Political Pressure on the Fed*

Thomas Drechsel

University of Maryland, NBER & CEPR

July 30, 2025

Abstract

This paper combines new data and a narrative approach to identify variation in political pressure on the Federal Reserve. From archival records, I build a data set of personal interactions between U.S. Presidents and Fed officials between 1933 and 2016. Since personal interactions do not necessarily reflect political pressure, I develop a narrative identification strategy based on President Nixon's pressure on Fed Chair Burns. I exploit this narrative through restrictions on a structural vector autoregression that includes the President-Fed interaction data. I find that political pressure to ease monetary policy *(i)* increases the price level strongly and persistently, *(ii)* does not lead to positive effects on real economic activity, *(iii)* contributed to inflationary episodes outside of the Nixon era, and *(iv)* transmits differently from a typical monetary policy easing, by having a stronger effect on inflation expectations. Quantitatively, increasing political pressure by half as much as Nixon, for six months, raises the price level by about 7%.

Keywords: Central bank independence, Federal Reserve, Inflation, SVARs, Narrative identification.

JEL Classification: C32, E31, E40, E50, D72.

*I thank Elias Papaioannou, five anonymous referees, Juan Antolin-Diaz, Jonas Arias, Boragan Aruoba, Miguel Bandeira, Gadi Barlevy, Francesco Bianchi, Allan Drazen, Leland Farmer, Yuriy Gorodnichenko, Amy Handlan, Fatima Hussein, Diego Kaenzig, Hanno Lustig, Fernando Martin, Emi Nakamura, Evgenia Passari, Mikkel Plagborg-Moller, Christina Romer, David Romer, Juan Rubio-Ramirez, Jon Steinsson, Paolo Surico, William Witheridge, Chris Wolf, and Sarah Zubairy for detailed discussions. Seminar and conference participants at MIT, UC Berkeley, Brown University, Duke University, Stanford SITE, Bocconi University, EIEF, University of Bonn, Texas A&M University, University of Florida, the NBER Monetary Economics Spring Meeting 2024, the Federal Reserve Board, the Boston Fed, Chicago Fed, Dallas Fed, Philadelphia Fed, Minneapolis Fed, Richmond Fed, St. Louis Fed, BIS, IMF, Bank of England, Swiss National Bank, Banco Central do Brasil, CEPR International Macro History Online Seminar, and the University of Maryland provided very useful suggestions. I am grateful to Ko Miura, Seho Kim, Giovanni Bardone and Daniel Schwindt for excellent research assistance. Contact: Department of Economics, University of Maryland, Tydings Hall, College Park, MD 20742, USA; drechsel@umd.edu. This paper was previously circulated under the title "Estimating the Effects of Political Pressure on the Fed: A Narrative Approach with New Data." The President-Fed personal interaction time series are available to other researchers at http://econweb.umd.edu/~drechsel/research.html.

1 Introduction

The political dimension of U.S. monetary policy is attracting renewed attention (Bianchi et al., 2023). A large empirical literature has studied the benefits of politically independent central banks (e.g. Alesina and Summers, 1993). This research is part of a broader tradition that takes a political angle to economic questions (Persson and Tabellini, 2002) and thinks of business cycles as having political drivers (Nordhaus, 1975; Drazen, 2000). Authors studying variation in central bank independence empirically have typically used relatively simple approaches, for example by constructing cross-country measures of central bank independence and correlating them with economic outcomes.

The application of modern macroeconomic identification techniques, e.g. those surveyed by Ramey (2016), to studying political influence on monetary policy has been limited. Indeed, the literature on central bank independence has been relatively dormant compared to its prominence in the 1990s. The lack of fresh evidence reflects the challenges with defining and measuring political pressure on central banks and the fact that identifying its economic effects is difficult. This is the case especially for the U.S., where threats to central bank independence have traditionally been infrequent.

This paper presents new data and develops a narrative identification strategy to isolate exogenous variation in political pressure on the Fed and quantifies its macroeconomic effects. The new data is extracted from archival records and captures personal interactions between U.S. Presidents and Fed officials from 1933 to 2016. The identification strategy exploits historical information about President Richard Nixon's pressure on Fed Chairman Arthur Burns in the run-up to the 1972 election. It also uses narrative evidence on Lyndon B. Johnson's pressure on the Fed in the 1960s to strengthen the identification.

My findings show that political pressure to ease monetary policy is inflationary, while not leading to a positive impact on real activity. Political pressure episodes are distinct from typical monetary policy easing episodes, as Presidential interactions with the Fed can be publicly observed and affect inflation expectations. The economic effects of political pressure are quantitatively meaningful and political pressure is found to occur in several periods of U.S. history. In addition to providing fresh impetus to political economy research on central banks, these results also highlight that political constraints and shocks are important for the field of monetary economics, which has often ignored political economy considerations, perhaps due to a lack of good measurement and credible identification strategies.

The first contribution of this paper is to hand-collect new data on personal interactions between U.S. Presidents and Fed officials. Political pressure can be exerted through numerous channels, but conversations with the highest-ranking U.S. politician—and arguably the most powerful individual in the world—are an attractive tool for

administrations tempted to interfere with the Fed. The source of the data are the historical daily schedules of U.S. Presidents, part of the Presidential Libraries from Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933 until Barack Obama in 2016. I find over 800 personal interactions with Fed officials in these records and collect detailed information for each of them. For example, the average duration of an interaction is 53 minutes; 11% are on weekends; 92% are with the Fed Chair and 8% with other Fed officials. I use the data set to construct new time series of "President-Fed interactions." There is large variation in these personal interactions over time. For example, President Nixon interacted with Fed officials 160 times, while only 6 interactions took place during the Clinton administration.

President-Fed interactions arise endogenously in response to economic conditions and may not always represent political pressure. For example, in a recession the President might contact the Fed chair to seek advice or information. The second contribution of this paper is to overcome this identification challenge using a narrative approach. I exploit an increase in President-Fed interactions that plausibly took place for purely political reasons, with the purpose of influencing Fed policy, and arguably had an impact on monetary policy. In his desire to be re-elected in 1972, Richard Nixon pressured Arthur Burns to ease monetary policy in 1971. Burns, a Republican and friend to Nixon, reportedly gave in to Nixon's pressure. I present a variety of external evidence that corroborates this narrative.

I exploit the narrative around Nixon's pressure in a structural vector autoregression (SVAR) framework. The SVAR is quarterly from 1933 to 2016 and contains the number of President-Fed interactions and standard macroeconomic data. By controlling for lagged macro variables, the VAR already cleans the variation in President-Fed interactions from past realizations of e.g. inflation and economic activity. By restricting the SVAR with identifying assumptions, contemporaneous endogeneity is addressed. My approach identifies "political pressure shocks", similar to how the literature identifies monetary policy shocks in SVARs. The main idea is to isolate shocks that ease monetary policy following increased President-Fed interactions and to impose that the Nixon-Burn episode in late 1971 reflects such a shock. I implement this idea through a combination of traditional sign restrictions and narrative sign restrictions (Antolin-Diaz and Rubio-Ramirez, 2018). Specifically, standard sign restrictions define a political pressure shock as an increase in President-Fed interactions, a reduction in interest rates, and an uptick in prices. These restrictions are the same ones that the literature uses for monetary policy shocks (Uhlig, 2005), with the only addition that I also impose an increase in my new President-Fed interaction measure. Through narrative restrictions, I further impose that the shock was the most important contributor to the spike in President-Fed interactions in late 1971, during the Nixon re-election drive.

To set a benchmark for my results, I provide preliminary results with simpler methods. By using a basic Cholesky-identified SVAR on the one hand and an event study approach

on the other hand, I separately explore the role of the new data and the narrative evidence. While both approaches have limitations, they already indicate a strongly positive price level response following President-Fed interactions. These benchmark results help interpret my main results, but they also put the findings of this paper on a broader empirical footing.

My full methodology yields four main findings. First, a transitory political pressure shock strongly and persistently raises the price level. I normalize the shock to increase the number of President-Fed interactions by 10 in one quarter. 10 more interactions represent a large increase compared to the typical President, but not in comparison to Nixon, who met with Burns 17 times in 1971:Q3 and 17 times in 1971:Q4. The shock is transitory, but personal interactions display endogenous persistence and reverse back to 0 after 2 years. It leads to a 100 basis points lower interest rate on impact, a substantial monetary policy easing. The price level response to the shock builds up gradually and goes to a 4% higher price level after several years. A back-of-the-envelope calculation based on my estimates implies that exerting political pressure 50% as much as Nixon did, over a period of six months, ends up increasing the U.S. price level by about 7% after a decade.

Second, political pressure to ease monetary policy does not lead to a positive effect on real GDP. It also leaves the unemployment rate unaffected. This finding suggests that political pressure, while being able to lower interest rates, is not ultimately "successful" from the point of view of a President who pressures the Fed to create economic stimulus in the aggregate economy. I provide a theoretical discussion of the finding that political pressure raises the price level but not real activity. My discussion clarifies which mechanisms could generate this stagflationary pattern in simple New Keynesian models. I also point to richer models that explicitly incorporate political pressure on the central bank, several of which are compatible with my empirical findings.

Third, political pressure contributes to inflationary episodes also outside the Nixon years. Constructing historical variance decomposition in an SVAR is an advantage relative to an event study, which remains silent about periods outside of the event window. I find that political pressure shocks mostly occurred in the 1970s, with strong evidence for the administrations of Nixon, Ford and Carter. Political pressure was also a meaningful inflation driver during the Johnson administration, but played virtually no role under Clinton.

Fourth, political pressure triggers different macroeconomic dynamics than expansionary monetary policy shocks. I distinguish these two types of shocks using formal derivations. My derivations show that with existing data and identification strategies, for example using the Romer and Romer (2004) approach, political pressure shocks are estimated as a subset of monetary policy shocks. With my new data and identification approach, however, they are distinct type of shocks that transmit differently. In my SVAR, I find that political pressure shocks are more inflationary than standard monetary easing shocks. Monetary policy easing

shocks also leads to an increase in activity, unlike political pressure shocks. I also show that 8% of the original Romer and Romer (2004) residuals capture political pressure.

A key reason why political pressure to ease is different from a standard monetary policy easing arises if President-Fed interactions are publicly observable. In that case, private agents might change their behavior differently from how they react to a standard monetary policy shock. Conversely, if political pressure leads to easier monetary policy in complete secrecy, the results should not be different from a typical monetary policy easing shock. I present evidence that political pressure shocks have a much stronger impact on inflation expectations and the dispersion of inflation expectations than monetary policy shocks. Interestingly, these effects arise with a relatively long delay.

Furthermore, I document that pressure by Presidents on the Fed is widely discussed in the media. I construct a news index that measures discussions of Presidential pressure on the Fed in major U.S. newspapers. Including this index as an additional variable in my SVAR allows me to identify a refined version of the political pressure shock that is additionally restricted to be informed by public attention to President-Fed interactions. This version of the shock leads to a quantitatively stronger and more cleanly identified response of the price level. This finding lends further support to the idea that the public observability of President-Fed interactions plays a central role in its transmission mechanism.

I examine several other dimensions of my approach through additional results. First, a concern is that other macroeconomic events took place in 1971, such as the suspension of the Bretton Woods exchange rate arrangement. To address this problem, I estimate an alternative SVAR *without* the President-Fed interaction data. I apply narrative sign restrictions to identify a generic '1971 inflationary shock.' This shock implies only a short-lived price level increase, in stark contrast to the political pressure shock.

Second, an important question is whether imposing narrative sign restrictions during only one Presidency is limiting. I therefore impose an additional narrative restriction based on Lyndon B. Johnson's political pressure on the Fed in the 1960s. When two historical episodes are exploited, I find similarly strong inflationary effects of political pressure. Hence, my findings do not hinge on identifying variation from only one Presidency.

Third, President-Fed interactions are a count variable instead of continuous and political pressure may be inherently nonlinear. I generalize my econometric framework to allow the President-Fed interaction count to be driven by a latent political pressure variable through a nonlinear measurement equation. This is a technical contribution to the SVAR literature, as I am the first to explicitly model count data in combination with narrative sign restrictions. In terms of IRFs, I find results similar to my baseline specification. The estimated evolution of the latent political pressure variable is an additional piece of evidence. It allows me to assess the estimation uncertainty around unobservable political pressure, which I show

is high outside the 1960s and 1970s. None of the existing literature has produced a long historical measure of uncertainty around the occurrence of political pressure on the Fed.

Finally, political pressure might be exerted through other channels, e.g. by other members of an administration, Congress, or in the media. I emphasize that I do not argue that personal interactions with the President are a necessary condition for political pressure. Instead, they capture one important channel through which political pressure occurs, which I can measure consistently over time and exploit for identification.

At the end of the paper, I present suggestive evidence on the Biden and Trump administrations and discuss research about interference with central banks in other countries. The discussion underscores that understanding political pressure on central banks remains a key priority in economic research.

Related literature. First, my work contributes to a large body of work on the benefits of and threats to central bank independence, which originates in the broader political economy tradition (Persson and Tabellini, 2002). Empirical approaches traditionally use simple cross-country setups (Alesina and Summers, 1993). Some also highlight variation through time (Dincer and Eichengreen, 2014; Binder, 2021; Romelli, 2024).[1] My data and methodology enable me to estimate quantitative effects of political pressure on the Fed using variation through time, more in the spirit of the modern identification approaches in macroeconomics. Bianchi et al. (2023) also exploit a new data source, in their case tweets by President Trump, to identify political pressure on the Fed over time.[2] They focus on one President and use a high-frequency approach. I instead use new historical data that captures variation over almost a century, covering 13 different U.S. administrations.

Second, a separate line of work studies "fiscal dominance" as a form of political pressure that entices the central bank to finance deficits through inflation. Leeper and Leith (2016) provide a comprehensive survey of that monetary-fiscal interaction literature. I focus my comparison here on empirical work for the U.S. economy. Bianchi (2012) and Bianchi and Ilut (2017) provide empirical evidence by estimating regime-switching DSGE models. More directly related to my approach, some studies use SVARs. They exploit alternative orderings depending on the policy regime (Canzoneri, Cumby, and Diba, 2001) or regime-switching specifications (Bianchi and Melosi, 2017). All these papers use standard macro time series only. My paper is the first to use narrative sign restrictions and the first to exploit personal interactions between politicians and the Fed as a novel source of data in a VAR.

Third, my approach is in the tradition of narrative strategies for identification in

[1] Alesina and Summers (1993) use measures based on researchers' judgment. There is also survey-based evidence, e.g. Cecchetti and Krause (2002). Dincer and Eichengreen (2014) provide further references.

[2] Garcia and Skaperdas (2024) study political pressure on the Fed by analyzing Congressional testimony. Pagliuca (2025) studies FOMC members' political leanings and their influence on monetary policy.

macroeconomics. Using historical and institutional knowledge in research on monetary policy was pioneered by Friedman and Schwartz (1963). A host of references are provided by Ramey (2016), with Romer and Romer (1989) being an influential early example. I exploit new data and institutional knowledge to identify a political shock driving monetary policy, something that the monetary economics literature so far has not devoted much attention to, perhaps due to lack of good measurement and suitable identification approaches.

Finally, other work documents Nixon's political pressure on the Fed, e.g. Abrams (2006). Meltzer (2009)'s view is also that President Nixon strongly interfered with the Fed. Weise (2012) analyzes FOMC minutes and concludes that political pressure contributed to the rise in 1970s U.S. inflation. I use these historical insights in an econometric identification strategy. To the best of my knowledge, Martin (2015) is the only study in economics that considers daily schedules of U.S. Presidents, but only for motivation and not identification.[3]

2 New data on President-Fed interactions

This section describes the data collection from the historical daily schedules of U.S. Presidents. It presents summary statistics and constructs time series of personal interactions between U.S. Presidents and Fed officials over almost a century.

2.1 Data construction from Presidents' daily schedules

The historical daily schedules of U.S. Presidents are available through each President's *Presidential Library*.[4] The schedules begin with Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933 and end with Barack Obama in 2016. For most Presidents, the schedules are provided in digital form online, though some are of poor typewriter quality and needed to be manually read. For President George H.W. Bush, at the time of collection they were only available as hard copies in the Presidential Library in College Station, TX, so they were accessed physically on site. I provide an overview and further information in the Online Appendix.[5]


The daily schedule of the U.S. President contains a detailed itemized list of meetings and

[3] Martin (2015) plots annual meetings with Fed Chairs from 1953 to 2000 in a purely descriptive figure. In addition to being the first to formally exploit the data for identification, I extend it to backwards and forwards to the 1933-2016 sample, up to daily frequency; I include the George HW Bush schedules that were only available physically on site and therefore omitted by Martin (2015); I do not limit myself to interactions with the Fed Chair but also other Fed officials; and I collect more details, such as length or day of week.

[4] The creation of the schedules and provision to the public is governed by the National Archives and Records Service (NARA) under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). There is a so-called *Presidential Diarist*, a National Archives employee detailed to the White House. The Diarist is responsible for creating the daily schedules as a minute-by-minute log, based on information across different White House units.

[5] The daily schedules are not yet available for Presidents Trump and Biden. Using calendars of Fed Chairs as an alternative source, I provide tentative evidence for those administrations in Section 7.

