

CRS Report for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

The U.S. Trade Deficit: Causes, Consequences, and Cures

Updated August 12, 2004

Craig Elwell
Specialist in Macroeconomics
Government and Finance Division

The U.S. Trade Deficit: Causes, Consequences, and Cures

Summary

The U.S. trade deficit has risen more or less steadily since 1992. This imbalance reached \$541.8 billion in 2003, an increase of nearly \$60 billion over the 2002 deficit, and a rise of about \$500 billion since 1992. The deficit's growth in 2003 was for the most part the consequence of a sharp acceleration of import purchases, up nearly \$110 billion, in a fast growing economy. Exports had been falling since 2000, but in response to a cheaper dollar and faster growth abroad, increased about \$40 billion in 2003. Together this has resulted in the trade deficit reaching another record size in 2003. The \$3.9 billion deficit in the investment income component in 2002 was followed by a \$16.6 billion surplus in 2003. This balance has bounced around a lot in recent years, but the large and growing size of U.S. foreign indebtedness suggests the longer term trend will be toward larger investment income deficits.

The size of the U.S. trade deficit is ultimately rooted in macroeconomic conditions at home and abroad. U.S. saving falls short of what is sought to finance U.S. investment. Many foreign economies are in the opposite circumstances, with domestic saving exceeding domestic opportunities for investment. This difference of wants will tend to be reconciled by international capital flows. The shortfall in domestic saving relative to investment tends to draw an inflow of relatively abundant foreign savings seeking to maximize returns and, in turn, the saving inflow makes a higher level of investment possible. For the United States, a net financial inflow also leads to a like-sized net inflow of foreign goods — a trade deficit. Absent the prospect of any major change in the underlying domestic and foreign macroeconomic determinants, most forecasts predict the continued widening of the U.S. trade deficit in 2004. But the rate of increase of the deficit is expected to slow as foreign investors slow the growth of their dollar asset holdings.

The benefit of the trade deficit is that it allows the United States to spend now beyond current income. In recent years that spending has largely been for investment in productive capital. The cost of the trade deficit is a deterioration of the U.S. investment-income balance, as the payment on what we have borrowed from foreigners grows with our rising indebtedness. Borrowing from abroad allows the United States to live better today, but the payback must mean some decrement to the rate of advance of U.S. living standards in the future. U.S. trade deficits do not now substantially raise the risk of economic instability, but they do impose burdens on trade sensitive sectors of the economy.

Policy action to reduce the overall trade deficit is problematic. Standard trade policy tools (e.g., tariffs, quotas, and subsidies) do not work. Macroeconomic policy tools can work, but recent and prospective government budget deficits will reduce domestic saving and most likely tend to *increase* the trade deficit. Most economists believe that, in time, the trade deficit will most likely correct itself, without crisis, under the pressures of normal market forces. But the risk of a more calamitous outcome can not be completely discounted.

This report will be updated annually.

Contents

Introduction	1
Trade Performance in 2003	1
Goods Trade	1
Services Trade	2
Investment Income	3
Why the Trade Deficit Widens	3
A Saving-Investment Imbalance	4
International Capital Flows	4
Interest Rates and International Capital Flows	5
Other Factors That Influence International Capital Flows	6
Recent Patterns of U.S. Saving and Investment Behavior	7
Sustainability of the Trade Deficit	10
Borrower's Constraint	10
Lender's Constraint	10
Special Considerations for the United States	11
Prospects	11
Is the Trade Deficit a Problem ?	12
Intertemporal Trade	13
Debt Service Burden	14
Instability	15
Effects on Total Output and Employment	16
Effects on Particular Sectors	17
Trade Policy Responses	18
Macroeconomic Policy Responses	19
The Effect of Tax Cuts	20
The Effect of Economic Policy Abroad	20
Conclusion	21

List of Tables

Table 1. U.S. Current Account and Components	2
Table 2. U.S. Saving-Investment Balance	8

The U.S. Trade Deficit: Causes, Consequences, and Cures

Introduction

International trade continues to grow in importance for the world economy as well as the U.S. economy, enhancing economic well-being generally, but also imposing costs on trade sensitive sectors of national economies. The importance of trade has been well-recognized by Congress, which in recent years has paid close attention to many dimensions of U.S. international trade performance. This report examines the trade deficit, paying special attention to why it continues to widen, why it may be a problem, and what can be done to correct it.

Trade Performance in 2003

The U.S. trade deficit as reflected in the *current account balance*¹ reached \$541.8 billion in 2003, up about \$60 billion over the deficit in 2002. As a percentage of GDP the 2003 trade deficit stands at 4.9%, exceeding the previous record share of 4.6% set in 2002. The trade deficit rose more or less steadily from 1992 to 1997, then posted particularly large increases as the economy boomed over the next three years. With recession in 2001, the trade deficit fell to under \$400 billion. With a steady improvement in the pace of economic growth in 2003 the trade deficit increased, but at a slower pace than in 2002. **Table 1** shows the anatomy of recent trade trends.

Goods Trade

Goods trade is the largest component of the current account, and events there have been the principal force pushing the current account deficit higher in 2003. The deficit in goods trade increased about \$67 billion over the 2002 goods deficit to stand at \$549.4. Since 1992 the goods trade deficit has increased nearly \$500 billion. Over this period both exports and imports generally rose, but import growth out paced export growth. In 2001, in response to slack demand across the world economy, U.S. goods exports had fallen, but the U.S. recession in 2001 also led to an even larger curtailment in the U.S. demand for imports, causing the goods deficit (and the current account deficit) to fall. In 2002, weak world demand continued to push U.S. exports down, but even a tepid U.S. economic recovery in 2002 was enough to cause goods imports to increase, and the goods deficit (and the current account deficit) was once

¹ The balance on current account is the nation's most comprehensive measure of international transactions, reflecting exports and imports of good and services, investment income (earnings and payments), and unilateral transfers.

again on the rise. In 2003 goods exports return to the upward track, increasing about \$30 billion in response to the stimulating effects of a weaker dollar and faster growth abroad. But accelerating U.S. economic growth in 2003 also accelerates the inflow of imports by about \$100 billion, causing the goods deficit to increase by about \$67 billion.

Table 1. U.S. Current Account and Components
(BOP basis, billions of dollars, annual rate)

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Current account balance	-143.5	-220.5	-331.5	-435.4	-393.8	-480.8	-541.8
Goods balance	-196.7	-246.9	-345.6	-499.5	-427.2	-482.9	-549.4
Exports	679.7	670.2	684.4	773.5	718.7	681.9	713.8
Imports	876.4	917.2	1029.9	1222.4	1145.9	1164.7	1,263.2
Services balance	91.9	82.7	80.6	81.0	69.4	64.8	59.2
Exports	258.2	263.6	271.8	296.2	288.9	292.2	304.9
Imports	166.9	181.0	191.3	215.2	219.5	227.4	245.6
Investment income	3.2	-7.0	-18.4	-13.7	10.7	-3.9	16.6
Transfers (net)	-41.9	-44.0	-48.0	-53.2	-46.6	-58.7	-68.3

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce (Bureau of Economic Analysis) and Global Insight

Services Trade

The U.S. surplus in services trade decreased in 2003 to \$59.2 billion from \$64.8 billion in 2002. In contrast to goods, services trade had shown a slowly rising surplus through the mid-1990s. That trend ended in 1997, however, with the services surplus peaking at \$91.9 billion. In 1998, the surplus fell to about \$83 billion, but steadied near that level through 2000. Service exports grew over \$30 billion in this period, but with the dual effects of very rapid economic growth in the United States and the continued strength of the dollar, services imports moved apace. From 2001 through 2002, the services surplus resumed its decline, falling about \$15 billion. The decline in this period reflected the continued increase of service imports despite recession and slow growth in the United States. It also damped export sales stemming from economic weakness in other economies and the continued negative impact of the strong dollar (the dollar had begun to depreciate in 2002, but given the typical lags, the positive effect of that depreciation was unlikely to have been significant in 2002). Despite a continued weakening of the dollar in 2003, the quickening of the pace of U.S. economic growth was sufficient to induce an \$18 billion (or 8%) increase in service imports. Service exports in 2003 also moved up about \$13 billion or 4%, but this was not enough to stop the services surplus from falling another \$6 billion. The prospects of improved economic growth abroad and a weaker dollar are forces likely to continue stimulating service exports.

