



apply now American Express Gold Card Get first year complimentary membership

The 2G Family Tree (Interactive Graphic) A RAJA

THURSDAY, JUNE 02, 2011

e-paper | TODAY'S NEWSPAPER | mint CODE

Search input field

- Home
Student Start-ups NEW
On the 2G Trail NEW
Budget 2011
MarketInfo
Mint Money
Economy & Politics
Corporate News
Families in Business
Views
Columns
Business of Life
BOL Archives
Technology
Marketing & Media
International News
Lounge
Doing Good
The Progress Series

ADVERTISEMENT HELP US serve you better Click here

- Reviews
Mint 50
Environment
Book Reviews
Blogs
Slideshows
Videos
Podcasts
Mint Reports
Webcast Archive
Partners
Wall Street Journal
Tools
Mint Mobile
RSS Feeds
RSS Story
mint e-paper
Email Alerts
Daily Newsletter
Follow us on Twitter
Follow us on Facebook

ADVERTISEMENT

Views RSS

Posted: Tue, Dec 30 2008. 12:09 AM IST

Bernanke's bond market bash

A central bank such as the US Fed, willing to buy long-term bonds, should also be willing to sell them

Try Livemint.com in the latest Windows Internet Explorer 9 Beta Free Download Now

Vivek Moorthy

TOOLS -a A A+



There is growing realization that the serial tsunamis of liquidity unleashed by Alan Greenspan upon the world economy contributed greatly to the deepening recession. The pertinent question is what role did the current Fed chairman Ben Bernanke play in these policies.

0 0 Like

In evaluating a central banker's performance, to begin with, it needs to be strongly emphasized that monetary policy works with long and variable lags. Much of what happens in a given year, and even over several years, is the outcome of earlier decisions.

In a speech as a board member ("Deflation: Making Sure it Doesn't Happen Here") in November 2002, Bernanke advocated strategies to avert deflation. Even mild deflation is a graver threat to an economy than moderate inflation.

Also See US Bond Yields VS Policy Rate (Graphic)

In his speech, Bernanke advocated the Fed buy longer-term bonds to tackle deflation. Normally, when the Fed lowers the short rate, the long rate also follows, although by a fraction of that.

Bernanke suggested that to lower long rates in such a situation, the Fed should "begin announcing explicit ceilings" for yields up to two years, and enforce these by "committing to make unlimited purchases" of those securities with targeted yields.

Now, Bernanke's Fed has gone way beyond buying long-term government bonds. It has been buying up much of the US—"quantitative easing" on a massive scale to directly increase private spending.

Nevertheless, many people were aghast by these "mild" suggestions in 2002. Justifiably so. A well-functioning central bank changes money supply through short-term money market operations, while the treasury borrows at the long end.



Mint on Facebook Like 168

follow us on twitter

Related Articles

- In Japan, the sun will rise again
'Minor' victims of terrorism
A difficult landing ahead
Keeping 'Certain Death' alive—II
'RBI has no plan to conduct open market operation as of now'
State govts invest heavily in 91-day T-bills: sources
Ask Mint Money | If you have liquidity in portfolio, get rid of recurring deposits
Japan's Recovery Bonds: the importance of 'kizuna'

replay




PocketInternet™
3G

Get ahead ▶

HT Sites

Hindustan Times
Hindustan
Online Classifieds
Fever 104
Shine: Jobs in India
Movie Reviews

ADVERTISEMENT

Granted, a serious threat of deflation may warrant such policies. But announcing it in advance creates the moral hazard of assuring private players that even if they expand recklessly, they are immune to deflation risk since the Fed stands ready to bail them out. Whether the deflation threat in 2002 was concrete enough to justify this speech requires evaluating the inflation and other data in real time.

As things turned out, the Fed reacted aggressively to deflation risk when its preferred inflation measure, the core personal consumption expenditures deflator, fell below the implicit 2% target. The funds rate was lowered to 1% during 2003 and 2004 (see chart), partly in response to this deflation scare. That huge infusion of liquidity paved the way for the emerging markets equity boom in recent years.

By the same logic, when the Fed raises the funds rate to ward off inflation or tackle an asset bubble, suppose the long rate does not rise, what should it do? The answer is obvious—sell bonds, and continue to do so in any amount, or some equivalent transactions, to ensure that long rates also rise enough.

However, the Fed failed to do so. Greenspan in February 2005 stated that the failure of long rates to rise despite the steep funds rate hike (200 basis points then) was a “conundrum”, an expression that caught on (implicitly, the Fed was powerless to raise mortgage rates to tackle the housing bubble). Bernanke explained this conundrum in an April 2005 speech as a “global savings glut” that was keeping bond yields low globally. Maybe so, but the Fed could have acted.

Overall, Bernanke has continued his predecessor's tradition. The “Greenspan put” (as in a put option) was a Wall Street expression to characterize his asymmetric bias towards equity price movements. When the dot-com bubble was under way, Greenspan repeatedly stressed that it was incorrect, and perhaps impossible, to fight market forces. But when the stock market declined, he would cut rates quickly and hugely. In effect, Bernanke extended the Greenspan equity put to the bond market.

Vivek Moorthy is professor of economics at IIM Bangalore. Comment at theirview@livemint.com

Tags - Find More Articles On:

[Theirview](#) | [Tsunamis](#) | [Liquidity](#) | [Alan Greenspan](#) | [World economy](#) | [Recession](#)

READ MORE ARTICLES BY: [Vivek Moorthy](#)

COMMENTS

Comments for this page are closed.

Showing 1 comment

Sort by Subscribe by email -Subscribe by RSS

Wilfred Lobo 07/31/2010 12:55 PM

Govt should regulate licensing in a systematic manner rather than spring surprises and shocks to the broadcasting industry which is expanding, creating jobs and media values.

The broadcast industry has just begun.. and the government has started to apply brakes, why can't govt restrict broadcasters who show Rs 1.50 crores nett worth and get a channel license, they then use the license as a bargaining tool to make money by selling the defunct or lousy channels to new entrants, this is a big money making racket, licenses are sold at premium prices and all sorts of black marketing is now a big game in broadcasting.

There are so many broadcasters who start the channel .. only to sell it to a buyer and again launch a new channel, and this continues forever, such broadcasters should be restricted or not given approval for new license.

Latest VIDEOS

[More videos >>](#)

Most Read | Most E-mailed | Editor's Picks

- Nvidia's India unit to spearhead Logan superchip development
- A yoga camp against corruption
- The ant and the grasshopper and my summer reading list
- Baba Ramdev intent on fast, puts UPA on the backfoot
- Economy may be poised for slower growth
- Reliance Infrastructure: valued at a pittance
- Miffed Afridi retires, calls PCB officials disgraceful



Microsoft Office 365

Your life, in balance.

Replay

[TRY THE FREE BETA >](#)



blog comments powered by DISQUS



[View the IBM System x3690 X5 demo](#)



replay

[Subscribe](#) [Log In](#) [Contact Us](#) [Customer Service](#) [Privacy Policy](#) [Terms of Use](#) [Advertising](#) [About HT Media](#) [Browse Jobs](#) [Site Map](#)
Copyright © 2011 HT Media All Rights Reserved