

TW Notes on  
Anat Admati and Martin Hellwig  
The Bankers' New Clothes  
Princeton 2013

The pro bank views after the crisis were based largely on "flawed narratives and invalid arguments" ... many of them had no interest in engaging on the issues - not because of what they knew or did not know but because of what they wanted to know" p v

"Banking is not difficult to understand" p xi but many people believe it is and don't understand that "Most of the issues are quite straight-forward" xi

"Today's banking system, even with proposed reforms, is as dangerous and fragile as the system that brought us to the recent crisis" xi, xii

"A major reason for the success of bank lobbying is that banking has a certain mystique ... [Many of the claims of leading bankers and banking made by

experts actually have as much substance as the emperor's new clothes in Anderson's story" p 2

↳ The bankers "may admit mistakes were made, but they portray the crisis as primarily a fluke" p<sup>3</sup>

"Tighter regulation, we are warned, would interfere with what banks do to support the economy, and this would have serious unintended consequences" p<sup>5</sup>  
"politicians seem to be taken in by the lobbying" p<sup>3</sup>

They not some academic research does support the view that banking fragility may be necessary for banks to perform their functions for the economy but question the relevance of the assumptions made in such analyses

Serious reform requires much less borrowing (leverage) and better incentive structures

Banking lobbyists have argued that higher capital requirements would substantially reduce the amount banks could lend but A & H argue that this is a fallacy based on a misleading meaning of capital in the banking context. It isn't a pile of cash that



can't be spent, it's the equity of the banks and determines how much they can borrow not how much they can lend

Most non bank corporations in the US have borrowing less than 50% of their assets while for banks it's often >90%. For some European banks it's >97%

For banks debt is cheaper than equity because the ~~cost~~ cost of the debt is partially borne by taxpayers through lower borrowing costs because of too big to fail

The too big to fail problem is greater today than before the crisis. There have been more mergers and the reforms aren't adequate to offset this

"~~Fixing~~ Living Wills" Even the ~~best resolution mechanism~~

the best resolution mechanism is likely to be disruptive and costly" p13

They give an excellent discussion of how modern banking works

The IMF estimates the total losses to financial institutions from the mortgage bust was  $\approx$  \$500 bn

The stock market crash after the tech bubble generated losses of  $> \$5$  trillion but banks weren't highly exposed to them and a chain reaction wasn't started

"The simplest form of contagion occurs through the effects of a borrower's default on his creditors" p 61

Most banking crises before 2007 didn't have major international effects (The Asian crisis was an exception)

They discuss the increased interconnectedness of the banking system and the overconfidence generated by the quantitative risk models

They discuss the limited credibility of threats to let large banks fail and that there's no internationally agreed system to deal with resolution

There's a major problem still of off balance sheet items. US accountancy rules don't include derivatives while the international ones do

For J.P. Morgan Chase this leads to  
 $\$3.22$  trillion under GAAP and  
 $\$4.06$  " " " IFRS

Its "fortress balance sheet" of 87% equity would drop to 4.5%



The GAPP nets all derivatives  
 but this ignores credit risk  
 Lending is a minority part of  
 Chase's assets,  $\frac{1}{3}$  under GAPP  
 and  $\frac{1}{5}$  under IFRS

On 12-30-11 the market price  
 of Chase's stock was \$126 bn  
 while the book value was \$184 bn  
 The market value of Citi and B of A  
 in recent have frequently been below  
 50% of book.

This is one reason bankers ~~look~~  
 wrongly look at equity as expensive  
 "There is little to suggest that banks  
 that grow beyond about \$100 billion  
 in assets ~~create~~ create gains in efficiency"  
 p 89 and large banks may become  
 inefficient with "serious governance  
 and control problems" p 89

The main advantage is the consistent  
 subsidy from TBTF

They think proposals like the Volcker  
 rule, the Independent Commission on Banking  
 in the UK and the Liikanen report for  
 the EU assume the main concerns  
 are for depositors and the payments  
 system ignore the problems of  
 non bank financial institutions

Like Bear Stearns, Lehman, LTCM and AIG and that commercial banking activities can also be a major source of risks such as the Irish and Spanish banks funding of their housing booms

