Episodes of Financial Deepening: Credit Booms or Growth Generators?

Peter L. Rousseau and Paul Wachtel

March 2015

Abstract. One strand of the economics literature addresses financial deepening as a precursor to economic growth. Another views it as a cause of financial crises. We examine historical data for 17 economies from 1870 to 1929 to distinguish episodes of growth induced by financial deepening from crises induced by credit booms. Cross-country panel regressions with five-year averages indicate that deepening episodes, defined as increases of more than thirty percent in the ratio of M2 to GDP over a ten year period, significantly enhanced the standard finance-growth dynamic, while deepening associated with financial crises sharply hindered it. We then describe some specific episodes of financial deepening in our sample.

Keywords – finance-growth nexus, Atlantic economies, financial deepening, financial crisis

Rousseau: Professor, Department of Economics, Vanderbilt University, Box 1819 Station B, Nashville, TN 37235. Phone 1-615-343-2466, Fax 1-615-343-8495, E-mail Peter.L.Rousseau@Vanderbilt.Edu.

Wachtel: Professor, Stern School of Business, New York University, 44 West 4th Street, New York, NY 10012. Email: pwachtel@stern.nyu.edu.

1. Introduction

A well-developed literature now recognizes that financial development plays an important role in promoting long-run growth.[1] Yet measures commonly used to gauge the extent of financial development, such as the ratio of broad money to output, also serve well as predictors of financial crises, especially when expressed as rapid changes in the ratio (Radelet and Sachs 1998; Terrones 2004; Schularick and Taylor 2012). History reinforces the second interpretation with account after account of credit booms and the accompanying monetary expansions leading to financial crashes and panics (Calomiris and Haber 2014).

These two parallel strands in the literature on financial development and economic performance of countries have developed largely independent of one another. The first, the finance-growth nexus, focuses on the role of financial deepening in economic growth while the second emphasizes the costly effects of financial crises that result from episodes of excess leveraging and credit bubbles. These two facets are particularly interesting because it is often difficult to distinguish one from the other.

The emphasis on financial crises, though certainly justified in the wake of the 2007-2008 disturbances and the obvious costs associated with them, may produce the impression that all credit booms are unhealthy for an economy. Recent historical work such as Reinhart and Rogoff (2009) and Schularick and Taylor (2012) reinforce that conclusion. We examine whether there is also scope for virtuous episodes of large credit expansions which spur growth and provide a countervailing force against crises. Rousseau and Wachtel (1998) offer evidence supporting this relationship in a study of five industrializing countries (Canada, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States) covering the period from 1870 to 1929, but sample selection

[1] See, among many others, King and Levine (1993), Demetriades and Hussein (1996), Rousseau and Wachtel (1998), and Levine, Loayza, and Beck (2000).

may limit the generality of the findings.[2] Cross country studies with many countries and data after 1960, such as King and Levine (1993), show correlations from financial development to higher subsequent growth rates, but it unclear whether the effects emerge from dynamics within individual countries as the relevant theory indicates they should (Gurley and Shaw 1955; Goldsmith 1969; McKinnon 1973), or are simply artifacts of omitted country characteristics that correlate with financial development to yield a result dominated by variation among countries (Wachtel 2001; 2011).

A connection between the two strands of the literature was suggested by our panel study with data for the last 50 years, Rousseau and Wachtel (2011). We found that the strength of the finance growth nexus weakened in the last decade of the 20th century and suggest that the reason might be the increased incidence of financial crises. The long term impact of financial deepening on economic growth is muted when a country experiences a financial crisis.

In this chapter, we examine the financial "deepening" experiences of 17 economies from 1880 to 1929 to identify cases of growth-enhancing expansions of credit.[3] The historical focus is useful because it is widely believed that financial development can have its strongest effects in the earlier stages of growth (Cameron 1963), and considering a simpler global economy and nations that would be classified as emerging markets by today's standards might shed light on the effects of financial expansions in modern emerging and transitional economies. The wider scope of seventeen countries also serves to attenuate selection issues.

We conduct the analysis using cross country regressions similar to those in the seminal literature on finance and growth, but determine episodes of financial deepening and then

[2] Rousseau (1999) provides similar evidence for Meiji-era Japan.

[3] The 17 countries are Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, and the United States.

distinguish the effects of those ending in a crisis from those that do not. This allows us to illustrate how credit booms affect the operation of the finance-growth nexus. We close by discussing some of the episodes of beneficial deepening that appear in our sample.

2. Describing the Data

The analysis covers 17 countries for which we have annual macroeconomic accounts dating back to at least 1880. Data for population, the broad money stock (M2), gross domestic product (GDP), the GDP deflator, imports and exports are from worksheets underlying Bordo and Jonung (1987), Obstfeld and Taylor (2000), Rousseau and Wachtel (1998), and Rousseau (1999). For the dating of financial crises we use the list found in Jordà, Schularick and Taylor (2013, Appendix 1) which starts in 1870 and add our own dates for two countries (Argentina and Brazil) that are not included in their sample.

