

The strange forecasts of the European Commission for 2014

By [Mathieu Plane](#)

The figures for French growth for 2014 published by the European Commission (EC) in its last report in May 2013 appear to reflect a relative consensus. Indeed, [the Commission expects GDP to grow by 1.1% in 2014](#), which is relatively close to the forecasts by [the OECD \(1.3%\)](#) and [the IMF \(0.9%\)](#) (Table 1). However, these forecasts of broadly similar growth hide some substantial differences. First, in defining future fiscal policy, the Commission, unlike the other institutions, considers only the measures already approved. While the Commission's growth forecasts for 2013 included the measures enacted by the Finance Act for 2013 (and therefore the austerity measures), the forecasts for 2014 do not include any forthcoming fiscal measure, even though according to [the stability programme submitted to Brussels in April 2013](#) the government plans austerity measures amounting to 20 billion euros in 2014 (a fiscal impulse of -1 GDP point). The exercise carried out by the Commission for 2014 is thus closer to an economic framework than an actual forecast, as it fails to include the most likely fiscal policy for the year. As a result, the French government has no reason to rely on the Commission's growth forecast for 2014 as it makes radically different assumptions about fiscal policy. But beyond this difference, there is also a problem with the overall coherence of the economic framework set out by the Commission for 2014. It is indeed difficult to understand how for 2014 the Commission can forecast an increase in the unemployment rate with a significantly worsened output gap and a positive fiscal impulse.

Overall, all the institutions share the idea that the output gap in France is currently very wide, lying somewhere between

-3.4 percent of GDP (for the EC) and -4.3 percent (for the OECD) in 2013 (Table 1). Everyone thus believes that current GDP is very far from its long-term trajectory, and this deficit in activity should therefore lead, in the absence of an external shock or a constraint on fiscal and monetary policy, to a spontaneous catch-up in growth in the coming years. This should result in a growth rate that is higher than the potential, regardless of the latter's value. So logically, if there is a neutral or positive fiscal stimulus, GDP growth should therefore be much greater than the trend potential. For the IMF, the negative fiscal impulse (-0.2 percent of GDP) is more than offset by the spontaneous catch-up of the economy, resulting in a slight closing of the output gap (0.2) in 2014. For the OECD, the strongly negative fiscal impulse (-0.7 percent of GDP) does not allow closure of the output gap, which continues to widen (-0.3), but less than the negative impact of the impulse due to the spontaneous process of catching up. In both these cases (OECD and IMF), the restrictive fiscal policy holds back growth but leads to an improvement in the public accounts in 2014 (0.5 percent of GDP for the OECD and 0.3 for the IMF).



As for the Commission, its budget forecasts include a positive fiscal impulse for France in 2014 (+0.4 GDP point). As we saw above, the Commission takes into account only the fiscal measures already approved that affect 2014. However, for 2014, if no new fiscal measures are taken, the tax burden should spontaneously decrease due to the fall between 2013 and 2014 in the yield of certain tax measures or the partial financing of other measures (such as the CICE Tax credit for competitiveness and jobs). This could of course result in a positive fiscal impulse in 2014. But despite this impact, which is similar to a stimulus policy (on a small scale), the closure of the output gap (0.1 percent of GDP) is less than the fiscal impulse. This suggests implicitly that fiscal

policy has no effect on activity and especially that there is no spontaneous catch-up possible for the French economy despite the very large output gap. But it is not clear why this is the case. Suddenly, the government balance deteriorates in 2014 (-0.3 percent of GDP) and the unemployment rate rises by 0.3 percentage points (which may seem paradoxical with an output gap that doesn't worsen). The French economy is thus losing on all fronts according to the major macroeconomic indicators.

In view of the potential growth, the output gaps and the fiscal impulses adopted by the Commission (the OECD and the IMF), and based on incorporating relatively standard assumptions ([a short-term fiscal multiplier equal to 1](#) and spontaneous closure of the output gap in 5 years), one would have expected the Commission to go for growth in France in 2014 of 2.1% (1.7% for the OECD and 1.2% for the IMF), and thus a steep reduction in unemployment.

Paradoxically, we do not find this same logic in the Commission's forecasts for Germany and the euro zone as a whole (Table 2). In the case of Germany, despite a slight deterioration in the output gap in 2013 (-1 GDP point), which would normally point to some spontaneous catch-up by the German economy in 2014, and an almost neutral fiscal impulse (0.1 GDP point), Germany's growth in 2014 is expected to be 1.8%, thus permitting the output gap to close by 0.5 GDP point, resulting in a fall in the unemployment rate and a reduction in Germany's public deficit in 2014.

