Discussion of "Financial Intermediation and Credit Policy in Business Cycle Analysis"

by Mark Gertler and Nobu Kiyotaki

Guido Lorenzoni

CFSP Workshop, October 2010

# 1 Objective

- a workhorse model to incorporate banks in general equilibrium models
- incorporate two crucial features:
  - transformation of deposits into risky loans
  - cash-in-the-market pricing with segmented markets
- the first feature captured by a standard agency problem between the bank and its lenders

- the second feature captured by two types of segmentation:
  - consumers cannot directly buy assets
  - bank A cannot buy assets that are bank's B specialty
  - but bank B can borrow from bank A: role for interbank market
- core amplification mechanism similar to Kiyotaki-Moore: feedback between asset prices and balance sheets
- various government policies analyzed

### 2 Intermediation with a representative agent

- Household is both shareholder and depositor
  - ...but of different banks
- Banks are robots that work in the household best interest ....but can only get equity injections occasionally

• Household with preferences

$$\mathsf{E}\sum \beta^{t} U(C_{t})$$

receives labor income  $W_t$ 

- shareholder: has many bankers out there, receives flow  $N_t^r$  from retiring bankers, gives fresh funds  $N_t^y$  to young bankers
- depositor: lends  $A_t$  to banks, receives  $R_{t+1}A_t$  tomorrow

$$C_t + N_t^y + A_t = W_t + N_t^r + R_t A_{t-1}.$$

#### 2.1 Shareholder model

$$C_t + N_t^y + A_t = W_t + N_t^r + R_t A_{t-1}.$$

• Crucial constraint on young bankers

$$N_t^y \le \xi N_t^r$$

• Flow from retiring bankers

$$N_{t}^{r} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (1 - \sigma)^{j-1} \sigma P_{t,t-j} N_{t-j}^{y}$$

where  $P_{t,t-j}$  are rates of return which depend on portfolio strategy of the bankers (to be determined)

• Optimality conditions

$$U'(C_t) = \lambda_t$$
  
$$\lambda_t + \mu_t = E_t \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (1 - \sigma)^{j-1} \sigma P_{t+j,t} \beta^j \left( \lambda_{t+j} + \xi \mu_{t+j} \right)$$

• To write portfolio problem recursively define

$$\Lambda_{t+j|t} = \beta^j \frac{\lambda_{t+j} + \xi \mu_{t+j}}{\lambda_t + \xi \mu_t}$$

#### 2.2 Portfolio problem

• The consumers wants each banker to maximize

$$E_t \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (1-\sigma)^{j-1} \sigma \Lambda_{t+j|t} P_{t+j,t}$$

(both young and continuing bankers)

• Dynamics of banker net worth

$$n_t = \tilde{R}_t s_{t-1} - R_t d_t$$
$$n_t = s_t - d_t$$

• Recursive problem

$$egin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_t\left(n_t
ight) &=& \max_{s_t,d_t} V_t\left(s_t,d_t
ight) \ & ext{ s.t. } s_t = n_t + d_t \ & ext{ } s_t \leq \ell_t n_t \end{aligned}$$

where  $\ell_t > 1$  leverage ratio

$$V_t(s_t, d_t) = E_t \Lambda_{t+1|t} \left[ \sigma \left( \tilde{R}_{t+1} s_t - R_{t+1} d_t \right) + (1 - \sigma) \mathcal{V}_{t+1} \left( \tilde{R}_{t+1} s_t - R_{t+1} d_t \right) \right]$$

- $\mathcal{V}_t$  and  $V_t$  are linear
- Endogenous borrowing constraint: market sets the largest  $\ell_t$  such that

$$V_t(s,d) \ge \theta s \iff s \le \ell_t n$$

- Microfoundation: banker can steal fraction  $\theta$  of assets and give them to consumer right away
- Then leverage ratio is

$$\begin{split} \ell_t &= \frac{V_{d,t}}{V_{d,t} - V_{s,t} + \theta} \text{ if } V_{d,t} - V_{s,t} + \theta > 0 \\ \ell_t &= \infty \text{ otherwise} \end{split}$$

- Result: if  $V_{s,t} > V_{d,t}$  and  $V_{s,t} V_{d,t} < \theta$  the leverage constraint is binding
- In steady state sufficient conditions are

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \beta \tilde{R} &> \ \mathbf{1} \\ \beta \tilde{R} - \mathbf{1} &< \ \theta \end{array}$$

## **3** Steady state(s) and not

• In steady state

$$V_s = \beta \tilde{R} V_d$$

and  $V_d$  satisfies

$$V_d = \sigma + (1 - \sigma) \frac{\theta}{\theta - (\beta \tilde{R} - 1) V_d} V_d$$

(Need to check

$$(1-\sigma)rac{ heta}{ heta-\left(eta ilde{R}-1
ight)V_d} < 1$$
 (\*)

- Suppose  $\tilde{R}$  given (AK model) and satisfies conditions above
- **Result**: either there is no steady state or there are two
- **Result**: if there are two ss and both satisfy (\*), then there is a continuum of equilibria!

• Changing assumption about stealing can eliminate multiplicity. E.g. after stealing banker remains in business with fraction  $\theta$  of assets.

