



Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

SciVerse ScienceDirect

Journal of Economic Theory 149 (2014) 100-127

JOURNAL OF Economic Theory

www.elsevier.com/locate/jet

## Money, financial stability and efficiency \*

Franklin Allen<sup>a,\*</sup>, Elena Carletti<sup>b,c,1</sup>, Douglas Gale<sup>d,2</sup>

<sup>a</sup> University of Pennsylvania, United States
<sup>b</sup> European University Institute, Italy
<sup>c</sup> IGIER, Bocconi University, Italy
<sup>d</sup> New York University, United States

Received 27 December 2011; final version received 1 October 2012; accepted 20 October 2012

Available online 19 February 2013

## Abstract

Most analyses of banking crises assume that banks use real contracts but in practice contracts are nominal. We consider a standard banking model with aggregate return risk, aggregate liquidity risk and idiosyncratic liquidity shocks. With non-contingent nominal deposit contracts, a decentralized banking system can achieve the first-best efficient allocation if the central bank accommodates the demands of the private sector for fiat money. Price level variations allow full sharing of aggregate risks. An interbank market allows the sharing of idiosyncratic liquidity risk. In contrast, idiosyncratic (bank-specific) return risks cannot be shared using monetary policy alone as real transfers are needed.

© 2013 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

JEL classification: G01; G21; G28

<sup>c</sup> Corresponding author. Fax: +1 215 573 2207.

0022-0531/\$ - see front matter © 2013 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jet.2013.02.002

<sup>\*</sup> We are grateful to Todd Keister, Michael Woodford, Luigi Zingales, participants at the Bank of Portugal Conference on Financial Intermediation in Faro in June 2009, at workshops at ESSET 2011 in Gerzensee, the Becker–Friedman Conference on Macroeconomic Fragility 2012, FIRS 2012 in Minneapolis, the NBER Finance and Macroeconomics Summer Institute Workshop 2012, the Federal Reserve Banks of Chicago and New York, the Sveriges Riksbank, the University of Maryland, the University of North Carolina, the University of Pennsylvania and particularly to the Associate Editor for helpful comments. This paper is produced as part of the project 'Politics, Economics and Global Governance: The European Dimensions' (PEGGED) funded by the Theme Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities of the European Commission's 7th Framework Programme for Research, Grant Agreement No. 217559. We are also grateful to the Wharton Financial Institutions Center for financial support.

*E-mail addresses:* allenf@wharton.upenn.edu (F. Allen), elena.carletti@eui.eu (E. Carletti), douglas.gale@nyu.edu (D. Gale).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Fax: +39 055 4685 902.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Fax: +1 212 995 3932.

Keywords: Central bank; Commercial banks; Risk sharing

## 1. Introduction

Most models in the banking literature (e.g., Diamond and Dybvig [15]; Chari and Jagannathan [12]; Jacklin and Bhattacharya [21]; Calomiris and Kahn [9]; Allen and Gale [2,3]; Diamond and Rajan [16,17]) treat banking as a real activity with no role for fiat money. Following Diamond and Dybvig [15], consumers' liquidity preference is modeled as uncertainty about their time preference for consumption. Liquid assets are modeled as a storage technology. A deposit contract promises a depositor a fixed amount of consumption depending on the date of withdrawal. Thus, a crisis can arise when a large number of consumers decide to withdraw their deposits from the banking system, because the demand for goods is greater than the banks' limited stock of liquid assets.

While "real" models have provided valuable insights into the nature of financial fragility, they do not capture important aspects of reality, such as the role of fiat money in the financial system. In practice, financial contracts are almost always written in terms of money. This fact has important consequences for the theory. Because the central bank can costlessly create fiat money in a crisis, there is no reason why the banking system should find itself unable to meet its commitments to depositors (see, e.g., Buiter [8]).

In this paper, we develop a model, based on Allen, Carletti and Gale [1], henceforth ACG, in which fiat money is issued by the central bank. Deposit contracts and loan contracts are denominated in terms of money and money is used in transactions. In other words, money is both a unit of account and a medium of exchange. In contrast to most of the banking literature, which is reviewed below, we show that the combination of nominal contracts and a central bank policy of accommodating commercial banks' demand for money leads to first-best efficiency. This result holds when there are aggregate liquidity and asset return shocks and also when there are idiosyncratic liquidity shocks.

There are three dates and, at each date, there is a single good that can be used for consumption or investment. Assets are represented by constant returns to scale technologies that allow the consumers' initial endowment of the good to be transformed into consumption at the second and third dates. The short-term asset is a storage technology. The long-term asset requires an investment at the initial date and yields a random return at the final date. There is a large number of ex ante identical consumers, each of whom is endowed with one unit of the good at the initial date. At the second date, a random fraction of consumers discover they are early type and want to consume only at the second date while the remaining consumers are late type and want to consume only at the third date.

We start by characterizing the first-best allocation as the solution to a planner's problem. The planner invests the consumers' endowments in a portfolio of short- and long-term assets and distributes the asset returns to the early and late consumers at the second and third dates. The portfolio is chosen before the realization of the aggregate state, which consists of the fraction of early consumers and the return on the risky asset. The consumption allocation is determined after the state is realized and is therefore state contingent.

Our first main result is to show that the planner's allocation can be implemented in a decentralized economy, where there are three types of institutions, a central bank, commercial banks, and firms. At the initial date, the central bank makes money available to the commercial banks on an intraday basis at a zero interest rate. The banks make loans to the firms, which in turn Download English Version:

## https://daneshyari.com/en/article/956713

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/956713

Daneshyari.com