

Scharpf, Fritz W.

Working Paper

Monetary Union, Fiscal Crisis and the Preemption of Democracy

LEQS Paper, No. 36

Provided in Cooperation with:

London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), European Institute

Suggested Citation: Scharpf, Fritz W. (2011) : Monetary Union, Fiscal Crisis and the Preemption of Democracy, LEQS Paper, No. 36, London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), European Institute, London

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/303319>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



THE LONDON SCHOOL
OF ECONOMICS AND
POLITICAL SCIENCE ■



LSE 'Europe in Question' Discussion Paper Series

LEQS Annual Lecture Paper 2011

Monetary Union, Fiscal Crisis and the Preemption of Democracy

Fritz W. Scharpf



LEQS Paper No. 36/2011

May 2011



Editorial Board

Dr. Joan Costa-i-Font

Dr. Mareike Kleine

Dr. Jonathan White

Ms. Katjana Gattermann

All views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the editors or the LSE.

© Fritz W. Scharpf



Monetary Union, Fiscal Crisis and the Preemption of Democracy

Fritz W. Scharpf*

LEQS Annual Lecture Paper 2011

Paper presented at the LEQS Annual Lecture ‘**Saving the Euro – at the expense of democracy in Europe?**’ on 12 May 2011 at the London School of Economics

Abstract

The European Monetary Union (EMU) has removed crucial instruments of macroeconomic management from the control of democratically accountable governments. Worse yet, it has been the systemic cause of destabilizing macroeconomic imbalances that member states found difficult or impossible to counteract with their remaining policy instruments. And even though the international financial crisis had its origins outside Europe, the Monetary Union has greatly increased the vulnerability of some member states to its repercussions. Its effects have undermined the economic and fiscal viability of some EMU member states, and they have frustrated political demands and expectations to an extent that may yet transform the economic crisis into a crisis of democratic legitimacy. Moreover, present efforts of EMU governments to “rescue the Euro” will do little to correct economic imbalances and vulnerabilities, but are likely to deepen economic problems and political alienation in both, the rescued and the rescuing polities.

* **Max Planck Institute for the Studies of Societies**
Emeritus Professor, Paulstraße 3, 50676 Cologne, Germany
Email: ms@mpifg.de

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
I. Democratic Legitimacy and Macroeconomic Management Europe	3
Keynesian problems and the Bundesbank's Monetarist social compact	5
II. From Monetarism in One Country to Monetary Union	8
III. From 1999 to 2007: Monetarism in a Non-optimal Currency Area	11
Germany: The sick man of Europe rescued by union wage restraint	13
The rise and increasing vulnerability of GIPS economies	16
Summary: The Eurozone on the eve of the crisis	19
IV. From 2008 to 2010: A Sequence of Three Crises	21
V. Beyond the Rescue Operations: Options for a Viable EMU?	23
The rescue-cum-retrenchment program	24
Political implications	27
From rescue operations to EMU reform	28
The worst of three worlds	30
Is there a hidden agenda of EMU reforms?	32
VI. Democratic Legitimacy in a Reformed Monetary Union	36
References	38
Appendix	41

Monetary Union, Fiscal Crisis and the Preemption of Democracy

Introduction

In capitalist democracies, governments depend on the confidence of their voters. But to maintain this confidence, they also depend on the performance of their real economies and, increasingly, on the confidence of financial markets. To meet these requirements at the same time is difficult even under the best circumstances. At the end of the long period of postwar economic growth, however, theorists of normative political economy had postulated the existence of a systemic contradiction between the state's need to ensure democratic legitimacy by responding to citizens' demands for public services and redistribution and the functional requirements of ensuring the continuing profitability of a capitalist economy. Depending on their position on the left-right spectrum of normative orientations, these authors would interpret the expected clash as either a "legitimacy crisis" or as a "governability crisis" of democratic capitalism (e.g., Offe 1972; Habermas 1973; Hennis et al. 1978; Schäfer 2009; Klenk/Nullmeier 2010).

In the following decades, however, neither of these expectations was confirmed. Instead, voters in capitalist democracies seemed to have realized that their well-being depended as much on the performance of the capitalist economy as on the public goods, services and transfers provided by the democratic state. Obviously, therefore, governments would be held politically accountable for the performance of the public sector, and its balance of benefits and compulsory contributions. But they would be held equally accountable for managing the capitalist economy and ensuring its continuing provision of jobs, incomes and consumer goods. In effect, the performance, rather than the transformation, of the capitalist economy seems to have become a crucial argument of democratic legitimacy.

Monetary Union, Fiscal Crisis and the Preemption of Democracy

That presupposes, however, that democratically accountable governments should have the capacity to shape the course of their economies. But compared to the situation in the early 1970s, the progressive internationalization of economic interactions has greatly increased the difficulties of successful economic management. At that time, liberalization had been largely confined to product markets. National economic policy needed to ensure international competitiveness under a balance-of-payments constraint – but it was free in the choice of production regimes and in the macroeconomic management of the domestic economy. With the increasing integration of capital markets, however, international capital flows became decoupled from transactions in product markets, and financial interpenetration made national economies vulnerable to crises originating elsewhere. At the same time, international, and even more so European rules on product and capital market liberalization have imposed legal constraints that eliminated many policy options on which governments had previously relied to manage national economies. Compared to the period before the 1970s, therefore, successful economic management has become much harder.

In the present essay I will focus on the European Monetary Union (EMU) which has removed crucial instruments of macroeconomic management from the control of democratically accountable governments. Worse yet, it has been the systemic cause of destabilizing macroeconomic imbalances that member states found difficult or impossible to counteract with their remaining policy instruments. And even though the international financial crisis had its origins outside Europe, the Monetary Union has greatly increased the vulnerability of some member states to its repercussions. Its effects have undermined the economic and fiscal viability of some EMU member states, and they have frustrated political demands and expectations to an extent that may yet transform the economic crisis into a crisis of democratic legitimacy. Moreover, present efforts of EMU governments to “rescue the Euro” will do little to correct economic imbalances and vulnerabilities, but are likely to deepen economic problems and political alienation in both, the rescued and the rescuing polities.

