Third Edition

# ethics in finance

John R. Boatright

WILEY Blackwell

# Ethics in Finance

## Foundations of Business Ethics
**Series editors: W. Michael Hoffman and Robert E. Frederick**

Written by an assembly of the most distinguished figures in business ethics, the Foundations of Business Ethics series aims to explain and assess the fundamental issues that motivate interest in each of the main subjects of contemporary research. In addition to a general introduction to business ethics, individual volumes cover key ethical issues in management, marketing, finance, accounting, and computing. The books, which are complementary yet complete in themselves, allow instructors maximum flexibility in the design and presentation of course materials without sacrificing either depth of coverage or the discipline-based focus of many business courses. The volumes can be used separately or in combination with anthologies and case studies, depending on the needs and interests of the instructors and students.

1. John R. Boatright, *Ethics in Finance*, third edition
2. Ronald Duska, Brenda Shay Duska, and Julie Ragatz, *Accounting Ethics*, second edition
3. Richard T. De George, *The Ethics of Information Technology and Business*
4. Patricia H. Werhane and Tara J. Radin with Norman E. Bowie, *Employment and Employee Rights*
5. Norman E. Bowie with Patricia H. Werhane, *Management Ethics*
6. Lisa H. Newton, *Business Ethics and the Natural Environment*
7. Kenneth E. Goodpaster, *Conscience and Corporate Culture*
8. George G. Brenkert, *Marketing Ethics*
9. Al Gini and Ronald M. Green, *Ten Virtues of Outstanding Leaders: Leadership and Character*

**Forthcoming**

Denis Arnold, *Ethics of Global Business*

# Ethics in Finance

THIRD EDITION

John R. Boatright

WILEY Blackwell

This edition first published 2014
© 2014 John Wiley & Sons, Inc

*Registered Office*
John Wiley & Sons Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

*Editorial Offices*
350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA
9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK
The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

For details of our global editorial offices, for customer services, and for information about how to apply for permission to reuse the copyright material in this book please see our website at www.wiley.com/wiley-blackwell.

The right of John R. Boatright to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats. Some content that appears in print may not be available in electronic books.

Designations used by companies to distinguish their products are often claimed as trademarks. All brand names and product names used in this book are trade names, service marks, trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective owners. The publisher is not associated with any product or vendor mentioned in this book.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty: While the publisher and author(s) have used their best efforts in preparing this book, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this book and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. It is sold on the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services and neither the publisher nor the author shall be liable for damages arising herefrom. If professional advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data applied for*
Paperback ISBN: 978-1-118-61582-9

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Cover image: © Getty Images / pepifoto.
Cover design by Cyan Design.

Set in 10.5/12.5 pt Minion by Toppan Best-set Premedia Limited

1 2014

# Contents


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *Preface* | | *vii* |
| *Acknowledgments* | | *ix* |
| *Abbreviations* | | *x* |
| 1 | Finance Ethics: An Overview | 1 |
| | The Need for Ethics in Finance | 2 |
| | The Field of Finance Ethics | 13 |
| 2 | Fundamentals of Finance Ethics | 26 |
| | A Framework for Ethics | 27 |
| | Agents, Fiduciaries, and Professionals | 40 |
| | Conflict of Interest | 45 |
| 3 | Ethics and the Retail Customer | 63 |
| | Sales Practices | 64 |
| | Credit Cards | 78 |
| | Mortgage Lending | 96 |
| | Arbitration | 108 |
| 4 | Ethics in Investment | 120 |
| | Mutual Funds | 121 |
| | Relationship Investing | 141 |
| | Socially Responsible Investing | 148 |
| | Microfinance | 155 |
| 5 | Ethics in Financial Markets | 171 |
| | Fairness in Markets | 172 |
| | Insider Trading | 182 |
| | Hostile Takeovers | 189 |
| | Financial Engineering | 201 |

6 Ethics in Financial Management 223
The Corporate Objective 224
Risk Management 234
Ethics of Bankruptcy 243
Corporate Governance 254

*Index* *273*

# Preface

Writing a book on ethics in finance poses a special challenge. The difficulty does not arise from a lack of subject matter, despite the cynical view that there is no ethics in finance. To the contrary, finance is infused with ethics and could not exist without it. Financial activity is governed by detailed rules, and a high level of integrity is expected of people who bear great responsibility. As a field of study, however, finance ethics is barely formed, and so the first task for a writer in this area is to define the subject, frame the main issues, and identify the relevant ethical principles. Whereas most textbooks present standard material, this one is forced by necessity to be original. Hopefully, *Ethics in Finance*, Third Edition, will continue to advance the important task of creating the field of finance ethics.

Not only is the field of finance ethics still being formed, but it is also highly diverse. People trained in finance enter many different lines of work, in which they encounter a variety of ethical situations and issues. The situation of a stockbroker is different from that of a mutual fund manager, a market regulator, or a corporate financial officer. In addition, finance ethics encompasses broader ethical issues in financial markets, financial services, and financial management, which are addressed by both industry leaders and government regulators. A book on finance ethics must also identify the relevant ethical principles for resolving many different kinds of questions. Some of these involve dilemmas of individual conduct, but the most perplexing and significant issues are related to the operation of financial services providers and financial markets and institutions.

Many ethical issues in finance have already been addressed by legal regulation, as well by firm and industry self-regulation. The role of ethics in such a highly regulated environment is problematic. Why is it not sufficient merely to obey the applicable rules? One answer to this question is that ethical principles lie at the heart of much regulation, and issues not yet settled by law or self-regulation are debated, in part, as matters of ethics. Much of this book is

devoted, therefore, to an examination of existing regulation and proposals for regulatory reform. In addition, regulation, whether it is by government or industry, is a rather ineffective, uncertain guide, and so a commitment to high ethical standards, and not merely to legal compliance, is essential.

