



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

378.794
G43455
WP-419

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Working Paper No. 419

THE TREATMENT OF FOREIGN TRADE IN
COMPUTABLE GENERAL EQUILIBRIUM MODELS OF SMALL ECONOMIES


by

Jaime de Melo and Sherman Robinson

WAITE MEMORIAL BOOK COLLECTION
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL AND APPLIED ECONOMICS
232 CLASSROOM OFFICE BLDG.
1994 BUFORD AVENUE, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA 55108

California Agricultural Experiment Station
Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics

June 1986



378.794
G43455
WP-41.9

THE TREATMENT OF FOREIGN TRADE IN
COMPUTABLE GENERAL EQUILIBRIUM MODELS OF SMALL ECONOMIES

by

Jaime de Melo
Development Research Department
The World Bank

Sherman Robinson
Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics
University of California, Berkeley

June 1986

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the NBER Applied General Equilibrium Workshop in Stanford, April 18-19, 1986. We thank David Wells for help with derivations in the appendix, Taheo Bark and T. N. Srinivasan for comments, and Gabriel Castillo and Jackson Magargee for research and logistic support. The World Bank does not accept responsibility for the views expressed herein which are those of the author(s) and should not be attributed to the World Bank or to its affiliated organizations.

Abstract

This paper examines the treatment of exports and imports, i.e. external closure rules adopted in recent single-country general equilibrium models of small economies. The paper presents the simplest one-sector analytic version corresponding to the multi-sector counterpart in applied models. The paper derives graphical and algebraic solutions to the model and shows that, unlike earlier external closures, this one gives rise to a well-behaved price-taking economy. The model is also useful to illustrate the role of elasticities in popular trade-theoretic models including traded and non-traded goods.]

1. Introduction

In recent years, two classes of computable general equilibrium (CGE) trade models have been used to investigate external sector policies: single-country and multi-country trade models. The multi-country trade models (e.g. Deardorff and Stern (1981) and Whalley (1985)) have typically been concerned with resource allocation and welfare implications of tariff reductions such as those of the Tokyo round. The single-country models have been used to analyze a variety of external sector issues ranging from the impact of restrictions on foreign trade (e.g. tariffs and QRs, with or without rent seeking) to the impact of changes in net foreign transfers or world prices on the equilibrium real exchange rate. 1/

For both types of models, the results from policy simulations depend on how export and import behavior are modelled. In a recent paper, Whalley and Yeung (1984) -- henceforth WY -- examine this issue for single country models using the term "external closure" to refer to the various assumptions about export demand and import supply behavior. After noting that most applied models are quite disaggregated and separate traded and non-traded goods, they review external closure rules in single-country models and choose a simple two commodity (import and export) formulation with no non-traded commodity to show that in these models, "... there is no currency exchange rate in the conventional use of the term as a financial magnitude determined from financial sector activity." 2/

Whalley and Yeung also show that the imposition of a zero trade balance condition in a two-good CGE model that incorporates product differentiation (i.e. the Armington assumption) with price-taking behavior for imports along with a downward-sloping foreign export demand curve with constant

elasticity yields a model in which both domestic and foreign offer curves lie on top of one another. 3/

Because these assumptions imply that the foreign offer curve is of opposite shape to that conventionally drawn, WY abandon this model and propose an external closure using a price taking formulation for all tradables along with non-tradables. They show that in this formulation, unlike the two good case, there is an exchange rate variable -- or "parameter," as they call it -- that measures the relative price between composites of traded and non-traded goods. They show that, in this model, the foreign offer curve is a straight line, while the domestic offer curve has some elasticity (thereby following more closely conventional trade theory). However, they feel that this price taking assumption will be unpalatable in empirical models of large countries. More generally, they note that this model will not allow two-way trade, or cross hauling, which is widely observed in trade statistics at the aggregations used in all CGE models, and so is not a desirable specification.