The paper begins with a brief reflection on the problematic relationship between democratic legitimacy and macroeconomic management, followed by an equally brief restatement of the essential elements of Keynesian and Monetarist policy models and their specific political implications. I then try to show how existing national regimes have been transformed by the creation of the European Monetary Union, and how the destabilizing dynamics of the European monetary policy have left some EMU member states dangerously vulnerable at the onset of the international financial crisis. In the concluding section, I will examine the likely politico-economic and political consequences of programs intended to rescue the Euro and to reform the regime of the monetary union.

I: Democratic Legitimacy and Macroeconomic Management.

After the Great Depression of the 1930s and World War II, governments in Western democracies had rejected “socialist” programs of centralized economic planning, but had nevertheless assumed political responsibility for preventing the return of similar economic catastrophes. This was to be achieved through “macroeconomic” policies that would allow the state to increase or reduce aggregate economic demand in order to dampen the ups and downs of economic cycles, to prevent the rise of unemployment or inflation, and to ensure steady economic growth. The belief that macroeconomic management could in fact realize these goals originated in the crisis of the 1930s. It was largely confirmed in the “Keynesian” decades after the War, and it survived the “Monetarist” counter revolution of the 1980s at least in the sense that economic crises continued to be seen as consequences of macroeconomic mismanagement. But the very possibility of effective control does then create an internal dilemma of democratic legitimacy – or, more precisely, a potential conflict

between the input-oriented and the output-oriented dimensions of democratic legitimacy (Scharpf 1999, ch. 1).¹

Governments are supposed to carry out the “will of the people”, and they are also supposed to serve the “common good”. In the input dimension, therefore, governors may be held accountable for policy *choices* that are in conflict with the politically salient preferences of their constituents, whereas in the *output* dimension, they may be sanctioned if *outcomes* that may be attributed to government policy are seen to violate the politically salient concerns of the governed.² In both dimensions, what is initially at stake is political support for the government of the day. But if it appears that elections and changes of government cannot make a difference, the democratic legitimacy of the political regime itself may be undermined.

With regard to macroeconomic management, the outcomes that potentially have very high political salience are rising mass unemployment and accelerating rates of inflation. Since these are not the direct object of policy choices, however, discussions of input legitimacy must focus on the policy instruments that may be employed to affect outcomes indirectly. In macroeconomic economic theory, these include choices in monetary policy, fiscal policy, incomes policy and exchange-rate policy – all of which are assumed to have a direct effect on aggregate economic demand and hence on economic growth, inflation and employment. They differ greatly, however, in their political salience and, hence, in their potential relevance for input-oriented democratic legitimacy.

¹ The distinction between input- and output-oriented dimensions of democratic legitimacy uses the vocabulary of political systems theory (Easton 1965), but has its roots in a much older tradition of normative political theory that struggles with the basic tension of having to treat governors, at the same time, as *agents* and as *trustees* of the people (Scharpf 1970).

² Salience is a highly contingent and selective attribute of policy issues or outcome conditions that may affect the outcome of elections or incite citizens to engage in political action. And whereas accountability for policy choices can be clearly targeted at a particular government, accountability for outcomes implies a distinction between events and conditions that are thought to be under the potential control of “government”, and others which are ascribed to an “act of god”. In multi-level polities, moreover, it is often unclear which level of government is causally responsible for which outcomes. But since voters are not obliged to be fair, they will tend to hold those governments accountable over which they happen to have electoral control – which in Europe is true of national governments, rather than European governing institutions.

Under normal conditions, monetary policy has relatively low salience in the electoral arena. It is seen to involve highly technical decisions that are best left to specialists in central banks and other agencies with an expertise in analyzing and manipulating macroeconomic aggregates. Ultimately, of course, these aggregates will also affect individuals and firms, and they may have massive distributional consequences. But these are not immediately visible, and when they occur, they are not obviously related to specific policy choices. The same is true of policies affecting the exchange rate. Fiscal-policy, by contrast, while also aiming at the public-sector deficit as an aggregate variable, must be implemented through disaggregated taxing and spending decisions that have a direct impact on the incomes of individuals and firms. And the same would be true if governments should (as they tried to do in some countries in the 1970s) adopt incomes policies that impose direct wage controls.

Unlike monetary policy, therefore, choices of fiscal and incomes policy are liable to become politicized. If they should violate the politically salient *ex-ante* preferences of constituencies, they may reduce the electoral support of governments, and in the extreme case undermine input legitimacy, regardless of their functional necessity for achieving acceptable macroeconomic outcomes. In other words, macroeconomic management does create the possibility of a democratic dilemma: By attempting to maintain *output legitimacy* through functionally effective policy choices, governments may undermine their *input legitimacy* – and *vice versa*. In actual practice, however, the intensity of the dilemma depends not only on the type of economic challenges but also on the choice between the Keynesian or Monetarist models or paradigms of macroeconomic management.

Keynesian problems and the Bundesbank's Monetarist social compact

The *Keynesian model* assigns the leading function to fiscal policy. In a recession, it is supposed to expand aggregate demand through tax cuts and deficit-financed expenditures; and when the economy is overheating, demand should be reduced through tax increases and spending cuts. Monetary policy is supposed to be

“accommodating” – that is to finance fiscal expansion at low interest rates and to avoid a collapse of domestic demand during fiscal retrenchment. Having been conceived in response to the Great Depression of the 1930s, the overriding goal of the Keynesian paradigm was to maintain full employment. In the U.S, and the U.K. it worked reasonably well in combating recessions during the early postwar decades. Even then, however, it was obvious that fiscal retrenchment was politically much more difficult to implement than fiscal expansion – which implied continuous inflationary pressures and a steady accumulation of public-sector debt.

Moreover, the British experience demonstrated that – under conditions of an industrial-relations system with powerful and competitive unions – an effective incomes policy should have been a necessary complement of fiscal Keynesianism. Without it, expansionary fiscal impulses were quickly consumed by wage increases. Since statutory wage controls did not seem to work, governments tried to contain wage-push inflation through stop-go policies that never allowed steady economic growth to take off. In the “stagflation” period of the 1970s, finally, when the oil price crisis combined the challenges of demand-deficient unemployment and cost-push inflation, the Keynesian model failed almost everywhere. Fiscal expansion would have accelerated inflation, and fiscal retrenchment would have driven up mass unemployment – and in fact most countries ended up with both. In a few countries, however, economically sophisticated and organizationally powerful and centralized unions were able to contain cost-push inflation through effective wage restraint, allowing fiscal and monetary refutation to prevent the rise of mass unemployment (Scharpf 1991).

