

# Optimal Bank Regulation and Monetary Policy

by

John J. Seater\*

January 2001

\*Economics Department, Box 8110, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, 27612; email: [john\\_seater@ncsu.edu](mailto:john_seater@ncsu.edu). This paper grew out of a suggestion from Anthony M. Santomero, who would have been a collaborator and co-author had he not received and graciously heeded a call to public service. His comments on the paper have been most helpful. I also have received valuable comments from Douglas Pearce and John Lapp.

## **Abstract**

A unified model of monetary policy and bank regulation is presented. In accordance with modern banking theory, banks not only intermediate loans and deposits but also provide a financial service affecting aggregate output. Optimal parameter settings for monetary and regulatory policy are derived. New results are that monetary policy affects the expected level as well as the variance of output, bank regulation should change continually in response to the state of the economy, and bank regulation and monetary policy should be tightly coordinated. This last result has important implications for the institutional arrangements for conducting regulatory and monetary policy.

## **I. Introduction**

What is the proper relation between the conduct of monetary policy and the regulation of the financial system? That question is important both for the conduct of the two types of policy and for the organization of the system in which the policies are carried out. The regulations imposed on the financial system affect the money multiplier mechanism and thus the impact of monetary policy; conversely, the reserve requirements and central bank emergency lending policies affect the riskiness of banks and thus the optimal structure of bank capital requirements, deposit insurance, and other such regulations. A deeper question is the optimal structure of the institutional framework for both monetary and regulatory policy. Should the two types of policy be carried out by separate agencies or a single agency? If by separate agencies, what should be the nature of coordination among them? These latter questions currently are of special interest to the European Community, which is wrestling with the issue of whether or not responsibility for the regulation of European financial institutions should be delegated to the new European Central Bank. On the one hand, financial institutions constitute the “channels of monetary policy” so often discussed in the literature on monetary policy. It would seem natural for a country’s central bank to have responsibility for financial regulation both to ensure that the structure of the financial institutions was sound and to provide useful information for the conduct of monetary policy.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, there is concern that if the central bank has the responsibility for regulation, the regulation will be carried out too much for the benefit of monetary policy and not enough for the benefit of the financial system itself.

A difficulty in addressing all the foregoing issues is that there is no theoretical treatment

---

<sup>1</sup>See Ferguson (2000) for a recent argument along these lines.

that simultaneously analyzes both regulation and monetary policy. The large literature on the optimal choice of monetary policy instruments, starting with Poole (1970), does not include regulatory policy in the analysis. The even larger literature on optimal regulation of financial institutions has the symmetric problem of not including monetary policy in the analysis. The present paper presents a unified analysis of optimal bank regulation and optimal money stock control. The approach is a generalization of Poole's (1970) original study of the optimal conduct of monetary policy, in which the central bank must decide how to respond to shocks to the economy while having only limited information on the current state of the economy. The model extends that line of analysis to include bank regulation as well as monetary policy.

There are two innovations in the model. One is the introduction of a financial service provided by the banking system. The financial service is tied to but not the same as the volume of bank lending, and it directly affects the productivity of the output sector of the economy. An example of such a service is bank monitoring of its borrowers (Fama, 1985; Holmstrom and Tirole, 1997). The financial service provides a crucial link between real economic activity and the financial sector that heretofore has been missing from most aggregate models. The work of Bernanke (1981, 1983) and Bernanke and Gertler (1989, 1990) suggests that such a link is important for understanding the effects of money on the real economy. The other innovation is inclusion of a bank regulatory requirement, such as a reserve requirement or required bank capital ratio, imposed on the banks by a bank regulator. This requirement affects the money multiplier; through that, it affects both the level and stability of the financial service and therefore the level and stability of real output. The trade-off facing the regulator is that a stricter regulatory requirement reduces both the mean and variance of output. The latter is desirable, but the former

is not. The optimal choice of the regulatory requirement reflects these competing effects.

Several interesting results emerge from the analysis. Contrary to the usual rational expectations result, monetary policy affects the expected level (“natural rate”) of real output. Bank regulatory policy should be reactive, that is, it should change continually to reflect current economic conditions. Optimal regulation therefore should not be a passive activity, setting the regulatory requirement only infrequently. The sign and magnitude of the reaction parameter depends on all the structural parameters of the system, including the variances and covariances among the random disturbances. Optimal monetary policy and bank regulation are simultaneously determined, implying that there must be tight coordination between the central bank and the regulator. The obvious institutional arrangement for achieving this coordination is to have a single agency conduct both monetary and regulatory policy.

## II. The Model

The analysis is conducted in the framework of a log-linear, rational expectations IS-LM model. The model includes a supply side for aggregate output and a governmentally regulated banking system that generates inside money through a standard money multiplier mechanism.

### 1. *Aggregate Demand for Output.*

Aggregate output demand has no special importance in the analysis, so we confine attention to the simplest possible model:

$$(1) \quad Y_t^D = d_0 - d_1 R_t + \delta_t$$

where  $Y$  is the log of output,  $R$  is the real interest rate,  $\delta$  is a random disturbance term, and the  $d_i$

are positive constants. Equation (1) is the IS equation. All effects of consumption and investment not arising from the interest rate, such as expectations of future income or of the marginal productivity of capital, are included in the term  $d_0$ . To keep the analysis tractable, we shall treat  $d_0$  as a constant, thus suppressing all dynamic elements of the economy's behavior that would arise from changes in household or firm expectations of the future. In principle, the model can be extended in a straightforward way to include these influences, but the analysis is difficult.

## 2. Aggregate Supply of Output.

The aggregate output is given by the indirect production function:

$$\tilde{Y}_t^S = \tilde{s}_0 \left( \frac{\tilde{P}_t}{\tilde{P}_t^e} \right)^{s_1} \tilde{F}_t^{s_2} \tilde{\Theta}_t$$

where  $P^-$  is the price level,  $P^{-e}$  is the expected price level,  $F^-$  is a the quantity of the financial service provided by banks,  $\Theta^-$  is a random term, and the  $s_i$  are positive constants. The term  $s_0 F^{-s_2} \Theta^-$  captures, among other things, the level of technical progress (i.e., total factor productivity). Taking logs of the production function gives a standard rational expectations supply function augmented to include the effect of the financial service:

$$(2) \quad Y_t^S = s_0 + s_1 (P_t - P_t^e) + s_2 F_t + \Theta_t$$

where variables without tildes are the logarithms those with tildes.

The novel aspect of this aggregate production function and its corresponding aggregate supply function is the presence of the financial service  $F$ . Modern theories of financial intermediation argue that banks and other financial intermediaries provide services beyond simply intermediating deposits and loans (an activity that is nonetheless still important and discussed momentarily). Examples of such services include liquidity insurance (Bryant, 1980; Diamond and

Dybvig, 1983), information sharing to overcome adverse selection (Leland and Pyle, 1977), monitoring (Diamond, 1984; Holmstrom and Tirole, 1997), facilitation of risk transfer (Allen and Santomero, 1997), and reduction of participation costs (Allen and Santomero, 1997). To expand on one specific example, we could suppose that the only element of F is monitoring, which Fama (1985) has argued is the essence of what banks really do. Monitoring prevents opportunistic behavior of the borrower during realization of the investment project funded by the loan. The possibility for opportunistic behavior arises because borrowing means that the entrepreneur has only a partial financial interest in the project and so has an incentive to devote some of his energies to other things, thus reducing the expected profitability of the project that has been financed. Monitoring prevents or at least reduces such behavior and thus increases the efficiency of the economy. See Holmstrom and Tirole (1997). This increase in efficiency can be captured by letting total factor productivity depend on the amount of monitoring, as done above. We thus have a simple model of aggregate production (and so of aggregate supply) that corresponds to the view of Bernanke (1981, 1983) and Bernanke and Gertler (1989, 1990) that financial intermediaries affect the aggregate economy through channels other than the traditional one of creating inside money.

### 3. *Money Market.*

Nominal money is defined as M1, the sum of private demand deposits and currency in the hands of the non-bank public. Consideration of broader aggregates is unnecessary, but attention cannot be restricted solely to high powered (outside) money because the non-monetary services

intimately associated with the presence of inside money is essential to the analysis.<sup>2</sup> Real money demand is the usual

$$(3) \quad M_t^D = a_0 + a_1 Y_t^D - a_2 R_t + \alpha_t$$

where M is the log of real M1,  $\alpha$  is a random disturbance, and the  $a_i$  are positive constants. Real money supply is determined by real high powered money and the money multiplier:

$$(4) \quad M_t^S = m_t + H_t - P_t$$

where m is the log of the money multiplier and H is the log of nominal high powered money.

High powered money is determined by the central bank according to its monetary policy function

$$(5) \quad H_t = h_0 + h_1 R_t + \eta_t$$

where  $\eta$  is a random disturbance and the  $h_i$  are constants chosen by the central bank. The money multiplier m is

$$(6) \quad m_t = m_0 - m_1 B_t + m_2 R_t + \mu_t$$

where B is the log of a regulatory variable constraining bank lending,  $\mu$  is a random disturbance, and the  $m_i$  are positive constants. The interest rate R affects the multiplier through the opportunity cost of holding excess reserves.<sup>3</sup> An increase in R induces banks to hold less excess reserves and thus raises m.

