Would You Invest in America?

Questions and Answers

Richard Marney and Philipp Waeber – August 2026

1. What is the central argument of the paper?

Investors should distinguish a country's current condition from its trajectory. Strong current outcomes can coexist with institutional deterioration, while weak current conditions can coexist with institutional improvement. Investment judgement therefore requires attention to direction as well as level.

2. Why begin in 1965 with Singapore, Ceylon, Botswana and Zambia?

The comparison removes hindsight. In 1965, Ceylon and Zambia had substantial apparent advantages, while Singapore and Botswana looked much less promising. Their subsequent divergence illustrates the difficulty of judging trajectory before the outcome is known—and the danger of treating current condition as destiny.

3. Is the paper arguing that US institutions are failing?

No. America's starting position remains exceptionally strong and its countervailing institutions remain formidable. The question is narrower: are institutional constraints and state capability becoming stronger or weaker, and does the system retain its capacity to correct itself when tested?

4. What institutional developments should investors watch in the United States?

The paper highlights the balance between presidential discretion and institutional constraints; the expertise and independence of public administration; predictability and impartiality of the rule of law; the role of political access in regulation, procurement, tariffs, subsidies and enforcement; fiscal decision-making capacity; and the effects of inequality, polarisation and declining trust.

5. How can investors distinguish institutional change from ordinary political turbulence?

By looking for persistence rather than isolated events. The paper proposes four tests: persistence, impartiality, state capability and behaviour. A confrontation between institutions may indicate erosion, but it may equally demonstrate that checks and balances are working. Recovery and correction are evidence too.

6. What does "triangulation" mean in practice?

Start with formal change: laws, mandates, appointments, budgets and constraints on authority. Then test implementation: whether court decisions are enforced, contracts honoured, regulators consistent and agencies capable. Finally examine behaviour: whether firms delay or shorten investment, move capital, demand stronger protection or become more dependent on political access. Convergence across these signals, sustained over time, provides stronger evidence of a changed trajectory.

7. Why does the paper discuss US fiscal policy and the Treasury market?

They provide a practical test of the link between institutions and Outcomes. Persistent deficits do not by themselves prove institutional weakness. The institutional question is whether the political system can reconcile spending, taxation and borrowing when circumstances require it. Treasury yields and investor demand then provide evidence to observe, rather than a verdict in themselves.

8. If US country risk is increasing, should an investor reduce exposure to America?

Not necessarily. Country analysis must be translated into the particular investment. The relevant questions are what asset, what sector, what duration, what dependence on government discretion, what price and what contractual protection. A country can deteriorate and still contain attractive investments.

9. Why might institutional change matter more to some investments than others?

Duration, reversibility and exposure to government discretion differ. A three-month Treasury bill is not exposed in the same way as a thirty-year infrastructure project. Regulated utilities, defence contractors and tariff-sensitive manufacturers may also be more directly affected by policy and political discretion than businesses with more mobile assets or less dependence on government.

10. What is the Investor's Rutter?

It is a framework for organising investment judgement under uncertainty. It examines four dimensions—Endowments, Enablers, Context and Outcomes—and asks how they are changing and interacting. The maritime metaphor distinguishes immediate "weather," more persistent "winds" and deeper "currents." The purpose is disciplined judgement, not false precision.

11. How does the Rutter turn country analysis into an investment decision?

Through a transmission sequence: country trajectory → sector transmission → company or project exposure → instrument structure → investment judgement. Institutional risk may lead to a higher required return, shorter duration, stronger guarantees or covenants, ring-fencing, arbitration or escrow, staged commitments, reduced exposure—or, where residual risk cannot be adequately mitigated, a decision not to invest.

12. What is the paper's final answer to "Would you invest in America?"

The question is deliberately reframed. "America" is not a single investment. The useful question is: in what, for how long, at what price and on what terms? Country analysis should improve how we think about a particular investment rather than produce a simple country label or veto.