

Bank Leverage, Welfare, and Regulation

Anat R. Admati

Graduate School of Business, Stanford University

Martin F. Hellwig

Max Planck Institute for Research on Collective Goods, Bonn

September 27, 2018

Abstract

We take issue with claims that the funding mix of banks, which makes them fragile and crisis-prone, is efficient because it reflects special liquidity benefits of bank debt. Even aside from neglecting the systemic damage to the economy that banks' distress and default cause, such claims are invalid because banks have multiple small creditors and are unable to commit effectively to their overall funding mix and investment strategy *ex ante*. The resulting market outcomes under *laissez-faire* are inefficient and involve excessive borrowing, with default risks that jeopardize the purported liquidity benefits. Contrary to claims in the literature that "equity is expensive" and that regulation requiring more equity in the funding mix entails costs to society, such regulation actually helps create useful commitment for banks to avoid the inefficiently high borrowing that comes under *laissez-faire*. Effective regulation is beneficial even without considering systemic risk; if such regulation also reduces systemic risk, the benefits are even larger.

Keywords: Liquidity in banking, leverage in banking, banking regulation, capital structure, capital regulations, agency costs, commitment, contracting, maturity rat race, leverage ratchet effect, Basel.

JEL Classification: D004, D53, D61, G01, G18, G21, G24, G28, G32, G38, H81, K23

Bank Leverage, Welfare, and Regulation

Anat R. Admati and Martin F. Hellwig*

September 27, 2018

1. Introduction

Banks tend to rely much more heavily on debt for their funding, i.e., to have significantly more financial leverage than other firms. Moreover, much of their debt is short-term or demandable. This funding mix makes banks fragile. If there is a lot of debt, even small losses can cause insolvency. Moreover, if much of the debt is short-term, there is a significant risk creditors will become concerned about potential default and the bank will lose funding. These two problems are linked, because concerns about insolvency are a major reason creditors might lose trust and withdraw their funds.

The financial system has also become increasingly complex in recent decades with the advent of derivatives, securitization, and globalization. Financial institutions are much more interconnected, and systemic risks have increased. Through various contagion mechanisms, distress or insolvency are likely to affect many institutions at the same time, and even one default may create a cascade of distress and affect the entire economy.

In the aftermath of the financial crisis of 2007-2009, bank regulators moved to reform the rules meant to restrain banks' leverage and the extent of the mismatch between the maturities of their assets and their liabilities. "Basel III," the international accord on banking regulation signed in 2010 imposed new rules concerning the maturity structure of banks' liabilities in relation to their assets.

Basel III still allows banks to fund 97 percent of their assets with debt. Yet, the banking industry lobbies strongly to reduce equity requirements even today. The mantras often used are "equity is expensive" and "credit and growth will suffer", suggesting that safety in banking comes at a cost and that society would have to sacrifice some of the benefits of the banking system if regulations require more equity in the funding mix.

Many of the arguments and warnings made by industry lobbies and others in this discussion are flawed. In particular, those who fight equity regulation often argue on the basis of private costs of

* This is an unedited draft of a chapter in the book, forthcoming in fall 2019, *Systemic Risk in the Financial Sector: Ten Years After the Great Crash*, edited by Douglas W. Arner, Emiliós Avgouleas, Danny Busch and Steven L. Schwarcz, CIGI Press, forthcoming, fall 2019. Anat Admati, is from the Graduate School of Business, Stanford University; Martin Hellwig is from the Max Planck Institute for Research on Collective Goods, Bonn. We are grateful to Paul Pfleiderer and Steven Schwarcz for helpful comments.

the regulation to banks and their loan customers without considering the benefits of the regulation to the banks' creditors, taxpayers, and the rest of the economy.

Some researchers have suggested that banks' choosing extremely fragile funding mixes is efficient. For example, bank debt is said to provide its holders with special benefits because it is liquid and can be used for payments at any time. Given these benefits, the more debt the bank issues, the better the outcomes are said to be.¹

However, the conclusion that high leverage of banks is desirable depends critically on special and unrealistic assumptions in the makeup of the models that are used to support the argument. If these assumptions are modified to make them more realistic, the conclusions are overturned. In fact, the banks' choices that we observe are much better explained by the incentives they have to act in ways that harm others and by their inability to commit to behavior that avoids the harm.

When managers and shareholders take actions to benefit themselves, the costs and risks are likely to be borne by creditors or taxpayers. Managers might be motivated to use debt and avoid equity because compensation structures reward risk and leverage or because tax subsidies and explicit or implicit government guarantees make debt more attractive than equity funding.² If excessive borrowing cannot be prevented by commitments to existing or prior lenders or by regulation the outcome can be very inefficient, a far cry from the standard view that *laissez-faire* yields efficient outcomes.

The conclusion that the funding mix under *laissez-faire* in banking is inefficient as it involves excessive borrowing holds even if we consider only the interests of the banks' investors (shareholders and creditors) and ignore the risks and potential harm to the rest of the financial system and the overall economy. The need for effective leverage regulation to counter the distorted incentives and to commit banks to avoiding excessive borrowing follows immediately. If in addition the regulation reduces systemic risk, the benefits are even larger.

