

The euro-isation of Europe

By Guillaume Sacriste, Paris 1-Sorbonne and Antoine Vauchez, CNRS and Paris 1-Sorbonne

In the latest article in [*La Revue de l'OFCE \(no. 165, 2019\)*](#), [*accessible here in French*](#), the authors analyze the emergence of a new European government, that of the euro, built to a great extent on the margins of the EU's existing framework. In noting this, the article takes stock of a process of the transformation of Europe (the European Union and Member States), which we call here the "Euro-isation of Europe", in three dimensions: 1) the creation at its core of a powerful pole of Treasuries, central banks and national and European financial bureaucracies; 2) the consolidation of a European system of surveillance of the economic policies of the Member States; 3) the gradual re-hierarchisation of the political priorities and public policies of the European Union and the Member States around the priority given to financial stability, balanced budgets and structural reforms. The article thus makes it possible to redefine the nature of the "constraints" that the management of the single currency is imposing on the economies of the Member States, constraints that are less legal than socio-political, less external and overarching than pervasive and diffuse, and ultimately closely linked to the key position now occupied by the transnational network of financial bureaucracies in defining European issues and policies.

Brexit: Roads without exits?

By [Catherine Mathieu](#) and [Henri Sterdyniak](#)

The result of the referendum of 23 June 2016 in favour of leaving the European Union has led to a period of great economic and political uncertainty in the United Kingdom. It is also raising sensitive issues for the EU: for the first time, a country has chosen to leave the Union. At a time when populist parties are gaining momentum in several European countries, Euroscepticism is rising in others (Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovenia, Slovakia), and the migrant crisis is dividing the Member States, the EU-27 must negotiate Britain's departure with the aim of not offering an attractive alternative to opponents of European integration. There can be no satisfactory end to the UK-EU negotiations, since the EU's goal cannot be an agreement that is favourable to the UK, but, on the contrary, to make an example, to show that leaving the EU has a substantial economic cost but no significant financial gain, that it does not give room for developing an alternative economic strategy.

According to the current timetable, the UK will exit the EU on 29 March 2019, two years after the official UK government announcement on 29 March 2017 of its departure from the EU. Negotiations with the EU officially started in April 2017.

So far, under the auspices of the European Commission and its chief negotiator, Michel Barnier, the EU-27 has maintained a firm and united position. This position has hardly given rise to democratic debates, either at the national level or European level. The partisans of more conciliatory approaches have not expressed themselves in the European Council or in Parliament for fear of being accused of breaking European

unity.

The EU-27 are refusing to question, in any respect, the way that the EU is functioning to reach an agreement with the UK; they consider that the four freedoms of movement (goods, services, capital and persons) are inseparable; they are refusing to call into question the role of the European Court of Justice as the supreme tribunal; they are rejecting any effort by the UK to “cherry pick”, to choose the European programmes in which it will participate. At the same time, the EU-27 countries are seizing the opportunity to question the status of the City, Northern Ireland (for the Republic of Ireland) and Gibraltar (for Spain).

Difficult negotiations

On 29 April 2017, the European Council adopted its negotiating positions and appointed Michel Barnier as chief negotiator. The British wanted to negotiate as a matter of priority the future partnership between the EU and the UK, but the EU-27 insisted that negotiations should focus first and foremost on three points: the rights of citizens, the financial settlement for the separation, and the border between Ireland and Northern Ireland. The EU-27 has taken a hard line on each of these three points, and has refused to discuss the future partnership before these are settled, banning any bilateral discussions (between the UK and a member country) and any pre-negotiation between the UK and a third country on their future trade relations.

On 8 December 2017, an agreement was finally reached between the United Kingdom and the European Commission on the three initial points^[1]; this agreement was ratified at the European Council meeting of 14-15 December^[2]. However, strong ambiguities persist, especially on the question of Ireland.

The European Council accepted the British request for a transitional period, with this to end on 31 December 2020 (so

as to coincide with the end of the current EU budgeting). Thus, from March 2019 to the end of 2020, the UK will have to respect all the obligations of the single market (including the four freedoms and the competence of the CJEU), even though it no longer has a voice in Brussels.

The EU-27 agreed to open negotiations on the transition period and the future partnership. These negotiations were to culminate at the European summit in October 2018 in an agreement setting out the conditions for withdrawal and the rules for the transition period while outlining in a political statement the future treaty determining the relations between the United Kingdom and the EU-27, so that the European and British authorities have time to examine and approve them before 30 March 2019.

However, both the EU-27 and the UK have proclaimed that “there is no agreement on anything until there is an agreement on everything”, meaning that the agreements on the three points as well as on the transition period are subject to agreement on the future partnership.

Negotiations for the British side

The members of the government formed by Theresa May in July 2016 were divided on the terms for Brexit from the outset: on one side were supporters of a hard Brexit, including Boris Johnson, who was then in charge of foreign affairs, and David Davis, then tasked to negotiate the UK’s departure from the EU; on the other side were members who favoured a compromise to limit Brexit’s impact on the British economy, including Philip Hammond, Chancellor of the Exchequer. The proponents of a hard Brexit had argued during the campaign that leaving the EU would mean no more financial contributions to the EU, so the savings could be put to “better use” financing the UK health system; that the United Kingdom could turn to the outside world and freely sign trade agreements with non-EU countries, which would be beneficial for the UK economy; and

that getting out of the shackles of European regulations would boost the economy. The hard Brexiteers argue against giving in to the EU-27's demands, even at the risk of leaving without an agreement. The goal is to get free of Europe's constraints and "regain control". For those in favour of a compromise with the EU, it is essential to avoid a no-deal Brexit – "going over the cliff" would be detrimental to British business and jobs. In recent months, it has been this camp that has gradually strengthened its positions within the government, leading Theresa May to ask the EU-27 for a transitional period during her Florence speech of September 2017, which also responded to the demands of British business representatives (including the Confederation of British Industrialists, the CBI). On 6 July 2018, Theresa May held a government meeting in the Prime Minister's Chequers residence to agree on British proposals on the future relationship between the United Kingdom and the European Union. The concessions made in recent months by the British government together with the Chequers proposals led David Davis and Boris Johnson to resign from the Cabinet on 8 July 2018.

On 12 July 2018, the British government published a White Paper on the future partnership^[3]. It proposes a "principled and practical Brexit"^[4]. This must "respect the result of the 2016 referendum and the decision of the UK public to take back control of the UK's laws, borders and money". It is about building a new relationship between the UK and the EU, "broader in scope" than the current relationship between the EU and any third country, taking into account the "deep history and close ties".

The White Paper has four chapters: economic partnership, security partnership, cross-cutting and other cooperation, and institutional arrangements. As far as the economic partnership is concerned, the agreement must allow for a "broad and deep economic relationship with the rest of the EU". The United Kingdom proposes the establishment of a free trade area for

goods. This would allow British and European companies to maintain production chains and avoid border and customs controls. This free trade area would “meet the commitment” of maintaining the absence of a border between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. The UK would align with the relevant EU rules to allow friction-free trade at the border; it would participate in the European agencies for chemicals, aviation safety and medicines. The White Paper proposes applying EU customs rules to the imports of goods arriving in the UK on behalf of the EU and collecting VAT on these goods also on its behalf.

For services, the UK would regain its regulatory freedom, agreeing to forego the European passport for financial services, while referring to provisions for the mutual recognition of regulations, which would preserve the benefits of integrated markets. It wishes to maintain cooperation in the fields of energy and transport. In return, the UK is committed to maintaining cooperative provisions on competition regulation, labour law and the environment. Freedom of movement would be maintained for citizens of the EU and the UK.

The security partnership would include the maintenance of cooperation on police and legal matters, the UK’s participation in Europol and Eurojust, and coordination on foreign policy, defence, and the fight against terrorism.

The White Paper proposes close cooperation on the circulation and protection of personal data as well as agreements for scientific cooperation in the fields of innovation, culture, education, development, international action, and R&D in the defence and aerospace sector. The UK wishes to continue to participate in European programmes on scientific cooperation, with a corresponding financial contribution. Finally, the United Kingdom would no longer participate in the common fisheries policy, but proposes negotiations on the subject.

In institutional matters, the UK proposes an Association Agreement, with regular dialogue between EU and UK Ministers, in a Joint Committee. The UK would recognize the exclusive jurisdiction of the CJEU to interpret EU rules, but disputes between the UK and the EU would be settled by the Joint Committee or by independent arbitration.

