

CURRENT POLICY CONUNDRUM

- 1) ORGANIC:** We hoped manufacturing would take up the slack for weak housing & consumers. This isn't happening as yet.
- 2) FISCAL:** Deficits must close or the retirement problems will increase. But short-term deficit reduction would be contractionary and further weaken the economy.
- 3) MONETARY:** Fed policy has limited impact. Like 2001, demand for credit is falling and banks are tightening lending standards.
- 4) FOREIGN:** Exports will help, but to what extent? And a large stimulus would probably require a significant reduction in the value of the dollar. Is this acceptable?
- 5) "COMBO" APPROACHES:** Might a combination of the above or some other "comprehensive approach" work ?

"COMBO" POLICY IDEA from Joe Stiglitz, 2001 Nobel in Economics

HE International Monetary Fund meeting in Singapore last month came at a time of increasing worry about the sustainability of financial imbalances: For how long can the global economy endure the United States' enormous trade deficit? The United States borrows close to \$1 billion on a day — or China's growing surplus of almost \$500 million

These imbalances simply can't go on forever. The good news is that there is a growing consensus to this. The bad news is that no country believes its policies are to blame. The United States points its finger at Asia's undervalued currency, while the rest of the world singles out the American fiscal and trade def-

icits. In its credit, the International Monetary Fund has started to focus on the issue after 15 years of preoccupation with development and growth. Regrettably, however, the current approach has been to monitor the country's economic policies, a strategy that risks addressing symptoms without confronting the larger structural problem.

Fixing the symptoms could actually make matters worse, at least in the short run. Take, for instance, the undervaluation of China's currency and the country's resulting trade surplus, which the United States Treasury suggests is at the heart of the problem. Even if China devalued its yuan relative to the dollar and eliminated its \$114 billion trade surplus with the United States, and even if that immediately translated into a reduction in the United States' trade deficit, the United States would still be borrowing more than \$2 billion a day; an improvement, but hardly a solution.

Worse, it is even more likely that there would be no significant improvement in America's multilateral trade deficit at all. The United States simply buys fewer textiles from China and more from Bangladesh and other developing countries.

Worse still, because a stronger dollar would make imported American goods cheaper in China, the poor rice farmers — the farmers — would see their incomes fall as domestic rice and agriculture dipped. China would be loathe to counter the depression of America's huge agricultural subsidies by diverting money to subsidize its farmers. Growth might accordingly be slowed, which would slow growth

Stiglitz, a professor of economics at Columbia and the author, jointly, of "Making Globalization Work," was awarded the Nobel Prize in economics in 2001.

How to Fix the Global Economy

By Joseph E. Stiglitz

...shows well that the United States: China helps finance the American deficits by buying treasury bonds with the money it gets from its exports. If it doesn't, the dollar will weaken further, which will lower the value of China's dollar reserves (by the end of the year, these will exceed \$1 trillion). Any

Start with a responsible fiscal policy at home.

country that might benefit from China's loss of export market share would put its money into a strong currency, like the euro, rather than the unstable and weakening dollar — or it might choose to invest the money at home, rather than holding more reserves. In short, the United States would find it increasingly difficult to finance its deficits, and the world as a whole might face greater, not less, instability.

Nothing significant can be done about these global imbalances unless the United States attacks its own problems. No one seriously proposes that businesses save money instead of investing in expanding production simply to correct the problem of the trade deficit; and while there may be sermons aplenty about why Americans should save more — certainly more than the negative amount households saved last year — no one

- 1) Cut Govt. Expenditures & Entitlements
- 2) Cut Taxes on Low Income
- 3) Raise Taxes on Higher Income

...er political party has devised a fail-proof way of ensuring that they do so. The Bush tax cuts didn't do it. Expanded incentives for saving didn't do it.

Indeed, most calculations show that these actually reduce national savings, since the cost to the government in lost revenue is greater than the increased household savings. The common wisdom is that there is but one alternative: reducing the government's deficit.

Imagine that the Bush administration suddenly got religion (at least, the religion of fiscal responsibility) and cut expenditures. Assume that raising taxes is unlikely for an administration that has been arguing for further tax cuts. The expenditure cuts by themselves would lead to a weakening of the American and global economy. The Federal Reserve might try to offset this by lowering interest rates, and this might protect the American economy — by encouraging debt-ridden American households to try to take even more money out of their home-equity loans to pay for spending. But that would make America's future even more precarious.

There is one way out of this seeming impasse: expenditure cuts combined with an increase in taxes on upper-income Americans and a reduction in taxes on lower-income Americans. The expenditure cuts would, of course, by themselves reduce spending, but because poor individuals consume a larger fraction of their income than the rich, the "switch" in taxes would, by itself, increase spending. If appropriately designed, such a combination could simultaneously sustain the American economy and reduce the deficit.

Not surprisingly, these recommendations did not emerge from the International Monetary Fund meeting in Singapore. The United States has a veto there, making it unlikely that the fund will recommend policies that aren't to the liking of American administration.

Underlying the current imbalances are fundamental structural problems with the global reserve system. John Maynard Keynes called attention to these problems three-quarters of a century ago. Ideas on how to reform the global monetary system, including creating a new reserve system based on a new international currency, with a little work, be adapted to today's economy. Until we attack structural problems, the world is likely to continue to be plagued by imbalances that threaten the financial stability and economic well-being of us all.

Thomas