Full commitment would require that contracts specify decisions and actions, including actions concerning additional funding, for every possible future situation.³ Moreover, the covenants detailing these decisions and actions must be enforceable. Enforceability in turn presumes that the decisions and actions and the situations in which they are to be taken can be observed by creditors and, in the case

¹ See, in particular, Gorton (2010), Gorton and Winton (2016), DeAngelo and Stulz (2015).

² Bank managers and executives are often compensated on the basis of Return on Equity (ROE). As we explain in Admati and Hellwig (2013a, Chapter 8), such compensation structure encourages excessive risk taking and borrowing. Tax subsidies and explicit and implicit guarantees and subsidies also encourage, enable and reward borrowing and discourage the use of equity. See Admati et al. (2013a, Section 2, 2018), Admati and Hellwig (2013a, Chapter 9) and Admati (2014).

³ The observation that this requirement is quite unrealistic is the starting point of the so-called *theory of incomplete contracts*; see, for example, Hart (1995).

of recourse to the legal system, verified by the courts. These presumptions may hold if covenants are simple and specific enough, but in that case the covenants may be so rigid that they do not allow the contracting parties to respond efficiently to changes in the economic environment. If covenants are complex, however, enforcement may require the creditors to devote significant resources to monitoring the firm and to influencing the borrower's ongoing behavior. When there are many creditors, any one of them may not have any strong incentives to do so, and the scope for this creditor to actually influence the borrower's behavior may be small.

The problem of how to assure creditors that their trust will not be abused concerns all firms, but is particularly difficult for financial institutions, especially banks. Whereas a typical non-financial company has only a few lenders with relatively large positions, a typical bank obtains funding from thousands or even millions of lenders, each of whom is small relative to the bank. Because their number is small, the lenders to a non-financial company are better able coordinate in on monitoring and control in their common interest. Such coordination is all but impossible for the lenders to a bank.

The fragmentation of lenders is not only a source of coordination problems in monitoring and control. This fragmentation is also a reason why banks borrow excessively, beyond the level they would choose with an effective *ex ante* commitment. For suppose that an already indebted bank negotiates with a new lender, out of sight of the other lenders. The additional debt harms the other lenders because they face a higher default risk and possibly lower returns in the event of default. The new lender may be willing to provide the additional loan if the promised interest is high enough or the loan is secured with collateral, but then the other lenders are hurt by the increase in default risk and the separation of the collateral from the set of assets available to creditors in default. If the damage to the other lenders exceeds the benefits to the bank and the new lender, the total social cost of the additional loan is larger than its benefits. If, in addition, the new loan imposes risks and costs on the rest of the financial system and on taxpayers, the inefficiency is even greater.

Effective leverage regulation can improve on *laissez-faire* outcomes by providing a mechanism of commitment. If supervision enforces the regulation, banks are effectively prevented from borrowing as much as they would under *laissez-faire* if they are unable to commit to a limit on their overall borrowing. In reality, the usefulness of regulation as a commitment device is even greater because creditors who expect to be paid by the government through deposit insurance or bailouts have even weaker incentives to monitor. Leverage regulation in effect serves as substitute for the debt covenants that depositors and other lenders are unable to put in place and enforce in order to commit the bank to be sufficiently safe.

2. The Inefficiency of *Laissez-Faire* in Banking

We start our discussion of the welfare implications of banks' funding by considering an important and special function of banks' debt, namely that it provides liquidity to banks' creditors. That is, in addition to the monetary returns that deposits and other short-term debt provide to their holders, the depositors and short-term creditors of banks attach a special value to their ability to convert their claims into cash quickly and to use them for payments.

Depositors count on the liquidity benefits from bank debt, but these benefits are not available if the bank is in default or in bankruptcy and if there are no outside support mechanisms, e.g. government guarantees, ensuring that the banks' services continue to be provided without disruption. If the bank is heavily indebted and its asset returns are uncertain, bankruptcy and a loss of liquidity benefits is a real risk. This risk is greatly reduced when the bank uses a substantial amount of equity in funding itself, which directly supports the safety of deposits and enhances the liquidity benefits they provide.⁴ In the absence of government support, prospective depositors and other market participants who are aware of these issues might therefore insist that banks have substantial equity funding, and the banks might actually want to use substantial equity funding as a means to attracting deposits.

The question then is whether arrangements under *laissez-faire* are likely to be efficient. In the following, we will argue that market outcomes under *laissez-faire* will actually involve inefficiently high levels of bank indebtedness. This inefficiency is likely to arise even if bank failures impose no collateral damage to third parties, such as taxpayers. Equity regulation can therefore improve on market outcomes. The inefficiencies we identify provide an additional rationale for regulation on top of the harms banks can inflict on the economy.

