



American regulators talk through a conic of laws approach to financial regulation.

American International Group (AIG), the former name of his company screams of its US origins. And yet, the regulator in the UK subsidiary of his multinational insurance corporation, operating under a French banking licence, were able to engage in risk-taking activities that were largely beyond the reach of US insurance and finance regulators. When AIG's London-based trades fell apart in 2008, the parent institution in the US – and hence the US taxpayers – found themselves on the hook for decisions made in AIG's overseas subsidiary.

In the world of financial regulation, national financial regulators are pitted against a global mobile financial system. Since 2008, regulators have made a concerted effort to address the national regulatory differences that have made AIG's trades possible in the first place. Nevertheless, hammered on at the G20, have we sought to address these challenges applicable to banks. How have the markets responded? Financiers have simply found a way of booking their transactions

of incorporation. It is also narrow. In his definition, a free-standing corporation based in the Cayman Islands, all of whose shares are held by a US entity would not qualify as a US insi

What is most important to the industry is the formal rule-like quality of ISDA's proposal because arbitrage, financial or legal, feeds on clear categories. You can only find arbitrage opportunities when you can see clear differences between assets or regulatory authorities. In other words, it is more important to the industry to be absolutely certain that US law will not apply to offshore transactions can be conducted or financial entities established outside the US.

In contrast, public advocacy groups such as Americans for Financial Reform have proposed a highly functional definition of a US insi