International Journal of Environmental Sciences
ISSN: 2229-7359
Vol. 11 No. 11s, 2025
https://theaspd.com/index.php

The Dynamics Of Monetary And Fiscal Policy Across Regimes: A Review Of The Literature

Brekhna Ali[1], Mukamil Shah[2]
[1] PhD Economics Scholar Institute of Management Sciences Peshawar, alibrekhna@gmail.com
[2]Assistant Professor Economics Institute of Management Sciences Peshawar,
alibrekhna@gmail.com[1], mukamil.shah@imsciences.edu.pk [2]

Abstract
This literature review explores the coordination of monetary and fiscal policies across various political regimes, with a specific focus on the context of Pakistan. It examines the historical evolution, theoretical underpinnings, institutional dynamics, and policy frameworks that have shaped macroeconomic management over time. By reviewing both classical and contemporary perspectives, this paper highlights the implications of policy misalignment and identifies opportunities for strengthening institutional coordination. Drawing comparisons with other developing economies and Pakistan's unique political shifts, it emphasizes the importance of integrated and adaptive policy strategies. The paper concludes by identifying key gaps in the literature and suggesting directions for future research in achieving sustainable macroeconomic governance.
Keywords: *monetary policy coordination; fiscal policy interaction; macroeconomic stability; policy regimes; Pakistan; fiscal dominance; central bank independence; developing economies; institutional reform*

INTRODUCTION

Monetary and fiscal policies are the twin pillars of macroeconomic management, shaping inflation, growth, public debt, and exchange rate dynamics (Blinder, 2006; Mishkin, 2007). In developing nations like Pakistan, the synchronized implementation of these policies is particularly critical given structural fiscal imbalances, political instability, and institutional deficiencies that characterize the economy (Arby & Hanif, 2010; Shah, Ali & Ziad, 2021). Uncoordinated policy moves can lead to adverse outcomes: for instance, Pakistan has frequently experienced fiscal dominance, where large budget deficits compel the State Bank of Pakistan (SBP) to monetize debt, fueling inflationary pressures and higher interest rates (Shahid, Qayyum, & Malik, 2016; Akram & Rais, 2011). Such scenarios illustrate how an expansive fiscal stance can directly undermine monetary policy objectives. Conversely, overly tight monetary policy amid lax fiscal discipline can stifle growth without reining in deficits, exemplifying a policy clash rather than a concerted strategy. These dynamics underscore the need for examining how Pakistan's fiscal and monetary authorities have interacted over time and under varying political regimes.Historically, Pakistan's experience offers stark examples of coordination (or the lack thereof) under different governance regimes. Military-led governments (most notably the Musharraf administration (1999–2008)), often achieved relatively better monetary-fiscal alignment, contributing to short-term macroeconomic stability (Arby & Hanif, 2010). This was facilitated by centralized, technocratic decision-making which streamlined policy goals. In contrast, democratic periods have tended to feature expansionary, populist fiscal measures coupled with delayed or politically constrained monetary tightening, a combination that exacerbated inflation and external imbalances (Agha & Khan, 2006; Jawaid, Qadri & Ali, 2011). The absence of formal coordination mechanisms meant that during civilian governments, fiscal and monetary authorities frequently operated in isolation, with policy decisions driven by electoral politics on one hand and inflation-targeting mandates on the other. The result has often been cyclical episodes of macroeconomic stress, including high inflation, currency pressures, and repeated reliance on IMF stabilization programs. Scholarly analyses employing regime-switching models (e.g., Markov-switching VARs) further confirm that akistan's policy transmission and outcomes differ significantly across regime types, with monetary shocks affecting output and prices differently under authoritarian versus democratic settings (Ali et al., 2012). Comparative perspectives from other developing economies reinforce these observations: for instance, Brazil's enforcement of fiscal discipline enabled successful inflation targeting, and India's adoption of fiscal responsibility laws improved synergy between its central bank and fiscal authority (Carvalho & Nechio, 2023; Sachdeva, Paras & Ahmad, 2024). Such cases suggest that Pakistan's difficulties are not unique (policy misalignment is a common challenge in developing economies) yet they also highlight the potential benefits of instituting formal coordination frameworks and safeguarding central bank independence.In this context, the present review aims to provide a comprehensive synthesis of the literature on monetary-fiscal policy coordination with a focus on Pakistan's regime-specific experience. It draws on diverse theoretical paradigms, empirical studies, and cross-country evidence to evaluate how Pakistan's monetary and fiscal authorities have interacted from independence to the present, and what the implications are for macroeconomic stability. By critically examining the evolution of policy frameworks, the role of institutional arrangements, and the influence of political regimes, the review identifies key obstacles that have impeded effective coordination. It also discusses recommended strategies, such as credible fiscal rules, enhanced SBP autonomy, and structured policy dialogue mechanisms, to achieve more coherent and sustainable macroeconomic management. This literature review was conducted using a systematic approach to ensure breadth and depth of coverage: major scholarly databases and institutional sources (including Google Scholar, JSTOR, ScienceDirect, IMF and World Bank reports, as well as publications by SBP, the Pakistan Institute of Development Economics (PIDE), and the Ministry of Finance) were surveyed. Keyword searches ranged from "monetary-fiscal coordination" and "macroeconomic policy Pakistan" to "fiscal dominance" and "central bank independence," yielding sources spanning the early 1980s (e.g., the seminal work of Sargent & Wallace, 1981) through 2024. Inclusion was focused on peer-reviewed articles, policy papers, and institutional studies that address coordination challenges, historical policy regimes, or propose institutional mechanisms for better policy alignment. The literature gathered has been organized thematically (covering theoretical foundations, Pakistan's historical policy trajectory, comparative international experiences, and institutional frameworks) in order to build a robust evidence base for the analysis and conclusions that follow.

