

# Repeat

By [Jérôme Creel](#)

In a beautiful book for children, every two pages [Claude Ponti](#) drew two chicks, one of which says to the other: “Pete and Repeat are in a boat. Pete falls overboard. Who is left?” Then the other chick says, “Repeat”, and off we go again. At the end of the book, the second chick, its eyes bulging, screams: “Repeat!” And it never stops. It’s a bit like these analyses of economic growth and fiscal contractions where almost every month it is rediscovered that the ongoing fiscal contractions are reducing economic growth or that underestimating the real impact of fiscal policy is leading to forecast errors.

Recently, and after having authored a box in the *2013 World Economic Outlook* in October 2012, Daniel Leigh and Olivier Blanchard of the IMF published a [working document](#) that confirms that the IMF’s recent forecasting errors are due to erroneous assumptions about the multiplier effect. Because this effect was underestimated, especially at the bottom of the economic cycle, the IMF forecasters, though they are not alone (see in particular the note by [Bruno Ducoudré](#)), underestimated growth forecasts: they had not anticipated that what was required by the austerity measures and their implementation would have such a negative impact on consumer spending and business investment. The attempt to reduce state debt was taking place during a period when households and businesses were also deleveraging, meaning that it would be difficult to avoid falling into the trap of recession.

Since it must be repeated, let’s repeat! “Expansionary-fiscal-contractions and Repeat are in a boat. Expansionary-fiscal-contractions falls overboard. Who is left in the boat? Repeat!” In support of this short story, it is worth referring to a literature review conducted by [Eric Hoyer](#): he shows the extent of the consensus that actually exists on the value of

the fiscal multipliers, a consensus that has emerged since 2009, *i.e.* in the midst of a recession and at the very time that recommendations for austerity measures began to emerge. A note by [Xavier Timbeau](#) shows that the analysis of current fiscal cutbacks supports an assessment that the value of the fiscal multiplier is much higher in a crisis than in normal times ... What paradoxes!

What is to be done now? Repeat, yet again, that recession may not be inevitable: as [Marion Cochard, Bruno Ducoudré and Danielle Schweisguth](#) pointed out in a supplement to the [2013 iAGS report](#), it is urgent to temper existing fiscal austerity measures in the euro zone: European growth but also actual fiscal consolidation would improve at last.

---

## Could France have a different fiscal policy?

By [Jérôme Creel](#)

Shouldn't the economic crisis that is gripping the euro zone, including France, lead to calling into question the approach being taken by fiscal policy? In light of the unprecedented [broad consensus](#) among economists about the impact of fiscal policy on the real economy, it is clear that the austerity measures being adopted by France are a mistake. Moreover, invoking European constraints is not a good enough argument to exclude a much more gradual process of putting the public purse in order (also see the [iAGS project](#)).

There is no need to go beyond what European legislation requires, and doing so can be especially harmful if in fact the additional budgetary efforts generate less growth and, ultimately, further deterioration in the public finances due to higher social spending and lower tax revenue. What do the existing European treaties actually demand? In the case of a government deficit that exceeds 3% of GDP, the minimum effort required for fiscal adjustment consists of reducing the cyclically adjusted deficit, *i.e.* the structural deficit, by at least 0.5% of GDP per year. Furthermore, the time period for reducing the debt to 60% of GDP is 20 years. Finally, exceptional circumstances now include an “unusual event” that could justify deviating from the current standards for the deficit.

Based on these exceptional circumstances and on the rule requiring an annual improvement of at least 0.5% of GDP in the structural deficit, it can be shown that the French government has fiscal maneuvering room in 2012 and 2013, while still complying with European fiscal rules.

Table 1 lists the sequence of public deficits and of GDP growth from 2011 to 2013 according to two forecasts produced by the European Commission in the Spring and then the Autumn of 2012. According to the Spring forecast, the French structural deficit was supposed to decrease by 1.2% of GDP between 2011 and 2013, on average slightly above what is required by the Commission. In fact, the improvement from 2011 to 2012 exceeded 0.5% of GDP, while it fell below that from 2012 to 2013.

