

Opinion

Bank of England

Tue 18 Mar 2014 10:47 GMT



41,9941,454

The truth is out: money is just an IOU, and the banks are rolling in it

David Graeber

The Bank of England's dose of honesty throws the theoretical basis for austerity out the window



▲ "The central bank can print as much money as it wishes." Photograph: Alamy

Back in the 1930s, Henry Ford is supposed to have remarked that it was a good thing that most Americans didn't know how banking really works, because if they did, "there'd be a revolution before tomorrow morning".

Last week, something remarkable happened. The Bank of England let the cat out of the bag. In a paper called "[Money Creation in the Modern Economy](#)", co-authored by three economists from the Bank's Monetary Analysis Directorate, they stated outright that most common assumptions of how banking works are simply wrong, and that the kind of populist, heterodox positions more ordinarily associated with groups such as [Occupy Wall Street](#) are correct. In doing so, they have effectively thrown the entire theoretical basis for austerity out of the window.

To get a sense of how radical the Bank's new position is, consider the conventional view, which continues to be the basis of all respectable debate on public policy. People put their money in banks. Banks then lend that money out at interest - either to consumers, or to entrepreneurs willing to invest in some profitable enterprise. True, the fractional reserve system does allow banks to lend out considerably more than they hold in reserve, and true, if savings don't suffice, private banks can seek to borrow more from the central bank.

The central bank can print as much money as it wishes. But it is also careful not to print too much. In fact, we are often told this is why independent central banks exist in the first place. If governments could print money themselves, they would surely put out too much of it, and the resulting inflation would throw the economy into chaos. Institutions such as the [Bank of England](#) or US Federal Reserve were created to carefully regulate the money supply to prevent inflation. This is why they are forbidden to directly fund the government, say, by buying treasury bonds, but instead fund private economic activity that the government merely taxes.

It's this understanding that allows us to continue to talk about money as if it were a limited resource like bauxite or petroleum, to say "there's just not enough money" to fund social programmes, to speak of the immorality of government debt or of public spending "crowding out" the private sector. What the Bank of England admitted this week is that none of this is really true. To quote from its own initial summary: "Rather than banks receiving deposits when households save and then lending them out, bank lending creates deposits" ... "In normal times, the central bank does not fix the amount of money in circulation, nor is central bank money 'multiplied up' into more loans and deposits."

In other words, everything we know is not just wrong - it's backwards. When banks make loans, they create money. This is because money is really just an IOU. The role of the central bank is to preside over a legal order that effectively grants banks the exclusive right to create IOUs of a certain kind, ones that the government will recognise as legal tender by its willingness to accept them in payment of taxes. There's really no limit on how much banks could create, provided they can find someone willing to borrow it. They will never get caught short, for the simple reason that borrowers do not, generally speaking, take the cash and put it under their mattresses; ultimately, any money a bank loans out will just end up back in some bank again. So for the banking system as a whole, every loan just becomes another deposit. What's more, insofar as banks do need to acquire funds from the central bank, they can borrow as much as they like; all the latter really does is set the rate of interest, the cost of money, not its quantity. Since the beginning of the recession, the US and British central banks have reduced that cost to almost nothing. In fact, with "quantitative easing" they've been effectively pumping as much money as they can into the banks, without producing any inflationary effects.

What this means is that the real limit on the amount of money in circulation is not how much the central bank is willing to lend, but how much government, firms, and ordinary citizens, are willing to borrow. Government spending is the main driver in all this (and the paper does admit, if you read it carefully, that the central bank does fund the government after all). So there's no question of public spending "crowding out" private investment. It's exactly the opposite.

Why did the Bank of England suddenly admit all this? Well, one reason is because it's obviously true. The Bank's job is to actually run the system, and of late, the system has not been running especially well. It's possible that it decided that maintaining the fantasy-land version of economics that has proved so convenient to the rich is simply a luxury it can no longer afford.

But politically, this is taking an enormous risk. Just consider what might happen if mortgage holders realised the money the bank lent them is not, really, the life savings of some thrifty pensioner, but something the bank just whisked into existence through its possession of a magic wand which we, the public, handed over to it.

