

## Why Have the Fed's Policies Failed to Stimulate the Economy?

Remarks of Mickey D. Levy<sup>1</sup>  
Berenberg Capital Markets

**SOMC** | SHADOW  
OPEN  
MARKET  
COMMITTEE

Shadow Open Market Committee  
Princeton Club, New York, New York  
October 7, 2016

**E21** Manhattan  
Institute

---

**ECONOMIC POLICIES FOR THE 21ST CENTURY**

---

<sup>1</sup> Chief Economist of Berenberg Capital Markets, LLC for the Americas and Asia. The views expressed in this paper are the author's own and do not reflect those of Berenberg Capital Markets, LLC.

The Fed's sustained low policy rate, QE and forward guidance have stimulated financial markets and boosted asset prices but have failed to stimulate the economy. As planned, the Fed's efforts to lower bond yields and reduce the real cost of capital, encourage risk-taking, and lift stock and real estate values have succeeded. But nominal GDP growth has actually decelerated to 2.5 percent in the last year from its subdued 3.9 percent average pace of the prior six years, and real growth has languished.

The most disappointing aspect of the slow economic expansion has been the weak rise in business investment. Consumption and residential investment have grown fairly steadily. But despite lower costs of capital and only modest increases in labor costs, investment has fallen persistently below expectations while employment gains have actually been strong. Labor productivity has risen at a painfully slow 0.5 percent pace in the last six years and has fallen in the last three quarters, a unique trend during modern economic expansions. These trends have far-reaching implications.

In response, estimates of potential growth and the natural rate of interest have been reduced sharply. The Fed has delayed normalizing rates and bond yields hover near historic lows. Even with mounting evidence that monetary policy is having little stimulative impact on the economy, a constant Fed theme has been that as long as inflation is below its longer-run 2 percent target and inflationary expectations remain well-anchored, then sustaining monetary ease is appropriate. This presumes that the economy is constrained by insufficient demand that may be remedied by monetary policy. Until recently, very few Fed members have challenged this assessment.

Recent trends make it increasingly clear that economic performance has been constrained by factors that are beyond the scope of monetary policy and that the Fed's policies are contributing to mounting financial distortions with unknown consequences. Such policies are inconsistent with the Fed's macro-prudential risk objectives. This point has been emphasized by Peter Fisher (Fisher 2016).

**Factors constraining investment and growth.** Standard explanations of weak investment are that business capital spending has been slowed by the rising share of GDP in less capital intensive production, particularly in some labor intensive services, rising investment overseas (that is not measured in GDP) and measurement issues. The largest US companies based on market capitalization are investing less in traditional physical capital than the largest companies in prior decades. Measurement problems center on the challenge of fully capturing information technology, human and intangible capital in the National Income and Product Accounts. These factors likely explain part of the weakness in measured domestic investment and GDP.

*Government economic, tax and regulatory policies also have been a key source of the weak investment and economic growth.* A growing web of government regulations and mandated expenses imposed by state and local governments as well as on the Federal level, and higher tax rates and administrative rulings that have raised effective tax rates (Federal, and state and local) have constrained growth and harmed investment prospects and also slowed consumption. Considered separately, the vast majority of these policies has little impact on macroeconomic performance. However, they combine to increase aggregate business costs, distort production processes and labor inputs, and lower risk-adjusted expected rates of return on investment, and they also influence household spending and financial decisions. Anecdotal evidence and business survey results reflect these negative impacts, but their cumulative effects are not captured in standard macro models, including the Fed's FRB-US.

While the Fed's monetary policies have lowered real costs of capital, the governments' economic policies have raised the hurdle rates on business investment decisions. Moreover, expectations of more mandated expenses and regulatory burdens in the future lead businesses to add uncertainty to expected rates of return. These regulatory and mandated expense burdens are in addition to the negative impact of the public debt overhang that is raising expectations of future taxes and appear to be dampening potential growth (Reinhart, Reinhart and Rogoff 2012). These burdens of government policies lead businesses to take a conservative approach to investment spending, replacing aged equipment and software, while trimming some large expansion plans. It has also encouraged business expansion overseas and the buying of foreign firms for tax reduction purposes (tax inversions).

In response to some government mandated expenses and labor laws, businesses are changing labor inputs and relying more on part-time workers. With less investment spending, businesses also invest less in training employees on how to use new capital. This reduction in capital and on-the-job training contributes to weaker labor productivity.

Businesses are taking advantage of the Fed-induced low yields to issue bonds, but are using the proceeds to buy back shares to meet the demands of yield-hungry investors. The rising corporate leverage and higher cash distributions to stockholders are efficient from a corporate perspective, but result in less investment and lower potential growth.

Household behavior is also affected. Households are allocating more out-of-pocket spending to medical care and health insurance, so they have less to spend on other goods and services. Tight mortgage credit standards and more onerous

administrative costs have constrained mortgage originations. Dimmed expectations of future disposable incomes have led to more precautionary saving, and real consumption has not quite kept pace with real disposable incomes.

The negative economic impacts of government policies are structural and beyond the scope of the Fed to remedy through monetary policy. Potential growth has been constrained. Prior to 2008-2009, potential growth was estimated to be approximately 2.75 percent, but is now closer to 2 percent - the Fed's latest estimate is 1.8 percent. This is a dramatic shift, with huge cumulative economic impact.

