

My Interview with Mike Graham on Talk TV/Radio

Yesterday I did an extensive interview with Mike Graham at Talk TV/Radio. You can watch it at:

My Interview with Talk TV/Radio

Yesterday I did an extensive interview with Mike Graham at Talk TV/Radio. You can watch it at:

My Interview With Mike Graham on Talk TV/Radio

Yesterday I did an extensive interview with Mike Graham on Talk TV/Radio. You can watch it at:

We all believe in an independent Central Bank

The independence of the Bank of England is widely asserted and almost universally applauded. Let me begin before I am condemned for views I do not hold, by saying I do support the Bank of England continuing to have the important independent power to fix and change short term interest rates by setting an official influential Base rate. The wider problem is money policy (anti inflation policy) is about much more than just fixing the short term official rate. In most of the other areas that matter the Bank is not independent.

The obvious point which no-one else ever seems to make in the debate concerns the main thrust of money policy since 2008. The decisions to create a lot of

money to buy up government bonds have always been joint between Chancellor and Bank. This was set up by the Labour government and continued under the Coalition and Conservative governments. The Treasury not only agrees and signs off the policy but also offers a full guarantee to the Bank against losses on the bonds bought. Presumably Chancellors as well as Governors have therefore taken this task seriously, as the Treasury runs the risks. When interest rates are around zero money policy is driven by decisions on how much to print and how many bonds to buy. Why did the Bank do so much for so long last year? Why didn't they have target interest rate levels for longer term borrowings to guide their interventions? Why didn't they monitor and comment on the explosion of money growth their bond buying generated?

These decisions have had a big impact in setting longer term interest rates at artificially low levels, which in turn leads to lower borrowing costs for property, business and other users. This has fuelled asset price inflation for more than a decade until this year when the underlying bond buying stopped. The Bank did not worry about asset inflation.

It is also the case that Gordon Brown when he wrongly said he was making the Bank of England independent took away crucial powers it used to have to regulate the commercial banks. The main UK clearing banks determine many of the details of how much credit is advanced, to whom. They decide how many loans to make. Regulation of these activities including warning them about running too much individual balance sheet risk rests with a different Regulator. Pre Gordon Brown the Bank directly and daily influenced clearing bank balance sheets and lending positions.

In practice the independent Central Bank, 100% owned by the state, answers directly to Parliament. The Treasury Committee makes the Governor attend and defend his actions on a regular basis. Parliament changed the legislative controls and requirements on the Bank when Labour took over and when the Coalition took over. Labour changed the inflation target when in office. I think it is right that the Bank should be held accountable for its actions through Parliamentary scrutiny and through media questioning of policy and results. There needs to be more consideration of why inflation is so far above target, and more analyses of past recessions when Bank tightness was part of the problem.

It remains a mystery how the Monetary Policy Committee thinks it can control inflation without monitoring and commenting on the amount of money in circulation or the speed at which it is used from bank accounts. Real money supply is now contracting. Money policy has lurched from far too loose to tight. I agree with the Bank who now forecast inflation will tumble next year. There is no need for them to be selling bonds at big losses to make things worse.

Inflation and debts

The recent decision by the Bank to raise interest rates by another 0.5% to 2.25% has done enough to slow the inflation the Bank had allowed to build over the last year. According to the Bank's own forecasts inflation will now subside to the 2% target over the next two years as the economy slows and as world commodity prices and energy prices come under control, whether from market forces or government intervention. The danger is the Bank will do too much by way of rate rises, withdrawing too much money and credit from the system, creating a nasty recession. Their own estimates already show the UK in recession as we enter next year on their current policy.

The Bank of England carried on creating money and buying up bonds for too long and on too vast a scale last year. An inflation was well set by early 2022 when the Russian invasion of Ukraine disrupted energy markets and added to the inflationary pressures with a surge in gas and electricity prices. Whilst this energy price shock had as its first impact a boost to inflation, if left untreated it would also bring about a recession. Large sums are removed from people and companies to pay the sky high bills, with much of that money sent abroad to pay foreign suppliers and pay the elevated energy supply tax bills of foreign governments. None of this money remains in the UK to pay wages and buy goods. It created a nasty double problem for both the Bank and the government.

The Bank was right to correct its past monetary excesses. It had bought too many bonds to keep the longer term interest rates too low for too long. In the process it allowed a bubble in the money supply to develop. At first the excess money simply created an inflation in the prices of the bonds the Bank bought and in shares and properties which the sellers of those bonds bought with the proceeds. It then started to seep out into the world of consumption, bidding up the costs and prices of a wider range of goods and services. This is now being adjusted sharply by a major change of money policy and by the inflation robber coming in the night to depress the real incomes of all energy buyers.

The Bank needs to be careful from here. The government is providing considerable assistance to people and companies through the energy support measures and through reversing or cancelling inherited and future tax increases. These are needed and are not in themselves inflationary if borrowed through issuing new debt to savers. The much tighter money will slow the economy, and as the Fed brakes the US economy violently so there will be reduced price pressures from global commodity prices, from international transport rates and from internationally traded goods. Nor need we worry unduly about the level of UK debt. At an official 96% of our national income it is way below Japan, and below Italy, the USA and various other advanced countries. As a substantial proportion of the debt is owned by the Bank of England and all is repayable in local currency the state should be able to roll over the bonds as they fall due without too much problem. The official figures and commentary spreads alarm about the current high level of debt interest. This is a distortion of the position. The cash sums the state has

to pay to cover the interest bill on the debt are at quite modest levels because so much of the debt has been financed at the very low interest rates of recent years. Of the £8.2bn of stated interest in August only £3.5bn were cash payments. The rest is the increased eventual repayment cost of the indexed debt, which will simply be refinanced when it falls due.

Of course I would like borrowing to fall and the budget to move closer to balance. The truth is there are no options to let that happen easily. Were the government to refuse to offset some of the energy damage we would have a deeper and longer recession. That would mean much less revenue and more costs from higher levels of benefit expenditure to compensate people for loss of some or all of their work incomes. If the government seeks to stop the recession then that entails in the first instance borrowing more to allow the tax cuts and subsidies to sustain more activity. The second round effects should mean the state borrows less if it stops a recession now than if it opted for austerity and a longer recession. The government needs to get more people off benefit into work, find ways of working smarter in crucial public services, and cutting out things the state does not need to do in order to control public spending. Getting a better grip on numbers of illegal and low paid economic migrants would also make a welcome saving.

Consider the environment – Think before you print

The contents of this email are confidential to the intended recipient and may not be disclosed. Although it is believed that this email and any attachments are virus free, it is the responsibility of the recipient to confirm this.

You are advised that urgent, time-sensitive communications should not be sent by email. We hereby give you notice that a delivery receipt does not constitute acknowledgement or receipt by the intended recipient(s).