In the case of the euro zone, we find the same scenario: a marginally positive fiscal impulse (0.2 percent of GDP) and a rapid reduction in the output gap (0.7 percent of GDP), which translates both into an improvement in the public accounts despite the positive fiscal impulse and a fall in the unemployment rate (even if we would have expected a greater reduction in the latter in light of the improvement in the output gap).

Given the potential growth, the output gaps and the fiscal impulses adopted for each country by the Commission, the forecast for 2014 could have been for growth of 2.1% in France, 1.6% in Germany and 1.3% for the euro zone.



Finally, why would France, despite a greater output gap than Germany and the euro zone and a stronger positive fiscal impulse, experience an increase in its unemployment rate in 2014 while the rate falls in the other countries? Should we interpret this as reflecting that it is a problem or even impossible for the Commission to include in a forecast that a policy without fiscal consolidation could lead to growth and reduce unemployment spontaneously in France?

Inequality and Global Imbalances: reconsidering old ideas to address new problems

by [Jean-Luc Gaffard](#) and [Francesco Vona](#)

The main challenge of the Bretton Woods agreements was to reconcile social justice and full employment to be achieved through domestic policies with an international discipline and progress toward trade liberalization (Rodrick 2011). After more than six decades, such division of objectives between international and domestic policies has been questioned by the

current economic crisis, characterized by high debt levels, remarkable global imbalances and low global demand. It can hence be useful to reopen an old debate by reconsidering ideas that were discarded in the past, such as the proposal of Keynes to create global demand stabilizers. Our suggestion is that a global stabilizer that prescribes surplus countries to gradually increase their wages can have both a direct positive effect on global demand, without increasing public debts, and an indirect one by favouring a reduction in income disparities.

The structural lack of global demand represents unquestionably the key constraint to exit from the great recession. Worldwide, sluggish demand appears as the resultant of two quite independent factors, a *constraint* and a *political choice*. The choice is of those countries, especially emerging ones plus Germany, that build up their wealth on export-lead growth using a mix of wage moderation and clever firms' industrial strategies. The public debt constraint, instead, impacts upon the possibility to expand demand of the majority of developed countries. As these countries should enforce restrictive fiscal policies to prevent default, their only chance to expand demand impinges on redistribution in favour of poorer households who consume a larger fraction of their incomes.

The current debate on this matter is misleadingly at best, oscillating between the usual Scylla and Charybdis of more or less state intervention. From a standard Keynesian viewpoint, the bottleneck in global demand is the consequence of neo-liberal policies, which in Europe are worsened by the opposition of Nordic countries against large scale public funded EU programs, possibly financed with EU bonds. From an orthodox viewpoint, which relies upon the belief in a trickle-down mechanism (increase the wealth of the rich eventually benefit all), the crisis represents an opportunity to remove the last barriers to a full liberalization of labor and goods

markets. These barriers would prevent EU economies to raise their competitiveness with respect to their new emerging competitors, the BRICS (Brazil- Russia- India-China- South Africa). While Keynesians are overoptimistic in their belief that more public expenditures will succeed in ensuring a fresh start to our feeble economies, orthodox economics neglects by assumption the problem of global demand. In particular, it ignores that a race for competitiveness based on further wage moderation and welfare state cuts would only amplify the global demand constraint.

It is well documented that, in last thirty years, living conditions and real wages of both low and middle skilled workers decreased substantially while profits and, in general, earnings of top 1% earners increased impressively, especially since the 2000s (Piketty and Saez 2006, Eckstein and Nagypál 2004, OECD 2011). The widening in incomes has been especially large in the US and Anglo-Saxon countries where deregulated labour markets allow wage to adjust downward, but also affected European economies in other forms such as structurally higher unemployment rates and higher profit shares (Krugman 1994). The excessive decrease of the median wage with respect to the average productivity created a fundamental wedge between demand, which is more sensible to wage changes than to changes in profit opportunities, and supply, for which the opposite holds. Globalization plays a key role in increasing inequality between profits and wages as increases in capital mobility were not accompanied in parallel increases in international labour mobility (Stiglitz 2012). Only the joint working of increasing debt (both private and public) and of productivity improvements related to new information & communication technologies prevented the demand deficit to emerge earlier together with the dysfunctional role of excessive inequality (see Stiglitz 2012, Fitoussi and Saraceno 2011, and on the role of technical change Patriarca and Vona 2013). Global imbalances played a key role in maintaining high the level of global demand as long as savings

