

CRS Report for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

India-U.S. Economic Relations

Wayne Morrison and Alan Kronstadt
Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

Summary

India is a country with a long history and a large population (more than one billion people, nearly half living in poverty). Given that it is the world's most populous democracy, a U.S. ally in anti-terrorism efforts, and a potentially major export market, India's economic development and its trade relations with the United States are of concern to Congress. This report will be updated as events warrant.

India's Economy

Upon achieving independence from British rule in 1947, India pursued policies that sought to assert government planning over most sectors of the economy and strove to promote relative economic self-sufficiency. These policies included extensive government spending on infrastructure, the promotion of government-owned companies, pervasive regulatory authority over private sector investment, and extensive use of trade and investment barriers to protect local firms from foreign competition. While these policies achieved some economic goals (such as rapid industrialization), the overall effect was to promote widespread inefficiency throughout the economy (e.g., unprofitable state-run firms and a constrained private sector) and to greatly restrict the level of foreign direct investment (FDI) in India. India's real GDP growth was relatively stagnant during the 1970s, averaging about 2.7%. Piecemeal economic reforms and increased government spending during the 1980s helped boost average real GDP growth to 6.0%.¹

1991 Economic Crisis and Reforms. India suffered a major economic crisis in 1991, largely due to the effects of oil price shocks (resulting from the 1990 Gulf War), the collapse of the Soviet Union (a major trading partner and source of foreign aid), and a sharp depletion of its foreign exchange reserves (caused largely by large and continuing government budget deficits).² The economic crisis led India, under the Indian National Congress (INC)-led government of Prime Minister Narasimha Rao, to cut the budget

¹ Unless otherwise noted, data on India are on a fiscal year basis, which runs from April-March.

² The central government's budget deficit as a percent of GDP averaged over 7% from 1980 to 1990. The high level of government debt became unsustainable as the high rate of government borrowing raised real interest rates, sparked inflation, and undermined faith in the currency.

deficit and implement a number of economic reforms, including sharp cuts in tariff and non-tariff barriers, liberalization of FDI rules, exchange rate and banking reforms, and a significant reduction in the government's control over private sector investment (by removing licensing requirements). These reforms helped boost economic growth and led to a surge in FDI flows to India in the mid-1990s (annual FDI rose from about \$100 million in 1990 to \$2.4 billion by 1996; more than one-third coming from U.S. investors). Reform efforts stagnated, however, under the weak coalition governments of the mid-1990s. The 1997/1998 Asian financial crisis, and U.S.-imposed sanctions on India (as a result of its May 1998 nuclear tests), further dampened the economic outlook. Following the 1999 parliamentary elections, the new Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) — led government, under Prime Minister Atal Vajpayee, launched second-generation economic reforms, including major deregulation, privatization, and tariff-reducing measures. During the 1990s, real GDP growth averaged 5.6%.

Current Economic Conditions. India has experienced relatively healthy economic growth over the past few years. From 2000-2002, real GDP growth averaged 4.6%.³ Global Insight, an economic forecasting firm, projects India's GDP will rise by 7.9% in (FY)2003.⁴ By some measurements, India is among the world's largest economies. While on a nominal basis, India's 2003 GDP was \$577 billion, on a purchasing power parity (PPP) basis, it was close to \$3 trillion, making it the world's 4th largest economy (after the United States, China, and Japan).⁵ However, its per capita GDP on a PPP basis (a common measurement of a nation's living standards) was \$2,780, equal to only 7.4% of U.S. levels. Poverty is perhaps India's greatest problem. According to the World Bank, India has 433 million people (44.2% of the population) living below the international poverty measurement of less than \$1 per day.⁶

India's trade is relatively small: in 2002, it was the world's 30th largest merchandise exporter and the 24th largest importer.⁷ India's principal exports in 2002 were textiles (22% of total), gems and jewelry (16.8%), and chemicals and related products (14.5%). Its top three imports were petroleum (27.4% of total), pearls and precious and semiprecious stones (9.0%), and gold and silver (8.9%). India's top three export markets were the United States (19.5% of total), the United Arab Emirates, and Hong Kong, and its top sources for imports were the United States (6.1% of total), Switzerland, and Belgium.