Since the publication of the first two editions of this book, much has changed and much has remained the same. In particular, the financial crisis that began in 2007 has renewed interest in finance ethics and led to calls for greater attention to the subject. However, this crisis, for all of the misconduct involved and damage done, raises few novel issues in finance ethics and presents mostly familiar issues in new guises. Still, the third edition of this book devotes considerable space to the ethical aspects of the greatest financial crisis since the Great Depression.

Readers of the first two editions will find the third one extensively revised and expanded. Although the number of chapters remains the same, the material has been substantially reorganized for greater clarity and orderliness. Chapter 2 now offers a more explicit framework for approaching ethics, which presents, first, ethics in markets and, second, the ethics of roles and relationships, including those of agents and fiduciaries. The remaining material is organized around the areas of financial services, financial markets, and financial management. Subjects that are new to this third edition include ethical issues in credit cards, subprime mortgages, microfinance, derivatives, high-frequency trading, and risk management.

As with the first two editions, I am indebted to W. Michael Hoffman and Robert E. Frederick of Bentley University, the editors of the series Foundations of Business Ethics, and my editor at Blackwell, Jeffrey Dean. The Quinlan School of Business at Loyola University Chicago has provided critical support for the preparation of the third edition. I am especially grateful for the resources of the Raymond C. Baumhart, S.J., Chair in Business Ethics, which was created to honor a former president of Loyola University Chicago and a pioneer in the field of business ethics. To Ray Baumhart I owe a special debt of gratitude. I also wish to express my appreciation to Kathleen A. Getz, dean of the Quinlan School of Business for her enthusiastic support. As always, I am indebted to my wife Claudia, whose affection, patience, and encouragement have been essential for my work.

John R. Boatright

# Acknowledgments

The following material is used in the third edition of *Ethics in Finance* with permission from the copyright holders.

John R. Boatright, “Financial Services,” in Michael Davis and Andrew Stark, *Conflict of Interest in the Professions* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), copyright 1999 by John R. Boatright.

John R. Boatright, “Fiduciary Duty,” “Soft Dollar Brokerage,” and “Bankruptcy,” in Robert W. Kolb (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Business Ethics and Society* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2007), by permission of the publisher.

John R. Boatright, “Ethics in Finance” in John R. Boatright (ed.), *Finance Ethics: Critical Issues in Theory and Practice* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2010), by permission of the publisher.

John R. Boatright, “The Ethics of Risk Management: A Post-Crisis Perspective,” *Ethics and Values for the 21st Century* (Madrid: BBVA, 2011), copyright 2011 by John R. Boatright.

John R. Boatright, “Why Financial Innovation Seems to be Associated with Scandals, Crises, Mischief, and other Mayhem,” in *Risks and Rewards of Financial Innovation* (Chicago: Loyola University Chicago School of Business Administration, 2010), copyright 2010 by John R. Boatright.

John R. Boatright, “Corporate Governance,” in *Encyclopedia of Applied Ethics*, Ruth Chadwick (ed.) (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2011), by permission of the publisher.

# Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| ABS | asset-backed security |
| ARM | adjustable-rate mortgage |
| ATR | annualized turnover ratio |
| CalPERS | California Public Employees' Retirement System |
| CAPM | capital asset pricing model |
| CARD | Credit Card Accountability, Responsibility, and Disclosure Act |
| CDO | collateralized debt obligation |
| CDS | credit default swap |
| CEO | chief executive officer |
| CFO | chief financial officer |
| CRO | chief risk officer |
| CSR | corporate social responsibility |
| ENE | early neutral evaluation |
| ERISA | Employee Retirement Income Security Act |
| ERM | enterprise risk management |
| ESG | environmental, social, governance |
| ETI | economically targeted investment |
| Eurosif | European Sustainable Investment Forum |
| EVA | economic value added |
| FINRA | Financial Industry Regulatory Authority |
| FTC | Federal Trade Commission |
| GAAP | generally accepted accounting principles |
| GDP | gross domestic product |
| GSE | government-sponsored enterprise |
| HFT | high-frequency trading |
| ICA | Investment Company Act |
| ICI | Investment Company Institute |
| IPO | initial public offering |
| ISS | Institutional Shareholder Services |

| | |
|---|---|
| LDC | less-developed country |
| LIBOR | London Interbank Offered Rate |
| M&E | mortality and expense risk |
| MBS | mortgage-backed security |
| NASD | National Association of Securities Dealers (now FINRA) |
| NASDAQ | National Association of Securities Dealers Automated Quotations |
| NPV | net present value |
| OPM | other people's money |
| OTC | over the counter |
| PDAA | predispute arbitration agreements |
| REIT | real estate investment trust |
| RI | relationship investing |
| SEC | Securities and Exchange Commission |
| SME | small and medium enterprise |
| SRI | socially responsible investing |
| SRO | self-regulating organization |
| SWM | shareholder wealth maximization |
| VaR | value at risk |
| VWAP | volume weighted average price |

# *Chapter One*

# Finance Ethics: An Overview

Some cynics jokingly deny that there is any ethics in finance, especially on Wall Street. This view is expressed in a thin volume, *The Complete Book of Wall Street Ethics*, which claims to fill "an empty space on financial bookshelves where a consideration of ethics should be."[1] Of course, the pages are all blank! However, a moment's reflection reveals that finance would be impossible without ethics. The very act of placing our assets in the hands of other people requires immense trust. An untrustworthy stockbroker or insurance agent, like an untrustworthy physician or attorney, finds few takers for the services offered. Financial scandals shock us precisely because they involve individuals and institutions that we should be able to trust.