The ratio of broad money (M2) to GDP is our measure of financial development; it primarily reflects the size of a country's banking system. Ideally we would like additional measures of financial development such as the ratio of private credit or stock market capitalization to GDP, but these data are not continuously available for a sufficient number of countries over the period we study. The M2/GDP ratio of course emphasizes the role of banks, which were the primary financial intermediaries at the time, and includes the provision of the transactions asset by both private-sector financial intermediaries and the government. Money creation by the private banking sector is a fundamental form of intermediation since bank liabilities are a way of holding savings and bank assets are used to finance investment activity.

We convert output to real per capita values using population and the GDP deflator before computing growth rates.

Episodes of financial deepening are determined from our annual data for the ratio of

broad money to GDP for each of the 17 countries by rolling through the samples and computing for each county-year:

$D_{i.t} = 1$ if $F_{i,t}/F_{i,t-10} > 1.3$, and

$D_{i,t} = 0$ otherwise,

where F represents the ratio of M2 to GDP, and the subscripts *i* and *t* index countries and individual years respectively. In words, we turn on a dummy variable indicating a "financial deepening" episode in year *t* when the growth rate of M2/GDP over the previous 10 years exceeds 30 percent.[4] This implies an average annual deepening of about 2.7 percent over the decade. Deepening episodes can thus span multiple years when the ratio's ten-year growth rate remains about 30 percent in consecutive years. The use of a criterion to identify deepening episodes was hinted at by Jordà, Schularick and Taylor (2013, p. 9) who note that "three quarters of all episodes during which credit to GDP rose by 30pps or more over a five-year period ended in a systemic crisis."

Determining whether a country is in the midst of a deepening episode at any point in time depends on criteria set by the researcher, and our strategy is no exception. For example, one year of extraordinary advance in the M2/GDP ratio could trigger the dummy variable for as many as ten subsequent years, even if there was no deepening in the interim. As it turns out, however, our threshold of a 30 percent increase avoids this outcome and we see very few lengthy episodes in the sample. This would not be the case if we lowered the threshold. Our choice of a 30 percent increase in the ratio therefore reflects a compromise between finding too many or too few deepening episodes.

Table 1 lists both the systemic financial crises and the episodes of financial deepening for

[4] We use a proportional increase for the threshold rather than a percentage point increase because the level of the ratio varies substantially from country to country.

the 17 countries in our sample. There were 54 systemic financial crises between 1870 and 1929. Seven countries experienced crises in 1907 and five in 1873. Four countries were in crisis in 1890, 1893 and 1921.

There are 55 episodes of financial deepening between 1880 and 1929, though 26 of these represent only a single year. Each country has at least one such episode. Of course, we must have data on M2/GDP for at least ten years prior to identify a deepening episode for a particular country in a given year, so we use annual data going back as far as 1870 to compute the ten-year growth rates needed to determine episodes in the 1880s. Although data are unavailable for more than two-thirds of the countries in our sample before 1870, we can identify another eight episodes of financial deepening prior to 1880 as well. As shown in Table 2, both crises and deepening episodes are spread throughout the sample period.

Table 3 reports the frequency of deepening episodes and crises by country since 1870. The left column shows the number of times a financial crises occurred during a credit boom, the center column indicates financial deepening episodes not associated with crisis and the right column indicates financial crises that occur outside of booms. There are more financial crises that occur outside of credit booms in our sample (26) than within them (22), and nearly two thirds of financial deepening episodes do not involve a financial crisis. Since economic theory suggests that the relation between finance and growth is a dynamic one, it is natural that distinguishing between these two types of deepening episodes should be central to the empirical models that we estimate in Section 3.

Table 4 reports average growth rates of real per capita GDP for the 17 countries across five-year periods from 1880 to 1929 based on whether a credit boom, financial crisis, or both a

boom and crisis occurred during the period.[5] The figures indicate that growth is most rapid over five-year periods with financial deepening episodes but without a financial crisis, and over five-year periods immediately following a financial crisis. Growth rates are also much higher on average in periods of credit booms that are not associated with a crisis than those that are (1.76% compared to 1.02%). Focusing on the financial crises, subsequent growth is more rapid after crises that are associated with a boom than those occurring outside of a boom (2.76% compared to 1.88%). Finally, growth rates during booms and following financial crises are higher than the average across all countries and five-year periods.

These statistics suggest a narrative in which financial deepening episodes can be growth-promoting if not taken to excess, but also that growth tends to recover rapidly after financial crises that follow credit booms. Given that rapid credit growth is related to about half of all financial crises in our sample (Table 3), the returns from moderate deepening coupled with rapid recoveries from financial crises suggest that the returns to modest episodes of financial deepening are substantial, and that taking them too far on occasion may be preferable to no deepening at all.

