The Minsky Trap: How Stability Breeds Instability

Jon Smirl

2026-03-01

"Stability Is Destabilizing"

Hyman Minsky said this in 1986, and the economics profession mostly shrugged (Minsky1986). Mainstream models treated stability as self-reinforcing: if the economy was calm, it would stay calm. Minsky insisted the opposite was true — that calm periods planted the seeds of their own destruction. Then 2008 happened, and suddenly everyone was a Minskyite.

But even after 2008, Minsky's insight remained more slogan than science. Everyone agreed that stability bred instability, but no one could write down *why* in a way that produced testable predictions. The mechanism was hand-waved: "animal spirits," "complacency," "risk appetite." The CES framework changes this. It provides a precise mathematical channel through which stability makes the economy fragile, and it explains exactly how much fragility accumulates and when the system will break.

The Boom-Time Logic

Consider what happens during a long expansion — say, the 2002–2007 period before the financial crisis. Interest rates are low. Markets are calm. Information friction T is small. Under these conditions, the rational thing for firms to do is *specialize*.

Why? Because complementary production — combining specialized inputs that work well together — generates a superadditivity bonus proportional to the curvature parameter K. When friction is low, the *ces-potential* tells us that the effective curvature K_{eff} is close to its full value K:

$$K_{\text{eff}} = K \cdot \left(1 - \frac{T}{T^*}\right)^+$$

With T well below the critical threshold T^*, specialization pays. So firms naturally adopt architectures with lower substitutability parameter ρ (higher complementarity):

- Supply chains get longer and more tightly coupled. A single car requires parts from dozens of countries, arriving just-in-time.
- Financial products get more complex. Simple loans become tranched securities, then CDO-squareds, then synthetic CDOs referencing other synthetic CDOs.
- Labor becomes more specialized. Generalists are replaced by narrow experts whose skills complement each other precisely.

Every one of these decisions is individually rational. In a low-friction environment, they increase output. No single firm is making a mistake.

The Trap

Here is where the mathematics bites. The critical friction threshold T^* is not fixed. It depends on the curvature K, which depends on ρ:

$$T^* = \frac{K}{2 \ln J} = \frac{(1-\rho)(J-1)}{2J \ln J}$$

As ρ falls (more complementary, more specialized), K rises, and at first glance it looks like T^* should rise too — more curvature means a higher threshold. But this is misleading. The *distance* between current friction T and the threshold T^* is not what matters. What matters is how the system responds when friction eventually rises. And a system with low ρ responds catastrophically.

Theorem (The Minsky Trap).

Let $\rho(t)$ evolve endogenously in response to information friction $T(t)$. During stable periods ($T \ll T^*$), profit-maximizing firms reduce ρ, increasing complementarity. This increases the curvature K and amplifies the *sensitivity* of the system to any future increase in T. The welfare loss from a given friction shock ΔT scales as:

$$\Delta W \propto K^2 \cdot \Delta T$$

Because $K = (1-\rho)(J-1)/J$, lower ρ means quadratically larger damage from the same shock.

The trap is now precise: success (low T) causes specialization (ρ falls), which raises sensitivity (K^2 grows), which means the *same* friction shock that would have been harmless five years ago now triggers a crisis.

This is not a story about irrational exuberance or animal spirits. Every firm made the right call given the environment it faced. The instability is emergent — it arises from the aggregate effect of individually rational decisions on the system's structural parameter ρ.

The Asymmetry: Slow In, Fast Out

One of the most striking features of financial crises is their asymmetry. Booms last years. Crashes happen in weeks. The Minsky trap explains why.

During booms, ρ drifts down *slowly*. Specialization is a gradual process. You don't restructure your supply chain overnight. You don't replace generalist workers with specialists in a quarter. The shift toward complementarity happens through thousands of small decisions over years — each new contract slightly more specialized, each new hire slightly more narrowly skilled, each new financial product slightly more complex.

During crises, ρ jumps up *fast*. When a shock hits a highly complementary system, the damage is immediate: a missing component shuts down the whole production line, a failed counterparty freezes the entire chain. Firms are *forced* to de-specialize — to find substitutes, to diversify suppliers, to simplify products. This restructuring is painful (layoffs, write-downs, plant closures) but it is rapid because survival demands it.

Example.

Pre-2008 banking illustrates the full cycle. In the 1990s, banks operated a relatively simple model: take deposits, make loans, hold some securities. Inputs were moderately substitutable (ρ moderate). Over the next decade, the industry moved steadily toward complementary complexity:

- **Securitization** turned individual loans into structured tranches that depended on precise correlation assumptions (lower ρ).
- **CDO-squareds** combined tranches from multiple securitizations, creating products whose value depended on dozens of interlocking default probabilities (much lower ρ).
- **Rehypothecation** chains meant the same collateral supported multiple positions simultaneously, creating tight coupling across institutions (very low ρ).

Each innovation increased output in the low-friction environment. Each one also lowered ρ and raised the system's sensitivity to friction. When the subprime shock arrived in 2007, it was not particularly large — initial losses were estimated at \$200–\$300 billion in a financial system worth tens of trillions (Reinhart2009). But the system's K^2 sensitivity was enormous. The damage cascaded through tightly coupled, non-substitutable linkages until the entire financial system froze.

The recovery took years precisely because rebuilding simpler, more substitutable structures (ρ rising) is a slow institutional process.

What the Data Say

The Minsky trap generates a testable prediction: during boom periods, measures of sectoral complementarity should increase (proxies for ρ should fall), and this increase should predict subsequent crisis severity.

The *test:minsky-rho-shift* examines this using industry-level data. At the 12-month horizon, the correlation between pre-crisis ρ decline and subsequent output loss is $r = -0.714$ (consistent with the theory). Sectors that specialized more aggressively during the boom experienced sharper downturns. The result is weaker at the 24-month horizon (r falls), which is expected: over longer windows, the recovery process (rising ρ) begins to offset the initial crash signal.

The Policy Implication

Minsky's original insight was often interpreted as fatalistic — if stability inevitably breeds instability, what can you do? The CES formalization suggests a concrete answer: *monitor* ρ.

Regulators already track leverage, capital ratios, and asset correlations. But these are symptoms, not causes. The underlying driver is the economy's substitutability structure — how tightly coupled and specialized it has become. Metrics that capture this — supply chain concentration indices, product complexity measures, labor specialization ratios — are leading indicators of fragility, not lagging ones.

The *minsky_trap_margin* result tells us that the danger zone is not high friction (by then the crisis is already underway). The danger zone is *low friction combined with high complementarity* — exactly the moment when everything looks fine and all the standard risk metrics are green.

This is perhaps the deepest lesson of the Minsky trap: the most dangerous state of the economy is the one that looks the safest.

References