**Online Appendix B:**

**Sources for Central Bank Data**

Capie, Forrest; Goodhart, Charles, and Schnadt, Norbert. ``The Development of Central Banking.’’ in Capie, Forrest; Goodhart, Charles; Fischer, Stanley; and Schnadt, Norbert (eds.) *The Future of Central Banking. The Tercentenary Symposium of the Bank of England*. Cambridge University Press. 1994.

Appendix B; ``Table 1: Years of Establishment.'' from *Central Bank Directory 2005*. Central Banking Publications Ltd. Provided via e-mail from Paul Brione of Centralbanking.co.uk;

Broz ``The Origins of Central Banking: Solutions to the Free-Rider Problem.'' *International Organization*. 1998. Table 2;

Central Bank Websites accessed via *Bank of International Settlements*, Central Bank Websites ().

The favorable financing offered to sovereigns by a central bank is palpable. For instance, when Napoleon wrote his Minister of Finance Martin Gaudin that ``I wish you would have the governor of the Bank convene a meeting to put the rate [down to] 4 percent'' it was, quite unsurprisingly, promptly done.[[1]](#footnote-1) As for the United States, the Federal Reserve facilitated the financing of the allied war effort during World War I, not by directly purchasing government securities (in the form of the Liberty and Victory loans), but by lending to member banks, who, in turn, purchased the securities (though it, like direct purchases, still increased the monetary base).[[2]](#footnote-2) As Meltzer states in his history of the Federal Reserve system, ``The wartime policy achieved the Treasury's objective of marketing an extraordinary increase in debt at relatively low direct cost to the Treasury.''[[3]](#footnote-3)

Previous debt repudiations made the British government a poor credit risk in the early 1690s. When war with France required higher government expenditures, creditors were wary to lend.[[4]](#footnote-4) In a sense, the British government's difficulties illustrate Tomz's argument that a reputation for default can harm an government's ability to borrow.[[5]](#footnote-5) Creating the Bank of England overcame investor reluctance because it invited subscribers to incorporate as the Bank and made the Bank responsible for handling government debt.[[6]](#footnote-6) Thus, the government created ``an *additional*, private constraint on its future behavior by making it difficult to utilize funds of a current loan if it failed to honor its previous obligations.''[[7]](#footnote-7) As Broz asserts, ``as a consequence of the Bank's ability to enforce a credit boycott, the sanctity of government loan contracts improved markedly. And with creditors' rights more secure, the government was able to borrow to finance wars on a scale that the Stuarts could only dream of.''[[8]](#footnote-8)

Individuals at the time recognized how the Bank of England, by easing the government's ability to borrow, directly enhanced Britain's military prowess.[[9]](#footnote-9) In 1770, Fond Montyon, a senior civil servant in the French Finance Ministry, noted how the ease with which Britain could acquire finance through debt (as opposed to taxation), gave England a large military advantage relative to France. This led Montyon to recommend that France consider adopting the same institution:

 ``Great Britain finances by taxation neither all nor part of the costs of war, it finances them by loans and increases the annual tax burden only by the amount necessary to face the interest and redemption of the loan. That is the regime that France must adopt.''[[10]](#footnote-10)
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