"The key objective of banking regulation should be to reduce the fragility of individual banks and of the system so that it can support the economy reliably" p 91

What kinds of assets should count for liquidity ratios? In a crisis

"Practically all assets other than cash and claims on the central bank may suddenly turn from very liquid to very illiquid" p 93

The danger of trying to deal with solvency problems through liquidity guarantees

While Basel III eliminates some abuses it doesn't deal with the ability of banks to game the system

"Nonsense in the Debate [on capital requirements]"  
"The pervasive confusion of capital with reserves is particularly insidious"

The focus on capital rather than requirements started in the 1990s p 97



Reserve requirements do have cost and unless they are very high they don't deal with the solvency problem

They have a good discussion of whether equity financing is especially expensive and criticize the focus on return on equity (ROE) since it ignores the risks being taken

"Quite often, the market value of a bank's stock is lower than the book ~~value~~ <sup>value</sup> because bank managers are reluctant to acknowledge losses. This may be due to wishful thinking ... Or managers may want to delay disclosing losses so that they can first reap a ~~bonus~~ bonus for the current year's profits" p 114

"... risks are difficult to judge and can be easy to hide" p 117

Risks can be high with even with small banks if they are all following similar strategies. ~~Two reasons~~ Avoiding blame because everyone was doing it creates incentives to herd

"Banks do not seem to put significant resources into risk management" 127

Large Banks get huge subsidies from government  
guarantees, and prospects of bailouts,  
and cheap borrowing from central banks

"The Dodd-Frank act forbids government  
bailouts "... hardly anyone considers  
the no-bailout commitments credible"

~~Of course~~ The FDIC is guaranteed  
by the taxpayers <sup>139</sup>

tax subsidies in borrowing

Haldane (2011) estimated in 2009 the  
subsidies associated with guarantees  
totalled worldwide  $\approx$  \$2.3 trillion

For Fannie + Freddie  $\approx$  1/3 of the  
implicitly subsidy went to share holders  
(estimate from BO)

There have always been bank crises  
There hasn't been a big increase in  
frequency since 1970

The analogy between banking ~~crises~~  
crises and natural disasters

isn't ~~appropriate~~ appropriate

"... it is abundantly clear that in the run-up  
to the financial crisis of 2007-2009, short-  
term debt did not discipline bankers" <sup>164</sup>

the "Principle of Unripe Time"  
delay can be very expensive



End 2011 Deutsche Bank had  
 € 2.2 trillion assets but only € 381  
 risk weighted

The 3% leverage ratio in Basel III  
 is "outrageously low" p 177

For much of the 19th century when  
 banks were partnerships fully liable  
 for debt equity ratios tended to  
 be around 40-50%.

The studies supporting Basel III  
 "understate the benefits" of higher  
 equity and make up "fictional costs" p 180

They assume without justification that  
 there is a cost of society of higher  
 bank equity

In many discussions "we have never  
 received a coherent answer to the question  
 of why banks should not have  
 equity levels between 20 and 30  
 percent of their total assets" p 182

"Abandon the Illusion of Fine Tuning"

"Regulators and others overlooked the  
 fact that the banks' interest in measuring  
 and managing risks are not the same  
 as the public interest in having a  
 safe financial system" 184

The regulation of low risk weights for AAA securities created an artificial demand for them and "contributed to the complete breakdown of market discipline in mortgage lending and securitization" 185

The illusion of fine-tuning risk weights "risks themselves are changing all the time, and even the banks lack the information necessary to ~~measure~~ measure them properly" 186

Demergue-Kunt et al (2010) and Breasley et al (2011) found that equity to total assets was a better measure of safety than to risk weighted assets

Severe contagion isn't adequately captured in the stress testing

Hybrid security holders were bailed out in the crisis

A+W are skeptical about the effectiveness of contingent convertible bonds CoCo

There should be a graduated system for dealing with equity shortfalls  
One step is to require banks to retain all earnings until equity levels are adequate



Regulators need to pay more attention to the risks of rare events

Concerns that they will lose out to international competitors is a powerful argument for the bankers - the 'level playing field' argument

A "~~deeper~~" deeper reason for the banks' clout is that they have money

"Financial Stability: Her No Constituency but is Everyone's Business" p 212