The *Monetarist paradigm*, which has its theoretical roots in pre-Keynesian neoclassical economics (Johnson 1971), owed its practical appeal to the collapse of Keynesian policies in the 1970s. From a political-science perspective, however, its greatest comparative advantage was its lesser dependence on politically salient policy choices. Abandoning the political commitment to full employment, the Monetarist paradigm assigned the leading role to the monetary policy of an independent central bank, whose paramount function is to maintain price stability. Beyond that, it should

ensure a steady money supply that was sufficient to allow non-inflationary economic growth. Whether it would be realized in practice would then depend entirely on the willingness of governments and unions to adjust their claims on the total economic product to the monetary corridor defined by the central bank.

The German *Bundesbank* was the first to establish a Monetarist regime in the early 1970s. After having dramatically demonstrated the destructive potential of monetary retrenchment in the crisis of 1973/4, the Bank did in fact confront the government and the unions with the offer of an implicit “social compact” (Scharpf 1991, 128-139). It took great pains to explain, to the government, the unions and the public, how coordination by monetary policy would not only ensure price stability but also produce economically superior and politically justifiable macroeconomic outcomes. Once rampant inflation was brought under control, it would precisely monitor the state of the German economy and pre-announce annual monetary targets by reference to the current “output gap”. Maximum non-inflationary growth would then be achieved if fiscal policy would merely allow the “automatic stabilizers” to rise and fall over the business cycle, and if wages would rise with labor productivity. Thus fiscal policy would be relieved of its heroic Keynesian role, and unions would no longer be pressured to enact a countercyclical incomes policy.

In other words, responsibility for the management of the economy would be assumed by the “non-political” monetary policy of the independent Bank, whereas non-inflationary fiscal and wage policies could be conducted with a low political profile. And as governments and unions did learn to play by the Bank’s new rules, the Monetarist regime did in fact work reasonably well, economically and politically, for Germany.³

³ This is a stylized account that does not apply to conflicts in 1991-92 when the Bank drastically (and from its perspective, successfully) intervened against rising public-sector deficits in the wake of German unification.

II: From Monetarism in One Country to Monetary Union

Originally, Monetarist as well as Keynesian models had been designed for national economies which were exposed to international competition in product markets, but retained control over their monetary regimes. For both, therefore, increasing capital mobility would raise difficulties. Keynesian reflation would become prohibitively expensive if the central bank was no longer able to maintain low interest rates; and monetary policy could not be targeted to the “output gap” of the national economy if interest rates were determined by the fluctuations of international capital markets. This became obvious in the early 1980s, when German recovery was crushed as the *Bundesbank* found it necessary to follow the dramatic increase of American interest rates, or when fiscal reflation in France had to be aborted under the pressure of massive capital flights. At the same time, capital mobility had also increased the volatility of exchange rates, which was seen as a major problem for exporters in integrated product markets. There were several reasons, therefore, for European governments⁴ to be interested in creating a common European monetary regime.

The first such attempt, the European “Snake in the Tunnel” of 1972, had quickly disintegrated in the oil-price crisis. Subsequently, the “European Monetary System” (EMS) of 1979 committed its member states to peg their currencies to a currency basket (the “ECU”). But since Germany was the biggest economy and the most important trading partner for most other member states, the EMS meant in fact that their currencies were pegged to the Deutschmark – which also implied that in order stay within the agreed-upon bandwidth, their central banks needed to mirror the stability-oriented monetary policy of the *Bundesbank*. For the other member states, this turned out to be difficult for several reasons:

First, German monetary policy continued to be precisely targeted to German conditions which could differ from those of the other member economies. Hence

⁴ It should be noted, however, that the initiatives were coming from Germany. With the breakup of the Bretton-Woods regime, German producers had lost the protection of an undervalued currency, and currency fluctuations were particularly unfavorable for export-oriented investment-goods branches operating with high fixed costs.

when, in 1992, the Bank decided to punish Helmut Kohl for the deficit-financing of German unification, other economies suffered as well – and the U.K. and Sweden (that had only recently joined the EMS) were catapulted out of the Monetary System by currency speculation. Moreover, governments and unions that had not gone through the harrowing German experiences of 1973-75 and 1981-82 did not necessarily appreciate the awesome power of monetary constraints. Nor had their central banks a background of institutional autonomy, experience and credibility that would have allowed them to intervene with equal authority against public-sector deficits and wage settlements that diverged from the path defined for Germany.

Even more important, however, were the institutional differences of national wage-setting systems. The Monetarist regime worked in Germany because wage leadership was exercised by large and economically sophisticated industrial unions that had learned to operate within the monetary constraints. In countries with powerful, but fragmented and competitive unions and decentralized wage-setting institutions, by contrast, unions simply did not have the capacity to contain the inflationary pressures of wage competition (Baccaro/Simoni 2010).

As a consequence, inflation rates (Figure 1) and unit labor costs (Figure 2) continued to differ; and in order to compensate for losses of international competitiveness, exchange rates and bandwidths were frequently re-adjusted. And as devaluation remained a possibility, the risk premia of government bonds differed considerably among EMS member states (Figure 3). Moreover, attempts to defend unrealistic exchange rates would invite currency speculation.⁵

These problems persuaded European governments that moving from the EMS to a monetary union with irrevocably fixed exchange rates would be desirable. It would end their dependence on the *Bundesbank*, and it would eliminate the possibility of devaluation – and hence both the risk of currency speculation, and the interest-rate differentials caused by the risk of devaluation. Germany in turn, which had much to

⁵ De Grauwe (2009, 137-142) argues that frequent small adjustments had worked well until 1987, and that it was the attempt to move toward more fixed exchange rates and greater convergence that made the EMS too rigid and then invited large-scale currency speculation.

lose in a monetary union⁶ but was willing to accept it as the political price for German unification, was able to insist that the *Bundesbank* and its version of Monetarism should become the model for the European system, and that candidate countries would have to meet tough convergence criteria as a condition of admission (Delors 1989; McNamara 1998; Dyson/Featherstone 1999; Jones 2002; Vaubel 2010).

