Move Fast and Break Things

The Market as a Voting Machine
As Warren Buffett famously observed, borrowing from his mentor Benjamin Graham, "In the short run, the market is a voting machine, but in the long run, it is a weighing machine." The stock market operates independently of political maneuvering, immune to the pressures that influence elected officials. It cannot be arrested, intimidated, or coerced, nor can it be seized or nationalized. Instead, it functions as the ultimate voting machine, continuously reflecting investor expectations for corporate earnings, economic stability, liquidity conditions, inflation, taxation, and the broader regulatory environment. Markets assumed that the administration would strike a balance between restrictive, inflation-curbing policies and pro-growth initiatives. Instead, the early execution of policy has leaned more toward disruption than stability, increasing uncertainty rather than setting a clear foundation for long-term economic expansion.

The Administration's Curious Stance on Markets
With this in mind, the administration's apparent apathy toward market performance becomes even more perplexing. Adding to the confusion is the administration's near-dismissal of equity market performance as a relevant indicator. While China has actively intervened to stabilize markets and Europe has embraced fiscal stimulus to reinforce growth, U.S. policymakers have adopted a posture that suggests market fluctuations are irrelevant to economic objectives. The contrast is striking, not only in terms of policy choices but in the message, it sends to investors.

In past administrations, market performance was viewed as a proxy for economic strength. Now, officials appear to be suggesting that markets are disposable, or at least that short-term declines are an acceptable consequence of broader policy objectives. Capital allocation decisions are not made in a vacuum. A prolonged period of market volatility, especially when coupled with restrictive trade policies, could push investors toward opportunities abroad, weakening the very economic foundation policymakers claim to be strengthening.

The administration's tone has shifted over time. Early on, market gains were touted as a sign of successful policy. Now, as equities waver, the messaging has changed to distance policy objectives from market outcomes. This inconsistency adds another layer of risk to an already uncertain economic environment.

The Administration's Economic Experiment: Disruption Without Direction
One of the more unusual aspects of the current policy landscape is the idea that an economic downturn is not only expected but actively managed. The administration's actions suggest an implicit belief that slowing the economy in the short term will yield long-term benefits, creating a controlled reset where debt is refinanced at lower rates, capital reallocates more efficiently, and inflationary pressures subside. But this approach rests on several assumptions that may not hold:

- Financial markets do not operate in isolation, and the consequences of a deliberately slowed economy may not be neatly contained. Consumer sentiment is fragile, and policy-induced uncertainty could trigger a sharper, less controllable downturn than anticipated.

- Global capital markets are increasingly discerning about where to allocate resources. If U.S. policymakers create an environment of volatility and unpredictability, capital may flow elsewhere, particularly toward regions where stability and growth policies are prioritized.

- The effectiveness of this strategy hinges on the ability to time policy interventions perfectly. Economic slowdowns do not always translate into quick rebounds, particularly if consumer and corporate confidence is eroded in the process.

Meanwhile, the messaging from officials has been consistent in emphasizing the necessity of a "detox period," with temporary economic pain being discussed as far back as Q4 of last year. Elon Musk, who appears to be a key influence on the administration's economic strategy, has long advocated for this approach. The framing of economic slowdown as an intentional reset suggests that policymakers view this contraction as a means to an end, with long-term stability outweighing short-term disruptions. This perspective has not wavered, even as market participants question the feasibility of engineering such a transition without greater structural consequences.

The Contrast with Milei: A Plan vs. Uncertainty

If the administration is intent on dismantling the existing economic framework, it must ensure there is a robust foundation for what comes next. Argentina's President Javier Milei, wielding an actual chainsaw as a symbol of his aggressive economic reform, at least had a plan for what followed his destruction. Just ten days after being sworn into office, his administration published Decree 70/2023, a sweeping 366-article document outlining his strategy for restructuring the Argentine economy. The plan detailed specific deregulation measures, labor reforms, and privatization efforts aimed at transitioning to a market-driven model. His administration rapidly implemented austerity measures, fiscal discipline, and deregulatory policies to stabilize the economy and shift toward market-driven growth. Whether one agrees with Milei's methods or not, his administration provided a structured, detailed plan to reshape Argentina's economy.

By contrast, the Trump administration's economic approach seems to be all chainsaw and no blueprint. While the rhetoric emphasizes the need for economic 'detox,' there is little indication of what will replace the existing structure. The messaging around tariffs, in particular, has become a moving target. One day, the justification is trade imbalances; the next, it's fentanyl concerns; after that, currency manipulation; and now, even food testing has entered the conversation. As Treasury Secretary Scott Bessent struggled to clarify in a recent interview, corporate America is left questioning where this is all headed. Markets, much like businesses, require predictability, yet the administration's lack of coherence suggests it is content to let uncertainty be a feature rather than a bug of its economic strategy.

If the goal is true economic realignment, then policymakers must do more than tear down inefficient systems; they must simultaneously cultivate industries that can support long-term, sustainable growth. Destruction, in and of itself, is not a strategy—there must be a clearly defined vision for what replaces it. Economic history shows that controlled deconstruction can be effective only when accompanied by investment in new growth industries. China, for instance, actively deflated its real estate bubble while channeling resources into manufacturing and industrial technology, fostering a new economic engine to replace the old. The U.S., by contrast, appears more focused on disassembling components of the current system without a fully articulated strategy for what will drive future expansion. Without a clear growth driver, the current approach risks being defined not by creative destruction, but by destruction alone.