of countries with commercial surpluses (e.g. China) were borrowed to households and governments in countries with commercial deficits (e.g. the US). By mitigating the consequence of on excessive inequality, they keep also under control the political pressure for redistribution. But, as we have seen, they are a source of macroeconomic instability. In fact, the saving glut in export-led economies creates a mass of liquidity in search of investment opportunities that increases the likelihood of asset price bubbles, especially in presence of an inadequate and oversized financial sector (Corden 2011).

Leaving ethical considerations aside, the concern for rising inequality in western economies would have been irrelevant for overall growth provided the lower demand there was compensated by a growing demand in emerging and export-led countries, such as China. Unfortunately, the compensation did not and is not expected to take place soon for at least two reasons.

First, oligarchies in emerging economies (especially China) found it convenient to sustain global demand indirectly, rather than through wage increases proportional to productivity, by investing large current-account surpluses in the US financial market and so financing US consumers. The indirect empirical support for this argument is that inequality increased in China too since the market friendly reform started. Especially inequality in factor shares, i.e. between profits and wages, increased substantially since the 1995 with the labour share falling by between 7.2% and 12.5% depending on the accounting definitions used (Bai and Qian 2010).

Secondly, a historical comparison of catching-up episodes can help shed light on the origin of the global demand glut. Between the second half of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, the economic catching-up of both Germany and the US with the UK was soon followed by convergence in

living standards and wages (Williamson 1998). Nowadays, the economic catching-up of China is much slower in terms of convergence of wages and living conditions. By way of example, China's GDP per capita increased from 5.7% to 17.2% of US GDP per capita from 1995 to 2010 (source: World Penn Tables), while the hourly labour compensation cost is also increasing but reached only 4.2% of the US labour compensation cost in 2008 (source: Bureau of Labor Statistics Data). This gap between GDP per capita and unit labour cost in China clearly shows that the catching-up in terms of workers' living conditions is far slower than the economic catching-up.

The reasons for this slow wage convergence deserve further investigations and have probably to do with factors affecting institutional changes that support redistribution from profits to wages, including culture and tax progressivity (Piketty and Qian 2009), in the catching up country. Certainly, the size of Chinese population relative to the world population did not help in fastening these institutional changes. By simple assumptions of standard bargaining theory, bargaining power depends on the outside option that, for workers, is limited by existence of a large 'reserve army' willing to work for extremely low wages. One can then argue that the larger the reserve army, the longer it takes to reduce the downward pressure on the workers' wages in the advanced part of the economy. De facto, the wage convergence has been much faster in previous catching-up episodes since the labour constraint becomes stringent sooner due to the smaller size of the population, allowing workers to fight for better conditions and higher wages. In a nutshell, an excessively large reserve army in the countryside prevents both wages to increase and democratic reforms to take off in China, thus creating a wedge between the timing of economic growth and the one of political reforms, required to rebalance demand and supply.

Not only the slow wage convergence of catching-up country causes persistent global imbalances between demand and supply,

it is also the essential reason of the obstacles faced to reduce inequality in western countries. First, implementing redistributive policies and increases in real wages are likely to further reduce competitiveness and to bring about a substantial investment outflows. Second, the trend of delocalizing production abroad can have forced workers to accept lower wages; an effect that is difficult to correlate empirically with observable proxies of globalization such as trade or investment outflows.. While empirical analyses looking at the last 30 years of the 20st century concur that globalization was not the main driver of inequality increases, recent evidence shows that: (i) Outsourcing had a negative impact on middle and low skill wages and employment levels in developed countries, especially in the last decade (Firpo, Fortin and Lemieux 2011); (ii) The effect of trade on inequality can be underestimated due to production fragmentation (Krugman 2008).

Global imbalances are also likely to create political obstacles to policies aimed at reducing inequality. An oversized financial sector contributed to increase earnings of the top 1% of the population and so their lobbying power. This allowed these super-rich to heavily influence political decisions making their rents higher, especially through a massive reduction of tax progressivity (Fitoussi and Saraceno 2012) and other opaque channels (e.g. fiscal loopholes, Stiglitz 2012). Now, this lobby of super-rich makes it exceedingly difficult to limit the power of finance and restore fairer tax rates for financial rents and top incomes.