3. Econometric Findings

Our econometric methodology is a modified version of the cross-country growth regression developed by Barro (1991) and extended to the study of the finance-growth nexus by King and Levine (1993). The analysis covers five-year periods from 1880 to 1929 to impose a reasonable degree of balance across the panel of countries and to work with the sample data that are most reliable. The baseline regression has the form

[5] The econometric analysis below uses five-year periods as the unit of observation as is common in the literature. A country experiences a boom in a given five year period if at least one of the deepening years indicated in Table 1 falls within the period, and similarly for the financial crises.

$$Growth\ Y_{i,t} = \alpha_0 + \alpha\ Y_{i,t} + \beta\ F_{i,t} + \Phi_t + \mu_{i,t,} \qquad (1)$$

where the dependent variable is the average annual percentage growth rate of real per capita income over the five year period *t* and $Y_{i,t}$ is the natural logarithm of its level at the start of period *t*. $F_{i,t}$ is the ratio of M2 to GDP at the start of each five-year period, the $\Phi_{i,t}$ are dummy variables for the five-year periods, and $\mu_{i,t}$ is the error term.[6] We expect a negative coefficient on the log of initial real per capita GDP due to the tendency for growth rates to converge across countries and over time.

We then augment the baseline with binary indicator variables for deepening episodes, financial crises, and their interactions with the ratio of M2 to GDP. We turn on the deepening indicator for a five-year period if at least one of the deepening years in Table 1 falls within it, and set the indicator for financial crises similarly. Thus, each 5 year period is characterized as being a crisis period, a deepening episode, both a deepening episode and crisis period, or a period with neither a deepening episode nor a crisis. About half of all the five periods are effected by either boom and/or crisis (Table 4). Crisis periods account for one-quarter of all periods, almost evenly split between those associated with a boom and those without a boom.

Table 5 presents ordinary least squares estimates of equation (1); the baseline specification in column (1) is followed by specifications where the dummy variables for financial deepening episodes and financial crises enter directly. The baseline indicates a positive coefficient for the initial value of the M2/GDP ratio that is significant at the one percent level.

[6] The five-year periods are 1880-84, 1885-89, 1890-94, 1895-1900, 1900-04, 1905-09, 1920-14, 1915-19, 1920-24, and 1925-29. Initial values of the ratios of M2 and international trade to GDP are measured in 1880, 1885, 1890, 1895, 1900, 1905, 1910, 1915, 1920, and 1925. This results in at least seven and up to ten observations for each of the 17 countries in our sample. The missing five-year observations due to insufficient data for computing deepening episodes are: Argentina 1880-84, 1885-89, 1890-94; Australia 1880-84; 1885-89; Brazil 1880-84, 1885-89; France 1915-19, 1920-24, 1925-29; Germany 1915-19, 1920-24, 1925-29; Japan 1880-84; Portugal 1880-84, 1885-89; and Spain 1880-84.

This is consistent with earlier findings by Rousseau and Sylla (2003), and relates a 10 percentage point increase in M2 as a share of GDP with a 0.3 percentage point increase in the rate of annual GDP growth. Column (2) indicates that financial crises have direct and negative effects on growth that are statistically significant at the ten percent level, with a financial crisis relating to a decline in annual per capita income growth of nearly 1.2 percent. Columns (3) and (4) find no significant direct effect of our deepening indicators (labelled "boom") on output growth. Columns (5) and (6) indicate that financial crises occurring during credit booms have even more severe effects on growth than those occurring outside of them. Columns (4) and (6) indicate that credit booms that occur without crisis have a positive effect on annual growth of about 0.4% although the effects are bared larger than their standard errors. Finally, column (7) shows that the results are robust to the inclusion of the initial value of the ratio of international trade (the sum of exports and imports) to GDP as an additional regressor.

The lack of direct explanatory power for the financial deepening episodes in our sample indicates that any effects on growth are likely to operate indirectly. The proposition that these deepening episodes act through the M2 ratios themselves is reasonable because we might expect episodes of rapid financial deepening to improve the fluidity of the finance-growth relationship so long as they are not excessive. We therefore turn next to specifications in which our indicator variables are interacted with the M2 to GDP ratio.[7]

Table 6 reports OLS regression results with interaction terms included. Column (1) repeats the baseline regression. But this time, column (2) adds an interaction of initial M2/GDP with the crisis dummy. The coefficient on M2/GDP rises to over four in this case, and the coefficient on the interaction term is negative and statistically significant at the one percent level.

[7] Rousseau and Wachtel (2011) show the effects of both financial crises and liberalizations on the strength of the finance-growth nexus with panel data for the period 1960-2004.

This suggests that financial crises also have negative effects on growth that operate through the finance growth nexus. Specifically, a 10 percentage point increase in M2 as a percent of GDP is associated with 0.43 percentage point increase in the annual growth rates for a country that avoids financial crisis and just 0.15 percentage points (0.43–0.28) otherwise.

Columns (3) and (4) address episodes of financial deepening. Column (3) includes results with interactions of the "boom' variable with M2/GDP and finds a positive coefficient that is not statistically significant. This might be expected as the dummy variable is turned on for all credit booms, including those associated with a financial crisis. When we remove those credit booms associated with a financial crisis in column (4), the potential for rapid and beneficial financial deepening to enhance growth becomes clear with a coefficient on the interaction term that is significant at the five percent level. The coefficient indicates that the additional impact of a 10 percentage point increase in the M2 to GDP ratio on the annual growth rate is 0.14 percent when a country experiences a credit boom without a crisis. That is, the effect of a 10 percentage point deepening on annual growth is 0.4 percentage points (0.26+0.14) for crisis-free deepening episodes and 0.26 percentage points otherwise.

