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## 1 Introduction

- The Great Depression led to profound debates about monetary reform.
- The intellectual depth of the 1930s debate was far greater than anything seen today.
- A large number of leading U.S. macroeconomists (Fisher, Simons, later Friedman) supported the so-called Chicago Plan:
- This reform separates the monetary and credit functions of banking.
- Deposits/Money: 100\% backing by public money becomes mandatory.
- Credit: Cannot be financed by creation, ex nihilo, of bank deposits.


## The Six Advantages of the Chicago Plan

The Four Advantages Identified by Fisher (1936)

1. Much better control of bank-lending-driven business cycles.
2. Complete elimination of bank runs.
3. Dramatic reduction of the (net) public debt.
4. Dramatic reduction of private debts.

The Two Additional Advantages Identified in This Paper
5. Large output gains approaching $10 \%$.
6. No liquidity trap problems, zero long-run inflation attainable.

## Six Advantages of the Chicago Plan: Detail

1. Much better control of bank-lending-driven business cycles:

- The key characteristic of today's banks is money creation/destruction.
- "Intermediation" is incidental/secondary.
- Banks can create/destroy deposits ex nihilo to start/crash a lending boom.
- This has proved very costly throughout history:

Reinhart and Rogoff (2009) + this paper's literature review.

- Creation of one's own funds is an extraordinary privilege enjoyed by no other business!
- Under the Chicago Plan bank money creation becomes impossible:
- Money \& credit are no longer tied together by balance sheets.
- Money (and to a lesser extent credit) can now be tightly controlled.
- Lending banks now become true intermediaries:

Have to obtain government money before lending it.
2. Complete elimination of bank runs requires two conditions:
i. Monetary liabilities must be fully backed by reserves of public money:

This is of course at the core of the Chicago Plan requirements.
ii. Credit assets must be funded by non-monetary liabilities -3 options:

1. Loans from the treasury: In this paper.
2. Bank equity:

* $100 \%$ equity or at least strict capital adequacy regulations.
* $100 \%$ equity $=$ only permissible funding for short-term lending.

3. Private savings/time deposits:

* They could become near-monies with financial engineering.
* Straightforward regulation is required to rule this out.

3. Dramatic reduction of the (net) public debt:

- To meet $100 \%$ reserve backing, banks have to borrow $\approx 185 \%$ of GDP.
- The public debt is only around $80 \%$ of GDP.
- Government becomes a large net creditor.
- Government can share gains through a citizens' dividend that must be used for the repayment of private debts.
- Model simulation: Net public debt goes from $80 \%$ to $-30 \%$ of GDP.
- Public money is not a debt, but equity! (FASAB (2012)).

4. Dramatic reduction of private debts:

- Government transfers part of treasury credit balances
to borrowers as citizens' dividend.
- Mandatory first use of dividends is repayment of private debts.
- Model simulation: Private debts go from $180 \%$ to $90 \%$ of GDP.
- Very beneficial because high debt levels are important crisis predictor:
* Schularick and Taylor (2012): Empirical support.
* Kumhof and Rancière (2010): Theoretical mechanism.


## Current Banking System Balance Sheet

| 20 | Government Bonds |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 100 | Short-Term and <br> Mortgage Loans | 184 | Deposits |
| 80 | Investment Loans |  |  |

## Transition to Chicago Plan Step 1

Banks purchase 100\% reserve cover against treasury credit IOU

| 20 | Government Bonds |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 100 | Short-Term and <br> Mortgage Loans | 184 | Deposits |
|  |  |  |  |

## Transition to Chicago Plan Step 2

Banks are split into money banks and credit investment trusts

## Credit Investment Trusts

| 20 | Government Bonds |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 100 | Short-Term and <br> Mortgage Loans | 184 | Treasury Credit |
| 80 | Investment Loans   <br>   16 | Bank Equity |  |