Figure 1: EXAMPLE OF THE DATA SOURCE – PRESIDENT JIMMY CARTER'S SCHEDULE FROM JULY 19, 1980



THE WHITE HOUSE

THE DAILY DIARY OF PRESIDENT JIMMY CARTER

LOCATION: THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, D.C. — DATE (Mo., Day, Yr.): JULY 19, 1980 — TIME: 5:30 a.m. — DAY: SATURDAY

TIME From	TIME To	PHONE P-Placed R-Rec'd	ACTIVITY
5:30		R	The President received a wake up call from the White House signal board operator.
6:06			The President went to the Oval Office.
8:00	8:01	P	The President talked with the First Lady.
8:08			The President returned to the second floor Residence.
8:15			The President and the First Lady had breakfast.
8:31			The President returned to the Oval Office.
9:10	9:12		The President participated in a photo opportunity with: Mrs. Carol Anderson, Plains, Georgia Jill Anderson, daughter Tim Lawson, Americus, Georgia Mrs. Tim (Peggie) Lawson Wendi Lawson, daughter Keeli Lawson, daughter Lorri Lawson, daughter
9:12			The President went to the South Grounds.
9:13	9:20		The President motored from the South Grounds to the Shoreham Hotel.
9:20			The President was greeted by: Clifford L. Alexander, Secretary of the Army Robert McIntosh, General Manager, Shoreham Hotel The President, escorted by Secretary Alexander, went to the VIP Room.
9:22	9:29		The President met with: Secretary Alexander Mrs. Clifford L. (Adele) Alexander Gen. Edward C. Meyer, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army Mrs. Edward C. (Carol) Meyer Lt. Col. Matt Urban, U.S. Army and recipient of the Medal of Honor Mrs. Matt (Jennie) Urban Jennifer Urban, daughter Kris Johnson, daughter Ms. Sophia Rockwell, governess
9:29	9:49		The President participated in a ceremony to present the Medal of Honor to Lt. Col. Urban. Members of the press

GPO : 1977 O—228-197 — Page 1 of 4 Pages

THE WHITE HOUSE

THE DAILY DIARY OF PRESIDENT JIMMY CARTER

LOCATION: SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C. — DATE (Mo., Day, Yr.): JULY 19, 1980 — TIME: 9:29 a.m. — DAY: SATURDAY

TIME From	TIME To	PHONE P-Placed R-Rec'd	ACTIVITY
			The President went to the offstage announcement area.
9:30			The President went to the podium inside the Regency Ballroom.
9:32	9:38		The President addressed approximately 1,200 guests attending the presentation.
9:44			The President presented the Medal of Honor to Lt. Col. Urban.
			The President returned to his motorcade. He was escorted by Secretary Alexander.
9:49	9:53		The President motored from the Shoreham Hotel to the South Grounds of the White House.
9:54			The President returned to the Oval Office.
10:15	10:35		The President met with Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Paul A. Volcker.
10:37	10:38	P	The President talked with the First Lady.
10:40		P	The President telephoned his daughter, Amy Carter. The call was not completed.
10:44			The President went to the doctor's office.
10:52	10:57	R	The President talked with Amy Carter.
10:59			The President returned to the Oval Office. Enroute, he greeted: Richard I. Queen, released U.S. Hostage Harold Queen, father, resident of Lincolnville Beach, Maine Mrs. Harold (Jeanne) Queen Alexander Queen, brother Warren M. Christopher, Deputy Secretary of State.
11:02			The Presidential party went to the Oval Office.
11:02	11:50		The President met with: Mr. Queen Mr. and Mrs. Harold Queen Mr. Alexander Queen Deputy Secretary Christopher The First Lady
11:02	11:50		
11:02	11:50		
11:02	11:50		
11:13	11:50		

GPO : 1977 O—228-197 — Page 2 of 4 Pages

THE WHITE HOUSE

THE DAILY DIARY OF PRESIDENT JIMMY CARTER

LOCATION: THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, D.C. — DATE (Mo., Day, Yr.): JULY 19, 1980 — TIME: 11:44 a.m. — DAY: SATURDAY

TIME From	TIME To	PHONE P-Placed R-Rec'd	ACTIVITY
11:44		R	The President was telephoned by Donald Manes, Borough President of Queens, New York. The call was not completed.
11:50			The President and the First Lady escorted Richard Queen and his family to the South Grounds.
			The President and the First Lady bade farewell to Richard Queen and his family.
			The President and the First Lady returned to the Oval Office.
?	11:55		The President 'met with the First Lady.
12:26			The President returned to the second floor Residence.
12:36			The President and the First Lady went to the pool.
			The President and the First Lady had lunch.
1:43			The President and the First Lady returned to the second floor Residence.
1:45		P	The President telephoned his Appointments Secretary, Phillip J. Wise, Jr. The call was not completed.
1:49	1:50	R	The President talked with Mr. Wise.
2:56		R	The President was telephoned by Senator James Sasser (D-Tennessee). The call was not completed.
3:10	3:11	R	The President talked with his Counsel, Lloyd N. Cutler.
4:03			The President and the First Lady went to the State Floor.
4:03	4:56		The President and the First Lady hosted a reception for Carter Mondale Delegates to the 1980 Democratic National Convention For a list of attendees, see APPENDIX "A."
			The President and the First Lady received guests.
			The President and the First Lady went to the East Room.
			The President addressed approximately 241 guests.
4:56			The President returned to the second floor Residence.

GPO : 1977 O—228-197 — Page 3 of 4 Pages

THE WHITE HOUSE

THE DAILY DIARY OF PRESIDENT JIMMY CARTER

LOCATION: THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, D.C. — DATE (Mo., Day, Yr.): JULY 19, 1980 — TIME: 5:39 p.m. — DAY: SATURDAY

TIME From	TIME To	PHONE P-Placed R-Rec'd	ACTIVITY
5:39	5:41	P	The President talked with Fred M. Gregg, Vice President for Marketing, Equitable Life Insurance Company, Washington, DC, and the President's Sunday School teacher.
6:01			The President returned to the South Grounds.
			The President greeted: Kirk Douglas, actor Mrs. Kirk Douglas
6:07			The Presidential party went to the second floor Residence.
9.03			The President went to the Diplomatic Reception Room.
			The President greeted Maxwell Cleland, Administrator of the Veterans Administration.
9:07	10:36		The President and the First Lady hosted a reception in celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Veterans Administration. For a list of attendees, see APPENDIX "B."
			The President and Mr. Cleland went to the South Grounds.
			The President addressed approximately 964 guests attending the reception.
9.10			The President escorted Mr. Cleland to the Truman Balcony. For a list of guests on the balcony, see APPENDIX "C."
9:10	10:00		The Presidential party attended a program, including fireworks and marching bands in celebration of Veterans Administrations anniversary.
10:26			The President and the First Lady returned to the State Floor.
10:36			The President and the First Lady returned to the second floor Residence.
12:05			The President retired.
			EJ/EJ

GPO : 1977 O—228-197 — Page 4 of 4 Pages

Note: The schedule for this day is 4 pages long (see the bottom right corner on each page for a page count). This is a typical length. The interaction with Fed Chairman Paul Volcker at 10:15am, highlighted in yellow, is collected in the data base.

events with time, place, duration, type (e.g. in person or phone call), and who the President interacted with. It is often visible whether other people were present. Figure 1 provides an example for President Jimmy Carter on July 19, 1980 to illustrate the structure and level of detail of a typical schedule. The schedule reveals an interaction with Fed Chair Paul Volcker at 10:15 am which lasts for 20 minutes.

I hand-collect information on all interactions between the Presidents and officials from the Federal Reserve. To this end, the schedules are searched for "Fed", "Federal Reserve", "FRB", "FOMC", "Reserve Bank" as well the names of the Fed Chairs, Governors, Reserve Bank Presidents, and other key Fed staff during each administration. For each interaction, I record the identity of the President and the Fed official, date, weekday, length of the interaction, and any further information if available. I cross-check the data with daily calendars of Fed Chairs available for a subset of the sample via FRASER (St. Louis Fed).[6]


Figure 2 presents the individuals involved in the President-Fed interactions. I plot the number as well as the total duration of the interactions in hours. Panel (a) reveals large variation across Presidents. While President Nixon met with Fed officials 160 times, only 6 President-Fed interactions happened during the Clinton administration. Presidents George W. Bush and Obama also interacted little with the Fed. A comparison of count vs. length shows that the average length of personal interactions with Fed personnel is also quite different across Presidents. For example, Nixon and Ford ran meetings that were on average longer than one hour, while Roosevelt and Truman tended to have shorter interactions.

Panel (b) focuses on the Fed officials. 92% of the interactions are with the Chair of the Federal Reserve, and 8% with other Fed officials. Over the whole sample there are 22 interactions with regional Federal Reserve Bank Presidents, 16 of which are with the New York Fed President. Arthur Burns stands out as having by far the most interactions with the White House. Alan Greenspan had relatively few interactions with U.S. Presidents.

Panels (c)–(f) of Figure 2 present additional statistics. Panel (c) shows a histogram over their duration. Many encounters are quicker than 15 minutes, typically phone calls. Some interactions can be as long as 5 or 6 hours, typically official ceremonies, or banquets. The average duration is 53 minutes. Panel (d) provides a histogram over weekdays, both for the count of interactions and for the total duration in hours. 11% of the interactions are on weekends. Panel (e) examines the nature of interactions. Most are simple meetings (569 with a total duration of 431 hours). I exclude them from the histogram and consider different contexts. Many of those are meals (breakfasts, lunches, or dinners). It is visible that these tend to have a longer duration. 'Other social' includes for example parties or church visits. Overall, there is rich variation in the characteristics of President-Fed interactions.

[6] I examine Fed Chair calendars for recent years in Section 7. Morse and Vissing-Jorgensen (2021) analyze Fed governor calendars to study how information flows from the Fed to stock prices.

Figure 2: SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR PRESIDENT-FED PERSONAL INTERACTION DATA




Notes. Panel (e) excludes simple face to face meetings. There are 545 of those with a total duration of 428 hours. 'Other social' includes for example parties or church visits.

2.2 Time series of President-Fed interactions

Based on the data retrieved from the daily schedules, I construct time series of personal interactions between U.S. Presidents and Fed officials, for short "President-Fed interactions." Figure 3 presents the number of personal interactions aggregated to annual frequency (the Online Appendix presents additional time series plots.). The figure also indicates the tenures of different Presidents through the vertical lines. It is visible that there is enormous variation over time. Interestingly, there seems to not be a clear pattern across party lines (Democrat/Republican). Instead, there are clusters of low or high interactions across eras of U.S. history. For example, President-Fed interactions are common in the 1960s and 1970s, but less frequent in the 1990s and 2000s. From this data alone, it is not clear whether political pressure took place during the President-Fed interactions. I therefore combine the data with an identification strategy.

Figure 3: ANNUAL NUMBER OF PRESIDENT-FED INTERACTIONS THROUGH TIME



3 Identification and estimation strategy

This section presents my identification strategy. It describes the historical context of the narrative evidence and the implementation through narrative sign restrictions in a SVAR. Explaining my identification and estimation strategy also clarifies how exactly political pressure is defined. While the strategy described in this section is my preferred method, I also consider a Cholesky-identified SVAR and an event study as alternatives.

3.1 Narrative approach exploiting Nixon's pressure on the Fed

Personal interactions between Presidents and Fed officials do not necessarily capture political pressure. They likely arise endogenously in response to economic conditions. The President might simply consult with the Fed chair in the event of a recession, or in a period when inflation is a concern. For studying the economic consequences of political pressure on the Fed, this poses an identification challenge. To overcome this challenge, I exploit an increase in the number of President-Fed interactions that satisfies two criteria. First, the President-Fed interactions arise mainly for reasons that are political, with the purpose of influencing monetary policy, and are therefore plausibly unrelated to economic conditions. Second, monetary policy changes because of the political pressure by the U.S. President.

My central identifying assumption is that an episode satisfying these two criteria occurred in late 1971. In his desire to be re-elected in 1972, President Richard Nixon pressured Fed Chair Arthur Burns to ease monetary policy in the fall of 1971, which is reflected by a spike in interactions clearly visible in Figure 3. Arthur Burns, a Republican and friend to Nixon, reportedly gave in to Nixon's persuasion and eased monetary policy. In what follows, I provide evidence that corroborates these identifying assumptions.

3.1.1 Nixon's appointment of Burns and motivation for pressuring the Fed

Richard Nixon and Arthur Burns knew each other long before Nixon became President, at least since 1960 (Nixon, 1962; Abrams, 2006; Ferrell, 2010). After Nixon became President in 1969, Arthur Burns first served as a close economic advisor in the White House. Nixon subsequently appoints Burns as Fed Chair. Jokingly, Nixon says during the swearing-in ceremony in January 1970: "I respect his independence. However I hope that—*independently*—he will conclude that my views are the ones that should be followed."

Presidents might have different reasons to influence the Fed, such as stimulating activity, or reducing the government's real fiscal burden. In the case of Nixon, his past election loss provides an important backdrop. Nixon first ran for President in 1960 and lost against Kennedy, as Eisenhower's Vice President. The economy was weak and monetary conditions were tight. In Nixon's view, Eisenhower's failure to stimulate the economy jeopardized Nixon's presidential campaign (Nixon, 1962). When Nixon was President and began preparing for re-election in 1971, he was eager to avoid past mistakes.

3.1.2 Evidence of political pressure on the Fed in the Nixon Tapes

For several years, President Nixon secretly recorded conversations in the White House. The Nixon Tapes led to enormous political controversy. Abrams (2006) provides a systematic

account of those conversations that were related to monetary policy. I present a small selection of quotes that support the view that Nixon exerted immense pressure on Burns.

December 24, 1971. Phone call with economic advisor George Shultz. Nixon: "Do you feel, as far as Arthur and the money supply, we got that about as far as we can turn it right now, have we? I mean as far as my influence on him, that's what I'm really asking." Shultz: "Yeah. Well, you know he said that he, that they voted to increase it [the money supply]."

February 14, 1972. Shultz tells Nixon that Burns is optimistic about the economy. Nixon: "Another defense he's building up for not raising the money supply. I'd rather he weren't so optimistic. [...] War is going to be declared if he doesn't come around some." Later in the day, Nixon speaks to Burns. Abrams (2006) documents that Nixon is aware of the "long and variable lags" in the transmission of monetary policy. Nixon: "You know the problem with it; you've always spoken of that time lag. [...] I really don't care what you do in April, but between now and April ... [garbled] that can hurt us ... [garbled] in November."

3.1.3 Evidence of political pressure on the Fed in Arthur Burns' personal diary

Between 1969 and 1974, Arthur Burns wrote a personal diary. It was private and only became available to the public in 2008. It is now published with contextual commentary by historian Robert H. Ferrell (Ferrell, 2010). I again provide a small selection of relevant quotes.

March 1971. Burns describes "I am convinced that the President will do anything to be reelected", "The President looked wild", 'I felt that the President was going mad".

July 1971. Burns writes: "I watched his (Nixon's) face, as he spoke, with a feeling of dismay; for his features became twisted and what I saw was uncontrolled cruelty." and "RN's entire manner was imperial; it was enough that he had reached a decision (...) he was still the emperor, and I should therefore toe the mark."


September-October 1971. "President called and asked me to come over within an hour. Hastily rearranged my schedule and spent an hour and a quarter with him." There are explicit requests from Nixon to ease monetary policy. "I got a stern letter from the President urging me start expanding the money supply and predicting disaster if this didn't happen."

3.1.4 Evidence about Arthur Burns' policy decisions in his personal diary

Did the pressure exerted by President Nixon ultimately affect Burns' decisions about U.S. monetary policy? While the descriptions in Burns' diary are not unambiguously clear on this question, there are some quotes that can be interpreted in this way.

November 1971. Burns notes that "I told him (Nixon) that (...) we of course would not permit the money supply to decline." and "President at this meeting again expressed his concern about the money supply. I reminded him that I was looking after that properly."

Figure 4: FEDERAL RESERVE BEHAVIOR BEFORE AND AFTER NIXON'S RE-ELECTION



Notes. The implied Fed Funds Rate changes and estimated monetary policy shocks in Panel (a) are from Romer and Romer (2004). The source for Panel (b) is Thornton and Wheelock (2014). Both panels split the time period from Arthur Burns' appointment until Nixon's resignation into before and after the November 1972 election.

February 1972. "I reassured him on the money supply (...) and that he need not be concerned about the possibility that the Fed would starve the economy."

While there is no "smoking gun" in the Burns' diary that he changed monetary policy in direct response to pressure, it is instructive to directly analyze monetary policy decisions.

3.1.5 Evidence on Fed policy changes before and after Nixon's re-election

Figure 4, Panel (a) compares the stance of U.S. monetary policy under Arthur Burns' command, before and following Nixon's re-election in November 1972. The Federal Funds Rate fell prior to Nixon's re-election (dark blue bars). This monetary easing could simply occur in response to changes in the economy. However during the same period Romer and Romer (2004) estimate large easing shocks to monetary policy (light blue bars). In 1971:Q4 alone, the easing shock amounted to more than 150 basis points. In other words, monetary policy was *exogenously* easier, not because economic conditions warranted it. My narrative attributes this to Nixon's influence on Burns. In fact in their original study Romer and Romer (2004) refer to politics as one of the fundamental drivers of monetary policy shocks. The exogenously easy policy before Nixon's re-election contrasts with a large tightening that took place after the re-election, in 1973 and 1974. According to Romer and Romer (2004), this was largely systematic, responding to the surge in inflation during those years.

