Deposits and bank capital structure*

Franklin Allen

Imperial College London and University of Pennsylvania

Elena Carletti

Bocconi University, CEPR and IGIER

Robert Marquez

University of California, Davis

December 3, 2014

Abstract

In a model with bankruptcy costs and segmented deposit and equity markets, we endogenize the cost of equity and deposit finance for banks. Despite risk neutrality, equity capital earns a higher expected return than direct investment in risky assets. Banks hold positive capital to reduce bankruptcy costs, but there is a role for capital regulation when deposits are insured. Banks could no longer use capital when they lend to firms instead of investing directly in risky assets. This depends on whether

*Corresponding author: Franklin Allen, University of Pennsylvania, 3620 Locust Walk, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6367, phone: 215-898-3629, fax: 215-573-2207, email: allenf@wharton.upenn.edu. We are particularly grateful to two anonymous referees and to Viral Acharya for very helpful comments, as well as to Xian Gu and Lin Shen for their help with the data for the figures. We also thank Patrick Bolton, Marcella Lucchetta, Loriana Pelizzon, Enrico Perotti, Enrique Schroth, Anjan Thakor, and Gerd Weinrich for numerous comments and suggestions and workshop and seminar participants at Banco de Portugal, Carlos III University, Cass Business School, European University Institute, Free University of Amsterdam, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, National Bureau of Economic Research Conference on Understanding the Capital Structures of Non-Financial and Financial Corporations, Norwegian School of Management, Olin Business School, Shanghai Advanced Institute of Finance, Temple University, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, University of Chicago, Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, and Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien.

the firms are public and compete with banks for equity capital or are private with exogenous amounts of capital.

JEL classification: G21, G32, G33

Keywords: Deposit finance, Bankruptcy costs, Regulation

Deposits and bank capital structure

Abstract

In a model with bankruptcy costs and segmented deposit and equity markets, we endogenize the cost of equity and deposit finance for banks. Despite risk neutrality, equity capital earns a higher expected return than direct investment in risky assets. Banks hold positive capital to reduce bankruptcy costs, but there is a role for capital regulation when deposits are insured. Banks could no longer use capital when they lend to firms instead of investing directly in risky assets. This depends on whether the firms are public and compete with banks for equity capital or are private with exogenous amounts of capital.

Keywords: Deposit finance, Bankruptcy costs, Regulation

JEL classification: *G21, G32, G33*

1. Introduction

A growing literature exists on the role of equity in bank capital structure focusing on equity as a buffer, liquidity, agency costs, and various other frictions.[1] One important feature of these analyses is that they involve partial equilibrium models in which equity capital for banks is usually assumed to be a more expensive form of financing than deposits.[2] Although theoretical foundations for this assumption are in the literature (e.g., Myers and Majluf, 1984, or Bolton and Freixas, 2006), many papers have questioned whether this assumption is justified in the banking system. Risky equity usually has a higher expected return than debt but, as in Modigliani and Miller (1958), this does not necessarily mean that it is more costly on a risk-adjusted basis (e.g., Miller, 1995; Brealey, 2006; and Admati, DeMarzo, Hellwig, and Pfleiderer, 2010). Moreover, the cost of equity capital should vary with bank capital structure rather than being assumed to be fixed and invariant to it.

To address these issues in more depth, we develop a general equilibrium model of bank and firm financing based on two main elements. First, unlike nonfinancial firms, banks raise funds using deposits, which are special in that the market for deposits is segmented from that of equity. Second, banks and firms incur bankruptcy costs when they fail. Our aim is to determine the optimal bank and firm capital structures and the implications of these for the pricing of equity, deposits, and loans.

Although the role of deposits has varied over time, they remain an important source of funds for banks in all countries. Fig. 1 shows deposits as a proportion of bank liabilities for a number of countries from 1990 to 2009. In all these countries, deposits are the major form of bank finance. Deposits also play an important role in the aggregate funding structure of the economy, as shown in Fig. 2, where the ratio between deposits and gross

[1] See, e.g., Diamond and Rajan (2000), Hellmann, Murdock and Stiglitz (2000), Gale (2004), Repullo (2004), Morrison and White (2005), Allen, Carletti and Marquez (2011), and Acharya, Mehran and Thakor (2012).

[2] See also Berger, Herring, and Szego (1995) and the survey by Gorton and Winton (2003) for a discussion of this issue.

domestic product in the period 1990 to 2009 is illustrated.

[INSERT FIGURES 1 AND 2 NEAR HERE.]

Several papers in the theory of bank funding have shown that deposits are often the optimal form of funding for banks (e.g., Diamond and Dybvig, 1983; Diamond, 1984; and many thereafter). In doing so, this literature tends to treat deposits simply as another form of debt.[3] However, considerable evidence shows that the market for deposits is significantly segmented from other markets. While most people in developed countries have bank accounts, with the exception of the US and a few other countries, the household finance literature finds that relatively few people own stocks, bonds, or other types of financial assets either directly or indirectly (see, e.g., Guiso, Haliassos, and Jappelli, 2002; and Guiso and Sodini, 2013). The lack of participation in markets for risky financial assets, and in particular for equity, is known as the participation puzzle. The usual explanation is that there are fixed costs of participation. In addition to deposits held by households, considerable amounts are held in this form by businesses. These amounts are held for transaction purposes and reserves. In most cases, there are limited substitution possibilities with other assets, particularly equity.

The other important foundation of our analysis is the significance of bankruptcy costs. Considerable empirical evidence shows that these are substantial for both banks and nonfinancial firms. For example, James (1991) finds that when banks are liquidated, bankruptcy costs are 30 cents on the dollar. In a sample of nonfinancial firms, Andrade and Kaplan (1998) and Korteweg (2010) find a range of 10% to 23% for the ex post bankruptcy costs and 15% to 30% for firms in or near bankruptcy, respectively. A number of issues arise with the measurement of bankruptcy costs that suggest they are in fact higher than these estimates (see, e.g., Almeida and Philippon, 2007; Acharya, Bharathc and Srinivasan, 2007; and Glover, 2012).

We start our analysis with a simple model in which banks finance themselves with

[3]For an exception, see Song and Thakor (2007). They show that core deposits are an attractive funding source for informationally opaque relationship loans.

equity capital and (uninsured) deposits and invest in risky assets.[4] The providers of equity capital can invest directly in the risky assets, while the providers of deposits have only a storage alternative opportunity with a return of one. For simplicity, both groups are risk neutral. There is a fixed supply of equity capital and deposits in the economy.

Several results hold provided that there are positive bankruptcy costs. First, as argued by Modigliani and Miller (1958), when markets are not frictionless, capital structure is relevant for bank value and there is a unique optimal capital structure, which involves banks holding a positive level of equity capital as a way to reduce bankruptcy costs. The optimal amount of bank equity capital is countercyclical as it decreases (weakly) with the return of the bank's assets. Second, equity capital has in equilibrium a higher expected return than investing directly in the risky asset, which in turn has a higher expected return than deposits. This implies that equity providers do not invest in the risky asset directly and that equity capital is costly relative to deposits. Third, for low expected returns of the risky asset, deposits yield the same as the storage opportunity so that deposit providers invest in both banks and storage and there is limited financial inclusion of deposits in the economy. For high expected returns of the risky asset, deposits yield an expected return greater than one and there is full financial inclusion as deposit providers invest only in banks.

We then introduce deposit insurance, and we analyze how regulatory distortions affect bank incentives and what implications those have for equilibrium returns. We show that, in the absence of regulation, banks no longer have any incentive to hold capital, instead choosing to finance themselves entirely with deposits. The primary reason relates to capital's primary function, which in our setting is to reduce expected bankruptcy costs by lowering the payment that must be promised to depositors. When deposits are insured, capital has no role to play and banks prefer not to raise any capital. This gives rise to a role for capital regulation. By requiring banks to hold capital, a regulator reduces bankruptcy

[4]The case in which banks invest directly in risky assets captures the idea that banks invest in a line of business with a risky income such as market making, underwriting, proprietary trading, or fees from advisory services such as mergers and acquisitions.

costs that would otherwise be borne by the deposit insurance fund (and ultimately market participants through some form of lump sum taxation). In fact, we show that deposit insurance coupled with capital regulation can always achieve a higher level of social welfare than what is achieved in the market solution when deposits are uninsured. The regulatory amount of capital is still countercyclical but (weakly) lower than the amount held by banks in the absence of deposit insurance.

We then extend the model along two important dimensions to consider the case in which firms, instead of banks, invest in the productive projects and need external financing. The analysis of this issue is important given banks' crucial role in channeling funds to firms through the allocation of credit. We first analyze the case of public firms, which we define as firms that have no inside equity but can attract funds from both banks and outside equity investors. Then, we turn to private firms, which are firms with an initial endowment of inside equity capital but which can raise external funds only in the form of bank loans and, in particular, are unable to raise outside equity financing. While the main results of the baseline model carry over to both cases (capital earns rents in excess of its outside option, and its equilibrium return is higher than that of deposits), substantial and important differences exist in how the funds of capital suppliers are allocated and thus in the optimal capital structure of both banks and firms.

In particular, for the case in which banks make loans to public firms, the equilibrium entails that banks hold zero capital while firms hold a positive amount. In essence, all equity capital is used by firms instead of being held at the banks. When banks hold zero capital, they are conduits that transfer firm payments on loans to depositors and their bankruptcy is aligned with that of the firms. This arrangement is privately and socially optimal because banks can go bankrupt only when firms do, so it is best to use equity to minimize firm, instead of bank, bankruptcy and thus avoid unnecessary costs. This is different from the case of private firms, which have some internal capital but can raise external finance only through a bank loan. The loan itself, however, could be funded through a combination of capital and deposits or solely through deposits. We show that

banks still act as pure conduits for depositors when project returns are sufficiently low and firm bankruptcy costs are sufficiently high. Otherwise, banks hold positive amounts of capital, with an expected return that is greater than that of the deposits invested at the bank.

The paper contributes to the literature in a number of ways. First, it provides a theoretical foundation for why bank equity capital is costly relative to deposits and for how its cost varies with the optimal capital structure. DeAngelo and Stulz (2013) provide an alternative rationale for why the seminal results of Modigliani and Miller (1958) might not hold for banks, so that capital structure is a relevant consideration. They show that banks could choose to be highly levered because of market frictions that lead banks to play a central role in the production of liquidity, which is highly socially valuable and thus earns a market premium. Our results abstract from any liquidity considerations and instead focus on limited market participation and bankruptcy costs, which are largely absent in the extant literature.

Second, relatively few empirical studies of bank capital structure have been made. Some recent examples are Flannery and Rangan (2008), Gropp and Heider (2010), and Mehran and Thakor (2011). Flannery and Rangan (2008) show how US banks' capital ratios varied in the last decade. Gropp and Heider (2010) find that the determinants of bank capital structure are similar to those for nonfinancial firms. Mehran and Thakor (2011) find a positive relation between bank value and capital in the cross section. Each bank chooses an optimal capital structure, and those with higher capital also have higher value. Our general equilibrium framework has many possible relations depending on which bank investment possibility is relevant. None of these studies is designed to consider the interrelations between asset and liability structures that is the focus of our model.

One important ingredient of our model is that depositors are segmented from capital providers in that they do not participate directly in financial markets and, thus, in firm financing. In this sense, the paper relates to the literature on limited participation in financial markets (see, e.g., the survey in Guiso and Sodini, 2013). In the context of

banking markets, Diamond (1984) and Winton (1995) study settings where, as a result of asymmetric information, banks emerge as intermediaries between firms and uninformed depositors to economize on bankruptcy costs at the firm level. Our focus, however, is on the role of capital as a way to reduce bankruptcy costs either at the bank or at the firm level and how the optimal capital structure varies depending on the organization form of banks and firms.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 develops the baseline model. The equilibrium of this is considered in Section 3. Section 4 introduces deposit insurance and studies the role for capital regulation. Section 5 introduces two alternative corporate forms - public firms and private firms - and analyzes how capital is allocated and what its return is under the two alternative forms. Finally, Section 6 contains concluding remarks. All proofs are in the Appendix.

2. A model of bank capital structure with direct investment

In this section, we develop a simple one-period ($T = 0, 1$) model of financial intermediation in which banks raise external funds through deposits and capital, and they invest in a risky technology. This can be interpreted either as investment in nonpublicly traded productive firms or as direct investment in a risky line of business such as market making, underwriting, proprietary trading or fees from advisory services such as mergers and acquisitions. We refer to this model as our baseline model because we study variations later in the paper.

The risky technology is such that for each unit invested at date 0 there is a stochastic return r at date 1 uniformly distributed on the support $[0, R]$, with $Er = \frac{R}{2} > 1$.

Because there are constant returns to scale we normalize the size of every bank to 1. Each bank finances itself with an amount of capital k_B and an amount of (uninsured) deposits $1 - k_B$. The bank has limited liability. There are two groups of risk-neutral investors: capital investors and depositors. The former have an endowment of 1 each and

can supply capital or deposits to banks, with the opportunity cost for investing in the bank equity or deposit market being ρ. Capital providers also have the outside option of investing directly in the risky technology so that $\rho \geq R/2$. The latter can supply deposits only. The promised per unit rate from the bank is r_D and the opportunity cost of deposits in the bank deposit market is u. Depositors have an endowment of 1 each and also have a storage option with return 1 for each unit invested so that $u \geq 1$. Banks compete for deposits and thus always set r_D at the level required for depositors to recover their opportunity cost u. The two markets are segmented in the sense that depositors do not have access to the equity market. The idea is that they have high participation costs that make them unwilling to enter the equity market. The depositors have total wealth D. The capital providers have zero participation costs and can access both markets. Their total wealth, and hence the total possible supply of capital, is denoted K. The ratio of the wealth of the capital providers to the wealth of the depositors is

$$\frac{K}{D} = \eta > 0. \tag{1}$$

There is free entry into banking so the banking sector is perfectly competitive. Because banks invest in a risky technology, deposits are risky. The bank repays the promised rate r_D if $r \geq \overline{r}_B$, where

$$\overline{r}_B = r_D(1 - k_B), \tag{2}$$

and it goes bankrupt otherwise. When it goes bankrupt, the proceeds from liquidation are $h_B r$ with $h_B \in [0, 1]$, which are distributed pro rata to depositors. The bankruptcy costs are thus $(1 - h_B)r$.