The variable B can represent many kinds of constraints; two straightforward possibilities

---

<sup>2</sup>McCallum (2000) has argued that omitting monetary aggregates from models of monetary economics is harmless. The analysis of this paper suggests otherwise, at least for some kinds of questions.

<sup>3</sup>As usual, it is the unlogged value of the interest rate that enters (6) because what really enters is  $\log(1+R)$  which is approximately equal to R for small values of R.

are a required reserve ratio or a required bank capital ratio. The precise channel through which B affects bank lending depends on what B represents, but the net effect is the same and is captured by (6). Consider the case where B is a required capital ratio. A bank's capital ratio is the ratio of the bank's capital (sources of funds obtained from the owners of the bank) to its total assets (loans plus cash). Regulators impose on banks a minimum value of the capital ratio.<sup>4</sup> Banks whose ratios fall below the required ratio are subject to disciplinary action, including being forced into receivership. The higher the required bank capital ratio, the less lending a bank can undertake for any given amount of capital that it has. To see this, suppose the required capital ratio is set at its upper limit of one. The banks then cannot lend any deposited funds; they can lend only their own capital. In this case, the banks cease to be banks in the usual sense of the term because they stop intermediating deposits and loans.<sup>5</sup> Inside money will be zero, and the money multiplier equals one. As the required capital ratio is reduced below one, the banks can and will start lending some fraction of their deposits. This increase in loans raises the amount of inside money from zero to a positive amount, and the value of the money multiplier rises above one.<sup>6</sup> We thus have a negative relation between the money multiplier and the value of the

---

<sup>4</sup>There actually are several capital/asset ratios varying in the assets considered and the risk adjustment applied to them. That complication is ignored here.

<sup>5</sup>It is assumed for simplicity that the banks have no sources of funds other than their own capital and their deposits. They thus cannot offset the constraining effect of the capital requirement. Other sources of funds could be introduced with no substantive change in results as long as banks could not use them to fully offset the capital ratio's negative effect on the volume of bank lending and therefore on the money multiplier. Furlong (1992) presents evidence that bank lending in the United States is indeed negatively related to the required capital/asset ratio, so the simplification of ignoring the existence of non-deposit sources of funds is qualitatively harmless.

<sup>6</sup>Note that this discussion implies that (6) is not exact but rather is an approximation. If the required capital ratio were set to its maximum possible value of 1, then as just noted the banks

required bank capital ratio. Exactly the same analysis applies if B is a required reserve ratio.

We suppose that B is determined by the bank regulatory authority according to the following regulatory policy function

$$(7) \quad B_t = b_0 + b_1 R_t + \beta_t$$

where  $\beta$  is a random disturbance and the  $b_i$  are constants chosen by the regulator. This function is unusual in that it allows the regulatory requirement B to be flexible, responding to the state of the economy through a feedback rule. One does not normally think of bank regulations as being flexible in this manner because they typically are not.<sup>7</sup> Nothing is lost by using the general functional form in (7); the standard inflexible requirement is obtained as a special case simply by setting the coefficient  $b_1$  and the disturbance term  $\beta$  to zero. However, one of the main results of the subsequent analysis is that an inflexible B generally is suboptimal.

A random term is included in (7) for two reasons. First, the regulator responsible for the day-to-day administration of regulatory policy may not be the sole institution setting regulatory policy. In the US, for example, federal regulation of financial institutions is administered by the Federal Reserve, the FDIC, and the Comptroller of the Currency, among others. The US Congress, however, can pass laws changing regulations at any time. In addition, state

---

could not lend any of their deposits. The banks would have no need of free reserves and so would not hold any. Also, the shocks  $u_t$  could not affect the money multiplier, which would be constant at a value of one. Consequently, an exact representation of the multiplier would have  $m_0$  and  $m_2$  dependent on B and also would have an exponent on  $u_t$  equal to zero whenever B equaled 1. An exact form of this nature is analytically intractable. For a critical discussion of bank capital ratios and their impact on bank behavior, see Santomero (1991).

<sup>7</sup>However, before central banks learned to use open market operations to control the money supply, they did often changed reserve requirements in response to economic or financial conditions. The notion of a flexible B thus is not completely novel.

governments institute regulations independently of the federal government. Second, equation (7) is a simplification of the complicated real world of bank regulation. Risk-adjusted bank capital requirements, for example, are fixed numbers. However, the impact they have on bank lending depends on the risk structure of the financial assets in existence. A change in the way underlying risk is distributed across different borrowers will change the mix of assets banks wish to hold. The existing bank capital requirements may be viewed as more or less stringent after the change than before. The random term in (7) picks up such effects. In any case, one always can eliminate the effects of the random term in (7) simply by setting  $\beta$  and its variance to zero in all that follows. None of the conclusions of the analysis is altered by doing so.

An issue that has been skirted in the foregoing specifications is the role of expected inflation in determining the demand for money and the money multiplier. The opportunity cost of holding currency is the spread between the real rates of return on the interest-earning asset and currency,  $R - R_C$ . This spread can be written in terms of nominal interest rates:

$$\begin{aligned}
 R - R_C &= (r - \pi^e) - (r_C - \pi^e) \\
 &= (r - r_C) \\
 &= r \\
 &= R + \pi^e
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $r$  is the nominal interest rate on the interest-earning asset and  $r_C$  is the nominal interest rate on currency, which is fixed at zero. Consequently, both real money demand and the money multiplier should depend on either both  $R$  and  $\pi^e$ , not just  $R$ . Inclusion of  $\pi^e$  is analytically difficult because it introduces expectations of future values of the system's variables into the expressions for the current values. We therefore will use the expressions for money demand and

the money multiplier given above and treat them as approximations to the true functions.

#### 4. Financial Services.

The financial service  $F$  is intimately tied to bank lending. Banks provide the service only their own borrowers; if there are no loans, there is no service, either. The quantity of financial services  $F$  therefore is a function of the quantity of real loans:

$$(8) \quad F_t = f_0 + f_1 L_t + \phi_t$$

where  $L$  is the log of the quantity of real loans,  $\phi$  is a random disturbance, and the  $f_i$  are positive constants. All loans are associated with an equal value of inside money; that is, the quantity of loans is that part of the money supply that is not high-powered money:

$$\tilde{L}_t \equiv \frac{(\tilde{m}_t - 1)\tilde{H}_t}{\tilde{P}_t}$$

or, in log terms,

$$(9) \quad L_t = \log(\tilde{m}_t - 1) + H_t - P_t$$

Unfortunately, this expression is hopelessly nonlinear because it involves the log of a difference.

We linearize (9) with the following approximation. For any value of  $\tilde{m}_t$ , there is a  $k_t$  such that

$$\tilde{m}_t - 1 = \tilde{m}_t^{k_t}$$

Define  $\bar{m}$  as the average value of  $m_t$  and  $0 < k < 1$  as the value of  $k_t$  such that

$$\bar{m} - 1 = \bar{m}^k$$

Then for any  $m_t$  we have the approximation

$$\begin{aligned}\log(\tilde{m}_t - 1) &\approx \log(\tilde{m}_t^k) \\ &= km_t\end{aligned}$$

Using this approximation, we can replace the intractable (9) with the tractable expression

$$(10) \quad L_t = km_t + H_t - P_t$$

### 5. *Random Disturbances.*

Up to now, nothing has been said about the properties of the various random disturbances appearing in the model. It is sufficient for our purposes to impose the simplest possible time series structure on the disturbances, so we assume they are white noise. Nothing important is changed by allowing a general ARIMA structure, but the analysis quickly becomes tedious once serial correlation in the disturbances is introduced. Contemporaneous correlation of disturbances is permitted throughout the analysis.

### 6. *Expectations.*

We assume rational expectations, so that the expected price level  $P^e$  is just the usual mathematical expectation of the solution of the model's solution for  $P$ :

$$(11) \quad P_t^e = E(P_t | I_t)$$

where  $I_t$  is the information set at time  $t$ . For most of the analysis, we assume that  $I_t$  includes the true values for all variables dated  $t-1$  and earlier, but we briefly discuss some other possibilities below.

## **III. Solution of the Model**

Equations (1)-(8), (10), and (11) constitute the model. The model is conceptually simple

and, having only linear equations, mathematically trivial. In this section, we derive the model's solution and then examine a graphical interpretation.

