




● UVA'S ECONOMIC INSIGHTS

Fannie/Freddie MBS Acquisitions: Trump's 2026 directive in a market of moving tectonic plates

 By Joshua Barone | Feb 18, 2025

Like steel girders hidden behind glass and marble, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac quietly hold up the towering edifice of U.S. housing finance, bearing the weight of millions of mortgages while remaining largely out of sight. They do more than circulate cash; they are the circulatory system that keeps credit flowing, turning the abstract dream of homeownership into a set of house keys in a borrower's hand (Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 2025; Brookings Institution, 2025). This paper explores how these government-sponsored enterprises (GSEs) design and support the agency mortgage-backed securities (MBS) market, and how the legal scaffolding around them shapes every move they make (Federal Housing Finance Agency Office of Inspector General, 2025; Structured Finance Association, 2025). Against this backdrop, President Donald Trump's early-2026 command that the GSEs buy an additional \$200 billion in agency mortgage bonds hit the system like a policy earthquake, sending shockwaves through spreads, rates, and recapitalization plans alike (Politico, January 8, 2026; CNBC, January 8, 2026; Scotsman Guide, January 8, 2026). What follows is a guided tour through that tremor, tracing the fault lines between political ambition and financial gravity (Axios, January 12, 2026; Fortune, January 23, 2026).

Background: GSE Origins, Operations, and Agency Mortgage Paper

Picture the pre-GSE mortgage market as a patchwork of small wells scattered across a desert—each local lender drawing from its own shallow pool of funds. Fannie Mae (born 1938) and Freddie Mac (born 1970) turned those isolated wells into a single engineered aqueduct, standardizing loans and creating a deep, national reservoir of mortgage liquidity (Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 2025). Once privatized but always shadowed by federal support, they were pulled decisively under Washington's wing during the 2008 crisis, when conservatorship under the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) made their systemic importance unmistakably official (Federal Housing Finance Agency Office of Inspector General, 2025). Through their core alchemy—buying conforming mortgages, pooling them, and issuing MBS with guarantees of timely principal and interest—they function like a vast recycling plant for capital, continuously transforming paid-in cash into new lending capacity (Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 2025; FHFA OIG, 2025 Update).

This standardization and securitization smoothed regional rough edges into a uniform product, allowing the housing finance system to flex with national needs instead of splintering under local strain (Brookings Institution, March 24, 2025; DIW Berlin, 2025). Agency MBS are, in essence, a vast mosaic made from millions of tiny tiles—each tile a single mortgage, each pool an intricate picture of household borrowing. Investors who buy these bonds hold fractional claims on the cash flows of those households, cushioned by credit enhancements that function like shock absorbers under a high-speed train (Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 2025). Ginnie Mae securities ride on the explicit full faith and credit of the U.S. government, a guarantee as direct as a federal seal stamped on every coupon payment (Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 2025). Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac MBS, by contrast, are supported by the enterprises' own guarantees, yet investors often view them as standing under a large federal umbrella thanks to conservatorship and history, lowering perceived credit risk and, in turn, investor yields (Federal Housing Finance Agency Office of Inspector General, 2025; Structured Finance Association, 2025). That lower yield is the invisible discount that flows back into borrowers' lives as reduced mortgage rates and improved affordability (Brookings Institution, February 5, 2026; DIW Berlin, 2025).

To enter this world, a mortgage must pass through the GSE gatehouse as a "conforming" loan—meeting FHFA-set underwriting rules and loan-limit thresholds that rise and fall with house prices and climb higher in costly markets (FHFA OIG, 2025 Update; VitalLaw, 2025). Anything above that fence becomes a "jumbo" loan, pushed into the private-label wilderness and funded without the comfort of GSE guarantees (Structured Finance Association, 2025). Meanwhile, the U.S. MBS market itself is a continent-sized landscape: more than a million outstanding pools together hold roughly \$7.7 trillion in home mortgage debt, about \$6.5 trillion of which sits in 30-year fixed-rate mortgages (Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 2025; Structured Finance Association, 2025). This sheer scale makes agency paper not just another asset class, but one of the main load-bearing beams of global fixed-income markets (Brookings Institution, March 24, 2025; DIW Berlin, 2025).