2.1 The Impact of Creditor Fragmentation

The terms under which the bank can raise debt and equity are in part determined by "expected returns" that must be offered to compensate these claimholders for their foregoing other investment opportunities and for accepting to bear the risks of the claims they acquire. For depositors and short-term debt holders the terms are also based in part on the liquidity benefits they receive as long as the bank does not go into default. Because of these liquidity benefits, depositors and short-term lenders will be willing to accept a lower interest rate than they would if they only consider the promised debt

⁴ For a thorough discussion of this point, see Admati and Hellwig (2013 a, Chapter 10).

payment. *Prima facie*, therefore, as long as the bank does not default, funding by debt that provides liquidity may seem like a particularly cheap source of funding.^{5 6}

However, if the bank funds itself almost entirely with debt, its default probability will be very high. For a given value of asset holdings, the greater is the bank's obligation to debt holders, the greater is the default probability. With a greater probability of default, the liquidity benefits are less likely to materialize, and investors will ask for higher interest to compensate for this loss. The bank's initial owners thus face a tradeoff: whereas debt funding appears like a cheap source of funding for fixed liquidity benefits, the per-dollar cost of debt funding itself may be lower if the bank has issued more equity, because the increase in expected liquidity benefits provides additional compensation to the creditors.

What funding mix will arise under *laissez-faire*? The answer depends among other things on the way the bank and its investors arrive at the terms of funding. If the bank is able to fully commit *ex ante* to a funding policy, which determines the fraction of its investments that it will fund by borrowing and the implied payment obligations to debt holders, and to an investment policy, which determines the risk of its assets, and if these commitments are binding, then prospective creditors and equity investors will be able to assess the bank's default probability and the prospects for monetary returns to debt and equity and the liquidity benefits of debt properly when they must do so. The investors will provide funding if the offered terms are attractive enough.

The bank's commitment to a funding policy and an investment policy is similar to the announcement of a quality specification for a car or any other good that can be provided in different qualities. The funding and asset policies are effectively quality parameters that determine the bank's default probability and the prospect that liquidity benefits will be enjoyed. If *ex ante* commitments of banks are in fact binding and if there is no additional collateral harm from bank defaults, then market outcomes under *laissez-faire* may be presumed to be efficient, or at least no less efficient than outcomes in any other market in which suppliers must choose the quality as well as the price of objects put on the market. In such markets, suppliers find that, although higher quality is more expensive to provide, it may still be worthwhile to do so if buyers are willing to pay for it.

Will market outcomes under *laissez-faire* and binding commitments involve the use of equity by banks? Of course, in the very special case where the bank's assets are entirely safe with no risk of losses and thus of default, there would be no point in issuing equity. In that special case, creditors

⁵ This consideration leads DeAngelo and Stulz (2015) to claim that "high leverage is optimal for banks."

⁶ Liquidity provision may involve some costs, for branches, ATMs, and payment services. However, the bank can also charge fees for its services. In one form or the other, depositors are willing to pay a premium for the liquidity benefits that the bank provides.

would enjoy the liquidity benefit from bank debt for sure and equity does not enhance the quality of the debt. If the banks' assets are risky though, we can expect banks to issue some equity as well as debt, thus enhancing the likelihood that creditors enjoy the liquidity benefits.

However, the assumption that banks can make binding commitments concerning their funding and investment policies is highly unrealistic. In practice there are only very limited ways in which the bank can make legally binding commitments concerning the various decisions that affect its default risk and the likelihood that creditors will be deprived of liquidity benefits. Moreover, such commitments are likely to fail because the banks will have both the incentives and the ability to break their promises and it is unlikely that depositors and short-term creditors will be in a position to enforce the commitments and control banks' behavior.

To see this point, note that bank debt funding generally comes from numerous small investors. This fragmentation of funding is obvious in the case of depositors and not much different when it comes to bank funding by money market funds and other wholesale investors. Reserve Primary, the money market fund that was effectively destroyed by the Lehman Brothers bankruptcy, provides an example. Reserve Primary had provided only between one and two thousandth of Lehman Brothers' total funding, some \$ 800 million out of more than \$ 600 billion; the rest was held by many other creditors with similarly small positions. The fragmentation of creditors makes it hard or even impossible for creditors to coordinate their actions. Any one creditor acting in his own interest is unlikely to take account of the collective interests of creditors as a whole.

To understand the implications of fragmentation, suppose that a bank has issued equity and debt in accordance with some previously announced funding mix. Consider a negotiation that a bank might have with a prospective new lender and assume that it takes place out of sight of other investors. If the bank proposes to borrow more without also raising additional equity, the prospective creditor will agree if bank provides him with compensation of protection for the extra risk. Compensation may take the form of a higher interest rate, protection the form of collateral for this particular loan that is separated out from the other assets.⁷

Can the bank and the prospective new creditor find terms to which they both agree? The answer is typically yes. If the new loan is small relative to the total amount the bank borrows, the increase in indebtedness has only a small effect on the bank's default risk. From the lender's perspective, the risk of losing liquidity benefits because of a default is hardly different than it is for the other lenders. However, the benefit the creditor obtains from the higher interest rate or from the collateral protecting

⁷ Admati and Hellwig (2013a, Chapter 10).

his loan is significant by effectively prioritizing the creditor. From the bank's perspective, the additional debt funding increases the returns to shareholder in the event where there is no default.