Column (6) shows that the effects of crisis-free deepening episodes persist even when we control for deepening episodes that end in a crisis, though the coefficient on the interaction term is now significant at the 10 percent level. A ten percentage point deepening episode has a differential effect on growth in crisis-free and non-crisis-free booms; it is 0.4 percentage points higher in crisis-free booms (the difference between 0.11 and -.29).

Finally, column (7) indicates that the results are robust to the inclusion of the ratio of international trade (i.e., imports plus exports) to GDP in the specification.

Table 7 includes results from re-estimating the models in Table 5 using contemporaneous five-year averages of the M2 to GDP and trade to GDP ratios with their initial values as instruments. The two-stage least squares estimates effectively extract the components of the M2/GDP and trade/GDP ratios that can be explained by their own past values and the other exogenous variables and then insert these fitted values into the actual (second stage) regression. The results are very similar to the OLS findings in Table 6. All coefficients retain their signs and levels of statistical significance, but the coefficients on the interaction terms are slightly smaller.

Our regression results provide strong support for the finance-growth nexus among the 17 economies in our sample starting in 1880. In fact, the results are very similar to those found with much larger groups of countries with data that begin about a century later. Many countries in our historical data experienced periods of rapid financial sector growth, particularly around the turn of the 20th century. In addition, financial crises were common occurrences, with each county having on average three crises in the 57 year period from 1873-1929. We find that the effects of credit deepening on growth are enhanced during credit booms that are not associated with crisis and diminished in crisis-boom periods compared to other periods. Thus, episodes of credit deepening are beneficial except when they are associated with financial crisis.

4. Financial Deepening and Financial Crises

In this section, we discuss the relationship between financial development and the incidence of crises and booms in several of the countries in our sample. We characterize the historical record and show that it is often consistent with the broad picture suggested by the econometric results. That is, deepening episodes are associated with economic growth though the relationship is often muted by crises.

For the United States, Rousseau and Sylla (2005) offer evidence for a financial revolution in the half-century following the ratification of the Constitution in 1789 that changed the trajectory of growth and got the nation off to a good start. Yet the econometric evidence for finance-led growth from 1870 to 1929 is even stronger (Rousseau and Wachtel 1998). The literature on the National Banking period often focuses on the System's deficiencies and the extent to which it left the nation vulnerable to financial crises, and indeed there were well-documented crises in 1873, 1884, 1893, and 1907. But the periods of financial deepening that we identify are no less striking. The resurgence of state banks outside of the National System and the shift toward deposit banking after 1880 led to rapid increases in the money stock and the amount of available credit over years between the disturbances of 1884 and 1893 and then again in 1894-1895. By most accounts the 1884 crisis was mild by 19th century standards, and the nation quickly rebounded from the crisis in 1893. Overall, the period from 1870-1914 in the United States may have been punctuated by several financial crises, but the deepening that accompanied these episodes relates closely to the rapid growth that the nation experienced as the path of industrialization continued to press forward.

Canada took a somewhat different route to financial development than the United States, but the rise of its banking system and intermediary assets exhibits similar albeit somewhat muted trends over our sample period. The key difference usually cited is that Canadian banks were fewer in number but allowed multiple branches rather than the unit system that characterized banks in the United States from the start. Consolidation also led a decline in the number of Canadian banks from 70 in 1870 to only 13 by 1935. Did branching and consolidation reduce competition and lower efficiency in lending? Bordo, Rockoff, and Redish (1994) show that Canadian banks did indeed achieve higher profit rates over the period, but also observe that the

profits were accompanied by higher shares of loans to total assets than typically held by U.S. banks. They proceed to point to Canada's banking stability as evidence that its more productive banks could promote growth while avoiding the negative consequences of financial crises.

Our lists of crises and episodes of financial deepening make it difficult to challenge this view. Even though Canada experienced three financial crises (1873, 1907, and 1923), these events were relatively mild in comparison to the disturbances experienced by the United States in 1873 and 1907. Canada also had an extended episode of financial deepening in the 1890s that is among the longest in the sample, and achieved a 3.7 percent growth average rate of per capita output over that episode. Annual growth averaged two percent in other years, and even that compares favorably with the 1.6 percent average growth rate achieved by the United States over the entire 1880-1929 period. Remaining relatively crisis-free as a banking system develops no doubt has its advantages.

England was the world's first great financial power, building upon early 17th century Dutch innovation to launch a financial revolution with the founding of the Bank of England in 1694. The monopoly granted to the Bank on note issue, coupled with restrictions on the formation of banks as corporations with limited liability until 1825, produced a banking system that was likely sub-optimal in terms of size and the diffusion of banking services. But the system improved upon these earlier deficiencies and by the late 19th century had established many more banks and a host of other intermediaries (Sheppard 1971). As the most mature financial system in our sample, the United Kingdom saw only a single financial crisis from 1880 until the Great Depression, but it is perhaps not surprising that it also experienced few episodes of financial deepening according to our criterion. This is consistent with Cameron (1963), who argued that financial development is most effective in the earlier stages of a transition to modern growth.