³ India's economy is heavily dependent on agriculture, which in turn is heavily dependent on rainfall during the monsoon season. In 2002, India experienced a drought, which had a major impact on GDP growth that year.

⁴ Source: Global Insight, *India, Interim Annual Forecast*, February 2004.

⁵ PPP data reflects foreign data in national currencies converted into U.S. dollars, based on a comparable level of purchasing power these data would have in the United States.

⁶ The World Bank notes that India has made significant progress in reducing poverty, especially in recent years. It estimates that India's poverty rate in the 1970s was over 50%. Official Indian government poverty rate measurements differ from World Bank data; it estimates that the poverty rate at 26% (at the end of the 1990s), down from 36% in 1993/1994.

⁷ The World Bank estimates that, based on the size of India's economy, its level of trade should be \$150 billion higher than it currently is.

Comparisons Between India and China. Many analysts argue that India's economy has failed to live up to its potential, especially relative to other developing countries, such as China, which has a comparable population size, but has enjoyed far greater economic development in recent years. **Table 1** indicates that both India and China experienced significant growth in population, GDP and per capita GDP (both measured on a PPP basis), trade, and FDI over the past 13 years. However, on several economic fronts, India lost significant ground to China.

**Table 1. Selected Comparative Data for India and China:
1990 and 2003**

	India		China		India's Size Relative to China	
	1990	2003	1990	2003	1990	2002
Population (millions)	850	1,062	1,139	1,295	74.6%	82.0%
GDP, PPP basis (\$billions)	1,189	2,951	1,583	6,675	75.1%	44.2%
Per Capita GDP in \$PPPs	1,400	2,780	1,390	5,150	100.1%	54.0%
Exports (\$millions)	17,975	54,000	62,090	438,500	28.9%	12.3%
Imports (\$millions)	23,438	68,800	42,354	413,098	55.3%	16.7%
FDI stock (\$millions)	1,592	34,559	68,513	490,243	2.3%	7.0%

PPP refers to purchasing power parity, which reflect the purchasing power of foreign data in U.S. dollars.
Sources: Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) and Global Insight.

In 1990, India's economy (GDP on PPP basis) was about three-quarters the size of China's, but by 2003 it fallen to 44% China's size. India's living standards (per capita GDP on PPP basis) were slightly greater than China's in 1990, but by 2003 it had fallen to 54% of China's. India's exports relative to Chinese exports fell from 29% in 1990 to 12% in 2003, while imports dropped from 55% to 17%. India made small gains in FDI flows relative to China over this period (rising from 2% to 7%); however, the total level of FDI stock in China remains substantially higher than in India. In fact, FDI flows to China in 2003 alone (nearly \$54 billion) were 54% higher the cumulative stock of FDI in India through 2003 (about \$35 billion). Many economists attribute the sharp widening economic gaps between India and China to differences in the pace and scope of economic and trade reforms undertaken by each country, where China has substantially reformed its trade and investment regimes (which has contributed to sharp rises in GDP growth, trade, and FDI flows), India's economic reforms have been far less comprehensive and effective. For example, China's average tariff has fallen from 43% in 1992 to 12% in 2002. India's average tariff during this period dropped substantially, from 128% to 32%, but still remains among the highest in the world.

U.S.-Indian Economic Relations

Trade between the United States and India is relatively small, but has risen sharply over the past two years. In 2003, U.S. exports to and imports from India totaled \$5.0 billion and \$13.1 billion, respectively (see **Table 2**), making India the 24th largest U.S. export market and the 18th largest supplier of U.S. imports. U.S. exports to, and imports from, India rose by 21.7% and 10.4% respectively in 2003 over 2002 levels. Major U.S. exports to India included chemicals, computers, and aircraft. Top U.S. imports from India

were non-metallic manufactured minerals (mainly processed diamonds), clothing and apparel, and miscellaneous manufactured items (mainly jewelry).

According to Indian government data, the United States is India's second largest source of FDI (after Mauritius⁸), accounting for or 16% of total FDI flows to India from 1991 through July 2001. U.S. Commerce Department data on U.S. FDI flows (which differ from Indian data) estimates total U.S. FDI in India at year-end of 2002 (on a historical cost basis) at \$3.7 billion, an increase of \$900 million over 2001 levels.