The underlying reason both the bank and the prospective new lender are willing to come to an agreement is that the costs of the agreement are largely borne by the bank's *other* lenders, whose interests neither the new lender nor the bank's shareholders or managers internalize.⁸ Other lenders suffer because the bank is more likely to go into default and because their returns in the event of default are diluted by the new debt.

Lenders may anticipate such behavior. Each lender will form expectations about what may be going on in the negotiations with other lenders and what the overall debt ratio and the default probability will be. However, if the lenders cannot coordinate their behaviors, each negotiation will proceed on the pattern just described. The problem arises regardless of whether negotiations take place sequentially, at different times, or at the same time, with different lenders in different places.⁹ Relative to the outcomes that would be achieved in a world with binding commitments, the overall *laissez-faire* outcome with fragmented negotiations will involve more borrowing, higher interest promises, higher default probabilities, and lower levels of welfare, due in particular to a lower expectation of liquidity benefits from bank debt.

The fragmentation of lenders and the banks' inability to commit fully to their overall funding policies create an additional conflict of interest between the banks and their lenders and ultimately an inefficient market outcome. Statutory regulation, such as an equity requirement, help create a substitute for the missing ability to commit in the *laissez-faire* environment and it can raise welfare by effectively committing the bank to a safer funding mix that enables more reliable liquidity provision and prevents the harm of excessive borrowing and risk of default. The increase in the share of equity in the funding mix also reduces incentives to pursue excessively risky investment policies, which mitigates the effects of the lack of commitment on that side as well.

In some circumstances, it may not even matter what the equity requirement is. For example, the *laissez-faire* outcome may involve little or no equity and a very high default probability so that, in expected-value terms, the liquidity benefits of debt are close to zero. In this case, there is a wide range of values for equity as a fraction of assets that would allow for bank debt to generate greater liquidity benefits, and *any* regulation requiring the share of equity in bank funding to lie in this range would increase welfare relative to *laissez-faire*.

⁸ Admati et al. (2018).

⁹ Brunnermeier and Oehmke (2013).

2.2 Leverage Dynamics

If banks engage with lenders sequentially over time (as actual banks do), the fragmentation of lenders is unavoidable. In this case there is an obvious conflict of interest between lenders in earlier debt contracts and lenders in subsequent debt contracts. Prior coordination between these different lenders is not possible if later lenders are not yet present at the time that earlier contracts are concluded.

In this setting, at any date, incumbent debt holders from older contracts may be like sitting ducks that can be taken advantage of by the borrower and new lenders. Debt covenants are meant to create some commitment, but may be ineffective or very costly to write and enforce. If they are effective, they may also prevent the borrower from reacting appropriately to changing circumstances.

If new lenders are not concerned about being themselves negatively affected by subsequent funding choices, then the bank would prefer to increase the amount of debt and harm these creditors later. If potential new lenders are concerned about being negatively affected by subsequent funding choices, they will try to protect themselves as best they can, for example by insisting on higher interest rates.

Admati et al. (2018) explores the forces that affect the choice of funding mix once debt is in place. In this paper, with coauthors Peter DeMarzo and Paul Pfleiderer, we show that if a firm has a one-time opportunity to adjust its funding mix without such an adjustment affecting the previous terms under which it obtained funding, it is *never* in the shareholders' interest to use this opportunity to reduce indebtedness, for example by raising new equity and buying back debt. By contrast, it is *always* in the shareholders' interest to increase the amount of debt in the funding mix, for example by making payouts to shareholders or by issuing new debt that is senior to or *pari passu* with existing debt. If there is a tax advantage to additional debt, it is in the shareholders' interest to increase indebtedness even if new debt must be junior to all existing debt. These conclusions hold no matter how heavily the corporation is already indebted and independent of the costs associated with bankruptcy, which shareholders do not bear because of limited liability.

Admati et al. (2018) also show that what they refer to as the *leverage ratchet effect* creates corporate funding dynamics in which shareholders choose to increase indebtedness when exogenous changes make borrowing more attractive but never choose to reduce indebtedness. If creditors are apprehensive about subsequent increases in leverage and charge higher interest to the borrower, initial indebtedness may be relatively low, but even then, indebtedness will eventually become inefficiently high when the ratchet dynamics play out.¹⁰

¹⁰ For an illustration of the argument, including the game-theoretic analysis of borrower-lender interactions in randomly changing environments, see Section 3 of Admati et al. (2018).

