



Two Views on the New Year from Across the Pond

JOHN MAULDIN | January 6, 2017

In today's *Outside the Box* we'll continue with our traditional New Year's forecasting theme, but we'll look to a couple of European voices – or I guess, especially considering the Brexit vote, I should just call them English voices.

Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, writing in the London *Telegraph*, see a rather less optimistic 2017 than the one I'm hoping for, but we have to acknowledge that he may be correct. His title pretty much says it all: "Trump, interest rates and Chinese panic: Why euphoria could turn to a credit crunch in 2017"; and his view back across the pond at us has him seriously squinting:

Donald Trump's reflation rally will short-circuit. Rising borrowing costs will blow fuses across the world before fiscal stimulus arrives, if it in fact arrives.


By the end of 2017 it will be clear that nothing has changed for the better. Powerful deflationary forces retain an invisible grip over the global economy. Bond yields will ratchet up further and then come clattering down again – ultimately driving 10-year US yields below zero before the decade is over.

There are few 'shovel ready' projects for Trump's infrastructure blitz. The headline figures are imaginary. His plan will be whittled down by Congress.

And he goes on. Without attempting to issue any sort of a corrective to his pessimism about our chances this year – we are, after all trying hard to stay outside the box in this letter – I'll just move on to introduce you (and to re-introduce most of you) to our second... Continental voice, my good friend Niels Jensen of Absolute Return Partners in London. (Note: Niels was born in Denmark but has been in London in the money business for 25 years and is one of the most astute observers of markets that I know.)

Niels isn't particularly sanguine about 2017, either – you'd have to be a pretty foolish investor to be *comfortable* with the coming year – but he does lead off with what he variously terms "a flicker of good news," "a glimmer of hope," and "a twinkle of optimism." Take your pick. What it amounts to is that it appears the post-Great Recession collapse of "discorrelation" among risk assets that has so plagued us all is finally appearing to reverse! He points as evidence to a precipitous fall over the past six months in the correlation between the S&P Index and S&P sectors. Here, let me pluck a chart out of his piece and show you:

Chart 2: Average correlation of weekly returns between S&P 500 and S&P sectors



Source: *The Daily Shot*, BNP Paribas, December 2016

Nice, huh? And now back to the future bad news. You'll find quite a bit of overlap between Ambrose's and Niels's worries for 2017, but also some intriguing differences. So now, let me get out of their way and let them give the New Year their best shot. And I remain convinced that, however things develop in our political and economic spheres, we can all achieve some personal bests in 2017.

You have a great week, and in a few days I'll send my own 2017 forecast.

Your hopeful but watchful analyst,

John Mauldin, Editor
Outside the Box

Trump, Interest Rates and Chinese Panic: Why Euphoria Could Turn to a Credit Crunch in 2017

By Ambrose Evans-Pritchard

[Originally published](#) in the *London Telegraph*, Jan. 2, 2017



The Trump effect is to accelerate capital outflows from China, increasing the risk of a painful reckoning this year.

Donald Trump's reflation rally will short-circuit. Rising borrowing costs will blow fuses across the world before fiscal stimulus arrives, if it in fact arrives.


By the end of 2017 it will be clear that nothing has changed for the better. Powerful deflationary forces retain an invisible grip over the global economy. Bond yields will ratchet up further and then come clattering down again – ultimately driving 10-year US yields below zero before the decade is over.

There are few 'shovel ready' projects for Trump's infrastructure blitz. The headline figures are imaginary. His plan will be whittled down by Congress.

The House will pass tax cuts for the rich but these are regressive, with a low fiscal multiplier. The choice of an anti-deficit Ayatollah to head the budget office implies swingeing cuts to federal spending. These will hit the poor, with a high multiplier.

This Gatsby mix is mostly self-defeating in economic terms. To the extent that there is any extra juice, it will be countered by the Fed at this late stage of the cycle. Tight money will push the dollar higher.

Once markets accept that Trump is not bluffing – that he really does intend to smash globalism – euphoria will give way to alarm. For now Wall Street remains drunk on wishful thinking. The longer the delusion lasts, the stronger the dollar, and the greater the trouble in Asia and Latin America.



The broad dollar index threatens to reach all time-highs in 2017, hammering vulnerable regions of the world. Credit: St Louis Federal Reserve

Such is the currency paradox. As the Fed's broad dollar index pushes towards an all-time high of 130, the mechanical effects will expose the Achilles Heel of an international system that has never been more dollarized – and never been more sensitive to US interest rates since the end of the Bretton Woods era.