Operationally, the GSEs behave like twin pumping stations in the housing-finance pipeline, moving capital from investors to borrowers and back again. One intake valve is whole-loan purchasing: they buy newly originated, conforming mortgages from lenders, bundle them, and securitize them into MBS, sending fresh cash back to originators for the next wave of lending (Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 2025; FHFA OIG, 2025 Update). The second valve sits in the secondary market, where the GSEs can buy outstanding agency MBS into their retained portfolios—reservoirs constrained by FHFA-imposed caps designed to temper risk (Structured Finance Association, 2025; Risk.net, 2026). Together, these channels keep the pressure in the system stable, making sure the flow of credit does not dry up when conditions become choppy (Brookings Institution, February 5, 2026; Marketplace, January 14, 2026).

The to-be-announced (TBA) market is the futures-like shadow where much of agency MBS truly lives—an invisible rail network that gets trains moving before anyone knows the exact car numbers. In this market, traders commit to buy or sell standardized packages of agency MBS—defined by issuer, coupon, maturity, and size—with the specific pools assigned just before settlement (Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 2025; FHFA OIG, "All OIG Reports," accessed 2025). This elegant abstraction supercharges liquidity and fungibility, giving originators a powerful hedge against "pipeline risk" as they lock in rates before loans are funded (Structured Finance Association, 2025). By selling TBAs, lenders can effectively freeze a price in a volatile rate environment, turning what could be a roulette wheel of market moves into a more predictable runway for borrowers and investors alike (Structured Finance Association, 2025; Brookings Institution, March 24, 2025).

Policy Shock: Trump's \$200 Billion Directive and Market Reaction

Housing-finance policy rarely moves in small increments; it lurches, like a giant turning its head, shifting the view and casting new shadows across the market. Reforms over the years have wrestled with how to limit taxpayer exposure, invite private capital back into the arena, maintain broad access to credit, and slowly build GSE capital toward a long-anticipated release from conservatorship (FHFA OIG, 2025 Update; VitalLaw, 2025). That release, however, has remained something like a mirage in the policy desert—visible in the distance, never quite reached (Politico, February 3, 2026; NPR, February 3, 2026).

In early January 2026, the policy landscape cracked with a thunderous directive: President Trump publicly ordered that \$200 billion of mortgage bonds be purchased, explicitly to push down mortgage rates and monthly payments (Politico, January 8, 2026; CNBC, January 8, 2026). FHFA Director Bill Pulte quickly confirmed that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac would carry out the order by buying mortgage-backed securities on the open market, echoing the structure of Federal Reserve-style MBS buying but with a more narrowly targeted, housing-centric purpose (Scotsman Guide, January 8, 2026; Marketplace, January 14, 2026). The announcement instantly raised a riddle: how could enterprises whose combined cash and cash equivalents were in the tens of billions, not hundreds of billions, plausibly fund such an enormous buying spree without external support or complex financing? (Fortune, January 23, 2026; Axios, January 12, 2026). Analysts worried that, depending on the structure, the directive might stretch the GSEs' balance sheets like a drumhead—amplifying every bump in the market and reigniting some of the very risks that had surfaced in 2008 (Structured Finance Association, 2025; Brookings Institution, March 24, 2025).

Markets reacted the way a crowded theater reacts to a sudden shout of "Fire!"—not with panic, but with a swift, jostling repositioning. In January 2026, spreads on agency MBS compressed as traders priced in a major new buyer, and 30-year mortgage rates briefly slipped below the 6 percent mark, lighting up refinancing pipelines (CNBC, January 8, 2026; Marketplace, January 14, 2026). Yet when placed against the backdrop of roughly \$7.7 trillion in home mortgage debt inside MBS and an overall MBS market in the \$10–11 trillion range, a \$200 billion purchase program looked more like a powerful wave than a true tide change (Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 2025; Structured Finance Association, 2025; Risk.net, 2026). Many observers concluded that while the initiative could nudge rates lower for a time, its gravitational pull would fade against the far larger force fields of Federal Reserve policy and global macro conditions (Brookings Institution, February 5, 2026; Brookings Institution, March 24, 2025).