3. The equilibrium with direct investment

In this section, we analyze the equilibrium of the model, which requires the following:

1. Banks choose k_B and r_D to maximize expected profits.

2. Capital providers maximize expected utility.

3. Depositors maximize expected utility.

4. Banks make zero expected profits in equilibrium.

5. The equity market clears.

6. The deposit market clears.

We start by considering the individual bank's optimization problem given by

$$\max_{k_B, r_D} E\Pi_B = \int_{\overline{r}_B}^{R} (r - r_D(1 - k_B)) \frac{1}{R} dr - \rho k_B \tag{3}$$

subject to

$$EU_D = \int_0^{\overline{r}_B} \frac{h_B r}{1 - k_B} \frac{1}{R} dr + \int_{\overline{r}_B}^{R} r_D \frac{1}{R} dr \geq u \tag{4}$$

$$E\Pi_B \geq 0 \tag{5}$$

and

$$0 \leq k_B \leq 1, \tag{6}$$

where $\overline{r}_B$ is as in Eq. (2). The bank chooses k_B and r_D to maximize its expected profit net of the cost of funds. The first term in Eq. (3) is what the bank obtains from the investment after paying $r_D(1 - k_B)$ to the depositors. This is positive only when $r > \overline{r}_B$, and it is distributed to the shareholders. When $r < \overline{r}_B$, the bank goes bankrupt and obtains nothing. The second term ρk_B is the shareholders' opportunity cost of providing capital. Constraint (4) requires that the expected utility of depositors is at least equal to their opportunity cost u. The first term is the payoff when the bank goes bankrupt and each depositor receives a pro rata share $\frac{h_B r}{1-k_B}$ of the liquidation proceeds. The second term represents the payoff depositors receive when the bank remains solvent. Because depositors are uninsured, the promised repayment r_D must compensate depositors for the

risk they face when placing their money in a bank that could go bankrupt. Constraint (5) is the requirement that the shareholders obtain their opportunity cost from providing capital to the bank. Constraint (6) is a feasibility constraint on the amount of capital.

In equilibrium, because there is free entry into the banking market, each bank's expected profit must be zero. This means that ρ adjusts so that $E\Pi_B = 0$. Capital providers can either supply equity to the banks for a return of ρ or invest in their outside option for a return $R/2$. The sum of these two investments must be equal to K for the equity market to clear. Capital providers invest in bank equity alone if $\rho > R/2$. They invest both in bank equity and in the outside option if $\rho = R/2$. In other words,

$$N_B k_B \leq K, \tag{7}$$

where N_B represents the number of banks and Eq. (7) holds with an equality when $\rho > R/2$.

Similarly, depositors can either deposit their money in the banks for a promised return of r_D and an expected utility $EU = u \geq 1$ or use the storage option with a return of 1 and an expected utility $EU = 1$. The investments in deposits and in the storage option must sum to D for the deposit market to clear. The depositors just deposit in banks and do not store if $u > 1$. They both deposit and store if $u = 1$. As shown below, the form of the equilibrium depends on whether constraint (4) binds with $u = 1$ or $u > 1$. In other words,

$$N_B(1 - k_B) \leq D, \tag{8}$$

where there is an equality when $u > 1$ and a strict inequality otherwise.

3.1 . *The Modigliani and Miller case: no bankruptcy costs ($h_B = 1$)*

We start by considering the benchmark case in which there are no bankruptcy costs so that $h_B = 1$. The difference is that depositors receive the full return r when the bank goes bankrupt. This leads to Proposition 1.

Proposition 1 *With $h_B = 1$, there are multiple equilibria. Each bank is indifferent between choosing any pair $k_B \in [0,1]$ and $r_D = \frac{(1-\sqrt{k_B})}{1-k_B} R$ for $k_B < 1$. In any equilibrium, $\rho = u = \frac{R}{2}$, $E\Pi_B = 0$, $EU_D = \frac{R}{2}, N_B k_B \leq K$, and $N_B(1-k_B) = D$.*

Depositors can have access to the risky technology only through banks. When there are no bankruptcy costs ($h_B = 1$), the efficient allocation is to channel all deposits into the risky technology given that $\frac{R}{2} > 1$. Banks simply channel funds from the deposit sector to more productive use. Competition among banks drives up the cost of deposits to the point $u = \frac{R}{2}$. Because equity providers have the option of investing directly in the risky technology and capital has no role in reducing bankruptcy costs $\rho = u = \frac{R}{2}$. With these equilibrium prices, Modigliani and Miller holds. Capital can be invested either in banks or directly in the risky technology, while all deposits are placed in the banking sector. This means that there are multiple equilibria depending on the proportion of capital invested in banks versus directly. This mix does not affect the real allocation.

3.2. *Bankruptcy costs ($0 \leq h_B < 1$)*

We now consider the case in which there are bankruptcy costs in the banking sector. For simplicity, we start with the case in which $h_B = 0$. This corresponds to zero liquidation proceeds so depositors obtain nothing in the case the bank goes bankrupt. The result is Proposition 2.

Proposition 2 *The unique equilibrium with $h_B = 0$ is as follows:*

i) For $R < \overline{R} = 4(\frac{1+\eta}{1+2\eta}) < 4, k_B = \frac{4-R}{R} \in (0,1), r_D = \frac{R}{2}, \rho = \frac{2}{4-R} > \frac{R}{2}, u = 1, E\Pi_B = 0, EU_D = 1, N_B k_B = K$, and $N_B(1-k_B) < D$.

ii) For $R \geq \overline{R}$, $k_B = \frac{\eta}{1+\eta} \in (0,1), r_D = \frac{R}{2}, \rho = \frac{1+4\eta(1+\eta)}{4\eta(1+\eta)} \frac{R}{2} > \frac{R}{2}, u = \frac{1+2\eta}{2(1+\eta)} \frac{R}{2} \in [1, \frac{R}{2}), E\Pi_B = 0, EU_D > 1$, $N_B k_B = K$, and $N_B(1-k_B) = D$.

Proposition 2 shows that once we have the friction of bankruptcy costs, Modigliani and Miller no longer holds. More equity financing leads to lower bankruptcy costs, and its opportunity cost is bid up as a result, so $\rho > \frac{R}{2}$. Thus, shareholders always obtain

strictly more than their outside option. There is a trade-off in that equity is a relatively costly form of finance but has the advantage of reducing expected bankruptcy costs. A unique optimal bank capital structure exists and each bank uses both capital and deposits to fund itself. The bank can afford to pay $\rho > \frac{R}{2}$ for equity finance because the cost of deposit finance is $u < \frac{R}{2}$. If there was no market segmentation so that depositors could invest directly in equity, then ρ would be equal to $\frac{R}{2}$. As shown above, when there are no bankruptcy costs so that $h_B = 1$, equity has no value in reducing the bankruptcy costs so $\rho = \frac{R}{2}$. Thus, both bankruptcy costs and market segmentation are necessary for the result that equity is costly. Because in equilibrium $\rho > \frac{R}{2}$, all the capital is absorbed in the banking sector and none is invested directly in the outside option.

Unlike capital, the opportunity cost of deposits u is not always bid up above the storage option. Deposit finance is cheaper than equity but introduces bankruptcy costs. The difference between the expected returns of the outside option of equity investors and the storage option of deposit providers is low when R is low. This means that deposits are not very attractive relative to equity given the bankruptcy costs they introduce. This is why for $R < \overline{R}$ deposits are only partly placed in the banking sector where they obtain $u = 1$, and the storage option is widely used. As R is increased, more deposits are used in the banking sector. At $R = \overline{R}$, all deposits are used there so that there is full inclusion. For $R > \overline{R}$, the opportunity cost of deposits is bid up and $u > 1$.

The results on the returns to the investors hold as long as the ratio of total capital to total deposits, η, is positive and finite. For $\eta \to 0$, deposits would always be abundant so that $u \to 1$ for any value of R. By contrast, for $\eta \to \infty$, both $\rho \to \frac{R}{2}$ and $u \to \frac{R}{2}$. In other words, when there is no scarcity of capital, capital loses it main role and its equilibrium return is the same as that of deposits.

A number of comparative statics results follow easily.

Corollary 1 *The following comparative statics results hold.*

i) The optimal amount of capital, k_B, is (weakly) decreasing in the project's return R, i.e., $\frac{\partial k_B}{\partial R} \leq 0$, with the inequality strict for $R < \overline{R}$.

ii) The equilibrium return on capital, ρ, is increasing in R, i.e., $\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial R} > 0$.

iii) The equilibrium expected return on deposits, u, is (weakly) increasing in R, i.e., $\frac{\partial u}{\partial R} \geq 0$, with the inequality strict for $R > \overline{R}$.

iv) The threshold value $\overline{R}$ is decreasing in η, the ratio of total available capital to deposits, i.e., $\frac{\partial \overline{R}}{\partial \eta} < 0$.

The corollary suggests that the amount of capital held by banks is countercyclical: It is high in recessions when R is low, and low in booms when R is high. Moreover, the split of the surplus generated from the banks' investments in the risky asset between the shareholders and the depositors depends also on R. For $R < \overline{R}$, all the surplus is captured by the shareholders through the return ρ. As R increases up to $\overline{R}$, capital decreases and ρ rises. As the return of the risky technology increases further, it is increasingly profitable for banks to use deposits for funding. This makes capital more valuable because bankruptcy increases and ρ is bid up. For $R > \overline{R}$, all deposits are used and thus bank capital structure remains constant. As R increases beyond $\overline{R}$, the shareholders and depositors share the surplus with both u and ρ continuing to rise.

The degree of financial inclusion in terms of the proportion of deposit funds used in the banking system depends also on R. For $R = 2$ financial inclusion is zero. As R increases to $\overline{R}$, it increases to 1. Full financial inclusion is reached at lower levels of R the greater is the ratio of capital to deposits because the threshold $\overline{R}$ decreases with η.

These comparative statics results hold in all cases below so we omit explicit discussion in all propositions that follow.

The insights of Proposition 2 remain valid in the case of partial bankruptcy costs where $h_B \in (0, 1)$ and depositors obtain $\frac{h_B r}{1-k_B}$ when the bank goes bankrupt. We obtain the result in Proposition 3, which is similar to that Proposition 2, but algebraically more complex. As the relation between R and financial inclusion is the same as in Proposition 2, we omit the explicit discussion here again.

Proposition 3 *The unique equilibrium with $h_B \in (0, 1)$ is as follows.*

i) For $R < \overline{R}, k_B = \frac{(2-h_B R)(2(2-h_B)-R)}{2(1-h_B)^2 R} \in (0,1), r_D = \frac{2(1-h_B)R}{2(2-h_B)-h_B R}, \rho = \frac{2-h_B R}{2(2-h_B)-R} > \frac{R}{2}, u = 1, E\Pi_B = 0$, *and* $EU_D = 1$.

ii) For $R \geq \overline{R}$, $k_B = \frac{\eta}{1+\eta} \in (0,1), r_D = \frac{2u(1-h_B)R}{2u(2-h_B)-h_B R}, \rho = \frac{u(2u-h_B R)}{2u(2-h_B)-R} > \frac{R}{2}, u = \frac{2(1+\eta)-(1-h_B)\left(1-h_B-\sqrt{4\eta(1+\eta)+(1-h_B)^2}\right)}{2(1+\eta)(2-h_B)} \frac{R}{2} \in [1, \frac{R}{2}), E\Pi_B = 0$, *and* $EU_D > 1$.

The expression for $\overline{R}$ *is given in the Appendix.*

The main difference from Proposition 2 is that banks' capital structure and the sharing of the surplus depend on the size of the bankruptcy proceeds as represented by h_B. For a given $R \leq \overline{R}$, the higher h_B the lower the amount of capital k_B at each bank and the higher the shareholders' return ρ. For a given $R > \overline{R}$, k_B remains constant as h_B increases, but both shareholders and depositors obtain higher returns ρ and u. The intuition is simple. As bankruptcy proceeds increase, capital becomes less necessary as a way to reduce bankruptcy costs and, thus, each bank uses less of it.

3.3 . *Efficiency of the market solution*

An important question is whether the allocations of the baseline model as described in Propositions 2 and 3, which we refer to as the market solution (in contrast to the regulatory solution we analyze in Section 4), are efficient. To analyze this, we consider the case in which, in the baseline model, the level of capital is chosen by a regulator that maximizes social welfare while deposit rates are still set by the banks to maximize their expected profits.

Formally, a regulator sets the level of capital k_B to maximize social welfare, which is given by

$$\max_{k_B} SW = \rho K + uD \tag{9}$$

subject to constraints (4)–(6) and

$$r_D = \arg\max_{r_D} E\Pi_B = \int_{\overline{r}_B}^{R} (r - r_D(1-k_B)) \frac{1}{R} dr - \rho k_B, \tag{10}$$

where $\overline{r}_B$ is as in Eq. (2). All other conditions for the equilibrium remain the same, and we obtain Proposition 4.