What about the Autumn 2012 forecast? The expected improvement in France’s structural deficit was now expected to be 1.1% of GDP between 2011 and 2012 and then 1.4% of GDP between 2012 and 2013, taking into account [the government’s commitment to reduce public spending and raise taxes](#). These projected improvements in the structural deficit are two and three times greater than what European fiscal rules require, which is a

lot! For the year 2013, this amounts to almost 20 billion euros that need not be levied on French households and businesses. Abandoning this levy does not mean abandoning fiscal austerity, but rather *spreading it out over time*.

Furthermore, the European Commission now expects a slowdown in the French economy in 2013. Unless one argues that the French government is responsible for this slowdown – and while this might indeed be the case in light of the austerity budget the government is imposing on the French economy, it is far from clear that the European Commission would want to employ such an argument, given its role in championing austerity! – this deterioration in the country's growth prospects could fall within the category of an “unusual event,” thus giving France an opening to invoke exceptional circumstances in order to *stagger* and *extend* its fiscal adjustment efforts.

Instead of awaiting the miraculous effects of structural reform – a potentially lengthy and uncertain process – all that is really needed is to apply the regulations in force, without imposing an overly restrictive reading of what they contain, so as to limit the reduction in growth being caused by austerity and avoid a new period of rising unemployment. According to the conclusions of the [iAGS report](#), staggering the fiscal austerity measures in France would lead to adding 0.7 GDP point to growth every year from 2013 to 2017.

The “unusual event” constituted by yet another year of very low growth in 2013 for France also opens the possibility of suspending the austerity policies, at least temporarily. Once again according to the findings of the iAGS report, the French government should put off till 2016 its policy of consolidating the public finances. The gain in terms of growth would be 0.9 percentage point per year between 2013 and 2017. Provided that this policy is actually conducted carefully and not postponed indefinitely, it would enable France to reduce its public debt to GDP ratio in compliance with existing EU

treaties.

### Forecast for the French economy

		2011	2012	2013
Public deficit (% of GDP)	Spring 2012	5.2	4.5	4.2
	Autumn 2012	5,2	4.5	3.5
Structural deficit (% of GDP)	Spring 2012	4.1	3.2	2.9
	Autumn 2012	4.5	3.4	2.0
PIB (%)	Spring 2012	1.7	0.5	1.3
	Autumn 2012	1.7	0.2	0.4

Source: European Commission forecasts.

---

# Friends of acronyms, here comes the OMT

By [Jérôme Creel](#) and [Xavier Timbeau](#)

We had the OMD with its Orchestral Manœuvres in the Dark, and now the OMT with its Orchestral Manœuvres in the [liquidity] Trap, or more precisely, “Outright Monetary Transactions”, which is undoubtedly clearer. The OMT is a potentially effective mechanism that gives the European Central Bank (ECB) the means to intervene massively in the euro zone debt crisis so as to limit the differences between interest rates on euro zone government bonds. The possibility that a country that comes into conflict with its peers might leave the euro zone still exists, but if there is a common desire to preserve the euro then the ECB can intervene and play a role comparable to that of the central banks of other major states. Opening this door towards an escape route from the euro zone’s sovereign

debt crisis has given rise to great hope. Nevertheless, certain elements, such as conditionality, could quickly pose problems.

The OMT is simply a programme for the buyback of government bonds by the European Central Bank, like SMP 1.0 (the Securities Markets Programme) which it replaces but limited to States that are subject to a European Financial Stability Fund / European Stability Mechanism (EFSF / ESM) programme and thus benefiting from European conditional aid. For the ECB to intervene, the country concerned must first negotiate a macroeconomic adjustment plan with the European Commission and the European Council, and apply it. The ECB, potentially members of the European Parliament or the IMF can be a party to this (these institutions – the Commission, the ECB and the IMF – form the Troika of men in black, so famous and feared in Greece). Secondly, and more importantly, the country will be under the supervision of the Troika thereafter.