Investment Income

Another telling aspect of trade in this period, has been the steady fall and eventual turn to deficit in 1997 of the current account's investment income component. This pattern was interrupted in 2001 with the investment income balance posting a surplus of \$10.5 billion, reflecting the depressing effect of the U.S. recession on earnings from foreign-held U.S. assets. In 2002, this balance was back in deficit, with the imbalance standing at \$3.4 billion. This swing reflected continued economic weakness in the rest of the world economy causing receipts from U.S. foreign investments to fall \$34 billion in 2001. Low interest rates and tepid U.S. economic growth kept payments to foreigners, more or less, level. In 2003, the investment income balance shifted back to surplus, tallying a positive balance of \$16.6 billion. This change was almost entirely the result of increased returns from U.S. held foreign direct investment assets, as payments on foreign held U.S. assets were only slightly above the 2002 level.

The investment income sub-balance had been in continuous surplus from the end of World War II through 1997, but the magnitude of those surpluses was in fairly steady decline in recent years. Unlike other components of the current account balance, the deterioration of the investment income balance is a direct consequence of America's long string of large trade deficits and the attendant accumulation of debt obligations to foreigners. This is a consequence that acts to exacerbate the deficit trend in the current account. Most importantly, the deterioration of the investment income balance over the last two decades is a measure of the growing economic cost of America's persistent large trade deficits and the associated accumulation of foreign debt. Yet, despite our heavy foreign indebtedness, the deficit is relatively small. The recent back and forth in this balance between surplus and deficit has been largely the consequence of changes in asset valuations driven by the short-run impact of the business cycle and exchange rate movements. In the long-run it seems very likely that the United States' large and still growing stock of net foreign indebtedness will come to dominate movement of this balance and lead to steadily larger deficits in the investment income balance.²

Why the Trade Deficit Widens

A rising current account deficit (or a falling surplus) over the course of a brisk economic expansion is not a remarkable event for the U.S. economy. In the 1960s, brisk economic growth steadily eroded a small current account surplus. In the 1970s, modest deficits occurred with each economic expansion. However, in the 1980s and

² The level and composition of the United States' net indebtedness to foreigners is found in the annual tally of the nation's *net international investment position* (NIIP) by the U.S. Department of Commerce and published in the June *Survey of Current Business*. In 2003, the NIIP was a deficit of \$2.4 trillion and the United States had received a capital inflow of \$856 billion. At the peak of the business cycle in 2000, the capital inflow was over \$1 trillion. The capital inflow is composed of several different types of assets including bank accounts, stocks, bonds, and real property. For more detail on cross-border capital flows, see CRS Report RL32452, *Foreign Investment in U.S. Securities*, by James Jackson

1990s, the size of the trade deficits increased greatly. Cyclical factors certainly at times played some role in this phenomenon, particularly in recent years with the U.S. growing rapidly relative to most major trading partners. Trend forces are also at work, however, inclining the U.S. economy toward generating large trade deficits in all but recession conditions. The next section will examine in more depth the fundamental determinants of the trade balance.

The trade deficit widens as the economy expands, not because of trade barriers abroad, not because of foreign dumping of exports, and not because of any inherent inferiority of the United States goods on the world market, but primarily because of underlying macroeconomic conditions at home and abroad. In effect, the U.S. economy spends more than it produces, and this excess of demand is met by a net inflow of foreign goods and services leading to the U.S. trade deficit.³ Of course, the U.S. trade deficit is only possible if there are foreign economies that produce more than is absorbed by their current spending and are able export the surplus. Trade deficits and trade surpluses are jointly determined. International capital flows will allow a mutually favorable reconciliation of these domestic spending-production imbalances. These imbalances will be sensitive to the short-run effects of the business cycle (at home and abroad) as well as long-term effects of trends in spending and production. But, these imbalances will not be efficiently changed by trade policies that try to directly alter the levels of exports or imports such as tariffs, subsidies, or quotas.

A Saving-Investment Imbalance

National spending-production imbalances are most usefully analyzed from the standpoint of national saving and investment behavior. Saving is just the flip side of the same phenomenon (an excess of spending essentially translates into a deficiency of savings) but has the advantage of more clearly rooting the phenomenon in the international asset market transactions that are the key to understanding aggregate trade imbalances.

International Capital Flows. A large and fluid trade in assets is one of the central attributes of the current world trading system, growing from flows totaling only a few billion dollars in 1970 to about \$1.5 trillion in 2000. The United States has been a major participant in international asset markets receiving inflows of \$856 billion in 2003 and as much as \$1 trillion at the last business cycle peak in 2000.⁴

With fluid world capital markets, domestic saving-investment imbalances involve equivalent transfers at two levels: an initiating transfer of real purchasing power through asset market transactions; and an induced corresponding transfer of real output through goods market transactions.

³ It is useful to remember that “income”/“spending” are the flip side of “production”/“output”. Any given value of production generates an equal value of income. Thus the income the economy earns can support spending sufficient to purchase the economy’s current output. With international trade, however, it is possible for there to be a divergence of spending and production through the borrowing and lending of current income and output between nations.

⁴ Op.cit. CRS Report RL32462.

It is an economic identity that the amount of investment undertaken by an economy will be equal to the amount of saving — that is, the portion of current income not used for consumption — that is available to finance investment. But for a nation this identity can be satisfied through the use of both domestic *and foreign saving*, or domestic *and foreign investment*. Therefore, a saving investment imbalance is a relationship between domestic saving and investment and one that can only occur if foreign saving or investment are available to satisfy the overall saving investment identity.⁵

International capital flows from lender to borrower are the means by which the saving of one country can finance the investment of another. If international capital flows did not exist, domestic investment could be no larger or smaller than domestic saving.

In a relatively open world economy with reasonably fluid and well functioning international asset markets, it is possible for domestic saving-investment imbalances to be reconciled by international capital flows. With a willing lender and a willing borrower, flows of capital from one nation to another can achieve *overall* saving-investment balance for both nations. These asset market transactions will change the demand for and supply of national currencies needed to purchase foreign assets, causing changes in exchange rates, which, in turn, induce an equivalent sized net flow of goods (i.e. trade deficits and trade surpluses) between economies.

