

Climate Stress and Capital Flow Instability: How Environmental Shocks Reshape International Investment Patterns

Jingxuan Xie

Business School, Henan Normal University, Xinxiang, P. R. China

Abstract: Environmental shocks are increasingly recognized as a driver of instability in international capital markets, yet the precise ways in which climate-related events translate into extreme movements of cross-border investment remain underexplored. This paper offers a conceptual framework that traces how climate disturbances propagate through financial channels and generate episodes of capital surge, sudden contraction, resident flight, and foreign withdrawal. Four distinct pathways are elaborated. The first concerns how climate uncertainty leads investors to defer long-term commitments. The second focuses on how disaster-induced fiscal strain weakens sovereign credit and provokes portfolio liquidation. The third examines the redirection of investment toward jurisdictions perceived as climatically secure. The fourth addresses how the low-carbon transition reshapes sectoral capital allocation across borders. These pathways are then integrated into a classification that links specific climate triggers to expected flow outcomes and their reversibility. Several recent episodes serve as illustrations. The paper closes with policy implications and suggestions for empirical testing.

Keywords: Climate shocks, Capital flow instability, Physical risk, Transition risk.

1. Introduction

The past two decades have witnessed a sharp increase in the frequency and severity of weather-related disasters, alongside an accelerating global effort to reduce carbon dependence. These twin developments have injected new sources of risk into international financial markets. For countries integrated into global capital markets, the consequences extend beyond direct economic damage. Environmental shocks can alter the calculus of foreign and domestic investors in ways that produce large, abrupt, and potentially destabilizing movements of capital across borders.

The foundational literature on capital flow volatility provides the conceptual vocabulary for analyzing such episodes. Forbes and Warnock [1] established a widely used taxonomy based on gross flows, distinguishing surges, sudden stops, flight, and retrenchment. Their analysis demonstrates that global risk factors, rather than domestic variables, are the primary drivers of extreme flow episodes. This insight is particularly relevant for climate-related disturbances, which are often exogenous to domestic policy choices. Subsequent research has confirmed that uncertainty—whether economic, political, or environmental—amplifies the incidence of extreme capital flow events [2]. However, existing studies tend to treat climate risk as a monolithic category of uncertainty. They do not adequately differentiate among the separate causal pathways through which distinct types of environmental shocks influence capital movements. A single climate event can produce opposite outcomes in different countries, with some experiencing sudden stops while others receive surges.

Recent empirical work has begun to address this gap. Ferriani, Gazzani, and Natoli [3] demonstrate that natural disasters in high-climate-risk emerging economies spur investment flows into advanced countries that are relatively safer from a climate perspective, providing direct evidence of a “flight to climatic safety” mechanism. Shear, Ashraf, and

Butt [4] find that foreign direct investment inflows are lower in countries more vulnerable to climate change, with the effect being stronger for developing economies. Kassouri [5] shows that temperature shocks lead to increased capital outflows and trade misinvoicing from African economies, with the relationship conditional upon institutional frameworks and state capacity. These studies collectively establish that climate-related disturbances have systematic effects on cross-border capital movements, yet they remain largely separate contributions rather than an integrated framework.

This paper develops a conceptual framework that disaggregates the climate-capital flow relationship into distinct mechanisms. Three questions guide the analysis. How should abnormal capital flow episodes be characterized when climate-related disturbances are the initiating factor? Through what specific mechanisms do climate shocks generate surges, sudden stops, flight, and retrenchment? How can these mechanisms be assembled into a classification that facilitates interpretation of real-world events? The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 establishes the conceptual foundations. Section 3 develops the mechanisms and presents the classification. Section 4 applies the framework to selected episodes. Section 5 draws out policy implications, and Section 6 concludes.

2. Setting the Conceptual Terrain

Capital moving across national borders takes several forms: direct investment in productive assets, portfolio investment in equity and debt securities, and lending through banking channels. Under ordinary circumstances, these flows respond to differences in expected returns, growth prospects, and the global appetite for risk. Environmental shocks can disrupt this normal functioning and push flows into extreme territory. The established taxonomy based on gross flows provides a useful starting point [1]. A surge denotes an unusually large increase in gross inflows. A sudden stop refers to a sharp contraction

in gross inflows. Flight captures a sharp increase in gross outflows by domestic residents. Retrenchment describes a sharp decline in gross outflows by foreign investors. Statistical identification of these episodes typically relies on deviations from historical means and standard deviations.

