The New Reality of U.S. Country Risk Premium: What It Means for Asset Management

By Ned Gandevani, MBA, PhD

CEO/CIO, NMG Income & Growth Funds

(www.nmgfunds.com)

This paper was presented as a keynote lecture at TSAM Boston on June 2, 2025.

Abstract

This paper explores the evolving nature of the United States' Country Risk Premium (CRP) and its far-reaching implications for global asset management. It identifies systemic fiscal, political, and geopolitical shifts that have led to a reassessment of the U.S. as a ‘risk-free’ anchor in international finance. Through economic data, market signals, and industry responses, the study outlines how asset managers must adapt valuation models, risk frameworks, and portfolio strategies to navigate the new investment paradigm.

Overview

For much of the 20th and early 21st centuries, U.S. financial assets held a near-unassailable position in global markets, backed by strong institutions, consistent policies, and unparalleled liquidity. However, structural debt imbalances, political gridlock, geopolitical tensions, and trade disruptions have challenged the perception of the United States as a low-risk environment. This paper evaluates these dynamics and proposes updated methodologies for assessing and applying Country Risk Premiums (CRPs) in investment analysis, with a specific focus on equity valuation and sovereign credit metrics.

The Foundations Are Moving

For more than eighty years since the Bretton Woods Agreement in 1944, U.S. financial markets have been the backbone of the global financial system. The U.S. secured its financial dominance first by linking the dollar to gold, then by moving to a fiat currency, yet the dollar has continued to command extraordinary trust worldwide. The U.S. Treasury market, now worth about $28.6 trillion, is the world's benchmark for risk-free assets, underpinned by the creditworthiness of the U.S. government. U.S. credit markets make up roughly 73% of global credit markets, and the dollar remains the primary reserve currency, accounting for about 59% of global foreign exchange reserves as of 2023 (IMF, 2023). American equities, especially the S&P 500, have long been at the heart of international investment portfolios, delivering an average annual return of around 10% over the past hundred years (Dimson, Marsh, & Staunton, 2021). As of early 2025, the U.S. equity market is still the world's largest, with a market cap of about $60.1 trillion, nearly 49% of the entire global equity market.

This American exceptionalism, rooted in sound policy, stable institutions, the rule of law, and economic dynamism, has repeatedly proven resilient through global crises. During the Great Recession of 2008, while global markets faced widespread collapse, U.S. Treasuries served as a safe haven. In fact, during the fourth quarter of 2008, yields on 10-year U.S. Treasury bonds dropped from over 4% to around 2.2% as global capital sought safety (Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis [FRED], 2023). Likewise, U.S. equities, though initially battered, led the recovery with the S&P 500 regaining pre-crisis levels by 2013 and reaching all-time highs shortly, thereafter, fueled in part by effective Federal Reserve monetary policy and massive fiscal stimulus (Congressional Budget Office [CBO], 2013).

Again, in the pandemic years of 2020–2021, when global markets plunged into uncertainty, the world turned to U.S. assets. The Federal Reserve's swift intervention, including slashing interest rates and purchasing more than $4 trillion in assets, restored liquidity and confidence (Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 2021). The U.S. dollar index (DXY) surged during the height of the crisis in March 2020, reflecting investor demand for dollar-denominated assets. Furthermore, the U.S. Treasury issued a record $3.5 trillion in debt in 2020, and markets absorbed it without hesitation, underscoring the enduring demand for dollar-backed safe assets (U.S. Department of the Treasury, 2021).

These episodes reaffirm the exceptionalism of U.S. financial markets. The stability of the dollar, the depth and liquidity of the Treasury market, and the innovative strength of U.S. equity markets provided a financial bedrock during turbulent times. Yet, recent geopolitical fragmentation, rising debt levels, and the emergence of alternative financial centers are prompting a reassessment of these once-unquestioned truths. While the U.S. retains structural advantages, the assumption of permanence is now under scrutiny. For ages, these roles felt untouchable. Now, they're being questioned. The latest news and numbers point to a shift, an era we thought would last forever may be slipping away.

Fiscal and Structural Pressures Are Building

Let’s look at the facts:

The U.S. national debt has now surged past $36 trillion as of April 2025, a historic high that has alarmed credit markets and fiscal watchdogs (U.S. Department of the Treasury, 2025).

The debt-to-GDP ratio stands at approximately 123%, the highest in U.S. peacetime history, surpassing even post-World War II levels when the ratio briefly hit 119% in 1946 (Congressional Budget Office [CBO], 2024).

The federal budget deficit has ballooned to $1.8 trillion, or 6.4% of GDP, driven by persistent structural imbalances, elevated entitlement spending, and rising interest costs (CBO, 2024).

Perhaps most alarming, annual interest payments on the national debt are near $900 billion, which is more than all discretionary non-defense spending combined, threatening to crowd out investments in infrastructure, education, and innovation (Office of Management and Budget [OMB], 2024).