Proposition 4 *The regulator chooses the same level of capital as banks choose in Propositions 2 and 3. The rest of the equilibrium is also the same as there.*

Proposition 4 shows that the allocations described in Proposition 2 for $h_B = 0$ and in Proposition 3 for $h_B > 0$ are (constrained) efficient. The amount of capital that banks hold in the market solution is the same as the level chosen by a regulator who maximizes social welfare. The competitiveness of the banking sector together with the fact that the deposit rate reflects the bank's bankruptcy risk induces banks to choose the social welfare maximizing levels of capital. Thus, no need exists for capital regulation in our model in the absence of other possible distortions, such as those we analyze next through the introduction of deposit insurance.

4. Deposit insurance and capital regulation

So far we have considered the case in which deposits are not insured so that the promised deposit rate reflects the risk taken by the bank. In that case, as shown above, banks have an incentive to hold a positive amount of capital as a way to reduce bankruptcy costs when investing directly in a risky technology and the resulting allocation is efficient. In this section, we study the case in which deposits are insured so that depositors always receive the promised deposit rate irrespective of whether their banks go bankrupt or not.

The presence of deposit insurance results in a need for capital regulation. To see why, we first introduce deposit insurance and show that there is scope for regulation as banks no longer have incentives to hold a positive level of capital. Then, we analyze the allocation with deposit insurance and capital regulation and compare it with the market allocation obtained in the baseline model.

4.1 . *Deposit insurance*

We now study the case in which deposits are fully insured so that depositors always receive the promised deposit rate irrespective of whether their banks go bankrupt or not. We interpret deposit insurance as being provided by the government: if the bank goes bankrupt, the government intervenes and pays the promised interest rate r_D to the depositors. The cost of the deposit insurance is paid from revenues raised by nondistortionary lump sum taxes.

The bank's optimization problem is still as in Eqs. (3)–(6) with the difference that constraint (4) becomes

$$EU_D = \int_0^R r_D \frac{1}{R} dr \geq u. \tag{11}$$

All other conditions remain the same. Proposition 5 results.

Proposition 5 *The unique equilibrium with deposit insurance and* $0 \leq h_B < 1$ *is as follows.*

i) Banks hold no capital, i.e., $k_B = 0$*, and set* $r_D = u = R$*.*

ii) Capital providers provide deposits so that $\rho = u = R$ *and* $N_B = D + K$*.*

As shown in Proposition 5, the introduction of deposit insurance induces banks not to hold any capital. Given that depositors are always repaid in full and banks do not internalize the cost of the deposit insurance, banks have no incentives to hold capital to reduce the bankruptcy costs. The equilibrium requires depositors to obtain the whole surplus from the project, with banks making zero expected profits in equilibrium, as before. Capital providers then prefer to offer their capital in the form of deposits to the banks and obtain the same return as depositors.

The equilibrium described in Proposition 5 implies that the bank always goes bankrupt and the government is always forced to intervene and guarantee the repayment $u = R$ to all the $D + K$ depositors. This implies a very high deadweight cost of bankruptcy. Given this, the presence of deposit insurance could give a role for capital regulation as

a way of reducing the disbursement for the deposit insurance fund as in, for example, Hellmann, Murdock and Stiglitz (2000), Repullo (2004), Morrison and White (2005) and Allen, Carletti, and Marquez (2011).

4.2. *The role of capital regulation*

The arguments above suggest a role for capital regulation in the presence of deposit insurance. As in Subsection 3.3, we consider the case in which a regulator sets the level of capital that each bank holds at the beginning of date 0 to maximize social welfare while the deposit rate is still determined by the banks and is thus part of the market solution. Formally, the regulator's maximization problem is

$$\max_{k_B} SW = \rho K + uD - N_B \int_0^{\overline{r}_B} \left(r_D(1-k_B) - h_B r\right) \frac{1}{R} dr \tag{12}$$

subject to the constraints (10), (11), (5), and (6) and $\overline{r}_B$ as in Eq. (2). As in Subsection 3.3, social welfare is given by the sum of the returns to the capital providers and depositors, as represented by the first two terms in Eq. (12). The provision of deposit insurance, however, is internalized by the regulator in setting the capital requirement. The last term in Eq. (12) captures the insurer's disbursement when, for $r \in (0, \overline{r}_B)$, N_B banks are insolvent and each needs $r_D(1-k_B) - h_B r$ to repay r_D to its $(1-k_B)$ depositors. The expression for the social welfare in Eq. (12) can equivalently be expressed as

$$SW = N_B \left(\frac{1}{2} R - \int_0^{\overline{r}_B} (1-h_B)\, r \frac{1}{R} dr \right) + \max\{(D - (1-k_B)\, N_B), 0\}, \tag{13}$$

where the first term is the total output of all the projects invested in by the N_B banks, minus the deadweight losses associated with bankruptcy, and the second term is simply the number of deposits that are invested in the storage alternative instead of being deposited at a bank. This term is zero when $u > 1$, because then all depositors place their money in a bank, while $D - (1-k_B)\, N_B$ could be positive when $u = 1$.

The rest of the equilibrium is as in the case with no deposit insurance. The returns

of the capital investors and of the depositors are determined by the banks' zero profit condition and the market clearing conditions, respectively, and the regulator takes into account how the choice of k_B affects them. We obtain Proposition 6, in which we omit the discussion on financial inclusion as it is the same as in the baseline model.

Proposition 6 *In the case of deposit insurance and capital regulation, the unique equilibrium with* $0 \leq h_B < 1$ *is as follows.*

i) For $R < \overline{R}^{reg}, k_B^{reg} = \sqrt{\frac{1-h_B+2R-R^2}{1-h_B}} \in (0,1), \rho^{reg} > \frac{R}{2}$, $u^{reg} = r_D^{reg} = 1, E\Pi = 0$, *and* $EU = 1$.

ii) For $R \geq \overline{R}^{reg}$, $k_B^{reg} = \frac{\eta}{1+\eta} \in (0,1), \rho^{reg} > \frac{R}{2}, u^{reg} = r_D^{reg} = \frac{2(1+\eta)\left(\sqrt{2+4\eta+\eta^2-h_B(1+2\eta)}-(1+\eta)\right)}{(1-h_B)(1+2\eta)}\frac{R}{2} \in [1, \frac{R}{2}), E\Pi = 0$, *and* $EU > 1$.

The expressions for $\overline{R}^{reg}$ *and* ρ^{reg} *are given in the Appendix.*

Proposition 6 has the same structure as Propositions 2 and 3, which describe the market allocation. As there, a unique optimal capital structure for banks maximizes social welfare. Likewise, Proposition 6 shows that, even under the regulatory solution, market segmentation implies that in equilibrium a wedge exists between the returns of capital and of deposits, so that $\rho^{reg} > \frac{R}{2} > u^{reg} \geq 1$.

The optimal capital requirement k^{reg} and the returns ρ^{reg} and u^{reg} to shareholders and depositors, respectively, depend on the return of the risky technology R. When R is low, the marginal benefit of adding another bank, which is achieved by having each bank hold less capital, is low relative to the increased bankruptcy risk associated with greater deposit financing. A regulator, therefore, trades off increasing output with reducing bankruptcy risk. As R increases, the incentive to channel funds toward productive projects increases, shifting the regulator's trade-off toward less capital at each bank - and, hence, more banks - and consequently a greater amount of deposit financing. In other words, there is a push toward greater financial inclusion, with all deposits being placed at banks instead of in storage, as R increases. The optimal capital requirement is therefore counter-cyclical: it is high in recessions when R is low, and it is low in booms when R is high. This suggests

that a contingent capital requirement could be optimal.

Given that deposit insurance introduces a market distortion (deposits are no longer priced to reflect their risk, leading banks to want to use no capital in the absence of regulation) it becomes important to understand how social welfare is affected relative to the unregulated market solution of the baseline model, where deposits are uninsured. We, therefore, compare the allocation with deposit insurance and capital regulation described in Proposition 6 with the market allocation described in Propositions 2 and 3. Proposition 7 results.

Proposition 7 *The regulatory solution always entails a higher level of social welfare than the market solution:* $SW^{reg} > SW$. *Moreover, it entails a lower level of capital,* $k_B^{reg} \leq k_B$, *with the inequality strict whenever* $u = 1$ *in the market solution.*

An interesting implication of our analysis is that deposit insurance coupled with capital regulation is beneficial in that it improves on the market solution by yielding a higher social welfare. In the market solution, the only way to avoid bankruptcy costs is through the use of capital. As shown above, this is efficient when deposits are uninsured, and a social planner would choose the same level of capital as what the bank chooses on its own. However, deposit insurance introduces a new channel through which deadweight losses from bankruptcy can be reduced. When deposits are insured, depositors are willing to accept a lower promised repayment on their deposits as they bear no risk of default from lending to the bank. The reduction in the deposit rate directly leads to a reduction in the threshold where bankruptcy occurs and, ceteris paribus, reduces the deadweight bankruptcy costs.

In the absence of capital regulation, banks would choose to hold no capital (Proposition 5), thus undoing much of the savings in bankruptcy costs obtained from deposit insurance. Consequently, a role exists for regulation: By requiring the banks to hold capital, a social welfare-maximizing regulator can further reduce bankruptcy costs, complementing the benefits obtained from the reduction in deposit rates. In other words, capital regulation

becomes important when deposits are insured, even if it is unnecessary when these are not insured.

Interestingly, the level of capital that maximizes social welfare when deposits are insured is never greater, and is often strictly lower, than that which maximizes bank profits in the market solution. The reason stems from the regulator's objective function, which reduces to maximizing aggregate output net of the deadweight losses of bankruptcy instead of the individual bank's expected profit. All things equal, aggregate output is increased by increasing the degree of financial inclusion, which is achieved by having more banks in operation. To accomplish this goal, the regulator has an incentive to reduce the level of capital at each bank relative to what occurs in the market solution. Therefore, a regulator whose objective is to maximize social welfare chooses a lower level of capital for each bank. Once all deposits are in use at a bank instead of invested in the storage technology in both solutions, the regulatory level of capital coincides with that of the market.

As a final point, given that social welfare is higher in the regulatory solution with deposit insurance, this also means that the payments to the investors – capital suppliers and depositors – in each bank must likewise be higher than in the market solution. This occurs because each bank now has a lower loss from bankruptcy costs and, thus, has more surplus to allocate to the providers of funds.

4.3 . *Deposit insurance premiums*

So far we have assumed that the cost of the deposit insurance is paid from revenues raised by nondistortionary lump sum taxes and is, therefore, independent of banks' capital structures. We now consider the case in which it is borne by the banking system in the form of fairly priced fixed deposit insurance premiums.

We consider the case in which banks pay a fixed deposit insurance premium P ex post out of the revenues generated by their investments. Specifically, each bank pays P when the investment returns $r > r_D(1 - k_B) + P$, and it pays $r - r_D(1 - k_B) < P$ when $r_D(1 - k_B) < r < r_D(1 - k_B) + P$. This implies that now the bank goes bankrupt for

$r < r_D(1-k_B)$ and obtains a profit only for $r > \overline{r}_B$, where $\overline{r}_B = r_D(1-k_B) + P$, and its maximization problem is given by

$$E\Pi_B = \int_{\overline{r}_B}^{R} (r - r_D(1-k_B) - P)\frac{1}{R}dr - \rho k_B, \tag{14}$$

subject to the same constraints that $r_D = u \geq 1$ and that the bank makes non-negative profits. Proposition 8 results.

Proposition 8 *The unique equilibrium with fixed-premium deposit insurance $P \geq 0$ and $0 \leq h_B < 1$ always has banks choosing to raise no capital, i.e., $k_B = 0$.*

As in the case in which deposit insurance is paid through lump-sum taxation, banks do not hold any capital when they are subject to a fixed deposit insurance premium. Given that depositors are always repaid in full and each bank takes the premium as given, banks have no incentives to hold capital to reduce bankruptcy costs. Moreover, this is true for any arbitrary premium $P \geq 0$, which could be assessed to banks, independently of whether it accurately represents the true cost of providing deposit insurance or is lower, reflecting a subsidy provided by the regulator.

The result suggests that there could be again scope for capital regulation setting minimum capital levels. The question is whether the allocation with deposit insurance and capital regulation can still be welfare superior to the unregulated market solution of the baseline model, given that banks are charged a premium for receiving the deposit insurance. To study this we turn to the regulator's maximization problem. As before, at the beginning of date 0 the regulator sets the level of capital that each bank has to hold, setting the deposit insurance premium so to be fairly priced in anticipation of the equilibrium deposit rate chosen by the banks. The bank pays the fixed premium P from the revenues generated by its investments. This means that, given the equilibrium value for r_D, the regulator receives from the bank in expectation

$$E[P] = \int_{\overline{r}_B}^{R} P\frac{1}{R}dr + \int_{r_D(1-k_B)}^{\overline{r}_B} (r - r_D(1-k_B))\frac{1}{R}dr, \tag{15}$$

while the cost of providing deposit insurance is

$$\int_0^{r_D(1-k_B)} \left(r_D(1-k_B) - h_B r\right) \frac{1}{R} dr. \tag{16}$$

These two have to be equal for the premium to be fairly priced, so that

$$\int_{r_D(1-k_B)+P}^{R} P\frac{1}{R}dr + \int_{r_D(1-k_B)}^{r_D(1-k_B)+P} \left(r - r_D\left(1-k_B\right)\right) \frac{1}{R} dr = \int_0^{r_D(1-k_B)} \left(r_D(1-k_B) - h_B r\right) \frac{1}{R} dr. \tag{17}$$

This expression defines P as a function of the equilibrium value for r_D and the regulator's choice of k_B.