Up to now Theresa May has tried to assuage both the hard Brexiteers – the UK will indeed leave the EU – and supporters of a flexible Brexit – the UK wants a deep and special partnership with the EU. Theresa May regularly repeats that the UK is leaving the EU but not Europe, but her compromise position is not satisfying supporters of a net Brexit. In September 2018, Boris Johnson has been accusing Theresa May of capitulating to the EU: “At every stage in the talks so far, Brussels gets what Brussels wants.... We have wrapped a suicide vest around the British Constitution – and handed the detonator to Michel Barnier. We have given him a jemmy with which Brussels can choose – at any time – to crack apart the union between Great Britain and Northern Ireland” [\[5\]](#). According to Johnson, the Chequers plan loses all the benefits of Brexit. The Remainers, those in favour of staying in the EU, are campaigning for a new referendum. This is nevertheless unlikely. Theresa May rejects it out of hand as a “betrayal of democracy”.

The Conservative Party’s annual convention, to be held from September 30 to October 3, could see Boris Johnson or Jacob Rees-Mogg [\[6\]](#) run for head of the Party. They do not have majority support, however, and the polls show Theresa May with greater popularity than her challengers. Barring a dramatic twist, Theresa May will continue to lead the Brexit negotiations in the coming months.

The British Parliament decided last December 13 that it will have a vote on any agreement with the European Union. So Theresa May must also find a parliamentary majority concerning the UK’s orderly withdrawal, in the face of opposition from

both Remainers and hard Brexiteers, which will require the support of some Labour MPs and will therefore be difficult.

The proposals of the July White Paper were not deemed acceptable by Michel Barnier. In August, Jeremy Hunt, the UK's new Foreign Minister, estimated the risks of a lack of agreement at 60%. On 23 August 2018, the government published 25 technical notes (out of 80 planned) that spell out the government's measures to be taken in case of a no-deal exit in March 2019. Their objective is to reassure businesses and households about the risks of shortages of imported products, including certain food products and medicines. At the time these notes were published, Dominic Raab, the new Minister in charge of the Brexit negotiations, took care to recall that the government does want an agreement be signed and that the negotiators agree on 80% of the provisions of the withdrawal agreement.

If the EU-27 remains inflexible, the British government will face a choice between leaving without an agreement, which the "hard" Brexiteers are ready to do, and making further concessions. Philip Hammond recalled the risks of failing to reach an agreement. But Theresa May is sticking to her line that the lack of an agreement would be preferable to a bad deal. On 28 August, she echoed the words of WTO Director-General Roberto Azevedo, that leaving without an agreement would not be "the end of the world", but nor would it be "a walk in the park". In an opinion column in the *Sunday Telegraph* of 1 September 2018, she reaffirmed her desire to build a United Kingdom that is stronger, more daring, based on meritocracy, and adapted to the future, outside the EU.

The negotiations from the EU viewpoint

The EU-27 is refusing that the UK could stay in the single market and the customs union while choosing which rules it wants to apply. It does not want the UK to benefit from more favourable rules than other third countries, in particular the

current members of the European Economic Area (the EEA: Norway, Iceland, Liechtenstein) or Switzerland. EEA members currently have to integrate all the single market legislation (in particular the free movement of persons) and contribute to the European budget. They benefit from the European passport for financial institutions, while Switzerland does not.

In December 2017, Michel Barnier made it clear that lessons had to be drawn from the United Kingdom's refusal to respect the four freedoms, its regaining of its commercial sovereignty, and its termination of its recognition of the authority of the European Court of Justice. This rules out any possibility of its participation in the single market and the customs union. The agreement with the UK will be a free trade agreement, along the lines of the agreements signed with Canada (the CETA), South Korea and more recently Japan. It will not concern financial services.

During the 2018 negotiations, the EU-27 was not particularly conciliatory about a series of issues: the UK's obligation to apply all EU rules and the guarantee of the freedom of establishment of people until the end of the transitional period; the Irish border (arguing that the absence of physical borders was not compatible with the UK's withdrawal from the customs union, demanding that Northern Ireland remain in the single market as long as the UK does not come up with a solution guaranteeing the integrity of the internal market without a physical border with Ireland); the role of the CJEU (which must have jurisdiction to interpret the withdrawal agreement); the EU's decision-making autonomy (refusing the establishment of permanent joint decision-making bodies with the UK); and even Gibraltar and the British military bases in Cyprus.

Thus, on 2 July 2018, Michel Barnier^[7] accepted the principle of an ambitious partnership, but refused any land border between the two parts of Ireland, while indicating that a land border is necessary to protect the EU (this would mean that

the only acceptable deal would involve a border crossing between Northern Ireland and the rest of the UK, which is unacceptable to the UK). He refused that the EU "loses control of its borders and its laws". Barnier therefore rejected the idea that the UK would be responsible for enforcing European customs rules and collecting VAT for the EU. He insisted that future cooperation with the UK could not rely on the same degree of trust as between EU member countries. He called for precise and controllable commitments from the United Kingdom, particularly with respect to health standards and the protection of Geographical indications. He wanted the agreement to be limited to a free trade agreement, with UK guarantees on regulations and state subsidies, and with cooperation on customs and regulations.

The UK would have to renegotiate all trade agreements, both with the EU and with third countries. These agreements will probably take a long time to set up, and in any case more than two years. The lack of preparation and the disorganization with which the UK has tackled the Brexit negotiations augurs poorly for its ability to negotiate such agreements quickly. The matter of re-establishing customs controls is crucial and delicate, whether in Ireland, Gibraltar or Calais. Many multinational corporations will relocate their factories and headquarters to continental Europe. The loss of the financial passport is a given. It is on this point that the British could see further losses, given the weight of the City's business (7.5% of British GDP). The United Kingdom will have to choose between abiding by European rules to maintain some access to European markets and entering into confrontation by a policy of liberalization. The EU-27 could seize the opportunity of the UK's departure to return to a Rhine-based financial model, centred on banks and credit rather than on markets or, on the contrary, it could try to supplant the City's market activities through liberalization measures. It is the second branch of these alternative that will prevail.

Choosing between three strategies

So far, the EU-27 countries have taken a position that is tough but easy to hold: since it is the UK that has chosen to leave the Union, it is up to it to make acceptable proposals for the EU-27, with regard both to its withdrawal and to subsequent relations. This is the approach that led to the current stagnant situation. The EU-27 now has to choose between three strategies:

- Not to make proposals acceptable to the British and resign themselves to a no-deal Brexit: relations between the UK and the EU-27 would be managed according to WTO principles; and the financial terms of the divorce would be decided legally. The United Kingdom would regain full sovereignty. There are two reasons to fear this scenario: trade would be disrupted by the re-erection of customs barriers in ports and in Ireland; and this “hard Brexit” would encourage the UK to become a tax and regulatory haven, meaning that the EU would be faced with the alternative either of following along or retaliating, both of which would be destructive;
- Face the issue head on and establish a third circle for countries that want to participate in a customs union with the EU countries in the short term, i.e. the United Kingdom and the EEA countries. It is within this framework that agreements on technical regulations and standards for goods and services would be negotiated. Thus, “freedom of trade” issue would be dissociated from issues of political sovereignty. However, this poses two problems: these agreements would need to be negotiated in technical committees where public opinion and national parliaments such as the European Parliament would have little voice. The fields of the customs union are problematic, in particular for fiscal matters, financial regulations, and the freedom of movement of persons and services;
- Choose the “special and deep partnership” solution, which

would entail reciprocal concessions. This would necessarily be able to serve as a model for relations between the EU and other countries. It would include a customs union limited to goods, committees for harmonizing standards, piecemeal agreements for services, the right of the UK to limit the movement of persons, undoubtedly a court of arbitration (which would limit the powers of the CJEU), and a commitment to avoid fiscal and regulatory competition. As is clear, this would satisfy neither supporters of a hard Brexit nor supporters of an autonomous and integrated European Union.

[1] See: *Joint report from the negotiators of the EU and the UK government on progress during phase 1 of negotiations under Article 50 on the UK's orderly withdrawal from the EU*, 8 December 2017.

[2] See Catherine Mathieu and Henri Sterdyniak: *Brexit, réussir sa sortie*, *Blog de l'OFCE*, 6 December 2017.

[3] HM Government: "The future relationship between the United Kingdom and the European Union", July 2018.

[4] The expression is in the original text: "A principled and practical Brexit". Translations of the summary note in the 25 languages of the EU are available on the web site of the Department for Exiting the European Union. The French version uses the term: "Brexit vertueux et pratique".

[5] Opinion column by Boris Johnson, *Mail on Sunday*, 9 September 2018.

[6] Favourable to a hard Brexit – from Eton-Oxford, a traditionalist Catholic who is opposed to abortion, public spending and the fight against climate change.

[7] See [Un partenariat ambitieux avec le Royaume-Uni après le Brexit](#), 2 July 2018.

How can Europe be saved? How can the paradigm be changed?

By [Xavier Ragot](#)

There are new inflections in the debate over the construction of Europe. New options from a variety of economic and political perspectives have seen the light of day in several key conferences and workshops, though without the visibility of public statements. The debate is livelier in Germany than in France. This is due probably to the caricature of a debate that took place during France's presidential elections, which took the form of "for or against the single currency", while the debate needed was over how to orient the euro area's institutions to serve growth and deal with inequalities.