Interest Rates and International Capital Flows. Differences in the level interest rates between economies are the basic equilibrating mechanism that works to induce saving (income) flows between countries as investors seek out higher rates of return. A nation with a “surplus” of domestic saving over domestic investment opportunities will tend to have relatively low domestic interest rates because the domestic supply of loanable funds (i.e. saving) exceeds the domestic demand for loanable funds (i.e. investment) pushing down interest rates (i.e. the price of loanable funds). As a result this economy will also likely see some portion of domestic saving flow outward, attracted by more profitable investment opportunities abroad. This net outflow of purchasing power, which generally can only be used to purchase goods (or assets) denominated in the country’s currency, will, through changes in exchange rates, induce a like-sized net outflow of real goods and services — a trade surplus. Japan is an example of a nation that in recent decades has produced large net outflows of saving to the United States and other nations.

Conversely, another nation that finds its domestic saving falling short of desired domestic investment will tend to have relatively high domestic interest rates because the domestic demand for loanable funds exceeds the domestic supply of loanable funds. As a result this economy will likely attract an inflow of foreign saving, attracted by the higher rate of return, and that inflow will help support domestic investment. Such a nation becomes a net importer of foreign saving (income), able to use the

⁵ Saving in a macroeconomic framework is the portion of current income that is left after households, businesses, and government pay for their current consumption. A household that diverts some amount of current income to a bank, mutual fund, or government bond is saving. Similarly the tax revenue that the government has left after paying for its spending is (public) saving.

borrowed purchasing power to acquire foreign output, and leading to a like sized net inflow of foreign output — a trade deficit. That deficit augments the output available to the domestic economy, allowing the nation to invest beyond the level of domestic savings.

Asset market transactions and goods market transactions both influence the demand and supply of dollars on foreign exchange markets. In most circumstances, however, there is a strong expectation that asset market transactions will tend to be dominant and dictate the exchange rate's direction of movement. This dominance is the result of asset market transactions occurring on a scale and at a speed that greatly exceeds what occurs with goods market transactions. Electronic exchange makes most asset transfers nearly instantaneous and we see that in most years U.S. international asset transactions were two to three times as large as what would be needed to simply finance that year's trade deficit. The telling sign that asset transactions have been the determining force is that the dollar appreciated as the trade deficit grew. If goods market transactions were the determining force, the increase of the trade deficit would tend to depreciate the dollar, as rising U.S. imports cause more dollars to be exchanged for foreign currency, increasing the supply of dollars on the foreign exchange market, and pushing the dollar down.

Other Factors That Influence International Capital Flows. While relative levels of interest rates between countries and expected return are likely to be a strong and prevalent force directing capital flows among economies, other factors will also influence these flows at certain times. For instance, the size of the stock of assets in a particular currency in investor portfolios can cause a change in investor preferences. We know that prudent investment practice counsels that one's portfolio should have an appropriate degree of *diversification*, across asset types, including the currency in which they are denominated. Diversification spreads risk across a wider spectrum of assets and reduces over exposure to any one asset. Therefore, even though dollar assets may still offer a high relative return, if the accumulation has been large, at some point foreign investors, considering both risk and reward, will decide that their portfolio's share of dollar denominated assets is large enough. To improve the diversity of their portfolios, investors will slow or halt their purchase of such assets. Given that well over \$8 trillion in U.S. assets are now in foreign investor portfolios, diversification may be an increasingly important factor governing the behavior of international investors towards dollar assets.

There is also likely to be a significant *safe-haven* effect behind some capital flows. This is really just another manifestation of the balancing of risk and reward by foreign investors. Some investors may be willing to give up a significant amount of return if an economy offers them a particularly low risk repository for their funds. In recent decades the United States, with a long history of stable government, steady economic growth, and large and efficient financial markets can be expected to draw foreign capital for this reason. The size of this effect is not easy to determine, but the disproportionate share of essentially no risk U.S. Treasury securities in foreign holdings suggests the magnitude of safe-haven motivated flows is probably substantial and must exert a bias towards capital inflows and upward pressure on the dollar.

We also know that governments will, with varying frequency, buy or sell assets on the international capital market in an attempt to influence the exchange value of

their currency. The United States and most other industrial nations have at times undertaken such *intervention*. In 2003, over \$200 billion (or about 25%) of total U.S. capital inflows were the result of foreign government purchases of U.S. assets. This was a somewhat atypical year with particularly strong efforts by many governments to limit the strengthening of their currencies relative to the falling dollar. Japan was particularly prominent in this regard with the government boosting its holdings of U.S. assets (mostly U.S. Treasury securities) by \$175 billion in 2003. The governments of China and other Asian economies that peg their currency's value to the dollar have also been recent large buyers of dollar assets. In most cases, however government exchange rate intervention is unlikely to be substantial enough to change the direction in which private investors are pushing a currency.

The macroeconomic forces that generate trade deficits are entirely consistent with high rates of capacity utilization and employment. Trade deficits, however, can have negative effects on output and employment in particular sectors. (The output, employment, and sectoral effects of trade deficits are discussed at greater length in a latter section of the report.) The United States has regularly been the net recipient of foreign capital inflows and regularly had trade deficits for the last 25 years. It has also regularly achieved high rates of economic growth and low rates of unemployment over this time period.⁶ It is also true that an overall trade imbalance need not be reflected in the balance with individual trading partners. Bi-lateral balances will reflect additional forces such as geographic proximity, scale economies, and comparative advantage, and therefore some could be in deficit and others in surplus. Similarly, overall trade balance can be consistent with significant bi-lateral imbalances.

Recent Patterns of U.S. Saving and Investment Behavior

A domestic saving-investment imbalance can occur as a result of either investment rising relative to saving or saving falling relative to investment (see **Table 2**). In the 1980s the saving rate and the investment rate both declined, but the saving rate fell substantially faster, inducing capital inflows and a rising trade deficit. The fall of the saving rate in this period was rooted in two occurrences. The first was a substantial fall in the public saving rate caused by the run up of large federal budget deficits (which amounts to negative saving or dis-saving). The second occurrence was the decline of the household component of the private saving rate. In the late 1980s this imbalance narrowed due to increased public saving (i.e., smaller deficits) and a sharp decline in the investment rate in response to a decelerating economy headed for recession.

After recovery from the 1991 recession, the U.S. saving-investment imbalance began to increase steadily, but the form of the imbalance changed. The rates of saving and investment both rose, but the investment rate climbed faster. The turnaround in the overall saving rate in the 1990s was the consequence of a sharp change in the public saving rate, where the steady move by the federal government from budget

⁶ For a fuller discussion of this analytical framework, see Mankiw, N. Gregory, *Principles of Economics* (Fort Worth, Tx: The Dryden Press, 1997), p. 659; and also, Congressional Budget Office, *Causes and Consequences of the Trade Deficit: An Overview*, CBO Memorandum, Mar. 2000.

deficits to budget surpluses increased the public saving rate from -2.5% (i.e., dis-saving) in 1992 to 5.2% in 2000. Dampening the rise of the overall saving rate, however, was the continued decline in the household saving rate, falling from about 6.5% in 1992 to 0.0% in 2000. The rise of the overall saving rate in the 1990s did not bring that rate up to the magnitude that prevailed in the 1950s, 1960s, or 1970s, and fell well short of the 1990s' briskly ascending rate of domestic investment. The predictable consequence of a widening savings-investment imbalance was a rising inflow of foreign savings to close that gap, and in turn, an ever larger trade deficit. A substantial decrease in the rate of investment during the 2001 recession narrowed this gap and the trade deficit in that year. With economic recovery in 2002 and 2003, the investment-saving gap widened again *and so did the trade deficit*. In this instance, the widening was not caused by an acceleration of investment spending, but by a decline in the economy's overall saving rate caused by a fall in the government saving rate.