King dollar will tighten the noose on emerging market debtors with \$3.5 trillion of liabilities in US currency. It will force banks in Europe – through complex hedging contracts – to curtail offshore lending to the Pacific Rim, Turkey, Russia, Brazil, and South Africa. It will lead to a credit crunch in the developing world.

China moves to a different rhythm but it cannot hide from higher US rates. The imported squeeze will come just as the latest 18-month boomlet rolls over, a form of pro-cyclical tightening on a Chinese economy that has already reached credit exhaustion.

It is whispered – and always denied – that the US agreed last February in Shanghai to delay rate rises, buying time for the People's Bank to calm the yuan panic. The Fed retreat worked like a charm. Markets did indeed stop worrying about China. Global bourses rebounded.

Next time – and it is coming soon – there will be no such accord. The Trumpians want China to blow up, thinking they can handle the blow-back. They can't.

Draconian controls by the People's Bank will not be enough to stem capital flight. Nor will reserve losses blowing past \$100bn a month in January. The nuclear risk through 2017 is that Beijing's 'weak yuan' mandarins will prevail. If they let the exchange rate go completely, the Asian currency storm that must inevitably follow will unleash a deflationary tsunami through the world. I think China will hold the line, but don't bet on it.

China's slowdown will kill the commodity rally stone dead. Saudi Arabia and Russia will find that output cuts agreed in Vienna are not enough to clear the oil glut this year, pushing off the desperately-awaited rebalancing into the distant future. Neither country can handle the implications of this. Riyadh will buckle before Moscow.

My New Year's piece last year spoke of sunlit uplands: "The economic sweet spot of 2016 before the reflation storm." I hoped the treacherous moment could be deferred until 2017. Unfortunately we are now almost there.

The tailwinds of global recovery are fading whatever equities purport to tell us. JP Morgan's 'Nowcast' measure of world growth has been slipping quietly for the last six weeks and is now down to an anemic 2.6pc, even before the China's credit curbs kick in and the Asian slowdown becomes obvious.

We have already enjoyed the \$2 trillion consumer windfall of cheaper oil. Europe has already enjoyed austerity relief. The European Central Bank has already played its cards. On a flow basis the ECB will soon be tapering, and therefore tightening.

Yields on Italian debt will climb well above the growth rate of nominal GDP – the fatal threshold – as markets anticipate the loss of the ECB shield. This means attrition on €400bn of sovereign paper held by banks, eroding capital buffers. Rome's €20bn fund for bank rescues will run dry within months, and the political costs of a second bail-out will be much higher.

It will become clear again that Euroland has resolved nothing. The fatal pathologies – lack of fiscal union, lack of a banking union beyond the name, the one-side adjustment imposed on the South, Germany's unpunished current account surplus – have merely been veiled by QE and the Draghi Put.

None of the elections in Holland, France, or Italy will bring an anti-euro government to power, but they will come close enough to rattle nerves and drive the euro below dollar parity.

The parliamentary balance of power will shift, greatly weakening the ideological lockhold of the Maastricht elites and free movement purists. Alternative fur Deutschland will make it into the Bundestag. The centre-Right will harden everywhere to stop leakage to the populist fronts.

Brexit Britain will no longer stick out in quite the same way. It may even start to look like a liberal haven set against Europe's unanswered rage, and this will change the narrative. The threads will become confused, the pieties of Remain less certain, the Scottish temptation a little less alluring.

The UK economy will not perform any better than the eurozone in 2017, but it will not do any worse either, and those who talk of 'punishing' Britain in EU capitals will discover the asymmetry of political risk. The British can perhaps fall back on the Dunkirk spirit. Brussels can fall back on nothing.

The next global downturn will come before the G4 central banks have been able to replenish their ammunition, while the bar on New Deals or budgetary largesse is dauntingly high. World debt ratios are already 35 percentage points of GDP higher today than they were at the top of the last cycle in 2008. Emerging markets cannot come to the rescue as they did after the Lehman crash. They too are now mortgaged, and psychologically battered.

As politics fray, those nation states with an organic cultural unity and strong allegiance to sovereign institutions will fare best. Utopian constructions and brittle dictatorships have less margin.

Will we make it through 2017 before the reckoning hits? Probably, by the skin of our teeth.