How to avoid the stalemate generated by global imbalances and global pressure for wage moderation? Are there in the system as it is endogenous forces that will eventually reduce global imbalances and inequality?

The first option is to wait for reforms in China. Politicians in western countries can hope in a speeding up of this process

that will lead to a parallel increase in real wages and hence global demand. This will be the ideal market solution, but it is unlikely to occur in the short- and medium-run. A second possibility will consist in a large scale devaluation of western economies' currencies: Dollar, Euro and Yen. However, such a policy is likely to create a devaluation spiral, also increasing investment uncertainty. Moral suasion is unlikely to convince Chinese politicians to not devalue the Yuan as their assets in dollars and euro will depreciate substantially. A third protectionist solution is not convincing at all as it is likely to trigger a retaliation spiral paving the way for global wars. Indirect and global political interactions are an issue at stake here: nationalistic political parties and the associated protectionist policies are more likely to become popular if the timing of Chinese reforms is too slow and so the adjustment process too painful in the medium-run. A fourth solution is to resort to an old idea of John Maynard Keynes on 'global automatic stabilizers'. In the post-WWII context, Keynes proposed an international institution, the so-called 'International Clearing Union' (ICU), to reabsorb both commercial surpluses and deficit, seen as equally worrisome (see also the article in Italian of A. Bramucci 2012). In particular, persistent commercial surpluses were seen as a potential source of long-term shortages of global demand. The main idea was to coordinate thorough the ICU both re-evaluations and demand expansions for the countries in surplus, and de-evaluation and control of capital movements for countries in deficit. Such an institution would go in the right direction to help reabsorbing global imbalances, but lack enforcement power to ensure that the necessary adjustments are effectively put in place.

Combining a global rule for wage adjustment with WTO sanctions can represent a more clever and reliable way to revive global demand. The first part of the proposal would consist in linking real wage growth not only to productivity growth, as

proposed by A. Watt (2011), but also to commercial surplus. Conditioned to the country's level of development (so the prescribed adjustments should take into account of initial level of GDP per capita and obviously adjusted for PPPs), countries experiencing medium-term growths both in productivity and in the commercial surplus have to increase real wages. Otherwise, other countries could raise tariffs on the products exported by the country that does not follow the rule. The effective capacity to implement of the rule can be reinforced by giving to Unions, either global or local, and NGOs the power to control for specific situations where the rule is not respected, i.e. special export-oriented zone in China where labour standards are particularly low. In the case of commercial deficits, the country could be asked to follow (real) wage moderation and to put under control public deficit. In such a context, these restrictive policies would have limited harmful effects on growth for the increase in external demand that follows the wage increase in the export-oriented countries. The proposal would have also positive effect in reducing the overall level of functional inequality worldwide, restoring a more balanced distribution between wages and profits.

Overall, the coordination of global demand and supply would be restored using a simple automatic stabilizer that will neutralize the protectionist treat and, at the same time, will relax the constraints that prevent inequality-reducing policies to be approved in western countries.

Readings:

- Bai, C., Qian, Z., 2010, "The factor income distribution in China: 1978-2007", China Economic Review, vol. 21(4), 650-670.
- Bramucci, A., 2012, "Gli Squilibri Europei e la Lezione di Keynes", sbilanciamoci.info.
- Corden, W., 2011, "Global Imbalances and the Paradox of Thrift", Policy Insight No.54, Centre for Economic

Policy Research (CEPR).

- Eckstein, Z., Nagypál, É., 2004. "[The evolution of U.S. earnings inequality: 1961-2002](#)", [Quarterly Review](#), Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, issue Dec, 10-29.
- Firpo, S., Fortin, N., Lemieux, T., 2011, "[Occupational Tasks and Changes in the Wage Structure](#)," [IZA Discussion Papers](#) 5542, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA).
- Fitoussi, J.-P., Saraceno, F., 2011, "[Inequality, the Crisis and After](#)," [Rivista di Politica Economica](#), issue 1, pages 9-27.
- Krugman, P., 1994, "Past and prospective causes of high unemployment," [Proceedings](#), Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, issue Jan, 49-98.
- Krugman, P., 2008, "Trade and Wages, Reconsidered", [Brookings Papers on Economic Activity](#), vol. 39(1), 103-154.
- OECD (2011), [Divided We Stand: Why Inequality Keeps Rising](#) www.oecd.org/els/social/inequality.
- Ottaviano, G., Peri, G., Wright, G., 2010, "[Immigration, Offshoring and American Jobs](#)", CEPR Discussion Paper N8078.
- Patriarca, F., Vona, F., 2013, "Structural Change and the Income Distribution: an inverted-U relationship", [Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control](#) forthcoming.
- Piketty, T., Qian, N., 2009, "[Income Inequality and Progressive Income Taxation in China and India, 1986-2015](#)", [American Economic Journal: Applied Economics](#), vol. 1(2), 53-63.
- Piketty, T., Saez, E., 2006, "[The Evolution of Top Incomes: A Historical and International Perspective](#)", [American Economic Review](#), vol. 96(2), 200-205.
- Rodrik, D., 2011, [The Paradox of Productivity](#), New York: Norton & Cie.
- Stiglitz, J., 2012, [The Price of Inequality: How Today's Divided Society Endangers Our Future](#), [W.W. Norton & Company](#).
- Watt, A., 2012, [La crisi europea e la dinamica dei](#)