Two conferences were held in Berlin one week apart that considered opposing options. The first tackled the consequences of a country leaving the euro area; the second examined an alternative paradigm for reducing inequalities in Europe. In other words, the two conferences covered almost the entire spectrum of conceivable economic policies.

Sowing fear: the end of the euro area?

The first question: What would happen if one or more countries left the euro area? Should we hope for this, or how could we prevent it? A [conference](#) held on March 14 under the title "Is the euro sustainable – and what if it isn't?" brought together the heads of influential institutes like Clemens Fuest, one of

the five German “wise men”, Christoph Schmidt, and economists frequently seen in the German media like Hans-Werner Sinn, as well as economists like Jeromin Zettelmeyer. The presence of the OFCE, which I represented, hopefully helped to serve as a reminder of some simple but useful points.

This first conference sometimes played with the ambiguity of the issue, with some contributions seeming to wish for an end to the euro area while others were more analytical in order to show the risks. The voice of Hans-Werner Sinn stood out during this discussion for its radical stance. Without going so far as to wish that Germany left the euro area, Sinn insisted in a systematic (and skewed) way that Germany was suffering under Europe’s monetary policy. He insisted in particular on the role of Germany’s hidden exposure to the debt of other countries through the European Central Bank and TARGET2, which books the surpluses and deficits of the national central banks vis-à-vis the ECB. The TARGET2 balance shows that the southern European countries are running a deficit, while Germany has a substantial surplus of almost 900 billion euros, which represents 30% of German GDP. These amounts are very significant, but do not in any way represent a cost for Germany.

In the most extreme case of a national central bank’s failure to pay (i.e. an exit from the euro area), the loss would be shared by all the other states independently of the surpluses. The TARGET2 balances are part of Europe’s monetary policy, which is aimed at achieving a goal that was agreed on: an average inflation level of 2%. This target has not been hit for many years. Moreover, this policy has led to low interest rates that benefit Germans who pay low interest charges on their public debt, as Jeromin Zettlemeier pointed out. Finally, Germany’s large trade surplus shows that the lack of an exchange rate mechanism in the euro area has benefited Germany significantly. Recall that the volume of Germany’s exports exceeded China’s in 2016, according to the German

institute Ifo!

My presentation was based on the OFCE's numerous studies of the European crisis. The OFCE has published an [analytical note](#) on the effects of an exit from the euro area, showing all the related costs. The studies by [Durand and Villemot](#) provide the analytical basis for providing orders of magnitude. How much would Germans' wealth decline if the euro area were to collapse? The result is, in the end, not very surprising. The Germans would be the greatest losers, with a loss of wealth on the order of 15% of GDP. These figures are of course very tentative and need to be interpreted with the utmost care. The collapse of the euro area would plunge us into unexplored territory, which could surprise us with unexpected sources of instability.

After these preliminary elements, the heart of my presentation was then focused on a simple point. The real challenge facing us is to build coherent labor markets within the euro area, while reducing inequalities. Following on the common monetary policy, the coordination of fiscal policy that was carried out so painfully after 2014 and the aberrations associated with the recessionary fiscal policy (austerity), the main question facing Europe over the next ten years is to develop coherent labor markets. Indeed, Germany's wage moderation, the result of the difficulties with reunification in the early 1990s, has been a powerful destabilizing force in Europe, as was shown in an [article by Mathilde Le Moigne](#). What is called the supply problem in France is in fact the result of divergences within Europe on the labor market in the wake of Germany's wage moderation. [I proposed that the European Parliament](#) initiate a Europe-wide discussion of national wage dynamics in order to bring about the convergence of wages in a non-deflationary way while avoiding high unemployment in southern Europe. This co-ordination of economic policy on the labor market is designated by the English term "wage stance". Co-ordination of changes in minimum wages and in regulated wages, which orients

the direction of wage changes in labour negotiations, are tools for the co-ordination of labor markets.

A second tool is of course the establishment of a [European system of unemployment insurance](#), which would be much less complex than one might think. A European unemployment insurance would aim to be complementary to national unemployment insurance, and not a replacement. National unemployment insurance systems are actually heterogeneous because, on the one hand, the labour markets are distinct, and on the other hand national preferences differ. Unemployment insurance systems are for the most part the result of historical social compromises.

How should this relatively radical German stance against Europe be interpreted today? Perhaps it represents the discontent of economists who are losing influence in Germany. It might seem paradoxical, but many German economists and observers are adjusting to recognize the necessity of building a different Europe, one not based on rules, but leaving room for political choices within strong institutions – i.e. for agile, well respected institutions rather than rules. This position is associated with France in the European debate: choices rather than rules. The German coalition agreement that paved the way for an SPD/CDU government has placed the issue of Europe at the center of the agreement, but with a great deal of vagueness about the content. Certain developments will test the relevance of this hypothesis, in particular the issue of a euro area minister and the nature of the decision-making rules within the key crisis-resolution mechanism, the European stability mechanism.

Europe: Changing the software / model / paradigm / narrative

A second, more confidential conference proved to be even more exciting, with the presence of the European Climate Foundation on the climate issue, the INET institute on developments in economic thought, and the OFCE on European imbalances. The aim

of the conference was to reflect on a shift in the paradigm, or narrative, and come up with a new articulation between politics and economics, the state and the market, in order to think sustainable growth in terms of both the climate and society. A narrative is a vision of the world conveyed by simple language. Thus the “neoliberal” narrative is built on positive words like “competition”, “markets” and “freedom” as well as negative words like “profit”, “interventionism” and “egalitarianism”, which allowed the creation of a language. Donald Trump produces an equally effective narrative: “giving power back to the people”, “America first”; this narrative marks the return of politics to a mode that assumes an underlying nationalism.

How could another narrative be built that has a central focus on the evidence for the fight against global warming and the aggravation of inequality and financial instability?

For one day economists who are renowned in Europe spoke about artificial intelligence, global warming, current forms of economic and industrial policies, the dynamics of credit and financial bubbles, and more. Empirical work at the forefront of current research as well as reflections about the possibility of a coherent storyline were combined in the promise of an alternative narrative. It was just the start. The possibility of a renewal of thought that transcended political divisions and spoke about what was essential came to light: how could the economy be placed at the service of a political project that aims not to rebuild borders to exclude but to imagine our common humanity?

These two conferences show the vitality of the European debate, which is presented from an overly technical perspective in France. The *raison d'être* of the euro is a common project. It is at this level that we need to conduct the discussion leading into the 2019 European elections.

Une (ré) assurance chômage européenne

par Léo Aparisi de Lannoy et [Xavier Ragot](#)

Le retour de la croissance ne peut faire oublier la mauvaise gestion de la crise au niveau européen sous son aspect économique, mais aussi social et politique. Les divergences des taux de chômage, des balances courantes et des dettes publiques entre les pays de la zone euro sont inédites depuis des décennies. Les évolutions de la gouvernance européenne doivent viser la plus grande efficacité économique pour la réduction du chômage et des inégalités tout en explicitant et en justifiant leurs enjeux financiers et politiques afin de les rendre compatibles avec des choix politiques nationaux. La constitution d'une assurance chômage européenne remplit ces critères.

L'idée d'un mécanisme européen d'indemnisation des chômeurs est une vieille idée dont les premières traces remontent au moins à 1975. Cette idée est aujourd'hui très débattue en Europe avec des propositions émanant d'économistes ou d'administrations italiennes, françaises, des études menées par des instituts allemands, dont le dernier [Policy Brief de l'OFCE](#) propose une synthèse. Cette possibilité est même évoquée dans des communications de la Commission européenne. Cette note présente les débats européens, ainsi que le système en place aux États-Unis.

Le mécanisme de réassurance chômage européen présenté dans cette note vise à financer les indemnités chômage des pays en cas de récession sévère et s'inspire pour cela de l'expérience des États-Unis. Ce mécanisme constitue un second niveau

européen en plus de niveaux nationaux d'assurance chômage différents. Il permet de soutenir les chômeurs dans les pays touchés par une récession importante, ce qui contribue à soutenir la demande agrégée et l'activité tout en réduisant les inégalités dans les pays bénéficiaires, et est compatible avec une réduction des dettes publiques. Ce mécanisme n'engendre ni transferts permanents vers les pays qui ne se réformeraient pas, ni de distorsions de concurrence, ni le transfert de pouvoirs politiques relevant aujourd'hui de la subsidiarité. Il est en effet, comme c'est le cas aux États-Unis, compatible avec une hétérogénéité de systèmes nationaux.

