

RIPPLE EFFECTS v1

Quantitative Easing
Interest Rates
The Dollar
The US Debt
The Chinese Are Coming
NMR & Its Gold Plans

Quantitative Easing Definition

TODAY the European Central Bank (ECB) launches its long-awaited programme of quantitative easing (or QE), adding lots of public debt to the private kind it has already been buying. Its monthly purchases will rise from around €13 billion (\$14 billion) to €60 billion until at least September 2016. The ECB is just the latest central bank to jump on board the QE bandwagon. Most rich-economy central bankers began printing money to buy assets during the Great Recession, and a few, like the Bank of Japan, are still at it. But what exactly is quantitative easing, and how is it supposed to work?

Central banks are responsible for keeping inflation in check. Before the financial crisis of 2008-09 they managed that by adjusting the interest rate at which banks borrow overnight. If firms were growing nervous about the future and scaling back on investment, the central bank would reduce the overnight rate. That would reduce banks' funding costs and encourage them to make more loans, keeping the economy from falling into recession. By contrast, if credit and spending were getting out of hand and inflation was rising then the central bank would raise the interest rate. When the crisis struck, big central banks like the Fed and the Bank of England slashed their overnight interest-rates to boost the economy. But even cutting the rate as far as it could go, to almost zero, failed to spark recovery. Central banks therefore began experimenting with other tools to encourage banks to pump money into the economy. One of them was QE.

To carry out QE central banks create money by buying securities, such as government bonds, from banks, with electronic cash that did not exist before. The new money swells the size of bank reserves in the economy by the quantity of assets purchased—hence "quantitative" easing. Like lowering interest rates, QE is supposed to stimulate the economy by encouraging banks to make more loans. The idea is that banks take the new money and buy assets to replace the ones they have sold to the central bank. That raises stock prices and lowers interest rates, which in turn boosts investment. Today, interest rates on everything from government bonds to mortgages to corporate debt are probably lower than they would have been without QE. If QE convinces markets that the central bank is serious about fighting deflation or high unemployment, then it can also boost economic activity by raising confidence. Several rounds of QE in America have increased the size of the Federal Reserve's balance sheet—the value of the assets it holds—from less than \$1 trillion in 2007 to more than \$4 trillion now.

RIPPLE EFFECTS v1

The jury is still out on QE, however. Studies suggest that it did raise economic activity a bit. But some worry that the flood of cash has encouraged reckless financial behaviour and directed a firehose of money to emerging economies that cannot manage the cash. Others fear that when central banks sell the assets they have accumulated, interest rates will soar, choking off the recovery. Last spring, when the Fed first mooted the idea of tapering, interest rates around the world jumped and markets wobbled. Still others doubt that central banks have the capacity to keep inflation in check if the money they have created begins circulating more rapidly. Central bankers have been more cautious in using QE than they would have been in cutting interest rates, which could partly explain some countries' slow recoveries. At least a few central banks are now experimenting with stimulus alternatives, such as promises to keep overnight interest-rates low for a very long time, the better to scale back their dependence on QE.

Quantitative Easing in Reality

THE conventional arms have run out. Central banks in America and Britain have long since pushed interest rates to close to zero. On July 5th the European Central Bank (ECB) joined them, slashing its rate on deposits to 0% and its main policy rate below 1%. A different sort of arsenal is now being deployed. Unconventional monetary policy covers everything from negative interest rates—now on offer in Denmark—to a change in inflation targets, but “quantitative easing” (QE), the creation of money to buy assets, has proved to be the most popular weapon of this crisis.


Its use is being stepped up. On July 5th the Bank of England (BoE) announced a £50 billion (\$78 billion) increase in the size of its asset-purchase programme, to £375 billion in total. Speculation is growing that the Federal Reserve may launch another round of QE, its third, perhaps as soon as next month. There is pressure on the ECB to follow suit. With QE increasingly pivotal to monetary policy, how much bang for the buck (or yen or euro) does it deliver?

First, some definitions. In normal times central banks move short-term interest rates via “open-market operations”: by buying or selling securities, they supply or subtract reserves from the banking system. The quantity of reserves that banks hold is a secondary consideration; the real target is the interest rate. A lower rate, for example, encourages spending and investment, boosting the economy.

In times of severe economic distress, however, rates may fall to zero. Cue QE. When the Bank of Japan (BoJ) pioneered QE in 2001, its goal was to buy enough securities to create a desired quantity of reserves (hence, “quantitative easing”). Its actions, it hoped, would raise asset prices and end deflation.