Happy New Year.

Hiccup of the Year?

By Niels Jensen, January 3, 2017

[Originally published here](#)

“What the New Year brings to you will depend a great deal on what you bring to the New Year.”

– Vern McLellan

The most outrageous predictions of 2017

Saxo Bank of Denmark (a bank I hold no grudges against, so don't assume I am on a mission here) have in recent years been high on entertainment value when publishing their now (in)famous list of *Outrageous Predictions* for the year to come, some of which are highly controversial. The 2017 list, which you can find [here](#), contains the usual mix of more plausible predictions combined with some truly outrageous ones. Amongst their 2017 predictions, I find the following particularly thought-provoking:

1. The high yield default rate exceeds 25%.
2. Brexit never happens as the UK Remains.
3. Italian banks are the best performing equity asset.

I am *not* into making outrageous predictions myself but, if I were, and given the fact that I have a rather wicked sense of humour, my outrageous prediction # 1 for 2017 would probably be for either David Cameron or Hilary Clinton to participate in the 2017 edition of BBC's flagship entertainment show *Strictly Come Dancing*. As Ed Balls just learned, that particular show provides an excellent platform to resurrect a fading political career (he probably got more votes for his dancing skills than he did in the last parliamentary elections, but that is an altogether different story). Having said that, only last month did I promise not to make fun of politicians anymore, so let's drop the ball right there.

Even if 2017 is not likely to be particularly high on entertainment value, it could certainly be high on drama, which makes this Absolute Return Letter particularly challenging. As you may recall from previous years, the January letter is always about the mine field laid out in front of us. What could cause 2017 to be a year to remember? What could possibly go horribly wrong? At this point in time, I see many potential problems. I have some concerns about the US. I see dark clouds gathering over Europe, and I see very slippery conditions in many emerging markets ('EM'). In other words, lots of markets around the world appear to be accident prone but for very different reasons, which I shall get back to in a moment.


A flicker of good news

However, before I go there, let me share with you a glimmer of hope; a twinkle of optimism that you don't find too often in the Absolute Return Letter. Not that I am a born pessimist – actually far from it. I just learned many moons ago that, when it comes to investing, good news is the last thing you should spend your energy and resources on. The secret to being a good investor is to focus on risk management and to be well prepared for bad news.

Long term readers of the Absolute Return Letter will know that I have always been of the opinion that we have never properly exited the global financial crisis (the 'GFC') of 2007-08. One of the conditions I have used to make my point is the high correlation between risk assets, and how life as an investment manager has become complicated as a result of that.

Prior to the GFC, you could fairly safely assume that diversification across a number of risk assets would dramatically reduce the overall volatility risk, but not anymore. The GFC changed how risk assets correlate with each other (chart 1), and when the correlation between risk assets approaches one, diversification does little to reduce the overall volatility risk.

Chart 1: Correlation among major asset classes pre- & post-GFC



Source: Business Insider, IMF, April 2015

Now the good news – it looks as if the correlation between risk assets – or at least between different types of equity risk – is finally coming down (chart 2). As you can see, the correlation between the S&P 500 and the average equity sector has fallen quite dramatically over the last six months. This is not the only dynamic that needs to change for me to become more optimistic, but it is an important one. Expect me to dig deeper on this topic at some point in 2017.

Chart 2: Average correlation of weekly returns between S&P 500 and S&P sectors



Source: *The Daily Shot*, BNP Paribas, December 2016

Growing nationalism

As we enter 2017, what should we worry most about? One factor appears to be standing out head and shoulders above everything else, and that is what is usually classified as growing nationalism. It forced the UK out of the EU, and it got Trump elected in the US, but I am not even convinced that the true driver is just growing nationalism.

As you may recall, national income is ultimately shared between capital and labour, and I think capital has belittled labour for too long by taking an ever larger share of national income. Frustrated by the stagnation in living standards, the man on the street wants *something* to change. The decision to vote for Brexit (or Trump) was a plea for change, as much as it was a sign of growing nationalism. When your own living standards are under pressure, the last thing you want is an army of immigrants to come in and put you under even more pressure.

Stagnating economic growth and low – or even negative – real wage growth has created a deep level of dissatisfaction that the electorate chose to use politically, and the Brexiters (and Trump) took advantage in spades.

For the first time in 150 years, the average Brit is now facing falling real wages (chart 3). That the low or negative growth in wages is driven by entirely different factors and have nothing whatsoever to do with Brussels is being conveniently ignored.