salari. La rotta d'Europa, 1. L'economia. Sbilanciamoci!, sbilibri, 2.

- Williamson, J. 1998. Globalization and the Labour Market: Using history to inform policy. in: Aghion, P., Williamson, J. 'Growth inequality and Globalization: Theory, History and Policy', Cambridge University Press.

Housing and the city: the new challenges

By Sabine Le Bayon, [Sandrine Levasseur](#) and Christine Rifflart

The residential real estate market is a market like no other. Since access to housing is a right and since inequalities in housing are increasing, the role of government is crucial to better regulate how the market functions. France has a large stock of social housing. Should it be expanded further? Should it have a regulatory role in the overall functioning of the housing market? Should our neighbours' systems of social housing, in particular the Dutch and British systems, be taken as models? On the private market, the higher prices of home purchases and rentals illustrate the lack of housing supply in the country's most attractive areas. At the individual level, the residential market is becoming less fluid: moving is difficult due to problems finding housing suited to career and family needs. It is therefore necessary to develop appropriate policies to enhance residential mobility and reduce imbalances by stimulating the supply of new housing.

Housing is also an integral part of our landscape, both urban and rural. It distinguishes our cities of today and of

tomorrow. The commitments made in the framework of the Grenelle environmental consultation process demand a real revolution in land use as well as in technical standards for construction. To ensure more housing, should undeveloped land be used or should developed land be exploited more intensely? How should a housing stock that has become obsolete in terms of energy standards be renovated, and how should this be financed?

These are the challenges addressed by the contributions collected in the new book [Ville et Logement](#) in the Débats et politiques series of the *Revue de l'OFCE*, edited by Sabine Le Bayon, Sandrine Levasseur and Christine Riffart. With authors from a variety of disciplines (economics, sociology, political science, urban planning) and backgrounds (researchers as well as institutional players), this review aims to improve our understanding of the issues related to housing and the city.

What factors have put the brakes on growth since 2010?

By [Eric Heyer](#) and Hervé Péléraux

At the end of 2012, five years after the start of the crisis, France's GDP has still not returned to its earlier level (Figure 1). At the same time, the labour force in France has grown steadily and technical progress has constantly raised workers' productivity. We are therefore more numerous and more productive than 5 years ago when output was lower: the explosion in unemployment is a symptom of this mismatch. Why

had the shoots of recovery seen in 2009 been choked off by mid-2010?



The main factor stifling the recovery has been the austerity measures that were enacted in France and Europe in 2010 and then intensified in 2011 and 2012 (Table 1). The impact of austerity has been all the more marked as it has been generalized throughout the euro zone. The effects of domestic cutbacks have combined with the effects of undercutting demand from other European partners. Given that 60% of France's exports are to the European Union, any external stimulus had virtually vanished by mid-2012, less due to the slowdown in global growth, which is still almost 3%, than to the consequence of the poor performance of the euro zone, which is on the brink of recession.

It is austerity that is at the root of the lack of growth: after shaving -0.7 GDP point off growth in 2010, its effects increased in 2011 and 2012 (respectively -1.5 and -2.1 points) because of the stepped-up measures and the existence of high fiscal multipliers. Indeed, in a period of low economic activity simultaneously tightening fiscal policy in all the European countries while there is very little manoeuvring room for monetary policy (real interest rates close to zero) has led to raising the value of the multiplier. There is now a broad consensus that the short-term fiscal multipliers are high, especially as full employment is still out of reach (see [Heyer \(2012\)](#) for a review of the literature on multipliers). The theoretical debate about the value of the multiplier and the role of agents' expectations must give way to empirical observation: the multipliers are positive and greater than 1.