In effect, therefore, the Maastricht Treaty did protect the institutional independence of the European Central Bank (ECB) even more firmly than had been true in Germany. And to ensure its Monetarist orientation, the priority of price stability was specified in the Treaty as well. Moreover, in order to gain access to the Monetary Union, EU member states had to remove all restrictions on capital mobility, to stabilize their exchange rates to the ECU, and to achieve convergence on low rates of inflation and low public sector deficits.

Perhaps unexpectedly, these “Maastricht criteria” on inflation, deficits, and exchange-rate stability were in fact met by a considerable number of unlikely candidate countries – sometimes through creative accounting, but mainly through heroic efforts at budget consolidation and “social pacts” whose short-term effectiveness was not necessarily sustainable over the longer term. In an attempt to forestall future lapses, therefore, Germany also insisted on a “Stability and Growth Pact” that defined permanent limits on national deficits and indebtedness together with seemingly tough sanctioning procedures (Heipertz/Verdun 2009).

⁶ The main loss, as will soon become clear, was the good fit of monetary policy. But from the perspective of export-oriented German industries, the pre-Maastricht EMS had also been an ideal arrangement. It was sufficiently effective in dampening currency fluctuations. And it also maintained the Deutschmark as an undervalued currency as other member states always tried, but never quite succeeded, to match the German passion for stability. This advantage was lost as other countries intensified their efforts to meet the Maastricht criteria on price stability, and as Germany came to adopt the Euro at an overvalued exchange rate.

III: From 1999 to 2007: Monetarism in a Non-optimal Currency Area

Initially, the Monetary Union did indeed fulfill the hopes of its supporters. The widely resented dominance of the *Bundesbank* was replaced by a common European central bank that targeted its policy choices on average inflation rates and output gaps in the Euro zone, rather than on the state of the German economy. National inflation rates that had steeply declined in the run-up to the Euro continued to remain significantly lower than they had been in the 1990s (Figure 4) and, most importantly, financial markets honored the elimination of devaluation risks, so that interest rates on government bonds and commercial credit declined steeply to the German level in all EMU member states (Figure 3). The result was an initial boost to economic growth in those Euro zone economies where interest rates had fallen – which of course was not the case in Germany (Figure 5). Despite the pre-1999 convergence, therefore, member states entered the EMU in significantly differing economic circumstances.

Such conditions had been discussed earlier under rubric of whether the EMU could be considered an “optimum currency area” – defined by high mobility of capital and labor and the availability of inter-regional transfers to deal with the possibility of “asymmetric shocks” (Mundell 1961; McKinnon 1963; Eichengreen 1990; Eichengreen/Frieden 1994). When compared to the United States, these conditions were lacking in Europe.⁷ But given the political commitment to monetary unification, and the encouraging effects of national efforts to meet the Maastricht convergence criteria, optimism prevailed: Considering national public-sector deficits as the main challenge to price stability, and assuming that the Stability Pact would effectively

⁷ Lars Jonung and Eoin Drea (2010) provide a comprehensive survey of American economic analyses of European monetary integration from 1989 to 2002. They argue that initial skepticism was based on a static interpretation of the optimal currency area that ignored the dynamic impact of currency union on trade and factor mobility, and that a more optimistic view came to prevail in academic analyses as well as the success of the Maastricht convergence criteria became apparent. Remarkably, however, none of these contributions seem to have focused on differences in wage-setting systems as a factor affecting the conditions of “optimality”, and it seems that only Milton Friedman was explicitly worried about the effect of unitary monetary policy on divergent member economies (at p. 29).

control these, it was expected that the increasing integration of capital and goods markets would also ensure a continuing convergence of prices, wages and business cycles (Issing 2002). As it turned out, however, these expectations were misleading⁸ for two related reasons:

On the one hand, the political crash programs, through which unlikely candidate countries had achieved an impressive convergence on the Maastricht criteria, had generally not addressed the underlying structural and institutional differences that had originally caused economic divergence. Once access was achieved, these differences would reassert themselves (Willett et al. 2010).

On the other hand, ECB monetary impulses reflected average economic conditions in the Euro zone and hence could not be targeted at the conditions of specific national economies. In effect, therefore, the crucial precondition of Monetarism – the precise fit between the money supply and the growth potential of the specific economy – would not exist in a heterogeneous monetary union. In other words, the European Central Bank could not be expected to reproduce the *Bundesbank's* success in Germany. Instead of ensuring steady, inflation-free economic growth in the member economies of the EMU, its uniform monetary policy would amplify deviant dynamics in economies above and below the average (Sinn et al. 2004; Enderlein 2004).

For countries with below-average rates of economic growth and inflation, the uniform ECB interest rates were too high, and the real interest rates faced by domestic consumers and investors were even higher – with the consequence that initially weak economic activity was depressed even further by restrictive monetary impulses. For countries with above-average rates of inflation, by contrast, ECB monetary policy was too loose, nominal interest rates were too low, and real interest rates became extremely low or even negative (Figure 6). Thus, the boost to economic

⁸ They were right in predicting that (1) monetary union would increase trade flows and capital flows, and that (2) increasing trade flows under a common currency would tend to equalize the prices of tradable goods and services. There was no reason to think, however, that (3) prices in the non-traded sector would be equalized as well. Thus differences in inflation rates could persist even though the Euro-level average rate was constrained by ECB monetary policy, and even though differences of consumer prices were reduced by price convergence in the traded sector.

activity that former weak-currency countries had received through the fall of nominal interest to German levels was subsequently intensified and accelerated by ECB monetary policy.

In dealing with the dynamics introduced by miss-specified monetary impulses, the Monetary Union left member states to their own devices. Since the “non-political” monetary and exchange-rate instruments of macroeconomic management were Europeanized, that meant that governments would again have to resort to those “Keynesian” instruments of fiscal and incomes policy which, because of their much greater political salience, had failed in most countries when they were employed in the 1970s. But that is not the complete story. Like its Keynesian counterpart, Monetarist theory is ostensibly concerned with the management of aggregate economic demand. But unlike Keynesianism, its “micro foundations” are provided by neoclassical micro-economics and its postulate of perfect markets. For its promoters it seemed plausible, therefore, to consider problems that might still arise under a Monetarist regime as the consequence of imperfectly flexible product and labor markets. In practice therefore, demand-oriented Monetarist macroeconomics was typically associated with a panoply of “supply-side” policy recommendations, including tax cuts, privatization, liberalization, deregulation and, if need be, union busting (all of which had been part of Margaret Thatcher’s and Ronald Reagan’s Monetarist programs). There is no question, however, that the use of these instruments would also have very high political salience in EMU member polities.