Chart 3: UK real wage growth



Source: Bloomberg, Bank of England, The Daily Shot, December 2016

Note: The chart shows 10-year moving average of real wages based on weekly pay and the CPI. Data from 2016 onwards is based on BoE projections.

Meanwhile, the political leadership in the UK is facing a very tricky year, with the real opposition to the ruling Conservative Party coming not from the Labour Party but from inside its own ranks. The Brexiters want Theresa May to act *now*, even if all logic would suggest that the country may be better off counting to 10 before any moves are made.

As 2017 progresses, we face important elections in the Netherlands, Germany and France. The Dutch will kick it all off on the 15th March with the extreme right-wing leader of the Freedom Party, Geert Wilders, currently in pole position. On the 23rd April, the French will be asked to choose their next president. If no outright winner is found in the first round, a run-off between the top two will be held on the 7th May. German general elections will follow in the autumn. The date hasn't been set yet, but German law prescribes the 2017 elections to take place in either September or October.

Radical forces in all three countries are on the roll and, given what happened in the UK and the US last year, and what happened in Berlin just before Christmas, nothing should be taken for granted.

As far as nationalism is concerned, we are also about to learn whether Trump walks like he talks, and we are saddled with a certain Mr. Putin in Russia, who clearly knows how to take advantage of rising nationalistic sentiment. All in all, 2017 could shape up to be a most interesting year.

The (over)valuation of US equities

That said, growing nationalism and the implications of negative real wage growth are by no means the only things we should worry about as we enter 2017. In the US, equities are *very* expensive irrespective of how they are valued (charts 4 a-b). Investors have ignored fundamentals in recent years and instead focused on the liquidity provided by the Fed through QE and other means of monetary policy.

Chart 4a: S&P 500 price/EBITDA (trailing)



Chart 4b: S&P 500 price/sales (trailing)



Source: Bloomberg, *The Daily Shot*, December 2016

This has created equity valuations in the US that almost certainly will come back and bite investors in the derriere at some point. The only question is whether it is going to happen this year or ...?

Take chart 4a (price/EBITDA). When acquisitions are made, most companies are acquired at valuations well below 10x EBITDA. If the average company in the S&P 500 now trades at 11x EBITDA, interesting M&A deals are likely to be few and far between. Companies on the acquisition trail simply cannot justify to pay 12x, 13x or even 14x EBITDA for their acquisition target, removing an important pillar for higher equity prices.

Chart 4a also confirms a point I have made in previous Absolute Return Letters, i.e. that US equities are *very* expensive on a cash earnings (EBITDA) basis. Many US companies ‘mislead’ investors by reporting solid EPS numbers (by buying back their own shares), but chart 4a tells a very different story.

Europe’s colourful menu of challenges

Let’s return to Europe for a minute or two, as there is an entire menu of potential problems to choose from. The constitutional crisis in the EU could worsen dramatically if either the Netherlands, France or Germany were to choose the ‘wrong’ leader later this year. Putin, who is clearly on a roll at present, could quite possibly upset the cards even further – in particular if the new leadership is relatively inexperienced.

In Italy, the banking crisis is an accident waiting to happen. Most Italian banks are seriously undercapitalised and will need many billions of euros of new equity capital. However, under European law, equity investors must take the first hit before the government steps in, but how that will all unfold in Italy, only time can tell.

Given the size of the Italian economy compared to the Greek one, you shouldn’t be overly surprised if the Italian banking crisis were to create bigger problems for the Eurozone than Greece ever did. My alter ego (the more sinister side) would even assign a meaningful probability to the entire euro currency system collapsing, with the member countries forced to re-introduce their original currencies. This would require for the Italian banking crisis to escalate further, and for either the Netherlands, France or Germany to exit the Eurozone. It is certainly not my core scenario, but it is not as far-fetched as some investors believe it is.

Brexit could also cause considerable damage to the European economy in 2017. Cocky British newspaper editors have left people with the impression that Brexit means nothing; it was all a storm in a teacup, they say, conveniently ignoring the fact that the ramifications of Brexit are yet to be felt. A hard Brexit will certainly be bad for the British economy, but little will change until people begin to lose their jobs.