3.1.6 Evidence on FOMC voting patterns before and after Nixon's re-election

Figure 4, Panel (b) shows that before Nixon's re-election, Burns suggested easy monetary policy in a manner that contradicted other FOMC members' views. The figure reports dissenting FOMC votes before and after the 1972 election. The total number of dissents is roughly similar in the time periods before and after Nixon's re-election, adding up to 22

before and 17 after. Importantly, before Nixon's re-election 20 votes, more than 90% of all dissents voted for tighter policy than what was finally decided, while after the re-election 12, more than 70% of all dissents, voted for easier policy. This suggests that prior to the election, Burns faced open objections from the FOMC in terms of his proposed course of policy as being seen as too loose. A possible explanation is that Burns indeed did a favor to Nixon.

3.1.7 Additional evidence and different point of views in the literature

Weise (2012) systematically analyzes FOMC minutes. According to this analysis, Arthur Burns brings up political considerations, especially in the December 1971 meeting, in which he warned that due to the slow monetary growth "some people were now asking whether the Federal Reserve was deliberately moving to a restraining policy so as to nullify what the Administration, with the support of Congress, was attempting to accomplish."

Several other scholars conclude that Nixon influenced Burns. Meltzer (2009) emphasizes the lack of central bank independence in the Nixon years. According to Bianchi (2012) "It is commonly accepted that he (Burns) had to succumb to the requests of the White House." Some historical accounts, however, present different views. Hetzel (1998) acknowledges the pressure by Nixon, but argues that Burns had a "nonmonetary view of inflation" by which the root of inflation was not monetary policy, but for example union power. His account does not contain any discussion of the fact that Romer and Romer (2004) estimate a non-systematic policy easing under Burns. Moreover, it precedes the publication of Arthur Burns' diary.

3.2 Implementation of narrative identification in the SVAR

I exploit the Nixon-Burns narrative in a formal econometric setting. My approach estimates variation in political pressure using SVAR techniques, just as the previous literature has estimated monetary policy or fiscal policy shocks.

3.2.1 Data and estimation settings

The SVAR is quarterly from 1933 to 2016. It contains the number of President-Fed interactions as well as standard macro data. The macro data includes the 3-month Tbill rate, the log GDP deflator, log government expenditures, log real GDP and the deficit scaled by GDP. See the summary in Table 1. Apart from my new data series, the data are from Ramey and Zubairy (2018) extended to 2016. Two arguments motivate my choice of variables. First, I want to capture monetary policy, with measures of interest rates, output and inflation.[7]

[7]In parts of the sample, the Fed targeted monetary aggregates. Using one policy instrument over time provides consistency and is common in the SVAR literature. Following Bernanke and Mihov (1998), I focus on the interest rate. During the zero lower bound period, I use the shadow interest rate from Wu and Xia (2016).

Table 1: SVAR DATA AND IDENTIFYING RESTRICTIONS

Variable	Traditional sign restrictions	Narrative restrictions
President-Fed interactions	+	1971:Q3, 1971:Q4
3-month Tbill rate	−	
Log GDP deflator	+	
Log real GDP		
Nom. Deficit / Nom. GDP		
Log government expenditures		

Notes. President-Fed interactions are included as the quarterly number of interactions, i.e. the quarterly version of Figure 3. The remaining data are taken from Ramey and Zubairy (2018). In my baseline setup, the sign restrictions on the Tbill rate and the GDP deflator are imposed for the initial and the following quarter (following Uhlig, 2005) and the sign restriction on President-Fed interactions is imposed on impact.

Second, I include fiscal variables, given the related literature on fiscal-monetary interactions. In robustness exercises, I include additional times series, such as oil prices. The SVAR is specified with 8 lags and priors are identical to Antolin-Diaz and Rubio-Ramirez (2018). I draw posterior densities over the model's parameters and impulse response functions (IRFs) using their Bayesian algorithm. See also Arias, Rubio-Ramirez, and Waggoner (2018).

3.2.2 Definition of political pressure shock and identifying restrictions

Antolin-Diaz and Rubio-Ramirez (2018) define structural shocks based on *(1)* their theoretical impact on economic variables and *(2)* by selecting key episodes in the sample during which the shock is imposed to be important in terms of its contribution to the historical variance of a specific variable. I define a *political pressure shock* as a shock that *(1)* raises President-Fed interactions, lowers interest rates, increases the price level and *(2)* is the main contributor to the increase in President-Fed interactions in 1971:Q3-Q4. These restrictions are summarized in Table 1. In the following, I expand on the logic behind them.

Sign restrictions. I posit that a political pressure shock should trigger a monetary policy easing that is driven by increased personal interaction between the President and the Fed. To capture the monetary policy element of this logic, my starting point is the literature that uses sign restrictions to identify monetary policy shocks. On top of that, I only impose one additional sign restriction, on the President-Fed interaction variable. In a separate section below, I provide a formal discussion about the differences between monetary policy and political pressure shocks, which further clarifies why I define them in a closely similar way.

Following Uhlig (2005), the sign restrictions literature defines a monetary policy easing (tightening) shock as a decrease (increase) in interest rates and an increase (decrease) in the price level. The response of real economic activity is unrestricted, to remain agnostic about the (non)neutrality of monetary policy. In models in which money is neutral, a monetary

easing leads to an increase in prices but no change in activity. Models in which money is not neutral still imply an increase in prices but also change real activity. Therefore, imposing a sign only the price level response is less restrictive from a theoretical point of view than a sign on real activity. This logic is followed in many subsequent studies that identify monetary policy shocks with sign restrictions, including Antolin-Diaz and Rubio-Ramirez (2018).[8]

I combine the exact same restrictions with the additional assumption that a monetary policy easing (tightening) coincides with an increase (decrease) in President-Fed interactions. The idea is to study monetary policy decisions that stem from the President meeting with Fed Officials. Of course, the sign restrictions by themselves only ensure a comovement between these variables, and not necessarily that the interactions *cause* the easing. For that reason, the identification scheme is combined with narrative restrictions, leveraging an episode for which narrative accounts support the view that there is such a causal relationship.

Narrative restrictions. I also impose a *narrative* sign restriction, which captures that the personal interactions between the President and the Fed in 1971:Q3 and 1971:Q4 increased mostly due to a political pressure shock (i.e. the shock defined by the sign restrictions explained above), and less because of any other shock. The interactions in these quarters can still partly be driven by other shocks, but gets restricted to move *mainly* due to political pressure. Formally, this restriction imposes that in the historical variance decomposition of the President-Fed interactions in 1971:Q3-Q4, the political pressure shock is more important than all other shocks combined.[9] The identifying assumption relies on the narrative account presented in the previous section. The third and fourth quarter of 1971 saw the largest spike in interactions prior to Nixon's re-election and coincide with the strongest monetary easing shocks estimated by Romer and Romer (2004) in the Burns years. In his diary, Burns writes about this period as "a definite and decisive turning point in the President's state of mind."

Additional considerations. Several aspects of my identifying restrictions are worth clarifying further. First, I impose the traditional sign restrictions on impact and the subsequent quarter, following Uhlig (2005) and Antolin-Diaz and Rubio-Ramirez (2018) who use 6-month restrictions in monthly data. I study robustness checks which vary the timing.

Second, it is important to keep in mind that the sign restrictions do *not* need to correspond to the goals of a President who exerts pressure on the Fed. A President might want to boost economic activity or reduce real deficits, but this does not mean that a sign restriction on these variables is a good assumption for the identification of a political pressure shock.

[8]Sometimes signs are imposed on additional policy related variables. In Uhlig (2005) a monetary easing (tightening) increases (decreases) non-borrowed reserves, a variable I do not include in my SVAR.

[9]Antolin-Diaz and Rubio-Ramirez (2018) refer to this narrative restriction as the "overwhelming"-type. They also suggest a "most important"-type, which I consider in a robustness exercise.

Instead, while I impose political pressure to be *proximately successful* at lowering interest rates, it should be as much as possible an open question whether political pressure is *ultimately successful* from the perspective of a pressuring politician.

Third, it could be the case that President pressures the Fed to tighten rather than to ease policy. This situation would lead to a positive comovement between President-Fed interactions and interest rates. It would therefore not fall into my definition of political pressure, which reflects presidential pressure to ease monetary policy. Instead, pressure to tighten would be estimated as part of the other shocks in the system. It is very rare that politicians pressure central banks for tighter policy, as shown by Binder (2021).

Fourth, one might argue that President-Fed interactions could be used as an external instrument instead of a restricted variable in the SVAR. However, President-Fed interactions themselves are not a valid instrument as they can respond to economic conditions. The narrative sign restrictions methodology circumvents this problem through the assumption that the variable is driven by political pressure only in selected periods.

3.3 Political pressure shocks vs. monetary policy shocks

My definition of a political pressure shock leads to an unsystematic easing of monetary policy. Therefore, one might interpret it as a *specific kind* of monetary policy shock. Indeed, as I show above, Romer and Romer (2004) estimate expansionary monetary policy shocks when Nixon's exerted pressure. Nevertheless, the political pressure shock I identify can have a *different macroeconomic transmission* from a monetary policy shock. I show this formally.

Consider a system of equations for economic activity (y), inflation (π), interest rates (i) and President-Fed interactions (x). For illustration, there is only one period, and there are two structural shocks. First, a shock ε^i that exogenously changes interest rates, "narrowly" interpreted as a monetary policy shock. Second, a shock ε^x that exogenously changes President-Fed interactions. This shock has a proper interpretation with further restrictions.

$$
\begin{aligned}
y &= \phi_{y\pi}\pi + \phi_{yi}i + \phi_{yx}x && (1)\\
\pi &= \phi_{\pi y}y + \phi_{\pi i}i + \phi_{\pi x}x && (2)\\
i &= \phi_{iy}y + \phi_{i\pi}\pi + \phi_{ix}x + \varepsilon^i && (3)\\
x &= \phi_{xy}y + \phi_{x\pi}\pi + \phi_{xi}i + \varepsilon^x. && (4)
\end{aligned}
$$

Suppose that a researcher does not use data on x but employs an identification scheme that appropriately controls for systematic reaction of monetary policy to changes in y and π. This is the aim of, for example, Romer and Romer (2004). To see what this researcher will capture, let us combine equations (3) and (4) and solve for i:

$$i = \frac{\phi_{iy} + \phi_{ix}\phi_{xy}}{1 - \phi_{ix}\phi_{xi}} y + \frac{\phi_{i\pi} + \phi_{ix}\phi_{x\pi}}{1 - \phi_{ix}\phi_{xi}} \pi + \frac{\phi_{ix}\varepsilon^x + \varepsilon^i}{1 - \phi_{ix}\phi_{xi}}. \tag{5}$$

With a suitable method to orthogonalize i with respect to y and π, she can retrieve the residual

$$\xi^m = \frac{\phi_{ix}\varepsilon^x + \varepsilon^i}{1 - \phi_{ix}\phi_{xi}} \tag{6}$$

and label it monetary policy shock.[10] If President-Fed interactions have no effect on monetary policy, $\phi_{ix} = 0$ and $\xi^m = \varepsilon^i$ so that the estimated shock corresponds to the monetary policy shock narrowly defined. However, if President-Fed interactions do influence interest rates, the researcher will estimate a combination of monetary policy shocks ε^i and the shock ε^x. In that sense, ε^x can be interpreted as a specific kind of the estimated monetary policy shock.

A researcher who instead uses data on all variables (y, π, i, x) and appropriate identifying restrictions can separately estimate ε^i and ε^x. Importantly, ε^x can have a different transmission from ε^i because ϕ_{yx} and $\phi_{\pi x}$ can differ from zero in (1) and (2). The shock to x can affect the economy in addition to its effect on interest rates. For example, a monetary easing that arises in response to President-Fed meetings might also have a different effect on expectations. If the President-Fed interactions are publicly observable to a meaningful degree, private agents might react to a political pressure shock differently than to a monetary policy shock. If, on the other hand, the President-Fed interactions were unobservable, an interest rate decision induced by political pressure should manifest itself in the same way as any unanticipated change in monetary policy, in the same way as the narrow monetary policy shock. To interpret ε^x as political pressure shock, I further restrict the system so that the shock ε^x lowers i, raises π, and is the main contributor of x in the Nixon re-election phase.

In sum, while variation in political pressure might be estimated as a subset of monetary policy shocks in settings with only standard macro data, I use the new President-Fed interaction data and narrative identification to estimate them as a separate type of exogenous shock. Below I examine the responses to the two shock types in the data and present evidence that their estimated transmission mechanisms differ when political pressure is observable.

3.4 Shocks vs. regime changes

My SVAR is specified with constant parameters and political pressure materializes as a structural shock. There are potential criticisms of this specification. One criticism, common to many macroeconometric analyses, is that instabilities in the economy might lead to

[10] Of course, simply running an OLS regression of i on y and π would lead to omitted variable bias. However, the expression in (6) should not be interpreted as the residual from a naive OLS regression, but reflects the object recovered by a researcher who appropriately controls for the systematic component of monetary policy with respect to y and π, using a valid identification strategy for monetary policy shocks.

misspecification. Another criticism is that, from a conceptual point of view, political pressure should materialize through the emergence of a policy regime and not as an exogenous shock.

I choose my 'shocks-based' approach for several reasons. First, the direct comparison to standard monetary policy shocks is central to my analysis. The explicit starting point for my identification approach are studies in the monetary policy literature that use (narrative) sign restrictions for monetary policy shocks in constant parameter SVARs. Second, in the U.S., political interference with the central bank is an infrequent phenomenon. Thus, even if political pressure was a regime change in the true data-generating process, the fact that the regime materializes rarely and briefly across the sample could allow the regime change to be absorbed as a structural shock. In other words, the misspecification in that case might be mild. Third, SVARs in general have been shown to be fairly robust to misspecification in the form of neglected parameter variation (Canova et al., 2015). Fourth, in the context of central bank independence literature, the concept of a political pressure shock in a SVAR is novel. Thus, I argue that there is value added in my method simply because it approaches an important research question through a different and new lens.

Beyond these arguments, my results include analyses that address the potential criticisms of my approach. In particular, I run my SVAR over several different subsamples, which is at least a rough way to address parametric instabilities. To do so, I choose points to split the sample based on changes in the monetary policy regime, by excluding the Greenspan era, the global financial crisis (GFC) or the period prior to the Treasury-Fed Accord.

4 Benchmark results with simple methods

My empirical strategy combines new data and narrative evidence. I begin by studying the role of these two components separately. On the one hand, I estimate an SVAR that contains the President-Fed interactions, but does not use narrative information about any presidency. Instead, I identify a shock with a Cholesky ordering as the simplest off-the-shelf SVAR approach. On the other hand, I set up an event study that captures the quarters related to the Nixon narrative as dummy variables. However, it does not use information about the intensity of political pressure from the personal interactions data.

Both methods have drawbacks relative to my preferred approach, but they are useful for two reasons. First, they provide simple benchmarks that help me interpret my main findings.[11] Second, they can be seen as alternative approaches to the question asked in this paper. In that sense, they also put my main findings on a broader footing.

[11]The two approaches are natural benchmarks due to their simplicity, though they do not strictly "add up" to my main approach, which combines restrictions on IRFs and on the historical variance decomposition. A third natural benchmark is a simpler SVAR with only sign restrictions, which I also study further below.

4.1 Using President-Fed interaction data without narrative restrictions

I estimate a Bayesian VAR using the data shown in Table 1, with estimation settings identical to my main approach described above. I identify a structural shock using a Cholesky approach, assuming that the President-Fed interaction time series can respond to all variables in the system contemporaneously, but the other variables respond to the shock to President-Fed interactions with a one-quarter lag.[12] This approach does not use narrative restrictions, so no presidency is treated differently from other periods. It is not clear whether the resulting shock can cleanly be interpreted as an exogenous shift in political pressure. However, it is a useful first pass as it captures a shift in President-Fed interactions controlling for the endogenous response of those interactions to all other shocks in the system.

The resulting IRFs are shown in Panel (a) of Figure 5. I normalize the shock to raise the number of President-Fed interactions by 10. The average number of quarterly interactions is 3, with a standard deviation of 2.7. So this is a relatively large shock, though not in light of Nixon's behavior, who met with Burns 17 times in both 1971:Q3 and 1971:Q4. The shock is transitory, but President-Fed interactions are unrestricted in terms of endogenous persistence. The dark (light) shaded areas show 68% (90%) posterior credible intervals.

The upward shift in President-Fed interactions coincides with a fall in interest rates of about 50 basis points. The rate reduction occurs with a lag of about one year and is short-lived. The price level increases gradually. It turns significantly positive after several years and reaches a 4-5% higher level after several years. Both the rate reduction and price level increase are detected according to the 68% posterior credible intervals, with the price increase just barely insignificant according to the 90% intervals. Interestingly, interest rates flip sign after about 10 quarters, likely reflecting an endogenous monetary policy in response to the rise in prices. For Real GDP, we cannot conclude that the response is different from zero at any horizon. There is some movement in fiscal variables, with a fall in government expenditures and the deficit after about two years, and a reversal in the deficit later on.