Table 2. U.S.-India Trade: 2000-2003
(\$millions)

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2002/2003 % change
Total U.S. Exports	3,663	3,764	4,098	4,986	21.7
Chemical materials and products	97	111	293	506	72.4
Office machines and automatic data processing machines (i.e., computers)	367	349	371	365	-1.8
Transport equipment (mainly aircraft and parts)	312	394	331	345	4.0
Total U.S. Imports	10,686	9,738	11,818	13,053	10.4
Nonmetallic mineral manufactures	2,768	2,180	2,931	2,962	1.1
Articles of apparel and clothing	2,002	1,934	2,064	2,156	4.5
Miscellaneous manufactured products	844	752	1,073	1,424	32.7

Source: U.S. International Trade Commission DataWeb.

Major U.S.-Indo Trade Issues

India's sizable population and large and growing middle class make it a potentially large market for U.S. goods and services.⁹ However, a number of factors hamper increased economic ties. First, in addition to maintaining high tariff rates on imports (especially on products that compete with domestic products), India also assesses high surcharges and taxes on a variety of imports. Major non-tariff barriers include sanitary and phytosanitary restrictions, import licenses, regulations that mandate that only public sector entities can import certain products, discriminatory government procurement practices, and the use of export subsidies.¹⁰ A variety of restrictions are placed on foreign services providers and on the level of permitted FDI in certain industries. Second, India

⁸ Many foreign firms invest in India through Mauritius for tax purposes.

⁹ Estimates of the size of India's middle class widely differ. Using Indian standards, estimates of the middle class run as high as 300 million people. The Commerce Department estimates that India has 20 million "well-off consumers" with annual incomes exceeding \$13,000, and 80 million people with incomes over \$3,500, and 100 million people with incomes over \$2,800.

¹⁰ Historically, India maintained extensive non-tariff barriers on many imports, based on balance-of-payments reasons. However, in 1999, a WTO dispute resolution panel ruled that these restrictions were no longer justifiable, which prompted India (in 2001) to remove many of its quantitative import restrictions (although many of these barriers were replaced with high tariffs).

continues to maintain a number of inefficient structural policies which affects its trade, including price controls for many “essential” commodities, extensive government regulation over many sectors of the economy, and extensive public ownership of businesses, many of which are poorly run. Third, despite India’s attempt to develop internationally competitive information technology industries (such as software), U.S. government officials charge that India has a poor record in protecting intellectual property rights (IPR), especially for patents and copyrights. The International Intellectual Property Alliance estimates that IPR piracy in India cost U.S. firms \$468.1 million during 2002.

India’s extensive array of trade and investment barriers has been criticized by U.S. government officials and business leaders as an impediment to its own economic development, as well as to stronger U.S.-Indian ties. For example, the Deputy U.S. Trade Representative asserted in February 2003 that progress in transforming the U.S.-Indian economic relationship has been “slow,” due in part to India’s “grudging attitude” toward imports that produces “multiple, onion-like barriers” to potential exporters. He also noted that “India’s tariff and tax structure undermines its commitments in the WTO,” and that its high agricultural support prices encourage overproduction in that sector.¹¹ Some U.S. interest groups have expressed concern that closer U.S.-India economic ties could accelerate the practice by some U.S. firms of outsourcing information technology (IT) and customer service jobs to India. Indian officials have expressed concern over legislation recently passed in Congress (H.R. 2673, P.L. 108-199) that limits certain federal government contractors from outsourcing work overseas.¹²

Prospects for India’s Further Economic Reform

India faces a number of significant challenges to its goals of sustaining healthy economic growth and further reducing poverty. Many economists argue that India needs to substantially liberalize its trade and investment regimes, accelerate privatization of state firms, cut red tape and crack down on corruption, and substantially boost spending on its in physical and human infrastructure.¹³ However, large and continuing government deficits, and the high level of public debt (equal to 62% of GDP in 2003) severely hamper the ability of the government to boost spending for needed infrastructure projects, without major reforms to the tax system and significant cuts in government subsidies. A July 2003 report of the World Bank lauded India’s “impressive progress” in increasing incomes and living standards, but warned that the trend cannot be sustained unless there

¹¹ Remarks by Ambassador Jon Huntsman, Deputy U.S. Trade Representative, February 5, 2003.