Trust is essential in finance, but finance ethics is about far more than trust. Finance consists of an array of activities that involve the handling of financial assets—usually those of other people. Not only does the welfare of everyone depend on the safeguarding and deployment of these assets, but billions of financial transactions take place each day with a high level of integrity. With this large volume of financial activities, there are ample opportunities for some people to gain at other's expense. Simply put, finance concerns other people's money (OPM), and OPM invites misconduct. Individuals in the financial services industry, such as stockbrokers, bankers, financial advisers, mutual fund and pension managers, and insurance agents, have a responsibility to the customers and clients they serve. Financial managers in corporations, government, and other organizations have an obligation to manage the financial assets of these institutions well. It is important that everyone else involved in

*Ethics in Finance*, Third Edition. John R. Boatright.
© 2014 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Published 2014 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

finance, in whatever role, conduct themselves with the utmost attention to ethics.

The ethics of an occupation or a profession is best understood not by examining the worst conduct of its members but by attending to the conduct that is commonly expected and generally found. In finance, as in other areas of life, three questions of ethics are critical: What are our ethical *obligations* or *duties*? What *rights* are at stake? And what is *fair* or *just*? Beyond these more specific questions lies the ultimate ethical question: How should we live? In the case of finance, this question goes to the heart of the purpose of financial activity: What role should finance play in our individual lives and in the development of a good society?[2] These four fundamental questions are not easily answered, but an attempt to answer them—or at least the first three—is the main task of this book.

This chapter lays the groundwork for the ones that follow by providing an overview of the need for ethics in finance and the main areas of finance ethics. A comprehensive treatment of ethics in finance is, of necessity, long and involved because of the diversity of financial activities and the range of ethical issues they raise. However, there is little that is unique to finance ethics. The ethics of finance has counterparts in other areas of business and in the professions, such as medicine and law. Thus, our discussion of ethics in finance can be facilitated by drawing on the well-developed fields of business and professional ethics.

## The Need for Ethics in Finance

Although the need for ethics in finance should be obvious, it is useful to understand both the misconduct that occurs all too frequently and its causes. Most people in finance are decent, dedicated individuals, but, unlike the professions, which involve a strong commitment to service, finance relies mainly on the search for gain, which can easily become greed. Moreover, individuals operate within and through organizations, institutions, and systems, including markets, which may be faulty. Consequently, scandals may occur that were part of no one person's intentions and for which no one bears responsibility. Many scandals result not from deliberate misconduct—doing what one knows to be wrong—but from rational actors following incentives in situations with complex interactions. Ethical misconduct is not always a matter of bad people doing bad things, but often of good people who stumble unwittingly into wrongdoing. This section describes some of the scandals of recent years, which have created an image of finance as an activity devoid of ethics, and it also explores some of the causes for these scandals.

## Financial scandals

Wall Street was shaken in the late 1980s by the insider trading and market manipulation of Dennis Levine, Martin Siegel, Ivan Boesky, Michael Milken, and others. In 1990, Mr Milken pleaded guilty to six felonies and was sentenced to 10 years in prison. Previously, his firm, Drexel Burnham Lambert, collapsed after admitting to six felonies and agreeing to pay $650 million. James B. Stewart, the author of *Den of Thieves*, calls their activities "the greatest criminal conspiracy the financial world has ever known."[3] Insider trading continues to be not only a frequent occurrence but also a source of controversy. Although the domestic maven Martha Stewart was convicted in 2004 for lying to investigators about a suspicious transaction, questions remain about whether she had actually committed insider trading. However, the investigation of Raj Rajaratnam, head of the Galleon Group—who was convicted of insider trading in 2011 and sentenced to 11 years in prison—also ensnared many members of the circle of informants that he had built over many years, including a respected director of Goldman Sachs and Procter & Gamble. This conviction exposed the extent to which insider trading had become organized in the hedge fund world through so-called expert networks.

The investment bank Salomon Brothers was nearly destroyed in 1991 by charges that traders in the government securities division had attempted to execute a "squeeze" by rigging several auctions of US Treasury notes. The total cost of this scandal—including legal expenses and lost business, on top of a $290 million fine—has been estimated at $1 billion. The firm dismissed the people responsible for the bid-rigging, as well as CEO John Gutfreund, who was unaware of the activity at the time. (Gutfreund's offense was that he sat on the news for more than three months before reporting it to the Treasury Department.) Also ensnared in this scandal was vice-chairman John Meriwether, who went on to head Long-Term Capital Management, a hedge fund that collapsed at great loss in 1998. The name of this venerable firm, founded in 1910, was eventually abandoned in 2003, after a new owner, Citigroup, was itself involved in a series of scandals. At that time, the reputational value of the Salomon Brothers franchise was apparently deemed to be worth little.

After losing $1.6 billion on derivative transactions in 1994, Orange County in California sued its financial adviser Merrill Lynch for concealing the amount of risk that was involved in its investments. In 1998, Merrill Lynch settled the suit for more than $400 million. In 1996, Procter & Gamble (P&G) settled with Bankers Trust after the bank agreed to forgive $200 million that P&G owed on failed derivative transactions. P&G's charge that Bankers Trust had

misrepresented the investments was bolstered by damaging audio tapes, including some in which bank employees were recorded using the acronym ROF for "rip-off factor" to describe one method for fleecing customers. Although derivative securities continue to be a source of considerable abuse, efforts to regulate them have been largely unsuccessful. Both Merrill Lynch and Bankers Trust were eventually saved from collapse by absorption into larger banks (Bank of America and Deutsche Bank respectively).