4.2 Using narrative events without President-Fed interaction data

As an alternative benchmark, I ignore the President-Fed interaction data, but exploit the narrative evidence on Nixon's pressure in an event study. I regress each of the time series from Table 1 on a dummy variable that equals to 1 in 1971:Q3-Q4 and zero otherwise, as well as lags of the same dummy. I also include 8 lags of the left-hand side and 8 lags of the four other macro variables, respectively. I then use the estimated coefficients of this


[12] In the terminology of Ramey (2016), President-Fed interactions are "ordered last." Other authors would refer to the "first Cholesky shock." It is analogous to how Christiano et al. (1999) identify a monetary policy shock by ordering the interest rate last. Unlike with narrative sign restrictions, the Cholesky approach point-identifies IRFs. I calculate standard errors based on the uncertainty surrounding the reduced-form parameters.

Figure 5: IRFS IN CHOLESKY-IDENTIFIED SVAR AND EVENT STUDY APPROACH

(a) IRFs to a structural shock identified from ordering President-Fed interactions last



(b) Dynamic responses to Nixon pressure event dummy



Notes. Panel (a) plots the IRFs from a Cholesky-identified SVAR in which President-Fed interactions can respond to all variables in the system contemporaneously, but the other variables respond to the shock to President-Fed interactions only with a one-quarter lag. Panel (b) plots the dynamic responses to a dummy variable that equals to 1 in 1971:Q3-Q4 and zero otherwise. The dark (light) shaded areas show 68% (90%) posterior credible intervals for Panel (a) and uncertainty bands based on the Delta method in Panel (b).

regression to predict the dynamic response of a given variable when we initialize it at zero and set the event time dummy to one for one quarter.[13] It is doubtful whether this procedure cleanly captures a shift in political pressure. For example, the dummy variable might reflect

[13]This procedure is inspired by the regression in Romer and Romer (1989). For a macro variable y_t, I run the regression $y_t = \alpha + \Sigma_{j=1}^{J}\beta_j y_{t-j} + \Sigma_{k=1}^{K}\gamma_k D_{t-k} + \Sigma_{j=1}^{J}\delta_j x_{t-j} + u_t$, where D_t is a dummy that equals 1 in 1971:Q3 and 1971:Q4 and 0 otherwise. x_t is a vector containing the other macro variables. I then compute the prediction $\hat{y}_\tau$ from setting $y_0 = 0$ and $D_1 = 1$ and iterating forward the estimated regression equation for $\tau = 1, 2, ..., K$. I set $J = 8$ and $K = 20$. Standard errors are calculated with the Delta method.

other macroeconomic shocks during the period. However, the approach offers a preliminary perspective on the variation in the data during the period of Nixon's pressure on Burns.

Figure 5, Panel (b) presents the results, variable by variable. I omit the responses of the fiscal variables, as they are mostly insignificant. I plot a shorter horizon than in Panel (a) as the simplicity of this prediction approach is not well suited to capture longer-horizon dynamics. I also cannot normalize these responses in the same way as those in Panel (a), as I do not use President-Fed interactions here. Instead, they should be interpreted as the dynamic response of a given variable to switching from the average quarter in the sample to a quarter in which Nixon had most meetings (17) with Arthur Burns, controlling for other macroeconomic data and the variable's own autoregressive dynamics.

The dynamics show that the event study approach does not detect a clear interest rate reduction triggered by the Nixon dummy, though the Tbill rate does turn significantly negative at the 68% level in quarters 2 and 4. Similar to the Cholesky-identified SVAR, the clearest response is that of the price level, which displays a gradual increase and turns significantly positive after two years, also at the 90% significance level. There is a positive response in real GDP, though the response is not statistically significant for most horizons.

In sum, both benchmark approaches show a clear increase in the price level, though they differ in the strength of the interest rate reduction, as well as in the presence of a real GDP response. If one is willing to accept that these approaches do capture consequences of political pressure, then these results already suggest that there are inflationary effects of interference with the Fed, while there is less of an activity reaction. The results in the following sections provide more carefully identified effects of political pressure.

5 Main results

This section presents my findings on the macroeconomic consequences of political pressure on the Federal Reserve to ease monetary policy. It contains further conceptual discussions and various exercises to unpack the mechanisms behind the results.

5.1 The macroeconomic effects of political pressure

Figure 6 presents IRFs to a political pressure shock identified based on the restrictions presented in Table 1. I estimate these over the full 1933-2016 sample and normalize the shock to increase President-Fed interactions by 10 in one quarter. The IRFs to the political pressure shock are as a solid blue lines, with the dark (light) blue shaded areas represent 68% (90%) posterior credible intervals. For comparison, I also show as dashed-dotted black lines the IRFs and 68% credible intervals for a shock identified from only imposing the standard sign

restrictions, that is, *not* using the narrative restriction that draws on Richard Nixon's behavior in 1971:Q3-Q4. This comparison makes clear to what degree my narrative approach enables precise inference about the macroeconomic effects of political pressure.

The number of President-Fed interactions displays persistence after the political pressure shock hits, with the IRF reversing to 0 after around 2 years. The shock induces a substantial monetary easing, with a roughly 100 basis points lower interest rate after a few quarters. The price level response to the shock builds up gradually and persistently, and goes to a roughly 4% higher price level after several years. The effect is different from zero at several horizons, based on the 68% posterior credible sets. The 68% width of posterior credible sets is often considered in the SVAR literature, e.g. in Antolin-Diaz and Rubio-Ramirez (2018), and one would expect that it is quite difficult to estimate the effects of political pressure with strong precision. In additional specifications I study below, the IRFs of the GDP deflator to political pressure shocks are economically stronger and more precisely estimated than in Figure 6.


The magnitude of the median price level effect implies that exerting political pressure 50% as much as Nixon did, over a period of six months, permanently increases the U.S. price level by more than 7% after several years.[14] This is an economically sizable effect. However, it is also not a catastrophic inflation surge, in light of the fact that the price level, unconditionally, doubled from 1971 to 1981. It makes clear that political pressure significantly increases prices, but U.S. inflation unconditionally is driven by many other shocks. I will elaborate further on this point when I analyze historical variance decompositions.

The responses of real GDP and fiscal variables are not distinguishable from zero. This finding indicates that political pressure above all induces a price level effect, different from the usual finding for a standard monetary easing, which stimulates real output. It also suggests that political pressure, while able to lower interest rates, is ultimately not "successful" from the point of view of the pressuring President. The lack of a real activity response is especially curious because the combined responses of the price level and nominal interest rates appear to imply a real interest rate reduction following political pressure. The stagflationary nature of political pressure deserves a more in-depth discussion, which I provide in a separate section below.

Comparison to simpler methods. A first useful comparison for these results is the one with superimposed IRFs that do not use the narrative restrictions (shown as the dashed-dotted black lines), it is visible that these are much less precisely estimated. There is a positive inflation response on impact, but it becomes indistinguishable from zero after three quarters. All other responses also display wide posterior intervals, even at the 68% level that

[14] Over 6 months, Nixon had 34 interactions with Burns. Half of that is 17 interactions, 1.7 more than the 10-interaction normalization in the figure. The implied GDP deflator response is therefore $1.7 * 4\% = 6.8\%$. Note that this is a simplified calculation which assumes all 17 President-Fed interactions are pressure-induced.

Figure 6: IRFS TO A POLITICAL PRESSURE SHOCK



Notes. The solid blue lines and dark (light) blue shaded areas represent the median IRFs and 68% (90%) credible intervals to a political pressure shock, defined by the restrictions in Table 1. The superimposed black dashed-dotted lines correspond to the IRFs and corresponding 68% bands to a shock identified with traditional sign restrictions but *without* the narrative sign restrictions. The sample is 1933:Q1-2016:Q4.

is plotted. This underscores that my narrative identification approach is critical to uncover the consequences of political pressure on the Fed for the economy.

The Cholesky and event study benchmarks in Section 4 are further useful comparisons. They also imply a price level increase. This is reassuring, as this central result holds up across different methods and different variants of how political pressure is defined. A key difference in Figure 6 relative to the benchmark results are the interest rate dynamics. My preferred approach with narrative sign restrictions implies a rate reduction that lasts for almost two years. In addition, the rate never reverts to positive territory as implied by the Cholesky results, suggesting that the inflationary effect from the initial easing is not leaned against. This implies that the intensity of Nixon's pressure that the interaction data can bring into the SVAR changes the precise variation in political pressure that is identified.


5.2 Estimated shocks and historical contribution across the full sample

The SVAR uses identifying variation generated by a particular historical episode, but also decomposes the variation in the data over the entire sample between the political pressure shocks and other structural shocks. It thus allows me to detect whether political pressure

shocks played a role *anywhere* in the 1933 to 2016 period. The event study approach, for example, could not be used for such an exercise.

Figure 7, Panel (a) plots the time series of estimated political pressure shocks. Its broad contours look somewhat similar to the raw number of President-Fed interactions. It is different in that the endogenous movements in President-Fed interactions have been removed. The 1970s stand out with large political pressure shocks, a reflection of the narrative evidence about the Nixon years. It is visible that the shocks generally display a much lower variance after the early 1980s.

Figure 7: ESTIMATED SHOCKS AND HISTORICAL VARIANCE DECOMPOSITIONS



Notes. Panel (a) plots the quarterly time series of political pressure shocks estimated by the SVAR, scaled in President-Fed interaction units. Panels (b) and (c) show historical variance decomposition for the President-Fed interaction time series (unit is quarterly meetings) and the GDP deflator (the unit is year-on-year log differences*100). The bars show the contribution of the political pressure shock to each time series.

Panels (b) and (c) of Figure 7 present historical variance decompositions of the data. The black line in Panel (b) represents the President-Fed interaction data, the quarterly version of Figure 3 that enters the SVAR. The blue bars show the exogenous component of President-Fed interactions, those explained by political pressure shocks and not because the interactions arise endogenously in response to other shocks. The variation indeed comes partly from endogenous personal interactions, but a meaningful portion can be attributed to political pressure shocks. Panel (c) presents a similar decomposition for quarterly inflation. It shows that political pressure contributes to inflationary episodes across the sample.[15]

[15]Historical variance decompositions in SVARs can be sensitive to the specific way in which they are constructed. In the Online Appendix, I explore alternative options to construct Panels (b) and (c) of Figure 7. I

Specifically, political pressure mostly occurred in the 1970s, also after the Nixon Presidency. The strongest evidence is present the administrations of Presidents Ford and Carter. For these Presidents the narrative record regarding Fed is less ample than for Nixon, but we do have tentative evidence. Ford said in a statement to Congress in 1974 that "You and the American people should know, however, that I have personally been assured by the Chairman of the independent Federal Reserve Board that the supply of money and credit will expand sufficiently to meet the needs of our economy." Bianchi and Ilut (2017) discuss that Carter openly criticized the Fed during his Presidential campaign and his election victory implies "an even weaker political support for fighting inflation." Romer and Romer (2004) note that "it has been argued that Arthur Burns pursued unusually expansionary policy at the beginning of the Carter administration because he believed it would increase his chances of being nominated for another term." The SVAR also detects political pressure as an inflationary driver in the 1960s. I separately discuss President Johnson further below.

The patterns prior to the 1960s are also noteworthy. Before the Treasury-Fed Accord in 1952, the Fed was formally less independent. The occurrence of a negative contribution of political pressure shocks to inflation in the mid-1950s might reflect the effect of the gained independence. In the period before that, political pressure should be a more "systematic" force. In the SVAR, this is not reflected in a big contribution of political pressure shocks. World War II likely clouds the interpretation of the decomposition in this period.

The contribution of political pressure to inflation fades and even turns negative in the 1980s, when U.S. inflation was brought down by Paul Volcker. There are arguments in the literature that the fiscal and broader political environment created by the Reagan administration helped Volcker achieve this. Bianchi and Ilut (2017) argue that Volcker brought a "change in the conduct of monetary policy at the end of 1979, but the fiscal authority accommodated such a change only at the end of 1981, after Reagan was elected."

Political pressure plays almost no role for inflation in the 1990s. This period coincided with a belief, shared by Republicans and Democrats, in the benefits of central bank independence. The shared view was encapsulated by the "Rubin doctrine" named after Clinton's' Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin. The 1990s was also the time when academic research on central bank independence and strict inflation targeting flourished.


Figure 7 shows tentative evidence that some political pressure materialized in the 2000s, in particular under President Obama. During that period, nonstandard monetary policy measures took place, which the SVAR might interpret as political pressure. Garcia and Skaperdas (2024) examine the political dimension of the Fed's nonstandard policies in that era. All my results are robust to excluding the part of the sample with nonstandard policies.

find broadly similar patterns, especially in terms of the relative difference between different time periods. The Appendix also investigates the role of the deterministic component in the historical variance decomposition.

5.3 Subsample analysis

I estimate the IRFs to political pressure shocks over different subsamples. This addresses the concern that there is structural or institutional change occurring in my long estimation sample. A key subsample is the one that ends when Alan Greenspan becomes Fed Chair in 1987:Q2. The variation in President-Fed interactions becomes much smaller after the early 1980s, potentially reducing statistical power. The results are presented in Figure 8 and show that IRFs in that subsample are broadly similar to Figure 6.

Figure 8: IRFS TO A POLITICAL PRESSURE SHOCK IN PRE-GREENSPAN SAMPLE



Notes. The solid lines and dark (light) shaded areas represent the median IRFs and 68% (90%) credible intervals to a political pressure shock, defined by the restrictions in Table 1. The sample is 1933:Q1-1987:Q2.

Two additional subsamples are analyzed in the Online Appendix. First, I show that excluding the GFC and subsequent recovery does not alter the results. In fact, the price level response is economically stronger and estimated more precisely than in the full sample. Second, I examine the period after 1952, when the Treasury-Fed Accord was reached. This Accord made the Fed de jure independent. Interestingly, excluding the pre-1952 period weakens the price level response. This indicates that variation during the pre-1952 period, when the Fed was formally less independent, is important for the main results.

5.4 Comparison to the effects of monetary policy shocks

Figure 9 presents the IRFs to a standard monetary policy easing shock estimated in the same SVAR. After I formalized above how the transmission of the two shocks can differ, analyzing their IRFs is a test of whether the dynamics actually deviate economically in the data. The monetary policy shock is identified based on sign restrictions of Uhlig (2005) (lowers the interest rate, raises the price level, for the initial and following quarter) and the narrative restriction of Antolin-Diaz and Rubio-Ramirez (2018) that it is the main driver of interest rates during the 1979:Q4 Volcker tightening. I show the results for the pre-Greenspan sample in 1987:Q2, where the effects can be more precisely estimated, and scale the IRFs to the same interest reduction as in Figure 8, to allow an appropriate comparison.


These IRFs make clear that a political pressure shocks is much more inflationary than traditional monetary policy easing, especially over the medium term. The expansionary monetary policy shock only triggers a short-lived increase in inflation, with the price level increase reversed to zero after just a few quarters. The estimates imply that the price level never rises anywhere near the the 4% increase after the easing of monetary conditions that follows political pressure. The monetary policy easing shock also leads to an increase in activity (according to the 68% bands, though barely significant), different from the lack of a real GDP response following the monetary easing triggered by political pressure. The estimate implies a 2% real GDP increase after about 2 years.

Contrasting the impact of a monetary policy easing shock to that of a political pressure shock confirms the formal distinction between the two shocks that I provided above. The transmission mechanism of these two shocks need not be the same theoretically and my empirical estimates show that they are indeed distinct in the data. Below I provide additional results that highlight the role of private agents' expectations in generating these differences.

Interestingly the number of President-Fed interactions endogenously reacts to a monetary policy shock. This finding links back to the heart of the identification challenge: personal interactions do not necessarily reflect political pressure but respond endogenously to changes in economic conditions, which are driven by other structural shocks. A monetary easing shock causes temporarily higher inflation, which might be the reason why President wants to talk more to the Fed Chair. The effect is relatively small, raising the amount of interactions by less than 2 per quarter according to the point estimate.

Do Romer-Romer residuals capture political pressure? To confirm the idea that, depending on a researcher's identification strategy and data, political pressure shocks are estimated as a subset of monetary policy shocks, I regress the monetary policy shocks of Romer and Romer (2004) on my political pressure shocks. In line with my arguments, I

Figure 9: IRFS TO STANDARD MONETARY POLICY EASING SHOCK IN SAME SVAR



Notes. The solid lines and dark (light) shaded areas represent the median IRFs and 68% (90%) credible intervals to a monetary policy easing shock. The IRFs are scaled to the same interest rate reduction on impact as the political pressure shock in Figure 8. The sample is 1933:Q1-1987:Q2.

find a statistically significant negative coefficient (more political pressure induces monetary easing). The R^2 of the regression is 0.068. In other words, almost 7% of the variation in the original Romer and Romer (2004) residuals is due to political pressure. The Online Appendix extends this analysis to other measures of monetary policy shocks.

5.5 Inflation expectations and public attention to political pressure

My conceptual discussion of the differences between political pressure and monetary policy shocks emphasizes private agents' expectations. To explore this idea further, I estimate the IRFs of measured inflation expectations. Furthermore, I construct an index of reporting about political pressure on the Fed in major newspapers and include it in my SVAR.


5.5.1 The dynamics of measured inflation expectations

I use the Livingston Survey, which collects forecasts of professional economists since 1946. As the survey is biannual, I aggregate shocks to biannual frequency, and then employ local projections to construct IRFs. I study the mean of the survey as well as the difference between the 75th and the 25th percentile as a measure of dispersion. Both are for the 6-month horizon

but results for the 12-month horizon look similar. In the local projection, I include one lag of the left-hand side and one lag of the shock on the right-hand side. Figure 10 compares the resulting IRFs to political pressure shocks and monetary policy shocks.

