I believe that you do not fully understand the consequences of the Mark to Market. The profits and the losses accounted through a mark to market rule rely on the assumption that somebody else will buy the assets at a so called market price (provided there is a market with enough liquidity). This is exactly what is a Ponzi scheme: One needs a newcomer to pay for the incumbent. The profits are not real profits as long the assets are not resold in cash. This is the basic rule of accounting. Mark to Market violates it. That is why the overall system has collapsed as a Ponzi scheme.

IASB and FASB experts should think about these consequences. Please!

Philippe Camus
Co managing Partner
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