Where Does This Leave Investors?

The relationship between policy and market outcomes is rarely linear, and current conditions reinforce that complexity. Efforts to stimulate U.S. manufacturing are entangled with trade policy decisions that introduce inflationary risks. Tariffs, while politically expedient, carry implications for both corporate margins and consumer prices, particularly when retaliatory measures disrupt global supply chains. The fiscal trajectory remains a source of uncertainty, with deficit spending and debt issuance trends influencing long-term yield dynamics in ways that are difficult to control. Meanwhile, the role of monetary policy is evolving in a world where prior cycles of accommodation are no longer a given.

For investors, the challenge lies in disentangling short-term policy shifts from the underlying structural forces shaping capital markets. Fixed-income volatility is likely to persist as markets grapple with the interplay of monetary decisions, fiscal realities, and global capital flows. Equity market performance will increasingly hinge on sector and security selection rather than broad market beta, as dispersion in earnings trajectories reflects the divergent impacts of policy initiatives. The role of industrial policy in reshaping supply chains will create both opportunities and risks, requiring a nuanced assessment of cost structures and competitive dynamics.

In an environment where policymakers are signaling detachment from market outcomes, investors must remain disciplined in focusing on fundamentals. Market resets, when they occur, are rarely painless. Policy miscalculations can have consequences beyond their immediate intent, particularly when global counterparts are actively managing their own economic narratives. The illusion of economic apathy may serve as a convenient talking point, but for capital markets, the consequences are very real.

IMPORTANT LEGAL DISCLOSURES

CURRENT MARKET DATA IS AS OF 03/18//2025. OPINIONS AND PREDICTIONS ARE AS OF 03/18/2025 AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AT ANY TIME BASED ON MARKET AND OTHER CONDITIONS. NO PREDICTIONS OR FORECASTS CAN BE GUARANTEED. INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN HAS BEEN OBTAINED FROM SOURCES BELIEVED TO BE RELIABLE BUT IS NOT GUARANTEED.

THIS PRESENTATION (THE "PRESENTATION") HAS BEEN PREPARED SOLELY FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES AND IS NOT INTENDED TO BE AN OFFER OR SOLICITATION AND IS BEING FURNISHED SOLELY FOR USE BY CLIENTS AND PROSPECTIVE CLIENTS IN CONSIDERING GFG CAPITAL, LLC ("GFG CAPITAL" OR THE "COMPANY") AS THEIR INVESTMENT ADVISER. DO NOT USE THE FOREGOING AS THE SOLE BASIS OF INVESTMENT DECISIONS. ALL SOURCES DEEMED RELIABLE HOWEVER GFG CAPITAL ASSUMES NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR ANY INACCURACIES. THE OPINIONS CONTAINED HEREIN ARE NOT RECOMMENDATIONS.

THIS MATERIAL DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A RECOMMENDATION TO BUY OR SELL ANY SPECIFIC SECURITY, PAST PERFORMANCE IS NOT INDICATIVE OF FUTURE RESULTS. INVESTING INVOLVES RISK, INCLUDING THE POSSIBLE LOSS OF A PRINCIPAL INVESTMENT.

INDEX PERFORMANCE IS PRESENTED FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY. DIRECT INVESTMENT CANNOT BE MADE INTO AN INDEX. INVESTMENT IN EQUITIES INVOLVES MORE RISK THAN OTHER SECURITIES AND MAY HAVE THE POTENTIAL FOR HIGHER RETURNS AND GREATER LOSSES. BONDS HAVE INTEREST RATE RISK AND CREDIT RISK. AS INTEREST RATES RISE, EXISTING BOND PRICES FALL AND CAN CAUSE THE VALUE OF AN INVESTMENT TO DECLINE. CHANGES IN INTEREST RATES GENERALLY HAVE A GREATER EFFECT ON BONDS WITH LONGER MATURITIES THAN ON THOSE WITH SHORTER MATURITIES. CREDIT RISK REFERES TO THE POSSIBLITY THAT THE ISSUER OF THE BOND WILL NOT BE ABLE TO MAKE PRINCIPAL AND/OR INTEREST PAYMENTS.

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN HAS BEEN PREPARED TO ASSIST INTERESTED PARTIES IN MAKING THEIR OWN EVALUATION OF GFG CAPITAL AND DOES NOT PURPORT TO CONTAIN ALL OF THE INFORMATION THAT A PROSPECTIVE CLIENT MAY DESIRE. IN ALL CASES, INTERESTED PARTIES SHOULD CONDUCT THEIR OWN INVESTIGATION AND ANALYSIS OF GFG CAPITAL AND THE DATA SET FORTH IN THIS PRESENTATION. FOR A FULL DESCRIPTION OF GFG CAPITAL'S ADVISORY SERVICES AND FEES, PLEASE REFER TO OUR FORM ADV PART 2 DISCLOSURE BROCHURE AVAILABLE BY REQUEST OR AT THE FOLLOWING WEBSITE: HTTP://WWW.ADVISERINFO.SEC.GOV/.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS, INQUIRIES AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION RELATING TO THIS PRESENTATION SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO GFG CAPITAL AT 305-810-6500.