The left panel shows that mean inflation expectations rise significantly in response to political pressure. After 5 to 6 years, the expected rate of inflation is about 4 percentage points higher than initially. In response to a monetary policy easing shock a qualitatively similar picture arises, but the magnitudes are much weaker. After a monetary policy easing, normalized to induce the same interest rate reduction as the political pressure shock, inflation expectations increase only by about one percentage point. The right panel of the figure shows similar results for the dispersion of inflation expectations. After the political pressure shock, the divergence between the 75th and the 25th percentile amounts to almost a full percentage point, whereas the effect is weaker and less significant for the monetary policy shock.[16]

Figure 10: THE RESPONSE OF MEASURED INFLATION EXPECTATIONS TO DIFFERENT SHOCKS



Notes. IRFs to a political pressure shock (blue solid line) and monetary policy shock (red dashed line), both scaled to a 100 basis point interest rate reduction. The IRFs are constructed using local projections, with 6-month ahead inflation expectations from the Livingston Survey as the dependent variable. Dispersion is the difference between the 75th and 25th percentile of survey respondents. Dark (light) bands represent 68% (90%) significance, based on HAC standard errors. The unit is YoY annualized percent. Sample: 1946-2016.

Figure 10 reflects pessimism about future inflation and public uncertainty about the ultimate consequences of the Fed being under pressure. A mechanism that operates through public perception and expectations makes the transmission of political pressure different from the transmission of typical monetary policy shocks, captured through parameters ϕ_{yx} and $\phi_{\pi x}$ in equations (1) and (2). The response of inflation expectations to political pressure is relatively gradual and starts picking up only after three years. My interpretation is that once inflation is clearly elevated and the public begins to argue whether political pressure might have something to do with it, inflation expectations begin to move. I investigate this idea further by studying media reporting about political pressure on the Fed.

[16] In the Online Appendix, I include inflation expectations in the SVAR, as an alternative to local projections. This requires filtering techniques, due to the different sample and frequency of the Livingstone Survey.

5.5.2 Is political pressure on the Fed publicly observed?

For expectations to change differently from how they respond to a monetary policy shock, private agents need to observe political pressure. There is evidence that President-Fed interactions were reported by the media, both in the Nixon years and across the sample.


Burns worries in his diary about journalists reporting on Nixon pressuring him: "A journalist came to see me and told me that some White House operatives (...) had their bayonets out for me." (March 1971). In July 1971, Nixon started a public smear campaign about Burns allegedly wanting a higher salary. Nixon also talked openly about his views on monetary policy. During a news conference in August 1971, he praises that "(...) you have seen an expansionary monetary policy, and that is one of the reasons we have had an expansionary economy in the first 6 months of this year." Newspaper articles from the period report on the political pressure, with the following example headlines from major U.S. news outlets: "Burns Supports Nixon Rate View" (Washington Post, May 20, 1971), "Inflation Tactics Dispute: Rift Between Nixon, Burns Widens" (Wall Street Journal, July 26, 1971) or "Nixon and Burns Termed At Odds" (New York Times, July 29, 1971).

To analyze the role of public observability across the full sample, Figure 11, Panel (a) presents the cumulative number of newspaper articles in the Wall Street Journal, Washington Post, and New York Times reporting on political pressure on the Fed or direct interactions between Presidents and Fed Chairs. The Online Appendix describes in detail how I construct this news index. At high frequencies, the frequency of newspaper articles and my President-Fed interaction time series do not show a tight correlation. However, there is a clearer relationship at lower frequencies. For this reason, I plot the time series in levels, which more clearly reveals the low-frequency properties of the news index. The pace at which new articles are written strongly accelerates after the 1970s, the period with many President-Fed interactions, and decreases after the 1990s, when President Fed interactions become very infrequent. The frequency of reporting also temporarily increases again in the GFC.

I use this data to identify a refined version of the political pressure shock that is additionally restricted to increase news reporting. To this end, I include the news index as an additional variable in my SVAR. I impose another sign restriction that the cumulative number of articles has increased after 4 years, motivated by the delayed response of inflation expectations and disagreement (though shorter run restrictions lead to similar results). I also impose the narrative restriction that political pressure is the main contributor to news articles in 1971:Q3-Q4. These restrictions are imposed on top of my baseline assumptions.

The IRFs resulting from this *media coverage-inducing* version of political pressure are economically similar to Figure 6. Importantly, they display quantitative differences. For a given number of President-Fed interactions, the publicly reported political pressure shock

Figure 11: NEWS INDEX OF POLITICAL PRESSURE AND IRFS WHEN INDEX IS USED FOR IDENTIFICATION



Notes. Panel (a) shows a news index, consisting of the cumulative number of articles written about Presidential pressure on the Fed and President-Fed interactions in major U.S. news papers. Panels (b) and (c) show IRFs from a version of the SVAR that contains this news index as an additional variable and uses it for identification of the political pressure shock. The shock is scaled to the same interest rate effect on impact as in Figure 6 and Panel (b) is shown in the same scale as the GDP deflator response in that figure.

leads to a weaker interest rate reduction but a stronger increase in the price level. In other words, among two versions of the political pressure shock normalized to the same-sized interest rate reduction, the one identified with the additional information that it increases news reporting has a stronger inflationary impact. To highlight this point, Panel (b) of Figure 11, shows the IRF of the GDP deflator when I scale the interest rate IRF to the same impact reduction as in Figure 6. I keep the scale of the corresponding panels the same, to highlight the differences in magnitudes. The price level response is now over 8% instead of 4%, more than double the magnitude the baseline results. Panel (c) shows the IRF of the number of newspaper articles itself. A political pressure shock increases the number of articles cumulatively by roughly 50 in the next 10 years. This is about 25% of the number of

articles written in the average decade, so not a large effect. The Online Appendix shows the remaining IRFs. The real GDP response remains indistinguishable from zero.

In sum, the specification underlying Figure 11 delivers sharper effects of political pressure than my baseline estimates. This finding lends further support to the idea that the public observability of President-Fed interactions plays a central role in its transmission mechanism.

5.6 Further discussion of strong price and weak output effects

The inflationary effects of political pressure occur without an increase in real economic activity. In this section, I discuss the stagflationary nature of political pressure in more depth.

5.6.1 Is political pressure on the Fed ultimately successful?

The lack of a GDP response suggests that political pressure, while proximately successful at lowering interest rates, is not ultimately successful from the point of view of a President who exerts pressure. A President might exert pressure to reduce the real deficit (or debt burden). However, the response of fiscal variables in my SVAR does not suggest success on this front either. Instead, a monetary easing might stimulate certain sectors or certain types of consumption that voters are sensitive to. For example, lower interest rates might ease mortgage origination which important groups of voters might see favorably, even if inflation increases. According to Gallup, Nixon's approval rating increased throughout 1972 after the height of Nixon's pressure on the Fed, to 62% around the election in November. Public approval depends on many dimensions, but it is a possible interpretation that in the short-run Nixon's popularity increased following his pressure on the Fed. The bulk of the inflationary impact occurs over a longer horizon, as the estimated IRFs show. Indeed in 1973, Nixon's approval collapsed to 25% amid the Watergate scandal. The Online Appendix presents the full evolution of Richard Nixon's public approval.

5.6.2 Theoretical discussion

It is surprising that easier monetary policy, when induced by political pressure, does not increase real GDP. The IRFs of the Tbill rate and the price level are consistent with a reduction in real interest rates. Theoretically, this should, all else equal, boost activity. However, my findings on the observability of President-Fed interactions and the rise in inflation expectations suggest that in a political pressure episode additional economic forces suppress activity, countervailing the stimulative effects of a lower real rate. This section discusses what economic forces are theoretically plausible, from three different angles.


First, consider a textbook New Keynesian (NK) model. The economy consists of a monetary authority that minimizes the loss from deviations of inflation from target $\hat{\pi}_t$ and

variation in the output gap $\hat{y}_t$, an IS curve, and a New Keynesian Phillips curve (NKPC),

$$\hat{\pi}_t = \beta \mathbb{E}(\hat{\pi}_{t+1}) + \kappa \hat{y}_t + v_t, \tag{7}$$

where β and κ are structural parameters and v_t is a shifter in the NKPC. In this framework, we can characterize the relation of inflation and the output gap in a diagram, where the upward-sloping NKPC and the behavior of the monetary authority, which implies downward-slop relation, intersect. This diagram is shown in each panel of Figure 12. For more details on the diagrammatic representation, see McLeay and Tenreyro (2020).[17]

Figure 12: SOME SIMPLE NEW KEYNESIAN ARITHMETIC



Panel (a) shows that a transitory monetary policy easing shifts the downward-sloping line that captures behavior of the central bank outwards, leading to an rise in inflation and output. This can rationalize the effects of a monetary easing shock in my SVAR and in many previous studies. The monetary easing implies a movement along the NKPC, meaning that expectations remain anchored at $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\pi}_{t+1}) = 0$. This is in line with my empirical results that the change in measured inflation expectations to a monetary policy shock is small.

The remaining panels illustrate which additional economic forces can suppress output and amplify inflation during a monetary easing. Panel (b) shows that the price response is stronger and the output response weaker, or even zero, when there is a simultaneous upward shift in the NKPC. Mechanically, this shift could arise from an increase in β, $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\pi}_{t+1})$, or v_t. Panel (c) shows that the inflation response is stronger and the output response muted when the slope of the NKPC steepens, that is, when κ increases. Thus, through the lens of very simple NK theory, my empirical findings are consistent with any deeper theory in which political pressure eases monetary conditions and unfolds through changes in the economy

[17] The IS curve can be substituted out and the behavior of the monetary authority is given by $\hat{\pi}_t = -\lambda/\kappa \hat{y}_t$, where λ is the weight on $\hat{y}_t$ in the loss function. In the origin point $\hat{y}_t = \hat{\pi}_t = \mathbb{E}(\hat{\pi}_{t+1}) = v_t = 0$. This characterization is for discretionary policy. McLeay and Tenreyro (2020) also discuss the commitment case.

that increase one or all of these components. Changes in the data-generating process along these lines would be captured by ϕ_{yx} and $\phi_{\pi x}$ in Section 3.3 when the SVAR is estimated.

An increase in $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\pi}_{t+1})$ is a plausible ingredient of specific theoretical mechanisms, given my empirical finding above that measured inflation expectations rise strongly after a political pressure shock and more strongly than after a monetary policy easing shock. Theoretically, there is not only a movement along the NKPC but also an "unanchoring" of inflation expectation that lifts the NKPC above the origin point, for given structural parameters.

Shifts in β or κ would reflect changes in micro-level firm behavior due to political pressure. β captures the sensitivity of inflation to inflation expectations and the weight that firms place on future expected marginal costs when setting prices. It is possible that an erosion of the Fed's credibility might make firms' decisions more sensitive to future economic developments. κ depends on several deeper parameters of firms' decisions, such as price stickiness and the elasticity of substitution between goods in consumer demand. It captures how sensitive inflation is to real economic activity. It is possible that political pressure alters firm behavior also in this dimension, for example if firms adjust prices more frequently when they perceive inflation to become unstable due to political pressure.[18]

Consistent with this reasoning, Carvalho et al. (2023) develop an NK model with richer micro-level firm behavior. In their setup, periods in which firms are uncertain about the central bank's inflation target are associated with a stronger feedback between expected and current inflation and a stronger feedback between economic activity and inflation. Although these authors do not draw a connection to political aspects, uncertainty about the central bank's target could be a plausible feature of political interference with the Fed. Interestingly, Carvalho et al. (2023) find their mechanism to be especially important in the 1970s.

Second, there is a separate type of mechanism through which inflation, by itself, has negative consequences for output. In NK models, price dispersion leads to misallocation and therefore lower output. This effect is typically second-order and does not show up in Figure 12, but it can have much stronger effects in richer models, e.g. with production networks (Afrouzi, Bhattarai, and Wu, 2023). However, such mechanisms should also apply to a standard monetary easing and not only for the political pressure shock. Thus, to explain my results, these mechanisms need to be quantitatively stronger for a political pressure shock than for a standard monetary policy shock. Ascari et al. (2023) show that higher expected inflation, by itself, can theoretically have direct negative consequences on real output. These authors specifically emphasize economic uncertainty. To the extent that uncertainty increases more strongly after a politically induced monetary easing than after a standard one, their theory could explain the stagflationary effects of political pressure. My empirical findings on

[18] Finally, political pressure may simply be thought of as a shift in v_t alongside a monetary easing. This term is purely exogenous and therefore does not help to think about the plausibility of deeper economic mechanisms.

the increase of dispersion in measured inflation expectations support such a mechanism.

Third, some researchers *explicitly* incorporate political pressure on central banks in richer macro models. I examine recent contributions in light of my results.[19] Halac and Yared (2021) provide a framework in which political pressure materializes as shocks to the weight on output stabilization in the central bank's objective function, λ in my notation. These shocks lead to an inflationary bias as in Barro and Gordon (1983): after some time, prices are higher but output is at the initial point, consistent with my results. However, temporarily their political pressure shock increases output, not in line with my IRFs. Witheridge (2023) builds a model in which the government can take over monetary policy from the central bank. To avoid a take-over, it can be optimal for the central bank to accommodate the government's preferences, leading to higher inflation. Although the mechanism mildly stimulates output, that effect is very small in quantitative simulations. Thus, that model is potentially consistent with my empirical findings. Afrouzi et al. (2024) develop a long-run aggregate demand and supply framework in which an exogenous shift in "political economy pressure" impacts inflation. The output effects are ambiguous, so compatible with my estimates, though these authors consider only longer-run effects. In sum, recent modeling attempts to explicitly incorporate political pressure on the central bank do potentially line up with my results. It would be promising to build a macro model with an explicit role for political pressure and discipline it directly with my SVAR results. The connection between my findings and basic elements of NK theory discussed above could provide additional guidance for such a model.

6 Additional results

6.1 Do other macroeconomic events in 1971 confound the results?

An objection to my identification strategy is that other important macroeconomic events took place in late 1971. The main concern is the suspension of convertibility between the U.S. dollar and Gold, which ended the Bretton Woods exchange rate arrangement in August 1971. Another example are price and wage controls implemented during this period. Using an additional test, I investigate whether such other events confound my results.

I estimate an alternative SVAR *without* President-Fed interactions. In that SVAR, I identify a generic '1971 inflationary shock' as the main contributor to inflation in 1971:Q3 and 1971:Q4. This shock does not have a clear structural interpretation, but spans *any* important potential contributor to inflationary developments that has roots in the second half of 1971, but is not restricted to unfold through interactions between the President and the Fed. The

[19] As already discussed in my literature review, models of fiscal-monetary interactions also incorporate a notion implicitly connected to political pressure. The papers examined here are selected based on the criterion that there is a model object (a choice variable or a shock) that is explicitly labeled "political pressure" or similar.

IRFs, shown in the Online Appendix, imply only a short-lived inflation increase, different from the strong and prolonged price level effect of a political pressure shock. Furthermore, the shock leads to a strong increase in real GDP and fiscal variables according to the 68% credible sets. This contrast highlights that the personal interaction data, and the information the data reveal about political pressure, are key to my findings. It also connects to the insights on the event study in Section 4, which omits the President-Fed interaction data as well.[20]

6.2 Using LBJ's pressure as a second narrative sign restriction

To alleviate concerns that identifying variation from only the Nixon Presidency is limited, I also exploit the behavior of Lyndon B. Johnson ("LBJ"). In two episodes during LBJ's Presidency he is reported to have exerted heavy pressure on Fed Chair William McChesney Martin (Fessenden, 2016). The most well-known is in 1965:Q4, when he invited Martin to his farm and allegedly physically assaulted him over a dispute regarding the course of monetary policy. This episode is not as clear-cut as the Nixon one, as Martin reportedly did not give in to the pressure. Another episode is the Fed's decision to ease in the spring of 1967:Q1. Reportedly, Johnson and Martin struck a deal that the Fed would ease monetary conditions and that Johnson would, in return, shepherd a tax increase through Congress. Martin openly regretted this decision in his testimony before Congress in 1969. I exploit these episodes as narrative sign restrictions, in addition to all previous restrictions. The full results are presented in the Online Appendix. I find that when the SVAR uses identifying restrictions related to two Presidents, it also yields a strong and persistent effect on the price level. Interestingly, using the 1967:Q1 episode yields an effect on fiscal variables, likely because Johnson's "Great Society" fiscal programs that get a higher weight in this specification.

6.3 Nonlinearities and latent political pressure

President-Fed interactions are a count variable instead of a continuous variable. Furthermore, their fluctuations are not Gaussian, with long periods of little movement and other periods with large spikes. These statistical properties might distort the estimation of the linear SVAR system. In addition, political pressure might be an inherently nonlinear phenomenon from a conceptual point of view. Potentially, this could mean that modeling nonlinearities explicitly might increase the precision of my estimates.

[20] Drechsel (2024) contains additional tests. First, I exclude President-Fed interactions during which other people were present. For discussions relating to Bretton Woods, foreign policy advisors such as Henry Kissinger were usually present, so 1-on-1 meetings are more likely about monetary policy. Using this alternative measure, the GDP deflator responds more rapidly to political pressure, though the posterior intervals are wider. Second, I show my results are robust to the exact timing of the narrative sign restrictions.

