Rebalancing for a Fragmenting World: Why Broad Commodities Still Matter

Published April 15, 2026

Christopher Gannatti, CFA
Global Head of Research

Key Takeaways

- Rising fertilizer costs and geopolitical trade disruptions are driving a supply-side agricultural shock, tightening corn, wheat and sugar markets, which the WisdomTree Enhanced Commodity Strategy Fund (GCC) is positioning to capture through increased allocations.
- While soybeans have already benefited from crop rotation trends and cattle prices remain elevated, GCC is rotating toward underappreciated, supply-constrained commodities where future price upside may not yet be fully reflected.
- In an environment defined by fragmented supply chains and second-order commodity linkages, GCC's dynamic, diversified approach offers investors targeted exposure to inflation-sensitive, supply-driven opportunities beyond traditional energy-heavy benchmarks.

A Different Kind of Commodity Cycle

Commodity markets are often framed through a familiar lens: global growth accelerates, demand rises, and prices follow. But the current environment is being shaped by something far less linear and possibly far more consequential.

Today's commodity cycle is increasingly defined by supply-side disruptions and geopolitical fragmentation, not synchronized demand strength. While energy markets remain central to the narrative, the more important developments are happening beneath the surface, in the inputs and linkages that tie the entire commodity ecosystem together.

One such linkage is fertilizer.

Significant geopolitical tensions in the Middle East, alongside broader dislocations in global trade flows, are beginning to affect fertilizer availability and pricing. This may seem like a niche issue, but fertilizer sits upstream of global agricultural production. When its cost or accessibility changes, it reshapes decision-making across millions of acres of farmland. Even if there is a ceasefire or deal, this cannot be instantly solved.

The result is a cascading set of second-order effects that markets do not always price efficiently or immediately. And it is within these second-order effects where we believe some of the most compelling potential opportunities, as well as risks, are emerging.

The Catalyst: Fertilizer Shock and Agricultural Repricing

To understand the current shift, it helps to simplify the mechanism.

When fertilizer becomes more expensive or less available, farmers respond rationally. They adjust crop selection toward those that require fewer inputs. In practice, this often means a relative shift toward soybeans, which are less fertilizer-intensive than crops like corn and wheat.[1]

This seemingly innocuous move then introduces new imbalances.

As more acreage shifts toward soybeans, the supply outlook for corn and wheat becomes more constrained. Even if demand remains stable, the risk of underproduction increases, tightening markets and creating upward pressure on prices. This is not a demand shock but instead a supply elasticity shock, where production cannot easily adjust to maintain equilibrium.

At the same time, other agricultural commodities are influenced by adjacent dynamics that are becoming increasingly important in today's environment. Sugar, in particular, sits at a unique intersection of food, energy, and geopolitics.[2]

Brazil, the world's largest sugar exporter, provides the clearest example of this dynamic. Its mills have the ability to allocate sugarcane between sugar and ethanol production in real time, based on relative profitability. When oil prices rise, ethanol prices tend to follow, creating a powerful incentive to divert sugarcane away from food production and toward energy.

But the story does not stop there.

Recent analysis suggests that this flexibility is being exercised at a meaningful scale. Brazilian producers are already increasing the share of sugarcane allocated to ethanol, with some estimates pointing to a majority of output shifting toward fuel production as ethanol prices materially exceed sugar prices. At the same time, global sugar balances that were previously expected to remain in surplus could quickly tighten, or even flip into deficit, if this allocation persists.

Layer on top of this additional constraints, and the setup becomes more compelling. Disruptions to Middle Eastern shipping routes, particularly through the Strait of Hormuz, are affecting refined sugar flows into key import regions. India, another major producer, is facing export limitations that further reduce available supply to global markets. Meanwhile, rising fertilizer costs are beginning to impact planting decisions and yield expectations, creating a lagged but potentially durable constraint on future production.[4]

What emerges is a commodity increasingly shaped by **multiple reinforcing supply pressures**:

- Energy markets pulling supply toward ethanol
- Trade disruptions limiting global availability

- Policy and export constraints reducing flexibility
- Input costs constraining future production

In combination, these forces highlight why sugar is not simply an agricultural commodity, but rather a cross-asset expression of tightening global supply conditions.

To be clear, this is not a call to "buy agriculture broadly." It is a recognition that **relative value within commodities is shifting**, driven by changes in production incentives rather than consumption trends.

From Signal to Action: How We Are Positioning GCC

Translating these macro signals into portfolio positioning requires discipline. The goal is not to chase recent price performance, but to identify where future imbalances are most likely to emerge.

In that context, we have implemented a series of measured adjustments within the WisdomTree Enhanced Commodity Strategy Fund (GCC):

- Reduced exposure to cattle
- Trimmed soybean exposure modestly
- Increased allocations to corn, wheat and sugar

Each of these moves reflects a consistent underlying principle: positioning away from areas where outcomes appear more fully priced and toward those where supply risks may be underappreciated.