Theoretical Perspectives on Monetary–Fiscal Policy Coordination

Academic perspectives on how monetary and fiscal policies should interact are rooted in several macroeconomic schools of thought, each offering distinct insights into the necessity and efficacy of policy coordination. At one end of the spectrum, Classical economics (and its modern extensions in New Classical and Real Business Cycle theory) posits that markets are self-correcting and that active government stabilization is largely unnecessary. From a classical viewpoint, fiscal expansions are prone to be ineffective or even counterproductive: increased government borrowing is believed to crowd out private investment by driving up interest rates, thus nullifying any stimulus to aggregate demand (Barro, 1981). In these models, money is neutral in the long run, and systematic monetary or fiscal interventions cannot sustainably influence real output or employment. New Classical theorists like Lucas (1976) further argue that rational expectations cause anticipated policy actions to be absorbed by the economy with little real impact, rendering coordination moot except for possibly managing unexpected shocks. Monetarist theory, championed by Friedman (1995) and others, shares some of this skepticism about fiscal activism. Monetarists assert that stable monetary growth aimed at controlling inflation is the most critical policy objective, while discretionary fiscal measures often introduce instability due to lags and political incentives. They contend that if fiscal deficits are persistently financed by central bank credit, the result will be inflationary pressure and loss of monetary policy credibility (Sargent & Wallace, 1981). Consequently, both classical and monetarist perspectives highlight the importance of central bank independence and rule-based policy: monetary authorities should focus on price stability without accommodating fiscal excess, and fiscal authorities should maintain discipline to avoid undermining monetary control. These schools thus imply that strong coordination is not inherently required if each authority follows its mandate; in fact, too much coordination could be harmful if it means the central bank subordinating its anti-inflation role to fiscal needs. Pakistan's recurring bouts of fiscal dominance, where large deficits compelled the SBP to print money, exemplify the very scenario monetarists warn against (Akram & Rais, 2011). The classical/monetarist lens would diagnose these episodes as failures of commitment to sound policy rules, suggesting that better outcomes depend on enforcing fiscal restraint and allowing the central bank autonomy to resist political pressures.In contrast, Keynesian and Post-Keynesian schools of thought strongly advocate for active policy coordination, especially during economic downturns or periods of crisis. From a Keynesian perspective, monetary and fiscal policies are complementary tools that should be used in tandem to stabilize the economy. Keynes (1937) famously argued that during a recession, when private demand is deficient, expansionary fiscal policy (increased government spending or tax cuts) is essential to boost aggregate demand and lift output and employment. However, if monetary policy simultaneously adopts a contractionary stance (for example, raising interest rates to combat inflation), it could counteract the fiscal stimulus, leading to suboptimal results. Keynesians therefore emphasize the need for counter-cyclical coordination: during recessions, fiscal expansion should be met with accommodative monetary policy, while in booms, fiscal tightening should coincide with monetary restraint (Blinder, 2006). This coordinated approach ensures that the policies reinforce rather than negate each other. Post-Keynesian economists extend these ideas by incorporating financial system nuances and uncertainties. They argue that money supply is largely endogenous (driven by credit demand) and that economies are frequently subject to shocks and instability that require flexible, coordinated interventions (Arestis & Sawyer, 2006; Lavoie, 2014). Post-Keynesian views place greater weight on the institutional context and the real-world frictions (such as liquidity constraints, unemployment, and distributional concerns) which mean that uncoordinated or single-policy approaches may fail to achieve stability. According to this view, countries like Pakistan, with underdeveloped financial markets, frequent supply-side shocks, and limited automatic stabilizers, stand to gain significantly from synchronized policy efforts. For instance, if the government embarks on development spending to address infrastructure gaps or a pandemic-induced recession, supportive low-interest-rate policies by the central bank can amplify the growth impact, whereas a conflicting tight monetary stance would dampen it. Indeed, recent Pakistani experience during the COVID-19 crisis showed that monetary easing alone could not revive growth without fiscal support, and vice versa; lack of a unified strategy limited the effectiveness of either policy (A. Ullah et al., 2021; SBP, 2021). Thus, Keynesian and post-Keynesian frameworks imply that policy synergies are vital: a well-coordinated mix can better manage the trade-offs between stimulating growth and controlling inflation, as opposed to isolated actions that may undermine each other. In summary, the theoretical literature reveals a spectrum of thought on policy coordination, from classical and monetarist caution against entangling policies, to Keynesian calls for joint action. Notably, in the context of a developing economy like Pakistan, where market imperfections, external vulnerabilities, and political constraints are pronounced, many scholars argue that the case for coordination is particularly compelling (Saheen, 2013; Andlib et al., 2012). While strict classical assumptions seldom hold in such environments (Agha & Khan, 2006), the more pragmatic Keynesian and heterodox approaches underscore the need for adaptable coordination mechanisms. These perspectives set the stage for examining Pakistan's actual monetary-fiscal dynamics, where theory meets the reality of governance and economic structure.