Pour donner des ordres de grandeur, un système de réassurance, équilibré sur le cycle économique européen et sans transferts permanents entre les pays, aurait augmenté la croissance de 1,6% du PIB en Espagne au cœur de la crise, et l'Allemagne aurait reçu une aide européenne de 1996 à 1998 et de 2003 à 2005. La France aurait connu une augmentation du PIB de 0,8% en 2013 grâce à un tel système, comme le montrent des simulations présentées par des équipes européennes.

Pour accéder à l'étude complète, consulter ici le [Policy Brief de l'OFCE, n°28 du 30 novembre 2017.](#)

Taux d'activité et durée du travail : des ajustements différenciés

par [Bruno Ducoudré](#) et [Pierre Madec](#)

La plupart des pays européens ont, au cours de la crise, réduit plus ou moins fortement la durée effective de travail,

via des dispositifs de chômage partiel, la réduction des heures supplémentaires ou le recours aux comptes épargne-temps, mais aussi via le développement du temps partiel (particulièrement en Italie et en Espagne), notamment le temps partiel subi. A contrario, l'évolution favorable du chômage américain s'explique en partie par une baisse importante du taux d'activité.


En supposant qu'une hausse d'un point du taux d'activité entraîne, à emploi constant, une hausse du taux de chômage, il est possible de mesurer l'impact de ces ajustements (durée du travail et taux d'activité) sur le chômage, en calculant un taux de chômage à emploi constant et contrôlé de ces ajustements. Excepté aux États-Unis, du fait entre autres des réformes des retraites menées, l'ensemble des pays étudiés ont connu une augmentation de leur population active (actifs occupés + chômeurs) plus importante que celle observée dans la population générale. Mécaniquement, sans création d'emploi, ce dynamisme démographique a pour effet d'accroître le taux de chômage des pays concernés.

Si le taux d'activité s'était maintenu à son niveau de 2007, le taux de chômage serait inférieur de 1,7 point en France, de 2,7 points en Italie et de 1,8 point au Royaume-Uni (Graphique). Par contre, sans la contraction importante de la population active américaine, le taux de chômage aurait été supérieur de plus de 3 points à celui observé en 2016. Il apparaît également que l'Allemagne a connu depuis la crise une baisse importante de son chômage (-5,1 points) alors même que son taux d'activité croissait de 2,2 points. À taux d'activité inchangé, le taux de chômage allemand serait de ... 1,2%. Il reste que les évolutions des taux d'activité résultent aussi de facteurs démographiques structurels si bien que l'hypothèse d'un retour vers les taux de 2007 est arbitraire. Pour les États-Unis, une partie de la baisse du taux d'activité s'explique par l'évolution de la structure de la population. Aussi, le chiffre de sous-emploi peut être considéré comme

surévalué.

Concernant la durée du travail, les enseignements semblent bien différents. Il apparaît ainsi que si la durée du travail avait été maintenue dans l'ensemble des pays à son niveau d'avant-crise, le taux de chômage aurait été supérieur de 3,9 points en Allemagne, de 3,4 points en Italie et de 0,8 point en France. En Espagne, au Royaume-Uni et aux États-Unis, le temps de travail n'a que très peu évolué depuis la crise. En contrôlant le temps de travail, le taux de chômage évolue donc comme celui observé dans ces trois pays.

Graphique. Taux de chômage observé au t2 2017 et taux de chômage si ...



Sources : Comptabilités nationales, calculs OFCE.

Il faut rappeler que la baisse de la durée du travail est tendancielle, ce qui se reflète dans les évolutions observées pendant la crise indépendamment des mesures spécifiques prises pour amortir le choc sur l'emploi par des mécanismes comme le chômage partiel ou l'utilisation de comptes épargne temps. Depuis la fin des années 1990, l'ensemble des pays étudiés ont fortement réduit leur temps de travail. En Allemagne, entre 1998 et 2008, cette baisse a été en moyenne de 0,6 % par trimestre. En France, le passage aux 35 heures a entraîné une baisse similaire sur la période. En Italie, au Royaume-Uni et

aux États-Unis, ces ajustements à la baisse de la durée moyenne du travail ont été respectivement de -0,3 %, -0,4 % et -0,3 % par trimestre. Au total, entre 1998 et 2008, la durée du travail a été réduite de 6 % en Allemagne et en France, de 4 % en Italie, de 3 % au Royaume-Uni et aux États-Unis et de 2 % en Espagne, *de facto* seul pays à avoir intensifié, durant la crise, la baisse du temps de travail entamée à la fin des années 1990.

Growth and inequality in the European Union

By [Catherine Mathieu](#) and [Henri Sterdyniak](#)

“Growth and Inequality: Challenges for the Economies of the European Union” was the theme of the 14th EUROFRAME Symposium on Economic Policy Issues in the European Union held on 9 June 2017 in Berlin. [EUROFRAME](#) is a network of European economic institutes that includes DIW and IFW (Germany), WIFO (Austria), ETLA (Finland), OFCE (France), ESRI (Ireland), PROMETEIA (Italy), CPB (Netherlands), CASE (Poland) and NIESR (United Kingdom). Since 2004, EUROFRAME has organized a symposium on an important subject for the European economies every year.

This year, 27 contributions from researchers, selected by a scientific committee, were presented at the symposium, most of which are available on the conference [web page](#). This text provides a summary of the studies presented and discussed at the symposium.

As DIW President Marcel Fratzcher pointed out in his opening remarks, the rise in inequality over the last 30 years has meant that inequalities that were previously subjects of study reserved for researchers in social policy have now become subjects for numerous economists. Several questions were posed: why this rise in inequality? Is the increase in inequality in each country a necessary consequence of the reduction in inequality between countries, in Europe or at the global level? What are the macroeconomic consequences of this increase? What economic policies could avoid this?

Income inequality: the facts. Mark Dabrowski (CASE, Warsaw) – “Is there a trade-off between global and national inequality?” – stresses that the growth of inequalities within each country (especially in the United States and China) goes hand in hand with the reduction of inequalities between countries, as both are fuelled by commercial and financial globalization. However, some advanced countries have succeeded in halting the growth in internal inequalities, which shows the continuing importance of national policy.

Oliver Denk (OECD) – “Who are the Top 1 Percent Earners in Europe?” – analyses the structure of the 1% of employees earning the highest incomes in the EU countries. They represent between 9% of total payroll in the United Kingdom to 3.8% in Finland (4.7% in France). Statistically, they are older than the mass of overall employees (this is less clear in the East European countries), more masculine (this is less clear in the Nordic countries), and more highly educated. They are more numerous in finance, communication and business services.

Tim Callan, Karina Doorley and Michael Savage (ESRI Dublin), analyse the growth in income inequality in the countries most affected by the crisis (“Inequality in EU crisis countries: Identifying the impacts of automatic stabilisers and discretionary policy”). In these five countries, Spain, Greece, Ireland, Portugal and Cyprus, primary income

inequalities have increased due to the crisis, but thanks to automatic tax and social transfers, inequalities in disposable income have remained stable in Ireland and Portugal and (to a lesser degree) in Greece.

Carlos Vacas-Soriano and Enrique Fernández-Macías (Eurofound) – “Inequalities and employment patterns in Europe before and after the Great Recession” – show that income inequality decreased overall in the EU before 2008, as new entrants caught up with the older members. Since 2008, the Great Recession has deepened inequalities between countries and within many countries. The growth of internal inequality is due mainly to rising unemployment; it is striking traditionally egalitarian countries (Germany, Sweden, Denmark); and it is mitigated by family solidarity and social protection, whose roles are nevertheless under question.

Modelling the growth / inequality relationship. Alberto Cardiac (University of Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan) and Francesco Saraceno (OFCE, Paris) – “Inequality and Imbalances: An open-economy agent-based model” – present a two-country model. In one, the search for external surpluses leads to pressure on wages and a depression of domestic demand, which is offset by export earnings. In the other, the growth of inequality leads to a downward trend in consumption, which is offset by the expansion of credit. The result is an endogenous debt crisis when the household debt of the second country reaches a limit value.

Alain Desdoigts (IEDES, University of Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne) and Fernando Jaramillo (Universidad del Rosario, Bogota) – “Learning by doing, inequality, and sustained growth: A middle-class perspective” – present a model where innovations can be applied in production only in sectors with a sufficient size, hence those that produce the goods purchased by the middle class (so neither in the luxury goods sector nor in the low-end goods sector). Growth is therefore stronger as the middle class expands. Redistribution is

favourable to growth if it is made from the rich to the middle class, and unfavourable if it goes from the middle class to the poor.

Inequality, financialisation, monetary policy. The article by Dirk Bezemer and Anna Samarina (University of Groningen) – “Debt shift, financial development and income inequality in Europe” – distinguishes between two types of bank credit: credit for financial and real estate activities, and credit for non-financial enterprises and consumption. They explain the growth of inequality in the developed countries by the growing role of credit that finances finance to the detriment of credit that finances production.