The restoration of the Meiji dynasty in 1868 is often credited with ushering in the start of financial reforms that put Japan on a modern growth trajectory. Much of the credit for the sea change should probably go to Masayoshi Matsukata, Japan's finance minister at the time. Matsukata commuted rents traditionally paid in rice to the feudal nobility in favor of long-term government bonds in 1872, and then much like the United States some 90 years earlier, allowed the bonds to be tendered as capital for shares in the Bank of Japan when formed in 1879. Combined with a nationalization of banking in 1876 along the lines of the U.S. National Banking System, these innovations generated markets to trade the government's debt and shares of the central bank, and a system of banks to lodge the new monetary balances. The rise of development banks such as the Yokahama Specie Bank followed quickly. The credit boom generated by this activity apparently jump-started economic growth (Rousseau 1999), but also ended in a spectacular inflation and crash in 1882. But with the seeds of modern markets in place, the nation was able to expand financially once again, with a continuous episode of financial deepening (according to our dating technique) from 1904-1915 that is among the longest in our sample. The fact that this deepening was actually punctuated by financial crises in 1907 and 1913 indicate just how resilient the burgeoning financial sector was to temporary disturbances. As such, Japan stands as a classic example of a financial revolution characterized by boom and bust cycles, yet this tumultuous path led the way to economic modernization.

One view of Swedish financial development is that mid-19th century Sweden was a poor country with a sophisticated financial system, much like the United States at the start of the century. In this view, the financial system along with a high level of education enabled the economy to take off rapidly in the second half of the century. Another view is that the banking system did not develop until commercial bank lending began to replace Riksbank credit after

mid-century (Hansson and Jonung 1997). In this view, two significant financial sector developments towards the end of the century were contemporaneous with economic growth. Specifically, the Riksbank developed modern central banking functions and the commercial banks replaced merchant banking houses as a source of credit. This latter interpretation is consistent with our data which indicates a period of financial deepening in the late 1880s while the only 19th century crisis occurred in 1878. Another distinguishing feature of Swedish financial sector development around the turn of the century was the emergence of strong links between banks and their industrial customers which strengthened over time. In this sense the dominant role of bank credit may have been destabilizing and Sweden experienced systemic crises in 1907 and 1921 (though the latter was the consequence of the post-World War I fall in output and ensuing deflation).

German economic growth in the three decades following political unification in 1871 was remarkable; the only comparable experience might be the growth of China in the last 30 years. Some of the institutions that support growth were in place prior to unification (e.g. railroads, the transportation infrastructure; education and the craft system) but finance was not one of them. A uniform currency was introduced in 1873 and the central bank, the Reichsbank, was established three years later. A liberal discounting policy by the Reicshbank led to the rapid growth of universal commercial banks and an explosion of credit. By our criterion, Germany was experiencing a credit boom in all but 6 years in the period from 1880 to 1911. The banks grew from trade financing institutions into universal banks with large deposit bases that provided both short and long term financing to German industry, particularly the rapidly growing capital intensive manufacturing firms. Thus it is not surprising that the banks developed the close ties to industrial firms that characterize the German economy to this day. Banks often maintained an

equity interest in firms and bank representatives served on supervisory boards voting the shares of the bank as well as those that other shareholders had deposited with the bank.[8]

The link between financial deepening and crisis in Germany is weak. The country experienced a major crisis in 1873 before our data period begins. The young banking institutions had substantial exposures to securities and were affected by the business cycle downturn and falling asset prices. Interestingly, there were no major banking crises in the following years of rapid credit expansion even though Germany had a largely free banking structure throughout this period. The crises on the list were either minor (e.g. the 1891 crisis was due to bank failures caused by fraudulent management) or caused by international shocks (e.g. 1907).

Argentina and Australia are two countries in our sample with similar experiences (see McLean (2006)). Table 1 indicates that both experienced one financial crisis, 1890 in Argentina and 1893 in Australia. These crises were both similar and related. Investment booms were fueled by foreign investment which dried up when asset prices fell. Further, the situation in Australia was affected by emerging markets contagion from the Argentine crisis that preceded it. Argentina rebounded quickly from its crisis while Australia experienced a very slow recovery. The post-crisis boom in the M2 to GDP ratio shown for Australia is due to the fall in GDP rather than a rise in credit. Episodes of credit deepening did occur in both countries in the first decade of the 20th century but this occurred simultaneously with more rapid growth.

Brazil's enormous land mass and strong ocean currents left it fragmented and isolated over much of its modern history, and its lack of financial development can be traced to a weak central government that emerged from these unfavorable initial conditions (Calomiris and Haber

[8] It is a matter of controversy whether Germany is an example of bank-led economic growth or whether the banking expansion occurred in response to demand from the industrial sector; see Burhop (2006) and Fohlin (2007).