Several features distinguish climate-related abnormalities from conventional flow disturbances. The initiating event is environmental rather than macroeconomic in nature, and it alters perceptions of asset productivity, sovereign creditworthiness, and the security of long-term investment returns. Climate shocks frequently produce compound episodes in which inflows contract while outflows accelerate, defying simple categorization. The temporal profile of climate risk is also distinctive. Acute physical hazards such as floods and storms generate immediate but potentially transient disruptions. Gradual physical changes such as sea-level rise and desertification exert slower but more enduring effects. Transition hazards associated with policy reform and technological change unfold over extended periods but can accelerate sharply when regulatory thresholds are crossed. The baseline level and volatility of capital flows may shift permanently following significant climate events, rendering purely statistical detection less reliable. These considerations motivate a conceptual approach that incorporates the nature of the climate trigger.

Climate risk encompasses two principal categories. Physical risk refers to losses arising from extreme weather events and from gradual shifts in climatic conditions. Transition risk refers to disruptions associated with the movement toward a low-carbon economy, including policy changes, technological displacement, and shifts in consumer preferences. From an investor's perspective, climate risk raises concerns about asset destruction, sovereign credit deterioration, and the possibility that certain assets will become stranded. Holdings in countries with elevated climate vulnerability may lose value through physical damage, insurance withdrawal, or regulatory intervention in ways that extend beyond ordinary market channels. Investor responses tend to be nonlinear, with positions maintained until a vulnerability threshold is breached and then liquidated rapidly. Existing measures of climate vulnerability, such as the Global Climate Risk Index, quantify the extent to which countries are affected by extreme weather events using data on fatalities, economic losses, and losses relative to GDP. These indicators are useful for assessing overall exposure but do not capture structural transformations such as the emergence of climate-driven sovereign risk premia or the segmentation of green investment corridors.

3. Pathways from Climate Stress to Capital Flow Instability

This section develops four distinct pathways through which climate-related disturbances can generate extreme movements in cross-border capital.

3.1. Deferred Commitment under Climate Uncertainty

The first pathway operates through the effect of climate-related uncertainty on investment timing. When the future is difficult to predict, and when commitments are costly to reverse, investors may choose to wait rather than act. This logic, drawn from the real options tradition, suggests that climate shocks can freeze capital in place by raising the value

of postponement [2]. For direct investment, the construction of physical facilities in climate-vulnerable locations involves substantial sunk costs, and relocating such facilities is difficult and expensive. For portfolio investment, the prospect of fire sales and reduced market liquidity during periods of climate stress makes rapid position adjustments costly. Faced with an uncertain climate environment, foreign investors may delay planned investments, producing a contraction in gross inflows. Domestic residents confronting similar uncertainty may move wealth abroad as a precaution, contributing to flight. The persistence of these effects depends on how long climate-related uncertainty remains elevated. If adaptation measures and credible policy signals restore confidence, the disruption may prove temporary. Where vulnerability remains unaddressed or policy direction remains unclear, deferral can persist for years, suppressing capital formation and external financing.

3.2. Sovereign Credit Deterioration after Climate Disasters

A second pathway runs through the sovereign balance sheet. Major climate disasters impose severe fiscal costs. Emergency response, reconstruction, and social support require substantial government spending at precisely the moment when economic disruption reduces tax revenues. The resulting fiscal deterioration raises sovereign borrowing costs and may trigger credit rating downgrades. Several consequences follow for cross-border capital flows. Higher sovereign risk premia increase external financing costs for domestic firms and banks, reducing their appeal to foreign investors. Rating downgrades can force institutional investors with minimum rating mandates to liquidate holdings automatically. Fiscal strain may also prompt authorities to impose capital controls or other restrictive measures, further discouraging foreign investment. Research on climate vulnerability and investment inflows confirms that countries with higher exposure to climate-related risks tend to receive lower levels of foreign direct investment, particularly in developing economies where fiscal buffers are limited [4]. Unlike conventional sovereign debt crises, which typically stem from fiscal mismanagement or external imbalances, climate-driven sovereign risk is exogenous to domestic policy choices. This makes it more difficult to address through standard adjustment programs. The resulting flight and sudden stop episodes tend to persist until fiscal stabilization is achieved and creditworthiness is restored.

3.3. Relocation toward Climatically Secure Jurisdictions

A third pathway involves the redirection, rather than the reduction, of capital flows. When climate-related disasters affect particular regions, global investors may reallocate portfolios toward economies perceived as climatically safer. The concept of a climate safe haven extends beyond physical safety from extreme weather. It encompasses robust adaptation infrastructure, limited transition risk exposure, and credible commitment to climate-resilient development. Evidence indicates that disasters in high-vulnerability emerging economies stimulate investment flows into advanced countries that are relatively safer from a climate perspective, suggesting that investors engage in a search for climatic safety [3]. The study by Ferriani and colleagues, using weekly data on financial flows to equity funds across 39 countries, finds that natural disasters have a negative effect

on net investment flows into the affected country only if the latter is an emerging economy at high climate risk. In that case, inflows also fall for other emerging countries at high climate risk in the same geographic area, suggesting heightened perception of climate risks on the part of investors, while flows to advanced countries increase, to a greater extent for those less exposed to such risks [3]. This relocation mechanism produces an asymmetric pattern in which capital exits climate-exposed countries and accumulates in sheltered destinations, generating appreciation pressures in recipient economies. This spillover dimension distinguishes climate-driven relocation from its geopolitical counterpart, where safe haven status is primarily determined by political alignment. In the climate context, physical geography and adaptive capacity play more prominent roles.