These are not abstract numbers; they represent a sea change in the risk profile of the U.S. economy. During prior debt peaks, such as after World War II, the U.S. faced a vastly different demographic structure, a booming postwar economy, and robust productivity growth. Today, by contrast, the aging population and slower productivity gains create a structurally weaker fiscal base (Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis [FRED], 2023).

April 2, 2025, policy announcement from the new administration, signaling possible tariff escalations and a rollback of key trade agreements, has further jolted markets. Major trading partners, including the EU and several Asia-Pacific nations, are now openly discussing "strategic decoupling" from the U.S., seeking trade and currency alternatives to mitigate exposure to American policy unpredictability (World Trade Organization [WTO], 2025). This sentiment reflects a broader erosion of confidence in U.S. leadership on global economic policy, a stark contrast to the post-Cold War era when Washington was seen as the architect of globalization and free markets.

Markets have reacted swiftly. The U.S. dollar index (DXY), which typically acts as a barometer of global confidence in the U.S., has experienced increased volatility, and Treasury yields have remained elevated despite safe-haven demand, suggesting a growing risk premium embedded in U.S. assets (Bloomberg, 2025).

Compounding these structural concerns is persistent political gridlock in Washington. From the debt ceiling standoffs in 2011 and 2023 to today’s hyper-partisan legislative landscape, the inability of Congress to enact long-term fiscal reforms or bipartisan economic policy has contributed to market anxiety and policy uncertainty (Moody’s Analytics, 2024).

In short, while the U.S. economy still possesses unparalleled scale, technological innovation, and capital markets depth, the fiscal and structural underpinnings are weakening. Risk is being repriced, not only in bond markets but in boardrooms and sovereign wealth strategies around the world.

Trade Tensions Hit Home

The fallout from shifting U.S. trade policy is no longer a theoretical debate, it's having direct and measurable impacts on major corporations and the broader U.S. economy. Recent tariff measures enacted under the "Liberation Day" policy initiative announced by President Donald Trump on April 2, 2025, have resulted in substantial financial and operational disruptions.

Apple Inc., one of the most globally integrated technology firms, reported a projected $900 million increase in input costs this quarter due to new tariffs imposed on Chinese-manufactured components. The company has already flagged a 15% reduction in operating margins, citing a necessary and urgent overhaul of its supply chain to minimize exposure to tariff-sensitive markets (Apple Inc., 2025). Similar to Apple's reaction to prior tariff rounds in 2018–2019, the current wave has prompted a pivot toward Southeast Asia and domestic suppliers, but with higher transitional costs and longer lead times (CNBC, 2025).

Ford Motor Company is also feeling the strain, facing an estimated $1.5 billion in additional annual expenses directly attributed to import duties on key auto parts and steel. As a result, Ford has suspended its forward guidance for the remainder of the year and announced a strategic review of its international operations. The company's prior experiences with trade uncertainty during the 2018–2020 U.S.–China trade war foreshadowed this: at that time, Ford lost over $1 billion in earnings due to shifting tariffs and retaliatory duties (Reuters, 2020).

Boeing, meanwhile, now finds a $50 billion order backlog jeopardized due to fresh export restrictions targeting aerospace goods, particularly jet deliveries to China and parts of the Middle East. In a highly globalized sector where long-term contracts and bilateral diplomacy go hand-in-hand, such restrictions have both strategic and economic consequences. A similar pattern emerged during U.S.–EU trade disputes in 2002 and again during the U.S.–China tensions of 2019, where aviation orders were used as leverage in broader geopolitical negotiations (U.S. International Trade Commission [USITC], 2020).

These examples are not isolated. They are early indicators of a systemic shift in global commerce. Following the April 2025 tariff escalation, the U.S. has levied broad-based duties on over $1.2 trillion in imports, affecting sectors from technology and automotive to semiconductors and pharmaceuticals. Preliminary estimates by the Peterson Institute for International Economics (2025) suggest that these tariffs could reduce U.S. GDP by approximately $600 billion over the next 12 months, equivalent to a 2% contraction. This would mark the most significant trade-induced GDP impact since the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930, which helped deepen the Great Depression by slashing U.S. exports and triggering a retaliatory global tariff war (Irwin, 2011).

The real economic danger lies in uncertainty. Trade policy unpredictability acts as a tax on investment, causing companies to delay capital expenditures, reduce hiring, and withhold strategic commitments. According to the National Association for Business Economics (NABE, 2024), over 70% of CFOs in multinational firms reported that trade tensions had become a “top-three” risk factor, up from just 22% five years earlier.

And it’s not just finance chiefs expressing concern, corporate leaders across sectors are sounding alarms. According to the most recent Conference Board CEO Confidence Survey, sentiment among CEOs has plummeted to its lowest level since late 2022. The report reveals a sharp deterioration in expectations, marking the steepest quarter-over-quarter decline in CEO confidence in over five decades. Most notably, over 70% of CEOs surveyed now anticipate a recession within the next 12 to 18 months, a significant shift in tone that underscores growing anxiety over inflation persistence, interest rate volatility, and geopolitical uncertainty (The Conference Board, 2025).