Motivated by these considerations, I estimate a version of my SVAR in which I explicitly model President-Fed interactions as counts and allow for nonlinearities in the mapping from underlying political pressure to observed President-Fed interactions. The enhanced SVAR contains the same standard macro time series as before and a latent variable capturing underlying political pressure. I put the sign and narrative restrictions directly on that latent variable. Furthermore, a nonlinear measurement equation maps latent political pressure into the observed count of President-Fed interactions according to a Poisson process. Formally,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{y}_t \\ x_t^\star \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{B}_1 & \boldsymbol{b}_2 \\ \boldsymbol{b}_3 & b_4 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{y}_{t-1} \\ x_{t-1}^\star \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{u}_1 \\ u_{x^*} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{8}$$


where vector $\boldsymbol{y}_t$ collects the standard macro data and x_t^* is the latent (unobserved) political pressure variable. The observed count of President-Fed interactions, denoted x_t, follows

$$\Pr(x_t \mid \lambda_t) = \frac{(\lambda_t)^{x_t} e^{-\lambda_t}}{x_t!} \quad \text{with} \quad \lambda_t = exp(x_t^*), \tag{9}$$

with narrative sign restrictions imposed on $\boldsymbol{y}_t$ and x_t^*. This approach is inspired by the political science literature that uses time series models with count data, for example to analyze conflicts or terrorism events (Brandt and Williams, 2001; Brandt and Sandler, 2012). I am the first to combine this approach with narrative sign restrictions, an additional technical contribution of this paper. To this end, I generalize my estimation algorithm using mixture sampling approaches for nonlinear and non-Gaussian hierarchical models. The Online Appendix describes the computational implementation and also discusses an extension to multiple observable count variables (i.e. the case when x_t is a vector).

Figure 13 presents results for the specification with narrative restrictions for Nixon and Johnson. Panel (a) shows the posterior estimate of latent political pressure x_t^*, together with 90% posterior credible intervals. This time series inherits the broad contours of the observed President-Fed interactions through the measurement equation (9). As x_t^* increases (decreases), the probability of observing a higher number of Fed interactions also increases (decreases) according to equation (9). Unlike President-Fed interactions, x_t^* can take on positive and negative values, which is an appealing property from an interpretation point of view: $-x_t^*$ could be interpreted as an index of Fed independence. The plot shows that latent political pressure also evolves in a much smoother manner than the interaction variable. Nevertheless, it points a broadly similar picture of political pressure episodes, with the 1960s and 1970s standing out. Interestingly, the uncertainty around latent political pressure also varies over time. For example, the variation around World War 2 leads to high uncertainty around whether there is political pressure or not, while in the 1960s and 1970s x_t^* is estimated quite precisely. As President-Fed interactions almost disappear beginning with

Figure 13: MODELING PRESIDENT-FED INTERACTIONS AS COUNT DATA AND ALLOWING FOR NONLINEARITIES



Notes. Panel (a) shows the posterior estimate of the latent political pressure variable, x_t^* in equations (8) and (9), together with 90% posterior credible intervals. Panel (b) shows selected IRFs to a shock that increases latent political pressure. More information and additional IRFs are presented in the Online Appendix.

the Greenspan era, the posterior intervals of x_t^* almost always include zero in that period.

Panel (b) shows the IRFs to a shock that increases latent political pressure. I only plot the responses of the pressure variable, interest rates and the price level and present the remaining responses in the Online Appendix. The IRFs are normalized to a unit increase in $x_t^* = \ln \lambda_t$, meaning that they correspond to a doubling in λ_t. A doubling in λ_t implies a shift in the Poisson distribution such that the mean of the count of President-Fed interactions doubles. The resulting macroeconomic dynamics are broadly similar to my baseline findings. There is a reduction in interest rates and an increase in the price level. Modeling the count nature of President-Fed interactions and nonlinearities does not increase the precision of the estimates. The 68% posterior intervals of the price level effect do exclude zero as in my baseline results.

The precision of the latent variable approach is determined by offsetting forces. On the one hand, the measurement equation allows the estimation to cut out potential noise in the data, especially if the steep spikes in the President-Fed interaction data reflect such noise.

On the other hand, the approach introduces estimation uncertainty around the latent state of the system. The results show that, on net, these two effects lead to IRFs that are still estimated with relatively high uncertainty. One possible interpretation of these results is that the steep spikes in the observed President-Fed interactions are important for identification of my baseline results in the previous figures, so should not necessarily be interpreted as noise.

In the Online Appendix, I study an extension with two rather than one observable count variables. I again do not find an increase in estimation precision. Investigating alternative approaches to modeling the nonlinearities inherent in political pressure is a promising avenue for future research. The economically intuitive posterior estimate of x_t^* in Figure 13 showcases the general appeal of modeling political pressure as latent.

6.4 Further specifications and robustness exercises

I provide several robustness exercises, with detailed results in the Online Appendix. First, I impose the traditional sign restriction on the GDP deflator after 1 year instead of on impact. The resulting IRFs display a similar magnitude and profile. Second, instead of the "overwhelming" type of narrative sign restriction, I use the less restrictive assumption that the shock is the "most important" one, relative to any other structural shock. See Antolin-Diaz and Rubio-Ramirez (2018) for details. The results are similar though the posterior bands are wider, as expected with a weaker restriction. Third, I add oil prices to the system, given that important oil price shocks followed later in the 1970s. Adding oil prices does not alter my findings and the response of oil prices itself is not different from zero. Fourth, given the lack of a real GDP response, I instead study the unemployment rate and again find a flat IRFs. Thus, the difficulty of finding real effects is not specific to GDP as a measure of activity.[21]

7 Outlook: more recent periods and other countries

Presidential schedules from the Trump and Biden administrations are not yet available. However, for those periods I can search the schedules of Fed Chairs Yellen and Powell, available through FRASER. As described in Section 2, I use these schedules to cross-check the main President-Fed interaction data. However, Fed Chair calendars by themselves are an insufficient source, for two reasons. First, they are much less detailed than the Presidential diaries, raising questions about missing information. Second, they do not contain meetings between the Presidents with Fed Officials other than the Chair. Keeping these caveats in mind, they allow for a tentative view into recent meeting patterns.

[21] Another robustness exercise relates to an ongoing discussion in the Bayesian SVAR literature around the role of prior information in the type of estimation algorithm I use in this paper (Baumeister and Hamilton, 2015; Arias et al., 2023). In Drechsel (2024), I check whether this concern drives my findings and conclude it does not.

Table 2: INTERACTIONS OF PRESIDENTS TRUMP AND BIDEN WITH FED CHAIRS

Year	U.S. President	Federal Reserve Chair	Personal Interactions
2017	Donald J. Trump	Janet Yellen	1
2018	Donald J. Trump	Jerome Powell	0
2019	Donald J. Trump	Jerome Powell	5
2020	Donald J. Trump	Jerome Powell	3
2021	Joseph R. Biden	Jerome Powell	2
2022	Joseph R. Biden	Jerome Powell	1
2023	Joseph R. Biden	Jerome Powell	0
2024	Joseph R. Biden	Jerome Powell	0

Table 2 summarizes the annual number of interactions Presidents Trump and Biden had with the respective Fed Chair. I find evidence of 8 Trump-Fed meetings during his first term, while Biden had 3 meetings during his Presidency. For comparison, Barack Obama had 11 and 5 meetings in his first and second terms. Nixon had 137 in his first term alone. Hence, by historical standards, neither of the two recent Presidents had a large number of meetings. Of course, we know from Bianchi et al. (2023) that Trump exerted a lot of public pressure on the Fed. Importantly, I do not argue that personal interactions with the President are a necessary condition for political pressure. Instead, they capture one important channel through which political pressure occurs, which I can measure consistently over a long time span.

Political pressure on central banks is common around the globe. Japan is an example of notational independence but intricate inter-dependencies between the Bank of Japan and the Ministry of Finance, see e.g. Chien, Cole, and Lustig (2023). The European Central Bank was under considerable pressure during the European Sovereign debt crisis, with public trust in it fluctuating (Ehrmann, Soudan, and Stracca, 2013). In emerging countries blurred lines between central banks and governments are even more common. See e.g. Witheridge (2023) for a study of Argentina, Colombia and Turkey. Gürkaynak, Kisacıkoglu, and Lee (2023) examine Turkey's experience in detail. A broad international perspective is given Ioannidou et al. (2025). Studying the widespread occurrence of political interference with central banks remains a crucial priority for researchers.

8 Conclusion

This paper combines new data and identification strategy to isolate shifts in political pressure on the Fed. The new President-Fed interaction data are informative on their own and might be useful to other researchers. Using a narrative identification strategy, I find that political pressure to ease monetary policy raises prices strongly and persistently. My procedure can quantify this effect: increasing political pressure 50% as much as Nixon for six months increases the U.S. price level by 7%. While the benefits of central bank independence have largely been highlighted using cross-country data, my results constitute novel evidence

that is quantitative and from within the U.S. economy over a long sample. My estimates can be useful to discipline macro models and hopefully inform an evidence-based assessment of the consequence of U.S. Presidents leaning on the Fed in the future.

References

ABRAMS, B. A. (2006): "How richard nixon pressured arthur burns: Evidence from the nixon tapes," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 20, 177–188.

AFROUZI, H., S. BHATTARAI, AND E. WU (2023): "The Welfare Cost of Inflation in Production Networks," *Mimeo*.

AFROUZI, H., M. HALAC, K. ROGOFF, AND P. YARED (2024): "Changing central bank pressures and inflation," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 2004, 205–241.

ALESINA, A. AND L. SUMMERS (1993): "Central bank independence and macroeconomic performance: some comparative evidence," *Journal of Money, credit and Banking*, 25.

ANTOLIN-DIAZ, J. AND J. F. RUBIO-RAMIREZ (2018): "Narrative Sign Restrictions for SVARs," *American Economic Review*, 108, 2802–29.

ARIAS, J., J. F. RUBIO-RAMIREZ, AND D. F. WAGGONER (2018): "Inference based on structural vector autoregressions identified with sign and zero restrictions: Theory and applications," *Econometrica*, 86, 685–720.

——— (2023): "Uniform priors for impulse responses," *FRB Atlanta Working Paper*.

ASCARI, G., S. FASANI, J. GRAZZINI, AND L. ROSSI (2023): "Endogenous uncertainty and the macroeconomic impact of shocks to inflation expectations," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 140, S48–S63, inflation: Drivers and Dynamics 2022.

BARRO, R. J. AND D. B. GORDON (1983): "A Positive Theory of Monetary Policy in a Natural Rate Model," *Journal of Political Economy*, 91, 589–610.

BAUMEISTER, C. AND J. D. HAMILTON (2015): "Sign restrictions, structural vector autoregressions, and useful prior information," *Econometrica*, 83, 1963–1999.

BERNANKE, B. S. AND I. MIHOV (1998): "Measuring Monetary Policy," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 113, 869–902.

BIANCHI, F. (2012): "Regime Switches, Agents' Beliefs, and Post-World War II U.S. Macroeconomic Dynamics," *The Review of Economic Studies*, 80, 463–490.

BIANCHI, F., R. GOMEZ-CRAM, T. KIND, AND H. KUNG (2023): "Threats to central bank independence: High-frequency identification with Twitter," *Journal of Monetary Economics*.

BIANCHI, F. AND C. ILUT (2017): "Monetary/fiscal policy mix and agents' beliefs," *Review of economic Dynamics*, 26, 113–139.

BIANCHI, F. AND L. MELOSI (2017): "Escaping the great recession," *American Economic Review*, 107, 1030–1058.

BINDER, C. C. (2021): "Political Pressure on Central Banks," *Journal of Money, Credit and*

Banking, 53, 715–744.

BRANDT, P. T. AND T. SANDLER (2012): "A Bayesian Poisson vector autoregression model," *Political Analysis*, 20, 292–315.

BRANDT, P. T. AND J. T. WILLIAMS (2001): "A linear Poisson autoregressive model: The Poisson AR (p) model," *Political Analysis*, 9, 164–184.

CANOVA, F., F. FERRONI, AND C. MATTHES (2015): "Approximating time varying structural models with time invariant structures," *Banque de France Working Paper*.

CANZONERI, M. B., R. E. CUMBY, AND B. T. DIBA (2001): "Is the Price Level Determined by the Needs of Fiscal Solvency?" *American Economic Review*, 91, 1221–1238.

CARVALHO, C., S. EUSEPI, E. MOENCH, AND B. PRESTON (2023): "Anchored Inflation Expectations," *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 15, 1–47.

CECCHETTI, S. G. AND S. KRAUSE (2002): "Central bank structure, policy efficiency, and macroeconomic performance: exploring empirical relationships," *Review-Federal Reserve Bank of Saint Louis*, 84, 47–60.

CHIEN, Y.-L., H. L. COLE, AND H. LUSTIG (2023): "What about Japan?" Tech. rep., National Bureau of Economic Research.

CHRISTIANO, L. J., M. EICHENBAUM, AND C. L. EVANS (1999): "Chapter 2 Monetary policy shocks: What have we learned and to what end?" Elsevier, vol. 1 of *Handbook of Macroeconomics*, 65–148.

DINCER, N. N. AND B. EICHENGREEN (2014): "Central Bank Transparency and Independence: Updates and New Measures," *International Journal of Central Banking*, 10.

DRAZEN, A. (2000): "The political business cycle after 25 years," *NBER macroeconomics annual*, 15, 75–117.

DRECHSEL, T. (2024): "Estimating the Effects of Political Pressure on the Fed: A Narrative Approach with New Data," *NBER Working Paper No w32461*.

EHRMANN, M., M. SOUDAN, AND L. STRACCA (2013): "Explaining European Union citizens' trust in the European Central Bank in normal and crisis times," *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 115, 781–807.

FERRELL, R. H. (2010): *Inside the Nixon administration: the secret diary of Arthur Burns, 1969–1974*, University Press of Kansas.

FESSENDEN, H. (2016): "1965: The Year the Fed and LBJ Clashed," *Econ Focus, Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond*, 4–7.

FRIEDMAN, M. AND A. J. SCHWARTZ (1963): *A monetary history of the United States, 1867-1960*, Princeton University Press.

GARCIA, B. AND A. SKAPERDAS (2024): "Central Bank Independence at Low Interest Rates," *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*.

GÜRKAYNAK, R. S., B. KISACIKOGLU, AND S. S. LEE (2023): "Exchange rate and inflation under weak monetary policy: Turkey verifies theory," *Economic Policy*.

HALAC, M. AND P. YARED (2021): "Inflation Targeting under Political Pressure," .

HETZEL, R. L. (1998): "Arthur Burns and inflation," *Economic Quarterly*, 84, 21–44.

IOANNIDOU, V., S. KOKAS, T. LAMBERT, AND A. MICHAELIDES (2025): "(In) Dependent Central Banks," *Working paper*.

LEEPER, E. AND C. LEITH (2016): "Chapter 30 - Understanding Inflation as a Joint Monetary–Fiscal Phenomenon," Elsevier, vol. 2 of *Handbook of Macroeconomics*, 2305–2415.

MARTIN, F. M. (2015): "Debt, inflation and central bank independence," *European Economic Review*, 79, 129–150.

MCLEAY, M. AND S. TENREYRO (2020): "Optimal inflation and the identification of the Phillips curve," *NBER macroeconomics annual*, 34, 199–255.

MELTZER, A. H. (2009): "A History of the Federal Reserve, Volume 2, Book 2, 1970-1986," .

MORSE, A. AND A. VISSING-JORGENSEN (2021): "Information Transmission from the Federal Reserve to the Stock Market: Evidence from Governors' Calendars," *Mimeo*.

NIXON, R. (1962): *Six crises*, Doubleday Publishers.

NORDHAUS, W. D. (1975): "The Political Business Cycle," *The Review of Economic Studies*, 42.

PAGLIUCA, A. (2025): "Partisan Fed," *Working paper*.

PERSSON, T. AND G. TABELLINI (2002): *Political economics: explaining economic policy*, MIT press.

RAMEY, V. A. (2016): "Macroeconomic shocks and their propagation," *Handbook of macroeconomics*, 2, 71–162.

RAMEY, V. A. AND S. ZUBAIRY (2018): "Government spending multipliers in good times and in bad: evidence from US historical data," *Journal of political economy*, 126, 850–901.

ROMELLI, D. (2024): "Trends in central bank independence: a de-jure perspective," *Mimeo*.

ROMER, C. D. AND D. H. ROMER (1989): "Does monetary policy matter? A new test in the spirit of Friedman and Schwartz," *NBER macroeconomics annual*, 4, 121–170.

——— (2004): "A New Measure of Monetary Shocks: Derivation and Implications," *American Economic Review*, 94, 1055–1084.

THORNTON, D. L. AND D. C. WHEELOCK (2014): "Making sense of dissents: a history of FOMC dissents," *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review*, 96, 213–227.

UHLIG, H. (2005): "What are the effects of monetary policy on output? Results from an agnostic identification procedure," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 52, 381–419.

WEISE, C. L. (2012): "Political Pressures on Monetary Policy during the US Great Inflation," *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 4, 33–64.

WITHERIDGE, W. (2023): "The Inflation Consequences of Political Intervention in Monetary Policy," *Working paper*.

WU, J. C. AND F. D. XIA (2016): "Measuring the Macroeconomic Impact of Monetary Policy at the Zero Lower Bound," *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 48, 253–291.