Throughout most of this expansion, the Fed has argued that the weak economic growth and labor market underperformance have been due to insufficient demand. This has supported the view that aggressive monetary ease is needed to stimulate the economy. The Fed has frequently argued that had it not pursued aggressive monetary ease, economic performance would have been much worse. Such statements are entirely appropriate in describing the Fed's alternative liquidity facilities and QEI that successfully lifted the US from financial crisis and deep recession in 2008-2009, but they grossly overstate the efficacy of monetary policy in recent years.

In the nearly six years since the Fed initiated QEII (followed by "calendar-based" forward guidance, Operation Twist, QEIII and the use of various moving targets to signal its wish to sustain the negative real Fed funds rate), the deceleration of GDP growth and subdued business investment highlight the non-monetary nature of the disappointing economic performance that is beyond the Fed's ability to influence. The Fed's assertion that its monetary policy has generated several million new jobs during this period is implausible.

Noteworthy, former Fed Chair Ben Bernanke stated in a recent blog that there may be supply constraints that are inhibiting economic growth, and if so, the Fed cannot do anything about it (Bernanke 2016). This is an important acknowledgement by the influential former Fed Chair. Leading economic media may also be acknowledging the Fed's limitations; witness a recent Wall Street Journal front page headline: "Central Bank Tools Losing Their Edge" (WSJ 2016).

Recently, the Fed's view has evolved toward a growing perception that its monetary policy is having a diminishing economic impact. At the same time, some Fed members are expressing concerns about mounting financial distortions. The three official dissents at the September 2016 FOMC meeting and votes of 8 of 12 Federal Reserve District Banks recommending an increase in

the discount rate in July reflect the increasing unease at the Fed about its current policy. (The Board of Governors voted to keep the discount rate unchanged.)

**A lower natural rate of interest.** The natural rate of interest has fallen as expected rates of return have declined and potential growth has been reduced by weak investment and productivity. These trends have heightened pessimism and lowered expectations about the future. In describing the fundamental linkages between economic performance, the time preferences of households and the natural rate, Marvin Goodfriend emphasizes the important role of taxes, regulations, markups and other distortions underlying the pessimism about future incomes that have driven down the natural rate (Goodfriend 2016).

Although persistently poor performance and diminished expectations about future incomes have lowered the natural rate of interest, nobody knows with any precision what the natural rate really is. The Fed's projections imply a natural rate of 0.9 percent (the median FOMC member projects a 2.9 percent longer-run Fed funds rate and the Fed's inflation target is 2 percent). Presumably, the Fed's estimate of potential growth of 1.8 percent is consistent with a positive real rate of return on capital and a positive natural rate of interest.

This implies that the Fed's monetary policy is very accommodative, with its current real policy rate of minus 1 percent and its extremely large balance sheet. Such policy is inconsistent with the Fed virtually achieving its dual mandate.

**What Should the Fed Do?** The Fed should commence raising rates toward a neutral rate consistent with its estimates of potential growth and its 2 percent inflation target, and it should shift the focus of its effort to be transparent to emphasize the proper role of monetary policy in achieving its longer-run objectives while de-emphasizing short-run economic and market concerns. This must involve articulating how economic performance is influenced by other policies and real factors that are beyond the Fed's scope. The Fed must cease altering policy in response to global and financial turmoil that do not materially influence the US economy, and make clear that volatility is a normal characteristic of financial markets.

Gradually raising rates would leave monetary policy easy with a negative real Fed funds rate and plentiful excess bank reserves and would not harm economic performance. History shows clearly that during economic expansions when the Fed raises rates from an accommodative stance of monetary policy, growth is sustained. A clear Fed explanation of why it is normalizing rates – and why it is no longer delaying raising rates--would boost confidence. The Fed projects that real GDP will grow at a 2 percent pace through 2018, slightly above its estimate of potential growth, even as it raises rates along the Fed's estimated appropriate

path (the so-called “dots” in the Fed’s official September projections). The Fed must align its monetary policy with its forecasts.

In addition, the Fed should stop using its bloated balance sheet as a forward guidance signaling device, and cease reinvesting the proceeds of maturing assets. Allowing for a very gradual unwinding of the excess reserves without any outright sales would have no impact on credit supply. The low bond yields that have resulted from the Fed’s forward guidance have not stimulated capital spending or the economy, and the excess reserves that exceed \$2.5 trillion only add to financial distortions. Any modest increase in bond yields from current very low levels would have negligible economic impact.

A clearer explanation by the Fed of the non-monetary policies and factors that have contributed to lower potential growth, weak capital spending and productivity, and structural unemployment would be critically important to the debate about economic policy. The Fed needs to correct misperceptions that monetary policy is capable of managing every aspect of economic performance, and that activist monetary policy is necessary because the government’s economic and fiscal policy processes are dysfunctional. Monetary ease cannot offset or cover up for misguided tax, spending and regulatory policies. The Fed should also spell out clearly how its easy monetary policies influence Federal budget and fiscal policies.

Such clarity of role may not sit well with Congress that has come to rely excessively on the Fed, but it would reset monetary policy and enhance the Fed’s credibility.

## References

Ben Bernanke, “The Fed’s shifting perspective on the economy and its implications for monetary policy”, The Brookings Institution, August 8, 2016.

Marvin Goodfriend, “The Case for Unencumbering Interest Rate Policy at the Zero Bound”, Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City Jackson Hole Policy Symposium, August 26, 2016.

Peter Fisher, “What’s the Matter with the Fed?”, Shadow Open Market Committee, April 29, 2016.

Carmen Reinhart, Vincent Reinhart and Ken Rogoff, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, “Public Debt Overhangs: Advanced –Economy Episodes Since 1800”, (Summer), pp. 69-86.