

Trump, or mercantilism 3.0

June 2019



Published

enath

June 3, 2019

3 minute(s) read

Equity markets continued up to the end of April to steer a precarious course between two dangers – an ailing economy and wavering monetary stimulus. But starting in May, the fallout from the Trump administration's increasingly tough stance in its trade talks with China has brought home to equity investors just how fragile the existing balance is.

The question now facing financial markets is whether a new pickup in global growth will be strong enough to outweigh the US economy's waning momentum. We haven't changed our views on this issue. The current balance is fragile, and the potential for an economic upsurge is being stymied by both long-term obstacles (too much debt, limited monetary policy leeway) and short-term ones (trade hostilities).

Further down the road, the question has to do with the global consequences of the growing rivalry between China and the US. For the first time in thirty years, geopolitics could once again take precedence over world trade.

The US versus China: is there room for two mercantilist powers?

It's apparently taken financial markets a while to admit that the tensions between the United States and China stem more from strategic rivalry than from trade issues.

Those tensions can also be interpreted as an irrepressible clash between two mercantilist powers. Donald Trump's America doesn't believe in the value of free trade – it even counts itself among free trade's victims. The Trumpians show a preference for brazenly exploiting a favourable balance of power with trading partners. That policy puts the US on an inevitable collision course with China – a country criticised, and not so unfairly, for its mercantilist behaviour. Presumably the same treatment will eventually be applied to all nations running trade surpluses with the United States – beginning with Germany and Japan.

In other words, the increasing friction between the United States and its trading partners is inherent in the economic model subscribed to by the Trump administration. And as far as China is concerned, that model is coupled with geostrategic rivalry. The problem for us investors is that this turn away from the "beneficial globalisation" patterns of the past few decades not only creates short-term uncertainty, but also adds the longer-term threats that disruptions up to the contract of the past few decades not only creates short-term uncertainty, but also adds the longer-term threats that disruptions up to the contract of the contr

consumers will be saddled with higher costs and that world trade will shrink. So it would be unw monetary policy shifts dramatically.

Do central banks still have their philosopher's stone at hand?

Over the past decade, investors have got hooked on the idea that a mere stroke of the magood news for financial markets.

The trouble is that even though the rate-hike programme initiated two years ago has been the US economy has softened further. This means that while expectations of a rate cut manappreciating, the grim truth is that the Fed is still hewing to a hawkish line. US monetary programme impact of mounting trade tensions on an economy already losing steam.

A color of the second of the s

ough to turn any bad economic or political

So pressure from financial markets will most likely have to build up considerably before we see a US monetary policy shift vigorous enough to make a real of



Europe between a rock and a hard place

In this complex environment, Europe is not operating from a position of strength. To start and several other member states have failed to give themselves the fiscal room to manoe up the level as well, Emmanuel Macron's proposal to create a common budget to rekindle growth.



The second source of vulnerability is Europe's onlooker status in the tug-of-war between the US and China. That conflict may well prove damaging to the EU, both if the global economic outlook sours (since the pace of European GDP growth depends heavily on the state of world trade) and in the event of a US-China trade agreement, because even a shaky deal would no doubt be reached at the expense of Europe.

The EU today lacks both the economic and political cohesion and the business strength required to effectively defend its interests in a world of mounting mercantilist rivalry.

Caution and discipline

We have maintained and strengthened our prudent investment orientation over the last two months. Our equity portfolios are characterised by moderate levels of exposure and a preference for growth stocks with low cyclicality. At the same time, our fixed-income portfolios favour long maturities and carefully selected corporate bonds.

Source: Bloomberg, 31/05/2019

This is an advertising document. This article may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, without prior authorisation from the management company. It does not constitute a subscription offer, nor does it constitute investment advice. The information contained in this article may be partial information and may be modified without prior notice. Past performance is not necessarily indicative of future performance. Reference to certain securities and financial instruments is for illustrative purposes to highlight stocks that are or have been included in the portfolios of funds in the Carmignac range. This is not intended to promote direct investment in those instruments, nor does it constitute investment advice. The Management Company is not subject to prohibition on trading in these instruments prior to issuing any communication. The portfolios of Carmignac funds may change without previous notice. In the United Kingdom, this article was prepared by Carmignac Gestion, Carmignac Gestion Luxembourg or Carmignac UK Ltd and is being distributed in the UK by Carmignac Gestion Luxembourg.