Unauthorized trading by individuals has caused great losses at several banks and trading firms. Nick Leeson, a 28-year-old trader in the Singapore office of Barings Bank, destroyed this venerable British firm in 1995 by losing more than $1 billion on futures contracts that bet the wrong way on the direction of the Japanese stock market. (The final blow to his precarious position came from an unpredictable event, the Kobe earthquake.) In 1996, the acknowledged king of copper trading was fired by Sumitomo Corporation for losing an estimated $2.6 billion, and Sumitomo also sued a number of banks for issuing derivative securities that enabled the trader to hide the losses. Between 2006 and 2008, Jérôme Kerviel, a trader at the French bank Société Générale, managed to lose 4.9 billion euros in unauthorized activity. UBS incurred losses of $2.3 billion in 2011 that had been hidden by a young trader named Kweku Adoboli. In most of these cases, the rogue traders exploited flaws in reporting systems and benefited from lax management supervision, which may have also been weakened by a reluctance to interfere in these traders' apparent money-making ability. Returns that are "too good to be true" often are, but who wants to point this out?

The usually staid mutual fund industry was roiled in 2003 when New York State attorney general Eliot Spitzer brought charges against a number of mutual fund sponsors, including Bank of America, Putnam Investments, Janus Funds, and Strong Capital Management. These companies had allowed favored traders to operate after the close of the business day and also to make rapid, market-timing trades. Late trading is illegal, and most funds discourage market timing with rules that prevent the practice by ordinary investors. In the case of Strong Capital Management, the founder, Richard S. Strong, not only permitted a favored investor, Canary Capital, to engage in market-timing trades but also engaged in the practice himself. He made 1400 quick trades between 1998 and 2003 in violation of a fiduciary duty that he, as the manager of the Strong family of funds, had to the funds' investors.

Also in 2003, 10 major investment firms paid $1.4 billion to settle charges that their analysis of securities had been slanted in order to curry favor with client companies. At the height of the Internet and telecommunications boom, the firms' securities analysts had issued favorable reports of companies such as WorldCom and Global Crossing that subsequently collapsed. These biased

reports induced thousands of people to invest millions of dollars, much of which was lost when the market bubble burst. The analysts were, in many cases, compensated for their ability to bring in investment banking business, which created a conflict of interest with their duty to offer objective evaluations of companies. Two analysts, Jack B. Grubman at Salomon Smith Barney, then a part of Citigroup, and Henry Blodget of Merrill Lynch, paid large fines and agreed to lifetime bans from the securities industry for their roles in pushing companies that they knew were troubled. William H. Donaldson, then chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, commented, "These cases reflect a sad chapter in the history of American business—a chapter in which those who reaped enormous benefits based on the trust of investors profoundly betrayed that trust."[4]

The fall of Enron in 2001 and WorldCom in 2002 involved many ethical lapses. An important part of the Enron story involved off-balance-sheet partnerships that generated phantom profits and concealed massive debts. These partnerships were formed by Enron's chief financial officer (CFO) Andrew Fastow. For Fastow to be both the CFO of the company and the general manager of the partnerships, and thus to negotiate for both sides in deals, constituted an enormous conflict of interest—a conflict that he used to reward himself handsomely. Shockingly, the Enron board of directors waived the prohibition on such conflicts in the company's code of ethics to allow Fastow's dual role. Aside from the fact that many of the partnerships violated accounting rules and should have been consolidated on the company's books, Enron guaranteed some of the partnerships against losses with a commitment to infuse them with more stock in the event they lost value. Because the partnerships were capitalized with Enron stock to begin with, a decline in the price of the stock triggered massive new debt obligations. The end for Enron came quickly when investors realized the extent of the company's indebtedness—and the faulty accounting that had hidden it.

By contrast, the accounting fraud at WorldCom was alarmingly simple: the company reported as revenue accruals that were supposed to be set aside for payments, and some large expenses were recorded as capital investments. Both kinds of entries are violations of generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP). WorldCom's end also came quickly when the head of internal auditing unraveled the fraud and courageously reported it to the board of directors. CEO Bernie Ebbers and CFO Scott Sullivan were convicted and sentenced to prison terms of 25 and 5 years respectively. The internal auditor, Cynthia Cooper, was later featured on the cover of *Time* as one of three women whistleblowers who were recognized with the magazine's 2002 Persons of the Year award. (Another awardee was Sherron Watkins, who blew the whistle on Enron's perilous financial structure.)

In the financial crisis that began in 2007, the most obvious target of ethical criticism was the mortgage origination process in which unsuitable loans were made without adequate determination and documentation of creditworthiness. Lax mortgage origination practices contributed, in part, to a bubble in housing prices, which precipitated the crisis and left many borrowers "under water," owing more on their mortgage than the house was worth. Mortgage originators were often heedless about suitability or creditworthiness because they could quickly sell the loans to major banks, which would combine many mortgages into securities that were sold to investors. Woefully inadequate documentation of mortgages (called "robo-signing") has also proven to be a serious problem as banks, which often lacked clear title to the property, sought to foreclose on borrowers, who, in some cases, did not owe the amounts charged.

Although the securitization of mortgages and other debt obligations has many benefits, the risks of default, which were increased by the housing bubble and uncreditworthy borrowers, tended to be overlooked by both the securitizers and investors. When the bubble burst, the banks that held many of the mortgage-backed securities and financed their holdings by short-term borrowing found themselves unable to obtain funding, and because of their high leverage and assets of questionable value, they faced the threat of insolvency. Since many of these banks were considered "too big to fail," their collapse threatened the whole economy, which prompted a vigorous government response. A failure on the part of rating agencies to accurately gauge the risk of the mortgage-backed securities and government policies supporting home ownership were also blamed for the crisis. In particular, the federally chartered, for-profit mortgage holders, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, were major factors in the financial crisis. Given the many factors in the crisis, controversy remains about which were more important and which of these involved distinctively ethical failings as opposed to poor judgment, failed systems, and plain bad luck.