ONLINE APPENDIX TO

"Political Pressure on the Fed"

by Thomas Drechsel

Contents

A Overview of data sources **2**

B Additional descriptive evidence **3**

C Additional SVAR results **5**

C.1 Further analysis of historical variance decompositions 5

C.2 Further subsample analysis 7

C.3 Adding measured inflation expectations directly in the system 9

C.4 IRFs to a generic '1971 inflationary shock' 12

C.5 Adding Lyndon B. Johnson narrative restrictions 13

C.6 Modified identifying restrictions 15

C.7 Adding oil prices to the system 17

C.8 Unemployment rate instead of real GDP 18

D Relation with monetary policy shock measures **19**

E Nixon's public approval **20**

F More details on the news index **21**

F.1 Index construction 21

F.2 Full SVAR results when news index is included 22

G More details and results for latent variable approach **23**

G.1 Description of methodology 23

G.2 Additional results for latent variable approach 26

A Overview of data sources

The historical daily schedules of U.S. Presidents are made available to the public by each President's *Presidential Library*. The creation of the schedules and provision to the public is governed by the National Archives and Records Service (NARA) under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). There is a so-called *Presidential Diarist*, a National Archives employee detailed to the White House. The Diarist is responsible for creating the daily schedules as a minute-by-minute log, based on information produced across different White House units.

The availability begins with Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933 and currently ends with Barack Obama in 2016. The daily schedules are not yet publicly available for Presidents Trump and Biden. The Trump Presidential Library launched a website with limited resources, but the library itself has not been created.

Table A.1 provides an overview, with links and information for each library. For most Presidents during this period, the schedules are provided in digital form online and the table provides a web link in each case. For President H.W. Bush, they were only available as hard copies in the Presidential Library in College Station, TX, at the time of the collection of this paper (they have more recently been digitized). The table also gives information about how the schedules are organized, in terms of the file structure and readability.


Table A.1: PRESIDENTIAL DAILY DIARY SOURCES

Start	End	President	Location (at time of collection)	Searchable data?	File frequency	Searchable pdfs?
2009	2017	Obama	Link	No	1 per day (in browser)	Yes
2001	2009	Bush Jr.	Link	No	1 per day (with gaps)	Mixed
1993	2001	Clinton	Link	No	1 per month	Mixed
1989	1993	Bush Sr.	College Station, Texas	No	1 per day (paper-based)	No
1981	1989	Reagan	Link	No	1 per month	Yes
1977	1981	Carter	Link	Yes	1 per day	Yes
1974	1977	Ford	Link	No	1 per day	Yes
1969	1974	Nixon	Link	No	1 per two weeks or annual	Yes
1963	1969	Johnson	Link	Yes	1 per day	Yes
1961	1963	Kennedy	Link	No	1 per month	Yes
1953	1961	Eisenhower	Link	No	1 per month	Yes
1945	1953	Truman	Link	Yes	Browser database	NA
1933	1945	Roosevelt	Link	Yes	1 per day & browser database	Yes

B Additional descriptive evidence

Figure B.1 corresponds to Figure 3 in the main text, but plots the total duration of President-Fed interactions (in hours), instead of the number of interactions. The overall pattern in the duration over time is similar to the number of interactions, though the 1970s stand out to an even stronger degree.

Figure B.1: TOTAL DURATION OF PRESIDENT-FED INTERACTIONS (IN HOURS PER YEAR) THROUGH TIME



Notes. Duration (in hours) of personal interactions between Presidents and Fed officials, aggregated to annual frequency. The duration of interactions was not visible in the daily schedules available for President Obama, so this time series stops in 2008.


Figure B.2 presents time series for different *types* of President-Fed interactions through time. Panels (a) and (b) plot the number of 1-on-1 interactions, that is, those on which other people were not indicated to be present. These two panels separately show the number of interactions as well as the total duration in hours. In the main text, I use the time series shown in Panel (a) in a robustness exercise to explore whether other macroeconomic events in 1971 confound my findings.

Panels (c) and (d) show interactions that took place on weekends. Again, the number of interactions as well as the total duration in hours is separately plotted.

Panels (e) and (f) show number and length of only social interactions, such as meals, parties or church visits.

Across these panels it becomes clear that during those times where lots of President-Fed interactions take place overall—in particular in the 1970s—we see these other indicators rise as well. For example, Richard Nixon was the President with most interactions occurring on weekends as well as a President who relied a lot on social interactions with Fed officials.

Figure B.2: ADDITIONAL INDICATORS OF PRESIDENT-FED INTERACTIONS



Notes. The duration and setting of interactions was not visible in the daily schedules available for President Obama.


C Additional SVAR results

C.1 Further analysis of historical variance decompositions

Historical variance decompositions in SVARs can be sensitive to the specific way in which they are constructed. This issue is discussed in detail in a recent paper by Bergholt et al. (2025). Following the same authors, I impose the single-unit-root prior, also known as dummy-initial-observations prior, suggested by Sims (1993), as a robustness check for the historical variance decompositions reported in the main text. I use the exact same settings as suggested Bergholt et al. (2025).

Figure C.1 shows the resulting historical variance decompositions. Relative to the results in the main text, the contribution of political pressure shocks to inflation becomes more pronounced on average. In that sense, my baseline estimates in the main text based on flat priors can be interpreted as a conservative assessment of the importance of political pressure shocks for the variation in macroeconomic data. Importantly, the general patterns implied by the relative differences across different periods is similar to the results in the text. Thus, my description and interpretation of the broad contours of the historical variance decompositions across different decodes would not be meaningfully different based on the single-unit-root prior.


Figure C.1: HISTORICAL VARIANCE DECOMPOSITIONS WITH ALTERNATIVE PRIOR CHOICE



Notes. Historical variance decomposition for the President-Fed interaction time series (Panel (a)) and the GDP deflator, in year-on-year log differences (Panel (b)). These results use the single-unit-root prior following Bergholt et al. (2025).

Figure C.2 explores the role of the deterministic component in the historical variance decomposition of inflation. Specifically, the figure repeats the historical variance decomposition of the growth rate in the GDP deflator from the main text, but subtracts the mean and initial conditions from the time series. Again, the contribution of the political pressure shock is larger on average but the relative differences across different episodes are similar, relative to the results presented in the main text.


Figure C.2: HISTORICAL VARIANCE DECOMPOSITION WITHOUT DETERMINISTIC COMPONENT



C.2 Further subsample analysis

Figure C.3 excludes the Global Financial Crisis (GFC) by ending the sample in 2007:Q4. The results are similar to the main results presented in the text. The response of the GDP deflator is economically stronger and more precisely estimated.


Figure C.3: IRFS TO A POLITICAL PRESSURE SHOCK EXCLUDING THE GFC



Notes. The solid lines and dark (light) shaded areas represent the median IRFs and 68% (90%) credible intervals to a political pressure shock, defined by the restrictions in Table 1. The sample is 1933:Q1-2007:Q4, excluding the GFC.

Figure C.4 limits the sample to start in 1952:Q2, after the Treasury-Fed Accord. The results display stronger interest rate response, but a weaker price level increase, which cannot be detected to be different from zero. These results suggests that the main results in the text get strengthened by the variation from the pre-1952 period, when the Fed was formally less independent.

Figure C.4: IRFS TO A POLITICAL PRESSURE SHOCK AFTER TREASURY-FED ACCORD



Notes. The solid lines and dark (light) shaded areas represent the median IRFs and 68% (90%) credible intervals to a political pressure shock, defined by the restrictions in Table 1. The sample is 1952:Q2-2016:Q4, after the Treasury-Fed Accord.

C.3 Adding measured inflation expectations directly in the system

This appendix presents SVAR results with inflation expectations included directly in the system. This is an alternative to the local projection approach, following Jordà (2005), used in the main text. As the Livingstone Survey starts only in 1946 and is released biannually, this required me to adapt the estimation algorithm for the SVAR, to incorporate missing data and mixed frequency data using Kalman filtering techniques.


Figure C.5 shows the resulting IRFs to the political pressure shock and Figure C.6 those to the monetary policy shock. In Figure C.5, I also include the posterior estimate of the latent variable that captures the unobserved quarterly inflation expectations over the full sample, as well as 90% posterior credible bands. In both cases, I add a sign restriction on inflation expectations. Moreover, I use a Minnesota prior instead of a flat prior for this version of the SVAR, which I found to help with the stability of the estimation of the latent variable.

The comparison between the political pressure shock and the monetary policy shock reveals an economically larger and more persistent inflation expectations response to the political pressure shock. This broadly confirms the insights from the local projection approach in the main text. However, the inflation expectation responses here are generally much less persistent than using local projections. The comparison between the simple local projection approach and the mixed-frequency SVAR are difficult and it is not obvious which one is preferable.


The results in Figures C.5 and C.6 can also be understood as robustness checks for the baseline results presented in the main text. Inflation expectations are a *forward-looking* variable, so including them directly in the system helps address potential informational deficiencies in the SVAR. In that sense, it is reassuring that the responses of the Tbill rate, the GDP deflator and real GDP are similar to results from the SVAR that does not include inflation expectations.

Figure C.5: SVAR RESULTS WITH INFLATION EXPECTATIONS INCLUDED

(a) IRFs to a political pressure shock with inflation expectations in the system




(b) Latent estimate of quarterly inflation expectations



Notes. The solid lines and dark (light) shaded areas in Panel (a) represent the median IRFs and 68% (90%) credible intervals to a political pressure shock when the SVAR directly includes inflation expectations. Panel (b) shows the posterior estimate of the latent variable that captures the unobserved quarterly inflation expectations, together with 90% posterior credible intervals and the original data. The sample is 1933:Q1-2016:Q4.

Figure C.6: IRFS TO A MONETARY POLICY SHOCK WITH INFLATION EXPECTATIONS IN THE SYSTEM




Notes. The solid lines and dark (light) shaded areas in Panel (a) represent the median IRFs and 68% (90%) credible intervals to a monetary policy easing shock when the SVAR directly includes inflation expectations. In normalize the responses to the same impact response of the Tbill rate as in Figure C.5. The sample is 1933:Q1-2016:Q4.

C.4 IRFs to a generic '1971 inflationary shock'

Figure C.7 presents the IRFs to a shock that is estimated as the main contributor to inflation in 1971:Q3 and 1971:Q4, in a version of the SVAR that does not contain President-Fed interaction data. This generic '1971 inflationary shock' does not have a clear structural interpretation, but spans *any* important potential contributor to inflationary developments that has roots in the second half of 1971, but is not restricted to unfold through interactions between the President and the Fed. The IRFs to this shock imply only a short-lived and imprecisely estimated price level increase. The shock also leads to a strong increase in real GDP and fiscal variables according to the 68% credible sets. This contrast with the main results highlights that the personal interaction data, and the information the data reveal about political pressure, are key to my findings.

Figure C.7: IRFS TO A GENERIC '1971 INFLATIONARY SHOCK' WITHOUT PRESIDENT-FED INTERACTIONS




Notes. The solid lines and dark (light) shaded areas represent the median IRFs and 68% (90%) credible intervals to a shock that is identified *without* President-Fed interaction data (for comparison to other figures, the first panel is left blank), with the traditional sign restrictions shown in Table 1 and a narrative restriction that imposes that shock is the main driver of the GDP deflator in 1971:Q3-Q4. I normalize the shock to a 1 percentage point reduction in interest rates. The sample is 1933:Q1-2016:Q4.

C.5 Adding Lyndon B. Johnson narrative restrictions

Figure C.8 uses 1965:Q4 as an additional narrative restriction on President-Fed interactions, on top of all restrictions imposed in the baseline specification. Figure C.9 instead uses 1967:Q1 as an additional narrative restrictions on President-Fed interactions, on top of all restrictions imposed in the baseline specification. Both historical episodes are discussed in more detail in the main text.


The effect of political pressure on the price level is somewhat weaker and less precisely estimated than in the main results, but I still estimate an inflationary impact. Figure C.9 also reveals a response of fiscal variables.

Figure C.8: IRFS TO SHOCK ALSO IDENTIFIED FROM LYNDON B. JOHNSONS' PRESSURE (1965:Q4)



Notes. The solid lines and dark (light) shaded areas represent the median IRFs and 68% (90%) credible intervals to a political pressure shock, defined by the restrictions in Table 1 and imposing 1965:Q4 as an additional narrative sign restriction on the President-Fed interaction variable. The sample is 1933:Q1-2016:Q4.

Figure C.9: IRFS TO SHOCK ALSO IDENTIFIED FROM LYNDON B. JOHNSONS' PRESSURE (1967:Q1)




Notes. The solid lines and dark (light) shaded areas represent the median IRFs and 68% (90%) credible intervals to a political pressure shock, defined by the restrictions in Table 1 and imposing 1967:Q1 as an additional narrative sign restriction on the President-Fed interaction variable. The sample is 1933:Q1-2016:Q4.

C.6 Modified identifying restrictions

Timing of traditional sign restrictions. Figure C.10 shows the IRFs of my SVAR when I modify the timing of the traditional sign restriction on the price level. Here it is imposed to be positive after 1 year (in quarters 4 and 5) instead of on impact (quarters 0 and 1), as in the mean text. The results are quite similar to the baseline results in the main text.


Figure C.10: IRFS TO A POLITICAL PRESSURE SHOCK WITH ALTERNATIVE SIGN RESTRICTION



Notes. The solid lines and dark (light) shaded areas represent the median IRFs and 68% (90%) credible intervals to a political pressure shock, with sign restrictions that are different from the main text: the inflation response is imposed to be positive after 4-5 quarters instead 0-1 quarters. The sample is 1933:Q1-2016:Q4.

Strength of narrative restriction. Figure C.11 shows the IRFs for the alternative narrative sign restriction that is of the "most important" type rather than the "overwhelming" type. Instead of having a more important contribution to President-Fed interactions in 1971:Q3-Q4 than the *sum* of all other shocks, the political pressure shocks is imposed to have a more important contribution that *any* other shock in the same period. See also the more detailed discussion of these different versions of narrative sign restrictions in Antolin-Diaz and Rubio-Ramirez (2018). The results are similar to the main results in the text, though with wider posterior bands. This is intuitive as the narrative restriction is weaker.

Figure C.11: IRFS TO A POLITICAL PRESSURE SHOCK WITH LESS RESTRICTIVE NARRATIVE ASSUMPTION




Notes. The solid lines and dark (light) shaded areas represent the median IRFs and 68% (90%) credible intervals to a political pressure shock, with a narrative sign restriction that is different from the main text: instead of having a more important contribution to President-Fed interactions in 1971:Q3-Q4 than the *sum* of all other shocks, the political pressure shocks is imposed to have a more important contribution that *any* other shock. The sample is 1933:Q1-2016:Q4.

C.7 Adding oil prices to the system

Figure C.12 shows IRFs to a political pressure shock when the SVAR includes oil prices as an additional unrestricted variable. The motivation for this exercise is that important oil supply shocks occurred in the 1970s. As these also impact inflation, omitting developments in oil markets in my main analysis based on exploiting variation during the Nixon Presidency might be a concern. The IRFs show that including oil prices does not materially impact my findings. In particular the response of the GDP deflator is similarly strong and persistent as in the results in the main text. The response of real GDP becomes much noisier. The response of the oil price itself is not distinguishable from zero.

Figure C.12: IRFS TO A POLITICAL PRESSURE SHOCK CONTROLLING FOR OIL PRICES




Notes. The solid lines and dark (light) shaded areas represent the median IRFs and 68% (90%) credible intervals to a political pressure shock. An oil price index is added to the system as an unrestricted variable. Specifically, I use a spliced series of the U.S. wholesale price of crude oil (prior to 1946) and the WTI (after 1946). The sample is 1933:Q1-2016:Q4.

C.8 Unemployment rate instead of real GDP

Figure C.13 shows IRFs to a political pressure shock when the SVAR includes the unemployment rate rather than real GDP, as in my baseline. Its response can also not be distinguished from zero, while the IRF of the GDP deflator is even a bit stronger in this specification.

Figure C.13: IRFS TO A POLITICAL PRESSURE SHOCK WHEN THE UNEMPLOYMENT RATE IS INCLUDED



Notes. The solid lines and dark (light) shaded areas represent the median IRFs and 68% (90%) credible intervals to a political pressure shock. Relative to my baseline specification, the unemployment rate replaces real GDP in the system. The sample is 1933:Q1-2016:Q4.

D Relation with monetary policy shock measures

Table D.1 reports the results from simple OLS regressions. In each case, the right-hand-side variable is the time series estimated political pressure shocks and the left-hand-side variable is a measure of monetary policy shocks from the literature. The first two measures are based on orthogonalizing Fed Funds Rate changes with respect to information from the Fed's Greenbook, with the classic measure from Romer and Romer (2004) ['RR'] and the recent refinement of Aruoba and Drechsel (2022) ['AD']. The remaining measures are different version of high-frequency monetary policy surprises, following Gürkaynak et al. (2005) ['GSS'], Gertler and Karadi (2015) ['GK'], Bauer and Swanson (2023) ['BS'] and Miranda-Agrippino and Ricco (2021) ['MAR']. The table reports standardized coefficients with t-statistics shown in parentheses. The sample for the estimation varies from case to case.