Creditors might try to protect themselves by writing covenants, but unless additional borrowing is precluded altogether, creditors can be diluted through the issuance of new debt with shorter maturities, which becomes effectively senior to all debt having longer remaining maturities. To avoid becoming victims of this effect, lenders might themselves want to insist on short maturities from the beginning. Brunnermeier and Oehmke (2013) show that, under *laissez-faire*, the resulting *maturity race* leads to outcomes with very short maturities only even though welfare might be higher if maturities were longer and banks less fragile. Moreover Admati et al. (2018) show that, even when maturities are very short, the leverage ratchet dynamics tend to drive debt to inefficiently high levels. As mentioned above, even if any newly issued debt must be junior to all existing debt, the leverage ratchet dynamics come in as long as an increase in debt generates additional tax benefits.

2.3 The Weakness of Creditor-Imposed Discipline

It has been suggested by some that the prominence of short-term funding of banks is useful because the fear of withdrawals by creditors imposes discipline on bank managers.¹¹ In fact, fragmented creditors, particularly if they can withdraw their funds easily, have little incentive to invest in monitoring banks' risks from additional borrowing or from their investments. Moreover, in virtually all jurisdictions depositors are currently protected by deposit insurance, which eliminates any incentives for them to monitor at all.

Money market funds and other wholesale lenders usually ask for collateral as a means of protection. When banks use collateral to obtain funding, the lender is not concerned about the bank's overall leverage but is instead focused on the "haircut" that is imposed, which is the difference between the value of the collateral and the size of the loan they are making. If lending takes the form of a so-called repo contract, with the fiction that the collateral is "sold" to the lender and "repurchased" by the borrowing institution on the following day or week, lenders are even exempt from a stay in bankruptcy through "safe harbor" rules, so they feel even safer than secured lenders in other contexts.¹²

Monitoring incentives would be stronger if there were no deposit insurance and if there was no exemption of collateral from bankruptcy proceedings.¹³ But even then, it is unlikely that monitoring would work well because of free-rider problems. Why should a lender invest in monitoring to impose

¹¹ Diamond and Rajan (2001), French et al. (2010).

¹² The insulation of collateral from the effects of bankruptcy comes at the expense of those lenders whose claims are settled in bankruptcy proceedings. It is thus another example for the possibility that the borrower and a new lender can write contracts at the expense of other lenders. The effect is particularly strong when, in the run-up to a possible bankruptcy, repo lenders insist on lever larger haircuts.

¹³ Of course, in that case, there might be inefficient runs that can take down even a healthy bank, as shown by Diamond and Dybvig (1983).

discipline on management when the benefits of such discipline will accrue to all lenders rather than just to himself or herself? Investment in monitoring might allow the lender to be first in line to get his money back, but in that case the investment in monitoring is only worthwhile if there is a significant chance of things going wrong so that this ability is worthy enough to cover the cost. But of course, the whole idea that banks' debt provides liquidity is predicated on the likelihood of default being small or zero so that deposits are "informationally insensitive" and reliably useful for making payments.¹⁴

If the bank's shares are listed on a public exchange, lenders might actually free-ride on the information contained in stock prices. Since shareholders returns are very sensitive to the returns on the banks' assets, shareholders have strong incentives to invest in information and this information is potentially valuable at all times, not just when things go badly. The information they gather affects stock prices, so stock prices provide a free source of information on how the bank is doing. For lenders, it makes sense to look at the borrower's stock prices and not to invest in monitoring at all if stock prices indicate that all is well. In such a situation, there is no reason to expect uninsured depositors and short-term bank lenders to impose discipline on bank managers and prevent the managers from increasing the bank's leverage.

The experience of the decade before the financial crisis of 2007-2009 accords with our analysis of leverage dynamics without creditor discipline. During this decade, the leverage of large banks went up significantly, without any imposition of discipline by debt holders. Share prices went up until the crisis broke. In the case of Lehman Brothers, the final run by money market lenders was triggered by a stock market fund manager selling the stock short and announcing that Lehman had large hidden losses – monitoring by stock market investors rather than debt holders.¹⁵

3. The Social Costs and Benefits of Leverage Regulation

The discussion above suggests that markets fail to produce an efficient level of leverage for banks even in the absence of systemic effects and the potential damage that bank failures can cause to the financial system and to the overall economy. If the possibility of bank failures creates systemic risk and harms un-related third parties, this collateral harm provides an additional compelling reason for considering *laissez-faire* to be inefficient.

¹⁴ See Gorton (2010). In Admati and Hellwig (2013b), we give an extensive discussion of the tension between the "liquidity explanation" of bank funding by short-term debt, which requires this debt to be information insensitive, and the "discipline explanation", which requires debt holders to take an interest in constant monitoring.

¹⁵ See Admati and Hellwig (2013b) and Admati et al (2013, Section 5).

Regulation that constrains banks' use of debt can address these market failures. Such regulation provides a substitute for the missing commitment powers of banks in their interactions with their creditors. The commitment created by equity regulation enables banks to provide liquidity and make loans more reliably to their creditors by being safer.