## Money Banks

## Transition to Chicago Plan Step 3

Bank-held government bonds are cancelled against treasury credit

## Credit Investment Trusts



## Money Banks

## Transition to Chicago Plan Step 3 - completed

Bank-held government bonds are cancelled against treasury credit

## Credit Investment Trusts



## Money Banks

## Transition to Chicago Plan Step 4

Part of treasury credit is distributed as a citizens' dividend

## Credit Investment Trusts



## Money Banks

## Transition to Chicago Plan Step 5

Mandatory first use of citizens' dividend is repayment of any debts

## Credit Investment Trusts



## Money Banks

## Transition to Chicago Plan Step 5 - completed

## Credit Investment Trusts



Money Banks

## Transition to Chicago Plan Step 6

Bank equity distribution due to reduced balance sheet size
Equity replaced by additional treasury credit

## Credit Investment Trusts



## Money Banks

Transition to Chicago Plan Step 7 - Optional
Treasury credit used to repay all remaining government debt held outside the financial system

- This is shown to illustrate that there is no need for government to have a dominant role in credit provision
- But the drawback is that this completely removes an important financial market benchmark and saving instrument


## Credit Investment Trusts



## Money Banks

## The Chicago Plan Is Completely Non-Inflationary

Prior to Chicago Plan


Deposits in private hands remain completely unchanged throughout. Inflation is determined by the relative supplies of deposits versus goods and services.

Chicago Plan 1


Chicago Plan 2


What changes is what deposits represent: Indestructible public money rather than volatile, destructible private money.

## Citizens' Dividend When Debts Are Unequal - Part 1

Equal per capita dividends but unequal debt levels

## Credit Investment Trusts

| 36 | Short-Term and <br> Mortgage Loans - <br> Low-Debt Individuals | 50 | Citizens' Accounts - <br> Low-Debt Individuals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64 | Short-Term and <br> Mortgage Loans - <br> High-Debt Individuals | 50 | Citizens' Accounts - <br> High-Debt Individuals |
| 80 | Investment Loans | 64 | Treasury Credit |
|  |  | 16 | Bank Equity |

## Money Banks

## Citizens' Dividend When Debts Are Unequal - Part 2

Application of citizens' dividend to debt repayment The dark red area is the remaining debt between private individuals

## Credit Investment Trusts



## Money Banks

# Citizens' Dividend When Debts Are Unequal - Part 3 

Intermediation of purely private credit continues through investment trusts

Residual
Non-Investment
Loans
Long-Term
Non-Monetary


## Money Banks

## Changes in Government Balance Sheet in Transition Period

Prior to Chicago Plan


Chicago Plan 1


Chicago Plan 2

5. Large output gains are due to:
a. Lower interest rates due to lower risk premia at lower debt levels.
b. Lower tax rates as seigniorage revenue is switched
from private banks to government.
c. Lower monitoring costs as money creation no longer requires
debt and thus costly monitoring.
6. No liquidity traps and zero steady state inflation:

- Main tools of monetary policy:

1. Nominal money growth rule that controls inflation.
2. Interest rate rule that controls price of treasury credit to banks.

- With these rules there can be no liquidity trap:
- Money is directly controlled by government, rather than by banks.
- Interest rate on treasury credit can become negative
$\Rightarrow$ no zero interest rate floor (ZIF).
- Implications for steady state inflation $\bar{\pi}$ :
- Under the current regime policy rate needs to stay above the ZIF.
- Higher $\bar{\pi}$ needed to permit safe distance between policy rate and ZIF.
- This is no longer an issue under the Chicago Plan.
- Therefore $\bar{\pi}=0$ is perfectly feasible.
- In other words, Chicago Plan is less, not more, inflationary than the current system!


## Any Disadvantages of the Chicago Plan?

1. Reasonable Concern: Transition Could be Difficult:

- Important economists did not think so: Fisher (1935), Friedman (1960).
- Many today agree that major reform is needed anyway.
- If we need to bite the bullet of a difficult transition, we might as well have a reform that maximizes the long-run benefits.

