

October 10 2011 | Last updated 4 minutes ago

gulfnews.com

Business | Features

New bank regulations: A deadly cocktail

loading
Close [x]

The global sovereign debt crises, and the Greek fiscal crisis, are bad enough on their own. Basel III, which mandates increases in bank capital-asset ratios, is just making things worse

By Steve H. Hanke, Special to Gulf News
Published: 00:00 October 9, 2011

GULF NEWS



Image Credit: Bloomberg

If Geithner (right), Bernanke and others insist on higher bank capital-asset ratios, the US might revisit 1937, when an unexpected recession — a double dip — followed the

Great Depression.

In my columns in April, July, August and September, I warned that the international push to implement Basel III, which mandates increases in bank capital-asset ratios, is a deadly cocktail to ingest in the middle of an economic slump.

The global sovereign debt crises, and the Greek fiscal crisis, are bad enough on their own.

Basel III is just making things worse. If I may summarise past arguments, under the purview of Basel III, banks in the United States, as well as those in the Eurozone are shrinking their risk assets relative to their equity capital.

The accompanying chart clearly shows the picture in terms of the banks' assets. Risk assets in the United States have all declined since May 2008, while banks' holdings of "risk-free" government securities and cash have soared.

Article continues below



CLICK TO PLAY HUNDREDS OF FREE GAMES!

Your Ad Here

As a result, broad money growth (M3) for the euro area is barely growing and moving sideways, while the US

M3 year-over-year growth rate is an anaemic 2.3 per cent. And Greece, which is at the epicentre of Europe's current crisis, is facing a rapidly shrinking money supply.

These money supply numbers will ultimately be the spike that is driven into the heart of the Greek economy and the false hopes of a peaceful resolution of Greece's fiscal woes (see the accompanying money supply chart).

Growth reduction

Not long after I warned of these developments in my September column, the chairman of Deutsche Bank, Josef Ackermann, weighed in during a Frankfurt speech with a blistering attack on raising capital-asset ratios in the middle of a slump.

He was armed with heavy artillery — a 123-page special report, titled *The Cumulative Impact on the Global Economy of Changes in the Financial Regulatory Framework*, produced by the Institute of International Finance (IIF).

The report from the IIF, which represents 400 of the world's largest banks, concluded that forcing banks to add up to \$1.7 trillion (Dh6.24 trillion) in capital to their balance sheets would reduce growth and undermine job creation at a time when the world needs more of both.

The loss in GDP in Europe, North America, Japan and the United Kingdom could total 3.2 per cent over the next five years and forgone employment of 7.5 million.

Another banker, Jamie Dimon, chief executive of JPMorgan Chase, has gone even further than the IIF

report.

In the *Financial Times* of September 12, Dimon suggested that the new Basel III capital requirements are anti-American and that the United States should consider pulling out of the Bank for International Settlements in Basel, Switzerland.

"I think any American president, secretary of treasury, regulator or other leader would want strong, healthy global financial firms and not think that somehow we should give up that position in the world and that would be good for our country," he wrote.

Deflationary

Both Ackermann and Dimon are right. The cheerleaders for the imposition of higher bank capital requirements in the middle of a slump, like US Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner and Fed chairman Ben Bernanke, are wrong.

We can demonstrate the validity of this conclusion with ease.

Higher capital-asset ratios are deflationary.

If we hold the level of a bank's capital constant, an increase in its capital-asset ratio requires that the level of its assets must fall.

This, in turn, implies that the banking system's liabilities (demand deposits) must contract. Since the money supply consists of demand deposits, among other things, the money supply must, therefore, contract.

Alternatively, if we hold assets constant, an increase in the capital-asset ratio requires an increase in capital.

This destroys money. When an investor purchases newly-issued bank shares, for example, the investor exchanges funds from a bank deposit for the new shares.

This reduces deposit liabilities in the banking system and wipes out money.

If Geithner, Prof. Bernanke and other members of the official chattering classes insist on higher bank capital-asset ratios, the United States might, unfortunately, revisit 1937, when an unexpected recession — a double dip — followed the Great Depression.

One contributor to that double dip was an increase in reserve requirements imposed on US banks by the Federal Reserve.

Steve H. Hanke is a Professor of Applied Economics at The Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore and a Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C.