2014). The government's regular practice of expropriating banking resources at times of need throughout its history rendered it difficult to raise banking capital or deposits, and inflationary finance was a ready tool when outright expropriation failed. A lack of a coordinated banking system was the result, and led to a tumultuous boom and bust in the early 1890s that ended in yet another crisis in 1900. By the end of our sample period the nation's financial system consisted primarily of a state-owned bank that directed much its credit flows to the treasury and a declining share to private businesses (Musacchio 2009). Our criterion identifies two episodes of financial deepening after 1914 (one in 1917-18 and the other from 1921-23). Part of this identification is surely due to the low level of M2/GDP in 1910 of only 0.24, making a 30 percent increase to 0.31 over ten years not too great a feat, yet it is also interesting to observe that Brazil experienced robust growth in real per capita output of nearly 5.5 percent between 1915 and 1925.

While the discussions above are only suggestive and necessarily brief, they are largely consistent with our econometric finding that episodes of financial deepening are beneficial to growth when they are not associated with financial crises.

5. Conclusion

The role of financial deepening in economic growth is thought to be a dynamic process that acts through the expansion and increased intensity of banking and other financial services, yet modern cross-country studies do not capture this dynamic explicitly. We examine evidence of it in a sample of 17 economies over the period from 1870 and 1929 – a time when many nations in our group might still be considered emerging markets. By identifying specific episodes of financial deepening in individual countries, we reach beyond standard relationships between initial financial conditions and subsequent growth to link the deepening episodes themselves to smoother operation of the finance-growth nexus. We find that episodes of financial deepening, if

not taken to the excesses that end in financial crises, enhance links between the level of financial development and growth, thereby revealing the role for dynamics described by theory. An examination of financial crises and episodes of financial deepening in the broader context of historical narratives offers further evidence of the plausibility of the mechanisms we uncover.

Financial crises are indeed costly and well deserving of the emphasis they have recently received in the economics literature. At the same time, our chapter aims to serve as a timely reminder that crises and output losses are not the only outcomes associated with credit expansion. Rather, the other side of the coin – robust economic growth – is much brighter, and its luster is only reinforced by the past.

Acknowledgments:

Research assistance from Filip Herceg is greatly appreciated.

References

Bordo, Michael D., and Lars Jonung. (1987). *The Long-Run Behavior of the Velocity of Circulation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bordo, Michael D., Hugh Rockoff, and Angela Redish. (1994). "The U.S. Banking System from a Northern Exposure: Stability vs. Efficiency." *Journal of Economic History* 54(2): 325–341.

Burhop, Carsten. (2006). "Did Banks Cause the German Industrialization?" *Explorations in Economic History* 43: 39-63.

Calomiris, Charles W., and Stephen H. Haber. (2014). *Fragile by Design: The Political Origins of Banking Crises and Scarce Credit*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Cameron, Rondo. (1963). "Banking in the Early Stages of Industrialization: a Preliminary Survey." *Scandinavian Economic History Review* 11(2): 117-134.

Demetriades, Panicos O., and Khaled A. Hussein. (1996). "Does Financial Development Cause Economic Growth? Time-Series Evidence from 16 Countries." *Journal of Development Economics* 51: 387–411.

Fohlin, Caroline. (2007). *Finance Capitalism and Germany's Rise to Industrial Power*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hansson, Pontus and Lars Jonung. (1997). "Finance and Economic Growth: The Case of Sweden 1834-1991." *Research in Economics* 51: 275-301.

Jordà, Òscar, Moritz HP. Schularick, and Alan M. Taylor. (2013). "Sovereigns Versus Banks: Credit, Crises, Consequences." Working Paper No. 19506, National Bureau of Economic Research, October.

King, Robert G., and Ross Levine. (1993). "Finance and Growth: Schumpeter Might Be Right."

Quarterly Journal of Economics 108(3): 717–737.

Levine, Ross, Norman Loayza, and Thorsten Beck. (2000). "Financial Intermediation and Growth: Causality and Causes." *Journal of Monetary Economics* 46: 31–77.

McLean, Ian W. (2006). "Recovery from Depression: Australia in an Argentines Mirror 1895-1913. *Australian Economic History Review.* 46:215-41.

Musacchio, Aldo. (2009). *GExperiments in Financial Democracy: Corporate Governance and Financial Development in Brazil, 1882-1950*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Obstfeld, Maurice, and Alan M. Taylor. (2000). *Global Capital Markets: Integration, Crises, and Growth*. Japan-US Center Sanwa Monographs on International Financial Markets. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Reinhart, Carmen M, and Kenneth S. Rogoff. (2009). *This Time is Different: Eight Centuries of Financial Folly*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rousseau, Peter L. (1999). "Finance, Investment, and Growth in Meiji-Era Japan." *Japan and the World Economy* 11(2): 185–198.

Rousseau, Peter L., and Richard Sylla. (2003). "Financial Systems, Economic Growth, and Globalization." In Michael D. Bordo, Alan M. Taylor, and Jeffrey G. Williamson (eds), *Globalization in Historical Perspective*, pp. 373–413. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rousseau, Peter L., and Richard Sylla. (2005). "Emerging Financial Markets and Early U.S. Growth." *Explorations in Economic History* 42(1): 1–26.