3.4. Sectoral Reallocation under Transition Policy

A fourth pathway operates through the structural transformation of the global economy away from carbon-intensive production. Climate policies, including carbon pricing, renewable energy mandates, and green finance regulations, alter the risk-return profile of entire sectors and countries. Capital flows increasingly favor economies and sectors well positioned for the green transition, while those dependent on carbon-intensive industries face structural retrenchment. This mechanism manifests in several ways. Carbon-intensive sectors such as fossil fuel extraction, heavy manufacturing, and thermal power generation experience reduced access to international capital as investors internalize transition risk and as green finance regulations constrain lending to high-carbon activities. Countries with stronger climate policies and greener energy mixes tend to attract greater capital inflows, particularly in the form of green bonds and sustainable investment funds. Divergence in environmental regulations between advanced and emerging economies can also generate an emission-shifting effect in which stricter regulations in advanced economies redirect investment toward emerging economies with weaker environmental standards, even as these same advanced economies channel green investment toward emerging economies with stronger climate policies. This dual dynamic creates complex and sometimes contradictory flow patterns that differ fundamentally from responses to climate disasters. Unlike episodic shocks, transition-policy-induced reallocation is secular and gradual, with very limited policy reversibility once regulatory frameworks and investment patterns have shifted.

4. Illustrative Cases of Climate-Related Capital Flow Disruptions

The episodes discussed below are interpreted through the pathways identified in Section 3. They serve as conceptual applications, demonstrating how the framework aids interpretation of observed capital flow dynamics.

4.1. The 2018 European Heat Wave

The severe heat wave that struck Europe in the summer of 2018 offers an instructive example of how physical climate shocks can disrupt cross-border capital flows through multiple channels simultaneously. The event caused widespread disruptions to inland waterway transport, electricity generation, and agricultural production across

several European countries. The congestion of rivers such as the Rhine, which serve as critical arteries for industrial supply chains, led to production delays that transmitted risks from the real economy to the financial sector. Research on global fund behavior during this episode found that international investors reduced their holdings in affected countries following the heat wave, with countries characterized by higher foreign exposure experiencing larger capital outflows. The deferred commitment pathway was clearly at work as investors reassessed the vulnerability of their portfolios to climate-related disruptions. The disruption proved relatively short-lived, and capital flows began to normalize as the immediate effects of the heat wave dissipated, consistent with the relatively higher reversibility that characterizes episodic physical shocks as opposed to structural transition risks.

4.2. Weather Shocks and Capital Flight from Africa

The relationship between weather shocks and capital flight from African economies illustrates the sovereign credit deterioration and deferred commitment pathways in a context of limited adaptive capacity. A study examining temperature and precipitation deviations from long-term averages found that temperature shocks lead to increased capital outflows and trade misinvoicing [5]. The long-run relationship between temperature and capital flight is conditional upon country-specific factors including reliance on oil exports, institutional frameworks, and financial infrastructure. Countries with weak state capacity experience more pronounced outflows as domestic agents and foreign investors alike respond to the compounding effects of climate stress and institutional fragility. The prevalence of trade misinvoicing, a mechanism for illicit capital movement, suggests that formal capital controls are insufficient to prevent flight when climate shocks undermine confidence in the domestic economy. This episode demonstrates how deferred commitment interacts with sovereign credit dynamics, as repeated climate shocks erode both the fiscal position and the institutional credibility of affected states, producing a self-reinforcing cycle of capital exit.

4.3. Global Climate Policy Divergence

The progressive divergence in climate policies between advanced and emerging economies illustrates the sectoral reallocation pathway. As advanced economies have intensified carbon pricing, renewable energy mandates, and climate-related financial regulations, the investment landscape has shifted in ways that affect cross-border capital flows through multiple channels. Evidence suggests that stricter environmental regulations in advanced economies lead to increased capital inflows to emerging markets with weaker green regulations, pointing to a potential emission-shifting effect. At the same time, emerging economies with greener energy mixes and stronger climate policies tend to attract greater capital inflows, particularly in the form of green bonds and sustainable investment funds. This dual dynamic creates a complex reallocation pattern that differs fundamentally from the responses observed during climate disasters. The structural nature of this reallocation implies that it is largely irreversible: once investment patterns and regulatory frameworks have shifted, a return to previous configurations is unlikely in the absence of major policy reversals.

A comparison of the three episodes reveals distinct patterns.