That said, a hard Brexit is likely to be even worse for the rest of the EU than it will be for the UK (as the EU is a net exporter of goods and services to the UK). I am not entirely convinced, though, that the full impact will be felt in 2017. These negotiations could take a *long* time – certainly longer than the couple of years that appears to be the consensus.

Rising leverage across emerging markets

My next worry is the rising indebtedness across emerging markets combined with weak EM currencies. Overall debt levels, in developed market (‘DM’) countries as well as in EM countries, are much higher today than they were when the GFC nearly took us all down in 2007-08 (chart 5). Although I am also worried about debt levels in DM countries, I think the risks associated with excessive debt are higher in EM countries than they are in DM countries, and that has to do with the implications of FX movements.

EM non-financial corporates have continued to accumulate debt as if there is no tomorrow (chart 6). As DM interest rates continued to fall, those corporates increasingly switched to borrowing in US dollars. Given the recent strength of the US dollar – in particular when measured against EM currencies – that decision has been a spectacular own goal. What appeared to be very cheap borrowing costs turned out to be anything but. USD 890 billion of EM bonds and syndicated loans (an all-time high) are coming due in 2017 with almost 30% of that denominated in US dollars.

Chart 5: Change in debt-to-GDP, 2007-14





Chart 6: Indebtedness in emerging markets by sector (% of GDP)



Source: Institute of International Finance, March 2016.

Weakening EM currencies vs. USD has been akin to a significant rise in interest rates for EM borrowers, and the possibility of a high profile accident or two should not be disregarded. I am not close enough to the EM corporate sector to tell you exactly how bad it is, but I am told it is pretty bad out there.

The high price of low interest rates

I have written extensively already about the consequences of very low interest rates for insurance companies, pension funds, local authorities, and therefore ultimately governments and shall not repeat myself. Suffice to say that, should rates stay this low, it is only a question of time before somebody noteworthy blows up right in front of us.

So far, all these very exposed entities have been able to extend and pretend, but it won't last. As long-term readers of the Absolute Return Letter will know, I expect interest rates to stay low for a *very* long time to come – particularly in Europe. It is possible that US interest rates will go through a cyclical upswing over the next year or two, but the longer term (structural) trend is still down – unless our political leaders take drastic action (see what could be done in the December Absolute Return Letter [here](#)).

Consequently, somebody will almost certainly default. It is only a question of who and when. Obviously there are the explicit defaults, and there are the implicit ones. Increasing the retirement age meaningfully, and implementing a mandatory conversion from defined benefit plans to defined contribution plans with a built-in haircut would translate into an implicit default, but before the unions bark too loudly, they'd better realise what the alternative is.

Local authorities in the US are at the very front of the bankruptcy queue. Take the state of Illinois with over \$200 billion of pension liabilities, much of which is unfunded. I am not saying that the state of Illinois *will* go bankrupt. If I went through the books of every single US state, I am sure I could find a few that are in an even worse condition. That said, the 1% rise in municipal bond yields since July (chart 7) could turn out to be not the buying opportunity that many argue it is, but still a great shorting opportunity despite the recent rise in yields, should the situation be as bad as I suspect it is.

Chart 7: S&P Illinois municipal bond index yield



Source: The Daily Shot, December 2016


Other possible hiccups

I think I will stop here. I could list quite a few other candidates for hiccup of the year 2017, but those that I have mentioned above are the ones I believe are most likely to do meaningful damage in the year to come, should they unfold.

I haven't mentioned the fact that the current economic cycle is getting *very* long in the tooth. The last recession ended in early 2009 and the next one will undoubtedly commence not too long from now. Could it possibly happen in 2017? I don't know, and I don't think anybody else does either, despite the fact that about 1/2 million commentators claim they do.

GDP growth projections for 2017 follow an almost perfect normal distribution, suggesting to me that few economists have a very clear idea what sort of conditions 2017 is likely to bring (chart 8). If I were a betting man I would bet against a recession in 2017, though, as almost everyone does in chart 8. There seems to be a great deal of momentum in both the US and the EU economy at present, and I see nothing to change that in the short term.

Chart 8: Economist projections for 2017 US GDP growth



Source: *The Daily Shot, Financial Times, Bloomberg, January 2017*

However, the Fed could quite possibly ignite the next recession, should it be necessary to tighten more in 2017 than they have already indicated. Based solely on US domestic data, they should probably have tightened a great deal more than they actually did in 2016, but weak data elsewhere kept them sitting on their hands – most likely because they didn’t want the US dollar to appreciate too much. That could potentially force them to tighten more than they would like in 2017. An increasingly capacity-constrained US economy could lead to rising inflationary pressures, but that is more likely to be an issue for 2018 than for 2017, I suspect.