Historically, the Bank of England has tended to be a bellwether, staking out seeming radical positions that ultimately become new orthodoxies. If that's what's happening here, we might soon be in a position to learn if Henry Ford was right.

You've read 11 articles...

... in the last two months, so we hope you will consider supporting our independent journalism today. More people, like you, are reading and supporting the Guardian's independent, investigative journalism than ever before. Unlike many news organisations, we made the choice to keep our reporting open for all, regardless of where they live or what they can afford to pay.

The Guardian will engage with the most critical issues of our time - from the escalating climate catastrophe to widespread inequality to the influence of big tech on our lives. At a time when factual information is a necessity, we believe that each of us, around the world, deserves access to accurate reporting with integrity at its heart.

Our editorial independence means we set our own agenda and voice our own opinions. Guardian journalism is free from commercial and political bias and not influenced by billionaire owners or shareholders. This means we can give a voice to those less heard, explore where others turn away, and rigorously challenge those in power.

We hope you will consider supporting us today. We need your support to keep delivering quality journalism that's open and independent. Every reader contribution, however big or small, is so valuable. **Support The Guardian from as little as €1 - and it only takes a minute. Thank you.**

Support The Guardian →



Topics

Bank of England · Opinion

Banking · Economic policy · Global economy · Economics · Austerity · comment



Reuse this content

You Might Also Like

Frank Lloyd Wright's Iconic Ennis House Sells for \$18 Million

MANSION GLOBAL

U.K. Prime Minister Boris Johnson Sells London Home

MANSION GLOBAL

A Grand English Castle in the Wiltshire Countryside

MANSION GLOBAL

20 Awesome Christmas Gifts

CHRISTMAS GIFTS GUIDE

25 Really Cool Products That You Don't Know About

NEXT TECH

This Smart Gadget Can Overcome All Language Learning Problems In Seconds

EN.NEXTTECH.COM

25 Insanely Cool Products You Didn't Know You Needed

NEXT TECH

This Brilliant Device Lets You Communicate In More Than 40 Languages

NEXT TECH

comments (1454)

Sign in or create your Guardian account to join the discussion.

Order by

Oldest

 Threads

Collapsed

1

2


3

4

...

>

Due to the large number of comments, they are being shown 100 per page.




Self

18 Mar 2014 6:53

I think most people realized all this a few years ago.

< Share

Report




DavidWarnes → Self

18 Mar 2014 6:56

I didn't, so I found the article very informative.

< Share

Report



godforbidowright → Self


18 Mar 2014 7:13

Well, yes and no. The detail of the matter is incredibly unintuitive to how we think about the world around us. What exactly we're supposed to do with this information is also a bit of a mystery. If we were to decide to double government spending through provision of the borrowing, presumably something would snag in the monetary infrastructure eventually? Or every country would be doing it?

< Share

Report

➕ Show 61 more replies



Self


18 Mar 2014 6:57

The fact is that money no longer bears any relation to the production of useful goods or services. This has been the case for some decades, and the trend becomes more pronounced with every day that passes. It suits two core groups: the banks and the govt/state, who are inextricably intertwined and mutually dependent.

Everyone else is more or less screwed within this deeply evil system, but only a global revolution can stop it now.

< Share

Report




magicmoneytoken → Self

18 Mar 2014 7:45

Since 1971 in fact, when Nixon abolished the convertibility of the United States dollar to gold. That's the date all currencies in the world essentially became unbacked by anything of value.

< Share

Report



twiggers → magicmoneytoken

18 Mar 2014 8:00

But gold does not have any intrinsic value either. It makes a pretty paperweight and nice jewellery but apart from that its value is completely arbitrary.

< Share

Report

➕ Show 51 more replies

➕ View more comments

Most popular

Sign up to our daily email

Email address

Sign up

Contact us

Complaints & corrections

SecureDrop

Work for us

Privacy policy

Cookie policy

Terms & conditions

Help

All topics

All writers

Digital newspaper archive

Facebook

Twitter

Advertise with us

Search UK jobs

Dating

Discount Codes

Support The Guardian

Available for everyone, funded by readers

Contribute →Subscribe →