Several points about the WY analysis deserve comment. First, the role of the exchange rate in computable general equilibrium models has received attention for some time and we can find no case in which modelers interpret it as a "financial variable." 4/ Second, the two-good model with both goods traded that WY use in their first discussion of external-sector closure does not represent well any of the applied CGE trade models, which invariably include some non-traded goods. 5/ Third, an external closure using a price-taking formulation for all tradables in a model with perfect substitution will be unpalatable for stronger reasons than those mentioned by WY. If the price-taking formulation is not accompanied by some product

differentiation, the model will generate extreme specialization whenever it is subjected to a policy simulation such as reduction in tariffs. The assumption of a downward-sloping foreign demand curve, while it will help (but not fix) the specialization problem, will lead to unrealistically strong terms-of-trade effects that will dominate the welfare results of policy changes in single country models. 6/

The essence of the external sector specification of most recent single-country CGE trade models can be captured by a simple one sector model with symmetric product differentiation for imports and exports. This model embodies (and extends) well-understood results from neoclassical trade theory and provides a compact statement of the external closures found in most applied models. The model is also useful to illustrate the role of trade elasticities in the Australian (dependent economy) model with traded and non-traded goods.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: In section 2 we present the model and use it in section 3 to show how equilibrium is affected by terms-of-trade shifts and by changes in net capital inflows, both common experiments in single country models. The model is also useful for illustrating the role of elasticities in popular trade-theoretic models including traded and non-traded goods. In Section 4, we derive an expression for the elasticity of the domestic offer curve in our model with symmetric product differentiation and set up a numerical example. The expression and the numerical example show the role of initial conditions (i.e. openness to trade) and of values of trade substitution elasticities in determining the shape of the well-behaved domestic offer curve. We also illustrate the well-known fact that -- once weights entering the relevant price indices are chosen

-- the equilibrium value of the real exchange rate (defined as the relative price of traded to non-traded goods) is indeed independent of the choice of numeraire.

2. A Small-Country Model with Differentiated Trade

For most countries, and especially for developing countries, it is reasonable to assume that the country is "small" on world markets and cannot affect its international terms of trade. However, it is also reasonable to assume that the tradable sectors do not dominate the domestic price system. We present below a simple analytic model which captures these stylized facts and discuss its theoretical structure.

Make the following assumptions: (1) domestically produced and imported goods are imperfect substitutes -- the Armington assumption; (2) domestically produced goods sold on the domestic market are imperfect substitutes for goods sold on the export market; (3) the economy can purchase or sell unlimited quantities of imports and exports at constant world prices -- the small-country assumption; (4) aggregate production is fixed; and (5) there is a balance of trade constraint.

2.1 Model Equations

In Table 1, equations 1 and 2 give the trade aggregation functions. In applied models, and in the numerical example of Section 4, equation 1 is a CES function, following Armington, and equation 2 is a CET (constant elasticity of transformation function). ^{7/} For the analysis here, we only require that $F(-)$ be convex to the origin, that $G(-)$ be concave, and that both be homogenous of degree one in their arguments. Given the assumption of fixed output, which is equivalent to assuming full employment, $G(-)$ represents a

production possibility frontier delineating the tradeoffs between exports and domestic supply.

Equations (3) and (4) translate foreign prices into domestic prices using a conversion factor, r , which we refer to as the "nominal" exchange rate. It should be clear, but is worth repeating (as has been pointed out by DMR and WY) that this conversion factor, r , is not a financial exchange rate variable. Though often referred to as "the" exchange rate, we refer to it as the "nominal" exchange rate so as not to confuse it with the real exchange rate -- the relative price of the domestic good in terms of the (fixed) traded goods -- which is determined by the model. Indeed, the model could be written without reference to r -- as is common in trade theory -- by implicitly choosing it as numeraire. (This is indeed what we do below in Section 2.2.) However since we wish to consider alternative choices of the numeraire we maintain r in our formulation. 8/

We assume that producers maximize profits and that demanders minimize the cost of purchasing a given quantity of composite good Q . 9/ These assumptions lead to equations 5 to 8. Equations 5 and 6 define composite good prices and are effectively dual cost functions. They are homogeneous of degree one in input prices. Equations 7 and 8 give the demand for imports and supply of exports arising from the first-order conditions.

Since only relative prices matter, the functions describing the model are homogeneous of degree zero in prices. To set the absolute price level, select r as numeraire. Equation 9 gives the equilibrium condition for the balance of trade; that in foreign units (expressed in terms of the numeraire) the value of imports equal the value of exports plus \bar{B} . Finally, equation 10 is the equilibrium condition for the supply and demand for the domestic

Table 1

A One Sector Small-Country Model with Differentiated Trade

(1)	$Q = F(M, D)$	Import aggregation function
(2)	$\bar{X} = G(E, D)$	Export transformation function
(3)	$p^m = r \bar{\pi}^m$	Import price
(4)	$p^e = r \bar{\pi}^e$	Export price
(5)	$p^q = f_1(p^m, p^d)$	Consumer price
(6)	$p^x = g_1(p^e, p^d)$	Producer price
(7)	$\frac{M}{D^d} = f_2(p^m, p^d)$	Import demand equation
(8)	$\frac{E}{D^s} = g_2(p^e, p^d)$	Export supply equation
(9)	$\bar{\pi}^m M - \bar{\pi}^e E = \bar{B}$	Balance of trade constraint
(10)	$D^d - D^s = 0$	Domestic demand - supply equilibrium

where:

M, E	=	imports, exports
D^d, D^s	=	demand and supply of the domestic good.
Q	=	composite consumer good
\bar{X}	=	composite production
$\bar{\pi}^m$	=	world price of imports
$\bar{\pi}^e$	=	world price of exports
r	=	Conversion factor; "nominal" exchange rate
p^m	=	domestic price of imports, M
p^e	=	domestic price of exports, E
p^d	=	domestic price of domestic sales, D
p^q	=	domestic price of composite consumer good, Q
p^x	=	domestic price of composite output, X
\bar{B}	=	exogenous balance of trade, or net foreign capital inflow (or outflow for negative \bar{B}).

good. Overall, the model has 10 equations and 10 endogenous variables: Q , M , D^d , D^s , E , P^m , P^e , P^d , P^q , and P^x . The homogeneity of equations 1 and 2 guarantee that the system satisfies Walras' Law. This can be easily seen by writing out the aggregate income and expenditure equations:


$P^x \bar{X} + r \bar{B}$	total income
$P^x \bar{X} = P^e E + P^d D$	the value of production or GDP
$P^q Q = P^m M + P^d D$	Total expenditure or absorption

Given the balance of trade constraint, equation 9, it follows that income always equals expenditure. The variable, \bar{B} , in equation 9, denominated in foreign units, can be thought of as representing an increase (or decrease) in real income measured in terms of imports, given the fixed world dollar price of imports.

2.2. A Graphical Presentation

This model is simple enough so that its properties can be shown graphically. Figure 1 presents a four-quadrant diagram that captures the essential features. For convenience, choose units so that the exogenous world prices for both exports and imports equal one. Also, set r as numeraire, and initially assume $\bar{B} = 0$. In this case, the balance of trade equation defines the foreign offer curve and graphs as a 45-degree line in quadrant 1. The production possibility frontier, PP , (equation 2) is graphed in quadrant 4. Quadrant 3 has a 45-degree line which simply indicates that domestic goods, D , which are supplied to the domestic market, are available for demand, defining equilibrium in the domestic goods market. The concave curve, CC , in quadrant

Figure 1




2 is the consumption possibility frontier, which is the locus of points that simultaneously satisfy the balance of trade constraint in quadrant 1 and the production possibility frontier in quadrant 4. Given our choice of units and the assumption that the balance of trade equals zero, the consumption possibility frontier in quadrant 2 is a mirror image of the production possibility frontier, PP in quadrant 4.

In quadrant 2, the import aggregation function, equation 1, generates a series of "iso-good" curves, II, analogous to indifference curves. ^{10/} Equilibrium is achieved at the point of tangency with the consumption possibility frontier. At this point, the equilibrium price ratios, P^d/P^m and P^d/P^e , equal the slope of the tangents in quadrants 2 and 4, and are derived from the first-order conditions in equations 7 and 8. ^{11/} Given our choice of units, the two ratios are equal, and the equilibrium value of P^d is the equilibrium value of the relative price of non-tradables to tradables. Thus, selecting r as numeraire is convenient since it allows us to interpret P^d as the real exchange rate.

Consider the limiting "Ricardian" case corresponding to an infinitely elastic supply of exports. Then PP becomes a straight line, which in turn implies a straight line consumption possibility curve. The real exchange rate is now fixed and, as in a Ricardian world, is determined by technology. Substitution possibilities in demand only determine the composition of production for domestic and for export sales. ^{12/}

Our graphical presentation can also be used to consider the closure criticized by WY, namely a specification with product differentiation on the import side and one in which foreign export demand is not infinite. In this case the model would include an extra equation, $E = \pi e^{-\zeta}$, where $\zeta > 0$ is the

Figure 2



constant foreign demand elasticity and π^e is now endogenous. Now the balance of trade constraint in quadrant 1 becomes a curve with declining slope, and the new consumption possibility frontier in quadrant 2 is inside the old frontier. In this model with symmetric product differentiation on the import and export sides, dropping the small country assumption does not give rise to any of the problems suggested by WY.