Cattle markets, for example, have been trading near elevated levels. At the same time, rising energy costs introduce potential demand sensitivity, as higher input and transportation costs can ultimately influence consumer behavior. Protein consumption is not perfectly inelastic, and over time, higher prices can lead to substitution effects. This creates a less favorable risk-reward profile at current levels.[3]

Soybeans, meanwhile, have already been beneficiaries of the crop rotation dynamic driven by fertilizer costs. While the fundamental story remains intact, incremental upside may be more limited as positioning becomes more crowded.

In contrast, corn and wheat represent areas where tightening supply conditions may not yet be fully reflected in prices. If fertilizer dynamics persist, the shift away from these crops could create a more constrained production environment, increasing the potential for upward price pressure.

Sugar adds a different dimension. We already noted its linkage to energy markets. In a world where energy markets remain volatile, this connection can amplify supply constraints and create the potential for asymmetric upside.

Across all of these adjustments, the guiding framework is consistent:

We are not reacting to price, but rather we are reacting to changing production incentives.

Built for Diversification: A Different Approach to Commodities

It is worth stepping back to consider how these adjustments fit within the broader design of GCC.

Many commodity strategies are, either explicitly or implicitly concentrated bets on energy markets. Oil often dominates index construction, meaning that performance becomes tightly linked to a single macro variable: the direction of crude prices.

At one end of the spectrum sits the S&P GSCI, which is a benchmark built on a simple and intuitive premise: weight commodities by their importance to the global economy. In practice, that means weighting by production. The result is an index that heavily reflects the scale of energy markets, where crude oil alone can represent a significant share of global commodity production.[4]

The logic is clean. But the outcome is less so.

A production-weighted approach implicitly assumes that economic importance should equal portfolio importance. That may be true for measuring the global economy, but it could be far less compelling as a portfolio construction framework. Investors don't allocate to commodities to mirror gross domestic product (GDP); they allocate to commodities for potential portfolio diversification, inflation sensitivity, and exposure to differentiated supply-demand shocks.

This is where the Bloomberg Commodity Index (BCOM) has represented a meaningful step forward.

Rather than allowing production weights to dominate, BCOM introduces constraints, which means capping sector exposures and limiting concentration in any single commodity. The goal is to prevent energy from overwhelming the index and to create a more balanced representation across agriculture, metals, and livestock.[5]

That is a clear improvement.

But it still largely operates within a static framework. The diversification is structural, not adaptive. It reduces concentration risk, but it does not actively respond to changing market conditions, term structure dynamics, or the evolving opportunity set across commodities.

We think that distinction matters.

Because commodity markets are not just different, but cyclical, fragmented, and often driven by idiosyncratic forces. Energy responds to geopolitics and global growth. Metals reflect industrial cycles. Agriculture is shaped by weather, policy, and input costs. These forces do not move in sync, and they may not reward static exposure.

This is where more dynamic approaches, such as the WisdomTree Enhanced Commodity Strategy Fund (GCC), begin to diverge more meaningfully.

Rather than simply redistributing weights, GCC incorporates signals, such as roll yield and momentum that attempt to selectively allocate toward commodities with more favorable structural characteristics. In doing so, it moves beyond the question of *how much* to own and toward the more important question of *which exposures are worth owning at a given point in time*.

In other words, put simply:

- GSCI asks: *What does the global commodity market look like?*
- BCOM asks: *How do we make that investable?*
- GCC asks: *How do we make it work for investors?*

That progression, from representation, to diversification, to optimization,is ultimately what defines the evolution of commodity indexing.

The Case for Broad Commodity Exposure

For investors, the relevance of commodities extends beyond tactical positioning. At a portfolio level, commodities offer a set of characteristics that are particularly valuable in the current macro environment.

1. Inflation Sensitivity[6]

Commodities are often the first responders to inflation, particularly when that inflation is driven by supply constraints rather than demand overheating.

Unlike financial assets, which can lag or be impacted by policy responses, commodity prices adjust in real time to changes in availability and cost structures. In an environment where inflation is increasingly shaped by geopolitical and supply-side factors, this sensitivity becomes more important.

2. Exposure to Supply Shocks[7]

Commodities embed a form of optionality to disruption.

It is difficult to predict the exact nature or timing of supply shocks, whether they originate from geopolitical conflict, trade restrictions, or environmental factors. But a diversified exposure allows investors to participate in these events when they occur, without needing to forecast the specific catalyst in advance.

This is particularly relevant today, as supply chains become more complex and more vulnerable to disruption.

3. Diversification and Low Correlation[8]

Commodities have historically exhibited low correlation to traditional equity and fixed income assets, especially during periods of stress driven by inflation or supply constraints.

In scenarios where both stocks and bonds face pressure, such as stagflationary environments, commodities can potentially provide a valuable counterbalance.

From Oil-Centric to System-Aware Investing

The evolution of commodity markets is subtle but significant.

For much of the past decade, the narrative has been dominated by energy. Oil prices have served as the primary signal, and many investment strategies have been structured accordingly.