At the same time, the directive pulled against the painstaking work of recapitalizing the GSEs. Profits diverted toward large-scale bond buying could slow the gradual accumulation of capital, making the climb toward post-conservatorship standards steeper and longer (FHFA OIG, 2025 Update; VitalLaw, 2025). In effect, the policy traded some near-term rate relief for potential delays in long-term structural reform, sharpening the long-standing tension between using the GSEs as crisis tools and preparing them to stand on their own (Brookings Institution, February 5, 2026; Politico, February 3, 2026; NPR, February 3, 2026). FHFA's long-term strategy for Fannie and Freddie resembles a tightrope act stretched over a canyon: expand credit access and mission activities, but never lose balance on capital strength and risk management (FHFA OIG, "All OIG Reports," accessed 2025). Recent supervisory focus has emphasized constraining retained-portfolio risk, broadening credit-risk transfer, and aligning guarantee-pricing with safety-and-soundness targets, while keeping an eye on how shifts in acquisition mix affect risk concentrations (FHFA OIG, 2025 Update; VitalLaw, 2025; Structured Finance Association, 2025).

Since September 2008, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac have lived inside a legal exoskeleton built by the Housing and Economic Recovery Act (HERA) and the Preferred Stock Purchase Agreements (PSPAs) with the U.S. Treasury. That structure did not merely put guardrails in place; it shrank and reshaped the GSEs' retained portfolios to reduce systemic risk, much as an engineer might reinforce a dam and lower water levels after a near-catastrophic flood (FHFA OIG, "All OIG Reports," accessed 2025; VitalLaw, 2025). FHFA, acting as conservator and regulator, continually recalibrates portfolio caps, stress-testing standards, and risk-transfer requirements to keep the enterprises aligned with safety-and-soundness objectives while still advancing their housing-access mission (FHFA OIG, 2025 Update; Structured Finance Association, 2025). Within this architecture, large-scale MBS purchase orders must be threaded carefully through existing capital-planning rules, stress scenarios, and risk-weighting constraints, turning each presidential initiative into a complex optimization problem rather than a simple command (Brookings Institution, February 5, 2026; Brookings Institution, March 24, 2025). Overlaying this is the political subplot around potential GSE privatization and possible Fannie/Freddie IPOs, turning the 2026 directive into both a market event and a chapter in a larger story about who ultimately holds the steering wheel of the housing finance system (Politico, February 3, 2026; NPR, February 3, 2026; Axios, January 12, 2026).

Market Function, Affordability, and the Future of the GSEs

The GSEs' purchasing decisions operate like a lever arm under the agency MBS market, shifting where yields settle and how generously credit flows. Their activity can compress spreads, stimulate refinancing waves, and subtly change the calculus for lenders considering which borrowers and products to support (Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 2025; Marketplace, January 14, 2026). Yet above this mechanism hangs the larger machinery of macroeconomic conditions and Federal Reserve policy—forces that operate like planetary orbits, determining the broad path of long-term interest rates regardless of smaller interventions (Brookings Institution, March 24, 2025; Brookings Institution, February 5, 2026; DIW Berlin, 2025). As dominant buyers and guarantors of conforming agency MBS, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac act like giant magnets drawing investor demand toward this segment of the market, anchoring mortgage spreads over Treasuries and lowering funding costs for eligible loans (Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 2025; Structured Finance Association, 2025). Forward-looking expectations for 2025–2026 point to modest drift downward in mortgage rates, driven primarily by anticipated Fed easing rather than any single programmatic intervention by the GSEs (Brookings Institution, February 5, 2026; Brookings Institution, March 24, 2025). In that environment, the \$200 billion initiative functions as an auxiliary booster rocket: powerful enough to temporarily compress spreads further and enhance liquidity—as illustrated by the brief dip in 30-year rates below 6 percent—but too small to permanently redraw the yield curve on its own (CNBC, January 8, 2026; Marketplace, January 14, 2026; Risk.net, 2026).