This collapse in executive sentiment aligns with macroeconomic indicators that show weakening business investment and consumer demand, an environment that historically precedes economic contraction. The depth of this sentiment reversal suggests that corporate planning is already shifting toward recession-resilient strategies, including cost controls, capital expenditure slowdowns, and workforce adjustments.

Thus, what we are witnessing is more than just turbulence in individual sectors. It is the unfolding of a broader structural transformation, wherein America’s role as a stable, rules-based participant in global trade is being questioned. The implications for supply chains, inflation, corporate strategy, and macroeconomic stability are profound.

Markets Signal Waning Confidence

In April 2025, U.S. equities, Treasury bonds, and the dollar all fell, a rare "triple drop" that signals growing investor unease. These assets typically move in opposite directions, serving as natural hedges in diversified portfolios. Their simultaneous decline suggests broad-based doubt about U.S. economic and political stability.

The U.S. Dollar Index (DXY) has dropped 8% year-to-date, reaching its lowest point since 2021, amid concerns over persistent deficits, fiscal gridlock, and geopolitical uncertainty (Bloomberg, 2025). Foreign central banks are increasingly reducing dollar holdings, with global U.S. dollar reserves falling to 58.4% in late 2024, down from over 70% in 2000 (International Monetary Fund [IMF], 2024).

Moody's downgraded the U.S. credit outlook to "negative" in 2023, warning of "weaker fiscal strength" and a "polarized political environment" (Moody's Investors Service, 2023). Standard & Poor's, which cut the U.S. rating from AAA to AA+ in 2011, reaffirmed its stance in 2023, citing continued governance risks and an unsustainable fiscal path (S&P Global, 2023).

Treasury debt now exceeds 123% of GDP, and net interest costs are projected to reach 3.2% of GDP by 2030, higher than defense spending (Congressional Budget Office [CBO], 2024). Such deterioration challenges the "risk-free" status of Treasuries and weakens the dollar's reserve currency dominance.

With bond yields rising and safer alternatives like German Bunds and Canadian government debt gaining appeal, global capital is rethinking its allegiance. The triple drop is more than a market blip; it reflects a deeper loss of faith in the U.S. as a financial anchor.

The Significance of the Triple Decline

Such a simultaneous retreat across all three asset classes is historically rare and deeply symbolic. Normally, when U.S. equities decline, investors seek safety in Treasuries or the dollar, pushing up their value. The inverse or low correlation between these instruments has long provided a bedrock of portfolio diversification. Their concurrent weakness implies a systemic shift in how global investors perceive U.S. economic and geopolitical stability.

Historically, this pattern has only emerged during moments of profound global or domestic uncertainty. One notable precedent is the 1970s stagflation era, when persistent inflation, oil shocks, and geopolitical turmoil undermined confidence across markets, causing U.S. stocks, bonds, and the dollar to decline in tandem (Federal Reserve History, 2021). Another was the 2013 Taper Tantrum, when Federal Reserve policy signals caused widespread capital flight from both U.S. and emerging markets, though the dollar held relatively steady (Bernanke, 2014). More recently, in mid-2022, simultaneous concerns over Fed tightening, a slowing economy, and geopolitical risks triggered brief periods of synchronized declines, although they quickly corrected (International Monetary Fund [IMF], 2023).

As Rogoff (2023) explains in his analysis of post-hegemonic currency systems, such triple declines may signal an erosion of confidence in the U.S. as the world's financial anchor, especially when accompanied by external signals like reserve diversification and increasing use of alternative payment systems.

A Shifting Global Currency Landscape

Adding to these concerns, the Taiwanese dollar (TWD) has appreciated nearly 10% in early May 2025, including an unprecedented 5% intraday spike, pushing the U.S. dollar to a three-year low against the TWD (Financial Times, 2025). While exchange rate movements can often be attributed to technical factors, the scale and timing of this appreciation suggest a deeper repricing of geopolitical risk.

This currency move coincides with growing "de-dollarization" discussions across Asia, where regional economies are increasingly transacting in local currencies, particularly in energy and high-tech supply chains. As of 2024, the share of cross-border trade settlements in Chinese yuan, for example, reached 4.5% globally, up from less than 2% five years earlier (SWIFT, 2024). Moreover, ASEAN countries have launched a regional payment network that further reduces dollar reliance in regional commerce (Asian Development Bank, 2024).

These changes reflect not just dissatisfaction with U.S. monetary policy but concerns over political stability, trade unpredictability, and sovereign debt risks, issues that lie beyond the Federal Reserve's monetary toolkit. Asset managers are now operating in a landscape where currency risk and capital flows are increasingly driven by geopolitical choices, not macroeconomic fundamentals alone.