### 1. *Mathematical Solution.*

Solution begins by substituting (5), (6), (7), (8), and (10) into (2) and (4). Then (3) and (4) are solved to obtain R as a function of P. This solution is substituted into (1) and (2), giving the semi-reduced forms

$$(12) \quad Y_t^D = d_0 - \frac{d_1 X_0}{X_1} - \frac{d_1}{X_1} P_t + \delta_t - \frac{d_1 (\alpha_t + a_1 \delta_t - \mu_t + m_1 \beta_t - \eta_t)}{X_1}$$

$$(13) \quad Y_t^S = X_3 + X_2 \frac{X_0}{X_1} + \frac{X_2 - s_2 f_1 X_1}{X_1} P_t + s_1 (P_t - P_t^e) + \theta_t + s_2 \phi_t + s_2 f_1 \eta_t \\ - s_2 f_1 k m_1 \beta_t + \frac{X_2}{X_1} (\alpha_t + a_1 \delta_t - m_1 \beta_t - \eta_t)$$

where

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} X_0 &= a_0 + a_1 d_0 - m_0 - h_0 + m_1 b_0 \\ &= U_0 + U_1 h_0 + U_2 b_0 \\ X_1 &= m_2 - m_1 b_1 + h_1 + a_1 d_1 + a_2 \\ &= U_3 + h_1 + U_4 b_1 \\ X_2 &= s_2 f_1 [k(m_2 - m_1 b_1) + h_1] \\ &= U_5 + U_6 h_1 + U_7 b_1 \\ X_3 &= s_0 + s_2 f_0 + s_2 f_1 k(m_0 - m_1 b_0) + s_2 f_1 h_0 \\ &= U_8 + U_6 h_0 + U_7 b_0 \end{aligned}$$

and the  $U_i$  are functions of the structural parameters excluding the four policy parameters  $b_0$ ,  $b_1$ ,

$h_0$ , and  $h_1$ . Table 1 shows the full expressions for the  $U_i$ . Notice that aggregate supply  $Y^S$  depends not only on  $P-P^e$  but also on  $P$  independently. The term  $P-P^e$  represents the usual influence of expectation errors in a rational expectations model. The independent term  $P$  reflects the influence of the financial service  $F$  in (2) and the dependence of  $F$  on real loans. A change in  $P$ , given the money multiplier  $m_t$  and high powered money  $H_t$ , changes real loans, thus also changing  $F$  and  $Y^S$ . This independent influence of  $P$  on  $Y^S$  is the source of several interesting conclusions derived below.

We use the semi-reduced forms for  $Y^D$  and  $Y^S$  to solve for  $P$  in terms of  $P^e$ , obtaining:

$$(15) \quad P = \frac{X_1 X_3 + X_0 X_2 - d_0 X_1 + d_1 X_0}{s_2 f_1 X_1 - X_2 - d_1} + \frac{s_1 X_1}{s_2 f_1 X_1 - X_2 - d_1} (P_t - P_t^e) \\ + \frac{X_1}{s_2 f_1 X_1 - X_2 - d_1} \theta_t + \frac{s_2 X_1}{s_2 f_1 X_1 - X_2 - d_1} \phi_t + \frac{s_2 f_1 X_1}{s_2 f_1 X_1 - X_2 - d_1} \eta_t \\ + \frac{s_2 f_1 k X_1}{s_2 f_1 X_1 - X_2 - d_1} \mu_t - \frac{s_2 f_1 k m_1 X_1}{s_2 f_1 X_1 - X_2 - d_1} \beta_t - \frac{X_1}{s_2 f_1 X_1 - X_2 - d_1} \delta_t \\ + \frac{X_1 + d}{s_2 f_1 X_1 - X_2 - d_1} (\alpha_t + a_1 \delta_t - \mu_t + m_1 \beta_t - \eta_t)$$

We then find the solution for  $P^e$  by taking the expectation of (15), which gives

$$(16) \quad P_t^e = \frac{X_1 X_3 + X_0 X_2 - d_0 X_1 + d_1 X_0}{s_2 f_1 X_1 - X_2 - d_1}$$

Substituting this expression back into (15) gives the reduced form solution for  $P$ :

$$(17) \quad P_t = P_t^e + [s_1 X_1 + s_2 f_1 X_1 - X_2 - d_1]^{-1} \cdot [X_1 \theta_t + s_2 X_1 \phi_t + s_2 f_1 X_1 \eta_t \\ + s_2 f_1 k X_1 \mu_t - s_2 f_1 k m_1 X_1 \beta_t - X_1 \delta_t + (X_2 + d_1)(\alpha_t + a_1 \delta_t - \mu_t + m_1 \beta_t - \eta_t)]$$

The expected supply of output is the mathematical expectation of (13):

$$\begin{aligned}
(18) \quad EY_t^s &= \frac{X_1 X_3 + X_2 X_0}{X_1} + \frac{X_2 - s_2 f_1 X_1}{X_1} P_t^e \\
&= \frac{-d_1 X_3 - s_2 f_1 d_1 X_0 - d_0 X_2 + s_2 f_1 d_0 X_1}{s_2 f_1 X_1 - X_2 - d_1}
\end{aligned}$$

The first line of (18) shows that expected *real* output depends on the expected price level, a *nominal* variable. This is a striking result, quite unlike the usual rational expectations solution in which expected nominal variables have no effects on real variables. It reflects the previously noted influence of the financial service on aggregate supply. The intuition is that, for any given amount of high powered money H and money multiplier m, an increase in the price level reduces there real quantity of loans, which also reduces the quantity of financial services. Note that in this argument, the value of H was held fixed. Changes in the price level brought about by changes in H just cancel, leaving both L and F unaffected; see equation (10). As we will see below, when we expand the  $X_1$  parameters in the second line of (18), some of the determinants of  $P^e$  drop out. In particular, the only policy parameters that will remain are  $b_0$  and  $b_1$  from the regulatory policy rule (7); the two parameters  $h_0$  and  $h_1$  from the monetary policy rule (5) disappear, so that the standard expectational neutrality of money holds.

Finally, the fully-reduced form solution for current output is

$$\begin{aligned}
(19) \quad Y_t^S &= EY_t^S + [(2x_1X_2 - d_1)X_2(s_1X_1 + s_2f_1X_1 - X_2 - d_1) \\
&\quad + d_1(X_2 - s_2f_1X_1 + s_1X_1)][X_1(s_1X_1 + s_2f_1X_1 - X_2 - d_1)]^{-1} \alpha_t \\
&+ [(2x_1X_2 - d_1)(m_1X_2 - s_2f_1km_1X_1)(s_1X_1 + s_2f_1X_1 - X_2 - d_1) \\
&\quad + d_1m_1(X_2 - s_2f_1X_1 + s_1X_1)][X_1(s_1X_1 + s_2f_1X_1 - X_2 - d_1)]^{-1} \beta_t \\
&+ [(2x_1X_2 - d_1)(a_1X_2 - X_1)(s_1X_1 + s_2f_1X_1 - X_2 - d_1) \\
&\quad + d_1a_1(X_2 - s_2f_1X_1 + s_1X_1)][X_1(s_1X_1 + s_2f_1X_1 - X_2 - d_1)]^{-1} \delta_t \\
&+ [(2x_1X_2 - d_1)(s_2f_1X_1 - X_2)(s_1X_1 + s_2f_1X_1 - X_2 - d_1) \\
&\quad + d_1(X_2 - s_2f_1X_1 + s_1X_1)][X_1(s_1X_1 + s_2f_1X_1 - X_2 - d_1)]^{-1} \eta_t \\
&+ [(2x_1X_2 - d_1)(s_2f_1kX_1 - X_2)(s_1X_1 + s_2f_1X_1 - X_2 - d_1) \\
&\quad + d_1(X_2 - s_2f_1X_1 + s_1X_1)][X_1(s_1X_1 + s_2f_1X_1 - X_2 - d_1)]^{-1} \mu_t \\
&+ (2s_1X_2 - d_1)s_2\phi_t \\
&+ (2s_1X_2 - d_1)\theta_t
\end{aligned}$$

This expression is not quite as horrendous as it seems. The first term on the right side is the expected level (“natural rate”) of output; all the other terms are disturbance terms multiplied by coefficients and represent temporary deviations from the expected level.