Evolution of Monetary and Fiscal Policy Coordination in Pakistan

Pakistan's macroeconomic policy coordination has evolved through distinct phases since independence, deeply influenced by the country's changing political landscape. The historical trajectory from 1947 to the present reveals periods of both cooperation and conflict between fiscal and monetary authorities, often aligned with whether the country was under military or civilian rule. Understanding this evolution is crucial, as it provides context for the current coordination challenges and the institutional inertia that Pakistan faces.In the first few decades after 1947, Pakistan pursued a strategy of state-led development with heavy government involvement in the economy. Fiscal policy was the dominant tool for development, exemplified by ambitious Five-Year Plans and public sector expansion, while monetary policy took a subordinate role. The State Bank of Pakistan, established in 1948, initially operated as a virtual arm of the Ministry of Finance, financing government expenditures through direct borrowing and seigniorage (printing money). Lacking statutory independence, the SBP's primary function was often to accommodate the treasury's needs. This era was marked by repeated budget deficits as the government invested in infrastructure and industry but struggled with a narrow tax base and political pressures for patronage spending. The result was a pattern of fiscal excess spilling over into macroeconomic instability: inflationary episodes occurred as the money supply expanded to finance deficits, and any nascent monetary tightening was overruled by financing needs (Zaidi, 2005; Khan & Gill, 2009). For example, the Raisman Award in the 1950s attempted to address federal-provincial revenue sharing and improve fiscal management, but its impact was limited amid rising expenditures. Although a State Bank Act in 1956 nominally broadened the central bank's mandate, in practice Pakistan did not grant meaningful autonomy to its monetary authority during this period (Library of Congress, 1994). Coordination between policies was largely implicit (both were geared toward the government's development objectives) but lacked any institutional mechanism to reconcile conflicts. By the late 1960s, the strains were evident in the form of inflation and balance-of-payments pressures, foreshadowing the need for a more balanced policy approach.Pakistan's policy framework began to shift in the 1980s and 1990s under the influence of structural adjustment programs and a wave of financial liberalization. After a turbulent 1970s (characterized by war, the loss of East Pakistan, and nationalization under Prime Minister Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto which had left fiscal burdens and high inflation), the 1980s brought a series of IMF and World Bank-sponsored reforms aimed at stabilization and market-oriented change. Key among these was a move to strengthen the State Bank and reduce the practice of deficit monetization. The promulgation of the SBP Act of 1994 was a milestone: it granted the central bank greater administrative autonomy and limited government borrowing from the SBP, signaling an intent to separate monetary policy from fiscal dominance (Husain, 2005; SBP). This was complemented by financial sector reforms in the late 1990s and early 2000s (such as privatization of banks and the SBP Amendment in 1997) intended to modernize monetary operations. On the fiscal side, successive governments attempted to curtail budget deficits, often under IMF programs that imposed austerity measures and targets for deficit reduction. Despite these efforts, however, genuine monetary-fiscal coordination remained elusive. Fiscal policy often deviated from plans due to political pressures, subsidies, defense spending, and public investments continued to drive deficits beyond agreed targets. The lack of a broad tax reform meant revenue growth was insufficient, forcing reliance on borrowing. Consequently, even as the SBP gained more tools and a clearer anti-inflation mandate, it frequently found itself reacting to fiscal slippages. Pakistan in the 1990s experienced several boom-bust cycles: brief periods of deficit reduction would be followed by expansionary spurts linked to political cycles, leading to renewed inflation and external imbalances (Khan, 2009; McGillivray, 2003). The overall macroeconomic instability of the 1988–1998 period (high public debt, double-digit inflation, and a near currency crisis in 1998) illustrated that partial reforms were not enough (without commitment to fiscal discipline), SBP autonomy alone could not guarantee stability (Akram & Rais, 2011; PIDE, 2021). In summary, the late 20th century laid the groundwork for a more independent monetary policy in Pakistan but did not yet achieve the requisite coordination, as structural weaknesses and political considerations on the fiscal front continued to dominate outcomes.A significant, albeit temporary, improvement in policy coordination took place during the military regime of General Pervez Musharraf. After seizing power in 1999, Musharraf's government (which lasted until 2008) implemented a technocratic approach to economic management. With financial experts like Shaukat Aziz (first as Finance Minister and later Prime Minister) at the helm, the regime prioritized macroeconomic stability and growth within a relatively centralized decision-making framework. This period saw Pakistan's most concerted effort in recent history to align fiscal and monetary policy objectives. On the fiscal side, the government pursued deficit reduction and structural reforms: it introduced a Medium-Term Development Framework to guide spending, undertook some privatization of state enterprises, broadened the tax base modestly, and restrained current expenditures. Consequently, the fiscal deficit was brought down from roughly 7% of GDP in the late 1990s to around 3% by mid-2000s (Arby & Hanif, 2010).

