Our Perspective on the Trade "Deficit"

June 17, 2024

According to Merriam-Webster's Dictionary, a "deficit" is falling short of an essential or desirable amount or number. In the specific case of a budget deficit, the definition becomes an excess of expenditure over revenue. Therefore, we assume that a "trade deficit" means a shortfall in exports since economists say exports exceeding imports mean a trade surplus. The implication is that this trade deficiency harms the economy while a surplus is good. The concern is so great that the government economists tell us that any trade deficit detracts from GDP (gross domestic product). So, for the first quarter of 2024, the economy grew by only 1.3%. However, due to the trade deficit, that number would have been 2.2% since 0.9% was the measure of the trade deficit. Strangely enough, the trade deficit expands as the economy grows faster and pulls in more goods and services than it exports, and the economic growth rate becomes understated.

Drilling down on these metrics, one might question the validity of the whole implication of a trade deficit. Consumers can buy more when imports are less expensive, meaning they are better off. In the bigger picture, countries that sell goods and services and take dollars in payment save to buy future goods and services from the U.S. If they did not have this intent, they would hold dollars forever. In other words, any dollar IOUs that are never collected benefit U.S. consumers. On the other hand, if they plan to acquire U.S. goods and services in the future, then U.S. production will rise to meet that demand, the economy will grow, and the budget deficit will become a budget surplus! This highlights the potential benefits of a trade deficit to U.S. consumers, challenging the negative perception of trade deficits.

The prospect of imposing tariffs on imports in this framework does not make sense. Tariffs raise the price of imports, which aids domestic manufacturers. Consumers may shift to domestically produced goods because of the tariff, but they may also look to buy other cheaper products that are not subject to the tariffs. At the same time, there is a decline in imports due to levies that undermine workers in those countries that are penalized. The affected country will likely impose retaliatory tariffs to level the playing field. As a result, both consumers and workers in both countries suffer from the tariff. This underlines the potential unintended consequences of imposing tariffs, advocating for a more cautious approach to trade policy decisions.

In summary, there is no global trade surplus or deficit. However, virtually all countries run either a deficit or surplus, depending on economic circumstances. Over time, such surpluses and deficits should be reversed unless there is government intervention via tools like tariffs, embargoes, and other restrictions that hinder the free flow of goods and services at the global level. This highlights the intricate and interconnected nature of global trade dynamics, a complexity that is often overlooked in the traditional understanding of trade deficits.

For years, the U.S. consumer has benefited from a U.S. trade deficit. Nobody forces Americans to buy foreign goods; they are purchased because they offer a favorable economic benefit. At the same time, purchases of those competitive goods benefit workers in countries that produce those goods or services. Politicians should look seriously at these relationships before making most of us worse.