Beware Modern Monetary Theory: An Opinion on Risks

Modern Monetary Theory (MMT) represents a structural change in how we think about money, inflation and asset prices. It is an increasingly popular narrative that is widely discussed in the markets today. While the current debate is immediately unlikely to have a significant impact on asset prices, it has the potential to affect the future of economic policy in a way that may present longer-term risks.

As a basic breakdown of a complex topic, MMT can be understood in basic form to be the opposite of fiscal austerity. Fiscal austerity is the notion that a country’s deficit—or rather, its deficit/GDP ratio—matters. This ratio is akin to a default-risk level. MMT, by contrast, suggests that the deficit/GDP ratio is less important because as long as a country can print its own money, it can pay off its debts in perpetuity and without problems. In this theory, the creation of money by the government is what directs economic activity.

In its original formulation in 1905, this was called “chartalism,” from the Latin *charta*, meaning token. While the first “M” in MMT stands for “modern,” the theory is also referred to as “neo-chartalism” by those with a taste for economic history. There is nothing modern about it.

Under standard monetary policy, the Fed uses interest rates to affect the value of money. Lower rates mean cheaper money and an accommodative policy, while higher rates make money more expensive and lead to monetary tightening. By contrast, under MMT, the government would take over responsibility
for the Fed’s dual mandate of price stability (inflation) and full employment. It would change the value of money through a combination of the printing press and taxation. Printing more would direct economic activity (easing) and increased taxation would drain money out of the system (tightening).

MMT is seeing a resurgence in popularity largely due to the belief that the global economy is in a “liquidity trap”—i.e., that interest rate policy as a tool to stimulate the economy is broken. In a liquidity trap, lower rates, no matter how low, will not stimulate growth, will not spur economic activity and will not increase employment. One of the explanations of why MMT has gained so much attention lately is “because it is a policy polemic for depressed times,”1 and there is indeed some validity to the liquidity trap argument. Japan’s 0% rate policy, the ECB policy rates at -0.40%, low real rates of growth, secular stagnation and so on all act as cases in point. In situations like this, the fiscal side of the economy needs to step up.

Can MMT work? As Yogi Berra eloquently explained, “In theory, there is no difference between theory and practice. In practice there is.”

“In theory, MMT can work. In practice, it is very unlikely to.”

Expectations of rising inflation due to MMT would have an impact on investing by potentially decreasing the value of cash flows in the future. The discount rate would thus be expected to rise and the present value of assets would fall. Financial assets, which were inflated under QE, would likely suffer, but real assets could benefit. This would take time, however. During the first few years of MMT, the potential impact may be similar to that of a fiscal stimulus, to the benefit of GDP. If—or when—the markets sense this spending is mishandled, it could lead to higher inflation and hurt financial assets. This is the general narrative today.

In our view, MMT is a risky economic experiment. It increases the size and the role of government in economic activity, despite overwhelming historical evidence that governments tend to be inefficient users of capital in comparison to the private sector. Under current monetary policy, the Fed simply sets the price of money and lets the “animal spirits,” innovation and efficiencies from the private sector take over. While this system is not perfect, we believe it is better than MMT, as MMT is very likely to create inflation and erode asset prices in the long term.

The key question becomes when? In its early stages, MMT could generate positive results, as it looks similar to fiscal stimulus. Those gains could mask the longer-term deleterious impact of higher inflation and eroding asset values. In other words, MMT could fool us in the short term.

Despite being based on shaky economics, MMT’s appealing politics have the potential to turn it into a real risk. If the U.S. or global economy falls into a recession, MMT may look like a good alternative in a time of economic stress as it provides a large fiscal impulse that seemingly works significantly better than lowering interest rates.

At the moment, the debate over MMT in the markets will only have marginal, if any, impact on asset prices and inflation. In our view, however, its growing popularity does present a longer-term risk that we will be watching closely, and we will adjust our portfolio positioning accordingly.