Rousseau, Peter L., and Paul Wachtel. (1998). "Financial Intermediation and Economic Performance: Historical Evidence from Five Industrialized Countries." *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 30(4): 657–678.

Rousseau, Peter L., and Paul Wachtel. (2011). "What is Happening to the Impact of Financial Deepening on Economic Growth. *Economic Inquiry* 49(1): 276–288.

Schularick, Moritz, and Alan M. Taylor. (2012). "Credit Booms Gone Bust: Monetary Policy, Leverage Cycles and Financial Crises, 1870-2008." *American Economic Review* 102(2): 1029–1061.

Sheppard, David K. (1971). *The Growth and Role of U.K Financial Institutions, 1880-1962*. London: Methuen.

Terrones, Marco. (2004). "Are Credit Booms in Emerging Markets a Concern?" *World Economic Outlook*, April: 147–166.

Wachtel, Paul. (2001). "Growth and Finance: What do we know and how do we know it?" *International Finance*, 4(3): 335–362.

Wachtel, Paul. (2011). "The Evolution of the Finance Growth Nexus." *Comparative Economic Studies* 53(3): 475–488.

Table 1. Years of Financial Crises and Credit Booms

Country and start of credit data	**Systemic Financial Crises, 1870-1929**	**Credit boom episodes to 1929**
Argentina (1884)	1890	1905 1910 1922
Australia (1880)	1893	1894-96 1899-00
Brazil (1880)	1891 1900	1890 1917-18 1921-23
Canada (1870)	1873 1907 1923	1885 1892-1901 1917
Germany (1880)	1873 1891 1901 1907	1880-92 1894-95 1898 1900 1902-04 1906-11
Denmark (1850)	1877 1885 1908 1921	1860 1862-64 1875-90 1910 1918
Spain (1875)	1883 1890 1913 1920 1924	1885-1901 1917-19 1921-26
Finland (1862)	1878 1900 1921	1872-76 1886-90 1892-04 1911 1915
France (1851)	1882 1889	1861-78 1909
Italy (1872)	1873 1887 1893 1907 1921	1883-84 1887-89 1892 1919
Japan (1878)	1882 1900 1904 1907 1913 1927	1899 1902 1904-15 1917-18 1923 1929
Netherlands (1850)	1893 1907 1921	1860-61 1867-69 1872-73

		1875-81 1883-84 1897-1902 1917-18
Norway (1865)	1899 1922	1878-88 1890 1901-03 1905-10 1918 1921-23 1925-26
Portugal (1880)	1890 1920 1923	1914-15 1917-23
Sweden (1870)	1878 1907 1922	1887-88 1909
USA (1850)	1873 1884 1893 1907 1929	1871-72 1874 1887-92 1894-95 1906
UK (1870)	1873 1890	1909 1921

Note: Financial crises from Jordà, Schularick and Taylor (2013, Appendix 1) and credit boom episodes are our calculation. Start of credit data availability is indicated in parentheses; credit booms can be identified 10 years afterward.

Table 2. Crises and Deepening Episodes by Decade

Decade	Crises	Deepening episodes
1860s	--	5
1870s	8	3
1880s	7	9
1890s	11	12
1900s	13	12
1910s	2	14
1920s	13	8

Note: Deepening episodes not observed for all countries in the 1860s, 1870s, 1880s, and 1920s. Crises are observed after 1870.

Table 3. Crises and Booms, 1870-1929

Country	Crises with Boom	Booms without Crisis	Crises without Boom
Argentina	0	3	0
Australia	1	1	0
Brazil	1	2	1
Canada	0	3	2
Germany	3	3	0
Denmark	2	2	2
Spain	3	0	2
Finland	1	3	2
France	0	2	2
Italy	2	2	2
Japan	3	4	1
Netherlands	0	5	3
Norway	1	6	1
Portugal	2	1	1
Sweden	0	2	3
USA	3	2	2
UK	0	2	2
TOTAL	22	43	26

Note: Uses only years where data are available to identify both crises and boom episodes.

Table 4. Average Real GDP Growth in Five-Year Periods, 1880-1929

	Booms with Crisis	Booms without Crisis	Crises without Boom	All periods
Growth rate in period	1.02	1.76	1.67	1.59
Growth rate in next period	2.76	1.57	1.88	
Number of periods	22	50	18	153

Table 5. Cross Country Growth Regressions, 1880-1929 (OLS).