The article by Mathias Klein (DIW Berlin) and Roland Winkler (TU Dortmund University) – “Austerity, inequality, and private debt overhang” – argues that restrictive fiscal policies have little impact on activity and employment when private debt is low (because there is a full Barro effect); they have a restrictive effect on activity and increase income inequality when private debt is high. Therefore, fiscal restraint should be applied only once private debt has been reduced.

Davide Furceri, Prakash Loungani and Aleksandra Zdzienicka (IMF) – “The effect of monetary policy shocks on inequality” – point out that the impact of monetary policy on income inequality is ambiguous. An expansionary policy can reduce unemployment and lower interest rates (which reduces inequality); it can also lead to inflation and raise the price of assets (which increases inequality). Empirically, it appears that a restrictive policy increases income inequality unless it is caused by higher growth.

Inequalities and social policy. Alexei Kireyev and Jingyang Chen (IMF) – “Inclusive growth framework” – advocate for growth indicators that include trends in poverty and in inequality in income and consumption.

Dorothee Ihle (University of Muenster) – “Treatment effects of Riester participation along the wealth distribution: An instrumental quantile regression analysis” – analyses the impact of Riester pension plans on the wealth of German households. They significantly increase the wealth of the participating households at the bottom of the income distribution, but these are relatively few in number, while this mainly has wealth redistribution effects for middle-class households.

Inequality, poverty and mobility. Katharina Weddige-Haaf (Utrecht University) and Clemens Kool (CPB and Utrecht University) – “The impact of fiscal policy and internal migration on regional growth and convergence in Germany” – analyse the factors for convergence of per capita income between the old and new German Länder. Convergence has been driven by internal migration, investment subsidies and structural funds, but fiscal transfers in general have had no effect. The 2008 crisis favoured convergence by hitting the richest regions in particular.

Elizabeth Jane Casabianca and Elena Giarda (Prometeia, Bologna) – “From rags to riches, from riches to rags: Intra-generational mobility in Europe before and after the Great Recession” – analyse the mobility of individual incomes in four European countries: Spain, France, Italy and the United Kingdom. Before the crisis, this was strong in Spain and weak in Italy. It declined markedly after the crisis, particularly in Spain; it remained stable in the United Kingdom.

Luigi Campiglio (Università Cattolica del S. Cuore di Milano) – “Absolute poverty, food and housing” – analyses absolute poverty in Italy using an indicator based on food consumption. He shows that poor families bear particularly high housing costs, which cuts into their food consumption and health care spending. Poor families with children are tenants and were hit especially hard by the crisis. Social policy should offer them better protection through targeted transfers in cash or in

kind (health, education).

Georgia Kaplanoglou and Vassilis T. Rapanos (National and Kapodistrian University of Athens and Academy of Athens) – “Evolutions in consumption inequality and poverty in Greece: The impact of the crisis and austerity policies” – point out that the crisis and austerity policies have reduced GDP and household consumption by about 30% in Greece. This has been accompanied by an increase in inequality in consumption, which the paper documents in detail. It analyses in particular the effect of VAT hikes. Families with children were especially hard hit.

Labour market. Christian Hutter (IAB, German Federal Employment Agency) and Enzo Weber (IAB and Universität Regensburg) – “Labour market effects of wage inequality and skill-biased technical change in Germany” – use German data to estimate a structural vector model for analysing the link between wage inequalities, employment, neutral technical progress and technical progress favouring skilled labour. The latter raises labour productivity and wages, but also wage inequalities, and it reduces employment. Wage inequalities have a negative impact on employment and overall productivity.

Eckhard Hein and Achim Truger (Berlin School of Economics and Law, Institute for International Political Economy) – “Opportunities and limits of rebalancing the Eurozone via wage policies: Theoretical considerations and empirical illustrations for the case of Germany” – analyse the impact of wage increases in Germany on the rebalancing of current account balances in Europe. They show that these play a role not only through a competitiveness effect, but also through a demand effect by modifying the wage / profit distribution and by boosting consumption. They must therefore also be supported by an increase in public spending.

Camille Logeay and Heike Joebges (HTW Berlin) – “Could a wage formula prevent excessive current account imbalances in euro

area countries? A study on wage costs and profit developments in peripheral countries” – show that the rule “wages must grow in line with labour productivity and the inflation target” should have had stabilizing effects in Europe both on the competitiveness of the member countries as well as on their domestic demand. This nevertheless assumes that companies do not take advantage of this to boost their profits and that no country seeks to increase its competitiveness.

Hassan Molana (University of Dundee), Catia Montagna (University of Aberdeen) and George E. Onwordi (University of Aberdeen) – “Reforming the Liberal Welfare State: International Shocks, unemployment and household income shares” – construct a model to show that a free market country, such as the United Kingdom, could improve the functioning of its labour market by reducing flexibility to move towards a flexi-security model: higher unemployment benefits, restrictions on redundancies, greater spending on training, and support for hiring. By boosting labour productivity, this strategy would reduce the structural unemployment rate and increase the share of profits.

Guillaume Claveres (Centre d’Economie de la Sorbonne, Paris) and Marius Clemens (DIW, Berlin) – “Unemployment Insurance Union” – propose a model for European unemployment insurance that would cover part of the expenses of unemployment benefits. This could reduce fluctuations in consumption and unemployment resulting from specific shocks. This assumes, however, that it would apply only to cyclical unemployment, which is difficult to define.

Bruno Contini (Università di Torino and Collegio Carlo Alberto), José Ignacio Garcia Perez (Universidad Pablo de Olavide), Toralf Pusch (Hans-Boeckler Stiftung, Düsseldorf) and Roberto Quaranta (Collegio Carlo Alberto) – “New approaches to the study of long-term non-employment duration via survival analysis: Italy, Germany and Spain” – analyse involuntary non-activity (people who would like to work but

have given up looking for a job and lost their rights to unemployment benefits) in Germany, Italy and Spain. This is particularly important and sustainable in Spain and Italy. They caution against measures to encourage redundancies, job insecurity and incentives for undeclared work.

Taxation. Markku Lehmus, (ETLA, Helsinki) – “Distributional and employment effects of labour tax changes: Finnish evidence over the period 1996-2008” – uses a general equilibrium model with heterogeneous agents to evaluate the impact of the reduction in the taxation of employment in Finland from 1996 to 2008. He shows that this explains only a small share of the rise in employment (1.4 points out of 16%) and of the rise in income inequality.

Sarah Godar (Berlin School of Economics and Law) and Achim Truger (IMK and Berlin School of Economics and Law) – “Shifting priorities in EU tax policies: A stock-taking exercise over three decades” – analyse the evolution of taxation in the EU states: from 1980 to 2007, taxation became less progressive with lower marginal rates of income tax and corporation tax, and preferred treatment of capital income. The crisis of 2008 and the difficulties with the public finances temporarily slowed this trend; an increase in revenues was, however, often sought by raising VAT.

Alexander Krennek and Margit Schratzenstaller (WIFO) – “Sustainability-oriented future EU funding: A European net wealth tax” – argue for the introduction of a European household wealth tax, which could help finance the European budget.

The macroeconomic consequences of inequalities. Bjoern O. Meyer (University of Rome – Tor Vergata) – “Savings glut without saving: Retirement saving and the interest rate decline in the United States between 1984 and 2013” – explains 60% of the decline in the interest rate in the United States, despite the decline in the overall household saving rate, by

demographic factors (the differential rise in life expectancy), the slowdown in labour productivity gains and the increase in income inequality.

Marius Clemens, Ferdinand Fichtner, Stefan Gebauer, Simon Junker and Konstantin A. Kholodilin (DIW Berlin) – “How does income inequality influence economic growth in Germany?” – present a macroeconomic model in which short-term income inequalities increase the productivity of each asset (incentive effect), but reduce overall consumption (savings effect); in the long term, they have a negative impact on the formation of the human capital of young people in the working classes. Hence an exogenous increase in income inequalities first has a negative effect on GDP (demand effect), then positive (individual incentive effect) and then again negative in the long term (human capital effect). The effect is always negative on household consumption and positive on the external balance.

Trends in labour force participation rates in Europe during the Great Recession: The role of demographics and job polarization

By [Guillaume Allègre](#) and Gregory Verdugo

In Europe as in the United States, employment fell considerably during the Great Recession. Moreover, over the last few decades, the labour markets in both regions have been

reshaped by the forces of automation and globalization. However, the response of labour force participation to these changes has varied from country to country. One of the most significant developments in the US labour market over the past decade has been the decline in labour force participation. Between 2004 and 2013, the labour force participation rate for the group aged 25 to 54 fell by 2.6 percentage points (from 83.8% to 81.1%), a decline that has persisted well beyond the end of the Great Recession. In the EU-15, on the other hand, the participation rate for this age group increased by 2 percentage points during the same period (from 83.7% to 85.6%), despite low growth and the persistence of high levels of unemployment.