Two questions may come to mind. One, why has the household saving rate collapsed over the last 20 years? Other factors unchanged, a higher rate of household savings would have likely meant the generation of smaller trade deficits. Two, why did U.S. investment spending boom in the 1990s? Other factors unchanged, a rate of investment at the lower level typical of other expansions would have also led to smaller trade deficits.

Table 2. U.S. Saving-Investment Balance
(percent of GDP)

	Ann. Avg. 1975 to 1982	Ann. Avg. 1983 to 1990	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Saving	19.7	17.1	17.4	17.3	18.6	18.2	16.5	14.7	13.5
Investment	20.3	19.5	18.6	21.2	21.8	21.8	19.1	18.4	18.4
Net^a lending(+) or borrowing(-)	-0.6	-2.4	-1.2	-2.9	-3.2	-3.6	-2.6	-3.7	-5.0

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis.

a. Net lending, in concept, should equal the size of the current account balance. Statistical discrepancies prevent a precise matching, however.

The fall of the household saving rate has been the object of much economic research, but the reasons for the decline remain problematic. No single theory can fully account for the phenomenon, but three have considerable plausibility. First, capital gains on real estate, stocks, and other investments, particularly in the 1990s, have greatly increased household wealth. Economic theory predicts that a rise in wealth reduces the need to save and increases the tendency to spend. Second, increased government outlays for Medicare and Social Security transfer income from a relatively high saving segment of the population to a relatively low saving segment.

Third, more streamlined credit market vehicles, such as credit cards and home equity loans, have removed constraints on household liquidity and prompted increased spending (and reduced saving).⁷

The reasons for the investment boom in the late 1990s also remain somewhat unclear, but three plausible forces have been suggested. First, the wealth induced spending mentioned just above also provides a stimulus to business investment, as new plant and equipment is needed to meet the rising demand for output. Second, it is argued that recent deregulation of industry, liberalization of trade, and massive integration of ever cheaper and more powerful computers into the production process have boosted productivity and raised the profitability of investment in the United States. Third, and perhaps most plausible, pervasive economic weakness abroad, most recently in Asia, has made the United States a singularly attractive destination for foreign investment.

Even the relatively slow pace of economic recovery in 2002 and early 2003, when juxtaposed with generally weaker growth in the rest of the world made it likely that the trade deficit would expand in 2002 and 2003. However, a change of note for the current period is the shift in the trajectory of public saving. In 2002, the federal budget moved back into deficit and that deficit rose to \$413 billion in 2003, with the prospect of sizable budget deficits persisting into the foreseeable future. Larger government budget deficits, by reducing domestic saving, will tend to exacerbate the saving-investment imbalance and, other factors constant, to widen the trade deficit. That outcome, however, assumes that there are foreign lenders willing to invest in the United States. If, to take one extreme position, there are no such investors then any fall in the domestic saving rate will, through higher interest rates, lead to a like sized fall in the domestic investment rate. If, at the other extreme, there are legions of investors eager to invest in the United States, the savings shortfall will be overcome with little dampening of domestic investment. More realistically, there will likely be willing foreign investors, but that willingness might have to be gained through the prospect of a higher rate of return. The higher domestic interest rates must go to attract investors to bridge the domestic saving shortfall, the more downward pressure there will be on domestic investment.

This overall scenario leaves one with three strong impressions. One, U.S. trade deficits appear to be largely (but not completely) created and propelled by macroeconomic forces in the domestic economy. Two, those deficits must be sustained by willing foreign lenders, and substantial reduction of that willingness, other factors constant, might lead to deficit reduction on less than the most favorable terms. And three, these forces may not be easily manipulated by policy.

⁷ See CRS Report RS20224, *The Collapse of Household Saving: Why Has it Happened and What Are its Implications?*, by Brian Cashell and Gail Makinen.

Sustainability of the Trade Deficit

With little prospect at home or abroad for any *dramatic* reversal of the forces determining the trade deficit, it is unlikely that the deficit will shrink any time soon. In fact, most projections out over the next one to two years see a further widening, with the current account deficit rising to the \$600 to \$650 billion range.⁸ Nevertheless, an ever larger trade deficit is not likely to be sustainable indefinitely. There are automatic adjustment processes that will work to dampen the willingness of borrowers to borrow and of lenders to lend, and which can effect a more or less orderly reduction of the trade deficit.

Borrower's Constraint

The central issue for a borrower country like the United States is the “ability to pay,” that is, the capacity to meet the interest and principal payments on the accumulated stocks of foreign debt. Such payments must come at the expense of other forms of national expenditure and, therefore, will not increase without bound. For the United States, the Net International Investment Position (NIIP) is the measure of our stock of obligations and GDP is the measure of our ability to pay. Therefore the ratio NIIP/GDP is a possible proxy of the borrower's constraint. Because we do not have much experience with a rising foreign debt to GDP ratio, it is difficult to judge at what value this ratio would begin to sharply deter more borrowing. Between 1992 and 2003, this ratio (expressed as a percentage) has risen from 7.3% to 22.5%, a substantial gain, but that is still below the 25% to 35% common among other high income countries, well short of the debt burden of most households, and apparently not high enough to sate our appetite for foreign capital. It remains problematic as to what value of this ratio would be binding on borrower behavior.

An alternative measure of constraint is the ratio of the current account balance (CA) to GDP (CA/GDP). This measure lays more stress on the size of the annual flow of foreign obligations relative to GDP as an initiator of borrower behavior. The value of CA/GDP for the United States has risen from 0.8% in 1992 to 4.4% in 2000. Evidence from industrial economies indicates that, on average, when the CA/GDP ratio exceeds 4.2% the current account begins to narrow.⁹ This suggests that the United States may be getting close to a point at which borrowers may begin to slow their rate of debt accumulation. We must also consider, however, that there are special attributes of the American economy that would allow it to prudently push borrowing beyond this benchmark ratio (see below).

Lender's Constraint

The willingness to lend to a particular destination will be influenced by the risk-return profile of a borrower's assets *relative* to other available assets. A broad array of alternatives with comparable risk-return prospects would tend to reduce the

⁸ See forecasts by Global Insight, *The U.S. Economy*, June, 2004.

⁹ See Catherine L. Mann, *Is the Trade Deficit Sustainable* (Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics, 1999), p. 156.

willingness to lend to a single borrower. Similarly, a paucity of alternative investment opportunities would have the opposite effect. One can expect that the array of alternatives faced would be influenced by the strength of economic conditions across the globe. In addition, the desire by investors for some degree of portfolio diversification will tend to limit their willingness to become overly saturated in assets from one destination. Beyond the willingness to invest is the issue of ability to invest. The ability to sustain a large or rising outflow of capital will be limited by the size of the lender economy and its wealth portfolio. Other economies are substantially smaller than the U.S. economy and may be unable to sustain the magnitude of outflow the U.S. can apparently readily absorb. Also limiting cross-border lending is the observed preference in most economies to hold a high percentage of wealth in home assets.