## 2. Graphical Interpretation.

We can depict the model in an IS-LM framework augmented to include aggregate supply and rational expectations (see Branson, 1989). The IS equation is simply equation (1) with current  $Y$  replacing  $Y^D$ . The LM equation is obtained by equating money demand and supply - equations (3) and (4) - and using (5), (6), and (7) to eliminate  $H_t$ ,  $m_t$ , and  $B_t$ , which gives

$$\begin{aligned}
(20) \quad Y_t &= (m_2 - m_1 b_1 + h_1 + a_2)R_t - P_t + (m_0 - m_1 b_0 + h_0 - a_0) - \alpha_t - m_1 \beta_t + \eta_t + \mu_t \\
&= (X_1 - a_1 d_1)R_t - P_t + (a_1 d_0 - X_0) - \alpha_t - m_1 \beta_t + \eta_t + \mu_t
\end{aligned}$$

The terms after the first two constitute the intercept, which consists of a constant and a linear combination of some of the disturbances. Finally, there is a third equation representing the output supply side of the economy; we can call it the SS equation (for Supply Side). It is obtained by using (8), (10), (5), (6), and (7) to eliminate  $F_t$  and then  $L_t$ ,  $H_t$ ,  $m_t$ , and  $B_t$  from (2), which gives

$$\begin{aligned}
(21) \quad Y_t &= (s_2 f_1 k m_2 - s_2 f_1 k m_1 b_1 + s_2 f_1 h_1)R_t + s_1 (P_t - P_t^e) - s_2 f_1 P_t \\
&\quad + (s_0 + s_2 f_0 + s_2 f_1 k m_0 - s_2 f_1 m_1 b_0 + s_2 f_1 h_0) - s_2 f_1 m_1 \beta_t + s_2 f_1 \eta_t + s_2 f_1 k \mu_t + s_2 \phi_t \\
&= [X_2 + s_2 f_1 (k-1) m_1 b_1]R_t + s_1 (P_t - P_t^e) - s_2 f_1 P_t \\
&\quad + [X_3 + s_2 f_1 (k-1) m_1 b_0] - s_2 f_1 m_1 \beta_t + s_2 f_1 \eta_t + s_2 f_1 k \mu_t + s_2 \phi_t
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 1 shows the IS, LM, and SS curves. The graph shows a situation of general equilibrium, with the three curves intersecting at a common point. Figure 1 differs from the standard augmented model in that the SS curve is sloped rather than vertical, reflecting the effect of the interest rate on the quantity of the financial service  $F$ , which in turn affects output. Also notice that the intercepts of the LM and SS curves depend on the policy parameters  $b_0$  and  $h_0$ , and the slopes depend on  $b_1$ , and  $h_1$ . The policy reaction parameters  $b_1$  and  $h_1$  can have either sign and any magnitude, so in general the slopes of the LM and SS curves can be either positive or negative. If  $b_1$  and  $h_1$  are small, the slopes are positive, and the curves have been drawn that way in Figure 1. The dependence of slopes and intercepts on the policy parameters is what underlies the optimal choice of those parameters, as we see shortly.

Figures 2 and 3 show two experiments that illustrate the workings of the model and that

also will help understand the subsequent discussion of optimal policy parameter choice.

Consider first an unexpected increase in the supply of financial services (that is, a positive realization of  $\phi$ ). The behavior of the economy is shown in Figure 2. The shock to  $\phi$  has no effect on either IS or LM but does move the SS curve rightward from its initial position  $SS_0$  to  $SS_1$ , thus disturbing general equilibrium. To restore equilibrium, the economy lowers the price level  $P$ , which causes shifts in both the LM and SS curves. The lower  $P$  raises real balances and thus shifts the LM curve right. The lower  $P$  has two effects on SS. First, for the usual rational expectations reasons,  $P^e$  lags behind  $P$ , so that  $(P - P^e)$  becomes negative. This perceptual error shifts the SS curve left. Second, the decrease in  $P$  raises the quantity of real loans  $L$ , which raises the quantity of financial services  $F$ , which in turn raises output supply. This effect shifts the SS curve right. The net shift in SS is unclear and depends on parameter magnitudes. Figure 2 shows the case where the perceptual error dominates. SS shifts left from  $SS_1$  to  $SS_2$ , meeting the LM curve at  $LM_2$ . There is a temporary equilibrium at  $E_2$  with the interest rate lower and output higher. The next period, the shock to  $\phi$  disappears (because the random terms are white noise) and everyone learns the true value of the  $\phi$  shock in the first period. The extra supply of financial services and the price perception error disappear, and the economy returns to its original state with an equilibrium position of  $E_0$ .

Consider next an unexpected decrease in aggregate demand (that is, a negative realization of  $\delta$ ), shown in Figure 3 as a shift from  $IS_0$  to  $IS_1$ . The economy's response is similar in character to that in the previous case. The price level in this case must fall to shift the LM curve rightward and restore equilibrium. As  $P$  falls,  $P^e$  lags behind, causing a perceptual error and thus shifting SS leftward. The fall in  $P$  also raises  $F$ . Again assuming that the perceptual error dominates, a

temporary equilibrium occurs at point  $E_1$  with the interest rate lower and output also lower. The next period, everything reverses and the economy returns to its original state.

The foregoing examples were chosen for illustrative purposes because of their simplicity. Nonetheless, they do lead to an important conclusion: the behavior of the financial sector affects the real economy both directly (through  $\phi$  and  $\mu$  shocks) and indirectly (through the effect of price level changes on real financial services  $F$ ). These effects are quite unlike anything seen in modern macroeconomic analysis (save for the work of Bernanke, 1981, 1983, and Bernanke and Gertler, 1989, 1990). They reflect the effects of a financial sector that provides real services; they are the reason that the behavior of the financial sector is important for real economic activity.

Finally, as already mentioned, the slopes and intercepts of the LM and SS curves depend on the regulatory and monetary policy parameters  $b_0$ ,  $b_1$ ,  $h_0$ , and  $h_1$ . These parameters are at the disposal of the authorities and can be used to offset or at least reduce the impact of shocks to the economy. For example, if  $b_1$  and  $h_1$  are chosen to make the LM and SS curves vertical, as shown in Figure 4, then the IS shift analyzed in Figure 3 would have no effect on output. The temporary equilibrium in the period of the shock would be  $E_1$  with the interest rate lower but the level of output unchanged. Unfortunately, when LM and SS are vertical, then the financial services shock analyzed in Figure 2 would have a large effect on output than when the curves are sloped as in Figure 2. If all shocks to the economy were IS shocks, then making the LM and SS vertical would totally eliminate variation in output. If shocks are of various types, however, parameter settings that reduce the output effects of one kind of shock can magnify the effects of other kinds of shocks. The problem facing the policy maker is to choose parameter settings that achieve an optimal balance in the face of various types of shocks. We now turn to an analysis of the optimal

choice of the four policy parameters.

#### **IV. Optimal Policy**

We suppose that the policy maker has two objectives: to maximize the expected value (the “natural rate”) of real output and to minimize the variance of current output around its expected value. In the usual analysis of optimal monetary policy choice under uncertainty, all interest centers on minimizing the variance of real output. No attention is paid to the level of output because monetary policy does not affect expected output  $EY$  in standard rational expectations models. In the present model, however, bank regulatory policy affects  $EY$ , so we need to include  $EY$  in the objective function. The formal objective function is discussed momentarily.

Policy makers would have no difficulty designing optimal policy if they could know the current state of the economy. They would observe the shifts in the IS, LM, and SS curves and would change their policy parameters ( $b_0$ ,  $b_1$ ,  $h_0$ , and  $h_1$  in this case) to eliminate the temporary deviations from full equilibrium that we saw in Figures 2 and 3. Unfortunately, policy makers cannot know the current state of the economy because of data limitations and so are forced to base their policy decisions instead on various indicator variables. To keep the present discussion simple, we will suppose that the only indicator variable available to policy makers is the interest rate. The two examples discussed at the end of the previous section illustrate the problem that policy makers face. In the example of Figure 2, a shock to money demand causes (1) a short-run decrease in  $R$  and increase in  $Y$  and (2) a long-run increase in  $R$  and decrease in  $Y$ . In the example of Figure 3, a shock to commodity demand also causes a short-run decrease in  $R$  but a concurrent decrease rather than increase in  $Y$ ; in the long run,  $R$  decreases even more, and output

rises, possibly ending up above its pre-shock value (but drawn in Figure 3 as ultimately lower than the pre-shock value). A policy maker who wants to use policy to stabilize real output will find himself in a quandary because a given observed movement in the interest rate - the only information he has on the current state of the economy - can correspond to a positive or negative shock to output about its expected value and to a positive or negative change in the expected value itself. The policy maker thus will have difficulty deciding which way to move his policy parameters and how far to move them.<sup>8</sup> The analysis that follows derives the optimal policy prescription.

Before we proceed to the formal analysis, we can see immediately something of the general character of the answer. Optimal choice of the four policy parameters will depend on two sets of parameters in the model: (1) the variances and covariances of all disturbance terms, and (2) the slope and intercept terms of the various demand and supply functions. The variances and covariances matter because they determine the probabilities that an observed change in the interest rate is caused by shifts in each of the IS, LM, and SS curves. The policy maker needs to know which curve is shifting to respond appropriately. The slopes and intercepts matter because they determine the impact that any policy response will have on output and therefore determine how big the policy response should be. (For example, if the LM curve were flat, then the money demand shock shown in Figure 2 would have no effect on the economy because the LM curve would simply shift rightward on top of itself.) The four policy parameters cause

---

<sup>8</sup>In fact, the information problem is even more difficult for the policy maker because the economy also can experience shocks to the aggregate supply function, causing shifts in the SS curve with commensurate changes in the interest rate. Such shifts are included in the formal analysis below, though not shown in Figures 2 or 3.

movements and tilts in the LM and SS curves; the effect on output of moving either of these curves depends on the initial positions and slopes of all three curves.<sup>9</sup>

We now proceed to a formal derivation of the optimal choice of the model's four policy parameters,  $b_0$ ,  $b_1$ ,  $h_0$ , and  $h_1$ .

