

## Smart<sup>im</sup>: Can politicians control trade?

19 July 2018

Smart Investment Management

When Donald Trump was elected US President, investors were aware that he brought with him the risk of global trade tensions or even a full-out trade war. His “Make America Great Again” campaign was based on the idea that the US was in decline and that unfair trade deals contributed to this loss of ‘greatness’, promising to tear up deals that he thought were unfair to the US. Whilst early in his Presidency there was little more than rhetoric on trade, 2018 has seen Trump go on the attack, with the result being a raft of ‘tit for tat’ tariffs. However, whilst he tweeted early this year that “trade wars are good, and easy to win”, evidence suggests that things are far more complicated.

As one might expect in any war, the countries targeted by Trump’s tariffs have responded in kind and, on 1 June, the European Union (EU) imposed tariffs on a range of US goods, including motorcycles, jeans and bourbon. The choice of goods seemed to target the blue collar states from which Trump garners much of his support and few miss the irony that, by attempting to deliver on his campaign promises, he may have placed the very people that supported him in the firing line. Within 48 hours of being hit by an increase in tariff from 6% to 31%, Harley Davidson announced that they would be moving production to Europe. Both Trump and the unions claimed that the company were using the tariffs “as an excuse” and had wanted to make such a move for some time, and it is true that Harley Davidson have been moving production into local markets for many years, with plants in Brazil, Australia and India and plans (announced shortly after Trump came to power) to build another in Thailand. However, appearance is everything in politics and, whatever the truth behind the decision, it may yet mean that something designed to improve his popularity may damage it.

Whilst Harley Davidson is a high profile brand, it employs just a few thousand people worldwide so, whilst politically unhelpful, any move of production overseas would have a limited impact on the US economy. The same is not true of General Motors (GM), and they were the next to wade in to the fray, stating that “Increased import tariffs could lead to a smaller GM, a reduced presence at home and risk (there being) less -- not more -- U.S. jobs”. This warning about the global nature of the supply chain and the impact that tariffs can have on it bought an immediate response from White House trade adviser Peter Navarro, who claimed that the effect of tariffs was marginal. However, somewhat contradictorily, he sought to use GM’s point that they import a lot of components against them by saying that their car plants had become little more than “assembly plants”, with about half the content of an average GM car being foreign. It should be noted that GM are not alone, with Bloomberg reporting that all major US car manufacturers, including Ford, import a substantial share of the vehicles that they sell within the US, and it is obvious why Trump might see forcing US companies to source parts locally as attractive. This may be why, in May, he ordered an investigation into whether car imports pose national security risks under the same 1960s trade law controversially used to impose levies on steel and aluminium. However, whatever the outcome of that

review, or any other steps taken, there is no guarantee that the car manufacturers will play ball. This may be because they cannot source the same quality of parts locally, or simply have existing supplier agreements in place that they do not want to break, and the global nature of the supply chain was illustrated earlier this month in the UK.

Whilst Donald Trump has a very clear plan around trade, the same cannot be said about the UK Government. The current lack of clarity around Brexit would appear to be an overwhelming deterrent to establishing new cross-border supply agreements and yet, on 2 July, Tesco announced plans for a "strategic alliance" with French retail giant Carrefour designed to use their joint buying power to cut costs and offer lower prices to customers. The idea of such an agreement between supermarkets that have been rivals for years would have been unthinkable until recently. However, increased competition in the sector has forced companies to secure ever increasing buying power with suppliers, and the Tesco/Carrefour deal is simply the latest. Even so, what is most interesting is that they are prepared to agree such a deal without clarity about future tariff arrangements between the UK and the EU, which would indicate that the needs of the businesses are greater than the impact of tariffs. If that is the case, one has to question to what degree politicians can influence corporate behaviour with them.

In summary, it is unclear how "easy" it is to win a trade war or whether Donald Trump may find out that a supposed vote-winning election pledge proves to be a political misstep. At the same time, with the latter stages of an economic expansion being more vulnerable to economic shocks, and a heightened chance that any such event can tip the economy into recession, using tariffs as a weapon may offer poorly asymmetric risks, with a greater likelihood of a negative outcome, both economically and politically, than a positive one.

**The information provided above is for Guardian Wealth Management Professional Advisers only. It is not intended for the use of consumers and therefore must not be relied upon.**

*Please note, that, all website links contained within this document are directed to a third party website and therefore we cannot be held responsible for the administration of their site. Providing links to other sites does not guarantee, approve, or endorse the content or the products contained within these sites.*

*Any investment must be made in conjunction with reading the relevant KIID or Investment Mandate. Clients should be aware that the value of investments and the income from these may fall as well as rise and they may not get back the amount originally invested. Investors should note that the views expressed and information given were current at the time of publication but may no longer be so and/or may have been acted upon by the Investment Manager already.*

*The Smartfund Range and the iGuard Model Portfolios are managed by Smart Investment Management. Smart Investment Management is authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority under reference 627829, registered in England and Wales, and is wholly owned by Praemium Portfolio Services Ltd (Company Number 05362168). The registered address of Smart Investment Management Ltd is 4th Floor, Suite 643-659, Salisbury House, London Wall, London, EC2M 5QQ. See [www.fca.org.uk/register](http://www.fca.org.uk/register) for more details.*

*This e-mail is confidential. It may also be legally privileged. If you are not the addressee you may not copy, forward, disclose or use any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please delete it and all copies from your system and notify the sender immediately by return e-mail. Internet communications cannot be guaranteed to be timely, secure, error or virus-free. The sender does not accept liability for any errors or omissions*