3. Terms-of-Trade and Transfers: A Graphical Analysis

Is the one sector model with differentiated trade well behaved? We examine two typical experiments conducted with single-country models: a terms-of-trade shift and a change in foreign transfers.

3.1 Terms-of-Trade Change

Figure 2 shows the effect on equilibrium of an improvement in the terms-of-trade ($TOT_0 \rightarrow TOT_1$) corresponding to an increase in π^e , $d\pi^e > 0$. This terms-of-trade change shifts out the consumption possibility schedule to C_0C_1 . Will the economy supply a larger volume of exports at this improved terms-of-trade? As drawn in figure 2, this is not the case. The demand for the domestic good increases, which in turn implies that the domestic offer curve, FF, is inelastic. ^{13/} Also note that the real exchange rate will appreciate. In the limiting "Ricardian" case considered above, the real exchange appreciation will be equal to the change in the terms of trade, i.e. $dp^d = d\bar{\pi}^e$. We conclude that this external closure need not give rise to the problems mentioned by WY.

Figure 3



3.2 An Increase in Foreign Transfers

Figure 3 shows the effect on equilibrium of an increase in foreign transfers. The effect of a transfer, \bar{B} , is an upward parallel shift of the external budget constraint to O_1O_1 and the consumption possibility curve to C_1C_1 . Will the increase in transfer lead to a real exchange rate appreciation as one would expect in a model where the domestic good is consumed? Yes, if the domestic goods is not inferior in consumption, which is the case drawn in figure 3 and is guaranteed for the CES function used in practice. Domestic consumption of D increases, exports fall, and imports rise.

The graphical apparatus developed here can also be used to examine the effects of a change in commercial policy. This is not done here since it does not lead to any new insights about the properties of the external closure under review. We conclude that the specified external closure gives rise to a well-defined real exchange rate whose variations to policy changes is in accord with the usual assumptions of neoclassical trade theory for small economies. The assumption of product differentiation thus leads to a much more realistic small-country model that can accommodate two-way trade and a degree of autonomy in the domestic price system, but retains all the desirable features of the standard neoclassical model. We also note that, contrary to the external closures examined by WY, the external closure specified here gives plausible and expected results to changes in terms-of-trade and transfers.

4. A Numerical Example

We conclude with a simple numerical example to show the influence of different parameter values on computed equilibria for an increase in transfers

and a terms-of-trade change. Assume, as in typical applications, that the import aggregation function is CES and the export transformation is CET. Then where a bar denotes an exogenous variable and σ and Ω are elasticities of substitution and transformation respectively. Following the calibration common in CGE models, we construct parameters for the CES and CET functions to equations (1) and (2) in Table 1 are given by:

$$(4.1) \quad Q = \bar{A}_1 (\beta M^{-\rho} + (1-\beta)D^{-\rho})^{-\frac{1}{\rho}}; \quad \sigma = \frac{1}{1+\rho}$$

$$(4.2) \quad \bar{X} = \bar{A}_2 (\alpha E^h + (1-\alpha)D^h)^{\frac{1}{h}}; \quad \Omega = \frac{1}{h-1}$$

Where a bar denotes an exogenous variable and σ and Ω are elasticities of substitution and transformation respectively. Following the calibration common in CGE models, we construct parameters for the CES and CET functions to

Table 2

Base Solution Values

Transfer (B)	Exports (E)	Imports (M)	Domestic Demand (D)	GDP (X)
0	25	25	75	100

produce the initial equilibrium formulated in table 2 such that all prices are unity i.e. $\bar{\pi}^m = \bar{\pi}^e = r = P^x = P^m = P^e = 1$ 14/

Table 3 shows the effects on the welfare indicator, Q, (Col. 3) and on the real exchange rate (Col. 4) of setting transfers equal to 10 -- i.e. to 10% of initial GDP -- under different values of the elasticities of substitution and of transformation. Note that, in the limit, the increase in

welfare is equal to the transfer itself. This is when the marginal rate of transformation of production between sales to the domestic and export markets is infinite, i.e. in the Ricardian case mentioned above. As expected, the required real exchange rate adjustment to absorb the transfer is an increasing function of the curvature of the CES and CET functions.