Proposition 9 results.

Proposition 9 *The regulatory solution always entails a higher level of social welfare than the market solution when the deposit insurance premium is fixed, fairly priced, and paid ex post.*

Our analysis shows that with an appropriately chosen deposit insurance premium and capital regulation, social welfare can be increased relative to the market solution without deposit insurance, in similar fashion to what was established in Proposition 7 for the case in which banks do not bear the cost of the insurance. In essence, the regulator is facilitating banks to cross-insure: Depositors at failed banks can draw on the funds being contributed by successful banks, so that successful banks subsidize banks whose project returns were low.

The analysis also shows that a lump-sum general tax is not a requirement for social welfare to increase as a result of the advent of deposit insurance. In our model, the ex post payment (i.e., upon success of the bank's project) is nondistortionary as it does not affect total output being produced, but only the distribution of this output. Other implementations for the payment of deposit insurance premiums could generate inefficiencies to the extent that they distort the optimal allocation of resources. One such example would be if banks were required to pay an up-front premium for deposit insurance, as been studied

elsewhere in the literature (see, for example, Chan, Greenbaum, and Thakor, 1992).[5] In this case, the bank would need to raise a total of $1 + P$ units of funds to finance the investment in the risky technology as well as to pay the insurance premium. As usual, k_B of these funds would represent capital, and $1 - k_B + P$ would be deposits, with the bank then going bankrupt for $r < \overline{r}_B$, where $\overline{r}_B$ is now $\overline{r}_B = r_D(1 - k_B + P)$. The bank's maximization problem would be

$$\max_{k_B, r_D} E\Pi_B = \int_{\overline{r}_B}^{R} (r - r_D(1 - k_B + P)) \frac{1}{R} dr - \rho k_B, \tag{18}$$

subject to the same constraints that $r_D = u \geq 1$ and that the bank make non-negative profits.

The main difference with the case in which the premium is paid ex post is that the ex ante payment of deposit insurance requires that the bank raise additional financing to make the initial payment P. This has two effects. First, it increases the bankruptcy threshold $\overline{r}_B$, thus offsetting some of the benefit of having deposit insurance in the first place. Second, and more important, it reduces the total amount of funds, $K + D$, that are available for investment in the productive project, requiring instead that some of them be diverted toward paying the insurance premium. These inefficiencies reduce the social benefit of deposit insurance even in our simple model, suggesting that how premiums for said insurance are established could be an important consideration in understanding the social benefit or loss associated with insuring deposits.

[5] A large literature also exists on risk-based deposit insurance premiums. Early contributions are Merton (1977, 1978) and Kareken and Wallace (1978). Allen, Carletti, and Leonello (2011) surveys this literature. In our model, capital regulation deals with the distortion introduced by deposit insurance (i.e., that banks wish to hold no capital) and leaves no additional role for risk-based pricing of deposit insurance. We, therefore, focus solely on fixed premium, but actuarially fair, pricing of deposit insurance in the analysis above.

5. Extensions: lending to firms

The results so far have focused on the case in which banks invest directly in the productive assets, essentially making them the owners of these projects. While useful for understanding the role of limited market participation and bankruptcy costs in determining banks' capital structures, the more common perspective on banks is that they channel funds to firms through the allocation of credit. In this section we analyze two extensions in that direction, each representing an alternative extreme in how a firm in need of financing could be organized. The first case considers public firms that have no inside equity but can attract funds from both banks and outside equity investors. The second case considers private firms that have an initial endowment of inside equity capital but can raise external funds only in the form of bank loans and, in particular, are unable to raise outside equity financing. While the main results of the baseline model carry over to both cases (capital earns rents in excess of its outside option, and its equilibrium return is higher than that of deposits), substantial and important differences exist in how the funds of capital suppliers are allocated and, thus, in the optimal capital structure of both banks and firms.

5.1. *Public firms*

In this subsection, we consider the case in which a continuum of publicly traded firms in a productive sector hold the risky technology with return $r \sim U[0, R]$ as before and can raise outside equity financing from the market. This means that capital suppliers now have a choice of investing in the bank or making equity investments directly into the public firms, so that these firms face no frictions in raising capital. As in the baseline model, deposits are uninsured.

Each firm requires 1 unit of funds and finances this with equity k_F and loans from banks of $1 - k_F$. As before, in equilibrium capital suppliers earn a return $\rho \geq \frac{R}{2}$, independently of whether they choose to invest in the firms or in the banks. The promised per unit loan rate on bank loans is r_L, which the bank receives if the firm is solvent. This is the case if

$r \geq \overline{r}_F$, where

$$\overline{r}_F = r_L(1 - k_F). \tag{19}$$

If $r < \overline{r}_F$, the firm goes bankrupt and the liquidation proceeds $h_F r$, with $h_F \in [0, 1]$, are distributed pro rata to the banks providing the $1 - k_F$ in loans.

Banks raise equity k_B and take deposits $1 - k_B$ in exchange for a promised rate r_D. When the bank receives r_L from the firms, it remains solvent and repays $r_D(1 - k_B)$ to its depositors. If $r < \overline{r}_F$, firms go bankrupt and banks receive $h_F r$ for each $1 - k_F$ loaned out so that each bank receives $\frac{h_F r}{1-k_F}$ per unit loaned. If $\frac{h_F r}{1-k_F} \geq r_D(1 - k_B)$ the bank remains solvent and pays depositors in full. Differently, if $\frac{h_F r}{1-k_F} < r_D(1 - k_B)$ the bank itself goes bankrupt and each depositor obtains only $\frac{h_F h_B r}{(1-k_F)(1-k_B)}$. This implies that when the firm goes bankrupt the bank can either remain solvent for $\frac{r_D(1-k_B)(1-k_F)}{h_F} < r < \overline{r}_F$ or go bankrupt with the firm for $r < \overline{r}_F$. Formally, the bank goes bankrupt for any $r < \overline{r}_B$, where

$$\overline{r}_B = \min\left\{\frac{r_D(1 - k_B)(1 - k_F)}{h_F},\ \overline{r}_F\right\}. \tag{20}$$

Banks choose the loan rate r_L and, for simplicity, we assume that they can impose loan covenants that specify the firms' level of equity k_F.

In addition to conditions (3)–(6), the equilibrium requires that

7. Banks choose k_F and r_L in addition to k_B and r_D to maximize their expected profits.

8. Firms make zero expected profits in equilibrium.

9. The loan market clears.

As before, the equity and the deposit markets have to clear in equilibrium. Given the presence now of two sectors, market clearing requires that

$$N_F k_F + N_B k_B \leq K \tag{21}$$

and

$$N_B(1-k_B) \leq D, \tag{22}$$

where N_F and N_B are the number of firms and banks respectively. Conditions (21) and (22) require that the total capital used in the productive and the banking sectors does not exceed the available capital K and that the total deposits in the banking sector do not exceed the total supply D in the economy. As before, Eqs. (21) and (22) hold with equality if $\rho > \frac{R}{2}$ and $u > 1$.

The loan market must clear so that

$$N_F(1-k_F) = N_B. \tag{23}$$

This states that the total lending $N_F(1-k_F)$ needed by the firms equals the total resources available for lending at the N_B banks.

Each individual bank's maximization problem is now given by

$$\max_{k_F, r_L, k_B, r_D} E\Pi_B = \int_{\overline{r}_B}^{\overline{r}_F} \left(\frac{h_F r}{1-k_F} - r_D(1-k_B) \right) \frac{1}{R} dr + \int_{\overline{r}_F}^{R} \left(r_L - r_D(1-k_B) \right) \frac{1}{R} dr - \rho k_B \tag{24}$$

subject to

$$E\Pi_F = \int_{\overline{r}_F}^{R} \left(r - r_L(1-k_F) \right) \frac{1}{R} dr - \rho k_F \geq 0, \tag{25}$$

$$EU_D = \int_{0}^{\overline{r}_B} \frac{h_B h_F r}{(1-k_B)(1-k_F)} \frac{1}{R} dr + \int_{\overline{r}_B}^{R} r_D \frac{1}{R} dr \geq u \geq 1, \tag{26}$$

and

$$0 \leq k_F \leq 1, \tag{27}$$

together with Eqs. (5) and (6). The first term in Eq. (24) represents the expected payoff to the bank when firms go bankrupt but the bank remains solvent for $\overline{r}_B < r < \overline{r}_F$. In this case, the bank obtains the firms' liquidation proceeds $\frac{h_F r}{1-k_F}$ after repaying the amount $r_D(1-k_B)$ to its depositors. By contrast, when $\overline{r}_B = \overline{r}_F$, the bank goes bankrupt

whenever the firm does so, and the first term in Eq. (24) becomes zero. The second term is the expected payoff to the bank from lending one unit to firms at the rate r_L after paying $r_D(1-k_B)$ to its depositors. The last term ρk_B is the opportunity cost for bank shareholders. Constraint (25) requires the expected profit of the firm to be non-negative. The first term is the expected payoff to the firm from the investment in the risky technology after paying $r_L(1-k_F)$ to the bank for $r > \overline{r}_F$. The last term ρk_F is the opportunity cost for firm shareholders. Constraint (26) is depositors' participation constraint. The first term is the payoff when the bank goes bankrupt for $r < \overline{r}_B$ and each depositor obtains a share $\frac{h_B}{(1-k_B)}$ of the $\frac{h_F r}{(1-k_F)}$ resources available at the bank. The second term is depositors' payoff for $r \geq \overline{r}_B$, when the bank remains solvent and each depositor obtains the promised repayment r_D.

We obtain Proposition 10.

Proposition 10 *The unique equilibrium with $0 \leq h_B, h_F < 1$ in the case of public firms is as follows.*

i) Banks hold $k_B = 0$ and set $r_D = r_L$.

ii) The rest of the equilibrium is as in the case in which banks hold the technology directly described in Propositions 2 and 3 with the difference that firms hold the same capital k_F as banks there.

Proposition 10 states that in equilibrium banks hold no capital and are thus simply a conduit between depositors and firms. This minimizes overall bankruptcy costs because it aligns bank and firm bankruptcies with $\overline{r}_B = \overline{r}_F$.

The result is illustrated in Fig. 3, which shows the output of a single firm as a function of the return r and how this is split among shareholders and depositors. Consider first the case in which both the bank and the firm hold positive capital and the firm goes bankrupt at a higher level of r than the bank, i.e., $\overline{r}'_F = r'_L(1-k'_F) > \overline{r}'_B = \frac{r'_D(1-k'_B)(1-k'_F)}{h_F}$. Region A represents the payoff to firm shareholders for $r \in (\overline{r}'_F, R]$, when the firm remains solvent and repays $r'_L(1-k'_F)$ to the bank. Region $B+C$ represents the payoff to the bank

shareholders. For $r \in [\overline{r}'_F, R]$, the bank receives the promised repayment $r'_L(1-k'_F)$. For $r \in [\overline{r}'_B, \overline{r}'_F)$, the firm goes bankrupt and the bank receives $\frac{h_F r}{1-k'_F}$. Region *D1* represents the deadweight loss derived from the bankruptcy of the firm. Region $E1+F$ represents the payoff to bank depositors. For $r \in [\overline{r}'_B, R]$, the bank is solvent, and each depositor receives the promised repayment r'_D. Because there are $(1-k'_B)(1-k'_F)$ depositors per firm, they obtain $r'_D(1-k'_B)(1-k'_F)$ in total. For $r \in [0, \overline{r}'_B)$ the bank goes bankrupt. Each of the $(1-k'_B)$ depositors in the bank receives a share $\frac{h_B}{1-k'_B}$ of the resources $\frac{h_F r}{1-k'_F}$ that the bank has. Thus, the $(1-k'_B)(1-k'_F)$ depositors per firm obtain $h_B h_F r$ in total. Finally, Region $D2+E2$ represents the deadweight losses from the bankruptcy of the bank for $r \in [\overline{r}^*_B, \overline{r}'_B]$.

[INSERT FIG. 3 NEAR HERE.]

Consider now transferring all capital from the bank to the firm and aligning the bankruptcy points of the bank and the firm. This entails setting $k^*_B = 0$ and $k^*_F = k'_B(1-k'_F)+k'_F$. The firm then has a transfer of $k'_B(1-k'_F)$, which is the amount of capital that the bank has per firm, in addition to its original amount k'_F. Because the bank has zero capital, it is possible to set $r^*_D = r^*_L = r'_D$ so that the bank becomes a conduit with zero profit. This aligns the firm and bank bankruptcy points and changes them to $\overline{r}^*_F = r^*_L(1-k^*_F) = \overline{r}^*_B = r'_D(1-k'_B)(1-k'_F) < \overline{r}'_B = \frac{r'_D(1-k'_B)(1-k'_F)}{h_F}$. It is immediate to see that this allows the deadweight losses in Region $D1+D2$ and $E2$ to be eliminated and improves the allocation.

This argument shows that in any equilibrium it must be the case that $k_B = 0$ and $r_L = r_D$. The optimal choice of k_F and r_L is then the same as the bank's choice of k_B and r_D when the bank invests directly in the risky asset except that the liquidation proceeds $h_B r$ are replaced by $h_B h_F r$. The equilibrium is then as described in Proposition 10.