Since the financial crisis, questions of ethics have been raised in such cases as the collapse of MF Global, in which about $1 billion in clients' money disappeared in a frantic effort to meet the firm's own obligations after the failure of risky bets on European sovereign debt. MF Global violated a fundamental requirement in their business of derivative trading to segregate client funds from those of the firm. The "flash crash" of May 6, 2010, and the $440 million loss at Knight Capital Group in 2012, both due to malfunctioning software programs, have focused attention on the dangers of high-frequency trading, which some charge is a predatory practice that provides little benefit to investors. Confidence in financial institutions was further imperiled by charges that major banks had intentionally manipulated the widely used

London Interbank Offered Rate (LIBOR) by submitting false information to the rate-setting organization. Banks have also been under investigation for aiding in illegal tax evasion and for deliberately circumventing rules to prevent money laundering for clients in countries under international sanctions, such as Iran.

These scandals not only undermine the public's confidence in financial markets, financial institutions, and indeed the whole financial system but also fuel popular perceptions of the financial world as one of personal greed without any concern by finance people for the impact of their activities on others. A 2011 Harris poll revealed that 67 percent of respondents agreed that "Most people on Wall Street would be willing to break the law if they believed they could make a lot of money and get away with it."[5] In addition, 70 percent believed that people on Wall Street are not as "honest and moral as other people." Only 31 percent of people agreed with the statements "In general, what is good for Wall Street is good for the country" and "Most successful people on Wall Street deserve to make the kind of money they earn." In 2006, 60 percent of respondents polled believed that "Wall Street only cares about making money and absolutely nothing else." These results are virtually unchanged from polls conducted annually by Harris since 1996.

The public's dim view of ethics in finance is shared by industry insiders. A 2012 survey of 500 financial services professionals in both the United States and the United Kingdom found that 26 percent of Wall Street and Fleet Street professionals had personally witnessed unethical conduct in the workplace.[6] In addition, 24 percent of the respondents believed that getting ahead requires people to engage in unethical and illegal behavior. Only 41 percent of respondents were sure that no one in their firm had "definitely not" engaged in such behavior, while 12 percent thought that it was likely that people in their firm had done so. Thirty percent of respondents in the United States and the United Kingdom also agreed that the compensation system in their firms created pressure to violate ethical and legal standards.

This image of the financial world as mired in misconduct is not entirely undeserved, of course. Ivan Boesky delighted a commencement audience of business school students at the University of California at Berkeley with the assurance that greed is "all right." "I think greed is healthy," he said. "You can be greedy and still feel good about yourself."[7]

## Causes of wrongdoing

Although scandals cannot be prevented entirely, it is important to understand why they occur and to undertake reasonable preventive measures. At the same time, we should aim not merely at the prevention of scandals but also at

achieving the highest possible level of exemplary ethical conduct. The goal should be not only to prevent the worst but also to achieve the best. Success in meeting this challenge depends on a complex interplay of the personal integrity of individuals, supportive organizations and institutions, and ethical leadership by people in positions of responsibility.

*Pressure and culture*

Some of the most difficult dilemmas of business life occur when individuals become aware of questionable behavior by others or are pressured to engage in it themselves. In a survey of 30 recent Harvard University MBA graduates, many of the young managers reported that they had received “explicit instructions from their middle-manager bosses or felt strong organizational pressures to do things that they believed were sleazy, unethical, or sometimes illegal.”[8] A survey of more than one thousand graduates of the Columbia University business school revealed that more than 40 percent of the respondents had been rewarded for taking some action they considered to be “ethically troubling,” and 31 percent of those who refused to act in ways they considered to be unethical believed that they were penalized for their choice, compared to less than 20 percent who felt they had been rewarded.[9] The Harvard graduates did not believe that their superiors or their organizations were corrupt. The cause is rather intense pressure to get a job done and to gain approval. Ethical and even legal restraints can get lost when the overriding message is “Just do it!”

Unethical behavior can also be fostered by the culture of an organization. In *Liar’s Poker*, an amusing exposé of the author’s brief stint as a trader at Salomon Brothers, Michael Lewis describes the coarse pranks of a group who occupied the back row of his training class.

> There was a single trait common to denizens of the back row, though I doubt it occurred to anyone. They sensed that they needed to shed whatever refinements of personality and intellect they had brought with them to Salomon Brothers. This was not a conscious act, more a reflex. They were the victims of the myth, especially popular at Salomon Brothers, that a trader is a savage, and a great trader is a great savage.[10]

In the culture that Lewis describes, ethical behavior is not readily fostered. He continues, “As a Salomon Brothers trainee, of course, you didn’t worry too much about ethics. You were just trying to stay alive. You felt flattered to be on the same team with the people who kicked everyone’s ass all the time.”[11]

*Organizational factors*

Although wrongdoing is sometimes attributable to a lone individual or rogue employee, some of the most common misdeeds are committed by organiza-

tions in which many people contribute to an outcome that no one intends or even foresees. Wrongdoing also occurs in large organizations when responsibility is diffused among many individuals and no one person is "really" responsible. In some cases, it is difficult to identify any one person or decision as the source of an act, and the wrongdoing can be attributed only to the organization as a whole. Such organizational wrongdoing is often due to the fragmented nature of decision making in which a number of individuals make separate decisions about different matters, often on the basis of diverse, sometimes conflicting, information. Typically, these decisions are not made all at once but incrementally over a long period of time in a series of small steps, so that their full scope is not readily apparent.