Rethinking Asset Valuation

Traditionally, asset managers have relied on rigorous analysis, evaluating everything from GDP growth and inflation to management decisions and corporate strategy, to assess the value of potential investments. In today's environment, however, estimating a company's worth and discounting future cash flows involves navigating a new set of uncertainties. The discount rate can no longer be determined solely by company-specific factors; it must now account for the country's risk as well, including fiscal policy, currency strength, political stability, and the broader economic cycle.

Asset valuation is both analytical and judgment-driven, requiring a careful blend of science and art. The process starts with comprehensive fundamental analysis. Asset managers assess both external and internal variables that influence a company's sustainability, profitability, and growth potential. Externally, macroeconomic indicators such as GDP growth, inflation, interest rates, unemployment levels, consumer sentiment, and housing permits all factors into a company's operating environment and future prospects (Damodaran, 2024). No business operates in a vacuum; each is part of a wider economic ecosystem and is inevitably affected by shifts in the broader landscape.

On the internal side, asset managers examine corporate strategy, scrutinize management quality, and review material disclosures that could impact strategic direction or performance. They conduct thorough financial analysis, digging into historical and current statements and applying ratio analysis to assess liquidity, leverage, operational efficiency, and profitability. This groundwork forms the basis for building pro forma financial statements, which allow managers to project future cash flows, either to equity holders or to the entire firm.

The core of valuation, then, is projecting these future cash flows and discounting them to present value to arrive at an intrinsic value for the company. Comparing this intrinsic value to the prevailing market price informs the buy, sell, or hold decision. The rigor of this process enables asset managers to identify mispriced opportunities and manage risk with discipline.

Determining the proper discount rate is a crucial part of this process. Typically, this means estimating the cost of equity, the minimum required return to justify owning the company’s stock. Models like the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) have long been used to account for market risk. Yet, in today’s interconnected and volatile environment, this approach is not sufficient. The discount rate must also capture the riskiness of returns stemming from the economic cycle, the reliability of government policy and the legal system, and, importantly, the stability and strength of the currency in which returns are realized.

This is where the country risk premium becomes essential. To achieve a realistic valuation, asset managers must factor in the unique risks inherent to the country in which the company operates. These include fiscal instability, political uncertainty, and currency volatility. The country risk premium is added to the discount rate to reflect these additional exposures. Overlooking these risks can lead to major over- or under-valuation, particularly in a world where geopolitical and macroeconomic shocks are increasingly common and severe (Damodaran, 2024; Kroll, 2024).

In short, asset valuation today demands not only technical expertise but also an acute awareness of the shifting global landscape. Only by rigorously integrating country risk premiums into their models can asset managers deliver realistic, risk-adjusted valuations that stand up to today's heightened uncertainty.

Calculating Country Risk Premium (CRP)

Estimating a country risk premium (CRP), the additional return investors demand for taking on the risks of investing outside a stable and mature economy, is a foundational tool in both equity valuation and sovereign risk analysis. While the methodology has remained largely consistent over the years, the inputs and implications are evolving dramatically, especially for countries previously considered low risk, including the United States.

Traditionally, one of the most direct methods of estimating the Country Risk Premium (CRP) is by looking at the sovereign credit spread, the difference in yield between a country's government bond and a U.S. Treasury bond of similar maturity, with the U.S. Treasury serving as the risk-free benchmark.

However, this basic spread often underrepresents true risk in more volatile economies. To capture a more nuanced view, analysts incorporate factors such as:

- Sovereign credit ratings (Moody's, S&P, Fitch)
- Credit default swap (CDS) spreads, which reflect market-implied default probabilities
- Political risk indices, like those published by the Economist Intelligence Unit or Transparency International
- Macroeconomic variables such as inflation, fiscal balance, and currency volatility
- Market liquidity and capital controls, which affect foreign investor accessibility

A widely used adjustment formula is:

CRP= (Sovereign Bond Yield – AAA Bond Yield) × (Equity Market Volatility / Sovereign Bond Volatility)

This volatility scaling, popularized by Damodaran (2024), acknowledges that equity markets are generally more volatile than debt markets, and this variability differs sharply across countries.

U.S. Country Risk: A Changing Narrative

Historically, the United States has been the benchmark for "risk-free" investing. However, that perception has begun to shift. In 2011 and again in 2023, S&P downgraded the U.S. credit rating from AAA to AA+ in response to political brinkmanship over the federal debt ceiling (Standard & Poor's, 2023). By 2025, with the national debt surpassing $36 trillion and debt-to-GDP exceeding 123%, the Country Risk Premium (CRP) for U.S. assets has risen modestly to 0.5–1.0%, reflecting growing concerns over fiscal governance and political polarization (Congressional Budget Office [CBO], 2025; Damodaran, 2024). On May 16, 2025, Moody's downgraded the U.S. sovereign credit rating from Aaa to Aa1, citing escalating national debt, widening fiscal deficits, and rising interest costs. Moody's projects the federal deficit reaching 9% of GDP and national debt rising to 134% of GDP by 2035, with interest payments consuming 30% of government revenue by that time (Moody's Investors Service, 2025).