Table 3

Welfare and Real Exchange Rate Calculations for an Increase in Transfers ^{a/}

σ ^{b/}	α ^{c/}	Q	r/p^d	r	r/p^x
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
.2	.2	106.9	.38	.46	.45
.5	.5	108.7	.68	.75	.74
2	2	109.6	.91	.93	.93
5	5	109.9	.96	.97	.97
5	∞	110.0	1.00	1.00	1.00

- ^{a/} Transfer (B) set equal to 10.
^{b/} Elasticity of substitution in CES (eq.1, table 1 and eq.4.1).
^{c/} Elasticity of transformation in CET (eq.2, table 2 and eq.4.2).



In this example the numeraire is $p^q \equiv 1$. Had we selected another numeraire -- a typical one in CGE applications is to fix the value of the GDP deflator with base year quantity weights i.e. to set $p^x \equiv 1$ -- then the equilibrium values of the "nominal" exchange rate (or conversion factor) in

column 5 would have been replaced by the values appearing in column 6. Likewise, with $p^d \equiv 1$ as numeraire, the equilibrium values for the "nominal" exchange rate would have been given by the values in column 4. And, with $r \equiv 1$ as numeraire, the equilibrium value of p^d appearing in column 4, would have corresponded to the equilibrium value of the real exchange rate. Regardless of the choice of numeraire, the equilibrium values of the relative price indices appearing in columns 4 and 6 of table 3 would have remained unaltered.

In this one sector model, there is no ambiguity with respect to the appropriate definition of the real exchange rate, r/p^d . In applied work, however, two problems arise. In multi-sector CGE applications, a choice must be made with respect to the weights entering the aggregator for the domestic price index. Even though the choice of weights will affect the computed values for the equilibrium real exchange rate, the equilibrating mechanism working through changes in the real exchange rate is the same, no matter what price is chosen as numeraire.

The other problem relates to the choice of weights used to proxy the domestic price index in computations of real exchange rate indices. Typically, the domestic price index is proxied by some published price index such as the CPI index or the GDP deflator. As shown by the values in the last two columns of Table 3, when values of σ and Ω are low, the choice of proxy for the domestic price index makes a great deal of difference in the computed value of the real exchange rate. For example with $\sigma = \Omega = 0.5$, the real exchange rate index with CPI (or GDP) weights used as proxy has a value of .75 (.74) whereas the correct value is .68.

Figure 4: Offer Curve Elasticity



Finally we come to the shape of the offer curve. It can be shown that the elasticity of the offer curve, ϵ^{OC} , is given by the following expression: 15/

$$(4.3) \quad \epsilon^{OC} = - \frac{\alpha (\sigma + \Omega) + \lambda \sigma (\Omega + 1)}{\Omega (1 - \sigma) \lambda}$$


where

$$\lambda \equiv (1 - \alpha) \left\{ \frac{\alpha (1 - \beta)}{(1 - \alpha) \beta} \right\} \frac{\sigma (1 + \Omega)}{\Omega + \sigma}$$

From expression (4.3) it is clear that the offer curve will be vertical ($\epsilon^{OC} = \infty$) for $\sigma = 1$, positively sloping ($\epsilon^{OC} > 1$) for $\sigma > 1$ and negatively sloping ($\epsilon^{OC} < 0$) for $\sigma < 1$. Since the elasticity of the foreign offer curve is unity throughout, it is evident that the domestic and foreign offer curves do not lie on top of one another in this external closure rule. Furthermore, for given values of Ω , ϵ^{OC} monotonically decreases for increasing values of σ (with discontinuity at $\sigma = 1$). For given values of σ , the curvature of the offer curve is less (ϵ^{OC} is lower), the higher is the value of Ω . Finally, for given values of σ and Ω , the value of ϵ^{OC} is larger, the more open the economy is. 16/

Figure 4(a) and 4(b) trace the elasticity of the domestic offer curve for different values of σ , $\sigma \neq 1$. Negative values of ϵ^{OC} correspond to a backward bending offer curve. In this case the income effect of an improvement in the terms of trade dominates the substitution effect and less exports are supplied. Negative values of ϵ^{OC} imply that the real exchange rate must

Figure 5: Welfare, Real Exchange Rate, and Terms of Trade



appreciate to insure a greater supply to the domestic market (this is the case drawn in Figure 2). Raising the elasticity of export supply lowers the offer curve elasticity which in the limit is unity. This result follows directly from the relation between the two elasticities along the external budget constraint. Increasing the degree of openness raises the offer curve elasticity, a result also found in standard trade-theoretic models.