But the current environment suggests a shift.

Second-order effects, like fertilizer availability influencing crop production, are becoming first-order drivers of market outcomes. Agricultural markets are being shaped by energy dynamics, policy decisions, and input costs in ways that are more interconnected than in the past.

At the same time, global supply chains are becoming less efficient, more regionalized, and more susceptible to disruption. This increases the likelihood that idiosyncratic shocks within specific commodity sectors will drive returns.

In this context, a more system-aware approach to commodity investing becomes essential.

Rather than concentrating exposure in a single sector, the opportunity lies in recognizing how different parts of the commodity complex interact, and positioning accordingly.

The adjustments we are making within GCC reflect that philosophy. They are not large, directional bets, but incremental shifts designed to align the portfolio with evolving supply dynamics and relative value opportunities.

1. Source: Hayden, M. (2026). *Soybean vs. corn fertilizer: Key differences in application and use*. ShunCy.
2. Source for narratives on sugar, unless otherwise stated: Taylor, C. (2026, March 20). *Sour strait = sweet sugar* (The Cascade, Vol. 389). Pinecone Macro Research.
3. Source: American Farm Bureau Federation. (2025). *Economics of the U.S. beef and cattle market*.
4. Source: S&P Dow Jones Indices. (2025, October). *S&P GSCI methodology*. S&P Global.
5. Source: Bloomberg Index Services Limited. (2025, January). *The Bloomberg Commodity Index methodology*. Bloomberg.
6. Source: Diaz, E. M., Cúñado, J., & Pérez de Gracia, F. (2023). *Commodity price shocks, supply chain disruptions and U.S. inflation*. Finance Research Letters.
7. Sources: Gorton, G., & Rouwenhorst, K. G. (2006). *Facts and fantasies about commodity futures*. Financial Analysts Journal; Hong, H., & Yogo, M. (2012). *What does futures market interest tell us about the macroeconomy?* Journal of Financial Economics.
8. Sources: Erb, C. B., & Harvey, C. R. (2006). *The strategic and tactical value of commodity futures*. Financial Analysts Journal; Bianchi, D., Büchner, M., & Tamoni, A. (2021). *Inflation hedging in the long run*. Journal of Alternative Investments.

Source: Hayden, M. (2026). Soybean vs. corn fertilizer: Key differences in application and use. ShunCy.

Source for narratives on sugar, unless otherwise stated: Taylor, C. (2026, March 20). *Sour strait = sweet sugar* (The Cascade, Vol. 389). Pinecone Macro Research.

Source: American Farm Bureau Federation. (2025). Economics of the U.S. beef and cattle market.

Source: S&P Dow Jones Indices. (2025, October). S&P GSCI methodology. S&P Global.

Source: Bloomberg Index Services Limited. (2025, January). The Bloomberg Commodity Index methodology. Bloomberg.

Source: Diaz, E. M., Cúñado, J., & Pérez de Gracia, F. (2023). Commodity price shocks, supply chain disruptions and U.S. inflation. Finance Research Letters.

Sources: Gorton, G., & Rouwenhorst, K. G. (2006). Facts and fantasies about commodity futures. Financial Analysts Journal; Hong, H., & Yogo, M. (2012). What does futures market interest tell us about the macroeconomy? Journal of Financial Economics.

Sources: Erb, C. B., & Harvey, C. R. (2006). The strategic and tactical value of commodity futures. Financial Analysts Journal; Bianchi, D., Büchner, M., & Tamoni, A. (2021). Inflation hedging in the long run. Journal of Alternative Investments.

Important Risks Related to this Article

There are risks associated with investing including possible loss of principal. An investment in this Fund is speculative, involves a substantial degree of risk, and should not constitute an investor's entire portfolio. One of the risks associated with the Fund is the complexity of the different factors which contribute to the Fund's performance. These factors include use of commodity futures contracts. In addition, bitcoin exchange-traded products (ETPs) and bitcoin futures are relatively new and the markets may be less developed. They are subject to unique and substantial risks, and historically, have been subject to significant price volatility. As a result, the markets for bitcoin futures and bitcoin ETPs may be less developed, and at times, potentially less liquid and more volatile, than more established commodity futures and ETP markets. While the bitcoin futures market has grown substantially since bitcoin futures commenced trading, there can be no assurance that this growth will continue. In addition, derivatives can be volatile and may be less liquid than other securities and more sensitive to the effects of varied economic conditions. The value of the shares of the Fund relate directly to the value of the futures contracts and other assets held by the Fund and any fluctuation in the value of these assets could adversely affect an investment in the Fund's shares. Because of the frequency with which the Fund expects to roll futures contracts, the price of futures contracts further from expiration may be higher (a condition known as “contango”) or lower (a condition known as “backwardation”) and the impact of such contango or backwardation may be greater than the impact would be if the Fund experienced less portfolio turnover. **The Fund will not invest in bitcoin directly**. Please read the Fund’s prospectus for specific details regarding the Fund’s risk profile.