Equity regulation also serves to constrain systemic risk and harms to third parties that are caused by bank failures and bank distress. In particular, if the government uses deposit insurance and other guarantees to contain such damage and to ensure the liquidity of deposits, there is a *prima facie* case for regulation to reduce the expected costs of such protection and counter the incentives the bank has to take more risk and engage in more borrowing in order to increase the value of the insurance relative to its cost. As discussed above, deposit insurance eliminates incentives for depositors to engage in monitoring or to impose covenants that would restrict banks' risk taking and borrowing, thus exacerbating the other effects. In a sense, therefore, regulations play the role of the debt covenants that would have been written by depositors as unsecured creditors who benefit greatly from safe banks but are unable to compel the bank to protect their interests. Constraining the extent of bank borrowing thus helps banks perform all their usual functions, including liquidity creation and lending.

Regulation to reduce banks' indebtedness and increase its reliance on equity produces another benefit by reducing the distortions of investment decisions that are caused by heavy borrowing. It is well known that, corporations are heavily indebted, the conflict of interest between shareholders and creditors causes inefficient investment decisions that reduce the overall value of the heavily indebted firm. First, heavily indebted firms may choose to shift risk to creditors by making risky investments that benefit shareholders while reducing the value of creditors' claims, because shareholders benefit fully from the upside while sharing the downside with creditors. Second, the shareholders of heavily indebted corporations may avoid taking worthy investments that are relatively safe. This avoidance occurs because some of the value created by the investment may accrue to the creditors because their claims become less risky and more likely to be paid in full. When banks are distressed, they frequently stop lending, which creates a credit crunch that also motivates bailouts and other forms of support. With more equity, this problem too would be alleviated.

Finally, when banks incur losses and face trouble in rolling over their short-term funding, they may engage in selling assets even at distressed "fire-sale" prices. The less equity the bank employs, the larger is the fraction of the equity that any given loss in the asset value causes, and the higher the fraction of the assets the bank would sell to continue to make the payments it owes. If many institutions sell assets at the same time and these assets are opaque, asset price declines exacerbate the weakness and make the situation worse. It is thus more likely that lending to businesses and households might

freeze and, again, bailouts and supports might have to be provided, as they were in October 2008. With more equity, the “fire-sale” dynamics would be much weaker, and bailouts might not be needed.

Since the benefits of regulation that require banks to use much more equity are so substantial, are there significant social costs associated with such regulations? If regulations prevented banks from taking on *any* debt, it would preclude their taking deposits and providing liquidity, since deposits are a form of debt. However, the equity requirements that we have are very far from such an extreme. Basel III still requires banks to fund at least three percent of their assets with equity, so they may fund up to 97 percent with debt. An increase in the required ratio for equity relative to assets can be realized by raising more equity, without any change in the amount of borrowing. The additional equity makes banks safer and thereby enhances the liquidity benefits that investors obtain from their deposits and other forms of short-term debt.

As we show in detail in Admati et al. (2013) and Admati and Hellwig (2013a, 2013b, 2015), the costs associated with significantly higher equity requirements are entirely private to the banks’ managers and shareholders, because with more equity they are less able to benefit from tax and other subsidies and are less able to shift risks and costs to taxpayers and the public. These subsidies are provided to banks only when they borrow. Reducing the subsidies by the use of more equity entails no social cost. While elimination of these subsidies has often been stated as an objective of the reforms undertaken after the crisis and many bankers and policymakers claim that implicit subsidies are no longer present, empirical studies show that the subsidies are still substantial.¹⁶ The persisting implicit and explicit guarantees continue to weaken investor monitoring and create moral hazard and distortions.

An increase in equity requirements does not actually force banks to reduce their funding by deposits or other short-term liabilities and the liquidity benefits that investors love. Banks could also raise additional equity in the market, or, with a lapse of time, increase their equity internally by retaining profits without reducing their deposit funding. They might use the additional funds for additional lending or for buying additional assets in the open market. As was shown by Admati et al. (2012), the latter can be done without adverse incentive effects on bank managers.¹⁷

¹⁶ See, for example, Kelly et al. (2016), and Gudmundsson (2016). Admati (2014) discusses the challenge of estimating the subsidies.

¹⁷ See also Admati et al. (2013, Section 7). Note that, if the funds raised by issuing equity are invested in the open markets for shares and debt securities of other firms, the operation need not involve any net inflow of cash into banks. The question of where would all the new equity funding come from would be moot because the cash raised would be given back to the market right away. The only thing that changes is the structure of ownership of claims to returns from the different firms in the markets.

In the political debate, banks often claim that equity is expensive, so that, if equity requirements are tightened, the rates they charge for their loans would increase and some loans will not be made altogether. However, loans should be made at appropriate rates that reflect the actual social costs of the funds being lent. From the perspective of society as a whole, low interest rates on bank loans are not necessarily desirable. If loan rates are low because of tax benefits and government subsidies through guarantees, bank lending to households and businesses may actually be excessive and wasteful. The expansion of mortgage lending in the years 2002-2007 in the US, Spain, Ireland and elsewhere provides an example. The ultimate social costs were enormous.