Special Considerations for the United States

There are factors unique to the United States that may reduce the constraints on international lending or borrowing. First, over 90% of the U.S. international borrowing is denominated in dollars.¹⁰ This means that the pressures that other borrowing countries might face due to fluctuations in the value of debt service burden caused by volatile exchange rates are largely not an issue for the United States. Second, about 75% of U.S. foreign investment is in more stable long-term investments. Such investments tend to have a more stable flow that is less prone to reversals caused by changes in investor confidence. Third, about 50% of the investment in the United States by foreigners is in the form of equity (stock) holdings. Equity holdings tend to carry less strict payment requirements than debt holdings, working to lower the potential service payments (for a given level of NIIP), and extend the period over which the nation can prudently run current account deficits. Finally, the size and importance of the U.S. in global trade and finance puts the United States in a special position as a borrower.

Prospects

Where is the trade deficit headed in the period just ahead? In the analytical framework presented in this report, the answer to that question will hinge on the net direction of capital flows into and out of the American economy. At present, the United States is an international borrower receiving a net inflow of foreign capital. If that net inflow decreases, the trade deficit will also decrease. If the net inflow increases, the trade deficit will also increase. If the capital inflow remains the same, so will the trade deficit. So, what direction are capital flows likely to take?

Whether the current capital inflow gets bigger, smaller, or remains the same will most likely be determined by the resolution of two contenting forces: risk and reward. If, on balance, foreign investors see further investment in the United States as a far more riskier undertaking, other factors equal, the capital inflow will ebb and bring the trade deficit down with it. On the other hand, if the relative rate of return from investment in U.S. assets grows more attractive the net capital inflow could expand and bring the trade deficit up with it.

¹⁰ See U.S. Treasury Department, *Treasury Bulletin*, Apr. 2002.

The important risk factor currently is the adequacy of *diversification* in investor portfolios. Very large dollar balances have been accumulated in recent years. A survey by *The Economist* magazine shows that American assets make up 53% of the typical foreign investors equity portfolio and 44% of the typical bond portfolio. As recently as the mid-1990s these percentages were only about 30%. It has also been estimated that the average investor in recent years has allocated about 80% of his increased wealth to dollar assets and would have to continue at this rate or higher to sustain the U.S. trade deficit for the next few years.¹¹ This is possible, but it is fair to doubt that it is probable, as standard investment practice increasingly suggests that investors move away from dollar assets. Such a shift is the most likely cause of the fall of the dollar since early 2002. But will it continue?

It is also true, however, that *rate of return* is a powerful incentive for holding an asset, and there are reasons to believe that for the immediate future dollar assets will be the most attractive alternative on the world market. For one reason, the U.S. economy is expanding at a quick pace, up 3.1% in 2003 and likely to pick up the pace of expansion in 2004 and 2005. Faster growth usually brings higher interest rates. Moreover, it is hardly improbable that economic growth in the United States will be faster than that in other major economies over the next few years and offer relatively more attractive rates of return to investors. In addition, for the time period just ahead the upward pressure on interest rates in the U.S. economy will likely be exacerbated by sizable government borrowing to finance large federal budget deficits.

Because of these strong but opposing factors, there is likely to be an above average degree of uncertainty in forecasting the trade deficit's path. Nevertheless, a common scenario sees the current account deficit continuing to advance in 2004 and 2005, perhaps exceeding \$650 billion. But the deficit climbs at a decelerated pace and stabilizes as a share of GDP. In this view, foreign investors are willing to continue their accumulation of dollar assets, but at a steadily slowing rate, as concerns about risk increase and opportunities for alternative investment destinations broaden. The impacts of past and prospective dollar depreciation and faster economic growth abroad will likely have a stronger impact on the goods and services deficit, perhaps even causing it to decline in 2005, but an accelerating deficit in investment income would likely keep the current account deficit from doing the same for a while longer.¹²

Is the Trade Deficit a Problem?

A trade deficit is not necessarily undesirable. It confers benefits and carries some costs, and the former may exceed the latter. Trade deficits are a vehicle for extending the gains from trade, where lending and borrowing among nations can lead to a more efficient allocation of saving and a preferred pattern of consumption over time. Trade deficits do not necessarily cause slower economic growth or lead to any economy-wide loss of jobs.

¹¹ *The Economist*, Sept. 18, 2003.

¹² See Global Insight, *U.S. Economic Outlook*, June 2004 and OECD, *Economic Outlook*, June 2004.

As seen in the 1980s and as was very evident in the 1990s, for the United States unemployment has fallen to record lows and the economy's growth rate has accelerated to record highs even as the trade deficit has risen. That deficit, therefore, does not necessarily come at the expense of current domestic economic activity. Of course, borrowing carries a cost as the lender demands that interest be paid on the funds borrowed and the principal one day be repaid. This "debt service cost" is a burden the borrower must carry tomorrow for living beyond his means today. One's evaluation of the desirability or undesirability of a trade deficit will hinge on the current benefits gained from that added spending relative to the future debt service burden that is incurred. Also, reliance on foreign sources of finance often raises concern that trade deficits carry an elevated risk of instability and disruption to the economy. Finally, trade deficits have differential effects on different sectors of the economy, often placing large burdens on exporting and import-competing sectors.

Intertemporal Trade

Gains from trade can arise from *intertemporal* exchanges. These are exchanges of *current* goods and services for claims on *future* goods and services, that is, an exchange of goods and services for an asset (i.e. cash in a bank account, stock, or bond). When the United States (or any trading nation) borrows from abroad to import materials for a current investment project, it is undertaking intertemporal trade. In such a transaction, the borrowing nation gains because it can support a higher rate of investment in capital goods than what current domestic saving alone could finance. The lending nation gains an asset yielding a higher rate of return than is available in the home economy. Because of the difference in their preferences for spending over time, the international asset market allows both parties to the transaction to raise their economic well-being. The borrower's economic well-being is raised by being able to spend more in the current period than current income allows. The lender's economic well-being is raised by being able to spend more in some future period. A country that is a net borrower will also run a trade deficit, while the country that is a net lender will run a trade surplus. This type of international asset transaction allows a more global utilization of the world's saving, a more efficient allocation of investment spending across nations, and a preferred distribution of spending over time.

Since the early 1980s, the United States has incurred trade deficits of moderate to large size, using international borrowing to push spending beyond current production, pursuing desired consumption and productive investment now rather than later. Similarly, nations like Japan have been able to run trade surpluses, using international lending opportunities to earn higher returns on their excess national savings and expanding the prospects for spending in the future. Such net flows have not grown as fast as gross flows of capital so that external sources of finance still claim only a small share of the total funding of domestic investment in most industrial countries. For the United States in 2003, for example, the trade deficit was equal to 4.9% of GDP and about 31% of domestic investment spending. The trend, nevertheless, has clearly been toward larger external imbalances (surpluses and deficits).