### 1. *Optimality Criterion.*

Optimality is defined as the maximization of a social welfare function  $V$  that depends on both the expected level of output  $EY$  and the variance  $VarY$  of output about  $EY$ . The function is

$$(22) \quad V(EY, VarY)$$
$$V_1 > 0 \quad V_{11} < 0$$
$$V_2 < 0 \quad V_{22} < 0$$

We have no intuition for the signs of the cross-derivative  $V_{12} = V_{21}$ . They play no role in what follows, so we leave them unspecified.

The reader will notice the absence from the welfare function of that standard goal variable of the banking literature, "banking system stability." The policy maker's goal is to maximize social welfare; banking system stability is in itself no more relevant to that goal than, say, cheese shop stability (apologies to Monte Python). Banking system stability does enter the welfare function indirectly, in a sense, because the banking system affects the economy in two important ways that other specific industries (including cheese shops) do not. The first is the classic monetary transmission mechanism. Inside money is created by bank lending, so disruptions to the banking system also disrupt the money supply. The second is the intermediary service, which

---

<sup>9</sup>Readers familiar with Poole's (1970) analysis will recognize the similarities between his work and the analysis presented here.

affects the efficiency of production. Banking system instability can cause instability in output through both channels. Nonetheless, minimization of banking system stability is not an objective of optimal policy and so is not an end in itself. It is relevant only to the extent that it leads to the optimal mix of expected output and variance of output. Indeed, as we now see, in a maximizing environment with policy trade-offs, it is as conceivable that there is not enough banking system instability as that there is too little.

Bank regulation affects the ability of both the monetary channel and the financial services channel to transmit any instability in the banking system to real output. In the model, “banking system instability” would be interpreted as the variance of the random term  $\mu$  in the money multiplier equation (6). That term captures various effects, including changes in the public’s desired currency/deposit ratio (which can change dramatically as part of a bank panic) and failure of banks (such as through bankruptcy, perhaps in response to a bank panic). Increasing the required bank regulation variable  $B$  reduces the transmission of any variability in  $\mu$  to aggregate output. To see this, recall that all equations in the model are in log form. Thus the money multiplier is the antilog of  $m_t$ :

$$\tilde{m}_t = e^{m_0}(1+B_t)^{-m_1}(1+R_t)^{-m_2}\tilde{\mu}_t$$

The variance of  $\tilde{m}$  involves the product of the variance of the random term  $\tilde{\mu}$  and the square of the term  $(1+B)^{-m_1}$ . A higher value of  $B$  thus reduces the variance of  $\tilde{m}$ . It then is clear from (2), (4), and (8) that the variances of aggregate output, the money supply, and the financial service all are reduced as well. Thus increasing the bank regulatory requirement reduces the variances of the variables of interest.

Finally, note that increasing the bank regulatory requirement affects not only the variances

of important variables but also their expected levels. In particular, a higher value of B means a lower value of expected output EY, as is easily seen by substituting the expected values of (6), (8), and (10) into the expected value of (2). We thus have the basis for a classic optimization problem: on the one hand, raising B is good because it reduces variance of output, but on the other hand it is bad because it reduces expected output. We now turn our attention to solving that optimization problem.

## 2. The Effects of the Policy Parameters on EY and Y.

It is convenient to consolidate the effects of the policy parameters in the expressions for EY and Y. If we substitute the expressions for the  $X_i$  given in (14) into (18) and (19) and rearrange terms, we get (after an enormous amount of tedious algebra)

$$(23) \quad EY_t = \frac{Z_{EY0} + Z_{EY1}b_0 + Z_{EY2}b_1}{Z_{D0} + Z_{D1}b_1} \\ \equiv Y^e(b_0, b_1)$$

$$(24) \quad Y_t = EY_t + \left( \frac{\sum_{i=0}^9 Z_{\alpha Yi} q_i}{\sum_{i=0}^5 Z_{YDj} q_j} \right) \alpha_t + \left( \frac{\sum_{i=0}^9 Z_{\beta Yi} q_i}{\sum_{i=0}^5 Z_{YDj} q_j} \right) \beta_t + \left( \frac{\sum_{i=0}^9 Z_{\delta Yi} q_i}{\sum_{i=0}^5 Z_{YDj} q_j} \right) \delta_t + \left( \frac{\sum_{i=0}^9 Z_{\eta Yi} q_i}{\sum_{i=0}^5 Z_{YDj} q_j} \right) \eta_t \\ + \left( \frac{\sum_{i=0}^9 Z_{\mu Yi} q_i}{\sum_{i=0}^5 Z_{YDj} q_j} \right) \mu_t + \left( \frac{\sum_{i=0}^2 Z_{\phi Yi} q_i}{\sum_{i=0}^5 Z_{YDj} q_j} \right) \phi_t + \left( \frac{\sum_{i=0}^2 Z_{\theta Yi} q_i}{\sum_{i=0}^5 Z_{YDj} q_j} \right) \theta_t \\ = Y_t^e + K^\alpha(b_1, h_1) \alpha_t + K^\beta(b_1, h_1) \beta_t + K^\delta(b_1, h_1) \delta_t + K^\eta(b_1, h_1) \eta_t + K^\mu(b_1, h_1) \mu_t \\ + K^\phi(b_1, h_1) \phi_t + K^\theta(b_1, h_1) \theta_t$$

where the Z coefficients, defined in Table 1, depend on the system parameters other than the four

policy parameters, the  $q_i$  are the elements of the 10-fold vector

$$\mathbf{q} \equiv (1, h_1, b_1, h_1 b_1, h_1^2, b_1^2, h_1^2 b_1, h_1 b_1^2, h_1^3, b_1^3)$$

and the  $K^j$  coefficients are the ratios of the sums in the coefficients in the first line of (24). These  $K^j$  are functions of  $b_1$  and  $h_1$ . We can make (24) more compact by defining the vector  $\Omega$  of random terms:

$$\Omega_t \equiv (\alpha_t, \beta_t, \delta_t, \eta_t, \mu_t, \phi_t, \theta_t)$$

so that we can write (24) as

$$(25) \quad Y_t = Y^e(b_0, b_1) + \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} K_\omega(b_1, h_1) \omega_t$$

We then can write the variance of current output as

$$(26) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Var} Y_t &\equiv E(Y_t - Y^e)^2 \\ &= E\left(Y^e + \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} K^\omega \omega_t - Y^e\right)^2 \\ &= E\left(\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} K^\omega \omega_t\right)^2 \\ &= \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} (K^\omega)^2 \sigma_\omega^2 + 2 \sum_{\omega \neq \nu \in \Omega} K^\omega K^\nu \sigma_{\omega\nu} \end{aligned}$$

There are some interesting things to notice here. Both expected income  $EY$  and current income  $Y$  depend on the bank regulation policy parameters  $b_0$  and  $b_1$ . Bank regulation affects the amount of loans made for any given stock of high powered money and so also affects the amount of the financial service offered by banks. The financial service has real effects and so affects both  $EY$  and  $Y$ . In contrast, monetary policy has much more limited impact.  $EY$  does not depend on either  $h_0$  or  $h_1$ ; money is expectationally neutral. Current income  $Y$  also is independent of  $h_0$ , but it does depend on  $h_1$ . Independence from  $h_0$  is another manifestation of expectational neutrality;

$h_0$  is the deterministic component of high powered money's intercept and affects no real variables. Dependence of  $Y$  on  $h_1$  reflects the ability of monetary policy to amplify or reduce random disturbances through the reaction function and is typical of rational expectations models such as that used here (Walsh, 1998; Woglom, 1979).

### 3. *Optimal Regulatory and Monetary Policy.*

We choose  $b_0$ ,  $b_1$ ,  $h_0$ , and  $h_1$  to maximize (22). The four first order conditions are

$$\begin{aligned}
 (27) \quad \frac{\partial V}{\partial b_0} &= V_1 \frac{\partial Y^e}{\partial b_0} + V_2 \frac{\partial Var Y}{\partial b_0} \\
 &= V_1 \frac{\partial Y^e}{\partial b_0} \\
 &\equiv J^{b_0}(b_0, b_1) \\
 &= 0 \quad \text{for max}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (28) \quad \frac{\partial V}{\partial b_1} &= V_1 \frac{\partial Y^e}{\partial b_1} + V_2 \frac{\partial Var Y}{\partial b_1} \\
 &\equiv J^{b_1}(b_0, b_1, h_1) \\
 &= 0 \quad \text{for max}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (29) \quad \frac{\partial V}{\partial h_0} &= V_1 \frac{\partial Y^e}{\partial h_0} + V_2 \frac{\partial Var Y}{\partial h_0} \\
 &\equiv 0 \quad \text{for all } h_0
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(30) \quad \frac{\partial V}{\partial h_1} &= V_1 \frac{\partial Y^e}{\partial h_1} + V_2 \frac{\partial \text{Var}Y}{\partial h_1} \\
&= V_2 \frac{\partial \text{Var}Y}{\partial h_1} \\
&\equiv J^{h_1}(b_1, h_1) \\
&= 0 \quad \text{for max}
\end{aligned}$$

The signs of the derivatives of the functions  $J^i$  generally are ambiguous, depending on the magnitudes of all the structural parameters of the system. The parameter  $h_0$  does not affect anything, so its first order condition (29) is identically zero irrespective of the value chosen. Choice of  $h_0$  is arbitrary, and we may ignore equation (29) hereafter. The other three policy parameters are chosen to satisfy the system consisting of (27), (28), and (30). In general, the three relevant policy parameters  $b_0$ ,  $b_1$ , and  $h_1$  must be determined simultaneously. This may seem a little surprising, given that  $b_0$  does not directly affect the variance of income  $\text{Var}Y$  and  $h_1$  does not directly affect the expected level of output  $EY$ . Indeed,  $b_0$  is absent from the first order condition (30) for  $h_1$ , and  $h_1$  is absent from the condition (27) for  $b_0$ . However,  $b_1$  enters both conditions and so ties  $b_0$  and  $h_1$  together. Choice of  $b_0$  affects choice of  $b_1$ ; choice of  $b_1$  affects choice of  $h_1$ ; and conversely.