The rise in U.S. credit default swap (CDS) spreads, from under 10 basis points pre-2020 to over 50 basis points in mid-2025, mirrors investor unease, marking a break from the post-2008 norm when U.S. sovereign default was viewed as virtually impossible (Bloomberg, 2025). This reflects not only debt levels but also broader uncertainties around trade policy, geopolitical leadership, and the integrity of democratic institutions.

Global Country Risk Premium Comparison (2024–2025 Estimates)

Country	**CRP (%)**	**Credit Rating**	**Commentary**
United States	0.5 – 1.0	AA+ (S&P)	Fiscal tensions and increased political risk

Country	CRP (%)	Credit Rating	Commentary
Germany	0.3 – 0.5	AAA	Strong institutions, low debt, eurozone anchor
Japan	0.5	A+	Stable but burdened by aging demographics and public debt >260% GDP
Brazil	3.5 – 4.5	BB-	High inflation, corruption issues, fiscal fragility
Türkiye	6.5 – 7.5	B	Currency volatility, policy unpredictability
Venezuela	>15	CCC/D	Default status, hyperinflation, international isolation
Nigeria	6.0 – 8.0	B-	Security concerns, capital controls, low FX reserves
Russia	>12	Sanctioned	Severe Western sanctions and financial isolation

(Source: Damodaran, 2024; Fitch Ratings, 2024; Kroll, 2024)

As this table shows, CRPs are a barometer for broader systemic risks, from inflation and default risk to governance quality. While emerging markets naturally demand higher premiums, the creeping CRP in developed economies like the U.S. and Japan signals a deterioration in previously unquestioned economic assumptions.

Country risk premiums are no longer the sole domain of emerging markets. As global investors reprice risk based on macroeconomic stress, political polarization, and institutional resilience, even historically stable markets like the U.S. are under scrutiny. This dynamic shift challenges the assumption of a “risk-free” anchor and requires a recalibration of models, expectations, and investment strategies.

Evolving Practices in Asset Management

The asset management industry is undergoing a profound transformation in response to geopolitical volatility, macroeconomic instability, and changing investor priorities. In an era where traditional 60/40 portfolios have come under pressure, particularly during simultaneous declines in both equities and bonds, as witnessed in 2022 and again in early 2025, major institutions are recalibrating their approaches to risk, diversification, and portfolio construction.

BlackRock: Integrating Geopolitical Risk and Dynamic Allocation

BlackRock, the world's largest asset manager with over $10 trillion in AUM as of 2024 (BlackRock, 2024), has taken a proactive stance in adapting to real-time global risks. The firm now incorporates geopolitical scenario analysis and satellite-based surveillance tools into its risk frameworks, helping anticipate shocks such as trade disruptions or regional conflicts (BlackRock Investment Institute, 2023). In response to Russia's 2022 invasion of Ukraine and the 2023 Middle East tensions, BlackRock adjusted its sovereign exposure and sector allocations within days, demonstrating a shift from static models to dynamic, adaptive allocation systems. The firm's Aladdin platform, used by over 240 institutional clients globally, now integrates geopolitical risk signals into asset-level risk attribution and stress testing (BlackRock, 2023).

Vanguard: Reinforcing Global Diversification and Systematic Allocation

Vanguard, managing over $8.6 trillion in assets (Vanguard, 2024), has maintained its long-term philosophy but introduced more granular enhancements to global diversification and systematic factor-based investing. After the sharp equity and bond market drawdowns of 2022, when the traditional 60/40 U.S. portfolio suffered a real return loss of -17.3%, its worst performance since 1937 (Morningstar, 2023), Vanguard began emphasizing global factor tilts, including quality, value, and low volatility factors across regions. The firm also expanded its use of risk parity and glidepath diversification in target-date funds, aiming to buffer future tail risks stemming from inflation, war, or fiscal policy shocks (Vanguard Research, 2024).

Brookfield and Oaktree: Pivot Toward Alternative Credit

Brookfield Asset Management and its subsidiary Oaktree Capital, known for credit and real assets, have strategically shifted their focus toward alternative credit strategies. With over $900 billion in combined AUM (Brookfield, 2024), the firms are capitalizing on a period marked by elevated equity risk premiums and tightening credit conditions. As the U.S. Federal Reserve held rates above 5% from 2023 into 2025, and traditional credit spreads widened amid increased default risks, Oaktree's distressed debt and private credit funds delivered double-digit net returns in 2023 and 2024 (Oaktree Capital, 2024).

Brookfield has also leaned into infrastructure and transition finance, raising a $15 billion energy transition fund in 2023 that invests in renewable projects with long-dated, inflation-linked cash flows (Brookfield Asset Management, 2024). These asset classes have proven resilient amid stagflation concerns and serve as a hedge against monetary policy volatility and geopolitical disruptions.

Institutional asset managers are no longer relying solely on backward-looking models or historical norms. Instead, they are deploying real-time risk analytics, alternative strategies, and globally diversified portfolios to stay ahead in an increasingly fragmented and uncertain financial landscape. The common thread is an evolution from static allocation to responsive, multi-asset frameworks that acknowledge and adapt to a world of rapid change and systemic risk.