Germany: The sick man of Europe rescued by union wage restraint

The first victim of miss-specified monetary impulses was Germany (Spethmann/Steiger 2005). Before 1999, not only nominal interest rates, but also real interest rates had been lowest in Germany. With the entry into Monetary Union, however, these comparative advantages were lost. Since nominal interest rates converged whereas German inflation rates continued to be lower, real interest rates in Germany became the highest in the Euro zone (Figure 6). As a consequence, economic growth was

lower in Germany than in almost all EMU member economies (Figure 5), unemployment increased dramatically from 2000 to 2005 (Figure 7), and so did social expenditures, whereas tax revenues fell by 2.4 percentage points from 2000 to 2004.

In responding to this deep recession, Germany could not rely on any one of the instruments of macroeconomic management. Where the *Bundesbank* would have lowered interest rates in response to the rapidly increasing output gap, ECB interest rates were causing the problem. And where an autonomous government would have resorted to fiscal reflation, Germany came to violate the 3-percent deficit limit of the Stability Pact by merely allowing the “automatic stabilizers” to operate. And if monetary as well as fiscal reflation was ruled out, incomes policy also could not be employed as an instrument of demand expansion. Even if unions had been able, in the face of rising mass unemployment, to achieve wage increases exceeding productivity gains plus inflation, the positive effect on domestic demand would have been overshadowed by job losses due to reduced profitability and falling export demand.

Instead, Germany’s large industrial unions in the export sectors decided to protect existing jobs through wage restraint – a supply-side strategy that allowed employers to capture most of productivity gains in the hope of stabilizing employment by improving the profitability of domestic production and the competitiveness of German industries in international markets.⁹ At the same time, however, stagnant or falling real wages (Figure 8) would further reduce domestic demand and keep inflation below the EMU average – with negative effects on domestic economic growth and on imports. And the Red-Green government on its part, bereft of all demand-side policy options, was also pushed toward supply-side policies. Between 2000 and 2005, the government managed to reduce taxes on company profits and capital incomes, to lower the level of employment protection, primarily by deregulating temporary and part-time employment (Figure 9), and to drastically cut benefits to the long-term unemployed in order to reduce the reservation wage of job

⁹ In real terms, German unions helped to re-establish the advantages of an undervalued currency – providing the functional equivalents of export subsidies and import duties in ways which could not be challenged under the EU’s competition and internal-market rules.

seekers (Trampusch 2009). There is no question that these policies were not only highly salient but also extremely unpopular, especially with the supporters of the social-democratic governing party. Mass demonstrations against the welfare reforms and the rise of a left-wing protest party brought about the defeat of the Red-Green government in the 2005 elections. And beyond this change of partisan fortunes, there is also a significant decline of lower-class electoral participation – which does indeed suggest a more serious erosion of political legitimacy (Schäfer 2010).

Economically, however, the combination of extreme wage restraint practiced by German unions and the government's supply-side policies achieved its hoped-for effect. Export demand and eventually employment in the export industries and in a growing low-wage sector increased, and registered unemployment began to decline after 2005 (Figure 7). In effect, Germany which had been the “sick man of Europe” between 2000 and 2005, managed to pull itself out of the long recession to become once more one of the strongest European economies at the onset of the international financial crisis in 2007.

In an integrated economic environment, however, successful supply-side policies which reduce the cost and increase the profitability of domestic production in one country must inevitably have the effect of beggar-my-neighbor strategies on its competitors (De Grauwe 2009, 112; Flassbeck 2010). In the process of coping with its own crisis, therefore, Germany also contributed to the economic vulnerability of other Euro zone economies, and to the increasing current-account imbalances among Euro zone economies (Figure 10).¹⁰

¹⁰ The link is established by a combination of three different mechanisms: By cutting costs and constraining domestic demand, Germany increased exports and reduced imports in relation to the rest of the world. Since revenues from the export surplus were not fully consumed or invested in Germany, they were available for investment and credit in those economies where, for reasons to be discussed below, demand for consumer and investment credit was particularly high. In effect therefore, German capital exports came to finance rising imports and increasing indebtedness in recipient economies.

The rise and increasing vulnerability of GIPS economies

In the former soft-currency countries – I will look at Greece, Ireland, Portugal and Spain, labeling them GIPS economies – accession to the EMU had the initial effect of interest rates falling to much lower German levels. The sudden availability of cheap capital, whose domestic attractiveness was further increased by near-zero or even negative real interest rates, fuelled credit-financed domestic demand in Greece, Ireland and Spain (though less so in Portugal, for reasons that I have not been able to explore). In Spain and Ireland, in particular, cheap credit came to finance real-estate investments and rapidly rising housing prices which, eventually, would turn into bubbles. As a consequence, economic growth (Figure 5), employment (Figure 11), per-capita incomes (Figure 12) and prices (Figure 4) continued to increase. At the same time, real wages (Figure 8) and unit labor costs (Figure 13) increased as well.¹¹ As a consequence, imports would rise, export competitiveness would suffer and deficits of current accounts would increase (Figure 10).

Even if they had considered the decline of their external balances a serious problem, however, the governments in GIPS economies found no effective way to counteract domestic booms that were driven by the cheap-money effect of uniform ECB interest rates. Spain and Ireland had at least tried to achieve some restraint through the instruments of macroeconomic policy that were still available nationally. But their attempts to contain wage inflation through a series of social pacts (Baccaro/Simoni 2010) and to practice fiscal constraint by running budget surpluses (Figure 15) proved insufficient. What could have made a difference was monetary restraint that would have impeded the credit-financed overheating of the Greek, Irish and Spanish

¹¹ The mechanism is complex: The initial fall of interest rates facilitated the rise of credit-financed consumer and investment demand. In the traded sector, imports would rise, prices would be constrained, and employment might fall. In the non-traded sector, however, increasing demand would raise domestic production and employment and create room for wage increases. Whether it will be exploited depends on national wage-setting institutions. In Sweden and Austria, centralized wage bargaining was generally able to prevent increases that would hurt international competitiveness in the traded sector. In Germany, the same effect is traditionally achieved by the wage leadership of the big industrial unions. But where such institutions do not exist, union competition and egalitarian norms of “comparability” will favor the diffusion of wage increases achieved in branches with the greatest ability to pay, or the least ability to resist (Scharpf 1991; Baccaro/Simoni 2010). In the traded sector, therefore, wages may rise even as employment is shrinking.