The European heat wave case features a relatively short-lived disruption driven primarily by the deferred commitment pathway, with capital flows normalizing as the physical shock receded. The African weather shock case demonstrates a more persistent pattern of capital flight driven by the interaction of repeated climate stress and weak institutional capacity. The climate policy divergence case is characterized by structural retrenchment and reallocation operating on a much longer time scale. Across all three, the dominant pathway aligns closely with the nature of the climate trigger, supporting the practical relevance of the classification.

5. Implications for Policy

For episodes driven by deferred commitment under climate uncertainty, policies that reduce ambiguity can help restore inflows. Transparent adaptation planning, credible climate policy frameworks, and clear communication on infrastructure resilience priorities may shorten waiting periods. Macroeconomic stabilization programs that incorporate climate adaptation measures can also reinforce credibility.

For episodes driven by sovereign credit deterioration, domestic policy options are constrained by the fiscal costs of climate disasters. Multilateral climate finance, including concessional loans and catastrophe bonds, can provide liquidity relief and reduce the risk of credit downgrades. Larger reserve buffers and diversified reserve currencies provide a degree of self-insurance against climate-induced balance of payments pressures. Given the finding that countries with higher climate vulnerability tend to receive lower foreign direct investment inflows, strengthening institutional frameworks and financial system development may help mitigate the adverse effects of climate risk on investment [4].

When relocation toward climatically secure jurisdictions generates surges, the primary challenge is managing the macroeconomic effects of large capital inflows. Countercyclical macroprudential tools, such as higher reserve requirements on non-resident deposits, can mitigate appreciation pressures and financial vulnerabilities in recipient economies. Regional coordination mechanisms may help address the spillover dimension of climate safe haven flows, given evidence that disasters in one emerging economy can reduce inflows to other high-risk economies in the same geographic area [3].

Where sectoral reallocation under transition policy is dominant, policymakers face longer-term adjustment challenges. Reduced access to capital for carbon-intensive sectors necessitates support for economic diversification and retraining programs. Deepening domestic green bond markets and strengthening regional financial integration can help offset foregone foreign financing in transition-affected sectors.

For multilateral surveillance, incorporating climate risk indicators into early warning systems for capital flow disruptions would help international financial institutions better identify emerging risks. The classification and pathway characteristics presented here can serve as a reference for structuring such enhanced surveillance. Coordinated global

climate policy action would also reduce the risk of abrupt and destabilizing reallocation shocks.

6. Conclusion

This paper has developed a conceptual framework for analyzing how climate-related disturbances affect cross-border capital flows and contribute to extreme flow episodes. By delineating four pathways, namely deferred commitment under climate uncertainty, sovereign credit deterioration after climate disasters, relocation toward climatically secure jurisdictions, and sectoral reallocation under transition policy, the study provides a structured approach to understanding the climate-capital flow nexus. The analysis demonstrates that specific flow outcomes depend on the nature of the climate trigger and the dominant pathway at work.

The classification and illustrative episodes serve as practical tools for interpreting capital flow events and guiding preliminary policy assessment. The framework yields testable propositions, such as the expectation that sovereign-credit-driven flight is less reversible than deferred-commitment-driven flight, or that climate safe haven surges concentrate in economies with high adaptive capacity. Existing evidence provides preliminary support for several of these propositions. The finding that natural disasters in high-climate-risk emerging economies redirect investment toward advanced economies [3], that climate vulnerability is associated with lower FDI inflows [4], and that temperature shocks trigger capital outflows and trade misinvoicing [5] all align with the pathways developed here. In an environment where climate factors increasingly influence financial decisions, a clear conceptual understanding complements empirical analysis and encourages further investigation into the climate dimensions of global capital flows.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge the Natural Science Foundation of Henan Province of China (Grant No. 262300422684) and the Doctoral Research Startup Fund of Henan Normal University (Grant No. 5101089171838).

References

- [1] Forbes, K. J., & Warnock, F. E. (2012). Capital flow waves: Surges, stops, flight, and retrenchment. *Journal of International Economics*, 88(2), 235–251.
- [2] Deng, C., Xie, J., & Zhao, X. (2023). Analysis of the impact of global uncertainty on abnormal cross-border capital flows. *International Review of Economics & Finance*, 87, 338–346.
- [3] Ferriani, F., Gazzani, A., & Natoli, F. (2023). Flight to climatic safety: Local natural disasters and global portfolio flows. Bank of Italy Temi di Discussione Working Paper No. 1420.
- [4] Shear, F., Ashraf, B. N., & Butt, S. (2023). Sensing the heat: Climate change vulnerability and foreign direct investment inflows. *Research in International Business and Finance*, 66, 102005.
- [5] Li, X., Lu, X., & Xie, W. (2024). Climate change in Europe and international portfolio allocation: Micro-level evidence from global funds. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 38(5), 1928–1955.