Debt Service Burden

With each successive trade deficit the stock of foreign obligations grows. The current size of this stock is formally measured by the NIIP. In 1981 the United States was a *net creditor* with a net accumulation of assets in the rest of the world of \$374 billion. But a steady and substantial stream of net foreign borrowing has swung the NIIP to a *net debtor* position of about \$2.4 trillion 2003, up from about \$2.2 trillion in 2002, and amounting to a cumulative swing since 1981 of nearly \$3 trillion over this period.¹³

The current annual debt service cost of America's stock of foreign debt can be roughly judged from behavior of the investment income component of the current account balance (see **Table 1**). That series is a measure of the nation's net payments and/or receipts on past investment and debt. If positive, the United States earned more than it paid; if negative, the United States paid more than it earned. Over time trend movement in this measure will be reflective of changes in the stock of net indebtedness. We see in **Table 1** that international investment income in 2002 was a deficit of about \$3.9 billion, down from a surplus of \$10.7 billion in 2001, in 2003 the deficit swung into a surplus of \$16.6. This shrinking of the investment income deficit is likely a short-run phenomenon caused by the current dynamics of interest and dividend payments among the United States and other nations. Over the long-run, if the trade deficit remains on its current upward trajectory, debt obligations will continue to grow, and it is quite credible to expect U.S. international debt payments to reach the \$100 billion range before the current account deficit is erased and net foreign borrowing stops.

A \$100 billion transfer of real income to the rest of the world is significant, but it is not an overwhelming outflow for the world's largest economy. In the year 2003, the United States will likely have a GDP valued at over \$11 trillion dollars. For an economy of this size, a \$100 billion foreign debt service burden amounts to only 1.0% of GDP. Clearly, insolvency is not lurking just over the horizon, particularly since the economy will be substantially larger in the future and even more able to afford a debt service burden of this size. Nevertheless, a debt service payment of this size is significant, particularly if viewed in the context of the economy's average annual growth rate of real GDP. For a mature industrial economy like the United States the long-term growth rate of real output can optimistically be expected to average as much as 3.0% per annum. Thus a yearly debt service burden of about 1.0% of GDP would mean that the rate of growth of output that is effectively available to the domestic economy is reduced to 2.0%. That would be a significant erosion of the rate of improvement in the U.S. living standard. At a 3.0% annual growth rate national income doubles about every 24 years, whereas at a 2.0% annual rate, doubling occurs every 35 years. Put another way, if the per-capita GDP in 2002 of \$36,600 grows on average at 3.0% for 24 years, GDP per capita would equal about \$75,000, whereas growing at 2.0% for that same period would bring per capita GDP to only \$59,000 or about 21% less.

¹³ See U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, *2003 Yearend Net International Investment Position*, June 30, 2004.

The degree of burden actually incurred, however, will depend in part on how the nation uses what it borrows. If foreign borrowing is used to finance an increase in domestic consumption (public or private), there is no boost given to future productive capacity. Therefore, to meet debt service expense, future consumption must be reduced below what it otherwise would have been. Such a reduction represents the burden of foreign borrowing. This is not necessarily bad; it all depends on how one values current versus future consumption. If, on the other hand, foreign saving is used to increase domestic investment the burden could be slight. We know that investment spending increases the nation's capital stock and expands the economy's capacity to produce goods and services. The value of this added output may be sufficient to both pay foreign creditors and also augment domestic spending. In this case, because future consumption need not fall below what it otherwise would have been, there would be no true economic burden. It is difficult to assess to what extent U.S. debt service cost will be attenuated by the shift in the 1990s to the pattern of supporting rising domestic investment using foreign borrowing from the pattern of the 1980s of support, more or less exclusively, added domestic consumption with foreign borrowing. (Keep in mind, however, that the accelerated rate of investment makes only a small net contribution to the size of the nation's huge capital stock. Thus its growth-accelerating effect is commensurately modest. In the calculations of debt burden done just above a relatively high rate of long-term growth was assumed. Therefore the possible boost from earlier elevated rates of investment has probably been accounted for.)

Instability

Trade deficits often raise concern about the potential instability of external sources of finance. What if foreign investors begin to pull their funds out of the United States, disrupting domestic capital markets and the wider economy? There are good reasons to doubt that a sharp turnaround in foreign capital flows is likely. Recent experience of other countries with the panic of foreign investors has shown that such behavior most often results from the growing likelihood that they would not be repaid, that debt service payments were doubtful. This occurred when a country's ability to pay debt service was imperiled by persistent weak economic growth or the rapid consumption of the nation's foreign exchange reserves in the defense of an overvalued currency. These are not risk factors that have much relevance to the circumstances of the United States, which has strong growth and does not fix its exchange rate.

In addition, a large proportion of investments made in the United States have been long-term in nature and not particularly prone to quick changes in commitment. It is very likely that many foreign investors generally see the U.S. economy as a bastion of long-run economic strength and will continue to invest for long-term gain. It is true that a sizeable share of the stock of U.S. foreign debt is in short term assets that can move quickly. That these types of assets will change direction as relative yields rise abroad is quite likely and does raise the risk of instability somewhat. But given the absence of the risk factors noted just above, it is far more likely that such capital outflows will be part of an orderly adjustment process and not lead to undue economic instability. The impact of any exodus of foreign capital, if it did occur, would tend to raise interest rates and dampen credit sensitive activities. But pain would be muted by the large size of the overall U.S. capital market relative to the scale of the foreign capital flows. In recent years the total funds raised in U.S. credit

markets have been around \$2,200 billion. Therefore, net borrowing from the rest of the world at around \$500 billion to \$700 billion represents 25% to 30% of the nations annual flow of credit. This is a magnitude of significance, but if withdrawn gradually it is not necessarily overwhelming.

Effects on Total Output and Employment

Standard economic analysis indicates that a trade deficit does not cause a net loss of output or jobs in the overall economy. Trade deficits will, however, likely change the composition of output and employment. This compositional effect occurs because the forces generating the trade deficit will tend to increase the dollar's exchange rate, raising the incentive to substitute some types of foreign output for similar types of domestic output. But this dampening effect on some domestic industries will tend to be offset by the positive effects of the trade deficits associated capital inflow on other parts of the economy. With a trade deficit some import sensitive industries (i.e. textiles) will have their output and employment decline, but some credit sensitive industries (i.e. housing) will have their output and employment increase. Recently we have seen some domestic manufacturing industries harmed by the trade deficit, but we have also seen a great surge in home-building stimulated by lower interest rates afforded by the trade deficits attendant inflow of foreign capital.

Also, the Federal Reserve, using monetary policy, can set the overall level of spending in the economy to a level consistent with full employment.¹⁴ While deviations from full employment can occur, a well run monetary policy will minimize the incidence and duration of such episodes and help keep the total level of employment high in most years with or without outsourcing, trade deficits, or trade in general.

Trade deficits are most often a means of augmenting the level of goods and services available to domestic purchasers, in effect, allowing the nation to spend beyond current domestic output by means of importing foreign output. Both domestic and foreign output are used to meet current domestic demand. With strong demand in an economy operating near or at its productive capacity, and unable to generate a near-term expansion of that productive capacity sufficient to meet that demand, it is possible for domestic industries to be working at full capacity, even as there are also large inflows of similar or related foreign products.

¹⁴ Economies always have some amount of unemployment. Each economy will tend to have a natural rate of unemployment around which the actual unemployment rate fluctuates. This natural rate will also represent the rate at which the economy is effectively at full employment because a lower rate of unemployment would not be sustainable due to the inducement of higher a rate of inflation. The natural rate is not zero because at any point in time there will be some people who are changing jobs and other people who normal market forces have temporarily displaced. More fluid the economy's labor markets the lower its natural rate of unemployment is likely to be. For most of the last 30 years the United States economy's natural rate was judged to be in the 5.5% to 6.0% range. Since the mid-1990s, the natural rate has likely fallen to the 4.5% to 5.0% range. Most often an appropriate level of aggregate spending is that consistent with employment at the natural rate. There is no theory or evidence to indicate full employment is influenced by the trade deficit.