So if Italy and Spain want to benefit from the purchase of their bonds by the ECB, then their governments will have to submit to an EFSF or ESM adjustment programme. This does not necessarily imply that the plan imposed will be more drastic in terms of austerity than what these governments might have already devised or implemented (the doctrinaire approach in the management of public finances is highly contagious in Europe), but it will require the two countries to submit *ex ante* to outside scrutiny of any adjustment plan they develop and *ex post* to control by the Commission and the Council. If the country under surveillance starts *ex post* to veer away from implementing the adjustment plan, then it could, of course, withdraw from the programme, but its sovereign bonds would no longer be covered by OMTs. They would lose the support of their peers and would thus sail into the financial markets in uncharted waters. That would probably be the first step towards a default or an exit from the euro.

Furthermore, the ECB has not committed itself to absorbing all

the bonds issued and thus maintains a real threat capacity: if the country were to rebel, it could be obliged to face higher rates. The OMT thus introduces both a carrot (lower rates) and a stick (to let the rates rise, sell the bonds the ECB holds in its portfolio and thereby push rates upward), upon each new issue. The OMT is therefore akin to being put under direct control (conditionality) with progressive sanctions and an ultimate threat (exiting the programme).

The ECB says that its interventions will mainly cover medium-term securities (maturity between 1 and 3 years), without excluding longer-term maturities, and with no quantitative limits. Note that short / medium-term emissions *usually* represent a small proportion of total emissions, which tend to be for 10 years. However, in case of a crisis, intervention on short-term maturities provides a breath of fresh air, especially as maturing 10-year securities can be refinanced by 3-year ones. This gives the Troika additional leverage in terms of conditionality: the OMT commitment on securities is only for three years and must be renewed after three years. The financial relief for countries subject to the programme may be significant in the short term. For example, in 2012 Spain, which has not yet taken this step, will have issued around 180 billion euros of debt. If the OMT had reduced Spain's sovereign borrowing rates throughout 2012, the gain would have amounted to between 7 and 9 billion for the year (and this could be repeated in 2013 and 2014, at least). This is because, instead of a 10-year rate of 7%, Spain could be benefitting from the 2% rate at which France borrows for 10 years, or instead of its 4.3% rate at 3 years, Spain could have borrowed at 0.3% (France's 3-year sovereign rate). This is the maximum gain that can be expected from this programme, but it is significant: this roughly represents the equivalent of the budgetary impact of the recent VAT hike in Spain (or a little less than one Spanish GDP point). This would not alter Spain's fiscal situation definitively, but it would end the complete nonsense that saw Spaniards paying much more for

their debt to compensate their creditors for a default that they have been striving arduously not to trigger.

It can even be hoped (as can be seen in the easing of Spanish sovereign rates by almost one point following the ECB announcement on Thursday, 6 September 2012, or the almost half a point reduction in Italian rates) that the mere existence of this mechanism, even if Spain or Italy do not use it (and thus do not submit to control), will be enough to reassure the markets, to convince them that there will be no default or exit from the euro and therefore no justification for a risk premium.

The ECB announced that it would terminate its preferred creditor status for the securities. This provision, which had been intended to reduce the risk to the ECB, led to downgrading the quality of securities held outside the ECB and thus reducing the impact of ECB interventions on rates. By acquiring a government bond, the ECB shifted the risk onto the bonds held by the private sector, since in case of a default the Bank was a preferred creditor that took priority over private holders of bonds of the same type.