Dependent variable: Five-year average growth rate of real per capita GDP (%)							
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Log real GDP p.c. (USD)	–0.693**	–0.789**	–0.698**	–0.662**	–0.912***	–0.878***	–0.878***
	(0.308)	(0.306)	(0.315)	(0.308)	(0.310)	(0.311)	(0.312)
Initial ratio M2 to GDP	3.102***	3.405***	3.114***	3.035***	3.609***	3.535***	3.533***
	(1.120)	(1.111)	(1.137)	(1.117)	(1.106)	(1.106)	(1.145)
Crisis		–1.192**					
		(0.513)					
Boom			–0.031				
			(0.439)				
Boom–Crisis				0.478		0.382	0.383
				(0.335)		(0.329)	(0.331)
Boom x Crisis					–1.830***	–1.752***	–1.751***
					(0.632)	(0.635)	(0.649)
Initial ratio trade to GDP							0.003
							(0.410)
Constant	4.437**	5.089***	4.470**	4.195**	5.503***	5.264***	5.263***
	(1.849)	(1.843)	(1.912)	(1.850)	(1.840)	(1.849)	(1.861)
Period dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
R2	0.133	0.165	0.133	0.145	0.182	0.190	0.190
Observations	153	153	153	153	153	153	153

Notes: Table 5 reports coefficients from ordinary least squares regressions using data covering five-year periods from 1880-1929 with standard errors in parentheses. "Boom" is a binary variable set to unity when any year within a given five-year period records an increase in the ratio of M2 to GDP of more than 30 percent over the previous 10 years. "Crisis" is a dummy variable set to unity if a country experiences a financial crisis in a given five-year period. *, ** and *** denote statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels respectively.

Table 6. Cross Country Growth Regressions with Financial Depth Interactions (OLS).

Dependent variable: Five-year average growth rate of real per capita GDP (%)							
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Log real GDP p.c. (USD)	–0.693**	–0.806***	–0.678**	–0.605**	–0.908***	–0.826***	–0.816***
	(0.308)	(0.302)	(0.321)	(0.307)	(0.309)	(0.313)	(0.312)
Initial ratio M2 to GDP	3.102***	4.300***	2.981**	2.570**	4.282***	3.749***	3.718***
	(1.120)	(1.160)	(1.321)	(1.133)	(1.164)	(1.205)	(1.249)
Initial M2/GDP x "crisis"		–2.810***					
		(0.937)					
Initial M2/GDP x "boom"			0.151				
			(0.867)				
Initial M2/GDP x (boom–crisis)				1.414**		1.121*	1.124*
				(0.653)		(0.650)	(0.655)
Initial M2 /GDP x crisis x boom					–3.245***	–2.910***	–2.896**
					(1.110)	(1.119)	(1.145)
Initial ratio trade to GDP							0.024
							(0.408)
Constant	4.437**	4.816***	4.372**	4.017**	5.241***	4.825***	4.817***
	(1.849)	(1.803)	(1.893)	(1.836)	(1.823)	(1.826)	(1.836)
Period dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
R2	0.133	0.185	0.133	0.161	0.183	0.200	0.200
Observations	153	153	153	153	153	153	153

Notes: Table 6 reports coefficients from ordinary least squares regressions using data covering five-year periods from 1880-1929 with standard errors in parentheses. "Boom" is a binary variable set to unity when any year within a given five-year period records an increase in the ratio of M2 to GDP of more than 30 percent over the previous 10 years. "Crisis" is a binary variable set to unity if a country experiences a financial crisis in a given five-year period. The binary indicators enter the specifications as interactions with financial depth (M2/GDP). *, ** and *** denote statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels respectively.

Table 7. Cross Country Growth Regressions with Financial Depth Interactions (IV).

Dependent variable: Five-year average growth rate of real per capita GDP (%)							
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Log real GDP p.c. (USD)	–0.690**	–0.793***	–0.685**	–0.598*	–0.902***	–0.809***	–0.808**
	(0.308)	(0.301)	(0.324)	(0.307)	(0.309)	(0.312)	(0.313)
Ratio M2 to GDP	2.994***	4.149***	2.962**	2.492**	4.128***	3.621***	3.590***
	(1.084)	(1.122)	(1.309)	(1.100)	(1.128)	(1.168)	(1.217)
M2 /GDP x "crisis"		–2.731***					
		(0.897)					
M2/GDP x "boom"			0.040				
			(0.846)				
M2/GDP x (boom–crisis)				1.312**		1.023*	1.027*
				(0.626)		(0.624)	(0.627)
M2/GDP x crisis x boom					–3.141***	–2.821***	–2.801**
					(1.057)	(1.066)	(1.091)
Ratio int'l trade to GDP							0.039
							(0.433)
Constant	5.214***	5.482***	5.199***	4.863**	6.062**	5.702***	5.698***
	(1.930)	(1.872)	(1.961)	(1.908)	(1.899)	(1.895)	(1.903)
Period dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
R2	0.129	0.187	0.129	0.161	0.181	0.201	0.200
Observations	153	153	153	153	153	153	153

Notes: Table 7 reports coefficients from instrumental variables regressions using data covering five-year periods from 1880-1929 with standard errors in parentheses. "Boom" is a binary variable set to unity when any year within a given five-year period records an increase in the ratio of M2 to GDP of more than 30 percent over the previous 10 years. "Crisis" is a binary variable set to unity if a country experiences a financial crisis in a given five-year period. The binary indicators enter the specifications as interactions with financial depth (M2/GDP). *, ** and *** denote statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels respectively.