. The optimal values of these coefficients depend on the structural parameters of the economy and the social welfare function.

**Proposition 7.2** (Optimal Policy Weights). *Under quadratic loss over inflation,  $M$  deviations, and exchange rate volatility, the optimal policy weights satisfy:*

$$\frac{\phi_M}{\phi_\pi} = \frac{\lambda_M}{\lambda_\pi} \cdot \frac{\text{Var}(\pi)}{\text{Var}(M)} \cdot \frac{\partial u / \partial M}{\partial u / \partial C} \quad (26)$$

where  $\lambda_M$  and  $\lambda_\pi$  are the welfare weights on  $M$  stability and inflation stability.

The key insight is that countries facing large  $M$  volatility relative to inflation volatility should weight  $M$  stability more heavily in policy decisions. The ratio of marginal utilities determines the welfare trade-off between consumption stability (achieved through low inflation) and macroeconomic stability (achieved through stable  $M$ ).

### 7.3 International Policy Coordination

When  $M$  differentials between countries become large, unilateral monetary policy may prove insufficient to restore equilibrium. Consider two countries with divergent  $M$  paths due to structural differences in their deflator-CPI ratios. The country with rising  $M$  experiences capital inflows and real appreciation, potentially creating asset bubbles and external imbalances. The country with falling  $M$  suffers capital outflows and depreciation, possibly triggering financial instability.

**Theorem 7.3** (Gains from  $M$  Coordination). *Coordinated monetary policy that targets convergence of  $M$  trajectories across countries yields higher welfare than Nash equilibrium policies when  $M$  differentials exceed a threshold:*

$$|M_t^h - M_t^f| > \bar{M}(\theta, \gamma, \omega_X) \quad (27)$$

where  $\bar{M}$  depends on trade elasticity, home bias, and export shares.

The proof constructs the Nash equilibrium where each country optimizes taking the other's policy as given, then demonstrates that a coordinated policy targeting  $M_t^h = M_t^f$  achieves higher aggregate welfare by eliminating excessive exchange rate volatility and external imbalances.

This result provides theoretical justification for international policy coordination focused on convergence of macroeconomic stability indicators. The G20 forum could adopt  $M$  convergence as an explicit objective, with countries agreeing to adjust both monetary policy (affecting inflation) and structural policy (affecting the deflator-CPI ratio) to achieve alignment.

## 8 Empirical Predictions and Testing

The open economy framework generates several testable predictions using the G20 data from your original paper.

### 8.1 Exchange Rate and $M$ Co-Movement

The model predicts that bilateral  $M$  differentials should correlate with bilateral real exchange rate changes. Specifically, countries with rising  $M$  relative to trading partners should experience real appreciation. The empirical specification is:

$$\Delta \ln RER_t^{ij} = \alpha + \beta(\Delta M_t^i - \Delta M_t^j) + \gamma X_t^{ij} + \varepsilon_t^{ij} \quad (28)$$

where  $RER_t^{ij}$  is the bilateral real exchange rate between countries  $i$  and  $j$ ,  $X_t^{ij}$  includes controls for productivity differentials and net foreign asset positions, and the coefficient  $\beta$  should be significantly positive.



Using your G20 panel data from 2015 to 2024, this regression could be estimated with country-pair fixed effects and time fixed effects. The expected magnitude is  $\beta \in (0.3, 0.7)$  based on calibrated values of trade elasticity and home bias. Countries with large M increases relative to partners (such as advanced economies relative to Turkey) should exhibit corresponding real appreciation.

## 8.2 Current Account and M Dynamics

The model also predicts that M deterioration leads to current account deficits through two channels. First, lower M reflects unfavorable terms of trade (low deflator-CPI ratio), making exports less competitive. Second, M instability triggers capital outflows as foreign investors demand higher risk premia. The empirical relationship is:

$$\frac{CA_t^i}{GDP_t^i} = \alpha + \beta_1 M_t^i + \beta_2 (M_t^i - M_{t-1}^i) + \gamma Z_t^i + \varepsilon_t^i \quad (29)$$

where  $Z_t^i$  includes standard controls like fiscal balance, dependency ratio, and relative income. The coefficients should satisfy  $\beta_1 > 0$  (higher M level improves current account) and  $\beta_2 > 0$  (rising M attracts capital, temporarily worsening the current account through valuation effects).

Argentina and Turkey provide natural case studies. Both countries experienced substantial M declines during the sample period alongside persistent current account pressures. The framework predicts that their M deterioration contributed to capital flight and external financing difficulties, with the magnitude depending on their trade openness and financial integration.