Virtually all organizations seek to direct and motivate members by means of incentives, which may produce unintended outcomes. Poorly designed incentive plans may either move people in the wrong direction (when incentives are misdirected) or too far in the right direction (when incentives are simply too strong). Perverted or overly powerful incentives are the root cause of many financial scandals. Another kind of incentive problem develops when individuals or organizations acquire interests that interfere with their ability to serve the interests of others when they have a duty to do so. When a broker, for example, is obligated to recommend only suitable investments for a client but is compensated more for some investments than others, a personal interest in more pay may lead the broker to fail in the duty to serve the client. The very existence of such an incentive to violate an obligation to serve the interest of another is a wrong that is known as a *conflict of interest*. Conflict of interest is a particularly prominent incentive problem in all areas of finance ethics.

These organizational factors are evident in the case of E.F. Hutton, a now-defunct brokerage firm, which was convicted in 1985 on 2000 counts of fraud for a check-kiting scheme. The firm obtained interest-free use of more than $1 billion over a 20-month period by systematically overdrafting checking accounts at more than 400 banks. This illegal scheme began as an attempt to squeeze a little more interest from the "float" that occurs when checks are written on one interest-bearing account and deposited in another. Until a check clears, the same dollars earn interest in two different accounts. No one person created or orchestrated the practice, and yet the firm, through the actions of many individuals, defrauded banks of millions. When the check-kiting scheme began, few people were aware of the extent of the activity, and it continued, no doubt, because anyone who intervened would have had to acknowledge the existence of the fraud and take responsibility for the loss of the extra income it generated. In addition, the participants could assure themselves that their own actions did no significant harm since each transaction seemed minor.

In another example, Marsh Inc., which called itself "the world's leading risk and insurance services firm," was accused in 2004 by the New York State attorney general of cheating its insurance brokerage clients by rigging bids and accepting undisclosed payments from insurance companies that it recommended. As an insurance broker, Marsh advises clients on the choice of insurance companies and policies. By accepting so-called contingency commissions—which are fees of 5 to 7.5 percent of the annual premium on top of a typical 15 percent standard commission—Marsh placed itself in a conflict of interest that potentially hampered its ability to offer its clients unbiased service. This added cost of companies' insurance policies, which is arguably exorbitant for the services provided, is passed along to the public in the form of higher prices. Although contingency commissions appear to be questionable, they have gone largely unquestioned by industry leaders. Jeffrey W. Greenberg, chairman and CEO of Marsh at the time, issued a statement calling them a "longstanding, common industry practice."[12] Nevertheless, Marsh paid $850 million in 2005 to settle the charges, agreed to forgo the payments permanently, and issued an apology for engaging in the practice. More ethically aware leadership might have recognized the inappropriateness of contingency commissions and ended their use much earlier.

Organizational factors are also impacted by leadership. Leaders of firms have a responsibility for the environment in which unethical conduct takes place. In a *Harvard Business Review* article, Lynn Sharp Paine writes:

> Rarely do the character flaws of a lone actor fully explain corporate misconduct. More typically, unethical business practice involves the tacit, if not explicit, cooperation of others and reflects the value, attitudes, beliefs, language, and behavioral patterns that define an organization's operating culture. . . . Managers who fail to provide proper leadership and to institute systems that facilitate ethical conduct share responsibility with those who conceive, execute, and knowingly benefit from corporate misdeeds.[13]

The bond-trading scandal at Salomon Brothers, for example, was not due merely to the willingness of the head of the government bond-trading department to violate Treasury auction rules. It resulted, in large measure, from the aggressive trading culture of the firm, from a poorly designed compensation system, and from a lack of internal controls. At Salomon Brothers, some units had negotiated compensation systems in which members shared a bonus pool equal to a percentage of the total profits, while managers in other units received lesser amounts that were based mostly on the overall performance of the firm. This system placed no cap on the bonuses of some traders and encouraged them to maximize profits without regard for the profitability of the whole firm.

In addition, there were few controls to detect irregular trading by the managers of the most profitable units. The task for the new leadership of Salomon Brothers included a thorough overhaul of the whole organization, which was led by major shareholder Warren Buffett, whose reputation for integrity was instrumental in regaining the trust of clients and regulators.

Leadership failures were abundant in the years leading to the financial crisis that began in 2007. The heads of large mortgage origination companies created a climate in which loan officers were actively encouraged, indeed forced, to abandon prudent standards in order to meet the insatiable demand from the packagers of mortgage-backed securities. Further, these companies created new types of mortgages with low teaser rates and generous repayment plans, such as interest-only and even negative amortization loans, in which unpaid interest was added to the principal. While praising these inventive mortgages in public, the founder of one of the largest origination companies, Countrywide, was more candid. About one of these products (a mortgage with no down payment), Angelo Mozilo wrote, "In all my years in the business, I have never seen a more toxic product."[14] Yet the sales went on.

*Innovation*

Although financial innovation has brought many benefits, its value has been questioned in the public mind and among some finance experts for the destructive consequences that sometimes follow. Economist and *New York Times* columnist Paul Krugman quipped that it is "hard to think of any major recent financial innovations that actually aided society, as opposed to being new, improved ways to blow bubbles, evade regulations and implement de facto Ponzi schemes."[15] Former Fed chairman Paul Volcker claimed that the only really useful recent innovation was the ATM machine.[16] Even good innovations, such as the credit card, have some socially destructive consequences. Robert Manning convincingly shows in *Credit Card Nation* that America's "addiction to credit," as he calls it, has brought misfortune to many.[17] The dangers of innovation are inevitable and may be inseparable from the benefits.