The system (27), (28), and (30) is highly non-linear in the three policy parameters, so an explicit solution is impossible to provide. Nonetheless, we can deduce several important conclusions quite quickly.

### 3.1. *Output effects of monetary policy.*

Standard rational expectations models obtain the result that monetary policy affects only

the variance of current output but not the level of expected real output. Once we introduce financial services and regulation of the banking system, we get quite a different result. In such a setting, monetary policy does affect the level of expected real output. The effect is indirect, but it is there. Bank regulatory requirements alter the amount of financial service provided by the banking system and thus affect expected output directly. However, the optimal values for the bank regulation parameters depend on the value of the monetary policy reaction parameter  $h_1$ , so the choice of  $h_1$  affects the choice of  $b_0$  and  $b_1$  and thereby affects not only  $\text{Var}Y$  but also  $EY$ .

### *3.2. The level of regulatory policy.*

Although the monetary policy intercept parameter  $h_0$  is not relevant to anything of interest here, the regulation policy intercept parameter  $b_0$  is. The mean level of the bank regulatory variable  $B$  is  $b_0 + b_1 ER$ , which depends not only on the reaction parameter  $b_1$  but also on the intercept parameter  $b_0$ . The value of  $b_0$  affects the amount of lending for any given quantity of high powered money and thus also affects the amount of the financial service  $F$  supplied by the banking system; that in turn affects aggregate output.

### *3.3. Active bank regulatory policy.*

A very interesting result is that the optimal bank regulation reaction parameter  $b_1$  generally is not zero. Both the sign and magnitude of  $b_1$  depend on all the non-policy parameters of the system: the intercept and slope coefficients from the demand and supply equations for both money and output and the variances and covariances of all the random disturbances in the economy. These system parameters are impounded in the  $J^i$  functions in (27), (28), and (30). This result mirrors the well-known conclusion from the literature on optimal monetary policy, where it is shown that the monetary policy reaction parameter generally is not zero and depends on all the

parameters of the system (Poole, 1970; Walsh, 1998; and Woglom, 1979). As in that literature, the parameter  $h_1$  generally is not zero.

An important implication is that bank regulation should not be a passive activity, in which the bank regulatory requirements are set once (or once in a great while) and then left unchanged. Rather, the requirements should change in response to the shocks hitting the economy.

As in all models of this type, the effectiveness of monetary policy hinges on the monetary authority having an information advantage over private agents. If the private sector knows everything the central bank knows, it can achieve everything that reactive monetary policy can simply by adjusting the price level.<sup>10</sup> The same conclusion is *not* true of bank regulation. Because both  $b_0$  and  $b_1$  directly affect the quantity of financial service  $F$  provided to the economy, they have real effects even if all agents in the economy have the same information as the regulators. We can see this in Figure 1, in which the slope of the SS function is not vertical, as it is in the usual treatment (Branson, 1989), but rather is positive, reflecting the effect of the financial service  $F$ . The quantity of  $F$  is determined in part by the values of  $b_0$  and  $b_1$ .

#### 3.4. *Institutional arrangements for optimal policy coordination.*

The simultaneity of optimal policy parameter choice means that regulation of bank capital and conduct of monetary policy should be coordinated. Neither can be done properly without

---

<sup>10</sup>Of course, it may be not be realistic to suppose that most private agents have same information about the economy that the central bank has. Indeed, some information available to the central bank is likely to be proprietary information that must be kept secret. This certainly is the case with the US central bank, which has access to a great deal of detailed information on individual private banks. In addition, it seems safe to say the average household knows much less than the central bank about the economy's structure and workings; this sort of information advantage, however, is very difficult to capture in a formal rational expectations model in which all agents know the true structure of the economy.

reference to the other. The requisite coordination is all the more demanding because, as just noted, bank capital regulation should be active rather than passive. The need for coordination arises from two separate sources in the model. First, random disturbances in the banking and monetary sectors may be correlated. It is quite plausible, for example, that the disturbance  $\phi$  to the supply of financial services is correlated with the disturbance  $\mu$  to the money multiplier. Second, even if the disturbance covariances are all zero, the optimal policy parameters are still related to each other through the structure of the economy. In general, each policy parameter depends on all the coefficients and variances of the system, so each policy parameter's optimal value is influenced by all sectors of the economy. Conversely, this fact implies that bank regulatory policy can be used to counteract disturbances in both the real and monetary sectors of the economy; indeed, the formal solution shows that the two sets of policy parameters must be varied simultaneously to achieve an optimal response to any given disturbance to the system.

These conclusions argue for a close link between the monetary and regulatory authorities. The obvious way to provide that link is to give responsibility for both types of policy to a single government agency. Indeed, the whole spirit of the foregoing analysis implies this arrangement. Choosing both the monetary and regulatory policy parameters by maximization of a single social welfare function amounts to having a central planner make all policy, and what is a central planner but a single agency?

Other considerations of the real world not included in the analysis here may call for modification of this conclusion. For example, Di Noia and Di Giorgio (1999) present evidence that countries where banking supervision is assigned monopolistically to the central bank are characterized on average by more protected and less efficient banking systems. Why this is true is

unclear. Perhaps it is just another manifestation of the tendency for regulated industries to end up dominating the agencies that regulate them; it may be that powerful banks get their governments to assign supervision of themselves to a single agency that they then end up controlling one way or another. In any case, monopoly control may be as inefficient and unimaginative in the regulatory sphere as it is in the productive one. If so, there is then a tension between the theoretical ideal of a single unified monetary and regulatory agency suggested by the results presented above and the political reality that monopoly agencies are inefficient.

A concern sometimes suggested in the literature is that bank regulators and the central bank have different objectives, so that assigning regulation to the central bank could pervert regulation if the central bank were to give too much weight to monetary policy considerations in deciding what the regulations should be. The analysis presented here suggests quite the opposite. With one agency responsible for both regulation and monetary policy, that agency then acts as a social planner and gives correct weight to all considerations. Indeed, if improper weights are ever likely to be given to parameter choices, it would seem to be when the two functions are assigned to separate institutions that may well have different, parochial objective functions.

## **V. Conclusions**

On a theoretical level, perhaps the most surprising conclusion of the foregoing analysis is that monetary policy can affect the expected level of real output even in a rational expectations model. This effect arises from the cross-effects of bank regulation and monetary policy on each other. Bank regulation affects the money supply, so it ends up being chosen simultaneously with and therefore influenced by monetary policy. However, bank regulation directly affects output, so

monetary policy affects output indirectly. Optimal choice of monetary policy takes this indirect effect into consideration.

On a practical level, the most important conclusions concern the conduct of regulatory policy and the implied institutional arrangements for carrying it out. Bank regulation should be active rather than passive, continually changing in response to economic conditions. This is an important conclusion. There is no question that financial regulation can have powerful effects on aggregate economic activity.<sup>11</sup> To my knowledge, however, systematic activism has not characterized bank regulatory policy in any country, although there is some evidence of occasional episodes in which regulations were conditioned on economic conditions.<sup>12</sup> No less important is the conclusion that optimal regulatory and monetary policy should be simultaneously chosen, implying that the institutions responsible for them must at least coordinate their activities and perhaps even should be combined into one agency.

The analysis here suggests some lines of future research. In the foregoing analysis, the policy objective function includes only the normal level of output and variation around that level. A more realistic objective function would also include at least the rate of inflation (possibly both its level and variance). A related issue is the form of the monetary policy and financial regulation

---

<sup>11</sup>For example, Choi (2000) argues that strengthening of capital adequacy requirements were an important contributor to the recent sharp recession in Korea.