5.2. *Private firms*

In this subsection we consider a slightly different setup from the one in Subsection 5.1 in that we study the case in which firms are 'private,' meaning that, while they could

possess some capital already, they are unable to raise additional outside equity from capital suppliers. Specifically, we assume that each private firm is endowed with capital $0 \leq k_F < 1$ but can raise the remaining $1 - k_F$ only as a bank loan instead of being able to obtain direct equity investments from capital suppliers. In the context of the discussion from Subsection 11, this can be interpreted as entrepreneurs or firms that face frictions in raising outside equity. Finally, to be consistent with our analysis of public firms, we focus on the case in which capital and deposits are in short supply relative to the number of private firms that would like to borrow, meaning that the number of entrepreneurs is large relative to the number of banks, which is at most $K + D$, but could be less for the case in which $u = 1$.

The bank's maximization problem is still given by Eqs. (24)–(26) with the difference that k_F is now fixed and that capital providers to banks and firms could obtain different returns denoted, respectively, as ρ_B and ρ_F. The latter is set equal to $\frac{R}{2}$ because of the assumption on the abundance of productive firms relative to capital and deposits. Finally, to simplify the problem, we focus on the case in which $h_B = 0$ so that there is no recovery if the bank is unable to meets its obligations to depositors. This eliminates the first term in depositors' expected utility in Eq. (26).

We can now obtain Proposition 11, which is illustrated in Fig. 4.

[INSERT FIG. 4 NEAR HERE.]

Proposition 11 *The unique equilibrium in the case of private firms, for Regions A through D, is as follows.*

A. $k_B = 0$, $r_L = r_D, u = u_C \in (1, \frac{R}{2}), E\Pi_B = 0, EU > 1$, *and* $N_B = D$.

B. $k_B > 0, r_L > r_D, \rho_B(u) \geq \rho_B(u_C) > \frac{R}{2}$, $u \geq u_C \in (1, \frac{R}{2}), E\Pi_B = 0, EU > 1, N_B k_B = K$, *and* $N_B(1 - k_B) = D$.

C. $k_B \geq \frac{\eta}{1+\eta}, r_L > r_D, \rho_B(u) > \frac{R}{2}, u \in [1, \frac{R}{2}), E\Pi_B = 0, EU \geq 1, N_B k_B = K$, *and* $N_B(1 - k_B) \leq D$.

D. There is no intermediation.

The boundaries $\underline{R}_C, \underline{R}_{k_B}, \underline{h}_F$ defining Regions A through D are shown in Fig. 4 and, together with the various expressions for $\rho_B(u), \rho_B(u_C), u$, and u_C, are defined in the Appendix.

Proposition 11 demonstrates that while our main results concerning the costs of bank capital relative to deposits carry over to a setting where firms are private in the sense of being unable to raise outside equity. However, it also shows that the introduction of private firms raises new issues for banks' capital structures that were not present when studying public firms in Subsection 5.1. In that case, Proposition 10 establishes that in equilibrium banks always act as conduit banks, with all capital flowing directly to the firms to minimize the deadweight costs of bankruptcy. When firms are private, however, capital cannot freely flow to firms needing financing and must instead be channeled through the banking sector in the form of loans.

As illustrated in Region D in Fig. 4, when projects' returns are very low, no intermediation is possible. In the region labeled *A1*, intermediation becomes possible, but only for a bank that holds no capital and acts purely as a conduit between depositors and firms. As h_F increases so that bankruptcy costs are reduced, a bank holding a positive level of capital becomes feasible when Region *A2* is reached. However, this capital structure is not yet optimal because the bank cannot provide depositors with the same utility u_C as the conduit bank. When h_F reaches $\underline{h}_F$ in Region B, the bank with positive capital becomes optimal as it can offer at least u_C to depositors and, at the same time, $\rho_B(u) \geq \rho_B(u_C) > \frac{R}{2}$ to capital providers. Region B can be thought of as contestable because banks can attract deposits only by paying at least what a conduit bank would pay. This limits banks' ability to remunerate capital suppliers, so that ρ_B could be constrained at a lower level than what would be optimal if there were no contestability. Only when conduit banks are not feasible, such as in Region C, do positive capital banks behave in an unconstrained manner, holding the optimal amount of capital and ignoring the possible entry of a conduit bank.

6. Concluding remarks

We have developed a general equilibrium model of banks and firms to endogenize the equity cost of capital in the economy. The two key assumptions of our model are that deposit and equity markets are segmented and bankruptcy costs exist for banks and firms. We have shown that in equilibrium equity capital has a higher expected return than investing directly in the risky asset. Deposits are a cheaper form of finance as their return is below the return on the risky asset. This implies that equity capital is costly relative to deposits. When banks directly finance risky investments, they hold a positive amount of equity capital as a way to reduce bankruptcy costs.

Much of the recent literature on bank capital structure has been concerned with issues of regulation (e.g., Hellmann, Murdock, and Stiglitz, 2000, Van den Heuvel, 2008, Admati, DeMarzo, Hellwig, and Pfleiderer, 2010, and Acharya, Mehran, and Thakor, 2012). In our baseline model, there are no benefits from regulating bank capital. The market solution is efficient because there are no pecuniary or other kinds of externalities. Requiring banks to hold higher levels of equity capital would reduce the number of banks and possibly the amount of deposits used in the banking sector. This is different once deposits are insured because then banks no longer have any incentive to hold capital and the market solution is not efficient. Capital regulation restores efficiency and, in fact, improves upon the market outcome.

As a final step, we extend the model to consider the case in which firms, not banks, invest in the productive assets and need external financing. We first consider the case of public firms that have access to financial markets and can raise both outside capital and bank loans and then that of private firms that have a given amount of inside capital but can raise external funds only through bank loans. The main results of the baseline model remain valid in that equity capital is still a costly form of finance, but the optimal capital structure differs significantly depending on the corporate structure of firms.

In our analysis, we have assumed that the supplies of capital and deposits are given.

An important issue is what would determine these in a full general equilibrium analysis. As discussed in the Introduction, the justification for market segmentation is that the participation costs for equity markets are much higher than for deposits. One way to model this explicitly is to assume an increasing marginal cost of participating in equity markets. This would determine the proportion of the population that supplies equity and the proportion that would supply deposits. Another important factor in determining the supplies of capital and deposits is the different services that the two savings instruments provide. Deposits provide transaction services that equity does not. For example, bank customers do not have to continually check that they have enough funds in their accounts to make payments. Providing a full understanding of the determinants of the supplies of capital and deposits is an important topic for future research.

References

Acharya, V., Bharath, S., Srinivasan, A., 2007. Does industry-wide distress affect defaulted firms? Evidence from creditor recoveries. Journal of Financial Economics 85, 787-821.

Acharya, V., Mehran, H., Thakor, A., 2012. Caught between Scylla and Charybdis? Regulating bank leverage when there is rent-seeking and risk-shifting. Unpublished working paper. New York University, New York, NY.

Admati, A., DeMarzo, P., Hellwig, M., Pfleiderer, P., 2010. Fallacies, irrelevant facts and myths in the discussion of capital regulation. Stanford Graduate School of Business, Unpublished research paper 2065. Stanford, CA.

Allen, F., Carletti, E., Leonello, A., 2011. Deposit insurance and risk taking. Oxford Review of Economic Policy 27, 464-478.

Allen, F., Carletti, E., Marquez, R., 2011. Credit market competition and capital regulation. Review of Financial Studies 24, 983-1018.

Almeida, H., Philippon,T., 2007. The risk-adjusted cost of financial distress. Journal of Finance 62, 2557-2586.

Andrade, G., Kaplan, S., 1998. How costly is financial (not economic) distress? Evidence from highly levered transactions that became distressed. Journal of Finance 53, 1443-1493.

Berger, A., Herring, R., Szego, G., 1995. The role of capital in financial institutions. Journal of Banking and Finance 19, 393-430.

Bolton, P., Freixas, X., 2006. Corporate finance and monetary transmission mechanism. Review of Financial Studies 19, 829-870.

Brealey, R., 2006. Basel II: the route ahead or cul-de-sac? Journal of Applied Corporate Finance 4, 34-43.

Chan, Y., Greenbaum, S., Thakor, A., 1992. Is fairly priced deposit insurance possible? Journal of Finance 47, 227-246.

Cihak, M., Demirguc-Kunt, A., Feyen, E., Levine, R., 2012. Benchmarking financial systems around the world. Unpublished policy research working paper 6175. World Bank, Washington, DC.

DeAngelo, H., Stulz, R., 2013. Liquid-claim production, risk management, and bank capital structure: Why high leverage is optimal for banks. Fisher College of Business Working Paper Series N. 2013-03-08, Ohio State.

Diamond, D., 1984. Financial intermediation and delegated monitoring. Review of Economic Studies 60, 393-414.

Diamond, D., Dybvig, P., 1983. Bank runs, deposit insurance and liquidity. Journal of Political Economy 91, 401-419.

Diamond, D., Rajan, R., 2000. A theory of bank capital. Journal of Finance 55, 2431-2465.

Flannery, M., Rangan, K., 2008. Market forces at work in the banking industry: evidence from the capital buildup from the 1990s. Review of Finance 12, 391-429.

Gale, D., 2004. Notes on optimal capital regulation. In: St-Amant, P., Wilkins, C. (Eds.), The Evolving Financial System and Public Policy. Bank of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, 225-253 .

Glover, B., 2012. The expected cost of default. Journal of Financial Economics, forthcoming.

Gorton, G., Winton, A., 2003. Financial intermediation. In: Constantinides, G., Harris, M., Stulz, R. (Eds.), Handbook of Economics and Finance. North Holland, Amsterdam, 431-552.

Gropp, R., Heider, F., 2010. The determinants of capital structure: some evidence from banks. Review of Finance 14, 587-622.

Guiso, L., Haliassos, M., Jappelli, T., 2002. Household Portfolios. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Guiso, L., Sodini, P., 2013. Household finance: an emerging field. In: Constantinides, G., Harris, M., Stulz, R. (Eds.), Handbook of Economics and Finance. North Holland,

Amsterdam, pp. 1397-1532.

Hellmann, T., Murdock, K., Stiglitz, J., 2000. Liberalization, moral hazard in banking, and prudential regulation: are capital requirements enough? American Economic Review 90, 147-165.

James, C., 1991. The losses realized in bank failures. Journal of Finance 46, 1223-1242.

Kareken, J., Wallace, N., 1978. Deposit insurance and bank regulation: a partial-equilibrium exposition. Journal of Business 51, 413-438.

Korteweg, A., 2010. The net benefits to leverage. Journal of Finance 65, 2137-2170.

Mehran, H., Thakor, A., 2011. Bank capital and value in the cross section. Review of Financial Studies 24, 1019-1067.

Merton, R., 1977. An analytic derivation of the cost of deposit insurance and loan guarantees. Journal of Banking and Finance 1, 3-11.

Merton, R., 1978. On the cost of deposit insurance when there are surveillance costs. Journal of Business 51, 439-452.

Miller, M., 1995. Does the M&M proposition apply to banks? Journal of Banking and Finance 19, 483-489.

Modigliani, F., Miller, M., 1958. The cost of capital, corporation finance, and the theory of investment. American Economic Review 48, 261-297.

Morrison, A., White, L., 2005. Crises and capital requirements in banking. American Economic Review 95, 1548-1572.

Myers, S., Majluf, N., 1984. Corporate financing and investment decisions when firms have information that investors do not have. Journal of Financial Economics 13, 86-105.

Repullo, R., 2004. Capital requirements, market power, and risk taking in banking. Journal of Financial Intermediation 13, 156-182.

Song, F., Thakor, A., 2007. Relationship banking, fragility, and the asset-liability matching problem. Review of Financial Studies 20, 2129-2177.

Van den Heuvel, S., 2008. The welfare cost of bank capital requirements. Journal of Monetary Economics 55, 298–320.

Winton, A., 1995. Costly state verification and multiple investors: the role of seniority. Review of Financial Studies 8, 91-123.

Appendix. Proofs

Proof of Proposition 1. Because there are no bankruptcy costs, there are no efficiency gains from having capital in the banks. This means a bank can always be set up with $r_D = R$ and $k_B = 0$ such that

$$EU_D = \int_0^R r \frac{1}{R} dr = \frac{R}{2}. \tag{28}$$

Thus, in equilibrium depositors must always receive $EU = \frac{R}{2}$. Because capital providers can always invest directly in the risky technology, they receive at least $\frac{R}{2}$ as well. Because total output with no bankruptcy costs is $\frac{R}{2}$ for each unit invested, the capital providers earn exactly $\frac{R}{2}$. So one equilibrium involves all depositors using banks with no capital and all capital providers investing in their alternative opportunity. However, there exist many other equilibria. In these, banks choose a pair k_B and r_D such that $E\Pi_B = 0$ and $EU_D = \frac{R}{2}$. Substituting $\rho = \frac{R}{2}$ in Eq. (3) and solving $E\Pi_B = 0$ with respect to r_D gives r_D as in the proposition. Given $\rho = u = \frac{R}{2}$, we have $N_B k_B \leq K$ and $N_B(1 - k_B) = D$. □

Proof of Proposition 2. Solving Eq. (4) with equality for k_B after setting $h_B = 0$, we find

$$k_B = 1 - \frac{(r_D - u)}{r_D^2} R. \tag{29}$$

Substituting this into Eq. (3), differentiating with respect to r_D, and solving for r_D gives

$$r_D = \frac{u(2\rho - u)}{\rho}. \tag{30}$$

Substituting this into Eq. (29) gives

$$k_B = 1 - \frac{\rho R(\rho - u)}{u(2\rho - u)^2}. \tag{31}$$

Using Eqs. (30) and (31) in Eq. (3), we obtain

$$E\Pi_B = \frac{\rho^2 R}{2u(2\rho - u)} - \rho. \tag{32}$$

Equating this to zero because $E\Pi_B = 0$ in equilibrium and solving for ρ gives

$$\rho = \frac{2u^2}{4u - R}. \tag{33}$$

Substituting Eq. (33) into Eqs. (30) and (31) leads to $r_D = \frac{R}{2}$, and

$$k_B = \frac{4u}{R} - 1. \tag{34}$$

If $\frac{k_B}{1-k_B} > \eta$, depositors use their alternative opportunity and $u = 1$. In this case, banks are formed until all the capital is used up. To find when this is the case, we solve

$$\frac{k_B}{1 - k_B} = \eta, \tag{35}$$

with respect to R, where k_B is given by Eq. (34) after setting $u = 1$. We then obtain that for $u = 1$ is an equilibrium for

$$R < \overline{R} = \frac{4(1 + \eta)}{1 + 2\eta}. \tag{36}$$

Putting $u = 1$ in Eqs. (33) and (34) gives $\rho = \frac{2}{4-R}$ and $k_B = \frac{4}{R} - 1$. It can easily be checked that $\rho > \frac{R}{2}$ and $k_B \in (0, 1)$. Given $\rho > \frac{R}{2}$ and $u = 1$, we have $N_B k_B = K$ and $N_B(1 - k_B) < D$. This gives the first part of the proposition.