First, innovation creates new situations in which the rules for proper conduct, as well as for safe practice, are uncertain and slow to develop. In the changed world wrought by innovation, the old rules may no longer apply, and, eventually, new rules will be developed, but in the meantime, there are windows of opportunity for misconduct. For example, in the early days of the Internet, there was great uncertainty about how to value dot.com businesses and, in particular, about how to recognize income for start-ups that were not making any money but had great potential. Many investment decisions were made on the basis of pro forma statements that presented hypothetical future

income and expenses that, in many cases, turned out to be wildly optimistic. The result was the Internet or dot.com bubble.

Second, new situations sometimes involve a change of incentives and a shift of risk and responsibility. This was certainly true of mortgage lending during the current financial crisis. In the old originate-to-hold model of mortgage lending, issuing banks had an incentive, and the responsibility, to ascertain and verify the creditworthiness of potential borrowers, inasmuch as they held the loans on their books and hence bore the full risk of default. With the shift to an originate-to-distribute model, in which mortgages were securitized and sold to investors, neither the originating banks nor the ones packaging the securities (which were sometimes the same) had an incentive to ensure borrowers' creditworthiness. The responsibility for this function was shifted to the ultimate investors, who, in many cases, were ordinary people, who were utterly unaware of the risk shift taking place and, in any event, had neither the information nor the ability to assess the quality of the underlying mortgages.

Third, innovation is inherently complex and opaque, and the dangers are difficult to perceive. Innovation takes place on the cutting edge of finance or any other domain and may be understood, at first, by only a few involved in the creative process, if at all. History is replete with examples of how inventions had profound and unexpected consequences. Moreover, some financial innovations are deliberately designed to be complex and opaque precisely in order to gain an advantage by deceiving or confusing others. In the recent financial crisis, the role of credit default swaps (CDSs) was a crucial factor inasmuch as many banks took greater risk in holding risky mortgage-backed securities, called collateralized debt obligation (CDOs), because they believed their positions were adequately hedged with the insurance-like credit default swaps. What they failed to see was that the insurers who issued these swaps would be unable to honor claims in a general crisis that would result from a collapse of the mortgage market. The two securities, CDOs and CDSs, turned out to be closely linked.

Fourth, given that the dangers of innovation are difficult to perceive, everyone is held captive to the least perceptive—or the most daring. Innovation is subject to a classic collective action problem in which no one individual can affect an outcome that can be avoided only if everyone cooperates. In *Fool's Gold*, Gillian Tett describes how the bankers at J.P. Morgan who developed the derivative called CDO squared (or synthetic CDO) foresaw the dangers of using their discovery to make bets on mortgage-backed securities.[18] In her account, the J.P. Morgan bankers looked on in horror as less cautious firms, who did not perceive the unique risks posed by using mortgages in these securities, proceeded to do exactly that. As long as a few banks and enough

investors failed to see the dangers, these securities would continue to be produced and purchased with the disastrous consequences that occurred. This dilemma was illustrated by Charles Prince, the CEO of Citigroup, who was aware of the dangers in financing long-term assets with short-term debt. Yet, he said, "But as long as the music is playing, you've got to get up and dance." This remark shows that his restraint would have had little effect unless all parties involved perceived the dangers and acted in concert to stop dancing to the music.

The causes of major scandals in finance involve more than individual conduct and range over many organizational and systemic factors. However, the field of finance ethics is concerned with more than these scandals, which are merely the most visible and troubling evidence of the need for ethics in finance. Ethics is probably most needed in the everyday activities that constitute the world of finance, in which individuals and firms work to spend, save, invest, produce, and, in general, secure our economic welfare. Scandals may be thought of as a malfunction in an otherwise smoothly operating machine, and ethics is not only the sand in these malfunctions but also the oil that maintains the machine's ordinarily smooth operation. Much of this book is concerned with specific ethical problems and issues in the financial sector—with securing a high level of ethical conduct in everyday financial activities—and not with the different challenge of preventing scandals.

## The Field of Finance Ethics

Finance is concerned broadly with the generation, allocation, and management of monetary resources for any purpose. It includes *personal finance*, whereby individuals save, spend, invest, and borrow money in order to conduct their lives; *corporate finance*, whereby organizations, both businesses and not-for-profits, raise capital, mainly through loans or the issue of stocks and bonds, and manage it in order to engage in their activities; and *public finance*, whereby governments raise revenue by means of taxes and fees and spend it to provide services and other benefits for their citizens. This financial activity is facilitated by *financial markets*, in which money and financial instruments are traded, and by *financial institutions*, such as banks and other financial services providers, which facilitate financial transactions and offer various kinds of products and services. Both markets and institutions are also important means for managing risk, which is another important service needed by individuals, corporations, and governments. In addition, financial activity takes place within an economic *system*, which in most developed countries can be characterized as capitalism. Thus, financial markets and

institutions assume very different forms in socialist or planned economies with state-owned enterprises, as in China.

## Defining the field

Ethics in finance consists of the moral norms that apply to financial activity broadly conceived. Moral norms, in this context, may be understood as prescribed guides for behavior or conduct about what is right or wrong or about what ought to be done, using such concepts as duty or obligation, rights, and fairness or justice. That finance be conducted according to moral norms is of great importance, not only because of the crucial role that financial activity plays in the personal, economic, political, and social realms but also because of the opportunities for large financial gains that may tempt people to act unethically.