<sup>12</sup>Berger, Kyle, and Scalise (2000) present evidence that U. S. bank regulators were stricter during the credit crunch period of 1989-92 than subsequently. The last recession in the U.S. occurred during 1989-92; after that, the U.S. economy enjoyed a major boom. Even if this behavior was part of a larger systematic relation between regulation and economic conditions, the direction of causality is unclear. If economic conditions drove regulatory behavior, the optimality of the latter cannot be known until the implied reaction function is compared with that suggested by the foregoing theory.

reaction functions. Most central banks seem to follow a feedback rule of the Taylor type, responding to lagged values of variables of interest and treat the interest rate as an instrument rather than an indicator, and it would be worthwhile to embed such monetary reaction functions in the analytical framework presented above. A more difficult challenge is a better specification of the financial regulation reaction function. Most financial regulators consider the soundness of financial institutions, worrying for example about the proper valuation and control of the riskiness of various types of capital that go into the capital ratio. Adding such concerns to the foregoing theory would be most useful to regulators, but it also seems quite difficult to do. Finally, the treatment of the financial sector should be extended. A full theory would include a cost of providing the financial service, an explicit benefit of doing so, and an exploration of how the provision of the financial service would change in response to monetary and regulatory policy changes. The relevant micro theories are well developed (see the literature cited earlier), but including any of them in a tractable macro model is a very difficult challenge.

These extensions all would greatly enrich the theory and would be useful to both theorists and policy makers. It seems unlikely, however, that they would alter any of the qualitative conclusions derived above.

## References

- Allen, Franklin, and Anthony M. Santomero. "The Theory of Financial Intermediation," *Journal of Banking and Finance* 11, 1997, pp. 1461-85.
- Berger, Allen N., Margaret K. Kyle, and Joseph M. Scalise. "Did U.S. Bank Supervisors Get Tougher During the Credit Crunch? Did They Get Easier During the Banking Boom? Did It Matter to Bank Lending?," Finance and Economics Discussion Series paper #2000-39, Federal Reserve Board, 2000.
- Bernanke, Ben S. "Bankruptcy, Liquidity, And Recession," *American Economic Review* 71, 1981, pp. 155-9.
- Bernanke, Ben S. "Nonmonetary Effects of the Financial Crisis in the Propagation of the Great Depression," *American Economic Review* 73, 1983, pp. 257-76.
- Bernanke, Ben, and Mark Gertler. "Agency Costs, Net Worth, And Business Fluctuations," *American Economic Review* 79, 1989, pp. 14-31.
- Bernanke, Ben, and Mark Gertler. "Financial Fragility And Economic Performance," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 105, 1990, pp. 87-114.
- Branson, William H. *Macroeconomic Theory and Policy*, Harper and Row, 1989.
- Bryant, John. "A Model of Reserves, Bank Runs, and Deposit Insurance," *Journal of Banking and Finance* 43, 1980, pp. 749-61.
- Choi, Gongpil. "The Macroeconomic Implications of Regulatory Capital Adequacy Requirements for Korean Banks," *Economic Notes* 29, 2000, pp. 111-43.
- Diamond, Douglas. "Financial Intermediation and Delegated Monitoring," *Review of Economic Studies* 51, 1984, pp. 393-414.
- Diamond, Douglas, and P. Dybvig. "Bank Runs, Deposit Insurance, and Liquidity," *Journal of Political Economy* 91, 1983, pp. 401-19.
- Di Noia, Carmine, and Giorgio Di Giorgio. "Should Banking Supervision and Monetary Policy Tasks Be Given to Different Agencies?" *International Finance* 2, 1999.
- Fama, Eugene F. "What's Different About Banks?" *Journal of Monetary Economics* 15, January 1985, pp. 29-40.
- Ferguson, Roger W., Jr. "Alternative Approaches to Financial Supervision and Regulation,"

- Journal of Financial Services Research* 17, 2000, pp. 297-303.
- Furlong, Frederick T. "Capital Regulation and Bank Lending," *Economic Review* 3, 1992, Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, pp. 23-33.
- Holmstrom, Bengt, and Jean Tirole. "Financial Intermediation, Loanable Funds, and the Real Sector," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 112, August 1997, pp. 663-691.
- McCallum, Bennet T. "Monetary Analysis in Models Without Money," typescript, Carnegie-Mellon University, 2000.
- Poole, William. "Optimal Choice of Monetary Policy Instruments in a Simple Stochastic Macro Model," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 84, May 1970, pp. 197-216.
- Santomero, Anthony M. "The Bank Capital Issue," in *Financial Regulation and Monetary Arrangements after 1992*, C. Wihlborg, M. Fratianni, and T. D. Willett, eds. Elsevier Science Publishers, 1991.
- Santomero, Anthony M., and John J. Seater. "Is There An Optimal Size for the Financial Sector?" *Journal of Banking and Finance* 24, June 2000, pp. 945-965.
- Walsh, Carl E. *Monetary Theory and Policy*. MIT Press, 1998.
- Woglom, Geoffrey. "Rational Expectations and Monetary Policy in a Simple Macroeconomic Model," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 93, February 1979, pp. 91-105.

**Table 1**  
Definitions of Composite Parameters in Equations ?, (23), and (24)

$U_0$	$a_0 + a_1d_0 - m_0$
$U_1$	-1
$U_2$	$m_1$
$U_3$	$m_2 + a_1d_1 + a_2$
$U_4$	- $m_1$
$U_5$	$s_2f_1km_2$
$U_6$	$s_2f_1$
$U_7$	- $s_2f_1km_1$
$U_8$	$s_0 + s_2f_0 + s_2f_1km_0$
$W_1$	$[s_1 - s_2f_1(k-1)]m_2 + (s_1 + s_2f_1)(a_1d_1 + a_2) - d_1$
$W_2$	$s_1$
$W_3$	$[- s_1 + s_2f_1(k-1)]m_1$
$W_4$	$[s_2f_1(k-1) + s_1]m_2 + (s_1 - s_2f_1)(a_1d_1 + a_2)$
$W_5$	$[- s_2f_1(k-1) - s_1]m_1$
$W_6$	- $s_2f_1(k-1)m_2 + s_2f_1(a_1d_1 + a_2)$
$W_7$	$s_2f_1(k-1)m_1$
$W_8$	$s_2f_1k(a_1d_1 + a_2)$
$W_9$	$s_2f_1(k-1)$
$W_{10}$	$2s_1(m_2 + a_1d_1 + a_2) - d_1$
$W_{11}$	$2s_1$
$W_{12}$	- $2s_1m_1$
$W_{13}$	$a_1s_2f_1km_2 - m_2 - a_1d_1 - a_2$
$W_{14}$	$a_1s_2f_1 - 1$
$W_{15}$	- $a_1s_2f_1km_1 + m_1$