If policymakers determine that bank loans are too expensive or that too few are made in a particular area (e.g., to small and medium enterprises), the proper remedy would be to intervene and target this problem directly, for example by subsidizing specific forms bank lending in certain circumstances. Doing so is better than providing blanket subsidies to bank borrowing and allowing banks significant discretion in how to use the funds, which can result in them gambling in securities market instead of making “boring” business loans.

There have been many attempts made to support the mantra “equity is expensive” in banking. In past writings such as Admati et al. (2013), we classified the claims and arguments that are put forwards as “fallacies, irrelevant facts, and myths,” where “irrelevant facts” involved claims referring to private, rather than social costs and benefits of equity funding and “myths” involved theoretical models explaining why “banks have to fund with short-term debt.”¹⁸ Most of the myths appear to represent an exercise in “reverse engineering” as discussed in Pfleiderer (2018). They also reflect the presumption that *laissez-faire* outcomes are efficient. As we have argued here, this presumption is unwarranted.

4. Concluding Remarks

At a conference at a central bank some time ago, Martin Hellwig was asked why he was dissatisfied with the regulatory reforms that have been implemented since 2008. In reply, he in turn asked, whether the crisis would have been avoided if all the reforms that have been introduced since 2008 had already been implemented in 2000. A former central bank governor who listened in immediately said “No!” Ten years after the Lehman Brothers bankruptcy, many of the key drivers of the crisis are still present, and the financial system changed too little and is still is unsafe. The repeated

¹⁸ In Admati and Hellwig (2013a) we called the flawed claims “the bankers’ new clothes”, arguments that lack valid substance. In Admati and Hellwig (2015), we inspected the continuing “parade of bankers’ new clothes, debunking 31 flawed claims.

claim by policymakers that the system is safer now is akin to claiming that roads are safer if the speed limit for trucks loaded with explosives is lowered from 100 miles per hour to 90 miles per hour – safer it is, but still unconscionably unsafe.

The massive supports that governments and central banks provided to banks and many other financial institutions in the crisis succeeded at preventing the implosion of the financial system and staving another Great Depression. One consequence of the success was that the industry and its lobbyists hardly lost their ability influence policy in ways that benefit the industry but harm the public. They continued to advise governments, parliaments, and regulators on the path of reform almost as if the crisis never happened. Their influence contributed significantly to the weakness of Basel III, with warnings about the impact of equity requirements on lending and growth having an impact even though most of them involved fallacies, irrelevant facts, and myths.¹⁹

The reform of equity regulation, which in our view is the most powerful tool for supporting financial stability and reducing systemic risk as well as distorted decisions, did not receive much public attention. Negotiations for Basel III took place behind closed doors in the Basel Committee for Banking Supervision and were effectively completed before the public in most countries had even become aware of the matter. These negotiations were not based on any deep scrutiny of the causes of the crisis; in fact the new Basel Accord was concluded even before any of the official inquiries into the causes of the crises had been completed.²⁰ In November 2010, a letter to the *Financial Times* from 20 leading academics in the area of banking of finance, including (by now) two Nobel laureates, protested the inadequacy of Basel III and called for requiring equity to be at least fifteen percent of total assets (compared to three percent in Basel III).²¹

Confusion, willful blindness, and conflicted interests on the part of many have combined to maintain a financial system in which incentives to harm and to take risks at the expense of others are insufficiently disciplined by either regulation or market forces. The enablers of this system include

¹⁹ In May 2010, a particularly outrageous statement from the British Bankers Association asserted that the Basel proposals would require British banks to “hold” more equity amounting to 700 billion pounds, and that this amount would not be available for lending. Since equity is a mode of funding rather than a cash reserve, this claim was outright nonsense. The lobby’s willingness to use such nonsense was witness to their sense of mastery of the proceedings. Connaughton (2012) quotes Paul Volcker, past Chair of the Federal Reserve, telling Senator Ted Kaufman in January 2010 “just about whatever anyone proposes, no matter what it is, the banks will come out and claim that it will restrict credit and harm the economy.... It’s all bullshit.”

²⁰ For example, the report of the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission appointed by the US Congress (FCIC 2011) came out after Basel III had been agreed upon and after the Dodd Frank Act has been signed into law.

²¹ In an Op-Ed the next day in the same paper, the CEO of Citigroup argued that “we must rethink Basel or growth will suffer,” illustrating the uphill battle of anyone trying to take on the industry on.

individuals from across the private sector and government institutions, as well as some economists and media.²²

Whereas the enablers argue that equity is “expensive,” it is actually the inefficiently high leverage and the inadequate levels of equity in banking that are expensive for society. Properly designed equity requirements are needed to deal with this problem.²³ The industry is strongly opposed to such requirements because they restrict the banks’ ability to borrow and take risks at the expense of creditors and taxpayers. When economists suggest that *laissez-faire* in banking is efficient and imply or state that equity regulation is harmful or expensive, they echo some of the flawed claims of the lobby. As we have shown, claims that *laissez-faire* in banking is efficient rest on special and unrealistic modelling assumptions. Once these assumption are brought closer to reality and the implications of creditor fragmentation and weak commitment powers are considered, high leverage in banking is seen to reflect distortions rather than the mandate of efficiency.