Finally Figure 5 traces the equilibrium values obtained from solving the model with the initial conditions in Table 2 under a high and a low set of trade substitution elasticities. Figure 5 draws the equilibrium values of the welfare indicator, the real exchange rate and the import share in absorption for different values of the terms-of-trade. (The arrows indicate the path of the variables as the terms-of-trade improves.) As expected, welfare gains -- measured here in terms of absorption, Q -- are larger for the higher set of trade substitution elasticities. (The higher gain attributable to greater specialization appears as a much larger variation in the share of imports in absorption for the high value of σ .) More importantly, Figure 5 confirms the critical role assumed by the value of σ in determining whether the real exchange rate will appreciate or depreciate when the terms-of-trade varies.

5. Conclusions

In this paper we have studied systematically the typical external closure of many single-country applied general equilibrium trade models. We have shown that the standard assumption of product differentiation on the import side can be naturally extended to the export side. An external closure with symmetric product differentiation for imports and exports is theoretically well-behaved and gives rise to normally shaped offer curves. We derive

the elasticity of the domestic offer curve for a one sector model and illustrate the model with a numerical example. The numerical example illustrates, under different trade substitution elasticities, the implications of the choice of weights used to proxy the domestic price index in computations of real exchange rate indices. The model is also useful to illustrate the role of foreign trade elasticities in the popular Australian model with traded and non-traded goods. In particular, we show the crucial role of trade substitution elasticities on the import side in determining the direction of change of the real exchange rate for terms-of-trade perturbations.

Appendix

1. Derivation of Equilibrium Conditions in Figure 1.

To show that in equilibrium the MRS in consumption in quadrant (2) is equal to the MRT in production in quadrant (4), maximize (1) subject to (2) and (9) by setting the following Lagrangian:

Maximize:

$$(A1) \quad L = Q - \lambda_x [\bar{X} - G(E, D)] - \lambda_b [\bar{B} - \bar{\pi}^m M + \bar{\pi}^e E]$$

The first-order conditions are

$$(A2) \quad \frac{\partial L}{\partial D} = \frac{\partial Q}{\partial D} + \lambda_x \left[\frac{\partial G}{\partial D} \right] = 0$$

$$(A3) \quad \frac{\partial L}{\partial M} = \frac{\partial Q}{\partial M} + \lambda_b [\bar{\pi}^m] = 0$$

$$(A4) \quad \frac{\partial L}{\partial E} = \lambda_x \left[\frac{\partial G}{\partial E} \right] - \lambda_b \bar{\pi}^e = 0$$

From (A4)

$$(A5) \quad \lambda_b = \lambda_x \frac{\partial G}{\partial E} / \bar{\pi}^e$$

Substitute (A5) into (A3):

$$(A6) \quad \frac{\partial Q}{\partial M} = -\bar{\pi}^m \lambda_x \frac{\partial G}{\partial E}$$

Divide (A6) into (A2) to get:

$$(A7) \quad \frac{\partial Q / \partial D}{\partial Q / \partial M} = \frac{\bar{\pi}^e}{\bar{\pi}^m} = \frac{\partial G / \partial D}{\partial E / \partial E}$$

Choose units so that $\bar{\pi}^e = \bar{\pi}^m = 1$. This establishes the condition asserted in the text, i.e.

$$(A8) \frac{\partial Q/\partial D}{\partial Q/\partial M} = \frac{p^d/p^q}{p^m/p^q} = \frac{\partial G/\partial D}{\partial G/\partial E} = \frac{p^d/p^x}{p^e/p^x} \dots \frac{p^d}{p^m} = \frac{p^d}{p^e}$$

2. Derivation of Elasticity of Offer Curve (Equation 4.3) 17/

We proceed in two steps. First we derive the relation between M and E when MRS = MRT. In the second step we bring in the balance of trade constraint.

From (4.2) note that the CET defines a relation between E and D, i.e.

$$(A9) D(E, \bar{X}) = \left[\frac{\bar{X}^h}{(1-\alpha)\bar{A}_2^h} - \frac{\alpha}{(1-\alpha)} E^h \right]^{\frac{1}{h}}$$

Using (A9) in the FOC of the Lagrangian in (A1) we have:

$$(A10) \frac{\partial L}{\partial M} = \frac{\partial Q}{\partial M} + \lambda_b \bar{\pi}^m = 0$$

$$(A11) \frac{\partial L}{\partial E} = \frac{\partial Q}{\partial D} \frac{\partial D}{\partial E} - \lambda_b \bar{\pi}^e = 0$$

Dividing (A10) and (A11) and rearranging gives:

$$(A12) \frac{\partial Q}{\partial M} = - \frac{\bar{\pi}^m}{\bar{\pi}^e} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial D} \cdot \frac{\partial D}{\partial E}$$