Many of the moral norms in finance are embodied in laws and regulations, which are enforced by prosecutors and regulators. Ethics plays a vital role in these matters, however, first, by shaping laws and regulations and, second, by guiding conduct in areas not governed by laws and regulations. In countries with well-developed legal systems, much of what is unethical is also illegal, and the law is constantly expanding to align ethics and law more closely. Thus, ethics is a major factor in the development of existing legislation and regulation and also a major source of new legislation and regulation. That is, ethics explains why we have the laws and regulations we do and guides their creation. However, in finance and other areas of life, some matters are not suited to legal control, and there ethics alone holds sway.

The moral norms that apply to financial activities are diverse and vary to some extent among societies or cultures. This is most marked in the case of Islamic finance, the moral norms of which contrast sharply with those of the United States and Europe. These norms are expressed in Islamic law, known as Shariah, and derive from the Qur'an, the sacred text of Islam, and the sayings of Muhammad, the prophet. In the Islamic view, all economic activity should aim at human well-being, which includes justice, equality, harmony, moderation, and a balance of material and spiritual needs. The main principles of Islamic finance are that wealth should come from legitimate trade and investment activity that has some social benefit, so interest or *riba* is forbidden as an unproductive activity; all harmful activities (*haram*) should be avoided, so investment should not be made in such prohibited activities as drugs, gambling or pornography; and risk should be limited and fairly shared, which rules out speculation (which is also gambling) and one-sided, sure-bet trades based on superior information (which describes a lot of arbitrage). Because so many financial instruments, such as conventional loans, options, futures,

and other derivatives, are forbidden, Islamic finance requires the creation of inventive means of achieving the same ends. For example, the purchase of business equipment might be accomplished without an interest-bearing loan through *Ijara*, in which the bank owns the equipment and leases it back to the user at an agreed-upon mark-up, which substitutes for interest.

A complete account of financial activity is not possible in a few words. First, finance is not a distinct, identifiable occupation or profession. Like medicine, law, engineering, and accounting, finance involves a highly technical body of knowledge, but people who are trained in finance engage in a much wider range of activities. Accountants, by contrast, do much the same work in every setting, and the different accounting functions—public and management accounting or external and internal auditing—raise similar ethical problems that can be identified and addressed in a code of professional ethics. Thus, accounting ethics, like the ethics of medicine, law, and engineering, focuses on the ethical problems of a relatively uniform activity. Although codes of ethics exist for many specific fields in finance—such as financial advisers, financial analysts, actuaries, and insurance underwriters—the idea of a single code of ethics for everyone in finance is impractical since the range of activities is so diverse.

Second, the ethics of finance is concerned not solely with the ethical problems of individuals in a specific occupation or profession but also with problems in financial markets and financial institutions, as well as the financial function of corporations and governments. Because market regulation is concerned, in part, with fairness (orderliness and efficiency are the other main aims), financial ethics must address such questions as what is a fair trading practice or the fair treatment of customers or clients. Finance is also a function in every business enterprise and in most nonprofit organizations and governmental units. Corporate financial managers are responsible for myriad decisions, from how best to raise and invest capital to the planning of mergers and acquisitions. Nonprofit organizations typically raise money from donors and apply it to public service causes. Public finance, on the other hand, is concerned largely with raising and disbursing funds for governmental purposes. These tasks raise ethical dilemmas of personal conduct, as well as broad questions of organizational or institutional practice, especially when important financial decisions affect society.

## Ethics and law

The close connection of ethics with law and regulation raises the question of why these more formal mechanisms are not enough. Why is ethics needed in finance *in addition to* legislation and regulation? Finance is perhaps the most

heavily regulated area of business. Not only is the basic framework of regulation established by major legislative enactments but legislatures on various levels have also created innumerable regulatory bodies with the power to create and enforce rules. The financial services industry in the US is now subject to oversight from the federal Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and some parts of the industry engage in self-regulation through, for example, the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (FINRA). Many questionable industry practices are challenged in court, so that the judiciary—which consists of prosecutors and judges—plays a prominent role in determining the boundaries of acceptable conduct. Most organized exchanges, such as the New York Stock Exchange and the Chicago Board of Trade, have their own private rule-setting and rule-enforcement bodies.

In view of this extensive body of law and regulation, people in finance might well assume that this is the only guide needed. Their motto might be: "If it's legal, then it's morally okay." However, this motto is inadequate for many reasons.

First, the law is a rather crude instrument that is not suited for regulating all aspects of financial activities, especially those that cannot be easily anticipated, reduced to precise rules, and enforced by appropriate and effective sanctions. The relationship between a broker and a client, for example, involves repeated interactions, and some of these are one-of-a-kind situations for which legal rules may not have been developed. In such situations, what constitutes fair treatment may be obvious, but a rule mandating a specific action may not be easy to formulate. Consequently, a moral rule "Be fair!" or a standard of suitability may be more effective than a precise legal rule of the form "Do such-and-such." Moreover, precise rules can often be "gamed" to produce results that may be considered unfair, and legal sanctions for violations of a rule may be difficult to devise and apply.

The example of conflicts of interest is illustrative. Because of the variety of conflicts, a law barring them would be difficult to draft, and such a law would be subject to difficulties of interpretation and enforcement. Conflicts of interest are often a matter of perception so that a strict legal definition would be elusive, and proving a conflict would be similarly difficult. Rules designed to prevent conflicts could be effective only if individuals obeyed the spirit as well as the letter of these rules. The difficulty of bringing legal action against some figures involved in the recent financial crisis also shows the limited use of the law in complex financial cases where it is difficult to prove individual culpability.

Second, the law often develops as a reaction to activities that are considered to be unethical. It would be perverse to encourage people in finance to do anything that they want until the law tells them otherwise. Besides, the law is