Complementing this, the SBP was allowed greater freedom to conduct a tighter monetary policy aimed at curbing inflation; interest rates were managed prudently, and the bank accumulated foreign exchange reserves during this period of relative stability (Husain, 2005). A Monetary and Fiscal Policies Coordination Board (MFPCB), originally created in 1994, was revitalized in the 2000s as a forum for the Finance Ministry and SBP to consult regularly (though its effectiveness still depended on the personalities in charge). The results of this de facto coordination were evident: inflation fell to single digits for several years, the exchange rate stabilized, and Pakistan experienced robust GDP growth above 6% towards the middle of the decade. International investors and institutions often cited Pakistan as a reform success story in this era, attributing part of the success to coherent policies working in tandem. However, it is important to note that these gains were not fully institutionalized. They owed much to strong leadership and the unusual political circumstances of a military government insulated from electoral pressures. Thus, while the Musharraf period demonstrated that effective coordination is possible (fiscal consolidation paired with supportive monetary policy can yield stability and growth) it also showed the fragility of those gains. Once the political context changed, the coordination mechanisms were not entrenched enough to survive on their own (Khanna, 2010; Husain, 2019).The return to parliamentary democracy in 2008 brought new challenges for monetary-fiscal coordination. Elected governments during this decade (the Pakistan Peoples Party, 2008–2013, followed by the Pakistan Muslim League-Nawaz, 2013–2018) faced intense public expectations and political incentives to increase spending on welfare, energy subsidies, public salaries, and infrastructure. Consequently, fiscal deficits swelled once again, and public debt climbed rapidly. For example, large subsidies were provided to shield consumers from rising global oil prices and to cover losses in the power sector (circular debt), while tax reforms progressed slowly, keeping the tax-to-GDP ratio low. These populist fiscal measures often had short-term political benefits but deteriorating effects on macroeconomic stability (Finance Division, 2018). On the monetary side, the State Bank struggled to assert its independence fully. Inflation spiked to over 20% in 2008–2009 amid global commodity shocks and loose fiscal policy, yet political considerations at times delayed the SBP's response or led to pressure for lower interest rates to spur growth. Throughout this period, Pakistan frequently turned to the IMF for balance-of-payments support (e.g., Stand-By Arrangement in 2008, Extended Fund Facility in 2013), which temporarily enforced some discipline. Under IMF programs, the government would commit to targets for deficit reduction and limiting borrowing from the SBP, while the SBP would adopt more market-determined exchange rates and interest rate policy to control inflation. These programs did lead to episodes of improved coordination (such as 2015–2016 when inflation was brought down and deficits shrank). However, once the programs ended, reform fatigue set in and policy slippages reoccurred. There was no lasting domestic institutional change to keep fiscal and monetary authorities in sync. The MFPCB existed on paper but met irregularly and had no binding power over fiscal decisions. Political imperatives, especially as elections approached in 2013 and 2018, led to fiscal loosening (higher spending, tax concessions) that negated hard-won stabilization gains (Shahid et al., 2016). The State Bank often ended up accommodating these deficits indirectly by keeping real interest rates low or by purchasing government securities when private demand was insufficient, reflecting a return of fiscal dominance through the back door (Jawaid et al., 2011). By 2018, Pakistan again faced a serious external and fiscal crisis (foreign reserves had plummeted and the fiscal deficit topped 6.5% of GDP) underscoring that the pattern of uncoordinated policy swings persisted. The democratic era thus highlighted how institutional weaknesses and political cycles in Pakistan continually undermined consistent policy cooperation: without structural reforms, the system reverted to pro-cyclical fiscal policy and reactive monetary tightening, an unhealthy dynamic for long-term growth.In the late 2010s and early 2020s, Pakistan undertook significant policy shifts amid a new set of crises. The Pakistan Tehreek-e-Insaf (PTI) government elected in 2018 initially sought to break the cycle of imbalances by embarking on another IMF Extended Fund Facility program in 2019. A notable reform was the State Bank of Pakistan Amendment Act of 2021, which substantially increased the legal autonomy of the SBP. The amended act explicitly prioritizes price stability as the SBP's primary objective, restricts the government's ability to borrow directly from the central bank, and strengthens the SBP's governance and accountability framework (Javed, 2021; Finance Division, 2023). This reform was designed to cement a more rule-based monetary policy and to prevent political interference, essentially a monetarist approach to curbing fiscal dominance. In parallel, there were attempts to improve fiscal management, such as efforts to broaden the tax base and reduce energy subsidies, though these met with mixed success. However, as these reforms were unfolding, Pakistan (like the rest of the world) was hit by the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020, followed by global commodity price surges and supply chain disruptions. The pandemic forced a sudden shift to expansionary policies: the government rolled out relief packages and extra spending to support healthcare and livelihoods, while the SBP slashed interest rates and launched refinancing schemes to support businesses. This emergency response, while necessary, led to a renewed spike in fiscal deficits and a surge in money supply growth, testing the limits of the new SBP autonomy. By 2022, Pakistan was experiencing strong inflationary pressures (headline inflation crossed 20% again) and facing a balance of payments crunch due to high import prices and capital outflows (World Bank, 2023). The SBP, now more independent on paper, attempted to counter inflation by tightening monetary policy aggressively; policy rates were raised and the currency was allowed to depreciate. Yet the government, facing political turmoil, was slow to enact parallel fiscal tightening, fuel subsidies and other populist measures continued in the face of rising prices, partly to assuage public discontent. This policy divergence led to a familiar outcome: monetary contraction alone could not stabilize the economy as fiscal operations continued to be expansionary and debt accumulated. Pakistan found itself once more seeking IMF assistance by mid-2022, eventually securing a short-term IMF Stand-By Arrangement in 2023. Importantly, the IMF agreements called for Pakistan to revive and empower its Monetary and Fiscal Policies Coordination Board and to develop a medium-term framework to anchor both policies (IMF, 2024). These stipulations reflect the recognition that without a formal coordination mechanism, even well-intentioned reforms like SBP independence can falter when crises hit. As of 2023, Pakistan's monetary-fiscal interplay remains in flux: the SBP's enhanced autonomy is being tested in an environment of fiscal stress, and the government's commitment to respecting the SBP's role is under strain from socio-political demands. The historical pattern thus seems unbroken—despite some progress, the absence of entrenched institutional coordination means the country remains vulnerable to repeating the cycle of policy misalignment. Overall, the evolution of Pakistan's monetary and fiscal policy coordination reveals a pendulum swinging between periods of convergence and divergence. The military regime example showed that coordination can yield positive outcomes, but sustainable coordination has not been achieved due to its dependence on individuals and transient conditions rather than robust institutions. This historical insight sets the stage for analyzing why Pakistan has struggled to maintain coordination and what structural challenges need to be addressed (IMF Staff Report, 2024; Batool et al., 2024).

Challenges to Effective Policy Coordination in Pakistan

Despite the evident need for harmonized monetary and fiscal strategies, Pakistan has continually struggled to achieve effective coordination due to a confluence of institutional, political, and economic factors. The literature points to several structural challenges that have prevented sustained policy alignment, thus undermining macroeconomic stability.A fundamental impediment is the weakness of formal institutional mechanisms for coordination. Pakistan does not have a strong, legally-empowered body that ensures continuous dialogue and joint planning between the Ministry of Finance (MoF) and the State Bank of Pakistan. The Monetary and Fiscal Policies Coordination Board (MFPCB), established in 1994 to fill this role, has largely been inactive or ineffective. Meetings have been infrequent and often convened only in reaction to crises rather than on a proactive, regular basis (Akhtar, 2008). Moreover, the MFPCB lacks binding authority—its recommendations, if any, cannot compel either the government or the SBP to alter their course (Choudhri & Malik, 2012; Arby & Hanif, 2010). There is also no independent fiscal council or similar institution to provide an objective assessment of fiscal policy and ensure it is consistent with monetary goals (FPCCI/World Bank, 2024). The absence of a medium-term fiscal framework means budget planning is done year-to-year without a credible path for debt and deficit sustainability, leaving the SBP to deal with whatever fiscal stance emerges annually (FPCCI/World Bank, 2024). In essence, the country's economic governance structure is siloed: the central bank and fiscal authorities operate under separate mandates with coordination being ad hoc and personality-driven rather than systemic. This institutional gap allows conflicts to persist—such as instances where the SBP is raising interest rates to fight inflation at the same time that the government is ramping up borrowing—since no framework exists to reconcile these opposing actions in advance. Pakistan's volatile political environment further complicates policy coordination. Elected governments, driven by short-term electoral incentives, often prioritize policies that yield immediate political gains even at the expense of long-term stability. This tendency is most evident in the run-up to elections, when ruling parties increase development spending, launch new public programs, and resist tax increases in order to please voters. Such populist fiscal expansions have been a recurring feature of Pakistan's democracy (Zaidi, 2005; Iqbal, ud Din, & Ghani, 2017). They lead to widening budget deficits and excessive public borrowing that directly conflict with the SBP's mandate to control inflation and maintain external balance. For example, subsidies on fuel and electricity are sometimes kept in place or even expanded during election years despite ballooning costs, forcing the government to borrow more from banks and the central bank—thus stoking inflation that the SBP then has to combat. Another political factor is the frequent change of governments and the often fragmented nature of coalitions, which disrupts continuity in economic policy. Reforms that could improve coordination (such as legislation for fiscal responsibility or strengthening the coordination board) are difficult to implement or sustain if there is no broad political consensus. Each government tends to start its own set of priorities, sometimes reversing predecessors' policies. In contrast, during periods of military rule, decision-making is centralized and insulated from public pressures, which historically allowed for more disciplined (if sometimes authoritarian) economic management (Zaidi, 2005). Military regimes, by concentrating power, have forced a degree of coordination simply because the same ruling circle dictates both fiscal and monetary stances. However, those gains often came without institutionalization; once democratic governance returned, the lack of built-in checks and forums meant old patterns re-emerged. Thus, Pakistan's political cycle inherently works against stable coordination: expansionary biases in fiscal policy peak when they are most damaging (at politically sensitive times), and any corrective influence from monetary policy is either delayed or diminished by the political imperative. The underlying state of Pakistan's economy itself poses serious challenges to effective policy coordination. Chronic fiscal deficits—often in the range of 5–8% of GDP during peacetime—and a high public debt-to-GDP ratio, which exceeded 70% in FY2023, create a situation where fiscal policy is frequently in crisis-management mode (World Bank & Ministry of Finance, 2023). The government's persistent need to finance its deficit often dominates macroeconomic priorities, thereby constraining the operational space for independent monetary action. A significant share of public expenditure—particularly interest payments on public debt, defense spending, and public-sector salaries—is non-discretionary, limiting the government's ability to implement meaningful expenditure cuts (World Bank, 2023 Public Expenditure Review).On the revenue side, Pakistan consistently ranks among countries with the lowest tax-to-GDP ratios in the region, owing to a narrow tax base, a large informal economy, and persistent administrative inefficiencies (World Bank & Ministry of Finance, 2023). This structural revenue weakness forces the government to rely on domestic and external borrowing. When external financing or commercial domestic borrowing becomes unavailable or too expensive, the government has historically resorted to borrowing from the State Bank of Pakistan (SBP)—despite legal restrictions—through various accommodations, thereby fueling inflationary pressures and undermining the SBP's mandate to ensure price stability (State Bank of Pakistan, 2024). The structural deficit problem thus creates a fundamental disconnect: even when the SBP attempts to maintain monetary discipline, its efforts are often overwhelmed by fiscal imbalances. Additionally, Pakistan's economy remains highly vulnerable to external shocks—including oil price spikes, sudden stops in capital inflows, or natural disasters—which demand a coordinated policy response. However, in the absence of proactive and institutionalized coordination, the typical policy reaction has been fragmented and contradictory. Governments often provide subsidies or cut taxes to appease public sentiment, while the SBP simultaneously raises interest rates to stabilize inflation and defend the exchange rate—leading to policy actions that work at cross-purposes (World Bank & Ministry of Finance, 2023; World Bank, 2023 Public Expenditure Review).