QE has now come to refer to several flavours of asset-purchase programme. One version is often called “credit easing”. The aim is to support the economy by boosting liquidity and reducing interest rates when credit channels are clogged. The Fed’s purchases of mortgage-backed securities, demand for which weakened sharply during the financial crisis, fall into this category.

RIPPLE EFFECTS v1



Another type of asset purchase aims to boost the economy without creating new money. The Fed’s ongoing “Operation Twist” is an example: the Fed sells short-term debt and uses the proceeds to buy long-term debt. Giving investors cash for long-term debt should prompt them to invest more money in other assets.

QE proper is a third type. The most straightforward way this is meant to help the economy is through “portfolio rebalancing”. The investors who sell securities to the central bank then take the proceeds and buy other assets, raising their prices. Lower bond yields encourage borrowing; higher equity prices raise consumption; both help investment and boost demand. To the extent that investors add foreign assets, portfolio rebalancing also weakens the domestic currency, fuelling exports.

If a central bank is expected to hold on to the government debt it buys, then QE can also support the economy by cutting government-borrowing costs and reducing the future burden of taxation. It can work by changing expectations, too. A promise to keep short-term interest rates low for a long time may be more credible if it is accompanied by QE, since the central bank is exposing itself through its holdings to the risk of a rise in interest rates.

That’s the theory, at any rate. Efforts to divine the actual results of these interventions are necessarily messy. Unconventional monetary tools were only rarely used before the crisis, which means the sample size of case studies is small. And events stubbornly refuse to pause in the immediate wake of new QE, making it hard for economists to isolate its impact.

RIPPLE EFFECTS v1

Enterprises of great pitch

Still, empirical studies generally turn up positive results from central-bank asset purchases. They appear to move interest rates, for example. The BoJ's foray into QE in 2001 quickly cut short-term rates to zero and is generally thought to have had a small but meaningful downward impact on medium- and long-run interest rates. Early reviews of crisis-era asset purchases are likewise modestly positive. A recent survey of QE research findings by the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco indicated that \$600 billion of asset purchases could be expected to reduce long-term rates by 15-20 basis points, equivalent to a 75-basis-point cut in the federal-funds rate.

Causation is harder to discern for equity prices. Some of the expected impact may be priced in before QE is announced, as happened when Ben Bernanke, the Fed chairman, hinted at QE2 in the summer of 2010. Yet QE programmes in Japan, Britain, and America appear to have been associated with rising equity prices.

The trillion-dollar question is whether QE boosts the broader economy (see chart on previous page). Early assessments answer with a cautious "yes". Research published by the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco indicates that the Fed's asset purchases have probably taken 1.5 percentage points off America's unemployment rate. Real output by late 2012 may be 3% higher than it would have been in the absence of QE1 and QE2, and payroll employment could be as much as 3m workers higher than it would otherwise have been. Research by some BoE economists on the impact of its first £200 billion in QE purchases suggests that it may have raised Britain's real GDP by as much as 2% and inflation by 1.5%, an impact equivalent to a three-percentage-point cut in the main interest rate. Although a different BoE study found a more modest impact, the data so far suggest that QE helps the real economy.

A sea of troubles

Yet in the minds of many critics, even such gains do not justify the risks, great and small, of large-scale asset purchases. Three dangers stand out. The first threat is to the function of some financial markets. The Bank for International Settlements (BIS) argued in its recent annual report that huge growth in bank reserves was driving overnight-lending rates to zero, causing the market for unsecured overnight lending to atrophy. Since the unsecured overnight rate has been the principal policy lever for central banks, this development could, the BIS warns, make it hard for them to rein in inflation in the future.

The risk can be mitigated, however. In late 2008 the Fed began paying interest on the reserves held by banks over and above the minimum required. Raising the rate of interest paid on excess reserves can make new bank loans less attractive, thus tempering overall credit creation. This tool represents a means to check inflation despite the breakdown in unsecured markets.

RIPPLE EFFECTS v1

A second risk from QE is of distortions in the market for government debt. The borrowing costs of some governments are extraordinarily low—an auction of ten-year Treasuries on July 11th produced record-low yields. A flight to safety is a contributing factor, but it seems that markets either anticipate decades of abysmal economic growth, or the risk premium for holding long-dated bonds is unsustainably low, thanks in part to central-bank purchases. Any adjustment may be sudden and have unpredictable consequences.

A related concern is that QE is reducing market pressure on sovereigns that would otherwise face higher interest rates and a corresponding need to deal responsibly with their public finances. This is not a concern to take lightly. A central bank can lose control over inflation if the market has lost confidence in the sovereign and the bank is forced into buying government debt. On the other hand, a central bank that neglected its duties to play fiscal watchdog could risk its independence.