Another reason why more imports do not lead to a reduction of domestic output and employment is because a very large share of U.S. trade is *intraindustry* trade in intermediate products — trade within the same industry due to an internationally fragmented production process — a final product will often be composed of several components, some of domestic origin and some of foreign origin.¹⁵ With this structure of production, an increase in the demand for the final product will increase both domestic output and imported foreign output of necessary components, regardless the level of capacity utilization. Finally, there may simply be no domestic counterpart for some goods because product differentiation has led to specialization across countries in the production of particular goods. (The economic gain from such specialization arises from economies of scale, not comparative advantage and is common among high income economies with very similar resource endowments).

For these reasons, to a substantial degree the size of the trade deficit during an economic expansion, as during the 1990s, cannot be taken as a one-for-one measure of reduced domestic output and the loss of the associated jobs.

Effects on Particular Sectors

While large trade deficits do not necessarily reduce the total level of economic activity, they can alter the composition of domestic output. There is evidence that over the last 20 years persistent trade deficits may have caused a reduction in the size of the domestic manufacturing sector.¹⁶ The trade deficit exerts some downward pressure on the size of the domestic manufacturing sector because the trade inflow cannot easily augment the full spectrum of goods and services that comprise the nation's increase in domestic demand. About 70% of domestic spending is on services, but because trade is a relatively poor vehicle for acquiring services, only about 15% of U.S. imports are services. Therefore the trade deficit, largely a net inflow of manufactured goods, may not meet the augmented domestic demand for goods *and services*. In this circumstance relative prices can be expected to change so as to reallocate some resources out of the domestic manufacturing sector and into the

¹⁵ The significance of intraindustry trade varies by industry. For industries that make sophisticated manufactured goods it tends to be very high with over 90% of trade of this form. In labor intensive industries, that manufacture less sophisticated products, very little trade is intraindustry. Intra industry trade is to a great degree a manifestation of a wide spread move towards more fragmented production processes, or what is called *vertical specialization*. It is estimated that about one-third of the growth of world trade since 1970 is the result of this phenomenon and can be expected to be even higher for the trade of an advanced industrial economy such as the United States. For further examination of the nature and significance of intraindustry trade, see Paul Krugman and Maurice Obstfeld, *International Economics: Theory and Policy* (Reading, MA: Addison Wesley, 1997), pp. 139-142. For further examination of the *vertical specialization* phenomenon, see David Hummels, Dana Rapoport, and Kei-Mu Yi, "The Nature and Growth of Vertical Specialization." *Journal of International Economics* 54 (June 2001) pp. 75-96.

¹⁶ See CRS Report RL32350, *Deindustrialization of the U.S. Economy: The Roles of Trade, Productivity, and Recession*, by Craig K. Elwell; CRS Report RL32179, *Manufacturing Output, Employment, and Productivity*, by Stephen Cooney; and Rowthorn, Robert and Ramana Ramaswamy, "Deindustrialization: Causes and Implications," *Staff Studies for the World Economic Outlook*, IMF, 1997.

production of services to help meet the added domestic demand for services. This, in turn, should induce a greater reliance on the net inflow of foreign manufactured goods to help meet the added domestic demand for manufactures. The outcome will be greater real output by the domestic service sector and smaller real output by the domestic manufacturing sector.¹⁷

Recent surges of the trade deficit have clearly had a sharp negative impact on particular sectors. On the export side, agriculture and commercial aircraft experienced dampened export sales, mainly due to general weakness in other economies, particularly in Asia. On the import side, the steel industry and the textile and apparel industries came under considerable pressure from low price competition from countries affected by economic crises. Adjustment to such trade effects can be economically painful for workers in these harmed sectors. Many economists argue that it is usually more beneficial to the overall economy to encourage adjustment than it is to protect sectors from the disruptive effects of trade. There are government programs that provide some amount of *trade adjustment assistance*, but there are important questions about the adequacy of these programs.

Policy Responses to Trade Deficits

So long as domestic saving in the United States falls short of domestic investment and an inflow of foreign saving is available to fill all or part of the gap, the United States will run a trade deficit. This suggests that the use of trade policy tools to alter the flow of exports or imports, while imposing efficiency costs on the domestic economy, would not *over time* change the domestic investment-saving imbalance and therefore, would not change the overall size of the trade deficit.¹⁸ On the other hand, macroeconomic policy tools have the potential to alter the saving-investment balance and the trade balance, but the realistic scope for their use is limited.

Trade Policy Responses

Trade policy involves actions to directly stimulate or retard the flows of imports and exports such as the erection or removal of tariffs and subsidies. Such actions will have significant impacts on the level of trade and economic efficiency (positive or negative) but will not change the balance of trade. In each instance action aimed at altering one side of the trade equation tends to induce effects via the exchange rate that will cause the other side of the equation to change in the same direction and by an equal amount. For example, using a tariff or quota as a barrier to stem the flow of imports into the United States would also reduce the demand for foreign exchange needed by the United States to purchase imports, appreciate the dollar's exchange rate,

¹⁷ This argument is not likely undermined by the development of U.S. trade surpluses in services in this period as *tradable* services are a small sub-set of the full spectrum of, largely non-tradable, services in domestic demand.

¹⁸ Similarly, the removal of U.S. trade barriers, while conferring efficiency gains, would not change the domestic investment-saving imbalance and, therefore, would not widen the trade deficit.

and induce an equivalent curtailment of export sales. With this policy the level of trade has been reduced along with the economic *gains from trade* and general economic well-being, but the trade deficit would be unchanged. Alternatively, getting our trading partners to remove trade barriers would stimulate export sales, but would increase the demand for dollars by foreigners, appreciate the dollar exchange rate and induce an equivalent increase of imports. In this case the level of trade is increased along with the gains from trade and economic well-being, but the trade deficit would be unchanged. Finally, an export subsidy would also stimulate export sales but an exchange rate induced rise of import sales would also leave the trade balance unchanged. (In the case of the subsidy, economic theory holds that a higher level of trade does not lead to an increase in economic welfare as the gains from trade are more than offset by the economic inefficiency of distorting the allocation of resources towards the export sector.)

Macroeconomic Policy Responses

The mechanics of the saving-investment relationship in an internationally open economy such as the United States suggests that there are essentially three ways the trade gap can be reduced. One, the rate of domestic investment falls. Two, the level of domestic saving rises. Or three, some combination of one and two occurs. Macroeconomic policy, the use of monetary and fiscal policy tools, can in theory effect changes in these variables. Monetary policy, by raising domestic interest rates and braking economic activity, can lower the rate of domestic investment and likely narrow the trade deficit. (At the extreme, a recession would likely dramatically reduce the trade deficit as it did in 2001.) Because of its negative effects on economic growth, decreasing the rate of domestic investment is not generally considered the most desirable economic course to follow, however.

The second course to a smaller trade deficit, raising the domestic saving rate, while having considerable economic merit, is a very problematic goal for macroeconomic policy. As explained above, fiscal decisions on taxing and spending influence the deficit or surplus position of the federal budget and the rate of public saving. We saw in the late 1990s a rise in the U.S. overall saving rate as a consequence of a rising public saving rate stemming from the sharp swing of the federal budget from a deficit of \$290 billion in 1992 to a surplus of \$236 billion in 2000. But budget deficits have returned and the government saving rate has fallen accordingly. Given the political nature of budget deliberations, it seems very problematic whether the federal budget can be an exploitable policy tool for reducing the trade deficit.