2. Unnecessary Concern: Banking System Could Become Uncompetitive

- Banking system remains private.
- Deposit banks: State-of-the-art payments system without loan worries.
- Lending banks: Efficient capital allocation without risk of bank runs.
- Lending banks operate as in today's textbooks: * First attract deposits of reserves, then lend them out.
* Supplemented by a highly flexible treasury credit line.
- Very effective mobilization of long-term savings: * Under CP this only requires creation of credit, not money.
- Consumption smoothing can continue as it does today: * Under CP many households can use debt-free cash to smooth.
- Only change: No more credit proliferation to create the money supply.


## 2 Chicago Plan in History of Monetary Thought

- A long line of distinguished thinkers has advocated government money issuance under the rule of law.
- Historical experience is very strongly in favor of it:
- Periods of private money issuance: Constant financial crises.
- Periods of government money issuance: Stability, very few crises.
- Are the many financial crises of the last 100 years a counter-argument?
- This would be a very serious logical error.
- Over the last 100 years governments have only ever been in charge of narrow money, and private banks in charge of overall money.
- If anything, recent financial crises must thus have been caused by banks.


## 3 The Model under the Current Monetary System

### 3.1 Banks' Central Bank Reserves Are Omitted

- Quantitatively: Reserves negligible at most times (not now).
- Conceptually: Reserves negligible at all times, for money creation.
- Why? The "deposit multiplier" is a fairy tale:
- Turns actual monetary transmission mechanism on its head.
- Kydland and Prescott (1990) for the monetarist era.
- Carpenter and Demiralp (2010) for the current era.
- If you control interest rates, you have to let reserves adjust freely.
- Bottom line: When banks ask for reserves, the central bank obliges.
- Transmission starts with deposit creation, and ends with reserve creation.
- Banks are therefore almost fully in control of the money creation process.


### 3.2 Banks Funded By Money Created Ex Nihilo, Not Savings

1. Agents who simultaneously borrow and hold deposits: Deposits $\neq$ savings.
2. Land that can be sold, against a deposit created through a loan, from financially unconstrained households to financially constrained households: Deposits $\neq$ savings.
3. Saving responds to investment, not the other way around. The steps are:

- New loan: Investor now has a loan liability and a deposit asset.
- Physical investment purchase:
- Investment happens first.
- Investor now hands his deposit to the seller.
- The seller's deposit is new saving, a consequence of investment.
- Critical step is initial creation of new money, ex nihilo, by the bank.


### 3.3 Banks

- Borrowers:

1. Financially constrained households:
(a) Mortgages on land.
(b) Consumer loans.
2. Manufacturing firms: Working capital loans.
3. Entrepreneurs: Investment loans.
4. Government: Holdings of government bonds.

- Depositors:

1. Financially unconstrained households (includes shadow banking).
2. Financially constrained households.
3. Manufacturing firms.

- Equity buffer to avoid penalties under Basel regulations.


### 3.4 Government

### 3.4.1 Monetary Policy

- Inflation forecast-based interest rate rule as currently used by the Fed.
- This rate only affects money and credit very indirectly and weakly.


### 3.4.2 Prudential Policy

- Passive Basel rule with fixed minimum capital adequacy ratio as currently mandated under Basel rules.


### 3.4.3 Fiscal Policy

- Structural deficit rule that responds to output gap. This represents automatic stabilizers currently in effect.
- Labor, capital and consumption tax rates adjust to satisfy the rule.


## 4 The Model under the Chicago Plan

- Basic structure of economy unchanged.
- Only describe decision problems that exhibit some changes.


### 4.1 Banks

- Money: $100 \%$ reserve backing of deposits by reserves.
- Credit: Investment loans financed by bank equity and treasury credit.
- All loans not fully repaid through citizens' dividend are spun off into nonbank investment trusts.