What explains these differences on the two sides of the Atlantic? To answer this question, we examine [here](#) the determinants of the evolution of labour force participation over the last two decades in twelve European countries and compare this with the United States.


Consistent with previous work on the United States, we found that recent demographic shifts account for a substantial share of cross-country differences. The share of retired baby boomers increased more rapidly in the United States and triggered a sharper decline in participation rates there than in Europe. Over the past decade, the rate of increase in the number of higher education graduates was twice as high in Europe as in the United States, especially in southern Europe and in particular for women. Women with higher levels of education are more likely to join the workforce, and they have contributed dramatically to the rise in labour force participation in Europe.

However, these changes do not explain everything. For the population with a diploma below the level of the high school baccalaureate, men's labour force participation rates have fallen in all countries. For women, they have increased rapidly, especially in the countries hit hardest by

unemployment. In Spain, Greece and Italy, the participation rates for women with a diploma below the baccalaureate level rose by 12, 5.5 and 2 points, respectively, between 2007 and 2013, while these economies were in the midst of a deep recession.

To explain these facts, we investigated the role of changes in patterns of labour demand in recent decades and in particular during the Great Recession. We show that, as in the United States, job polarization (which denotes the reallocation of employment towards the lowest and highest paying occupations at the expense of intermediate professions) accelerated in Europe during the Great Recession (Figure 1). Due to the greater destruction of jobs in intermediate occupations, the recent polarization has been much more intense in Europe.

Figure 1. Changes in employment according to wage level, 2007-2013




Source : EU-LFS, CPS (US).

Another important difference with the United States is that occupational segregation between men and women is more pronounced in Europe. The intermediate jobs that are rapidly disappearing are much more likely to employ male workers in Europe, whereas the expansion of low-skilled occupations is disproportionately benefitting women (Figure 2). As a result,

in Europe, more than in the United States, job polarization and the destruction of intermediate jobs has led to a decline in labour market opportunities for men that is more dramatic than the decline for women. We find that these asymmetric demand shocks between the genders accounted for most of the increase in labour force participation rates for women with the lowest educational levels during the Great Recession.

Figure 2. Proportion of women according to wage level, 2007



Source : EU-LFS, CPS (US).

For further information: [Gregory Verdugo, Guillaume Allègre, "Labour Force Participation and Job Polarization: Evidence from Europe during the Great Recession", Sciences Po OFCE Working Paper, no. 16, 2017-05-10](#)

Beyond the unemployment rate. An international comparison since the crisis

By [Bruno Ducoudré](#) and [Pierre Madec](#)

[According to figures from the French statistics institute \(INSEE\) published on 12 May 2017](#), non-agricultural commercial employment in France increased (+0.3%) in the first quarter of 2017 for the eighth consecutive quarter. Employment rose by 198,300 in one year. Despite the improvement on the jobs front experienced since 2015, the impact of the crisis is still lingering.


Since 2008, employment trends have differed significantly within the OECD countries. Unemployment rates in the United States, Germany and the United Kingdom are now once again close to those seen before the onset of the crisis, while the rates in France, Italy and particularly Spain still exceed their pre-crisis levels. Changes in unemployment reflect the gap between changes in the active population and changes in employment. An improvement in unemployment could therefore mask less favourable developments in the labour market, in terms of employment behaviour (changes in the labour force participation rate and the “unemployment halo”) or an increase in precarious employment (involuntary part-time work, etc.). In this paper we take another look at the contribution of changes in participation rates and in working time duration relative to changes in unemployment rates and to a broader measure of the unemployment rate that encompasses the “halo of unemployment” and involuntary part-time work.

Unemployment rates are marked by the crisis and reforms

With the exception of the United States, employment rates have changed considerably since 2008. In France, Italy and Spain,

the employment rate for 15-24 year-olds and for those under age 55 more generally has fallen sharply (Figure 1). Between the first quarter of 2008 and the last quarter of 2016, the employment rate for 18-24 year-olds fell by 19 percentage points in Spain, by more than 8 percentage points in Italy and by almost 4 percentage points in France, while at the same time the unemployment rates in these countries rose by 9, 5 and 3 percentage points respectively. The poor state of the economy in these countries, accompanied by negative or weak job creation, has hit young people entering the labour market hard. Conversely, over this same nine-year period, the employment rate of individuals aged 55 to 64 increased in all the above countries. In France, as a result of successive pension reforms and the [elimination of the job search exemption](#), the employment rate of older workers increased by 12.3 percentage points in nine years to 50% in Q4 2016. In Italy, even though the labour market worsened, the employment rate of 55-64 year-olds has risen by almost 18 percentage points.

Figure 1. Change in employment rate by age between Q1 2008 and Q4 2016



Sources: OECD, OFCE calculations.

A sharp impact of the participation rate on unemployment,

offset by a reduction in working time

During the course of the crisis, most European countries reduced the actual working hours to a greater or lesser extent by means of partial unemployment schemes, the reduction of overtime and the use of time-savings accounts, but also through the expansion of part-time work (particularly in Italy and Spain), including involuntary part-time work. On the other hand, the favourable trend in unemployment in the US (Table 1) is explained partly by a significant decline in the labour force participation rate of people aged 15 to 64 (Table 2). The rate in the last quarter of 2016 was 73.1%, i.e. 2.4 points less than at the beginning of 2007.

Table 1. Change in ILO unemployment rate (in % points)

	Q1 2007 – Q4 2011	Q1 2012 – Q4 2016	Q1 2007 – Q4 2016
DEU	-3,4	-1,7	-5,1
ESP	14,6	-4,2	10,3
FRA	0,9	0,7	1,6
ITA	3,1	2,7	5,8
GBR	2,9	-3,6	-0,7
USA	4,1	-3,8	0,4

Source: National accounts, OFCE calculations.

Table 2. Change in the participation rate (in % points)

	Q1 2007 – Q4 2011	Q1 2012 – Q4 2016	Q1 2007 – Q4 2016
DEU	2,1	0,6	2,8
ESP	2,5	0,0	2,5
FRA	0,6	1,2	1,8
ITA	0,5	2,7	3,2
GBR	0,2	1,7	1,9
USA	-2,3	-0,2	-2,4

Sources: National accounts, OFCE calculations.

Assuming that a one percentage point increase in the labour force participation rate leads, holding employment constant, to a 1 percentage point increase in the unemployment rate, it is possible to measure the impact of these adjustments (working hours and participation rate) on unemployment, by calculating an unemployment rate at constant employment and

controlling for these adjustments. Except in the United States, all the countries studied saw a greater increase in their labour force (employed + unemployed) than in the general population, owing, among other things, to pension reforms. Mechanically, absent job creation, this demographic growth has the effect of increasing the unemployment rate of the countries concerned.

If the labour force participation rate remained at its 2007 level, the unemployment rate would fall by 1.7 percentage points in France, 2.8 percentage points in Italy and 1.8 percentage points in the United Kingdom (Table 3). On the other hand, without the large contraction in the US labour force, the unemployment rate would have been at least 2.3 percentage points higher than in 2016. It also seems that Germany experienced a significant decline in the level of its unemployment (-5.1 points), even though the participation rate rose by 2.8 percentage points. For an unchanged employment rate, the German unemployment rate would be 1.3% (Figure 2).

As regards working hours, the lessons seem quite different. It seems that if working time had been maintained in all the countries at its pre-crisis level, the unemployment rate would be higher by 3.4 points in Germany, 3.1 points in Italy and 1.5 points in France. In Spain and the United Kingdom, working time has changed very little since the crisis. By controlling for working time, the unemployment rate changes in line with what was observed in these two countries. Finally, without adjusting for working time, the unemployment rate in the United States would be 1 point lower.


Table 3. Difference between the unemployment rate seen at Q4 2016 and the unemployment rate in case of (in % points)

	...keeping working time at its 2007 level	... keeping the participation rate at its 2007 level	...keeping working time and the participation rate at their 2007 levels
DEU	-2,6	3,4	0,9
ESP	-2,2	0,3	-1,9
FRA	-1,7	1,5	-0,2
ITA	-2,8	3,1	0,3
GBR	-1,8	0,3	-1,5
USA	2,3	-1,0	1,3

Sources: National accounts, OECD, OFCE calculations.

Note that this trend towards a reduction in working hours is an old one. Indeed, since the end of the 1990s, all the countries studied have experienced large reductions in working time. In Germany, this decline averaged 0.5% per year between 1998 and 2008. In France, the transition to the 35-hour work week resulted in a similar decrease (-0.6% per year) over that period. Overall, between 1998 and 2008, working hours were down 5% in Germany, 6% in France, 4% in Italy, 3% in the United Kingdom and the United States, and 2% in Spain.