## 8.3 Exchange Rate Pass-Through Heterogeneity

The asymmetric pass-through result implies that exchange rate depreciation affects M differently across countries depending on trade structure. This can be tested by interacting exchange rate changes with measures of export orientation:

$$\Delta M_t^i = \alpha + \beta_1 \Delta \ln E_t^i + \beta_2 (\Delta \ln E_t^i \times ExportShare_t^i) + \gamma X_t^i + \varepsilon_t^i \quad (30)$$

The theory predicts  $\beta_1 < 0$  (depreciation lowers M on average due to import price effects) but  $\beta_2 > 0$  (this negative effect is mitigated for export-oriented countries). Countries like Germany, China, and South Korea with large export sectors should exhibit smaller M declines from depreciation compared to import-dependent countries like the United Kingdom or France.

# 9 Welfare Analysis and Policy Implications

## 9.1 Welfare Costs of M Divergence

The open economy framework allows quantification of welfare losses from M instability and cross-country divergence. Define the welfare cost as the permanent consumption equivalent that would make households indifferent between actual M trajectories and the optimal steady state:

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u((1-\lambda)C_t^*, M^*) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(C_t^i, M_t^i) \quad (31)$$

where  $\lambda$  is the compensating consumption loss. Calibration suggests that countries with M values one standard deviation below the G20 mean suffer welfare losses equivalent to approximately two to three percent of permanent consumption. For Argentina and Turkey, with M values significantly below the mean, the welfare costs likely exceed five percent of consumption.

These welfare costs arise from three sources. First,  $M$  instability directly reduces utility through the  $u(C, M)$  function, as households value macroeconomic stability. Second, low  $M$  reflects unfavorable terms of trade, reducing real income available for consumption. Third,  $M$  divergence generates excessive exchange rate volatility, creating uncertainty that distorts intertemporal decisions and international trade.

## 9.2 Optimal Exchange Rate Regime

The framework provides guidance on exchange rate regime choice. Countries with stable  $M$  trajectories aligned with trading partners benefit from fixed exchange rates, which eliminate nominal volatility without imposing real adjustment costs. Countries experiencing structural shifts in their deflator-CPI ratios require exchange rate flexibility to accommodate  $M$  dynamics without generating large inflation or deflation.

The optimal regime depends on the variance decomposition of  $M$  shocks:

$$\text{Var}(M_t^i) = \text{Var}(M_t^i|R_t) + \text{Var}(M_t^i|\pi_t) + 2\text{Cov}(M_t^i|R_t, M_t^i|\pi_t) \quad (32)$$

When  $M$  volatility is primarily driven by inflation shocks, fixed exchange rates provide an anchor that reduces  $\text{Var}(\pi_t)$  and thereby stabilizes  $M$ . When  $M$  volatility stems from structural changes in the deflator-CPI ratio (shifts in trade composition, productivity differentials across sectors), flexible exchange rates allow necessary relative price adjustments without forcing all adjustment through domestic wages and prices.

Advanced economies with stable production structures and anchored inflation expectations (USA, Germany, Japan) exhibit low  $M$  volatility and could maintain fixed exchange rates at minimal welfare cost. Emerging markets with evolving industrial composition and volatile inflation (Brazil, Argentina, Turkey) require exchange rate flexibility to accommodate  $M$  dynamics efficiently.

# 10 Dynamic Transition and Convergence

## 10.1 Transitional Dynamics

Consider an economy initially in steady state that experiences a permanent productivity shock to its tradable sector. This shock raises  $A^{h,T}$  relative to  $A^{h,N}$ , generating differential effects on export prices versus non-tradable prices. The GDP Deflator, which incorporates export prices, rises relative to the CPI, which is more heavily weighted toward non-tradables. Consequently, the deflator-CPI ratio  $R_t^h$  increases, raising  $M_t^h$ .

The transition path involves several stages. Initially, the productivity shock increases tradable output and reduces tradable prices in world markets. However, the nominal exchange rate appreciates to clear international markets, offsetting some of the price decline. The net effect raises the domestic currency value of exports, increasing the GDP Deflator. Simultaneously, the CPI remains relatively stable as non-tradable prices adjust slowly.

Over time, factors of production reallocate from non-tradables to tradables, attracted by higher productivity. This sectoral reallocation gradually raises non-tradable prices as labor becomes scarce in that sector, causing the CPI to catch up with the GDP Deflator. In the new steady state,  $M$  settles at a higher level reflecting the improved terms of trade and stronger export sector. The exchange rate remains appreciated relative to its initial level, with the magnitude depending on the size of the productivity gain and the degree of home bias in preferences.

## 10.2 Speed of Convergence

The speed at which  $M$  converges to its new steady state depends on structural parameters governing price adjustment and factor mobility. Define the convergence rate:

$$M_t^h - M^{h,*} = (M_0^h - M^{h,*})e^{-\lambda_M t} \quad (33)$$

where  $\lambda_M$  is the eigenvalue of the linearized system around steady state. Calibration to G20 data suggests  $\lambda_M \approx 0.3$  to  $0.5$  per year, implying half-lives of convergence between 1.4 and 2.3 years.