For $R \geq \overline{R}$, deposits are in short supply and in this case $u \geq 1$, with the inequality strict for $R > \overline{R}$. The equilibrium level of u is then found from solving Eq. (35) with respect to u, where k_B is given by Eq. (34). We obtain

$$u = \frac{1 + 2\eta}{2 + 2\eta} \frac{R}{2}. \tag{37}$$

Using this in Eqs. (33) and (34) gives $\rho = \frac{1+4\eta(1+\eta)}{4\eta(1+\eta)} \frac{R}{2}$ and $k_B = \frac{\eta}{1+\eta}$. It can easily be checked that $\rho > \frac{R}{2}$, $k_B \in (0, 1)$, and $u \in (1, \frac{R}{2})$ for any $R > \overline{R}$. Given $\rho > \frac{R}{2}$ and $u > 1$, we the have $N_B k_B = K$ and $N_B(1 - k_B) = D$ for $R \geq \overline{R}$. This gives the second part of the proposition. □

Proof of Proposition 3. Solving Eq. (4) with equality for k_B, we find

$$k_B = 1 - \frac{2(r_D - u)}{(2 - h_B) r_D^2} R. \tag{38}$$

Substituting this into Eq. (3), differentiating with respect to r_D, and solving for r_D gives

$$r_D = \frac{2u\left((2 - h_B)\rho - u\right)}{(2 - h_B)\rho - u h_B}. \tag{39}$$

Using Eq. (39) in Eq. (38) and then both expressions into Eq. (3), and solving the resulting expression for ρ after setting it to zero because $E\Pi_B = 0$ in equilibrium gives

$$\rho = \frac{u\,(2u - h_B R)}{2u(2 - h_B) - R}. \tag{40}$$

Substituting Eq. (40) into Eq. (39) leads to

$$r_D = \frac{2u(1 - h_B)R}{2u(2 - h_B) - h_B R}, \tag{41}$$

and substituting this into Eq. (38) gives

$$k_B = \frac{(2u - h_B R)(2u(2 - h_B) - R)}{2u(1 - h_B)^2 R}. \tag{42}$$

As in the case with $h_B = 0$, depositors use their alternative opportunity and thus $u = 1$ when $\frac{k_B}{1-k_B} > \eta$. To find when this is the case, we solve Eq. (35) with respect to R, where k_B is given by Eq. (42) after setting $u = 1$. We then obtain that, for $u = 1$,

$$R < \overline{R} = \frac{2(1 + \eta) - (1 - h_B)\left(1 - h_B + \sqrt{4\eta(1 + \eta) + (1 - h_B)^2}\right)}{(1 + \eta)h_B}. \tag{43}$$

Then, substituting $u = 1$ into Eqs. (42), (41), and (40) gives $k_B = \frac{(2-h_B R)(2(2-h_B)-R)}{2(1-h_B)^2 R}$, $r_D = \frac{2(1-h_B)R}{2(2-h_B)-h_B R}$ and $\rho = \frac{2-h_B R}{2(2-h_B)-R}$. To show that r_D, ρ, and k_B are positive, we start by showing that $2 - h_B R > 0$ and $2(2 - h_B) - R > 0$ for any $R < \overline{R}$. Substituting Eq. (43) into $2 - h_B R$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 2 - h_B \overline{R} &= \frac{2(1 + \eta)h_B - h_B\left(2(1 + \eta) - (1 - h_B)^2 - (1 - h_B)\sqrt{4\eta(1 + \eta) + (1 - h_B)^2}\right)}{(1 + \eta)h_B} \\ &= \frac{(1 - h_B)\left(1 - h_B + \sqrt{4\eta(1 + \eta) + (1 - h_B)^2}\right)}{(1 + \eta)} > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Then, substituting Eq. (43) into $2(2-h_B)-\overline{R}$, we obtain

$$2(2-h_B)-\overline{R}=\frac{(4-2h_B)(1+\eta)h_B-\left(2(1+\eta)-(1-h_B)\left(1-h_B+\sqrt{4\eta(1+\eta)+(1-h_B)^2}\right)\right)}{(1+\eta)h_B} \tag{45}$$

$$=(1-h_B)\frac{\sqrt{4\eta(1+\eta)+(1-h_B)^2}-(1+2\eta)(1-h_B)}{(1+\eta)h_B}.$$

The sign of the numerator is the same as the sign of

$$4\eta(1+\eta)+(1-h_B)^2-(1+2\eta)^2(1-h_B)^2. \tag{46}$$

This simplifies to

$$4\eta\,(1+\eta)\left(1-(1-h_B)^2\right)>0, \tag{47}$$

so that

$$2(2-h_B)-\overline{R}>0. \tag{48}$$

This implies that r_D is positive and less than R as $h_B<1$ and

$$R-r_D=\frac{(2-h_BR)R}{(2(2-h_B)-h_BR))}>0 \text{ for } R\leq\overline{R}. \tag{49}$$

Finally, it can be seen that $\rho>\frac{R}{2}$, as

$$\rho-\frac{R}{2}=\frac{(R-2)^2}{2(2(2-h_B)-R)}>0 \text{ for } R\leq\overline{R}. \tag{50}$$

It follows from Eqs. (44) and (48) that $k_B>0$. Also, $k_B<1$ because, using the expression for k_B in the proposition, we have

$$2(1-h_B)^2R-(2-h_BR)(2(2-h_B)-R)=(R-2)(2(2-h_B)-h_BR)>0 \text{ for } R<\overline{R}. \tag{51}$$

This completes the first part of the proposition.

For $R\geq\overline{R}$, deposits are in short supply and in this case $u\geq 1$, with the inequality strict for $R\geq\overline{R}$. The equilibrium level of u solves Eq. (35), where k_B is given by Eq.

(42). This gives

$$u = \frac{2(1+\eta) - (1-h_B)\left(1 - h_B + \sqrt{4\eta(1+\eta) + (1-h_B)^2}\right)}{2(1+\eta)(2-h_B)} \frac{R}{2}. \tag{52}$$

As usual, it holds that $u < \frac{R}{2}$ because, given Eq. (48), $(2(2-h_B) - h_B R) > 0$ and thus $\frac{h_B \overline{R}}{2(2-h_B)} < 1$. Substituting u as in Eq. (52) into Eq. (42) gives $k_B = \frac{\eta}{1+\eta}$. Similarly, closed form solutions for r_D and ρ can be found from substituting Eq. (52) into expressions (41) and (40). To check that $r_D < R$, we calculate

$$R - r_D = \frac{(2u - h_B R)R}{(2u(2-h_B) - R)}. \tag{53}$$

Substituting for u from Eq. (52), the numerator becomes

$$\begin{aligned} 2u - h_B R &= \left(\frac{2(1+\eta) - (1-h_B)\left(1 - h_B - \sqrt{4\eta(1+\eta) + (1-h_B)^2}\right)}{(1+\eta)(2-h_B)} - h_B \right) R \\ &= \left(\frac{1 + \eta h^2 + (1-h_B)\left(2\eta + \sqrt{4\eta(1+\eta) + (1-h_B)^2}\right)}{(1+\eta)(2-h_B)} \right) R > 0, \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

while the denominator is

$$\begin{aligned} 2u(2-h_B) - R &= \left(\frac{2(1+\eta) - (1-h_B)\left(1 - h_B - \sqrt{4\eta(1+\eta) + (1-h_B)^2}\right)}{(1+\eta)} - 1 \right) R \\ &= \left(\frac{1 + \eta - (1-h_B)\left(1 - h_B - \sqrt{4\eta(1+\eta) + (1-h_B)^2}\right)}{(1+\eta)} \right) R > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

This implies that $r_D < R$ for $R > \overline{R}$. Moreover, it is easy to see that $\rho > \frac{R}{2}$, because $\rho - \frac{R}{2} = \frac{(R-2u)^2}{2(2u(2-h_B)-R)} > 0$. This completes the second part of the proposition. □

Proof of Proposition 4. We consider the more general case when $h_B > 0$. The case when $h_B = 0$ can be derived similarly. The model is solved backward. Solving Eq. (4)

with equality for r_D, we find

$$r_D = \frac{R - \sqrt{R\left[R - 2u(2-h_B)(1-k_B)\right]}}{(2-h_B)(1-k_B)}. \tag{56}$$

Substituting this into Eq. (3) and solving for ρ after equating the bank's expected profit to zero gives

$$\rho = \frac{(2-2h_B+h_B^2)R - 2u(2-h_B)(1-k_B) + 2(1-h_B)\sqrt{R\left[R-2u(2-h_B)(1-k_B)\right]}}{2k_B(2-h_B)^2}. \tag{57}$$

Substituting this into Eq. (9) and differentiating it with respect to k_B gives

$$k_B = \frac{(2u - h_B R)(2u(2-h_B) - R)}{2u(1-h_B)^2 R}, \tag{58}$$

which is the same as in Eq. (42).

It is then easy to see that the regulatory solution coincides with the market solution in Proposition 3. As there, if depositors use their alternative opportunity then $u = 1$, which occurs for

$$R < \overline{R} = \frac{2(1+\eta) - (1-h_B)\left(1 - h_B + \sqrt{4\eta(1+\eta) + (1-h_B)^2}\right)}{(1+\eta)h_B}. \tag{59}$$

Substituting $u = 1$ into Eqs. (58), (56), and (57) gives k_B, r_D, and ρ as in part (i) of Proposition 3.

For $R \geq \overline{R}$, $u \geq 1$, with the inequality strict for $R > \overline{R}$. Substituting Eq. (58) into Eq. (35) and solving it with respect to u gives u as in Eq. (52). The rest of part (ii) of Proposition 3 follows from substituting the expression for u into those for k_B, r_D, and ρ given above. □

Proof of Proposition 5. Solving Eq. (11) with equality for r_D gives $r_D = u$. Substituting this into Eq. (3) and differentiating it with respect to k_B gives

$$\frac{\partial E\Pi_B}{\partial k_B} = \frac{-(1-k_B)u^2 - (\rho - u)R}{R}, \tag{60}$$

which is negative for any $\rho \geq u$. This implies $k_B = 0$. Substituting this into Eq. (3) gives $E\Pi_B = \frac{R}{2} - u + \frac{u^2}{2R}$. Equating this to zero because $E\Pi_B = 0$ in equilibrium and solving for u gives $u = R$. This gives the first part of the proposition.

Given $u = R$, the capital providers prefer to provide deposits to the bank and obtain $\rho = u = R$ instead of investing in the technology and obtain $\frac{R}{2}$. Thus, the number of banks is given by $N_B = D + K$. This gives the second part of the proposition. □

Proof of Proposition 6. Solving Eq. (11) with equality for r_D gives $r_D = u$. Substituting this into Eq. (3) and solving this equal to zero with respect to ρ gives

$$\rho^{reg} = \frac{R\left[R - 2u(1-k_B)\right] + u^2\left[1 - k_B(2-k_B)\right]}{2k_B R}. \tag{61}$$

Substituting this into Eq. (12) and differentiating it with respect to k_B gives

$$k_B^{reg} = \sqrt{\frac{u^2(1-h_B) + 2uR - R^2}{u^2(1-h_B)}}. \tag{62}$$

To have a real non-negative solution for k_B^{reg}, it must hold that $u^2(1-h_B)+2uR-R^2 \geq 0$, which implies $R \leq u(1+\sqrt{2-h_B})$.

As usual, $u = 1$ as long as $\frac{k_B^{reg}}{1+k_B^{reg}} > \eta$ is satisfied. Substituting Eq. (62) with $u = 1$ into Eq. (35) and solving it for R, we obtain that $u = 1$ holds in equilibrium for

$$R < \overline{R}^{reg} = \frac{1 + \eta + \sqrt{2 + 4\eta + \eta^2 - h_B(1+2\eta)}}{1+\eta}. \tag{63}$$

As required above, $\overline{R}^{reg} < 1 + \sqrt{2-h_B}$. To see this, we substitute the expression for $\overline{R}^{reg}$ and, after rearranging the expression, we obtain

$$\sqrt{2 + 4\eta + \eta^2 - h_B(1+2\eta)} < (1+\eta)\sqrt{2-h_B}. \tag{64}$$

Squaring both terms and rearranging them gives $\eta^2 < (2-h_B)\eta^2$. This implies that $\overline{R}^{reg} < 1 + \sqrt{2-h_B}$.

