

# Austerity is not enough

By André Grjebine and [Francesco Saraceno](#)

It is certainly possible to question whether the role acquired by the rating agencies in the international economy is legitimate. But if in the end their message must be taken into account, then this should be done based on what they are really saying and not on the economic orthodoxy attributed to them, sometimes wrongly. This orthodoxy is so prevalent that many commentators are continuing to talk about the decision by Standard & Poor's (S&P) to downgrade the rating of France and other European countries as if this could be attributed to an insufficiently strong austerity policy.

In reality, the rating agency [justifies](#) the downgrade that it has decided with arguments opposed to this orthodoxy. For instance, the agency criticises the agreement between European leaders that emerged from the EU summit on 9 December 2011 and the statements that followed it, making the reproach that the agreement takes into account only one aspect of the crisis, as if it "... stems primarily from fiscal profligacy at the periphery of the euro zone. In our view, however, the financial problems facing the euro zone are as much a consequence of rising external imbalances and divergences in competitiveness between the EMU's core and the so-called 'periphery'. As such, we believe that a reform process based on a pillar of fiscal austerity alone risks becoming self-defeating, as domestic demand falls in line with consumers' rising concerns about job security and disposable incomes, eroding national tax revenues."

Based on this, S&P believes that the main risk facing the European states could come from a deterioration in the fiscal positions of certain among them "in the wake of a more recessionary macroeconomic environment." As a result, S&P does not exclude a further deterioration in the coming year of the

rating of euro zone countries.

So if the European countries do indeed take into account the explanations of the rating agency, they should implement economic policies that are capable of both supporting growth and thereby facilitating the repayment of public debts while at the same time rebalancing the current account balances between the euro zone countries. This dual objective could be achieved only by a stimulus in the countries running a surplus, primarily Germany.

### **Unsustainable debt**

The budget adjustments being imposed on the countries of the periphery should also be spread over a period that is long enough for its recessionary effects to be minimised. Such a strategy would accord with the principle that in a group as heterogeneous as the euro zone, the national policies of member countries must be synchronised but certainly not convergent, as is being proposed in some quarters. Such a policy would boost the growth of the zone as a whole, it would make debt sustainable and it would reduce the current account surpluses of some countries and the deficits of others. The least we can say is that the German government is far from this approach.

Didn't Angela Merkel respond to the S&P statement by calling once again for strengthening fiscal discipline in the countries that were downgraded, that is to say, adopting an analysis opposed to that of the rating agency? Given its argumentation, one begins to wonder whether the agency wouldn't have been better advised to downgrade the country that wants to impose austerity throughout the euro zone rather than wrongly to give it a feeling of being a paragon of virtue by making it one of the few to retain its AAA rating.