Was the Classical Gold Standard Credible on the Periphery? Evidence from Currency Risk — CORRIGENDUM

KRIS JAMES MITCHENER AND MARC D. WEIDENMIER

doi: 10.1017/S0022050715000686, Published for The Economic History Association in cooperation with the University of Michigan by Cambridge University Press.

In *The Journal of Economic History*, Vol. 75, No. 3, in the article titled "Was the Classical Gold Standard Credible on the Periphery? Evidence from Currency Risk" p. 499, the information on page 499 should read:

PANEL DATA ESTIMATES OF CURRENCY RISK

To understand the extent to which country-specific factors account for the observed variation in currency risk, we constructed a weekly panel dataset for the 21 borrowers over the sample period 1870–1914. We estimate the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned} CURRENCYRISK_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 INTRASTATE_{it} + \beta_2 INTERSTATE_{it} \quad (2) \\ + \beta_3 INDIA_i + \beta_4 CENTRALBANK_{it} + \beta_5 STOCKMARKET_{it} \\ + \beta_6 DEFAULT_{it} + \beta_7 GOLD_{it} + \gamma_i + \lambda + \varepsilon_{it} \end{aligned}$$

We regret these errors in this publication and apologize for any confusion.

The Journal of Economic History, Vol. 75, No. 4 (December 2015). © The Economic History Association. All rights reserved. doi: 10.1017/S0022050715001576

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022050715001576 Published online by Cambridge University Press