Effective coordination also hinges on the capacity to analyze and forecast economic conditions jointly, an area where Pakistan's institutions have room for improvement. Ideally, a finance ministry and central bank should share data and collaborate on macroeconomic models to predict how various policy combinations will play out. In Pakistan, however, data-sharing between agencies is limited and sometimes subject to bureaucratic turf battles. There is no integrated macroeconomic forecasting unit that brings together fiscal, monetary, and external sector projections into one coherent framework. Instead, the SBP and MoF often rely on their own separate models and assumptions, which may not be consistent (Din, Ghani & Siddique, 2003). This can lead to misjudgments—for instance, the finance ministry might overestimate revenue or growth in its budget projections, assuming optimistic outcomes, while the SBP might be working with a more conservative outlook; if these are not reconciled, policies will be based on different expectations. Moreover, Pakistan's data quality and timeliness issues (such as delays in reporting fiscal outcomes or revision of growth figures) hinder real-time policy coordination. Limited human resource capacity in economic analysis within parts of the government further means that sophisticated coordination—like simulating the impact of a fiscal expansion on inflation and debt dynamics before a decision is made—is often not done. Instead, coordination tends to occur only after problems manifest (for example, when inflation jumps or reserves fall, prompting emergency meetings). The absence of institutionalized, forward-looking analysis jointly conducted by SBP and MoF means policy synchronization is reactive and frequently too late. Lastly, there is a conceptual challenge in balancing the SBP's drive for greater autonomy with the need for coordination. The SBP Amendment Act 2021, while boosting central bank independence, also led to concerns that an "over-insulated" central bank might not be responsive to legitimate fiscal concerns or might lack accountability in a democratic context. Some critics argue that by focusing narrowly on price stability, the SBP might neglect output and employment considerations, especially if there is no mechanism to have a conversation with fiscal authorities about trade-offs (IMF, 2022). On the other side, the Ministry of Finance remains subject to intense political control and faces difficulty committing to multi-year fiscal prudence. The divergence in institutional incentives (a conservative central bank vs. a politically-driven fiscal authority) can be healthy as a check and balance, but without a coordination framework, it can also mean stalemate or inconsistent messaging to markets. For example, in 2022, as inflation surged, the SBP was vocal about tightening and reform, whereas parts of the government were initially in denial or resisted certain measures, sending mixed signals to investors and the public. Effective coordination in such a scenario would require mechanisms to align these perspectives, through formal agreements or rules that tie fiscal policy to debt and deficit limits and monetary policy to clear inflation targets, with each side aware of the other's constraints. In Pakistan, those mechanisms are not yet fully in place, meaning that even well-intentioned policies can end up at odds due to institutional culture and communication gaps.In summary, Pakistan's difficulty in synchronizing monetary and fiscal policy is not due to a single flaw but a web of interrelated challenges. The institutional voids (like a dormant coordination board and lack of fiscal rules) provide no guardrails for policy; the political imperatives drive policies in divergent directions; structural economic weaknesses create constant pressure on policy tools; and the limited technical coordination impairs timely joint responses. All these factors contribute to a scenario where policy misalignment is more often the norm than the exception. Recognizing these challenges is the first step toward crafting solutions—many of which involve learning from international best practices and tailoring them to Pakistan's context, as discussed in the comparative analysis below.

Comparative Insights from Other Developing Economies

Pakistan's struggles with monetary-fiscal coordination are shared by many developing economies, but several countries have implemented frameworks to mitigate these issues. Examining experiences from peer nations (such as India, Ghana, Indonesia, Brazil, and South Africa) highlights how institutional reforms and legal measures can enhance policy coordination, offering valuable lessons for Pakistan.

