

Eurozone: Big bang from Karlsruhe

It will take some time to fully understand the implications of the German Constitutional court's ruling on the ECB's quantitative easing programme today. There are several ways to read a ruling which agrees to some of the complaints brought forward. But this could certainly become a real problem for the ECB in the recovery phase of the crisis



The members of the German Federal Constitutional Court's second senate

Source: Shutterstock

What did the court decide?

- The German court ruled that the German government and national parliament failed to take steps challenging the European central bank's decision.
- With quantitative easing, the ECB violated the principle of proportionality of its monetary policy and did not take into account the impact of QE on economic policy. Read that as: the ECB exceeded its mandate and did not sufficiently take into account the adverse effects of its monetary policy decisions.
- QE did not violate the prohibition of monetary financing of governments.
- The German government and parliament have “a duty to take active steps against the PSPP in its current form.”
- The Bundesbank is no longer allowed to participate in QE or reinvestments unless the ECB “adopts a new decision that demonstrates in a comprehensible and substantiated manner that the monetary policy objectives pursued by the PSPP are not disproportionate to the economic and fiscal policy effects resulting from the programme.” within three months.

End of a long saga

Today's ruling is a big bang at the end of a long saga of several lawsuits against the ECB's QE programme and the OMT programme.

What followed was a series of expert hearings, including Bundesbank President Jens Weidmann, expressing doubts over a possible breaching of the treaty prohibition on monetary financing of governments and an over-stretching of the ECB's mandate.

An optimistic interpretation could be this is lots of barking without biting and that everything is fine as long as the ECB demonstrates that it has thought through the economic consequences of its decisions but a pessimistic interpretation could be no amount of additional ECB analysis will convince German judges and could, therefore spell the end of QE.

In 2017, the German court asked the European Court of Justice (ECJ) for advice. In 2018, the ECJ backed the validity of the QE programme but added some conditions. Today, the German Constitutional court came back with vengeance. It did not only basically tell the European Court of Justice that it didn't have a clue when coming up with its verdict, but it also puts new uncertainty with open questions in the eurozone and the ECB.

To our knowledge, there have been plenty of papers and analysis from the ECB pointing to the positive and negative effects of QE. One keyword here is 'counterfactual' as it will always be very hard to demonstrate proportionality of its actions if there is no evidence how the economy would have looked like without QE.

Apart from the fact that the war of the courts continues, the most relevant part of today's ruling is the part prohibiting the Bundesbank to participate in QE unless the ECB comes up with a better explanation of its proportionality analysis. An optimistic interpretation could be this is lots of barking without biting and that everything is fine as long as the ECB demonstrates that it has thought through the economic consequences of its decisions but a pessimistic interpretation could be no amount of additional ECB analysis will convince German judges and could, therefore spell the end of QE.

What does it mean for the ECB?

Today's decision did not concern the recent PEPP to tackle the Covid-19 crisis. Some might see it as an attempt to also hit PEPP but at the same time, the proportionality of PEPP in the midst of severe economic crisis will be probably less contested than QE. So, we will have to give it some time and wait for the ECB's reaction.

Today's decision could become a real problem for the ECB in the next phase of the crisis when the recovery starts. Then, a reshuffling between PEPP and PSPP could take place to shift from fire extinguishing mode to a growth supportive model. This shift has now been complicated. What a big bang!

Author

Carsten Brzeski

Global Head of Macro

carsten.brzeski@ing.de

Disclaimer

This publication has been prepared by the Economic and Financial Analysis Division of ING Bank N.V. (“ING”) solely for information purposes without regard to any particular user’s investment objectives, financial situation, or means. *ING forms part of ING Group (being for this purpose ING Group N.V. and its subsidiary and affiliated companies)*. The information in the publication is not an investment recommendation and it is not investment, legal or tax advice or an offer or solicitation to purchase or sell any financial instrument. Reasonable care has been taken to ensure that this publication is not untrue or misleading when published, but ING does not represent that it is accurate or complete. ING does not accept any liability for any direct, indirect or consequential loss arising from any use of this publication. Unless otherwise stated, any views, forecasts, or estimates are solely those of the author(s), as of the date of the publication and are subject to change without notice.

The distribution of this publication may be restricted by law or regulation in different jurisdictions and persons into whose possession this publication comes should inform themselves about, and observe, such restrictions.

Copyright and database rights protection exists in this report and it may not be reproduced, distributed or published by any person for any purpose without the prior express consent of ING. All rights are reserved. ING Bank N.V. is authorised by the Dutch Central Bank and supervised by the European Central Bank (ECB), the Dutch Central Bank (DNB) and the Dutch Authority for the Financial Markets (AFM). ING Bank N.V. is incorporated in the Netherlands (Trade Register no. 33031431 Amsterdam). In the United Kingdom this information is approved and/or communicated by ING Bank N.V., London Branch. ING Bank N.V., London Branch is authorised by the Prudential Regulation Authority and is subject to regulation by the Financial Conduct Authority and limited regulation by the Prudential Regulation Authority. ING Bank N.V., London branch is registered in England (Registration number BR000341) at 8-10 Moorgate, London EC2 6DA. For US Investors: Any person wishing to discuss this report or effect transactions in any security discussed herein should contact ING Financial Markets LLC, which is a member of the NYSE, FINRA and SIPC and part of ING, and which has accepted responsibility for the distribution of this report in the United States under applicable requirements.

Additional information is available on request. For more information about ING Group, please visit <http://www.ing.com>.