References

- Admati, Anat R., Franklin Allen, Richard Brealey, Michael Brennan, Markus K. Brunnermeier, Arnoud Boot, John H. Cochrane, Peter M. DeMarzo, Eugene F. Fama, Michael Fishman, Charles Goodhart, Martin F. Hellwig, Hayne Leland, Stewart C. Myers, Paul Pfleiderer, Jean Charles Rochet, Stephen A. Ross, William F. Sharpe, Chester S. Spatt, and Anjan Thakor (2010), “Healthy Banking System is the Goal, Not Profitable Banks,” *Financial Times*, Nov. 9.
- Admati, Anat R., Peter Conti-Brown, and Paul Pfleiderer. 2012. “Liability Holding Companies.” *UCLA Law Review* 852: 852–913
- Admati, Anat R. 2014. “Examining the GAO Report on Expectations of Government Support for Bank Holding Companies,” Testimony for hearing of Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection, July 31, 2014.
- . 2016. “The Missed Opportunity and Challenge of Capital Regulation.” *National Institute Economic Review*, February, R4-R14.
- . 2017. “It Takes a Village to Maintain a Dangerous Financial System,” *Just Financial Markets? Finance in a Just Society*, Lisa Herzog, editor, Oxford University Press.

²² As described by Admati (2017), the enablers of the dangerous financial system include individuals from across the private sector and government institutions, as well as some economists and media. After discussing the action and inaction of the enablers and their moral disengagement, she concludes that “change is possible, but it will take a village to repair a financial system.” A major challenge comes from the use of confusing jargon to exclude much of the public, and the politics of banking, where politicians tend to view banks as a source of funding and do not have enough incentives to care about risk.

²³ For a detailed discussion of the flaws in the existing design of capital regulations under Basel III, specific steps that can be taken immediately, and related policy recommendations see Admati and Hellwig (2013a, Chapter 11) and Admati (2016).

- Admati, Anat R., Peter M. DeMarzo, Martin F. Hellwig, and Paul Pfleiderer. 2013. "Fallacies, Irrelevant Facts, and Myths in the Discussion of Capital Regulation: Why Bank Equity Is Not Socially Expensive." Working Paper (original draft August, 2010).
- . 2018. "The Leverage Ratchet Effect." *Journal of Finance*
- Admati, Anat R. and Martin F. Hellwig. 2013a. *The Bankers' New Clothes: What's Wrong with Banking and What to Do About It*. Princeton University Press.
- . "Does Debt Discipline Bankers? An Academic Myth about Bank Indebtedness." 2013b. Working paper.
- . 2015. "The Parade of Bankers' New Clothes Continues: 31 Flawed Claims Debunked." Working paper.
- Brunnermeier, Markus, and Martin Oehmke. 2013. "The Maturity Rat Race," *Journal of Finance*, 68:483-521.
- Connaughton, Jeff. 2012. *Payoff: Why Wall Street Always Wins*, Prospecta Press.
- DeAngelo, Harry, and René M. Stulz. 2015. "Liquid-claim production, risk management, and bank capital structure: Why high leverage is optimal for banks." *Journal of Financial Economics* 116: 219-236.
- Diamond, Douglas W. and Phil Dybvig. 1983. "Bank Runs, Deposit Insurance, and Liquidity", *Journal of Political Economy* 91: 401 – 419.
- Diamond, Douglas W., and Raghuram G. Rajan. 2001. "Liquidity Risk, Liquidity Creation and Financial Fragility." *Journal of Political Economy* 109: 287–327.
- French, Kenneth, Martin N. Baily, John Y. Campbell, John H. Cochrane, Douglas W. Diamond, Darrell Duffie, Anil K Kashyap, Frederic S. Mishkin, Raghuram G. Rajan, David S. Scharfstein, Robert J. Shiller, Hyun Song Shin, Matthew J. Slaughter, Jeremy C. Stein, and René M. Stulz. 2010. *The Squam Lake Report: Fixing the Financial System*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gorton, Gary. 2010. *Slapped by the Invisible Hand: The Panic of 2007*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Gorton, Gary, and Andrew Winton 2016. "Liquidity Provision, Bank Capital, and the Macroeconomy," Working paper.
- Gudmundsson, Tryggvi. 2016. "Whose Credit Line is it Anyway: An Update on Banks' Implicit Subsidies." IMF Working Paper 16/24.
- Hart, Oliver. 1995. *Firms, Contracts, and Financial Structure*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Kelly, Bryan, Hanno N. Lustig and Stijn Van Nieuwerburgh, 2016. "Too-Systemic-to-Fail: What Option Markets Imply about Sector-Wide Government Guarantees." *American Economic Review*, 106(6), 1278-1319.
- Pfleiderer, Paul. 2018. "Chameleons: The Misuse of Theoretical Models in Finance and Economics." *Economica*, Forthcoming.