Can macroeconomic policy lift the low private saving rate? Proposals have been made to use the tax code to raise incentives for saving by households. Careful analysis reveals that such proposals most often have uncertain effects on the saving-investment balance, as they tend to raise both saving and investment.¹⁹ Other proposals, such as individual retirement accounts, may just redistribute saving, raising the household rate (a little), but lowering the public rate by an offsetting amount.

¹⁹ See CRS Report RL30873, *Saving in the United States: How Has It Changed and Why Is It Important?*, by Brian Cashell and Gail Makinen.

The Effect of Tax Cuts. Federal budget surpluses of recent years have been an important source of saving for the U.S. economy. But changes in federal tax and spending policies have now turned the budget to deficit for the foreseeable future. It is possible that tax cuts in particular could lead to an increased rate of household saving, leading to no deterioration of the national saving rate and no increase of the trade deficit. The more likely outcome, however, is that some portion of the tax cut will be saved and some portion will be spent. Recent household behavior would suggest that the proportion spent has been much larger than the proportion saved. To the extent that the tax cut is spent by households the national savings rate will fall. In the framework outlined above, such a large reduction of saving will tend to raise domestic interest rates and attract more foreign capital (foreign saving) and induce a substantial increase of the trade deficit. Of course, a rise in the trade deficit can occur if there is also an available flow of savings from the rest of the world. The less able the U.S. is to attract foreign saving the less the trade deficit will rise and the more domestic investment would be trimmed to accord with a smaller flow of saving.

The Effect of Economic Policy Abroad. Foreign economic policy can help or hinder efforts by the United States to decrease the size of its trade deficit. As discussed above, the U.S. trade deficit is a two-way affair, reflecting the behavior of borrower and lender alike. On the other side of the U.S. inclination to spend beyond current domestic output by importing the difference is a symmetrical inclination of one or more foreign nations to spend well short of domestic output and export the difference. It seems that American spending is as important to these economies as foreign borrowing is to the United States. The most orderly adjustment to a smaller U.S. trade deficit is likely to occur if as the United States moves to bring domestic spending *down* closer to domestic output, our major trading partners move to bring domestic spending *up* closer to their domestic output. In so doing, our efforts to become less dependent on imports from them is complemented by their efforts to become less dependent on exports to us. The less willing foreign economies are to change this current pattern of spending the more protracted and difficult shrinking the U.S. current account deficit could be. If foreign economic policies work to counter U.S. policies attempting to raise domestic saving by reducing their domestic saving, then the dollar depreciation needed to induce a sizable reduction of the U.S. trade deficit would be larger than if foreign policies were more supportive of the change in spending patterns.

Without such mutually supporting policies, the dollar might have to fall 40% to 50% to achieve any sizable reduction of the U.S. trade deficit. A depreciation of that magnitude is risky for two reasons. One, some would argue that the greater the size of the currency's fall, the greater the chance that it will fall too far, too fast, sending a jolt to world financial markets that could possibly precipitate a world recession. Two, the dollar may not fall evenly against other currencies. Since 2002, the dollar has fallen over 30% against the euro but only about 15% against the Japanese yen. This has occurred because Japan has more actively tried to limit the strengthening of the yen relative to the dollar, accumulating a large stock of dollar assets. If such behavior becomes wide-spread, then the burden of adjustment of trade flows would fall heavily on the euro area and raise the risk of major economic collapse there.

Because of their size and degree of economic interaction with the United States, Japan and the euro zone (particularly Germany) would likely have to play a key role

in assuring the world economy has an orderly adjustment to a weaker dollar and a much smaller American trade deficit. Yet neither has had a recent history of economic strength and there are reasons to doubt their willingness to undertake the actions that would better insure an orderly adjustment to a smaller U.S. trade deficit. Japan has struggled with poor economic performance for more than a decade and despite much better performance recently it is unclear that it is willing to overcome its fears of deflation and move strongly toward a stronger yen and reduced dependence on exports to support economic activity there. In Europe, structural rigidities continue to slow economic growth and a distinct bias towards tight macroeconomic policies further inhibits economic activity. In addition, there is an evident tendency of the euro zone to also use exports to support economic activity and therefore an inclination to avoid significant strengthening of the euro. Of course, this adjustment process would also be assisted by the appreciation of other currencies, particularly in other Asian economies that have 'pegged' their currency to the dollar. There has been much attention focused on China and its pegged currency, but the case for a stronger yuan is more tentative. Unlike Japan, China has a relatively small trade surplus. And unlike Japan and the euro zone, China does not have a well developed and stable financial system and as a result probably has limited ability to successfully contend with currency instability. All and all, it would seem quite problematic whether other countries will follow policies that would increase the prospect for an orderly shrinking of the U.S. current account deficit.

Conclusion

A trade deficit is not necessarily bad. It is most useful to see it as a vehicle to achieve an economic end, conferring some benefit at some cost. Whether the trade deficit is good or bad will hinge on how one weighs the benefit against the cost. The overriding benefit is the ability to borrow internationally so as to push current spending beyond current production. Trade deficits in the 1990s have been a means to help finance an elevated level of domestic investment. Investment augments the nation's future productive possibilities and is a boon to long-term economic welfare.

The cost of the trade deficit is the debt service that must be paid on the associated borrowing from the rest of the world. The U.S. debt service has grown steadily and will soon reach a size that could impose a significant decrement to the rate of growth of our living standard. It is a burden that is still well within the U.S. means to pay, but some might argue it is a burden that needs to be curtailed.

Reducing the trade deficit by policy actions is very problematic, however. It is clear that standard trade policy tools such as tariffs, quotas, and subsidies will not change saving or investment behavior and, therefore, will not reduce the trade deficit, but in many cases will create distortions that reduce national economic welfare. Macroeconomic policy can affect the saving-investment balance and can change the trade deficit, but how to do so by raising domestic saving rather than reducing domestic investment remains unclear. Recent policy changes have turned the federal budget from surplus to deficit for the next several years, reducing public saving, and tending to increase the trade deficit. The trend toward larger trade deficits will be reinforced by the prospect of sustained economic weakness in Japan and Europe leading to an increasing stream of capital outflows to the U.S. economy. Generating

a sustained increase in the U.S. economy's rate of saving by reversing the steadily sagging rate of household saving would reduce the trade deficit, but how to raise that rate is uncertain.

There is also the very likely prospect that the trade deficit may correct itself without any inducement by economic policy. There are good reasons to expect that economic forces will work to sate the demand for foreign borrowing as well as reduce the supply of foreign funds being offered. A significant acceleration of the rate of growth abroad relative to that of the United States (raising domestic investment relative to domestic saving abroad) would likely initiate such a process. A change in relative growth rates would most likely alter rates of return between the U.S. and the rest of the world, redirect a larger share of international investment flows towards destinations other than the U.S., and shrink the U.S. trade deficit. This correction does not necessarily have to lead to an elimination of the trade deficit. It might only fall enough to assure a more sustainable rate of accumulation of foreign debt. Nevertheless, a smaller trade deficit will, lacking an increase in the rate of domestic saving, likely lead to higher interest rates and a lower rate of domestic investment. And sustaining that lower rate of investment will still require some net inflow of foreign saving.