Figure 2. Unemployment rate...



Sources: National accounts, OECD, OFCE calculations.

Beyond the “unemployment rate”


In addition to obscuring the dynamics affecting the labour

market, the ILO's (International Labour Organization) strict definition of unemployment does not take into account situations on the margins of unemployment. So people who wish to work but are considered inactive in the ILO sense, either because they are not quickly available for work (in under two weeks) or because they are not actively seeking employment, form what is called a "halo" of unemployment.

The OECD's databases can be used to integrate into the unemployed category people who are excluded by the ILO definition. Figure 3 shows for the years 2008, 2011 and 2016 the observed unemployment rate, to which are added, first, people who are employed and declare that they want to work more, and second, individuals who are inactive but want to work and are available to do so. In Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States, changes in these various measures seem to be in line with a clear improvement in the labour market situation. On the other hand, between 2008 and 2011, France and Italy experienced an increase in their unemployment rates, especially from 2011 to 2016, both in the ILO's strict sense of the term and in a broader sense. In Italy, the ILO unemployment rate increased by 3.4 percentage points between 2011 and 2016. At the same time, underemployment rose by 3.2 percentage points and the proportion of individuals maintaining a "marginal relationship" with employment by 1 percentage point. Ultimately, in Italy, the unemployment rate including some of the jobseekers excluded from the ILO definition came to 26.5% in 2016, more than double the ILO unemployment rate. In France, because of a lower level of unemployment, these differences are less significant. Despite this, between 2011 and 2016, underemployment increased by 2.4 points while unemployment in the strict sense grew "only" by 1 percentage point. In Spain, although there was notable improvement in ILO unemployment over the period (-3 points between 2011 and 2016), underemployment continued to grow strongly (+1.5 points). By 2016, Spain's ILO unemployment rate was 7

percentage points higher than it was in 2008. By including jobseekers excluded from the ILO measure, this difference comes to 11.0 percentage points.

Figure 3. Unemployment rate at Q4 2016...



Note : For 2016, as all the data were not available, we assume that the "halo" changed in line with 2015.

Sources : OCDE, calculs OFCE.

Small recovery after a big crisis

By the Analysis and Forecasting Department

[This text summarizes the 2016-2017 outlook for the global economy and the euro zone. Click here to consult the complete version \[in French\].](#)

Global growth is once again passing through a zone of turbulence. While growth will take place, it is nevertheless being revised downwards for 2016 and 2017 to 2.9% and 3.1%, respectively. The slowdown is first of all hitting the

emerging countries, with the decline in Chinese growth continuing and even worsening (6.1% anticipated for 2017, down from 7.6% on average in 2012-2014). The slowdown in Chinese demand is hitting world trade and fuelling lower oil prices, which in turn is exacerbating the difficulties facing oil and commodity producers. Finally, the prospect for the normalization of US monetary policy is resulting in a reflux of capital. The dollar is appreciating even as the currencies of the emerging countries of Asia and Latin America are depreciating. While the industrialized countries are also suffering from the Chinese slowdown through the demand channel, growth is resilient there thanks to falling oil prices. The support provided by monetary policy is being cut back in the US, but is strengthening in the euro zone, keeping the euro at a low level. Countries are no longer systematically adopting austerity policies. In these conditions, growth will slow in the US, from 2.4% in 2015 to 1.9% in 2016 and then 1.6% in 2017. The recovery will pick up pace slightly in the euro zone, driven mainly by the dynamism of Germany and Spain and the improved outlook in France and Italy. For the euro zone as a whole, growth should come to 1.8% in 2016 and 1.7% in 2017. This will push down the unemployment rate, although by year-end 2017 it will still be 2 points above its pre-crisis level (9.3%, against 7.3% at year-end 2007).

While the United States seems to have avoided the risk of deflation, the euro zone is still under threat. Inflation is close to zero, and the very low level of expectations for long-term inflation reflects the ECB's difficulty in regaining control of inflation. Persistent unemployment indicates some continuing shortcomings in managing demand in the euro zone, which has in fact been based entirely on monetary policy. While the ECB's actions are a necessary condition for accelerating growth, they are not sufficient, and must be supplemented by more active fiscal policy.

At the level of the euro zone as a whole, overall fiscal policy is neutral (expansionary in Germany and Italy in 2016 but restrictive in France and even more so in Greece), whereas it needs to be more expansionary in order to bring unemployment down more rapidly and help to avert deflationary risks. Furthermore, the continuing moderate growth is leading to the accumulation of current account surpluses in the euro zone (3.2% in 2015). While imbalances within the euro zone have been corrected to some extent, this mainly took place through adjustments by countries in deficit prior to the crisis. Consequently, the surplus in the euro zone's current account will eventually pose risks to the level of the euro, which could appreciate once the monetary stimulus ends, thereby slowing growth.

Table. Outlook for world growth

Annual growth rate (%)

	Weight in the total(1)	GDP in volume		
		2015	2016	2017
DEU	3,7	1,4	1,9	1,6
FRA	2,6	1,2	1,6	1,6
ITA	2,3	0,6	1,2	1,0
ESP	1,6	3,2	3,3	2,4
EUZ	13,4	1,5	1,8	1,7
GBR	2,4	2,3	2,1	1,7
NPM(2)	2,4	3,8	3,1	3,2
UE 28	18,6	1,9	2,0	1,8
USA	17,2	2,4	1,9	1,7
JPN	4,8	0,5	0,7	0,4
Developed countries	44,5	1,9	1,7	1,6
RUS	3,6	-3,7	-1,0	1,0
CHN	14,9	6,9	6,3	6,1
Other Asian countries	16,6	5,2	5,2	5,4
Latin America	8,8	-0,4	-0,9	1,5
World	100	2,9	2,9	3,1

(1) Weight according to GDP and PPP estimated by the IMF for 2008.

(2) Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic, Romania, Bulgaria and Croatia.

Sources: IMF, OECD, national sources, OFCE calculations and forecast, April 2016.

Can steel revive Europe's industrial policy?

By [Sarah Guillou](#)

The situation of the European steel industry was on the agenda of the European Council's Competitiveness session held on Monday, 29 February 2016. One of the Council's conclusions was

to issue a demand to speed up the anti-dumping investigations by two months. This demand follows a letter sent on 5 February to the European Commission by ministers from seven European countries, including France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom, urging it to take measures to protect the steel sector vis-à-vis what was deemed unfair competition from China and Russia.

The steel industry, which successively pushed forward Europe's industrial development and then European cohesion through the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), subsequently became a theatre for the violent winds of globalization and a symbol of Europe's industrial decline – will it now be the sector that leads a revival of Europe's industrial policy?

In retrospect, a question arises as to whether the difficulties facing the European steel industry, which is subject both to the fussy oversight of the European Competition Commission and to low-cost Chinese imports, are partly a symptom of failings in Europe's industrial policy, which is wedged between a very active competition policy and a timid trade policy?

The history of Europe's steel industry does in fact fall closely in line with the history of Europe's industrial policy: from a central and highly sectoral industry at the time of the ECSC, with a great deal of state aid going to the sector under various exemptions, it then became primarily horizontal and subject to competition policy. The sector only found its way by means of trade policy in response to increased competition from emerging countries. No steps have been taken in the steel industry towards European alliances or regroupings since the 1980s, and there have been no Europe-wide plans to rationalize production capacity so as to hold down the decline in jobs in the industry. This decline went hand in glove with the development of the continent's specialization in high-tech steel products. But today even those jobs are under threat. Could a different industrial

policy save them?

The state of the industry in Europe

Steel now accounts for 360,000 jobs in the European Union. The European sector has lost nearly a quarter of its workforce since 2009, with job losses accelerating: 3,000 jobs lost in the last 6 months.

In terms of production, the steel industry generates a turnover of 180 billion euros, with an output of 170 million tons from 500 production sites in 23 Member States. If countries are ranked individually in terms of international steel producers, Germany comes in 7th place, Italy 11th and France 15th. The sector is dependent on the import of iron ore, alumina and coal. Fortunately, the decline in steel prices has gone hand in hand with lower prices for these commodities. The industry is highly capital-intensive, requiring major investments. At the same time, the transport of steel coils and flat products is inexpensive, making it easier to import them.

The 2008 economic crisis cascaded through the sector, as steel products constitute intermediate consumption for many other industrial sectors as well as for construction. Steelmakers in Europe also face stricter environmental constraints than elsewhere. The steel industry is a major source of CO₂ emissions, and is very sensitive to carbon prices and to regulatory changes. It is also a key player in the EU's emissions trading system (ETS) for greenhouse gas quotas, and while the crisis has enabled the industry to make profits from the sale of surplus emissions rights, steelmakers who are currently experiencing problems vis-à-vis their non-European competitors will be very sensitive to the forthcoming reform of the system for the 2020-2030 period.