economies. This, however, would have required differentiated, rather than uniform, monetary policies that would not be defined by Eurozone averages, but would be targeted to the specific conditions and problems of individual economies.¹² Such ideas,¹³ however, had played no role in the construction of either the European Monetary Union or of the Stability Pact (Heipertz/Verdun 2009), nor have they been considered by mainstream monetary economics before the present crisis (De Grauwe 2009; but see, De Grauwe 2011).¹⁴ Under the dominant view, the ECB was only responsible for average price stability in the Eurozone as a whole, whereas all adjustment problems of individual economies should be dealt with by EMU member states.

At the onset of the financial crisis, therefore, the GIPS economies found themselves in extremely vulnerable positions defined by severe current-account deficits, an extreme dependence on capital inflows and severely overvalued real exchange rates. For countries with independent currencies (unless that currency was the U.S. Dollar), this process could not have continued very long. Under fixed exchange rates, it would be stopped by a balance-of-payments crisis, and if rates were flexible, devaluation would raise the price of imports and restore the competitiveness of exports. In the Monetary Union, however, external constraints were eliminated. Foreign investors and creditors no longer worried about currency risks, and banks in countries like Germany were happy to re-invest export incomes in bonds and asset-based securities issued by Greek, Spanish or Irish banks. Hence the rapidly

¹² De Grauwe (2009, 177-182) shows how the higher interest rates required (under the “Taylor rule”) for high growth economies like Ireland, Greece or Spain would be systematically outvoted in the ECB Governing Council under the influence of the ECB Board whose members are assumed to target average Euro-zone conditions.

¹³ In the history of economic theory, the need for and the feasibility of differentiated solutions had been postulated by the renowned Swedish economist Erik Lindahl (1930). In his view, the central bank of a monetary union of independent states would need to correct diverging business cycles and inflation rates in member economies by differentiating the supply of central-bank money that national central banks could offer to national banks – which would in turn lead to nationally differing interest rates. It has recently been argued, albeit by heterodox economists, that such options could also be realized in the EMU (Spethmann/Steiger 2005).

¹⁴ One would of course need to know whether, under present conditions of high capital mobility, the effect of differentiated monetary policies would be immediately wiped out by arbitrage, or whether some forms of capital controls could be designed to ensure their effectiveness. Moreover, one would have to explore the political and intra-institutional implications for ECB monetary policy if it were to become responsible for explicitly discriminating measures addressed to individual member economies.

increasing deficits of current accounts were not corrected, but financed through equally increasing capital flows from surplus to deficit economies in the Euro zone (Figure 14). By the same token, of course, real effective exchange rates diverged as well, with Germany benefitting from an increasingly undervalued currency, and GIPS economies suffering from over-valuation (Figure 17).

What did matter most, eventually, was the increasing dependence on capital inflows and the rise of external – and mainly private¹⁵ – indebtedness, which left GIPS economies extremely vulnerable to disturbances of international financial markets that might provoke capital flight.¹⁶ Hence even if the toughened version of the Stability Pact that is presently being enacted had been in place in 2007, it would hardly have reduced the economic vulnerability of the GIPS economies. In any case, however, under the rules of the Monetary Union that were then in place neither rising current-accounts deficits, nor the increasing dependence of GIPS economies on capital imports and divergent real exchange rates were treated as problems that would require intervention by either the Commission or the European Central Bank.

The Stability Pact was supposed to deal only with excessive budget deficits (Figure 15) and, what is even more important, it did not differentiate between deficits incurred in a recession and in high-growth periods. Thus after Germany (with the support of France) had successfully resisted punishment for the operation of automatic stabilizers during its deep recession between 2000 and 2005 it would have been politically difficult to prosecute high-growth Greece (even if its deficit had been correctly reported). But while the Stability Pact could and should have worked against Greece, it was simply irrelevant for Spain and Ireland. Compared to Germany, their governments were models of fiscal probity, running budget

¹⁵ In contrast to currently popular narratives, external indebtedness even in Greece and Portugal was mainly, and in Spain and Ireland it was exclusively, due to private-sector, rather than public-sector borrowing. Thus in 2007, the year before the financial crisis, the external balance of Greece had amounted to -14.67% of GDP, to which public-sector borrowing contributed only -5.3%. The respective figures for Portugal are -9.78% and -2.65%. In Spain (-10.02% and +1.09%) and Ireland (-5.34% and +0.14%), public sector surpluses actually had reduced the external imbalance (Eurostat data).

¹⁶ Excessive external indebtedness caused by capital inflows did of course also occur in countries with their own currency whose central bank had stimulated the demand for credit through low interest rates. But in that case, a sudden capital flight would produce devaluation, rather than a liquidity and solvency crisis (de Grauwe 2011).

surpluses in most years up to 2007, and reducing total public-sector debt far below the official target of 60 percent of GDP (Figure 16). Even though, in the absence of monetary restraint, sound macroeconomic management might have required even more aggressive fiscal retrenchment, there was nothing in the Stability Pact that would have suggested to governments that this might be a European requirement.

At the same time, the ECB also would see no reason for alarm as average Euro-zone inflation rates remained within the limits to which its monetary policy was committed. And while all the GIPS economies had higher rates than Germany, these were not exorbitantly higher and they did not seem to accelerate (Figure 4). That may appear surprising since the bursting of credit-financed real-estate bubbles in Ireland and Spain is now seen as a major cause of the present crisis in these countries. But technically, escalating real-estate and housing prices are defined as “asset price inflation” which the ECB, like other central banks, will only take into account if their “wealth effect” may be expected to affect the rise of consumer prices as well (Trichet 2005; de Grauwe 2009, 207-209).¹⁷ And the rise of consumer prices in GIPS economies continued to be constrained by lower-priced imports.