What Asset Managers Should Do Now

In a climate of heightened geopolitical uncertainty, rising fiscal instability, and market volatility, asset managers must go beyond traditional models and embrace a multi-dimensional, adaptive approach to portfolio construction, risk management, and communication. Recent crises, ranging from the COVID-19 pandemic to the 2022 inflation shock and the 2025 trade disruptions, demonstrate how fast-changing global events can undermine static strategies and expose unprepared portfolios.

1. Portfolio Construction: Factor in Cross-Border Risk, Strengthen Correlation Analysis, and Use Dynamic Hedging Strategies

Asset allocation must now incorporate cross-border geopolitical risk, trade realignment, and macroeconomic divergence. For instance, the correlation between U.S. equities and international markets has weakened post-2022, with S&P 500 correlation with MSCI Emerging Markets falling from 0.89 in 2021 to 0.62 in 2024, reflecting fragmented global recovery paths (MSCI, 2024). Similarly, country-specific shocks, such as the imposition of new tariffs in 2025, have broken down traditional hedging models.

Asset managers should employ dynamic hedging tools, such as currency overlays and interest rate swaps, to manage exposure in real time. In 2023, 73% of large institutional investors reported incorporating tactical hedging strategies to combat currency and commodity volatility (State Street Global Advisors, 2024). Moreover, multi-factor models must be recalibrated to account for non-economic triggers, including political elections, supply chain realignments, and conflict escalation.

2. Risk Management: ***Stress-Test Portfolios, Add Political Risk Metrics, and Bolster Liquidity Management***

Stress testing needs to evolve beyond traditional recessionary or inflation scenarios. During the COVID-19 market collapse of March 2020, global equities lost $16 trillion in market value in just three weeks (Bloomberg, 2020), but the recovery was uneven, favoring tech-heavy and U.S.-centric portfolios. Similarly, the 2022 energy crisis and the 2025 tariff wave proved that political risk is now financial risk.

Leading firms like Bridgewater and BlackRock have incorporated Country Risk Premiums (CRPs) and political stability indices into their scenario frameworks, using sources such as the World Bank's Worldwide Governance Indicators and CDS spreads. Enhanced liquidity management is also critical. In March 2023, the failure of Silicon Valley Bank and the temporary liquidity squeeze in the repo market reminded managers how quickly funding risk can materialize, even in developed markets (Federal Reserve Board, 2023).

3. Communication: Keep Stakeholders Informed, Maintain Transparency, and Clarify Risk Attribution

Investor confidence hinges not just on returns, but on clarity and transparency. The 2008 Global Financial Crisis demonstrated the damage that opacity can inflict. Lehman Brothers' failure and the subsequent market panic were intensified by poor communication of balance sheet risks, which ultimately led to a $10 trillion loss in global equity value (IMF, 2009).

Modern stakeholders, especially institutional clients, pension boards, and regulators, demand real-time updates on risk exposure, performance attribution, and strategic adjustments. A 2024 survey by Deloitte found that 84% of institutional investors prioritize timely and granular reporting, with many incorporating ESG and political risks into performance reviews (Deloitte, 2024). Communicating how risk translates into portfolio outcomes can strengthen trust and preserve capital commitments during turbulent periods.

The old playbook no longer suffices. Asset managers today must adapt to a landscape where geopolitical instability, macroeconomic divergence, and fiscal unpredictability are central features, not exceptions. A proactive stance, blending advanced analytics, forward-looking risk models, and transparent client engagement, is essential not just for outperformance, but for survival.

Final Thoughts

The evolving U.S. risk premium is not a temporary anomaly; it signals a paradigm shift in the global investment landscape. For decades, the United States served as the world's benchmark for risk-free assets, policy stability, and reserve currency strength. This foundation underpinned asset allocation strategies, sovereign debt pricing, and multinational capital flows. However, today's environment, characterized by fiscal strain, political polarization, and trade realignment, demands a new framework for risk assessment and asset management.

Historically, U.S. Treasuries and the U.S. dollar provided the ballast for global portfolios, particularly during crises. During the 2008 Global Financial Crisis, investors flooded into U.S. bonds, pushing the 10-year yield from 4.7% in mid-2007 to 2.1% by December 2008, reflecting the flight-to-safety premium (Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, 2023). Likewise, in early 2020 during the COVID-19 pandemic's market panic, the DXY Dollar Index rose by 8% in just 30 days, as global institutions rushed to the dollar for stability (Bloomberg, 2020).

But the backdrop is changing. As of 2025, the U.S. debt-to-GDP ratio stands at 123%, the highest peacetime level in U.S. history, and annual interest payments on the national debt are nearing $900 billion, more than the total non-defense discretionary budget (U.S. Treasury, 2025). Furthermore, credit default swap (CDS) spreads for U.S. government debt rose by 42% between January and April 2025, signaling rising concern among investors over fiscal and political risks (S&P Global, 2025).