The ECB explained that its OMT operations will be fully sterilized (the impact on the liquidity in circulation will be neutral), which, if it is taken at its word, implies that other types of operations (purchases of private securities, lending to banks) will be reduced correspondingly. What do we make of this? The example of the SMP 1.0 can be drawn on in this regard. SMP 1.0 was indeed also accompanied by sterilization. This sterilization involved short-term deposits (1 week, on the ECB's liabilities side), allocated in an amount equal to the sums involved in the SMP (209 billion euros to date, on the ECB's assets side). Each week, the ECB therefore collects 209 billion euros in short-term fixed-term deposits. This is therefore a portion of bank deposits that the ECB assigns to the sterilization instrument, without there being sterilization in the strict sense (because this does not

prevent an increase in the size of the ECB's balance sheet nor does it reduce the potential liquidity in circulation). The mention of sterilization in the OMT appears to be an effort at presenting this in a way that can convince certain states, such as Germany, that this monetary policy will not be inflationary and therefore not contrary to the mandate imposed on the Bank by the Treaty on the European Union. Currently, and because the crisis remains unresolved, private banks have substantial deposits with the ECB (out of fear of entrusting these deposits to other financial institutions), which gives it considerable flexibility to prevent the announced sterilization from affecting the liquidity in circulation (the ECB has a little more than 300 billion euros in deposits that are not mobilized for sterilization). The ECB can then probably use the current accounts (by blocking them for a week), which poses no difficulty since the ECB lends to the banks on tap through long-term refinancing operations (LTROs). At worst, the ECB would lose money in the sterilization operation in case of a gap in compensation between the fixed-term deposits and the loans granted to banks. Sterilization could therefore lead to this kind of absurd accounting, but wind up, in a situation of monetary and financial crisis, having no impact on liquidity. On the other hand, if the situation normalizes, the constraint of sterilization would weigh more heavily. We're not there yet, but when we do get there, the ECB needs to limit lending to the economy or to accept an increase in liquidity if the OMT continues to be implemented for some euro zone members.

The deal that is now on the table places the euro zone countries in a formidable dilemma. On the one hand, acceptance of the Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance of the euro zone (TSCG) determines eligibility for the EFSF and the ESM [\[1\]](#), and therefore now determines eligibility for the OMT programme. Refusing to sign the fiscal treaty means rejecting in advance the potential intervention of the ECB, and thus accepting that the crisis continues until the breakup of the

euro zone or until a catastrophic default on a sovereign debt. On the other hand, signing the treaty means accepting the principle of an indiscriminately restrictive fiscal strategy (the rule on public debt reduction included in the TSCG will be devastating) that will trigger a recession in the euro zone in 2012 and perhaps in 2013.

Signing the treaty also means relieving the pressure of the markets, but only to wind up submitting solely to the Troika and to the baseless belief that the fiscal multipliers are low, that European households are Ricardian and that the sovereign debt is still holding back growth. It is true that lowering sovereign interest rates, particularly those of Italy and Spain, will create some breathing room. But the main gain from lower rates would be to spread the fiscal consolidation over a longer period of time. Interest rates place a value on time, and reducing them means granting more time. The debts contracted at negative real interest rates are not ordinary debts, and do not represent the same kind of burden as debts issued at prohibitively high rates.

It would be a terrible waste to gain new maneuvering room (the OMT) only to bind one's hands immediately (the TSCG and the Troika's blind fiscal strategy). Only a change in fiscal strategy would make it possible to take advantage of the door opened by the ECB. In short, saving the euro will not help if we do not first save the EU from the disastrous social consequences of fiscal blindness.

---

[\[1\]](#) Paragraph 5 of the preamble to the Treaty establishing the European Stability Mechanism states: "This Treaty and the TSCG are complementary in fostering fiscal responsibility and solidarity within the economic and monetary union. It is acknowledged and agreed that the granting of financial assistance in the framework of new programmes under the ESM will be conditional, as of 1 March 2013, on the ratification

of the TSCG by the ESM Member concerned and, upon expiration of the transposition period referred to in Article 3(2) TSCG on compliance with the requirements of that article.”