Clearly, there are risks to unconventional policy (abroad as well as at home, where emerging markets have long complained that expansionary rich-world policy has caused waves of capital inflows). But the critical judgment is whether uncertain risks of uncertain magnitude outweigh the benefits of doing more. Cumulative output gaps across the rich world now run into the trillions of dollars. Tens of millions of people are unemployed, and many have been so for several years. The bar to not doing QE should be high.

The gains from asset purchases would seem to be clearest and largest in the euro area. Although the ECB is prohibited by law from providing direct fiscal aid to member governments, it may buy debt in the market to ensure the proper conduct of monetary policy. It has on occasion bought the debt of troubled peripheral sovereigns.

An ECB programme of QE would probably aim to spread purchases across all member governments, but could nonetheless benefit troubled governments. If QE successfully reduced government-borrowing costs, the pressure for ever-stricter austerity measures would ease marginally. Portfolio rebalancing could bring down private borrowing costs. Purchases of foreign assets might weaken the euro, helping exports. And the possibility of a swifter end to the recession could encourage euro-zone countries to push ahead with structural and institutional reforms.

For economies that have already used QE, the problem is one of diminishing returns. The Fed's first round of asset purchases between late 2008 and 2010 reduced corporate-borrowing rates by nearly a percentage point; its QE2 programme of \$600 billion in Treasury purchases, rolled out in late 2010, succeeded in bringing down corporate rates by 13 basis points. In Britain, banks still face high borrowing costs and remain nervous about lending more to small and medium-sized enterprises: a new credit-easing programme about to be introduced by the BoE and the Treasury is long overdue.

RIPPLE EFFECTS v1

For additional QE to prove effective in both Britain and America, central banks must change their approach to inflation. Temporary, higher-than-normal inflation can facilitate wage and price adjustments and help erode the real value of household debts. Most importantly, when nominal interest rates can go no lower, a higher inflation rate corresponds directly to a lower, and more stimulating, real interest rate.

The pale cast of thought

Both the BoE and the Fed target an inflation rate of 2%. Even a modestly effective new round of QE should quickly lift inflation expectations back to target. But if markets think above-target inflation will prompt a reversal of the policy, then new QE will have very little impact.

The Japanese experience of QE illustrates the problem. In 2006, with inflation barely above zero, the BoJ brought QE to an end, rapidly reducing the monetary base and then raising its benchmark interest rate. Real interest rates never wandered far into negative territory. Although the BoE in particular has been prepared to tolerate inflation above its formal target, neither it nor the Fed has moved away from a goal of 2% inflation.

One answer may be a temporarily higher inflation target. Charles Evans, the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, has proposed a plan in which the Fed would announce its intention to accommodate inflation of up to 3% a year as long as the unemployment rate remained above 7%. The plan would allow the Fed to gin up a bit more inflation now without committing it to a permanent rise in the target rate, something the inflation-averse central bank is loth to consider.

Relaxing inflation targets is hard for central bankers with intellectual roots in the stagflationary 1970s. In Mr. Bernanke's view, central bankers' victory over the runaway inflation of that decade is a momentous achievement. But that stability is now being purchased at a very dear price.

Short Explanation of Quantitative Easing

What the above means is that the governments of Japan, USA, England and now Europe are printing more money with no backup of support of the extra cash such as gold, and buying securities so to reduce and keep interest rates low and to trigger investment and growth by the private sector and worrying later of the ripple effects of such actions.

RIPPLE EFFECTS v1

Therefore pushing down the road, in the future, the inevitable correction of the markets due to the increase of the money supply therefore debt.

Key words / effects

Money printing

Low interest rates

Increase of government debt

Lower value of the dollar

China showing its hand and forcing it based on the strength of its currency due to its gold reserves

China which is paying its own games and has its own plans to destabilize the dollar as the world's currency is still buying gold as a backup to its currency and with its 4 trillion dollars of US cash reserves, at some point, when one of the countries above comes for correction, China can emerge with a new option based on its currency support by its vast gold bullion holdings of which still rise s well as with its own initiative of the AIB or Asian Investment Bank.

Nevada Mining Resources Position

Nevada Mining Resources can gain substantially from its portfolio of mines, operations, gold reserves, contracts and position as the above actions and ripple effects trigger a run from the dollar and a run to gold which will push the demand for gold in physical form and its price per ounce.

The window of opportunity and of the trigger of the above events, we estimate them to be between 2 to 4 years before a trigger unravels the ripple effects of the financial system as now US is in another quantitative easing program.