Simultaneously, global diversification is becoming more urgent and more difficult. As China, the EU, and emerging markets develop deeper capital markets, the once-unquestioned dominance of U.S. financial instruments is eroding. In 2024, the share of global reserves held in U.S. dollars fell to 58.4%, down from 71% in 1999, a sign of accelerating de-dollarization trends (IMF, 2024).

Asset managers must therefore recalibrate their frameworks. The U.S. equity risk premium, long anchored near 4–5%, is now adjusting upward amid growing macro uncertainty (Kroll, 2024). Meanwhile, country risk premiums (CRPs) that once applied mainly to emerging markets are now being applied to the United States itself, with estimates ranging between 0.5% and 1.0%, depending on the model and time horizon (Damodaran, 2024).

This is not business as usual. The rules of the game are evolving, and firms that cling to outdated models risk significant underperformance. Staying competitive will require integrating real-time geopolitical risk indicators, enhancing stress testing methodologies, and adopting globally agile, multi-asset strategies that reflect this new financial order.

In short, we are witnessing the slow-motion re-pricing of what was once considered immovable: the United States as the financial anchor of the world. Smart asset managers will not resist this shift; they will lead through it.

References

Apple Inc. (2025). *Q2 2025 earnings guidance*. https://investor.apple.com

Apple CEO Tim Cook says tariffs to add $900M in costs in Q3. (2025, May 1). *TechCrunch*. https://techcrunch.com/2025/05/01/apple-ceo-tim-cook-says-tariffs-to-add-900m-in-costs-in-q3/

Asian Development Bank. (2024). *ASEAN digital financial integration report*. https://www.adb.org

Autoweek. (2025, May 6). *Tariff battle with China already impacting supply chain for Ford*. https://www.autoweek.com/news/a64690636/tariffs-impacting-ford-supply-chain/

Barron's. (2025, May 7). *Sirens are sounding about the market. The U.S. has a lot to lose*. https://www.barrons.com/articles/dollar-stocks-bonds-market-tariffs-0e486e18

Bernanke, B. S. (2014). *The Federal Reserve and the financial crisis*. Princeton University Press.

BlackRock. (2024). *Annual report*. https://www.blackrock.com

BlackRock Investment Institute. (2023). *Geopolitical risk dashboard*. https://www.blackrock.com/institutions/en-us/insights/geopolitical-risk

Bloomberg. (2020). *Dollar index surges amid COVID-19 panic*. https://www.bloomberg.com

Bloomberg. (2020). *Global markets lost $16 trillion in value in March 2020*. https://www.bloomberg.com

Bloomberg. (2025). *Dollar index hits multi-year low as confidence wanes*. https://www.bloomberg.com

Bloomberg. (2025). *U.S. CDS spreads widen amid fiscal tensions*. https://www.bloomberg.com

Bloomberg. (2025). *U.S. dollar index plunges to four-year low amid trade and fiscal fears*. https://www.bloomberg.com

Bloomberg. (2025). *U.S. Treasury yields climb amid fiscal concerns*. https://www.bloomberg.com

Bloomberg. (2025, April 15). *China orders Boeing jet delivery halt as trade war expands*. https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2025-04-15/china-tells-airlines-stop-taking-boeing-jets-as-trump-tariffs-expand-trade-war

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. (2021, March 15). *Federal Reserve issues FOMC statement*. https://www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/pressreleases/monetary20200315a.htm

Brookfield Asset Management. (2024). *Brookfield infrastructure & transition fund update*. https://www.brookfield.com

Brookfield Oaktree Wealth Solutions. (2024). *Credit has outshined equities amid unfavorable risk premium*.

CNBC. (2025). *Apple shifts production to Vietnam and India amid new U.S. tariffs*. https://www.cnbc.com

Congressional Budget Office. (2013). *The budget and economic outlook: Fiscal years 2013 to 2023*. https://www.cbo.gov/publication/43907

Congressional Budget Office. (2024). *The budget and economic outlook: 2024 to 2034*. https://www.cbo.gov/publication/59930

Congressional Budget Office. (2024). *The federal budget in fiscal year 2024: An infographic*. https://www.cbo.gov/publication/61181

Congressional Budget Office. (2025). *Updated budget projections: 2025 to 2035*. https://www.cbo.gov/publication/58946

Damodaran, A. (2024). *Country risk data 2024*. https://pages.stern.nyu.edu/~adamodar/pdfiles/blog/CountryRisk2024.pdf

Damodaran, A. (2024). *Equity risk premiums (ERP): Determinants, estimation, and implications – 2024 edition*. NYU Stern. http://pages.stern.nyu.edu/~adamodar/

Deloitte. (2024). *Global investment management outlook 2024*. https://www2.deloitte.com

Dimson, E., Marsh, P., & Staunton, M. (2021). *Credit Suisse global investment returns yearbook 2021*. Credit Suisse Research Institute.

Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. (2023). *10-year Treasury constant maturity rate [GS10]*. https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/GS10

Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. (2023). *Debt to GDP ratio, historical series*. https://fred.stlouisfed.org

Federal Reserve Board. (2023). *Review of bank failures and liquidity risks in 2023*. https://www.federalreserve.gov

Federal Reserve History. (2021). *Stagflation and the 1970s*. https://www.federalreservehistory.org

Financial Times. (2025). *Taiwan dollar surges amid global market unease*. https://www.ft.com

Fiscal Data. (2024). *U.S. national debt*. https://fiscaldata.treasury.gov/americas-finance-guide/national-debt/

Fitch Ratings. (2024). *Global sovereign rating summary*. https://www.fitchratings.com

GAO. (2024). *America's fiscal future*. https://www.gao.gov/americas-fiscal-future

International Monetary Fund. (2009). *World economic outlook: Crisis and recovery*. https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO

International Monetary Fund. (2023). *Currency composition of official foreign exchange reserves (COFER)*. https://data.imf.org

International Monetary Fund. (2023). *World economic outlook: A rocky recovery*. https://www.imf.org

International Monetary Fund. (2024). *Currency composition of official foreign exchange reserves (COFER)*. https://data.imf.org/

Irwin, D. A. (2011). *Peddling protectionism: Smoot-Hawley and the Great Depression*. Princeton University Press.

Kroll. (2024). *U.S. equity risk premium and risk-free rate report*. https://www.kroll.com

MarketWatch. (2025, May 7). *A currency-market 'avalanche' is heading for the U.S. dollar, and the tremors started this week*. https://www.marketwatch.com/story/a-currency-market-avalanche-is-heading-for-the-u-s-dollar-and-the-tremors-started-this-week-93c8d7ec

Moody's Analytics. (2024). *Economic consequences of debt ceiling brinkmanship*. https://www.economy.com

Moody's Investors Service. (2023). *Moody's changes outlook on United States to negative from stable; affirms Aaa rating*. https://www.moodys.com/

Moody's Investors Service. (2025, May 16). *Moody's downgrades United States credit rating on increase in government debt*. https://www.reuters.com/markets/us/moodys-downgrades-us-aa1-rating-2025-05-16/

Morningstar. (2023). *60/40 portfolio suffers worst year since Great Depression*. https://www.morningstar.com

MSCI. (2024). *Global market correlations and regional risk*. https://www.msci.com

National Association for Business Economics. (2024). *Outlook survey: Trade policy risks dominate business sentiment*. https://www.nabe.com

Oaktree Capital. (2024). *Q4 2024 market commentary*. https://www.oaktreecapital.com

Office of Management and Budget. (2024). *Fiscal year 2024 budget of the U.S. government*. https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb

Peterson Institute for International Economics. (2025). *Macroeconomic effects of April 2025 tariffs*. https://www.piie.com

Reuters. (2020, October 21). *Ford says tariffs cost company $1 billion in profit*. https://www.reuters.com

Reuters. (2025). *Taiwan dollar surges to three-year high*.

Rogoff, K. (2023). *The decline of dollar dominance: What comes next?* Harvard University Press.

S&P Global. (2023). *U.S. sovereign rating affirmed at 'AA+' on expected fiscal policy continuity; outlook stable*. https://www.spglobal.com/ratings/en/

S&P Global. (2025). *U.S. sovereign CDS pricing data – Q1 2025*. https://www.spglobal.com

South China Morning Post. (2025). *Taiwan's currency and the U.S. dollar*.

Standard & Poor's. (2023). *U.S. credit rating downgraded to AA+*. https://www.standardandpoors.com

State Street Global Advisors. (2024). *Institutional investor survey: Hedging strategies in volatile markets*. https://www.ssga.com

SWIFT. (2024). *RMB tracker monthly*. https://www.swift.com

The Conference Board. (2025, May). *CEO confidence survey: Q2 2025 results*. https://conference-board.org/data/ceoconfidence.cfm

U.S. Department of the Treasury. (2021). *Monthly treasury statement of receipts and outlays of the United States government*. https://fiscaldata.treasury.gov

U.S. Department of the Treasury. (2025). *Monthly statement of the public debt of the United States*. https://fiscaldata.treasury.gov

U.S. International Trade Commission. (2020). *The economic effects of U.S. trade disputes*. https://www.usitc.gov

U.S. Treasury. (2024). *Financial report of the United States government*. https://www.fiscal.treasury.gov/files/reports-statements/financial-report/2024/management-discussion-analysis-2024.pdf

Vanguard. (2024). *Long-term investment strategies amidst market volatility*. https://www.vanguard.com

Vanguard Research. (2024). *Global factor investing and risk management*. https://research.vanguard.com

Wall Street Journal. (2025). *The Taiwan dollar's rally and Asia's de-dollarization trend*.

World Bank. (2023). *Worldwide governance indicators*. https://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/

World Trade Organization. (2025). *Annual trade report: Strategic realignments in global trade*. https://www.wto.org