India provides a regional example of strengthening coordination through legal mandates. Facing chronic fiscal deficits in the 1990s, India introduced the Fiscal Responsibility and Budget Management (FRBM) Act in 2003, which established statutory limits on deficits and government borrowing. The FRBM Act enforced greater fiscal discipline and transparency, compelling the government to commit to medium-term fiscal targets (Pattnaik & Verma, 2016; International Monetary Fund, 2006). On the monetary side, India modernized its framework by adopting a formal inflation-targeting regime. In 2016, it established a Monetary Policy Committee (MPC) within the Reserve Bank of India to set interest rates with the explicit objective of maintaining inflation within a specified target range. The MPC institutionalized monetary decision-making and insulated it from short-term political pressures. Together, these reforms ensured that fiscal and monetary authorities operate with clearer rules of engagement—fiscal policy is legally constrained to avoid excessive deficits, and monetary policy is guided by a defined price stability mandate. This institutional clarity has contributed to improved macroeconomic outcomes, including a sustained reduction in fiscal deficits and better anchoring of inflation expectations (Herd & Leibfritz, 2008; Pattnaik & Verma, 2016). For Pakistan, India's case highlights the potential benefits of legislating fiscal responsibility and empowering the central bank to foster a more coordinated and stable macroeconomic policy environment.Ghana offers an instructive example from a low-income country context, illustrating the role of external anchors in fostering fiscal-monetary coordination. Throughout the 2010s and early 2020s, Ghana engaged in multiple IMF-supported programs under the Extended Credit Facility (ECF). These programs introduced a Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), requiring the government to plan budgets beyond the annual horizon and prioritize debt sustainability (International Monetary Fund, 2024; Short, 2003). At the same time, reforms under IMF guidance imposed strict limits on central bank financing of budget deficits, effectively restricting the Bank of Ghana from monetizing fiscal imbalances beyond a narrow threshold (International Monetary Fund, 2024). These measures were accompanied by improvements in public financial management and the establishment of fiscal oversight mechanisms, which collectively strengthened policy discipline. A key feature of these programs was the adoption of a joint macroeconomic framework, ensuring that fiscal projections and monetary policy paths were aligned across multiple scenarios (IMF, 2024). Over time, this consistency was institutionalized, enabling more predictable and coordinated economic policy responses. Ghana's experience highlights that even in challenging political environments, externally driven reforms can impose discipline and coordination mechanisms. For Pakistan—also a frequent participant in IMF programs—the lesson is to use such arrangements as opportunities to embed coordination frameworks (such as fiscal rules or limits on central bank financing) into national legislation or practice, ensuring policy consistency that endures beyond the program lifecycle.Indonesia is an example of crisis-driven reform yielding lasting change in monetary–fiscal relations. The Asian financial crisis of 1997–98 exposed significant weaknesses in the country's economic governance and institutional structure. In response, Indonesia enacted the Bank Indonesia Act No. 23 of 1999, which granted the central bank full legal independence, prioritized price stability as its main objective, and explicitly prohibited direct central bank financing of government deficits (Republic of Indonesia, 1999). These legal reforms were complemented by a series of fiscal transparency and debt management improvements throughout the 2000s. The prohibition on central bank financing compelled the government to adopt a more disciplined fiscal stance, while Bank Indonesia gained operational autonomy to focus on inflation control without political interference (Artha & de Haan, 2010). Empirical assessments show that these reforms contributed to a notable reduction in inflation volatility and helped rebuild market confidence in Indonesia's macroeconomic framework (IMF, 2023). The country's experience highlights the value of clear institutional separation and legal mandates in improving coordination between fiscal and monetary authorities. For Pakistan, Indonesia's example offers a roadmap: legal clarity—especially concerning central bank independence and deficit monetization—can help align macroeconomic policies even in politically constrained environments.Brazil showcases how formal rules and cooperative structures can function effectively in a large emerging economy with a federal system. In 2000, Brazil passed the Fiscal Responsibility Law (FRL), widely regarded as one of the most stringent fiscal frameworks in the developing world. The FRL imposes ceilings on public debt and deficits across all levels of government and mandates transparency and accountability in fiscal operations—including penalties for officials who violate these limits (Arraes & Matias-Pereira, 2024; IMF, 2023). Simultaneously, Brazil had adopted an inflation-targeting regime in 1999, with the Central