The partial derivatives in (A12) are obtained from differentiation of (4.1), (4.2) and (A9).

$$(A13) \frac{\partial Q}{\partial M} = \beta \bar{A}_1 (\beta M^{-\rho} + (1-\beta)D^{-\rho})^{\frac{-(1+\rho)}{\rho}} M^{-(\rho+1)}$$

$$(A14) \frac{\partial Q}{\partial D} = (1-\beta) \bar{A}_1 (\beta M^{-\rho} + (1-\beta)D^{-\rho})^{\frac{-(1+\rho)}{\rho}} D^{-(\rho+1)}$$

$$(A15) \frac{\partial D}{\partial E} = \frac{-\alpha}{1-\alpha} \left[\frac{\bar{X}^h}{\bar{A}_2^h (1-\alpha)} - \frac{\alpha}{(1-\alpha)} E^h \right]^{\frac{1-h}{h}} E^{h-1}$$

Substitution of (A13), (A14) and (A15) into (A12) yields, after manipulation, the following:

$$(A16) \quad M = \left(\frac{\frac{-m}{\pi}}{\frac{-e}{\pi}} \frac{\alpha(1-\beta)}{(1-\alpha)\beta} \right)^{\frac{-1}{\rho+1}} \left[\frac{\bar{X}^h}{\bar{A}_2^h(1-\alpha)} - \frac{\alpha}{(1-\alpha)} E^h \right] \frac{\rho+h}{(\rho+1)h} E^{-\frac{h-1}{\rho+1}}$$

Which gives the relation between M and E when MRS = MRT.

The second step involves taking into account the balance of trade constraint,

$$(A17) \quad E = \frac{\frac{-m}{\pi}}{\frac{-e}{\pi}} M$$

Substituting (A16) into (A17) and rearranging gives the required equilibrium relation between E and M:

$$(A18) \quad E = \frac{\bar{X}}{\bar{A}_2} \left\{ \alpha + (1-\alpha) \left[\left(\frac{-e}{\frac{-m}{\pi}} \right)^{1-\sigma} \left(\frac{\alpha(1-\beta)}{(1-\alpha)\beta} \right)^\sigma \right]^{\frac{\Omega+1}{\Omega+\sigma}} \right\}^{-\frac{\Omega}{1+\Omega}}$$

To get an expression for the elasticity of the offer curve, ϵ^{oc} , note that the following hold along an offer curve:

$$(A19) \quad \epsilon^{oc} = \frac{1}{\epsilon_x^s} + 1 \quad ; \quad \epsilon_x^s + \epsilon_m^d = -1$$

where

$$\epsilon^{oc} \equiv \frac{d \log M}{d \log E} \quad ; \quad \epsilon_m^d \equiv \frac{d \log M}{\left(d \log \frac{\frac{-m}{\pi}}{\frac{-e}{\pi}} \right)} \quad ; \quad \epsilon_x^s \equiv \frac{d \log E}{\left(d \log \frac{\frac{-e}{\pi}}{\frac{-m}{\pi}} \right)}$$

Log differentiate (A18) to get an expression for ϵ_x^s . Manipulation eventually yields:

$$(A20) \quad \epsilon_x^S = \frac{-\Omega(1-\alpha)(1-\sigma)\gamma \frac{\sigma(1+\Omega)}{\Omega+\sigma} \left(\frac{-e}{\pi^m}\right) \frac{(1-\sigma)(1+\Omega)}{\Omega+\sigma}}{(\sigma+\Omega) \left\{ \alpha + (1-\alpha) \left[\left(\frac{-e}{\pi^m}\right) (1-\sigma)\gamma \sigma \right] \frac{\Omega+1}{\Omega+\sigma} \right\}}$$

where

$$\gamma \equiv \frac{\alpha(1-\beta)}{(1-\alpha)\beta}$$

By choice of units let $\pi^e = \pi^m = 1$. Then (A20) simplifies to

$$(A21) \quad \epsilon_x^S = \frac{-\Omega(1-\sigma)\lambda}{(\sigma+\Omega)(\alpha+\lambda)}$$

where

$$\lambda \equiv (1-\alpha) \gamma \frac{\sigma(1+\Omega)}{(\Omega+\sigma)}$$

Substitution of (A21) into (A19) yields equation (4.3) in the text.