¹² They have also expressed concern over proposals in the United States to limit outsourcing overseas by state government contractors (such as S. 2094, introduced by Senator Dodd) and other possible restrictions that might be placed on U.S. firms moving operations overseas. U.S. officials have countered that the best way for India to counter “protectionist” pressures in the United States is to further liberalize its markets.

¹³ On the political front, tensions with Pakistan and continued violence in the disputed territory of Kashmir pose serious threats to India’s long-term economic health.

is “an acceleration of reforms.”¹⁴ However, Prime Minister Vajpayee stated in May 2003 that India “cannot simply push through reforms as shock therapy.”¹⁵

Organized resistance to many of the desired reforms comes in large part from Hindu nationalist groups that are increasingly influential since the BJP’s ascendance in 1998. The “Forty Points of Hindu Agenda,” as outlined by the World Hindu Council in 1997, includes an explicit call for an Indian economic policy “based on *Swadesh*” (or self-reliance). As a “sister organization” to the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) — itself the major Hindu nationalist organization — the Swadeshi Jagaran Manch (SJM) has taken the lead in efforts to forward the *Swadeshi* cause. According to the SJM, “The Western notion of a global market does not fit into the *Swadeshi* approach,” nor does the “Western notion of individual freedom, which fragments and compartmentalizes family, economy, culture, and social values ...” The SJM is resolved to oppose any further globalization of India’s economy, claiming that the “invasion” of FDI has caused “unprecedented unemployment” and the closure of thousands of small-scale industries. Another affiliated group, the Bharatiya Mazdoor Sangh, lobbies in opposition to any further liberalization of India’s labor laws. Protection of India’s agriculture and textile industries is viewed as especially vital. These kinds of anti-globalization policies continue to enjoy limited, but still substantial backing among Indians.¹⁶

Despite the sometimes considerable resistance to further progress with India’s economic reforms, most analysts believe that state elections in 2003 and national elections in 2004 will not alter New Delhi’s policy direction in any meaningful way. Top BJP figures appear eager to move forward with privatization and the main opposition INC, while posturing itself as a protector of public sector jobs, has assisted in the reform process. Still, many observers argue that a sometimes fractious national coalition government is unlikely to amass the parliamentary votes necessary to push through legislation on controversial major economic reforms (such as those dealing with the financial and agricultural sectors), or to significantly reduce the government’s budget deficits, barring a major economic crisis. Thus, New Delhi’s movement on key reform issues could remain slow in the near- and medium-term.¹⁷ Despite this, India’s near-term economic prospects appear to be positive. Global Insights projects India’s real GDP will rise by 6.4% in FY2004, while the EIU projects growth at 6.9%. The growth in IT-related service exports is expected to play a major factor in India’s GDP growth.¹⁸

¹⁴ “India Urged to Reduce High Debt Burden,” *Financial Times*, July 21, 2003; “India: Sustaining Reform, Reducing Poverty,” World Bank India Development Policy Review, July 19, 2003.

¹⁵ “India For Reforms, But No Shock Therapy,” *Times of India* (Delhi), May 30, 2003).

¹⁶ See the Swadeshi Jagaran Manch at [<http://www.swadeshi.org>]. During the autumn of 2002, New Delhi’s efforts to move forward with the privatization of the country’s two largest oil concerns — Bharat Petroleum and Hindustan Petroleum — ran into considerable resistance from the so-called *Swadeshi* lobby.

¹⁷ “India Risk: Government Effectiveness Risk,” Economist Intelligence Unit, April 9, 2003; “Govt Win in Gujarat May Revive India’s Selloff Program,” Dow Jones International News, December 5, 2002; Rajesh Ramachandran, “Cong Get Economic Slogans to Take on BJP,” *Times of India* (Delhi), March 31, 2003.

¹⁸ *Global Insight, India*, February 10, 2004, and EIU DataServices.