Bank of Brazil granted operational autonomy to set interest rates and conduct monetary policy (Bogdanski, Tombini & Warlang, 2000; de Mello, 2008). A key feature of Brazil's institutional setup is its emphasis on coordination through structured dialogue. The National Monetary Council, which includes the Ministry of Finance, Planning Ministry, and Central Bank, plays a central role in aligning fiscal and monetary strategies. Additionally, technical committees and Brazil's budgeting process ensure that monetary policy assumptions—such as inflation and exchange rate forecasts—are factored into fiscal planning, and vice versa (de Mello, 2008; IMF, 2023). For instance, the COPOM (Monetary Policy Committee) of the Central Bank of Brazil regularly communicates with the Treasury on debt issuance strategies to avoid policy conflicts. This level of coordination has enabled Brazil to manage high debt burdens and external shocks with greater coherence. As a result, the country experienced notable improvements in inflation control and fiscal discipline throughout much of the 2000s, even amid volatility. For Pakistan, the Brazilian experience underscores the value of combining comprehensive legal frameworks—like a fiscal responsibility law—with structured inter-agency coordination platforms. High-level committees with formal authority and regular meetings between the State Bank of Pakistan and Ministry of Finance could promote a more synchronized and credible macroeconomic policy stance.South Africa provides a contrast where formal rules are fewer, but a tradition of cooperation yields effective coordination. The country has not legislated strict deficit or debt limits comparable to India or Brazil, nor does it currently operate under an IMF program. Instead, it relies on what may be termed informal but institutionalized coordination. The National Treasury and the South African Reserve Bank (SARB) maintain close communication channels; for instance, they engage in joint macroeconomic forecasting exercises and consult each other when major fiscal or monetary decisions are being considered (Nyati, Muzindutsi, & Tipoy, 2023). During both the global financial crisis and the COVID-19 pandemic, South Africa convened special forums to craft a coordinated response that included fiscal stimulus and monetary easing implemented in a complementary manner. The credibility of the SARB in managing inflation remains high, and the Treasury generally respects this by avoiding fiscal policies that would undermine monetary efforts (South African Reserve Bank, 2023). In addition, technical assistance—such as IMF Financial Sector Assessment Programs and advisory services—has been used to strengthen macroeconomic tools and forecasting capacity. The culture in South Africa's economic governance emphasizes transparency and mutual respect: the SARB's policy decisions are clearly communicated, while the Treasury frames budgets with a focus on debt sustainability. This interaction fosters consistency and credibility in macroeconomic policy. For Pakistan, South Africa's case illustrates that beyond laws and formal mechanisms, a culture of coordination is essential. This can be encouraged by enhancing transparency (e.g., publishing underlying assumptions in monetary and fiscal policy documents), building institutional trust through regular secondments or joint training programs, and fostering a shared understanding of economic challenges.Across these cases, a common thread emerges: effective coordination in developing economies often stems from institutional commitments that outlast individual policymakers. Whether through legal constraints (as in India's FRBM Act or Brazil's FRL), external pressures (such as IMF-supported programs), or home-grown practices of consultation, these countries have created systems that guide the behavior of fiscal and monetary authorities toward shared objectives. Empirical research supports this view, indicating that countries with clearly defined fiscal rules and independent central banks tend to achieve better outcomes in terms of inflation control and sustainable economic growth (Debrun & Kumar, 2007; International Monetary Fund, 2022). Moreover, the presence of coordination mechanisms—be it India's formal inter-agency committees or South Africa's informal dialogue between the Treasury and the Reserve Bank—helps enhance transparency, reduce policy uncertainty, and build investor confidence (de Mello, 2008). For Pakistan, the implications are clear: there is much to gain from adopting similar measures. A legally binding fiscal responsibility framework could help contain persistent deficits. Empowering the State Bank of Pakistan (SBP) with greater operational independence, as already initiated, must also be paired with accountability mechanisms and strong communication protocols to ensure its actions are aligned with broader fiscal objectives. Additionally, establishing a permanent coordination council with statutory status—modeled on Brazil's

National Monetary Council or a revitalized version of Pakistan's own Monetary and Fiscal Policies Coordination Board (MFPCB)—could institutionalize policy alignment. Regular joint economic assessments, potentially under a reformed Planning Commission or a newly constituted Fiscal Council, would help ensure both arms of macroeconomic policy are working from the same forecasts and strategic framework. International experience makes one thing clear: coordination is not automatic. It must be engineered through robust rules, enduring institutions, and a culture of cooperation. By drawing lessons from these comparative cases, Pakistan can move toward a more disciplined and harmonized approach to economic policymaking.

CONCLUSION

This literature review emphasizes that effective coordination between monetary and fiscal policies is central to achieving macroeconomic stability in Pakistan. Historical evidence reveals that a lack of alignment (especially under populist democratic regimes) has led to inflation, debt accumulation, balance-of-payments crises, and stunted growth. In contrast, limited periods of coordination have produced better outcomes, though often short-lived due to the absence of institutional mechanisms. Scholarly consensus supports moving from ad hoc cooperation to a rules-based framework. Lessons from countries like India and Brazil highlight the value of fiscal rules, independent central banks, and formal coordination bodies. For Pakistan, establishing a legally mandated, empowered Monetary-Fiscal Coordination Board could bridge gaps between policy domains, enabling timely and consistent macroeconomic responses. As external vulnerabilities grow (from global market volatility to climate-related risks) Pakistan needs a unified policy front. The literature urges institutional reforms, stronger accountability, and transparent dialogue between authorities. A credible commitment to coordination would not only reduce policy contradictions but also build investor trust and enhance economic resilience. Aligning fiscal and monetary strategies is no longer optional, it is vital for Pakistan's sustainable development.

REFERENCES

1. Agha, A. I., & Khan, M. S. (2006). An empirical analysis of fiscal imbalances and inflation in Pakistan. *SBP research Bulletin*, *2*(2), 343-362.
2. Akram, N., & Rais, S. I. (2011). Synthesis of the Fiscal and Monetary Policies in Price Level Determination: Evidence from Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Applied Economics*, *21*(1 & 2), 37-52.
3. Ali, W., Ahmad, I., Javed, A., & Rafiq, S. (2020). Regime switches in Pakistan's fiscal policy: markov-switching VAR approach. *Applied Economics Journal*, *27*(2), 45-76.
4. Andlib, Z., Khan, A., & Ul Haq, I. (2012). The coordination of fiscal and monetary policies in Pakistan: an empirical analysis 1980–2011. *The Pakistan Development Review*, 695-704.
5. Arby, M. F., & Hanif, M. N. (2010). Monetary and fiscal policies coordination-Pakistan's experience.
6. Arestis, P., & Sawyer, M. (2006). The nature and role of monetary policy when money is endogenous. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, *30*(6), 847-860.
7. Arraes, J., & Matias-Pereira, J. (2024). Uncovering the Influence of the Fiscal Responsibility Law in Brazilian States: Inferences Regarding Debt Sustainability, Personnel Expenditure Efficiency, and Responsible Fiscal Management. *Accounting, Management, and Governance* , *27* (1), 128–156. https://doi.org/10.51341/cgg.v27i1.3215
8. Artha, I. K. D. S., & de Haan, J. (2010). Legal and actual central bank Independence: A case study of Bank of Indonesia.
9. Barro, R. J. (1981). Output effects of government purchases. *Journal of political Economy*, *89*(6), 1086-1121.
10. Basri, M. C. (2018). "Chapter 2: Twenty Years after the Asian Financial Crisis". In *Realizing Indonesia's Economic Potential*. USA: International Monetary Fund. https://doi.org/10.5089/9781484337141.071.ch002
11. Batool, I., Chandia, K. E., Sarwar, B., & Iqbal, M. B. (2024). Fiscal dominance and the inflation dynamics in Pakistan: An empirical analysis. *Millennial Asia*, *15*(1), 51-71.
12. Blinder, A. S. (2006). *Monetary policy today: sixteen questions and about twelve answers*. Center for Economic Policy Studies, Princeton University.
13. Blinder, A. S. (2007). Monetary policy by committee: Why and how?. *European Journal of Political Economy*, *23*(1), 106-123.
14. Blood, P. R. (Ed.). (1994). Pakistan: A country study. Federal Research Division, Library of Congress.
15. Bogdanski, J., Tombini, A. A., & Werlang, S. R. D. C. (2000). Implementing inflation targeting in Brazil. *Werlang, Sergio R., Implementing Inflation Targeting in Brazil (July 2000). Banco Central do Brasil Working Paper*, (1).
16. Carvalho, C., & Nechio, F. (2023). Challenges to Disinflation: The Brazilian Experience. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, *2023*(1), 217-242.