Table D.1: STATISTICAL RELATION BETWEEN MONETARY POLICY SHOCKS AND POLITICAL PRESSURE SHOCKS

	(1) RR	(2) AD	(3) GSS	(4) GK	(5) BS	(6) MAR
PP shock	-0.196	-0.422	0.279	-0.422	-0.200	-0.073
	(0.069)	(0.174)	(0.212)	(0.209)	(0.187)	(0.228)
Constant	0.005	-0.001	0.003	-0.005	-0.046	-0.001
	(0.092)	(0.095)	(0.105)	(0.104)	(0.094)	(0.115)
Sample	1969:Q1–1996:Q4	1982:Q4–2008:Q4	1990:Q1–2012:Q2	1990:Q1–2012:Q2	1988:Q1–2016:Q4	1991:Q1–2009:Q4
Observations	112	105	90	90	116	76
R-Squared	0.068	0.054	0.019	0.044	0.010	0.001


Notes. The coefficients are standardized. Parentheses present t-statistics. The Bauer-Swanson surprise is their orthogonalized version. The Gertler-Karadi and Gürkaynak-Sack-Swanson surprises were obtained through the replication package of Miranda-Agrippino and Ricco.

In line with the arguments about the relation between the two shock types in the main text, several of the regressions imply a statistically significant negative coefficient, meaning that more political pressure is associated with a monetary easing. The R^2 of the first regression is 0.068, meaning almost 7% of the variation in the original Romer and Romer (2004) residuals is due to political pressure shocks. This not only confirms the logic provided in the text, it is also acknowledged in the original Romer and Romer (2004) paper, where the authors explain that one source of monetary policy shocks is politics and speculate about Arthur Burns' expansionary policies under President Jimmy Carter. The R^2 falls with the measure of Aruoba and Drechsel (2022), in line with the idea that their procedure provides a measure that more narrowly captures "pure" monetary policy shocks. However, even with their methodology some variation in the monetary policy shocks appears to capture political pressure. Interestingly, the R-squared is lower for high-frequency measures. However, these measures are available for a much shorter period, starting in the late 1980s or early 1990s. In these samples, political pressure shocks were extremely rare and thus naturally have less statistical association with monetary policy shocks.

E Nixon's public approval

Figure E.1 presents the public approval rating of Richard Nixon over his Presidency, from January 1969 to August 1974, according to the Gallup opinion poll. Burns' appointment as Fed Chair and the November 1972 election are indicated as vertical lines. The shaded area captures 1971:Q3 and 1971:Q4, the periods in which I impose the narrative sign restriction on the President-Fed meeting variable. (Source: UCSB, *The American Presidency Project*).

Figure E.1: NIXON'S PUBLIC APPROVAL RATING ACCORDING TO GALLUP POLLS



F More details on the news index

This Appendix explains how the news index is constructed and shows the full set of IRFs when the index is included in the SVAR.

F.1 Index construction

Using the ProQuest newspaper data base (accessed through the University of Maryland library), I query all articles published by the Wall Street Journal, the New York Times and the Washington Post between 1933 and 2016. I identify articles that satisfy the following criteria:

1. Article headline contains 'federal reserve' **OR** 'fed'
   - **AND** -
2. Article text contains ('political' **AND** 'pressure') **OR** ('political' **AND** 'interference') **OR** 'independence'
   - **AND** -
3. Article text contains 'president' **OR** the name of any President in the sample ('roosevelt' **OR** 'truman' **OR** 'eisenhower' **OR** ...)

   - **OR** -


4. Article headline contains both the name of the current President and the name of the current Fed Chair, i.e. ('nixon' **AND** 'burns') **OR** ('obama' **AND** 'bernanke') **OR** ...

These criteria are intended to identify articles that mainly cover the Fed and likely discuss political pressure exerted by the U.S. President, as well as articles that report on direct interactions between the President and the Fed Chair. I find a total of 2,461 newspaper articles that satisfy these criteria. To construct an index from the articles that I identify, I simply count the number of articles per quarter. This is plotted cumulatively in the figure shown in the main body of the paper.

F.2 Full SVAR results when news index is included

Figure F.1 presents the IRFs to the version of the political pressure shock that also increases the number of newspaper articles written about political pressure. The main text describes the exact restrictions imposed and shows a subset of the IRFs, those of the GDP deflator and the number of news articles. The figure here shows the complete set of seven IRFs.

Figure F.1: IRFS TO A POLITICAL PRESSURE SHOCK CONTROLLING THAT ALSO INCREASES NEWS REPORTING



Notes. The solid lines and dark (light) shaded areas represent the median IRFs and 68% (90%) credible intervals to the version of the political pressure shock that also increases number of newspaper articles about political pressure. The sample is 1933:Q1-2016:Q4.

G More details and results for latent variable approach

This appendix discusses the methodology that I apply to model latent political pressure in my SVAR. It also presents additional results obtained with this approach.

G.1 Description of methodology

Equations (8) and (9) in the main text specify a latent political pressure variable x_t^* that maps into the observed number of President-Fed interactions x_t through a Poisson distribution. The idea behind this comes from the political science literature (Brandt and Williams, 2001; Brandt and Sandler, 2012), which employs time series models in combination with count data, for example to analyze conflicts or terrorism events. A related literature is the Qual-VAR literature, which models binary variables, for example in a forecasting context (Dueker, 2005; McCracken et al., 2022).

I embed these equations as an additional block in the sampling algorithm of Antolin-Diaz and Rubio-Ramirez (2018), which builds on Arias et al. (2018). That additional block draws the latent variable x_t^*, while the remaining blocks of the algorithm condition on the draw of x_t^*. The presence of a Poisson observation equation makes the system non-Gaussian and nonlinear, so it is not trivial to embed the new block in the algorithm.[1] I proceed by using a mixture sampling approach, developed by Frühwirth-Schnatter et al. (2009). This approach transforms the nonlinear observation equation into a linear non-Gaussian equation that approximates the non-Gaussian noise with a mixture of normal distributions. Once this transformation is applied, the system is (conditionally) Gaussian. Similar approaches are used in the estimation of macroeconometric models with stochastic volatility. The relevant mixture sampling approach in that literature was developed by Kim et al. (1998) and is used for example in Primiceri (2005), Antolin-Diaz et al. (2017) and Antolín-Díaz et al. (2024).

In what follows, I briefly summarize the idea of the mixture sampling step and then explain how that step fits into the BVAR algorithm. I also explain how this approach can be extended to a second observable. Finally, I discuss some practical considerations for implementation with my President-Fed interaction data.

Mixture sampling approach. I follow Frühwirth-Schnatter et al. (2009) in converting the Poisson process (9) into an arrival time expression, by introducing two auxiliary latent variables τ_{t1} and τ_{t2}. τ_{t2} is the arrival time of the last Poisson arrival within period t. τ_{t1} is the inter-arrival time between the last Poisson arrival within t and within $t+1$:

[1] In Brandt and Williams (2001), for example, the econometric problem is simpler because they can assume that the mean of the Poisson distribution (the analogue of x_t^*) has a conjugate distribution. This is not possible in my setup, as x_t^* appears in the SVAR.

$$\tau_{t1} = \frac{\xi_{t1}}{\lambda_t}, \quad \xi_{t1} \sim \mathcal{E}(1) \tag{10}$$

$$\tau_{t2} = \frac{\xi_{t2}}{\lambda_t}, \quad \xi_{t2} \sim \mathcal{G}(x_t, 1), \tag{11}$$

where $\mathcal{E}(.)$ denotes the exponential distribution and $\mathcal{G}(.,.)$ denotes the Gamma distribution. Taking logs, we obtain

$$-\ln \tau_{t1} = \ln \lambda_t + \varepsilon_{t1}, \quad \varepsilon_{t1} = -\ln \xi_{t1} \tag{12}$$

$$-\ln \tau_{t2} = \ln \lambda_t + \varepsilon_{t2}, \quad \varepsilon_{t2} = -\ln \xi_{t2}. \tag{13}$$

The non-Gaussian error is approximated as

$$p_\varepsilon(\varepsilon;\nu) = \frac{\exp(-\nu\varepsilon - e^{-\varepsilon})}{\Gamma(\nu)} \approx \sum_{r=1}^{R(\nu)} w_r(\nu)\, \varphi\left(\varepsilon; m_r(\nu), s_r^2(\nu)\right), \tag{14}$$

where φ is the normal distribution and $\nu = 1$ for τ_{t1}, $\nu = x_t$ for τ_{t2}. r is also a latent variable that indicates which normal distribution to use. w, m, and s are numerically given by Frühwirth-Schnatter et al. (2009). Conditional on τ_{t1}, τ_{t2}, r_t, the system is linear and Gaussian:

$$-\ln \tau_{t1}^\star = \ln \lambda_t + m_{r_{t1}}(1) + \varepsilon_{t1}, \qquad \varepsilon_{t1} \mid r_{t1} \sim \mathcal{N}(0,\, s_{r_{t1}}^2(1)), \tag{15}$$

$$-\ln \tau_{t2}^\star = \ln \lambda_t + m_{r_{t2}}(x_t) + \varepsilon_{t2}, \qquad \varepsilon_{t2} \mid r_{t2} \sim \mathcal{N}(0,\, s_{r_{t2}}^2(x_t)). \tag{16}$$

We can then apply the Kalman filter and smoother to sample $\{\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_T\}$ and obtain x_t^* from $\lambda_t = exp(x_t^*)$.

Sketch of algorithm. Let $\boldsymbol{B}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ represent the coefficients and covariance matrix of the VAR system represented by (8). The full sampling algorithm works as follows:

1. Initialize $\boldsymbol{x}^*$
2. Draw $\boldsymbol{B}$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ conditional on $\boldsymbol{x}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$ (standard BVAR estimation, treating $\boldsymbol{x}^*$ as data)
3. Draw $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ and $\boldsymbol{r}$, conditional on $\boldsymbol{B}$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, $\boldsymbol{y}$, $\boldsymbol{x}$, $\boldsymbol{x}^*$, based onFrühwirth-Schnatter et al. (2009)
4. Draw $\boldsymbol{x}^*$ conditional on $\boldsymbol{B}$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, $\boldsymbol{y}$, $\boldsymbol{x}$, using simulation smoother
5. Repeat 12,000 times and discard first 2,000 draws; check convergence

Once the reduced-form parameters are obtained, proceed to the sampling of the structural parameters following Antolin-Diaz and Rubio-Ramirez (2018). Narrative sign restrictions can be applied to x_t^* and $\boldsymbol{y}_t$.

Multiple observables. The approach described above can also be extended to multiple observed count variables for the same latent variable. In that case, in analogy to equation (9) a second measurement equation is specified as

$$\Pr(z_t \mid \mu_t) = \frac{(\mu_t)^{z_t} e^{-\mu_t}}{z_t!} \quad \text{with} \quad \mu_t = Nexp(x_t^*), \tag{17}$$

where z_t is the additional observed count variable and μ_t is the natural logarithm of the latent variable x_t^* with scaling factor N. Parameter N governs the "exposure" of z_t to x_t^*.

In this case, the sampling of Frühwirth-Schnatter et al. (2009) is still applicable. I include two additional linearized equations that are analogous to (15) and (16), but $\ln N + \ln \mu_t$ appears instead of $\ln \lambda_t$. Otherwise these two equations introduce the same amount of additional parameters and latent objects to initialize and sample as (15) and (16).


One difference in the overall BVAR algorithm is that with two observables for the latent variable N needs to be sampled as well. I assume that $\ln N$ has a normal prior, and sample it in a separate step of the algorithm conditional on $\boldsymbol{x}^*$, $\boldsymbol{\tau}$, $\boldsymbol{r}$.

Practical considerations. When I apply the algorithm to the data summarized in Table 1, additional tweaks are helpful for the stability of the estimation. The reason is that when x_t (or z_t) has many zeros, then the algorithm can lead to some extremely large negative draws for $\ln \lambda_t$ and extremely high posterior bands around x_t^*. For the results shown in the text and subsequent appendices, I prevent this by simply adding 1 to the President-Fed interaction data. While this is an ad-hoc patch, it leads to a very sensible sequence draws for x_t^*.

G.2 Additional results for latent variable approach

Full results from specification presented in the main text. Figure G.1 presents the IRFs to the version of the political pressure shock that increases the latent measure of political pressure. The main text describes the exact restrictions imposed and shows a subset of the IRFs, those of the latent pressure variable, the Tbill rate, and the GDP deflator. The figure here presents the full set of IRFs to all six variables.

Figure G.1: FULL SET OF IRFS TO SHOCK THAT INCREASES LATENT POLITICAL PRESSURE VARIABLE



Notes. The solid lines and dark (light) shaded areas represent the median IRFs and 68% (90%) credible intervals to a shock that increases latent political pressure. The sample is 1933:Q1-2016:Q4.


Results from specification with two observables. Figure G.2 presents the posterior estimates of the latent variable political pressure variable x_t^*, as well as the IRFs to an increase in political pressure, when it is informed by two observable count variables. As a proof of concept, I use the President-Fed interactions *that occurred on weekends* as the second observable (see Figure B.2, Panel (c)). The idea is that weekend meetings between the President and Fed officials can reveal additional information about political pressure due to their either social or urgent nature. I estimate this specification in the pre-Greenspan sample, since the additional observable is almost always equal to zero in the period afterwards.

Panel (a) shows that the estimated evolution of latent pressure is similar to that estimated in the main text. One difference is that it becomes slightly noisier with the beginning of the 1980s. The reason is that weekend interactions become very rare during this period and the second observable thus provides a less informative signal in that part of the sample.


The results in Panel (b) show that the IRF of the latent pressure variable is estimated to be less persistent. The reduction in the Tbill rate and increase in the GDP deflator are of similar magnitude but less precisely estimated than in the case with one observable. Overall, the results are robust to the use of a second observable, but the estimation uncertainty around the latent pressure variable cannot be meaningfully reduced with the additional observable.

Figure G.2: MODELING PRESIDENT-FED INTERACTIONS WITH TWO OBSERVABLE COUNT TIME SERIES

(a) Estimated evolution of latent political pressure



(b) IRFs to a shock that increases latent political pressure



Notes. Panel (a) shows the posterior estimate of the latent political pressure variable, x_t^* in equations (8), (9) and (17), together with 90% posterior credible intervals. Panel (b) shows selected IRFs to a shock that increases latent political pressure, when it is informed by two observable count variables. The sample is 1933:Q1-1987:Q2.

References

Antolin-Diaz, J., Drechsel, T., and Petrella, I. (2017). Tracking the slowdown in long-run gdp growth. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 99(2):343–356.

Antolin-Diaz, J. and Rubio-Ramirez, J. F. (2018). Narrative sign restrictions for svars. *American Economic Review*, 108(10):2802–29.

Antolín-Díaz, J., Drechsel, T., and Petrella, I. (2024). Advances in nowcasting economic activity: The role of heterogeneous dynamics and fat tails. *Journal of Econometrics*, 238(2):105634.

Arias, J., Rubio-Ramirez, J. F., and Waggoner, D. F. (2018). Inference based on structural vector autoregressions identified with sign and zero restrictions: Theory and applications. *Econometrica*, 86(2):685–720.

Aruoba, S. B. and Drechsel, T. (2022). Identifying monetary policy shocks: A natural language approach. *CEPR Discussion Paper No. DP17133*.

Bauer, M. D. and Swanson, E. T. (2023). An alternative explanation for the "fed information effect". *American Economic Review*, 113(3):664–700.

Bergholt, D., Canova, F., Furlanetto, F., Maffei-Faccioli, N., and Ulvedal, P. (2025). What drives the recent surge in inflation? the historical decomposition rollercoaster. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics (forthcoming)*.

Brandt, P. T. and Sandler, T. (2012). A bayesian poisson vector autoregression model. *Political Analysis*, 20(3):292–315.

Brandt, P. T. and Williams, J. T. (2001). A linear poisson autoregressive model: The poisson ar (p) model. *Political Analysis*, 9(2):164–184.

Dueker, M. (2005). Dynamic forecasts of qualitative variables: a qual var model of us recessions. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 23(1):96–104.

Frühwirth-Schnatter, S., Frühwirth, R., Held, L., and Rue, H. (2009). Improved auxiliary mixture sampling for hierarchical models of non-gaussian data. *Statistics and Computing*, 19:479–492.

Gertler, M. and Karadi, P. (2015). Monetary policy surprises, credit costs, and economic activity. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 7(1):44–76.

Gürkaynak, R. S., Sack, B., and Swanson, E. (2005). The sensitivity of long-term interest rates to economic news: Evidence and implications for macroeconomic models. *American Economic Review*, 95(1):425–436.

Jordà, O. (2005). Estimation and inference of impulse responses by local projections. *American Economic Review*, 95(1):161–182.

Kim, S., Shephard, N., and Chib, S. (1998). Stochastic volatility: likelihood inference and comparison with arch models. *The review of economic studies*, 65(3):361–393.

McCracken, M. W., McGillicuddy, J. T., and Owyang, M. T. (2022). Binary conditional forecasts. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 40(3):1246–1258.

Miranda-Agrippino, S. and Ricco, G. (2021). The transmission of monetary policy shocks. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 13(3):74–107.

Primiceri, G. E. (2005). Time varying structural vector autoregressions and monetary policy. *The Review of economic studies*, 72(3):821–852.

Romer, C. D. and Romer, D. H. (2004). A new measure of monetary shocks: Derivation and implications. *American Economic Review*, 94(4):1055–1084.

Sims, C. A. (1993). A nine-variable probabilistic macroeconomic forecasting model. In *Business cycles, indicators, and forecasting*, pages 179–212. University of Chicago press.