Summary: The Eurozone on the eve of the crisis

By 2007, therefore, conditions in the Eurozone could be described as follows: The Monetary Union had achieved its proximate political purposes by eliminating currency fluctuations and interest-rate differentials among its member economies. At the same time, however, it had deprived member governments of the monetary and exchange-rate instruments of macroeconomic management and it had tried, through the Stability Pact, to also constrain their employment of fiscal instruments. But since the Eurozone was not an “optimal currency area”, the imposition of one-size-fits-all

¹⁷ By hindsight it seems clear that the Irish and Spanish (or American and British) governments might have stopped their real-estate bubbles through legislation tightening the availability of housing credit. But if even central-bank economists see no way to distinguish between price increases determined by “rational markets” and “speculative” excesses, it would have taken a good deal of political courage for governments to stop the party on grounds of old-fashioned paternalism.

ECB interest rates produced “asymmetric” impulses in EMU economies with above-average or below-average rates of growth and inflation. In low-growth Germany, high real interest rates had deepened and prolonged a recession which, since monetary as well as fiscal reflation were ruled out, was eventually overcome through wage restraint and supply-side “reforms” that constrained domestic demand and increased export competitiveness. In GIPS economies, by contrast, very low real interest rates had fueled credit-financed economic growth and employment, but also rapid increases in unit labor costs that reduced export competitiveness. The resulting rise of current-account deficits was accommodated by equally rising capital inflows from investors in surplus economies leading rising external debts accumulated primarily or exclusively in the private sector. As a consequence, GIPS economies were becoming extremely vulnerable to potential disturbances in international financial markets that might induce capital flight – followed by potential liquidity and solvency crises.

Governments in GIPS countries may have been as unconcerned as the American or British governments about the rise of these imbalances. But even where they tried to constrain their overheating economies through fiscal retrenchment and attempts at wage moderation, the instruments of macroeconomic policy that were still available to national governments proved insufficient to neutralize the expansionary effects of EMU monetary impulses. At the same time, moreover, the escalating economic imbalances and vulnerabilities were of no concern for EMU policy makers, neither for the Commission enforcing the Stability Pact nor for the ECB carrying out its mandate to ensure price stability.

IV: From 2008 to 2010: A Sequence of Three Crises

For how long external imbalances in the Euro zone could have continued, whether they could have been gradually corrected by market forces or would soon have ended in a crash, has become an academic question. In the real world, the international financial crisis of 2008 did trigger chain reactions which, in the Eurozone, had the effect of transforming the vulnerability of the deficit countries into a systemic crisis that is thought to challenge the viability of the Monetary Union itself. The much-researched story is far too complex to be retold here in any detail, but for present purposes a thumb-nail sketch of three distinct, but causally connected crises will suffice (Jones 2009).

Initially, the direct impact of the American “subprime mortgage crisis” and the Lehman bankruptcy was limited to European countries that had allowed their banks to invest heavily in “toxic” American securities. Apart from the UK, the main victims were Germany and Ireland, whereas in Spain banking supervision had effectively prevented Spanish banks from engaging in off-balance activities abroad. As a consequence, the budget deficits of countries that had to rescue “system-relevant” private or public banks, escalated to previously unheard-of levels (Figure 15).

The secondary impact of the international financial crisis was a dramatic credit squeeze on the real economy as banks had to write off insecure assets on their balance sheets while interbank lending was stopped by mutual distrust. As a consequence, economic activity declined and unemployment increased in the countries immediately affected by the banking crisis, and these effects spread quickly to closely-linked other economies. In addition to the fiscal effects of bank bailouts, therefore, governments had to accept a steep decline of tax revenues and an equally steep rise of expenditures on unemployment and on the protection of existing jobs. Quite obviously, however, the effects of the credit squeeze would hit hardest on countries whose economic activity had come to depend most on the availability of cheap credit and massive capital inflows– which in the Euro zone had been true of the GIPS economies. In Ireland and Spain, moreover, the real-estate bubble had burst

under the impact of the recession, and the defaults of mortgages created a secondary banking crisis in which governments had to rescue even more financial institutions (or their creditors in the financial institutions of surplus economies). The result was an even more dramatic rise of public-sector deficits and debt ratios even in countries like Spain and Ireland whose indebtedness had been far below the Eurozone average (Figure 16).

In the process, thirdly (and belatedly), international rating agencies and investors ceased to be satisfied with the elimination of currency risks and finally began to worry about the sustainability of public-sector indebtedness – in particular for countries whose current-account deficits suggested economic weaknesses that might also affect the capacity of governments to meet financial commitments. As this happened, the price of outstanding bonds declined, refinancing as well as the placement of new issues became difficult, and the convergence of nominal interest rates on German levels came to an end. As a consequence, risk premia on sovereign debt rose to very high and practically prohibitive levels after 2008 (Figure 18).

The specter of “sovereign default” arose first in Greece. There, the incoming *Pasok* government had to admit that public sector deficits (which had significantly violated the Stability Pact even during the high-growth years following accession to the Euro zone in 2001) had in fact been grossly under-reported by its predecessors. Confronted with the potential repercussions of Greek bankruptcy on their own banks, and with speculative attacks on other EMU member states, capital-exporting countries agreed to create a common “Stability Mechanism” that would ensure Greek government obligations – which was soon followed by a much larger European Financial Stability Fund (EFSF) whose guarantees were first invoked by Ireland and now also by Portugal. In all cases, governments had to accept extremely tough commitments to fiscal retrenchment and supply-side policy reforms – which are becoming the model for a general regime of fiscal supervision and controls in the Eurozone.

V: Beyond the Rescue Operations: Options for a Viable EMU?

The commitment to create the rescue funds must be understood in the light of its perceived alternative: If GIPS states had gone bankrupt they could have left the Monetary Union and returned to their former national currencies at an exchange rate that corrected the real effective over-valuation. In theory, that would have re-established the international viability of their economies. But domestically the transition would have been very painful, and its technical difficulties were perceived as being so overwhelming¹⁸ that no practical solutions in that direction were even tentatively considered. At the same time, the European Commission, the ECB and the governments of surplus countries also rejected the “bankruptcy-cum-devaluation” scenario for reasons of their own which, not necessarily in the order of their importance, could be listed as follows: (1) if GIPS states should leave the EMU, it would be perceived as a major setback for European integration; (2) it would encourage speculative attacks on other EMU member states; (3) the bankruptcy of GIPS states would entail heavy losses for banks in surplus countries and for the ECB, and (4) the expected revaluation of the Euro would hurt export industries in Germany and other surplus economies that benefited from an undervalued real exchange rate. Given these beliefs, the expensive guarantees and credits appeared as a lesser evil that was necessary to keep the GIPS countries within the Monetary Union (and, perhaps, to provide a push for European solidarity and political integration).