## Preventing the Emergence of Near-Monies

1. All or most investment lending financed by treasury credit.
2. All short-term lending funded by $100 \%$ equity.
3. All longer-term lending funded by maturity-matched debt liabilities.
4. No tax advantages for borrowing, or even tax advantages for equity.
5. No FDIC coverage for private liabilities of investment trusts.
6. Use of non-reserve liabilities illegal in payment or as collateral.

### 4.2 Government

4.2.1 Money

- Money growth rule: Growth of money = growth of output.
4.2.2 Credit I - Price of Credit
- Very gradual reduction of treasury credit rate to avoid investment boom.
- Eventual use of treasury credit rate to stabilize the business cycle.
- This rate is a restricted-access borrowing rate, not a general investment rate $\Rightarrow$ no zero lower bound.


### 4.2.3 Credit II - Quantity of Credit

- Quantitative lending guidance (Richard Werner).
- How? Government penalties through countercyclical Basel minimum capital adequacy requirement (MCAR).
- MCAR raised when investment is high.
- Results in reduced lending at higher cost.


## 5 Transition to the Chicago Plan

## Three of Fisher's (1936) Claims Are Validated

1. Bank runs are completely eliminated.
2. Net public debt goes from $80 \%$ to $-30 \%$ of GDP.
3. Private debts go from $180 \%$ to $90 \%$ of GDP.

Additional Important Results from the Simulations

1. Output gains approach $10 \%$.
2. Inflation can fall to zero without the risk of liquidity traps or ZIFs.

## Chicago Plan - Main Macro Variables

GDP


Investment
(\% Difference)


Real Wholesale Lending Rate


Consumption
(\% Difference)


Inflation
(pp Difference)


Labor Tax Rate
(pp Difference)


## Chicago Plan - Fiscal Variables

Government Deficit/GDP


Net New Treasury Credit/GDP


Seigniorage/GDP


Gross Debt Service/GDP
(pp Difference)


Transfers/GDP
(pp Difference)


Tax Revenue/GDP
(pp Difference)


## 6 Credit Booms and Busts

## The Fourth of Fisher's (1936) Claims Is Validated

- Boom-bust cycles caused by banks' sudden shift in optimism about borrower risk can be dramatically reduced.
- But policy needs quantity as well as price instruments to accomplish this.


## Chicago Plan - Business Cycles (Risk Shocks)



Bank Loans/GDP


Real Treasury Credit Rate


Consumption


Bank Deposits/GDP


Real Wholesale Rate
(pp Difference)


Investment
(\% Difference)


Bank Basel Ratio
(pp Difference)


Inflation
(pp Difference)


## 7 Summary

- Our Aim: Re-examine the 1930s Chicago Plan in today's environment.
- Our Tool: A modern, microfounded, and carefully calibrated DSGE model.
- Our Result: Transition to $100 \%$ reserve banking would have dramatic benefits that go even beyond those emphasized by Frederick Soddy, Henry Simons, Frank Knight, Irving Fisher and Milton Friedman.
- Several of these authors also emphasized that the transition to such a system can be technically straightforward.
- Many details of this analysis can and should be debated and refined. But the main result appears very robust.


## 8 Conclusion - The Big Picture

- I am convinced that the real economy will soon be facing massive challenges:
- Fossil Fuel Scarcity:
* IMF WP "The Future of Oil: Geology versus Technology".
* IMF WP "Oil and the World Economy: Some Possible Futures".
* Disclaimer: This is not an official IMF position.
- Climate Change: Somewhat more distant than fossil fuel problems.
- In such an environment all of society's efforts need to be directed towards solving real problems - engineering problems.
- In such an environment we therefore really do not need an "exciting", "innovative" financial system, because that excitement can become a heavy distraction - see the last 5 years.
- Rather, what I think we need is:
- A really boring financial system.
- A really exciting industrial and engineering system.