Substituting $u = 1$ into Eq. (62) gives $k_B^{reg} = \sqrt{\frac{1-h_B+2R-R^2}{1-h_B}}$. This satisfies the feasibility constraint in Eq. (6) with strict inequality because $\frac{1-h_B+2R-R^2}{1-h_B} > 0$ for $R < \overline{R}^{reg} < 1 + \sqrt{2-h_B}$ and $\frac{1-h_B+2R-R^2}{1-h_B} < 1$ for $R > 2$. Substituting the expression for k_B^{reg} into Eq. (61) gives

$$\rho^{reg} = \frac{2 - h_B(2 - 2R + R^2) + 2(R-1)\sqrt{(1-h_B)(1-h_B+2R-R^2)}}{2R\sqrt{(1-h_B)(1-h_B+2R-R^2)}}. \tag{65}$$

To show that $\rho^{reg} > \frac{R}{2}$, we first note that ρ^{reg} is increasing in h_B because

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial R} = \frac{(2-h_B)(R-2)^2 R}{4\sqrt{(1-h_B)^3(1-h_B+2R-R^2)^3}} > 0. \tag{66}$$

It is then enough to show that $\rho^{reg} > \frac{R}{2}$ for $h_B = 0$. Substituting $h_B = 0$ into Eq. (65) and rearranging the expression we obtain $\rho^{reg} = 1 + \frac{1-\sqrt{1+2R-R^2}}{R\sqrt{1+2R-R^2}}$. To show that this is greater than $\frac{R}{2}$, we differentiate it with respect to R and obtain

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial R} = \frac{-1-3R+2R^2+(1+2R-R^2)\sqrt{1+2R-R^2}}{R^2(1+2R-R^2)\sqrt{1+2R-R^2}} > 0 \tag{67}$$

because $-1-3R+2R^2 > 0$ for any $R > 2$. This, together with the fact that $\rho^{reg} = 1$ for $R = 2$, implies $\rho^{reg} > \frac{R}{2}$ for $h_B = 0$ and thus for any $0 < h_B < 1$. This completes the first part of the proposition.

For $R \geq \overline{R}$, $u \geq 1$ with the inequality strict for $R > \overline{R}$. The expression for u is found by substituting k_B^{reg} as in Eq. (62) into Eq. (35) and solving it with respect to u. We obtain

$$u^{reg} = \frac{2(1+\eta)\left(\sqrt{2+4\eta+\eta^2-h_B(1+2\eta)}-(1+\eta)\right)}{(1-h_B)(1+2\eta)}\frac{R}{2}. \tag{68}$$

As usual, it holds that $u < \frac{R}{2}$ for $R > \overline{R}$ because $\frac{2(1+\eta)\left(\sqrt{2+4\eta+\eta^2-h_B(1+2\eta)}-(1+\eta)\right)}{(1-h_B)(1+2\eta)} < 1$ for any $h_B < 1$. To see this, it is enough to note that this coefficient is increasing in h_B and tends to 1 for $h_B \to 1$. The equilibrium return to capital, ρ^{reg}, can now be obtained by substituting the above expression for u^{reg} into Eq. (61). To show that $\rho^{reg} > \frac{R}{2}$, note that for $u > 1$ we must have $k_B = \frac{\eta}{1+\eta}$ because there is full inclusion of capital and deposits. Substituting into Eq. (61) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^{reg} &= \frac{R\left(R-2u\left(1-\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}\right)\right)+u^2\left(1-\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}\left(2-\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}\right)\right)}{2\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}R} \\ &= \frac{R}{2}+\frac{(R-2u)}{2\eta}+\frac{u^2\left(1-\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}\left(2-\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}\right)\right)}{2\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}R}.\end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

The sum of the first two terms is clearly greater than $\frac{R}{2}$ because $u < \frac{R}{2}$. The last term is strictly positive for any η. Therefore, $\rho^{reg} > \frac{R}{2}$, as desired. This completes the second part of the proposition. □

Proof of Proposition 7. We first show that social welfare is always higher under de-

posit insurance with capital regulation than under the market solution when deposits are uninsured. For an arbitrary fixed R, suppose that the regulator chooses the same level of capital at each bank as in the market solution, which we denote by k_B^M; that is, $k_B^{reg} = k_B^M$. This implies that the number of banks also is the same, i.e., $N_B = \frac{K}{k_B^{reg}} = \frac{K}{k_B^M}$, which means that total output, gross of bankruptcy costs, is the same as well and equal to $N_B \frac{R}{2} + D - \left(1 - k_B^M\right) N_B$. Banks now maximize

$$\max_{r_D} E\Pi_B = \int_{\overline{r}_B}^{R} \left(r - r_D(1 - k_B^M)\right) \frac{1}{R} dr - \rho k_B^M, \tag{70}$$

where $\overline{r}_B = \left(1 - k_B^M\right) r_D$, and subject to the same constraints as before except that the depositors' participation constraint is given by

$$EU_D = \int_0^R r_D \frac{1}{R} dr \geq u. \tag{71}$$

Compare this with the problem the bank maximizes in the market solution:

$$\max_{k_B, r_D} E\Pi_B = \int_{\overline{r}_B}^{R} (r - r_D(1 - k_B)) \frac{1}{R} dr - \rho k_B. \tag{72}$$

If $\{k_B^M, r_D^M\}$ are solutions to Eq. (72), then choosing $\{r_D^M\}$ for the problem given in Eq. (70) must give the bank the same value. But, in that case, depositors are better off because $\int_0^R r_D^M \frac{1}{R} dr > \int_0^{\overline{r}_B} \frac{h_B r}{1 - k_B} \frac{1}{R} dr + \int_{\overline{r}_B}^R r_D^M \frac{1}{R} dr = u^M$, where u^M is the equilibrium return depositors make in the market solution. Therefore, the bank can increase its value by lowering r_D below r_D^M and transferring some of the surplus to itself. With no change in the total amount of investment, the reduction in r_D reduces deadweight costs of bankruptcy, thus raising SW. Raising r_D beyond r_D^M cannot be optimal as it would increase the bankruptcy threshold and lead to lower value for the bank. Therefore, by choosing $k_B^{reg} = k_B^M$, the regulator can increase social welfare when deposits are insured relative to the market solution when deposits are uninsured.

Finally, the optimal regulatory solution could be different from the market solution k_B^M but cannot do worse than the SW obtained when choosing k_B^M. Therefore, deposit insurance coupled with capital regulation improves upon the market solution.

To show that the optimal level of capital under regulation is always (weakly) lower than in the market solution, $k_B^{reg} \leq k_B^M$, consider again the maximization problem under

regulation, which is to maximize Eq. (13) with respect to k_B, subject to Eq. (71) and

$$r_D = \arg\max_{r_D} E\Pi_B = \int_{\overline{r}_B}^{R} (r - r_D(1-k_B))\,\frac{1}{R}dr - \rho k_B. \tag{73}$$

Now consider the problem in the market solution, which is to maximize Eq. (3) subject to depositors' participation constraint in Eq. (4). Start by rewriting the participation constraint for the depositors by multiplying both sides by $(1-k_B)$:

$$(1-k_B)EU_D = \int_0^{\overline{r}_B} h_B r\frac{1}{R}dr + \int_{\overline{r}_B}^{R} r_D(1-k_B)\frac{1}{R}dr \geq u(1-k_B). \tag{74}$$

Setting this with equality, we can solve:

$$\int_{\overline{r}_B}^{R} r_D(1-k_B)\frac{1}{R}dr = u(1-k_B) - \int_0^{\overline{r}_B} h_B r\frac{1}{R}dr. \tag{75}$$

We can now substitute this into Eq. (3) to get a maximization problem that depends only on k_B:

$$\max_{k_B} E\Pi_B = \int_{\overline{r}_B}^{R} r\frac{1}{R}dr - u(1-k_B) + \int_0^{\overline{r}_B} h_B r\frac{1}{R}dr - \rho k_B = \int_{\overline{r}_B}^{R} r\frac{1}{R}dr + \int_0^{\overline{r}_B} h_B r\frac{1}{R}dr - \rho k_B - u(1-k_B). \tag{76}$$

We can add and subtract $\int_0^{\overline{r}_B} r\frac{1}{R}dr$ to obtain

$$\max_{k_B} E\Pi_B = \frac{1}{2}R - \int_0^{\overline{r}_B} (1-h_B)\,r\frac{1}{R}dr - \rho k_B - u(1-k_B). \tag{77}$$

Note now that we can write SW as (we ignore the expectation term, E, for ease of notation)

$$\begin{aligned} SW &= N_B\left(\Pi_B + \rho k_B + u(1-k_B)\right) + \left(D - (1-k_B)\,N_B\right) \\ &= N_B\Pi_B + \left(D - (1-k_B)\,N_B\right) + N_B\left(\rho k_B + u(1-k_B)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

For an interior solution in the market problem the standard first order condition $\frac{\partial E\Pi_B}{\partial k_B} = 0$ must be satisfied. Call this solution k_B^M. Now consider the first order condition for the

SW problem, assuming again an interior solution:

$$\frac{\partial SW}{\partial k_B} = N_B \frac{\partial \Pi_B}{\partial k_B} + \frac{\partial N_B}{\partial k_B}\Pi_B + N_B - (1-k_B)\frac{\partial N_B}{\partial k_B} + \frac{\partial N_B}{\partial k_B}(\rho k_B + u(1-k_B)) + N_B(\rho - u) \tag{79}$$

$$= N_B\left(\frac{\partial \Pi_B}{\partial k_B} + 1 + (\rho - u)\right) + \frac{\partial N_B}{\partial k_B}(\Pi_B + \rho k_B + (u-1)(1-k_B)).$$

We know from the Envelope Theorem that, at k_B^M, $\frac{\partial \Pi_B}{\partial k_B} = 0$. Recall as well that $N_B = \frac{K}{k_B}$ and that, therefore, $\frac{\partial N_B}{\partial k_B} = \frac{-K}{k_B^2}$. Substituting, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial SW}{\partial k_B} &= \frac{K}{k_B}(1 + (\rho - u)) - \frac{K}{k_B^2}(\Pi_B + \rho k_B + (u-1)(1-k_B)) \\ &= -\frac{K}{k_B}\left(\frac{u-1}{k_B} + \frac{\Pi_B}{k_B}\right) < 0.\end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

This means that, at the market solution for the level of capital (assuming an interior solution), a regulator would prefer to reduce the amount of capital each bank holds. In other words, the incentive to hold capital is lower when maximizing social welfare, and the regulatory solution entails $k_B^{reg} < k_B^M$. The strict inequality holds as long as $u = 1$ in the market solution because, as it can easily be shown, $\overline{R} > \overline{R}^{reg}$; that is the critical value of R above which u becomes greater than 1 (and thus $k_B = \frac{\eta}{1+\eta}$) is lower in the regulatory solution than in the market solution. □

Proof of Proposition 8. Substituting $r_D = u$ into Eq. (14) and differentiating it with respect to k_B gives

$$\frac{\partial E\Pi_B}{\partial k_B} = \frac{-[(1-k_B)u + P]u - (\rho - u)R}{R}, \tag{81}$$

which is negative for any $\rho \geq u$. This implies $k_B = 0$, as desired. □

Proof of Proposition 9. We can rewrite the bank's expected profits in Eq. (14) as

$$E\Pi_B = \int_{r_D(1-k_B)}^{R} (r - r_D(1-k_B))\frac{1}{R}dr - E[P] - \rho k_B, \tag{82}$$

where $E[P]$ is as in Eq. (15) and, from Eq. (17), it equals the anticipated cost of providing insurance, $\int_0^{r_D(1-k_B)} (r_D(1-k_B) - h_B r)\frac{1}{R}dr$, at the equilibrium deposit rate

r_D. Substituting this last term in for $E[P]$ and manipulating slightly yields

$$E\Pi_B = \int_0^R r\frac{1}{R}dr - \int_0^{r_D(1-k_B)} (1-h_B)\, r\frac{1}{R}dr - r_D\,(1-k_B)\,\frac{1}{R}dr - \rho k_B. \tag{83}$$

Denote r_D^I as the equilibrium deposit rate with deposit insurance and r_D^M as the equilibrium deposit rate for the market solution in the absence of deposit insurance. To offer depositors the same return when deposits are insured as what they receive when uninsured, for a given level of bank capital k_B, the bank has to offer only

$$r_D^I = r_D^M - \int_0^{r_D^M(1-k_B)} \left(r_D^M - \frac{h_B r}{1-k_B}\right)\frac{1}{R}dr \tag{84}$$

or, equivalently,

$$r_D^I\,(1-k_B) = r_D^M\,(1-k_B) - \int_0^{r_D^M(1-k_B)} \left(r_D^M\,(1-k_B) - h_B r\right)\frac{1}{R}dr. \tag{85}$$

Substituting Eq. (85) into Eq. (83) gives, after some manipulations,

$$\begin{aligned} E\Pi_B &= \int_{r_D^I(1-k_B)}^{R} \left(r - r_D^M\,(1-k_B)\right)\frac{1}{R}dr + \int_0^{r_D^I(1-k_B)} h_B r\frac{1}{R}dr - \int_0^{r_D^I(1-k_B)} r_D^M\,(1-k_B)\,\frac{1}{R}dr \\ &\quad + \int_0^{r_D^M(1-k_B)} \left(r_D^M\,(1-k_B) - h_B r\right)\frac{1}{R}dr - \rho k_B \\ &= \left(\int_{r_D^M(1-k_B)}^{R} \left(r - r_D^M\,(1-k_B)\right)\frac{1}{R}dr - \rho k_B\right) + \int_{r_D^I(1-k_B)}^{r_D^M(1-k_B)} r\,(1-h_B)\,\frac{1}{R}dr. \end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

The term in parentheses is exactly the equilibrium bank profits in the market solution with no deposit insurance, for any level of capital that could be chosen. The second term, which represents the savings from the lower deadweight bankruptcy losses when deposits are insured and can, therefore, be offered a lower interest rate, is strictly positive.