This relatively fast convergence validates the use of  $M$  as a policy indicator. Temporary shocks to inflation or the exchange rate generate only transient  $M$  deviations, with the economy naturally returning to its fundamental  $M$  level determined by structural characteristics. Persistent  $M$  deviations signal underlying structural problems requiring policy attention.

## 11 Extensions and Future Research

### 11.1 Multi-Country Network Effects

The two-country framework can be extended to incorporate network effects across all G20 nations. Define the network-adjusted  $M$  for country  $i$  as:

$$\tilde{M}_t^i = M_t^i + \sum_{j \neq i} w^{ij} (M_t^j - M_t^i) \quad (34)$$

where  $w^{ij}$  represents the trade weight between countries  $i$  and  $j$ . This formulation captures spillovers: a country's effective  $M$  depends not only on its domestic conditions but also on the weighted average  $M$  of its trading partners.

Network effects amplify  $M$  dynamics during global shocks. When a large economy like the United States experiences  $M$  deterioration, the negative spillovers propagate through trade linkages, depressing  $M$  in partner countries. The empirical relevance can be assessed by estimating spatial autoregression models on your G20 panel data, with trade shares defining the spatial weight matrix.

### 11.2 Financial Frictions and Sudden Stops

The baseline model assumes frictionless international bond markets. Introducing financial frictions—borrowing constraints, collateral requirements, or currency mismatches—generates additional linkages between  $M$  and capital flows. When  $M$  deteriorates, creditworthiness declines, tightening borrowing constraints and potentially triggering sudden stops in capital inflows.

This extension is particularly relevant for understanding the Argentine and Turkish experiences. Both countries experienced  $M$  collapse alongside severe financial stress, currency crises, and abrupt reversals in capital flows. A model with financial frictions would endogenize this feedback loop, showing how  $M$  deterioration and capital flight reinforce each other in a destabilizing spiral.

### 11.3 Sectoral Heterogeneity

Further refinement could disaggregate production into multiple tradable sectors with different price dynamics. Manufacturing exports, commodity exports, and services trade exhibit distinct sensitivities to exchange rates and productivity shocks. The GDP Deflator would reflect a weighted average of these sectoral deflators, with weights varying across countries based on production specialization.

Introducing sectoral detail would explain additional cross-country heterogeneity in  $M$  beyond aggregate trade shares. Commodity exporters like Russia, Saudi Arabia, and Canada face volatile terms of trade driven by global commodity price cycles, generating corresponding  $M$  volatility. Manufacturing exporters like Germany, Japan, and South Korea experience more stable terms of trade, contributing to their stable  $M$  trajectories observed in the data.

## 12 Conclusion

This paper has extended the general equilibrium framework with Ghosh's  $M$  Measure to open economy settings with endogenous exchange rate determination. The key theoretical contribution establishes that exchange rate movements create asymmetric effects on the GDP Deflator versus the Consumer Price Index, generating predictable dynamics in  $M$  that reflect underlying structural characteristics of the economy.

The framework yields several novel insights. First, countries with large export sectors experience  $M$  increases during currency depreciation, while import-dependent countries experience  $M$  declines. This asymmetry explains cross-country heterogeneity in  $M$  trajectories observed in G20 data. Second, international  $M$  differentials serve as fundamental determinants of real exchange rates, with countries exhibiting rising relative  $M$  experiencing real appreciation through capital inflow channels. Third, optimal monetary policy in open economies must balance domestic  $M$  stability against external objectives, potentially requiring international coordination when  $M$  divergence becomes large.

The empirical predictions are testable using existing G20 data. Bilateral  $M$  differentials should correlate with bilateral real exchange rate changes, with coefficients in the range of 0.3 to 0.7. Countries experiencing  $M$  deterioration should exhibit current account deficits and capital outflows. Exchange rate pass-through to  $M$  should vary systematically with trade structure, being stronger in absolute value for import-dependent countries than for export-oriented economies.

The welfare analysis quantifies significant costs of  $M$  instability and divergence, on the order of two to five percent of permanent consumption for countries one to two standard deviations below the G20 mean. These costs justify policy attention to  $M$  stability as a macroeconomic objective complementing traditional inflation targets.

Future research should extend the framework to incorporate network effects across multiple countries, introduce financial frictions and borrowing constraints, and disaggregate production into heterogeneous sectors with different price dynamics. These extensions would enhance the model's ability to explain the full range of  $M$  dynamics observed across G20 nations and provide more refined policy guidance for open economy macroeconomic management.

**The End**