Some companies are now in real trouble, such as Arcelor Mittal, which announced a record loss for 2015 (nearly 8

billion euros), partly due to the need to depreciate its mines and steel stocks. The company, which is heavily in debt because of its many acquisitions in Europe, plans to close some plants. Tata Steel, for its part, has closed sites in Britain. In Japan, Nippon Steel, which just acquired an interest in the capital of the French firm Vallourec and is preparing to buy the Japanese Nisshin Steel, is doing better.

The difficulties facing a sector that built up excess capacity during the crisis have been aggravated by the economic downturn in China. Thus, 2015 was the first year to experience a decline (-3%) in global production (1,622 million tons), after 5 years of growth. Global production did not adjust immediately to falling demand, with prices initially acting as the adjustment variable. The decline in production was the signal for the closures of steel factories and mining operations. This has marked the end of a cycle of rising Chinese production that strongly destabilized the market.

The Chinese tornado

Chinese production doubled in volume between 2000 and 2014, and on its own now accounts for more than twice the combined output of the next four major producing countries, Japan, India, Russia and the United States. This performance is the result of several factors: massive government support; dynamic growth in construction, in infrastructure investment, and in the Chinese market's production of cars and machinery; and favourable access to iron ore. China produces nearly 50% of the world's steel, i.e. approximately 800 million tons of steel. The second-largest producer is Japan, with 100 million tons. India and the United States are contending for third place, at around 5% of global production. If we count the Europe-28 as a single entity, then it would take second place with 10% (Source: [World Steel Association](#)). But the slowdown in the Chinese economy and the strong inertia characterizing production capacity in the steel industry have created substantial excess capacity, which the authorities are now

trying to reduce. Domestically, China needs only about half of its output, so it exports the other half.

The 400 million tons China exports represent twice Europe's output. The price of the Chinese offer is therefore likely to greatly upset the balances in other countries. Any excess capacity is directed onto foreign markets to be gotten rid of at low prices, as Chinese exporters are not going to fail to sell off their steel products. Hence China's exports to Europe rose from 45 million tons in 2014 to 97 million tons in 2015, which exceeds the 43 million tons produced by Germany.

China is also likely to experience a significant decline in its workforce, and some production sites, drowning in massive debt, have already closed. Chinese steelmakers are losing money, and small units are going bankrupt. Large units, however, are often state property, and are weathering the storm (at the cost of heavy indebtedness) and becoming aggressive predators, in terms not only of price but also of acquisition capabilities. The weak position of Europe's firms is also leaving them vulnerable to foreign takeovers. China Hebei Iron and Steel Group is, for instance, about to acquire a Serbian steelmaker, which would be yet another means of entering Europe.

The policy response

The public authorities have long been heavily involved in the steel sector. It was a strategic sector for post-war economic development, and was the source of European economic construction at a time when the "small steps" policy of Robert Schuman led to putting the coal and steel production of France and Germany under a common authority, later joined by other countries. For a long time the sector then benefited from various public aid measures and subsidies that kept up excess capacity relative to demand, now estimated at 10-15% of output. The sector then was gradually freed from public tutelage, and in the mid-1990s was excluded from the list of

sectors in difficulty that were eligible for aid for restructurings and bailouts. Nevertheless, state support never disappeared completely, but today, the European Commission, through the Competition Commission, is relatively strict about applying the market investor principle to assess the legality of public support.

While tracking distortions in competition on the market, the European Commission recently opened an investigation into Italy's support for the steelmaker Ilva (2 billion euros), and demanded that Belgium repay 211 million euros of aid paid to the steelmaker Duferco. In 2013, the Commission opened an investigation into aid awarded by "Belgian Foreign Strategic Investments Holding" (FSIH), a body created in 2003 by the Walloon management and investment company Sogepa to invest in the steel industry. This aid, paid between 2006 and 2011 by the Walloon government [a Belgian regional government], was considered to constitute unfair competition on the European market. Indeed, for the Commission, private investors would not have voluntarily made such investments.

These subsidies by the Walloon government therefore constituted aid that put competitors at a disadvantage. The Commission recognized that there is very strong foreign competition, but it considered that the best way to cope with this is to have strong, independent European players. It noted that despite the government aid, the Duferco group wound down all its activities in Belgium, meaning that the aid merely postponed the departure of a company that was not viable. The Commission is currently supporting the retraining of workers in the Walloon region through the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund. The point is to combat the recourse to public funding in Europe, which would ultimately be detrimental to the sector.

At the same time, so-called "anti-dumping" trade retaliation measures were implemented by the European Commission. In May 2014, following a complaint from Eurofer (the European steel

association), the Commission imposed temporary anti-dumping duties of up to 25.2% on imports of certain steel products from the People's Republic of China and duties of up to 12% on imports from Taiwan. The EC investigation ultimately concluded that China and Taiwan were selling at dumping prices. More recently, Cecilia Malmström, the head of trade policy at the European Commission, wrote to her Chinese counterparts warning them that she was launching three anti-dumping investigations against Chinese exporters (February 2015) in the field of seamless pipes, heavy plates and hot-rolled steels. Provisional anti-dumping duties (of between 13% and 26%) were also set on 12 February 2016 (complaints in 2015) with respect to China and Russia.

Some thirty anti-dumping measures protect the European steel industry, but the Member States where steel has been hit particularly hard by Chinese competition are calling for stronger measures. Politicians are railing against China's loss-making exports and demanding that Europe take steps. They envy the US, which has acted more quickly and not skimped on the level of the duties it's enacted, i.e. up to 236%. But the nature of these measures depends on the economic status accorded to China. Anti-dumping measures are not defined in the same way. As long as China is not a market economy, it is assumed that it provides strong support for its economic sectors, and that its prices are thus not market prices. Italy is struggling in Europe to prevent China from being granted this status, while the United Kingdom is supporting China at the WTO (even though the industry is also in trouble in Britain). The Commission has postponed its decision until summer.

What policy for tomorrow?

Should we allow the production of steel to disappear in Europe? It still represents more than 300,000 jobs there, though this is of course out of more than 35 million jobs in manufacturing in 2014. The sector is symbolic of heavy

industry, and a supplier of the transportation and defence industries as well as construction – its disappearance would definitively turn a new page in European industry.

Do we need to recognize that, according to the theory of comparative advantage, it is better to buy cheaper Chinese steel and use the revenue freed up for other, more profitable uses? For example, shouldn't it be used to upskill employees? In theory yes, but the revenue freed up goes to the purchasers of steel, so it is they who should supply the European conversion fund. What about taxing the consumption of the now cheaper steel? The flaw in the reasoning shows up when you realize that what is true with respect to macroeconomic balances is difficult to reconcile with microeconomic imbalances: those who are losing their jobs today are not the consumers who are benefitting. Ultimately, the microeconomic articulations can unsettle the macroeconomic balances.

The loss of know-how is indeed the main challenge, as it is here that resources are really wasted. In so far as skills are a competitive factor, difficulties related to a lack of demand should be considered transitional problems that need to be managed as well as possible. Neither contributions of foreign capital nor government support should be excluded. What justifies these investments are the returns expected from the use of human capital. To deal with these challenges, alliances on market segments that are not in trouble might be possible, even if they confer excessive market power, so long as they allow margins that make it possible to maintain the business during cyclical difficulties.

This is why competition policy has to be opened up to considerations of industrial policy (which is concerned about expertise) and trade policy (which appreciates the cyclical and / or unfair character of competition).

European actors need to be brought around a table – they are already grouped in Eurofer – and together with the European

Commission develop a European plan for managing excess capacity and forging alliances. The Competition Directorate of the European Commission needs to relax its intellectual rigidity and adapt its reading of competition to the nature of contemporary globalization. Although it is based on an indisputable logic in the name of the single market, the approach of the Competition Directorate is sometimes no longer suited to the way that competition is unfolding on the global value chain today, which has no precedent on the 20th century European market. Who would believe that the market power resulting from a European merger would not be challenged very quickly by foreign forces if the new enterprise began to take advantage of its market power? The limits on market power are much stronger in the 21st century, with low inflation and depressed commodity prices an illustration of this. The risk that multinationals might abuse their power is posed less in terms of excessive prices than excesses in the capture of customers and in tax avoidance. This last point seems to have been understood clearly by the European Commission. In addition to this, there is the added competition from new applications driven by the digital industry, which manufacturers cannot escape. In other words, competition is no longer what it used to be: companies' excessive power is no longer expressed much in prices or restrictions on quantities.

Competition policy, industrial policy and trade policy need to be developed in coordination, with a strengthened Competition Directorate that includes an element of industrial policy and trade policy. While strict controls on competition were a clear priority during the period of forging the single market when competition was essentially focused between the developed countries, today it is urgent to review the linkages between these three policy fields in order to consolidate the future of industry in Europe.