17. Choudhri, E., & Malik, H. (2012). Monetary policy in Pakistan: confronting fiscal dominance and imperfect credibility. *Carleton University and State Bank of Pakistan*, *1*.
18. de Mello, L. (2008), *Monetary Policies and Inflation Targeting in Emerging Economies*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264044630-en.
19. Din, M. U., Ghani, E., & Siddique, O. (2003). Openness and economic growth in Pakistan. *The Pakistan Development Review*, 795-807.
20. Federation of Pakistan Chambers of Commerce & Industry. (2024). *Impact of IMF programs: A context of Pakistan* [Policy brief]. FPCCI. https://fpcci.org.pk/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Impact-of-IMF-Programs-A-Context-of-Pakistan.pdf
21. Finance Division, Government of Pakistan. (2018). Fiscal Policy Statement 2017–18. Ministry of Finance. https://www.finance.gov.pk/publications/FPS_2017_18.pdf
22. Finance Division, Government of Pakistan. (2023). *Pakistan Economic Survey 2022–23*. Islamabad: Ministry of Finance. https://www.finance.gov.pk/survey
23. Friedman, M. (1995). *The role of monetary policy* (pp. 215-231). Macmillan Education UK.
24. Herd, R., & Leibfritz, W. (2008). Fiscal Policy in India: Past Reforms and Future Challenges. *OECD Economic Department Working Papers*, (595), 0_1.
25. Husain, I. (2005). Banking sector reforms in Pakistan. *Governor of the State Bank of Pakistan, reproduced from Blue Chip–The Business People's Magazine*.
26. Husain, I. (2019). Economic highs and lows of Pakistan: Analysing the last 70 years. *SS Aneel, UT Haroon, & I. Niazi (Eds.)*, *70*, 7-29.
27. Iakova, D. (2007). Flattening of the Phillips curve: Implications for monetary policy.
28. International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2024). *Islamic Republic of Pakistan: Staff Report for the 2023 Article IV Consultation and Request for a Stand-By Arrangement*. IMF Country Report No. 24/XX. International Monetary Fund. https://www.imf.org
29. International Monetary Fund. (2006). India: Selected issues (IMF Staff Country Report No. 06/56). https://doi.org/10.5089/9781451818635.002
30. International Monetary Fund. (2022). Safeguards assessments: Review of experience. IMF Policy Paper. https://www.imf.org/-/media/Files/Publications/PP/2022/English/PPEA2022058.ashx
31. International Monetary Fund. (2023). *Brazil's fiscal framework: Past reforms and outcomes* [IMF Country Report]. https://www.elibrary.imf.org/downloadpdf/view/journals/002/2023/289/article-A001-en.pdf
32. International Monetary Fund. (2024). Ghana: First Review under the Extended Credit Facility Arrangement-Press Release; Staff Report; and Statement by the Executive Director for Ghana (IMF Country Report No. 24/334). International Monetary Fund. https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/CR/Issues/2016/12/31/Ghana-First-Review-Under-the-Extended-Credit-Facility-Arrangement-and-Request-for-Waiver-and-43243
33. International Monetary Fund. External Relations Dept. (1999). Assessment of Programs IMF Releases Internal Review of Its Response To Crisis in Three Affected Asian Countries. IMF Survey, 0028(002), A001. https://doi.org/10.5089/9781451936841.023.A001
34. International Monetary Fund. Institute for Capacity Development, & International Monetary Fund. African Dept. (2024). Ghana: Technical Assistance Report-Report on Developing the Forecasting and Policy Analysis System (FPAS) at the Bank of Ghana (BOG). Technical Assistance Reports, 2024(080), A001. https://doi.org/10.5089/9798400290169.019.A001
35. International Monetary Fund. Middle East and Central Asia Dept. (2022). Front Matter. *IMF Staff Country Reports*, *2022*(027), A000. Retrieved Jun 19, 2025, from https://doi.org/10.5089/9798400200212.002.A000
36. Iqbal, N., ud Din, M., & Ghani, E. (2017). The fiscal deficit and economic growth in Pakistan: New evidence. *The Lahore journal of economics*, *22*(special edition), 53-72.
37. Javed, S. A. (2021). First Response to the SBP Amendment Act 2021.
38. Jawaid, S. T., Qadri, F. S., & Ali, N. (2011). Monetary-fiscal-trade policy and economic growth in Pakistan: Time series empirical investigation. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, *1*(3), 133-138.
39. Keynes, J. M. (1937). The general theory of employment. *The quarterly journal of economics*, *51*(2), 209-223.
40. Khan, M. Z. (2009). Liberalization and economic crisis in Pakistan. *Rising to the Challenge in Asia: A Study of Financial Markets: Asian Development Bank*, *9*.
41. Khan, R. E. A., & Gill, A. R. (2009). Crowding out effect of public borrowing: A case of Pakistan.
42. Khanna, S. (2010). Growth and Crisis in Pakistan's Economy. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 39-46.
43. Lavoie, M. (2014). Post-Keynesian economics: new foundations. In *Post-Keynesian Economics*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
44. Lucas Jr, R. E. (1976, January). Econometric policy evaluation: A critique. In *Carnegie-Rochester conference series on public policy* (Vol. 1, pp. 19-46). North-Holland.
45. McGillivray, M. (2003). Policy-based lending, structural adjustment and economic growth in Pakistan. *Journal of Policy Modeling*, *25*(2), 113-121.
46. Mishkin, F. S. (2007). *Monetary policy strategy*. Mit press.
47. Nyati, M. C., Muzindutsi, P. F., & Tipoy, C. K. (2023). Macroprudential and monetary policy interactions and coordination in South Africa: Evidence from business and financial cycle synchronisation. *Economies*, *11*(11), 272.
48. OECD (2011), OECD Economic Surveys: India 2011, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/eco_surveys-ind-2011-en.