At their core, the GSEs are chartered to be the scaffolding that supports an affordable housing superstructure, not merely profit-seeking conduits. FHFA's performance goals emphasize equitable access to credit, support for underserved segments such as rural and manufactured housing, and underwriting that balances inclusion with prudence (FHFA OIG, "All OIG Reports," accessed 2025; VitalLaw, 2025). Through standardized products and targeted affordable-housing programs, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac help lower transaction costs and spread fixed costs across an enormous volume of loans, pushing rates down for many borrowers at once (Brookings Institution, February 5, 2026; Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 2025). The true impact of the 2026 purchase directive on affordability is therefore a multidimensional puzzle, depending on how much of the spread compression filters into primary mortgage pricing, how benefits are distributed across income and demographic groups, and how the initiative interacts with stubborn constraints such as local zoning, construction costs, and housing supply shortages (Brookings Institution, March 24, 2025; Politico, January 21, 2026; DIW Berlin, 2025).

The fate of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac remains a political and financial cliffhanger—an extended drama in which the final act keeps being rewritten. FHFA strategic plans consistently highlight the need to build capital, expand risk-transfer mechanisms, and prepare for an eventual exit from conservatorship, even as the timetable for that exit remains uncertain and contested (FHFA OIG, 2025 Update; VitalLaw, 2025). Given the complexity of revising charters, redefining capital standards, and managing investor expectations, incremental evolution rather than sweeping revolution appears the most likely path through the mid-2020s (Brookings Institution, February 5, 2026; Brookings Institution, March 24, 2025). Meanwhile, the enterprises continue to perform their central function: buying conforming loans, guaranteeing agency MBS, and providing the liquidity spine of the mortgage market while policymakers debate what their end-state should look like—and whether privatization via public offerings can reconcile private incentives with public purposes (Politico, February 3, 2026; NPR, February 3, 2026; Axios, January 12, 2026).

Despite their indispensable structural role, the GSEs often resemble lightning rods atop the financial system, drawing political and analytical fire whenever storms gather. One recurring worry is that they operate with a safety net so visible it becomes a hammock, inviting complacency (Brookings Institution, February 5, 2026; Brookings Institution, March 24, 2025). If investors assume that Fannie and Freddie obligations carry an implicit government guarantee, they may demand less compensation for risk, and the enterprises may feel pressure—political or market-based—to run leaner on capital than a purely private institution would (FHFA OIG, 2025 Update; VitalLaw, 2025). The outsized presence of the GSEs can also act like a gravitational well, bending the trajectory of mortgage finance around conforming products and crowding out some private-label structures that lack comparable guarantees, even as supporters argue that the GSEs serve as crucial shock absorbers when private capital retreats (Structured Finance Association, 2025; DIW Berlin, 2025). Because Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac sit inside conservatorship and operate under federal oversight, they inevitably function as instruments on which political leaders can attempt to play policy melodies, as the 2026 order to buy \$200 billion in mortgage bonds vividly demonstrates (Politico, January 8, 2026; Axios, January 12, 2026; Fortune, January 23, 2026).

Conclusion and Paths for Further Inquiry

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are not just gears in the housing-finance machine; they are pillars embedded in its foundation, channeling liquidity, stabilizing spreads, and broadening access to mortgage credit through their continuous issuance and guaranty of agency MBS (Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 2025; FHFA OIG, 2025 Update). The 2026 presidential directive to buy \$200 billion of mortgage bonds underscored how directly political power can shape demand for these securities and, at least temporarily, push mortgage rates lower (Politico, January 8, 2026; CNBC, January 8, 2026; Marketplace, January 14, 2026). At the same time, the episode illuminated enduring tensions between short-term affordability objectives and the slower work of capital-building and risk-transfer necessary for a durable exit from conservatorship (Brookings Institution, February 5, 2026; VitalLaw, 2025; Structured Finance Association, 2025). Under FHFA's watchful eye and within the constraints of HERA and the PSPAs, the GSEs are likely to remain central actors in the mortgage market through 2025–2026, even as debates over privatization, governance, and ultimate end-state continue to swirl around them (FHFA OIG, "All OIG Reports," accessed 2025; Politico, February 3, 2026; NPR, February 3, 2026).