Neither have I mentioned China at all, but China could certainly blow up. After all, the credit bubble appears to be bigger in China than anywhere else. How that will all pan out I don’t know, but I have learned over the years that normal rules do not apply in China. Despite what the rulers want us all to believe, it is most definitely *not* a proper market economy; hence applying normal logic doesn’t work as far as China is concerned. Investing in China is about knowing the right people and little else. In our part of the world you would most likely go to jail if you applied that investment technique, but not in China – at least not so far.

Summing it all up

The combination of Brexit and Trump has generated significant momentum for nationalistic forces worldwide, and one would be foolish to conclude that the worst is over. I certainly expect *at least* one of the forthcoming elections in Europe to deliver an outcome that will create further problems for project EU, but don't assume that I am bearish on the euro for that reason.

Yes, low economic growth across the EU will almost certainly lead to further USD appreciation vs. EUR, but a complete collapse of the euro currency system – or at least a reconfiguration (the latter of which I think is the more likely outcome) – will not necessarily cause the euro to weaken. It will all depend on how the crisis is handled.

The timing of the forthcoming weakening of US equities (which I consider a given) will to a substantial degree depend on when the US economy goes into reverse and, as I said earlier, that is more likely to materialise in 2018, but it could certainly happen as early as 2017.

Some sort of emerging market crisis driven by a combination of high USD- denominated debt and weak EM currencies is my prime candidate for hiccup of the year, but it is not entirely clear what the implications will be for developed markets – sort of depends on where it happens and to what degree DM banks are implicated. Generally speaking, though, DM banks are only modestly involved in emerging markets these days; hence an EM crisis doesn't necessarily imply that we all get sucked in.

What to do in practice

You would be forgiven for thinking that, from an investment point-of-view, the not insignificant risks laid out in front of us makes it virtually impossible to construct a portfolio that is likely to generate an attractive return in 2017, but nothing could be further from the truth.

Firstly, remember what I said earlier. I usually focus on the negative aspects when investing; hence my writing also has a negative bias. That is not the same as saying that I am always bearish, and I am most definitely *not* particularly bearish going into 2017.

Secondly, given the risk factors mentioned above, I would emphasise alpha risk over beta risk at this (late) point in the economic cycle. There are indeed many ways that can be accomplished, and that is precisely what next month's Absolute Return Letter will be about. This month's letter is already too long, so all I will do for now is to wish you a very successful 2017.

Niels C. Jensen
3 January 2017

Copyright 2017 John Mauldin. All Rights Reserved.

Share Your Thoughts on This Article

Post a Comment

Like *Outside the Box*? Then we think you'll love John's premium product, *Over My Shoulder*. Each week John Mauldin sends his *Over My Shoulder* subscribers the most interesting items that he personally cherry picks from the dozens of books, reports, and articles he reads each week as part of his research. [Learn more about Over My Shoulder](#)

Outside the Box is a free weekly economic e-letter by best-selling author and renowned financial expert, John Mauldin. You can learn more and get your free subscription by visiting <http://www.mauldineconomics.com>.

Please write to subscribers@mauldineconomics.com to inform us of any reproductions, including when and where copy will be reproduced. You must keep the letter intact, from introduction to disclaimers. If you would like to quote brief portions only, please reference <http://www.mauldineconomics.com>.

To subscribe to John Mauldin's e-letter, please click here: <http://www.mauldineconomics.com/subscribe/>

To change your email address, please click here: <http://www.mauldineconomics.com/change-address>

If you would ALSO like changes applied to the Mauldin Circle e-letter, please include your old and new email address along with a note requesting the change for both e-letters and send your request to compliance@2000wave.com.

To unsubscribe, please refer to the bottom of the email.