Footnotes

- 1/ Dervis, de Melo and Robinson (1982) -- henceforth DMR -- review the theoretical specification of single country trade models and present a number of applications analyzing the types of issues mentioned above.
- 2/ Whalley and Yeung (1984), p. 126.
- 3/ WY also note that because export and import demand elasticities are not independent, the reduced forms for the export and import demand functions differ from the specification intended. Although econometricians do not typically incorporate the restrictions implied by the trade balance when they estimate export demand and import supply elasticities, the point that trade balance restrictions should be recognized in specifying combinations of export demand and import supply elasticities is correct and nicely made. For a general treatment in the n-commodity case see Jones and Berglas (1977).
- 4/ See for instance DMR chp. 6, sections 2 and 3.
- 5/ WY do consider in equations (22-25) a formulation with one domestic good but only for an exchange economy. As argued below, this formulation is not a simplified representation of a typical single-country CGE trade model.
- 6/ See DMR ch. 6 for a discussion of specialization and ch. 7 for an alternative specification for export behavior. The importance of terms-of-trade effects with constant foreign export demand is shown in chapter 9.
- 7/ The CET formulation was first suggested by Powell and Gruen (1969). Though more elegant and easier to work with than the logistic supply curve proposed by DMR, it can be shown that, for a suitable parametrization, the specifications are identical for local changes around equilibrium. De Melo and Robinson (1985) explore analytically in a partial equilibrium context, the implications of product differentiation on the domestic price system.
- 8/ It is for this reason that referring to r as "the" exchange rate is often confusing. However, under appropriate numeraire selection, r becomes the real exchange rate, in which case it should be referred to as such.
- 9/ In fact, for the analysis here, we could assume that equation 1 is a utility function which consumers seek to maximize.
- 10/ If we replace equation 1 with an explicit utility function, the "iso-goods" can be interpreted as indifference curves. Nothing changes in the analysis.

- 11/ This result can be derived from the maximization of (1) subject to (2) and (9) and is derived in an appendix available from the authors upon request.
- 12/ This is the case that would correspond most closely to the two-commodity external closure examined by WY in section 4 of their paper (eqs. 22-25). However, even in this case, the domestic offer curve need not lie on top of the (straight line) foreign offer curve. To see this consider a small increase in π_e , $d\pi_e$. In this case $dP^d = d\pi^e$. Suppose for example, that the increase in the demand for D due to the income effect associated with the improvement in the terms-of-trade just offsets the substitution effect raising the demand for M. This is the case corresponding to a Cobb-Douglas Aggregation function for equation (1). Then the domestic demand for D is unchanged and the domestic offer curve is vertical. This result is derived in the appendix and used in section 4.
- 13/ As shown in Figure 4, the shape of the domestic offer curve depends on the two substitution elasticities and on trade shares.
- 14/ The numeraire is $P^q \equiv 1$ and the solution is found by solving the maximization problem set in the appendix using the GAMS package developed by Arne Drud and Alex Merraus.
- 15/ This result is derived in the appendix with $\pi^e = \pi^m = 1$ by choice of units.
- 16/ Openess is defined in the sense of high initial trade (E/D, M/D) shares.
- 17/ We thank David Wells for suggesting the approach followed in this derivation.

References

- Armington, P., 1969, "A Theory of Demand for Products Distinguished by Place of Production," IMF Staff Papers, 1969, vol. 16, 159-176.
- Deardorff, A. V. and R. M. Stern, 1981, "A Disaggregated Model of World Production and Trade: An Estimate of the Impact of the Tokyo Round", Journal of Policy Modeling, pp 127-152.
- Dervis, K., J. de Melo, and S. Robinson, 1982, General Equilibrium Models for Development Policy, Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, R. W. and E. Berglas, 1977, "Import Demand and Export Supply: An Aggregation Theorem", American Economic Review, pp 183-7.
- Melo, J. de and S. Robinson, 1985, "Product Differentiation and Trade Dependence of the Domestic Price System in Computable General Equilibrium Trade Models," in T. Peeters, et al, eds. International Trade and Exchange Rates North-Holland, pp 91-107.
- Powell, A. and F. Gruen, 1968, "The Constant Elasticity of Transformation Production Frontier and Linear Supply System," International Economic Review, vol. 9, 315-28.
- Whalley, J., 1985, Trade Liberalization among Major World Trading Areas, MIT press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Whalley, J. and B. Yeung, 1984, "External Sector 'Closing' Rules in Applied General Equilibrium Models," Journal of International Economics, vol. 16, 123-38.

pd. T. 10/1/86
10/1/86