1 Palley, Thomas, Modern money theory (MMT): the emperor still has no clothes, 2014.
Risk Considerations

There is no assurance that a Portfolio will achieve its investment objective. Portfolios are subject to market risk, which is the possibility that the market values of securities owned by the Portfolio will decline and may therefore be less than what you paid for them. Accordingly, you can lose money investing in this Portfolio. Please be aware that this Portfolio may be subject to certain additional risks.

Fixed income securities are subject to the ability of an issuer to make timely principal and interest payments (credit risk), changes in interest rates (interest rate risk), the creditworthiness of the issuer and general market liquidity (market risk). In the current rising interest rate environment, bond prices may fall and may result in periods of volatility and increased portfolio redemptions. Longer-term securities may be more sensitive to interest rate changes. In a declining interest rate environment, the Portfolio may generate less income. Mortgage- and asset-backed securities are sensitive to early prepayment risk and a higher risk of default, and may be hard to value and difficult to sell (liquidity risk). They are also subject to credit, market and interest rate risks. Certain U.S. government securities purchased by the Strategy, such as those issued by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, are not backed by the full faith and credit of the U.S. It is possible that these issuers will not have the funds to meet their payment obligations in the future. High-yield securities ("junk bonds") are lower-rated securities that may have a higher degree of credit and liquidity risk. Public bank loans are subject to liquidity risk and the credit risks of lower-rated securities. Foreign securities are subject to currency, political, economic and market risks. The risks of investing in emerging market countries are greater than risks associated with investments in foreign developed countries. Sovereign debt securities are subject to default risk. Derivative instruments may disproportionately increase losses and may have a significant impact on performance. They also may be subject to counterparty, liquidity, valuation, correlation and market risks. Restricted and illiquid securities may be more difficult to sell and value than publicly traded securities (liquidity risk).

IMPORTANT DISCLOSURES

Past performance is no guarantee of future results. The returns referred to in the commentary are those of representative indices and are not meant to depict the performance of a specific investment.

The views, opinions, forecasts and estimates expressed of the author or the investment team are as of the date of preparation of this material and are subject to change at any time due to market, economic or other conditions. Furthermore, the views will not be updated or otherwise revised to reflect information that subsequently becomes available or circumstances existing, or changes occurring, after the date of publication. The views expressed do not reflect the opinions of all portfolio managers at Morgan Stanley Investment Management (MSIM) or the views of the firm as a whole, and may not be reflected in all the strategies and products that the firm offers.Forecasts and/or estimates provided herein are subject to change and may not actually come to pass. Information regarding expected market returns and market outlooks is based on the research, analysis and opinions of the authors. These conclusions are speculative in nature and are not intended to predict the future performance of any specific Morgan Stanley Investment Management product.

Certain information herein is based on data obtained from third party sources believed to be reliable. However, we have not verified this information, and we make no representations whatsoever as to its accuracy or completeness. This material is a general communication, which is not impartial, and all information provided has been prepared solely for informational and educational purposes and does not constitute an offer or a recommendation to buy or sell any particular security or to adopt any specific investment strategy. The information herein has not been based on a consideration of any individual investor circumstances and is not investment advice, nor should it be construed in any way as tax, accounting, legal or regulatory advice. To that end, investors should seek independent legal and financial advice, including advice as to tax consequences, before making any investment decision.

This communication is not a product of Morgan Stanley’s Research Department and should not be regarded as a research recommendation. The information contained herein has not been prepared in accordance with legal requirements designed to promote the independence of investment research and is not subject to any prohibition on dealing ahead of the dissemination of investment research.

DISTRIBUTION

This communication is only intended for and will be only distributed to persons resident in jurisdictions where such distribution or availability would not be contrary to local laws or regulations.

There is no guarantee that any investment strategy will work under all market conditions, and each investor should evaluate their ability to invest for the long term, especially during periods of downturn in the market. Prior to investing, investors should carefully review the strategy/product’s relevant offering document. There are important differences in how the strategy is carried out in each of the investment vehicles.