Outside the Box and JohnMauldin.com is not an offering for any investment. It represents only the opinions of John Mauldin and those that he interviews. Any views expressed are provided for information purposes only and should not be construed in any way as an offer, an endorsement, or inducement to invest and is not in any way a testimony of, or associated with, Mauldin's other firms. John Mauldin is the Chairman of Mauldin Economics, LLC. He also is the President of Millennium Wave Advisors, LLC (MWA) which is an investment advisory firm registered with multiple states, President and registered representative of Millennium Wave Securities, LLC, (MWS) member FINRA, SIPC. MWS is also a Commodity Pool Operator (CPO) and a Commodity Trading Advisor (CTA) registered with the CFTC, as well as an Introducing Broker (IB) and NFA Member. Millennium Wave Investments is a dba of MWA LLC and MWS LLC. This message may contain information that is confidential or privileged and is intended only for the individual or entity named above and does not constitute an offer for or advice about any alternative investment product. Such advice can only be made when accompanied by a prospectus or similar offering document. Past performance is not indicative of future performance. Please make sure to review important disclosures at the end of each article. Mauldin companies may have a marketing relationship with products and services mentioned in this letter for a fee.

Note: Joining the Mauldin Circle is not an offering for any investment. It represents only the opinions of John Mauldin and Millennium Wave Investments. It is intended solely for investors who have registered with Millennium Wave Investments and its partners at www.MauldinCircle.com or directly related websites. The Mauldin Circle may send out material that is provided on a confidential basis, and subscribers to the Mauldin Circle are not to send this letter to anyone other than their professional investment counselors. Investors should discuss any investment with their personal investment counsel. John Mauldin is the President of Millennium Wave Advisors, LLC (MWA), which is an investment advisory firm registered with multiple states. John Mauldin is a registered representative of Millennium Wave Securities, LLC, (MWS), an FINRA registered broker-dealer. MWS is also a Commodity Pool Operator (CPO) and a Commodity Trading Advisor (CTA) registered with the CFTC, as well as an Introducing Broker (IB). Millennium Wave Investments is a dba of MWA LLC and MWS LLC. Millennium Wave Investments cooperates in the consulting on and marketing of private and non-private investment offerings with other independent firms such as Altegris Investments; Capital Management Group; Absolute Return Partners, LLP; Fynn Capital; Nicola Wealth Management; and Plexus Asset Management. Investment offerings recommended by Mauldin may pay a portion of their fees to these independent firms, who will share 1/3 of those fees with MWS and thus with Mauldin. Any views expressed herein are provided for information purposes only and should not be construed in any way as an offer, an endorsement, or inducement to invest with any CTA, fund, or program mentioned here or elsewhere. Before seeking any advisor's services or making an investment in a fund, investors must read and examine thoroughly the respective disclosure document or offering memorandum. Since these firms and Mauldin receive fees from the funds they recommend/market, they only recommend/market products with which they have been able to negotiate fee arrangements.

PAST RESULTS ARE NOT INDICATIVE OF FUTURE RESULTS. THERE IS RISK OF LOSS AS WELL AS THE OPPORTUNITY FOR GAIN WHEN INVESTING IN MANAGED FUNDS. WHEN CONSIDERING ALTERNATIVE INVESTMENTS, INCLUDING HEDGE FUNDS, YOU SHOULD CONSIDER VARIOUS RISKS INCLUDING THE FACT THAT SOME PRODUCTS: OFTEN ENGAGE IN LEVERAGING AND OTHER SPECULATIVE INVESTMENT PRACTICES THAT MAY INCREASE THE RISK OF INVESTMENT LOSS, CAN BE ILLIQUID, ARE NOT REQUIRED TO PROVIDE PERIODIC PRICING OR VALUATION INFORMATION TO INVESTORS, MAY INVOLVE COMPLEX TAX STRUCTURES AND DELAYS IN DISTRIBUTING IMPORTANT TAX INFORMATION, ARE NOT SUBJECT TO THE SAME REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS AS MUTUAL FUNDS, OFTEN CHARGE HIGH FEES, AND IN MANY CASES THE UNDERLYING INVESTMENTS ARE NOT TRANSPARENT AND ARE KNOWN ONLY TO THE INVESTMENT MANAGER. Alternative investment performance can be volatile. An investor could lose all or a substantial amount of his or her investment. Often, alternative investment fund and account managers have total trading authority over their funds or accounts; the use of a single advisor applying generally similar trading programs could mean lack of diversification and, consequently, higher risk. There is often no secondary market for an investor's interest in alternative investments, and none is expected to develop.

All material presented herein is believed to be reliable but we cannot attest to its accuracy. Opinions expressed in these reports may change without prior notice. John Mauldin and/or the staffs may or may not have investments in any funds cited above as well as economic interest. John Mauldin can be reached at 800-829-7273.