In addition to the fiscal drag, there is the effect of tight monetary conditions: the easing of monetary policy – seen in

particular in the lower key interest rates – is far from enough to offset the negative effect on the economy of tighter borrowing conditions and the widening of the spread between private investment and risk-free public investment.

All things considered, including taking into account the impact of the resurgence in oil prices after the onset of the recession, the spontaneous growth of the French economy would have averaged 2.6% over the past three years. The realization of this potential would have led to a further reduction in excess production capacity and would ultimately have cut short the downturn in the economy that actually took place.

In the Netherlands, change is for now!

By [Christophe Blot](#)

While France has just reaffirmed that it will meet its commitment to reduce its budget deficit to below 3% by 2014 (see [Eric Hoyer](#)), the Netherlands has announced that it is abandoning this goal on the grounds that additional austerity measures could jeopardize growth. The country plunged into recession in 2012 (-1%), and GDP will fall again in 2013 (see [the analysis of the CPB](#), the Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis). In these circumstances, the social situation has deteriorated rapidly, with a 2 percentage point rise in unemployment in five quarters. In the first quarter of 2013, 7.8% of the workforce was out of work. Beyond the implications for the Netherlands itself, could this rejection of austerity (finally) signal a shift in Europe's strategy of fiscal

consolidation?

Up to now, the coalition government elected in September 2012 and led by the Liberal Mark Rutte had followed the general strategy of consolidation, with expectations of rapidly bringing the deficit below 3%. However, the austerity measures already being implemented together with an adjustment in the housing market and the general decline in activity throughout the euro zone led the Netherlands into a new recession in 2012 and put off the prospects of meeting the budget target in 2013. In view of the European Commission's projections for growth and for the budget deficit in 2013, it does however seem that the Dutch government would have been able to achieve a deficit of 3% in 2014, but like France, at the cost of taking additional measures.

The budget deficit is expected by the Commission to come to 3.6% in 2013. The CPB expects an even slightly lower deficit (3.3%), using growth forecasts similar to those of the Commission. In these conditions, the fiscal effort required to reach the 3% target in 2014 would amount to between 3.5 and 7 billion euros. In comparison, for France this would require the approval of additional austerity measures for 2014 amounting to 1.4 GDP points, *i.e.* just under 30 billion euros (see [France: holding to the required course](#)).

However, under pressure from the social partners, the Dutch government ultimately abandoned the plan announced on March 1 that provided for savings of 4.3 billion euros, which mainly consisted of a wage freeze in the public sector, a freeze in the income tax scale and the stabilization of public spending in real terms. Putting austerity on hold like this should give a small boost to the economy without calling into question fiscal sustainability, as the improved prospects for growth should reduce the cyclical component of the budget deficit.

While the 3% target will of course not be met, it is not at all clear that the markets will make much out of this

infringement of the rules. In fact, the difference in interest rates vis-à-vis the German rate has stabilized since it was announced that the plan had been abandoned, whereas the difference had tended to increase in the previous weeks (see figure).



While this decision should not upset the economic and financial stability of the Netherlands or the euro zone, it does nevertheless send a strong anti-austerity signal from a country that had hitherto favored fiscal consolidation. It is therefore one more voice that is challenging the effectiveness of this strategy and emphasizing the economic and social risks associated with it ([see here](#) for an overview of the case against austerity and the 2013 [iAGS report](#) for more specific points concerning an alternative strategy for Europe). It is also a decision that should give France inspiration. Credibility is not necessarily gained by sacrificing one objective (growth and employment) for another (the budget deficit). It is still necessary to await the response of the European Commission in that the Netherlands, like most countries in the euro zone, is subject to an excessive deficit procedure. If the decision of the Netherlands is not challenged, then this will represent a significant shift in European macroeconomic strategy.

France's Stability Programme:

the missing line

By [Eric Heyer](#)

On April 17, the government presented its Stability Programme for 2013-2017 for the French economy. For the next two years (2013-2014), the government has relied on the projections of the European Commission in forecasting growth of 0.1% in 2013 and 1.2% in 2014. Our purpose here is not to revisit these forecasts, though they do seem overly optimistic, but rather to discuss the analysis and outlook for France for the period 2015-2017 that is explicit and sometimes implicit in this document.