If a regulator chooses the market solution for capital, k_B^M, the bank could choose a deposit rate that is designed to give depositors the same utility as in the market solution with no deposit insurance and generate higher profits when deposits are insured and it pays an actuarially fair premium. Given that bank profits are higher, depositors are equally well off, and bankruptcy costs are lower, it must be that social welfare per bank has increased. □

Proof of Proposition 10. As argued, any equilibrium must involve $\overline{r}_F \geq \overline{r}_B$. We show

that $\overline{r}_F > \overline{r}_B$ cannot hold in equilibrium and that equilibrium entails $k_B = 0$ and $r_L = r_D$.

Suppose there exists a candidate equilibrium, defined as X, with

$$k'_B > 0, k'_F > 0, r'_L > r'_D, \rho' \geq \frac{R}{2}, u' \geq 1,\ \overline{r}'_F = r'_L(1-k'_F) > \overline{r}'_B = \frac{r'_D(1-k'_B)(1-k'_F)}{h_F}. \tag{87}$$

This cannot be an equilibrium because, by transferring the capital of the bank to the firm and aligning the bankruptcy thresholds of the bank and the firm, overall bankruptcy costs can be reduced. To see this, consider the following deviation, which we denote Z, where

$$k^*_B = 0, k^*_F = k'_B(1-k'_F) + k'_F, r^*_D = r^*_L = r'_D, \overline{r}^*_F = \overline{r}^*_B = r^*_L(1-k^*_F) < \overline{r}'_B. \tag{88}$$

It can be seen from Fig. 3 that this deviation eliminates the firm bankruptcy costs represented by Region $D1 + D2$, and the bank bankruptcy costs represented by $E2$. The shareholders are better off by the amount $D1 + D2$ and the depositors are better off by the amount $E2$. This implies that the deviation Z represents a Pareto improvement.

When $k'_B = 0$, it must be the case that $r'_L = r'_D$ for bank expected profits to be zero. In this case, $\overline{r}'_F = \overline{r}'_B$ and this is the equilibrium because no profitable deviation is possible. The choice of the optimal value of k_F and r_L are then identical to the choice of k_B and r_D in the case in which the bank invests directly in the risky asset except the liquidation proceeds are $h_F h_B r$ instead of $h_B r$. □

Proof of Proposition 11. We start by noting that to satisfy the zero profit condition of the firm, the loan rate must be set so that

$$r_L = \frac{R}{1+\sqrt{k_F}}. \tag{89}$$

We now distinguish between two cases depending on whether $\overline{r}_B = \overline{r}_F = r_L(1-k_F)$ or $\overline{r}_B = \frac{r_D(1-k_B)(1-k_F)}{h_F} < \overline{r}_F$, and we first analyze when either case is feasible.

Suppose first that $\overline{r}_B = \overline{r}_F$ holds in equilibrium. Then, the bank's maximization problem simplifies to

$$\max_{k_B, r_D}\ E\Pi_B = \int_{\overline{r}_F}^{R} \left(r_L - r_D(1-k_B)\right) \frac{1}{R} dr - \rho k_B \tag{90}$$

subject to

$$EU_D = \int_{\overline{r}_F}^{R} r_D \frac{1}{R} dr \geq u. \tag{91}$$

Solving Eq. (91) with equality with respect to r_D after substituting r_L as in Eq. (89) gives

$$r_D = \frac{Ru}{R-(1-k_F)r_l} = \frac{u}{\sqrt{k_F}}. \tag{92}$$

We now substitute Eqs. (89) and (92) into the bank's profit as in Eq. (90) and differentiate it with respect to k_B. We obtain

$$\frac{\partial E\Pi_B}{\partial k_B} = -\rho + u \leq 0 \tag{93}$$

for $\rho \geq u$. This implies $k_B = 0$, which is consistent with $\overline{r}_B = \overline{r}_F$, and also that $r_L = r_D$ so that the bank makes zero expected profit. This solution is feasible when the bank can offer at least $u = 1$ to its depositors. To see when this is the case, we substitute $u = 1$ into $r_L = r_D$, where r_L and r_D are given in Eqs. (89) and (92), and solve the equality with respect to R. This gives the minimum level of R, denoted $\underline{R}_C$, that allows a bank with no capital to be feasible:

$$\underline{R}_C = \frac{1+\sqrt{k_F}}{\sqrt{k_F}}. \tag{94}$$

Thus, the solution with $k_B = 0$ is feasible for $R \geq \underline{R}_C$ while it is not feasible for $R < \underline{R}_C$. Depositors obtain $u = 1$ for $R = \underline{R}_C$ and $u = u_C > 1$ for $R > \underline{R}_C$. The value for u_C is found by equating r_L in Eq. (89) to r_D in Eq. (92) and solving the equality with respect to u. This gives

$$u_C = \frac{\sqrt{k_F}}{1+\sqrt{k_F}}R < R/2. \tag{95}$$

Now suppose that $\overline{r}_B = \frac{r_D(1-k_B)(1-k_F)}{h_F}$ so that $k_B > 0$ must hold. We first find k_B and r_D as the solutions to the bank problem in Eqs. (24)–(26) for given ρ_B and u, and we then analyze when such a solution is feasible. Solving Eq. (26) with equality with respect to k_B after setting $h_B = 0$ gives

$$k_B = 1 - \frac{h_F(r_D-u)}{(1-k_F)r_D^2}R. \tag{96}$$

Substituting this expression for k_B and r_L as in Eq. (89) into Eq. (24) and differentiating it with respect to r_D gives

$$r_D = \frac{u(2\rho-u)}{\rho}. \tag{97}$$

Substituting Eq. (97) into the expression for k_B above gives

$$k_B = 1 - \frac{h_F \rho R(\rho - u)}{(1 - k_F)u(2\rho - u)^2}. \tag{98}$$

This solution is feasible when capital providers and depositors obtain at least $\rho = \frac{R}{2}$ and $u = 1$, respectively, and the bank makes non-negative profits. We, therefore, substitute $\rho_B = \frac{R}{2}$ and $u = 1$, Eqs. (97) and (98) into Eq. (24), set it equal to zero and solve for R. This gives the minimum value of R, denoted $\underline{R}_{k_B}$, that is needed for a bank with $k_B > 0$ to be feasible:

$$\underline{R}_{k_B} = \frac{2}{h_F}\sqrt{\left(1 - 2(1 - h_F)\sqrt{k_F} + (1 - h_F)k_F\right)}\left(\begin{array}{c}\sqrt{1 - 2(1 - h_F)\sqrt{k_F} + (1 - h_F)k_F} \\ +(1 - \sqrt{k_F})\sqrt{(1 - h_F)}\end{array}\right). \tag{99}$$

Thus, the solution with $k_B > 0$ is feasible for $R \geq \underline{R}_{k_B}$, while it is not feasible for $R < \underline{R}_{k_B}$. Capital providers and depositors obtain, respectively, $\rho = \frac{R}{2}$ and $u = 1$ for $R = \underline{R}_{k_B}$ and $\rho > \frac{R}{2}$ and $u \geq 1$ for $R > \underline{R}_{k_B}$. The boundaries $\underline{R}_C$ and $\underline{R}_{k_B}$ meet for h_F equal to

$$\underline{h}_F = \frac{4\sqrt{k_F}}{1 + 4\sqrt{k_F}}. \tag{100}$$

It follows that $\underline{R}_C < \underline{R}_{k_B}$ for $h_F < \underline{h}_F$ and $\underline{R}_C > \underline{R}_{k_B}$ for $h_F > \underline{h}_F$. This implies that there is no intermediation in Region D of Fig. 4 as defined by $R < \min[\underline{R}_C, \underline{R}_{k_B}]$; that only the solution with $k_B = 0$ and $u = u_C$ given in Eq. (95) is feasible in Region *A1* of Fig. 4 as defined by $\underline{R}_C < R < \underline{R}_{k_B}$; and that only the solution with $k_B > 0$ is feasible in Region C as defined by $\underline{R}_{k_B} < R < \underline{R}_C$. In the last, depositors obtain $u > 1$ or $u = 1$ depending on whether Eq. (35) binds at $u = 1$ or at $u > 1$, while capital providers always obtain a return $\rho_B > \frac{R}{2}$. This also implies $k_B \geq \frac{\eta}{1+\eta}$ when $u = 1$ and $k_B = \frac{\eta}{1+\eta}$ when $u > 1$, while $r_L > r_D$ must hold for the bank to make non-negative profits with $k_B > 0$.

It remains now to establish which solution, $k_B = 0$ or $k_B > 0$, is optimal in the sense that it provides a higher return when both are feasible for $R > \underline{R}_{k_B} > \underline{R}_C$. Recall first that for any $R > \underline{R}_C$, $u_C > 1$. Any bank with $k_B > 0$ can, therefore, compete with the bank with $k_B = 0$ only if it can offer depositors at least $u = u_C$, while at the same time offering at least $\rho = \frac{R}{2}$ to the capital providers. In other words, the bank with positive capital is constrained by the potential entry of the bank with zero capital. To analyze this contestability argument formally, we substitute the expression for u_C in Eq. (95) and $\rho_B = \frac{R}{2}$ into Eq. (24), set it equal to zero, and solve for h_F. This gives the minimum value of h_F that allows a bank with positive capital to offer $u = u_C$ while still attracting

capital providers with $\rho_B = \frac{R}{2}$ and making non-negative profits:

$$h_F = \underline{h}_F = \frac{4\sqrt{k_F}}{1 + 4\sqrt{k_F}}. \tag{101}$$

This critical value of h_F coincides with the value $\underline{h}_F$ in Eq. (100) at which the boundaries $\underline{R}_C$ and $\underline{R}_{k_B}$ are equal. Thus, in Region *A2* defined by $R > \underline{R}_{k_B}$ and $h_F < \underline{h}_F$ and illustrated in Fig. 4, a bank with $k_B = 0$ offering $u = u_C$ is optimal as it can offer a higher return to its depositors. By contrast, a bank with $k_B > 0$ is optimal in Region B of Fig. 4 as defined by $R > \underline{R}_C$ and $h_F > \underline{h}_F$. In this region, the bank offers $u \geq u_C$ to the depositors and $\rho_B(u) \geq \rho_B(u_C)$, depending on whether it is constrained by the threat of entry of a zero capital bank, where $\rho_B(u)$ is the expected return to capital suppliers when depositors earn a return of u. This completes the proof of the proposition. □



Fig. 1. The relative importance of customer deposit funding for banks. The figure plots (Customer deposits/(Capital and reserves + Borrowing from the central bank + Customer deposits + Bonds) in percent for the years 2000–2009. Source: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development and Japanese Bankers Association.



Fig. 2. The importance of deposit funding for banks relative to gross domestic product in percent for the years 2000–2009. Data source is World Bank Financial Development and Structure Dataset. Cihak, Demigurc-Kunt, Feyen and Levine (2012) contains a description of the data.



Fig. 3. Output of a single firm and returns to capital providers and depositors as a function of the project return r in the case of public firms. The graph shows how the output of a single public firm is split between capital providers, depositors, and deadweight losses for different bankruptcy thresholds for the firm and the bank. Consider first that the firm remains solvent for $r > \bar{r}'_F$ and the bank for $r > \bar{r}'_B$, with $\bar{r}'_F > \bar{r}'_B$. Region *A* represents the payoff to firm shareholders for $r > \bar{r}'_F$. Region *B+C* represents the payoff to the bank shareholders for $r > \bar{r}'_B$, and Region *D1* is the deadweight loss from the bankruptcy of the firm for $\bar{r}'_B < r < \bar{r}'_F$. Region *E1+F* is the payoff to bank depositors, and Region *D2+E2* is the deadweight loss from the bankruptcy of the bank for $\bar{r}^*_B < r < \bar{r}'_B$. Consider now that both the firm and the bank go bankrupt for $\bar{r}^* < \bar{r}^*_F = \bar{r}_B < \bar{r}'_B < \bar{r}'_F$. This implies that the deadweight losses in Region *D2+E2* are eliminated.



Fig. 4. The case of private firms as a function of the recovery rate h_F and the maximum project return R. The figure describes the amount of capital k_B and the payoffs ϱ_B and u to capital providers and depositors, respectively, of a bank lending to a private firm. In Region *A1+A2*, as defined by $h_F < \underline{h}_F$ and $R > \underline{R}_C$, the bank holds $k_B = 0$ and depositors obtain $u = u_C > 1$. In Region *B*, as defined by $h_F > \underline{h}_F$ and $R > \underline{R}_C$, $k_B > 0$, $u \geq u_C$ and $\varrho_B(u) \geq \varrho_B(u_C) > R/2$. In Region *C*, as defined by $h_F > \underline{h}_F$ and $R_{K_B} < R < \underline{R}_C$, $k_B > 0$, $u > 1$ and $\varrho_B(u) > R/2$. Finally, in Region *D*, as defined by $R < \min\{\underline{R}_C, R_{K_B}\}$, there is no intermediation.