The intersection of policy mandates, market dynamics, and GSE structure is a terrain rich enough to occupy an entire generation of researchers. Future work could quantify the causal, rather than merely correlative, impact of large-scale bond-purchase directives on mortgage rates, spreads, and refinancing behavior across different borrower cohorts; examine how such mandates reshape GSE capitalization trajectories and the timing and feasibility of conservatorship exit; map the distributional consequences for housing affordability across income, geography, race, and tenure; compare GSE-driven purchase programs with Federal Reserve quantitative easing in terms of market distortion, crowding-out, and exit-strategy challenges; and explore the political economy of GSE interventions, including who benefits, who bears the risks, and how governance and accountability mechanisms might be redesigned to better align public objectives with private incentives (Brookings Institution, March 24, 2025; Brookings Institution, February 5, 2026; DIW Berlin, 2025; Structured Finance Association, 2025; Politico, January 21, 2026).

Joshua Barone

Josh Barone is an investment adviser representative with Savvy Advisors, Inc. ("Savvy Advisors"). Savvy Advisors is an SEC registered investment advisor. The views and opinions expressed herein are those of the speakers and authors and do not necessarily reflect the views or positions of Savvy Advisors. Information contained herein has been obtained from sources believed to be reliable, but are not assured as to accuracy.

Material prepared herein has been created for informational purposes only and should not be considered investment advice or a recommendation. Information was obtained from sources believed to be reliable but was not verified for accuracy. All advisory services are offered through Savvy Advisors Inc., an investment advisor registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC").

References

Federal Housing Finance Agency Office of Inspector General. "2025 Update of Mortgage Insurers as Enterprise Counterparties." WPR-2025-001, March 19, 2025.
Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia. "Mortgage-Backed Securities." Working Paper 25-10, 2025.
Politico. "Trump Announces \$200B Bond Purchase in Bid to Lower Mortgage Rates." January 8, 2026.
NPR. "A Fannie/Freddie Stock Offer Could Be a Boon for Rich Trump Donors." February 3, 2026.
Scotsman Guide. "Pulte Confirms Fannie and Freddie Will Buy \$200 Billion of Mortgage Bonds." January 8, 2026.
CNBC. "Trump 'Instructing' His 'Representatives' to Buy \$200B in Mortgage Bonds to Lower Rates." January 8, 2026.
Axios. "Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac: Trump Gets Creative to Bypass Congress." January 12, 2026.
Marketplace. "How Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac Could Push Mortgage Rates Lower." January 14, 2026.
Politico. "Pulte: 'We Don't Have to Do' Fannie and Freddie IPOs." February 3, 2026.
NPR. "A Fannie/Freddie Stock Offer Could Be a Boon for Rich Trump Donors." February 3, 2026.
Politico. "How Greenland and Housing Affordability Are Linked." Morning Money newsletter, January 21, 2026.
Brookings Institution. "Quantitative Easing and Housing Inflation Post-COVID." March 24, 2025.
Brookings Institution. "Housing Policy, Inflation, and Monetary Policy." February 5, 2026.
Structured Finance Association. "Reassessing the Single-Family Agency CMO Market: Implications of the Federal Reserve's MBS Holdings." SF Journal, December 16, 2025.
DIW Berlin. "The House Price Channel of Quantitative Easing." Discussion Paper 2141, September 11, 2025.
Federal Housing Finance Agency Office of Inspector General. "All OIG Reports." Accessed September 28, 2025.
VitalLaw. "Government Sponsored Enterprises—FHFA's OIG Provides Update on Mortgage Insurers as Enterprise Counterparties." 2025.
Fortune. "From \$40 Billion to \$225 Billion: Inside the Trump Housing Plan to Turbocharge Mortgage Bonds." January 23, 2026.