According to the document provided to Brussels, the government is committed to maintaining its fiscal consolidation strategy throughout the five-year period. The structural effort will lessen over the years, representing only 0.2 percent of GDP in 2017, *i.e.* nine times less than the effort required of citizens and business in 2013. Under this assumption, the government expects a return to 2% annual growth during the period 2015-2017. The deficit will continue to shrink, reaching 0.7 percent of GDP in 2017. This effort would even lead for the first time in over 30 years to a structural fiscal surplus in 2016, rising to 0.5 percent of GDP in 2017. For its part, public debt would peak in 2014 (at 94.3 GDP points) then begin to decline from 2015 to a level of 88.2 GDP points by the end of the five-year period, which is lower than the level when the Socialists came to power (Table 1). It should be noted, however, that in this official document nothing is said about the changes in unemployment that the government expects will result from its policies by the end of the five-year period. This is the reason for our introduction of a missing line in Table 1.



Based on assumptions similar to those of the government for fiscal policy as well as for the potential for growth, and starting from the same short-term situation, we have attempted to verify the analysis provided by the government and to supplement it by integrating the changes in unemployment related to its Programme.

Table 2 summarizes this work: it indicates that growth would accelerate gradually over the period 2015 to 2017, to over 2% in 2017. Growth over the period would average 1.8%, a rate close to but slightly lower than the 2% expected in the Stability Programme [\[1\]](#).

At end 2017, the deficit would be close to the government target, without however reaching it (1 GDP point instead of 0.7 GDP point). The public debt would also fall to a level comparable to that in 2012.

In this scenario, which is similar to that of the government, the trend in unemployment will not reverse until 2016; by the end of the five-year period, the unemployment rate is expected to be 10.4% of the working population, *i.e.* a level higher than that prevailing at the time François Hollande assumed office.



The scenario proposed by the government in the Stability Programme seems optimistic in the short term and misses the goal in the medium term. On this last point, it seems surprising to want to stick to a policy of austerity after the economy has seen the public finances balanced in structural terms and while the unemployment rate is rising above its historical peak.

A more balanced approach could be considered: assume that from 2014 the euro zone adopts a “reasonable” austerity plan aimed at both restoring the structural balance of the public

finances and reducing the unemployment rate. This alternative strategy would involve rolling back the planned fiscal stimulus in all the euro zone countries and limiting it to 0.5 GDP point [2]. This would constitute a fiscal effort that could be sustained over time and allow France, for example, to eliminate its structural deficit by 2017. Compared to the current plans, this would provide a greater margin for maneuver that would spread the burden of the adjustment more fairly.



Table 3 summarizes the results of simulating this new strategy. Less austerity leads to more growth in all the countries. However, our simulation also takes into account the impact of economic activity in one country on other countries via international trade. In 2017, in the “less austerity” scenario, the public finances would be in the same state as in the baseline scenario, with the additional growth offsetting the reduced effort. However, in this scenario, unemployment would decline in 2014, and by 2017 would have fallen to a level comparable to the 2012 level.

[1] The difference in growth can arise either because of not taking into account the impact of foreign trade due to the austerity plans being implemented in other partner countries, or because the fiscal multiplier used in the Stability Programme is lower than in our simulation, where it is around 1. Indeed, we believe that in a period of low economic activity, adopting policies of fiscal restraint that are applied simultaneously in all the European countries and when there is little maneuvering room for monetary policy (real interest rates are close to zero) leads to pushing up the value of the multiplier. There is also now [a broad consensus on the fact that the short-term multipliers are high](#), especially given that full employment is still out of reach

(see [Heyer \(2012\)](#) for a review of the literature on multipliers).

[2] This strategy has already been simulated in previous OFCE work, such as that by [Heyer and Timbeau in May 2012](#), by [Heyer, Plane and Timbeau in July 2012](#) and by the [iAGS report in November 2012](#).

What kind of pension reform for 2013?

In a speech on 28 March, Francois Hollande raised the 20 billion euro deficit forecast for 2020 in order to announce a further extension of the pension contributions period, while refusing to end the indexation of low state pensions and pensions in the statutory pension system. Francois Hollande and the French government also pledged to re-balance the public finances by 2017. As they no longer wish to increase the tax burden in a period of weak or even non-existent growth, this means cutting public spending by at least 70 billion euros, or about 7%. As pensions account for a quarter of public expenditure, they cannot be spared the austerity axe. There is a major risk that the goal of re-balancing the public finances will result in lowering the level of pension payments. When negotiating the supplemental pension arrangements in March 2013, the MEDEF managed to obtain pension increases of 1 percentage point below the inflation rate for 3 years, meaning a 3% loss in purchasing power. In a [recently published note](#) (*Notes de l'OFCE*, no. 26 dated 24 April 2013), Henri Sterdyniak explains that there are other

possible approaches to reform.