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{EY0} & - d_1 s_0 - d_1 s_2 f_0 + s_2 f_1 d_0 (a_1 d_1 + a_2) - d_1 s_2 f_1 (a_0 + a_1 d_0) - d_1 s_2 f_1 (k-1) m_0 - s_2 f_1 d_0 (k-1) m_2 \\
Z_{EY1} & d_1 s_2 f_1 (k-1) m_1 \\
Z_{EY2} & s_2 f_1 d_0 (k-1) m_1 \\
\\
Z_{D0} & s_2 f_1 (a_1 d_1 + a_2) + s_2 f_1 (k-1) m_2 - d_1 \\
Z_{D1} & s_2 f_1 (k-1) m_1 \\
\\
Z_{EP0} & (m_2 + a_1 d_1 + a_2)(s_0 + s_2 f_0 + s_2 f_1 k m_0) + (a_0 + a_1 d_0 - m_0) s_2 f_1 k m_2 - (m_2 + a_1 d_1 + a_2) d_0 + \\
& d_1 (a_0 + a_1 d_0 - m_0) \\
Z_{EP1} & (m_2 + a_1 d_1 + a_2) s_2 f_1 - d_1 \\
Z_{EP2} & (s_0 + s_2 f_0 + s_2 f_1 k m_0) + (a_0 + a_1 d_0 - m_0) s_2 f_1 - s_2 f_1 k m_2 - d_0 \\
Z_{EP3} & (m_2 + a_1 d_1 + a_2)(-s_2 f_1 k m_1) + m_1 + d_1 s_2 f_1 k m_2 + d_1 m_1 \\
Z_{EP4} & - m_1 (s_0 + s_2 f_0 + s_2 f_1 k m_0) - s_2 f_1 k m_1 (a_0 + a_1 d_0 - m_0) + d_0 m_1 \\
Z_{EP5} & s_2 f_1 \\
Z_{EP6} & - s_2 f_1 m_1 \\
Z_{EP7} & - s_2 f_1 k m_1 \\
Z_{EP8} & s_2 f_1 m_1 \\
Z_{EP9} & s_2 f_1 k m_1 \\
Z_{EP10} & - s_2 f_1 \\
\\
Z_{YD0} & (s_1 + s_2 f_1)(m_2 + a_1 d_1 + a_2)^2 - s_2 f_1 (m_2 + a_1 d_1 + a_2) k m_2 - d_1 (m_2 + a_1 d_1 + a_2) \\
Z_{YD1} & 2s_1 (m_2 + a_1 d_1 + a_2) + s_2 f_1 (m_2 + a_1 d_1 + a_2) - s_2 f_1 k m_2 - d_1 \\
Z_{YD2} & - 2(s_1 + s_2 f_1)(m_2 + a_1 d_1 + a_2) m_1 + s_2 f_1 (m_2 + a_1 d_1 + a_2) k m_1 - s_2 f_1 k m_1 m_2 + d_1 m_1 \\
Z_{YD3} & - 2s_1 m_1 + s_2 f_1 (k-1) m_1 \\
Z_{YD4} & s_1 \\
Z_{YD5} & s_1 m_1^2 - s_2 f_1 (k-1) m_1^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{\alpha Y0} & \quad \mathbf{W}_{10} \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{U}_5 + \mathbf{d}_1 \mathbf{W}_4 \\
Z_{\alpha Y1} & \quad \mathbf{W}_{10} \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{U}_6 + \mathbf{W}_{11} \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{U}_5 + \mathbf{W}_{10} \mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{U}_5 + \mathbf{d}_1 \mathbf{W}_2 \\
Z_{\alpha Y2} & \quad \mathbf{W}_{10} \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{U}_7 + \mathbf{W}_{12} \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{U}_5 + \mathbf{W}_{10} \mathbf{W}_3 \mathbf{U}_5 + \mathbf{d}_1 \mathbf{W}_5 \\
Z_{\alpha Y3} & \quad \mathbf{W}_{11} \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{U}_7 + \mathbf{W}_{12} \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{U}_6 + \mathbf{W}_{10} \mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{U}_7 + \mathbf{W}_{12} \mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{U}_5 + \mathbf{W}_{10} \mathbf{W}_3 \mathbf{U}_6 + \mathbf{W}_{11} \mathbf{W}_3 \mathbf{U}_5 \\
Z_{\alpha Y4} & \quad \mathbf{W}_{11} \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{U}_6 + \mathbf{W}_{10} \mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{U}_6 + \mathbf{W}_{11} \mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{U}_5 \\
Z_{\alpha Y5} & \quad \mathbf{W}_{12} \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{U}_7 + \mathbf{W}_{10} \mathbf{W}_3 \mathbf{U}_7 + \mathbf{W}_{12} \mathbf{W}_3 \mathbf{U}_5 \\
Z_{\alpha Y6} & \quad \mathbf{W}_{11} \mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{U}_7 + \mathbf{W}_{12} \mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{U}_6 + \mathbf{W}_{11} \mathbf{W}_3 \mathbf{U}_6 \\
Z_{\alpha Y7} & \quad \mathbf{W}_{12} \mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{U}_7 + \mathbf{W}_{11} \mathbf{W}_3 \mathbf{U}_7 + \mathbf{W}_{12} \mathbf{W}_3 \mathbf{U}_6 \\
Z_{\alpha Y8} & \quad \mathbf{W}_{11} \mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{U}_6 \\
Z_{\alpha Y9} & \quad \mathbf{W}_{12} \mathbf{W}_3 \mathbf{U}_7
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{\beta Y0} & \quad m_1(- \mathbf{W}_{10} \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{W}_8 + \mathbf{d}_1 \mathbf{W}_4) \\
Z_{\beta Y1} & \quad m_1(- \mathbf{W}_{10} \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{W}_9 - \mathbf{W}_{11} \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{W}_8 - \mathbf{W}_{10} \mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{W}_8 + \mathbf{d}_1 \mathbf{W}_2) \\
Z_{\beta Y2} & \quad m_1(- \mathbf{W}_{12} \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{W}_8 - \mathbf{W}_{10} \mathbf{W}_3 \mathbf{W}_8 + \mathbf{d}_1 \mathbf{W}_5) \\
Z_{\beta Y3} & \quad m_1(- \mathbf{W}_{12} \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{W}_9 - \mathbf{W}_{12} \mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{W}_8 - \mathbf{W}_{10} \mathbf{W}_3 \mathbf{W}_9 - \mathbf{W}_{11} \mathbf{W}_3 \mathbf{W}_8) \\
Z_{\beta Y4} & \quad m_1(- \mathbf{W}_{11} \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{W}_9 - \mathbf{W}_{10} \mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{W}_9 - \mathbf{W}_{11} \mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{W}_8) \\
Z_{\beta Y5} & \quad m_1(- \mathbf{W}_{12} \mathbf{W}_3 \mathbf{W}_8) \\
Z_{\beta Y6} & \quad m_1(- \mathbf{W}_{12} \mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{W}_9 - \mathbf{W}_{11} \mathbf{W}_3 \mathbf{W}_9) \\
Z_{\beta Y7} & \quad m_1(- \mathbf{W}_{12} \mathbf{W}_3 \mathbf{W}_9) \\
Z_{\beta Y8} & \quad m_1(- \mathbf{W}_{11} \mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{W}_9) \\
Z_{\beta Y9} & \quad 0
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{\delta Y0} & \quad \mathbf{W}_{10} \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{W}_{13} + \mathbf{d}_1 \mathbf{a}_1 \mathbf{W}_4 \\
Z_{\delta Y1} & \quad \mathbf{W}_{10} \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{W}_{14} + \mathbf{W}_{11} \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{W}_{13} + \mathbf{W}_{10} \mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{W}_{13} + \mathbf{c}_1 \mathbf{a}_1 \mathbf{W}_2 \\
Z_{\delta Y2} & \quad \mathbf{W}_{10} \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{W}_{15} + \mathbf{W}_{12} \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{W}_{13} + \mathbf{W}_{10} \mathbf{W}_3 \mathbf{W}_{13} + \mathbf{d}_1 \mathbf{a}_1 \mathbf{W}_5
\end{aligned}$$

$$Z_{\delta Y3} \quad W_{11} W_1 W_{15} + W_{12} W_1 W_{14} + W_{10} W_2 W_{15} + W_{12} W_2 W_{13} + W_{11} W_3 W_{13}$$

$$Z_{\delta Y4} \quad W_{11} W_1 W_{14} + W_{10} W_2 W_{14} + W_{11} W_2 W_{13}$$

$$Z_{\delta Y5} \quad W_{12} W_1 W_{15} + W_{10} W_3 W_{15} + W_{12} W_3 W_{13}$$

$$Z_{\delta Y6} \quad W_{11} W_2 W_{15} + W_{12} W_2 W_{14} + W_{11} W_3 W_{14}$$

$$Z_{\delta Y7} \quad W_{12} W_2 W_{15} + W_{11} W_3 W_{15} + W_{12} W_3 W_{14}$$

$$Z_{\delta Y8} \quad W_{11} W_2 W_{14}$$

$$Z_{\delta Y9} \quad W_{12} W_3 W_{15}$$

$$Z_{\eta Y0} \quad W_{10} W_1 W_6 - d_1 W_4$$

$$Z_{\eta Y1} \quad W_{11} W_1 W_6 + W_{10} W_2 W_6 - d_1 W_2$$

$$Z_{\eta Y2} \quad W_{10} W_1 W_7 + W_{12} W_1 W_6 + W_{10} W_3 W_6 - d_1 W_5$$

$$Z_{\eta Y3} \quad W_{11} W_1 W_7 + W_{10} W_2 W_7 + W_{12} W_2 W_6 + W_{11} W_3 W_6$$

$$Z_{\eta Y4} \quad W_{11} W_2 W_6$$

$$Z_{\eta Y5} \quad W_{12} W_1 W_7 + W_{10} W_3 W_7 + W_{12} W_3 W_6$$

$$Z_{\eta Y6} \quad W_{11} W_2 W_7$$

$$Z_{\eta Y7} \quad W_{11} W_2 W_7 + W_{11} W_3 W_7$$

$$Z_{\eta Y8} \quad 0$$

$$Z_{\eta Y9} \quad W_{12} W_3 W_7$$

$$Z_{\mu Y0} \quad W_{10} W_1 W_8 - d_1 W_4$$

$$Z_{\mu Y1} \quad W_{10} W_1 W_9 + W_{11} W_1 W_8 + W_{10} W_2 W_8 - d_1 W_2$$

$$Z_{\mu Y2} \quad W_{12} W_1 W_8 + W_{10} W_3 W_8 - d_1 W_5$$

$$Z_{\mu Y3} \quad W_{12} W_1 W_9 + W_{12} W_2 W_8 + W_{10} W_3 W_9 + W_{11} W_3 W_8$$

$$Z_{\mu Y4} \quad W_{11} W_1 W_8 + W_{10} W_2 W_9 + W_{11} W_2 W_8$$

$$Z_{\mu Y5} \quad W_{12} W_3 W_8$$

$$Z_{\mu Y6} \quad W_{12} W_2 W_9 + W_{11} W_3 W_9$$

$$Z_{\mu Y7} = W_{12} W_3 W_9$$

$$Z_{\mu Y8} = W_{11} W_2 W_9$$

$$Z_{\mu Y9} = 0$$

$$Z_{\phi Y0} = s_2 W_{10}$$

$$Z_{\phi Y1} = s_2 W_{11}$$

$$Z_{\phi Y2} = s_2 W_{12}$$

$$Z_{\theta Y0} = W_{10}$$

$$Z_{\theta Y1} = W_{11}$$

$$Z_{\theta Y2} = W_{12}$$




Figure 1: IS-LM-SS




Figure 2: Increase in financial services supply




Figure 3: Negative shock to output demand




Figure 4: Negative shock to output demand when IS is horizontal