The chalice of austerity, right to the dregs

[Céline Antonin](#), [Christophe Blot](#) and Danielle Schweisguth

[This text summarizes the OFCE's April 2013 forecasts](#)

The macroeconomic and social situation in the euro zone continues to cause concern. The year 2012 was marked by a further decline in GDP (-0.5%) and a continuing rise in the unemployment rate, which reached 11.8% in December. While this new recession is not comparable in magnitude to that of 2009, it is comparable in duration, as GDP fell for the fifth consecutive time in the last quarter of 2012. Above all, for some countries (Spain, Greece and Portugal), this prolonged recession marks the beginning of deflation that could quickly spread to other countries in the euro zone (see [The onset of deflation](#)). Finally, this performance has demonstrated the failure of the macroeconomic strategy implemented in the euro zone since 2011. The strengthening of fiscal consolidation in 2012 did not restore market confidence, and interest rates did not fall except from the point when the risk of the euro zone's collapse was mitigated by the ratification of the Treaty of stability, coordination and governance (TSCG) and the announcement of the new WTO operation allowing the ECB to intervene in the sovereign debt markets. Despite this, the fiscal dogma has not been called into question, meaning that in 2013, and if necessary in 2014, the euro zone countries will continue their forced march to reduce their budget deficits and reach the symbolic threshold of 3% as fast as

possible. The incessant media refrain that France will keep its commitment is the perfect reflection of this strategy, and of its absurdity (see [France: holding the required course](#)). So until the chalice has been drunk to the dregs, the euro zone countries seem condemned to a strategy that results in recession, unemployment, social despair and the risk of political turmoil. This represents a greater threat to the sustainability of the euro zone than the lack of fiscal credibility of one or another Member State. In 2013 and 2014, the fiscal stimulus in the euro zone will again be negative (-1.1% and -0.6%, respectively), bringing the cumulative tightening to 4.7 GDP points since 2011. As and to the extent that countries reduce their budget deficits to less than 3%, they can slow the pace of consolidation (Table). While in the next two years Germany, which has already balanced the public books, will cease its consolidation efforts, France will have to stay the course in the hope of reaching 3% in 2014. For Spain, Portugal and Greece, the effort will be less than that what has already been done, but it will continue to be a significant burden on activity and employment, especially as the recessive impact of past measures continue to be felt.

In this context, the continuation of a recession is inevitable. GDP will fall by 0.4% in 2013. Unemployment is expected to break new records. A return to growth is not expected until 2014, but even then, in the absence of any relaxation of the fiscal dogma, hopes may again be disappointed since the anticipated growth of 0.9% will be insufficient to trigger any significant decline in unemployment. In addition, the return to growth will come too late to be able to erase the exorbitant social costs of this strategy, while alternatives to it are discussed inadequately and belatedly.

Table. Public balance and fiscal impulse in the euro zone countries

In GDP points

	Public deficit			Fiscal impulse	
	2012	2013 (p)	2014 (p)	2013 (p)	2014 (p)
Germany	0,2	-0,4	-0,1	0,1	0,0
Austria	-3,0	-2,5	-1,8	-0,6	-0,3
Belgium	-3,0	-2,8	-1,9	-0,5	-1,0
Spain	-10,2	-6,5	-5,8	-2,0	-1,1
Finland	-1,6	-1,5	-0,9	-0,8	-0,7
France	-4,8	-3,9	-3,0	-1,8	-1,4
Greece	-6,6	-5,4	-4,5	-3,8	-2,0
Ireland	-8,2	-8,4	-6,6	-1,9	-1,8
Italy	-3,0	-3,9	-3,4	-1,4	-0,7
Netherlands	-4,1	-3,4	-3,0	-1,7	-0,7
Portugal	-5,0	-4,4	-3,0	-2,1	-1,9
Euro zone 11*	-3,2	-2,6	-1,8	-1,1	-0,6

* Excluding Cyprus, Luxembourg, Malta, Slovakia and Estonia.

Sources : Eurostat, European Commission, OFCE calculations and forecast March 2013.