¹⁸ As George Selgin (2010) put it: “In effect, the authorities kicked away the ladder Europe’s economies had scaled to establish a common currency, leaving Europeans with no equally convenient way of retreating to the *status quo*.” Thus American economists who had warned against creating the EMU were now convinced that the exit option was effectively foreclosed (Eichengreen 1990; 2010).

The rescue-cum-retrenchment program

The immediate goal of the rescue programs was to avoid bankruptcy by providing access to immediately needed credit at rates that did not include exorbitant risk premia. This goal is being pursued through a combination of guarantees, ECB open market operations (Sinn 2011) and direct loans provided by the IMF and by the stability funds set up by the EU (EFSM) and by the EMU member states (EFSF). As a consequence, Greece, Ireland and now Portugal have so far been able to avoid insolvency. By themselves, however, the guarantees and credits could only buy time. In order to ensure that governments will be able to restore the confidence of financial markets, they are coupled with stringent “conditionalities” which are meant to reduce the short-term need for credit through rigorous fiscal retrenchment. At the same time, moreover, the conditions imposed are meant to facilitate economic recovery and to restore the international viability of the economies in question.

Thus the Commission’s “Economic Adjustment Programme for Greece” of May 2010 postulated two goals to be pursued over the coming years:

“The immediate priority is to contain the government’s financing needs and reassure markets of the determination of authorities to do whatever it takes to secure medium- and long-term fiscal sustainability.” ...

In parallel with short-term anti-crisis fiscal measures, there is a need to prepare and implement an ambitious structural reform agenda to strengthen external competitiveness, accelerate reallocation of resources from the non-tradable to the tradable sector, and foster growth.” (Commission 2010a, 10/90).

The Program accordingly included immediate increases of VAT and excise taxes, cuts of public-sector wages, pensions, social expenditures and public investments, and it would continue in 2011–2014 with long lists of further tax increases and expenditure cutbacks. The structural reforms to which the government had to commit itself included “the implementation of an ambitious pension reform”,

reforms of the budgeting and tax systems and of public administration, plus “ambitious labor and product market reforms.”

And even though some of these commitments might have appeared somewhat vague, they were specified in much greater detail and continuously tightened by a “Memorandum of Understanding on Specific Economic Policy Conditionality” (Memorandum 2010) and its quarterly “updates”. These are used to assess progress achieved, to extend the range of required structural reforms and to specify concrete requirements to be met in the following periods¹⁹. These “Memoranda of Understanding” and their quarterly updates cut ever more deeply into details of national legislation.²⁰ And the opening paragraphs of the Greek and Irish Memoranda and of all subsequent updates leave no doubt as to who is in control of these “understandings”:

“The quarterly disbursements of bilateral financial assistance ...are subject to quarterly reviews of conditionality for the duration of the arrangement. The release of the tranches will be based on observance of quantitative performance criteria and a positive evaluation of progress made with respect to policy criteria in ...this memorandum.... The authorities commit to consult with the European Commission, the ECB and the IMF on the adoption of policies that are not consistent with this Memorandum. They will also provide the European Commission, the ECB and the IMF with all information requested that is available to monitor progress during programme implementation and to track the economic and financial situation. Prior to the release

¹⁹ Exactly the same approach has been used in the “Economic Adjustment Programme for Ireland” published in February 2011 (Commission 2011), and there is no reason to think that it will not also be used for Portugal.

²⁰ To illustrate, in the Greek case, the “second update” of 22 November 2010 contained a commitment to “comprehensive reform of the health care system” which in the “third update” of 23 February 2011 came to include detailed targets for the pricing of generics and for the methods by which social security funds are paying physicians. Similarly, where the original agreement had contained a commitment to “ambitious labor market reforms”, the second update specified a new law allowing firm-level collective agreements to prevail over sector and occupational agreements, and the third update committed the government to “simplify the procedure for the creation of firm-level trade unions”. In the Irish case, the “Memorandum of Understanding” of 8 December 2010 was more detailed on reforms of the banking system but also included precise commitments on labor market and pension reforms, on cuts in public-sector employment and pay, on cuts in social programs and reductions of the statutory minimum wage.

of the instalments, the authorities shall provide a compliance report on the fulfilment of the conditionality.”²¹

In other words, once an EMU member state has applied for the protection of European rescue funds, its government will be operating under a form of “receivership”.²² European and IMF authorities will define the criteria to be treated as “conditionality”; the Commission will analyze financial and economic problems, define the policy choices that are required, monitor compliance and evaluate progress or failure. Of course it will prefer to do so in consultation with national authorities and expertise. But in cases of disagreement, the bargaining power of the national government will be minimal – except that it might still threaten to commit political suicide or to reconsider the “bankruptcy-cum-devaluation” option.

Whether the policies imposed by these “rescue-cum-retrenchment” regimes, assuming that they would be faithfully implemented, have a chance of succeeding economically over the medium term appears doubtful. The short-term results, at any rate, do not appear promising: Total debt burdens are still increasing (Figure 16), and the interest rates for government bonds seem to be still on the rise as well (Figure 19). At the same time, GIPS economies continue to be in a deep recession, with negative or near-zero rates of economic growth in 2010 and 2011, and with unemployment rates of 15 percent in 2011 in Greece, 14 percent in Ireland, 11-12 percent in Portugal and 20 percent in Spain²³ (Figure 20). In order to meet their minimal political responsibilities, therefore, governments must deal with high and rising expenditures on unemployment and welfare benefits and they must cope with falling, rather than rising tax revenues – with the implication that despite current denials a severe “restructuring” of existing debt may become unavoidable.

²¹ Quoted from the Irish Memorandum of 3 December 2010:

http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/articles/eu_economic_situation/pdf/2010-12-07-mou_en.pdf

²² In the recent blog of Max Keiser, a British TV presenter and former Wall Street broker, the Greek situation is equated with an occupation regime imposed by the “Troika” of EU, ECB and IMF authorities. <<http://maxkeiser.com/2011/04/28/the-greek-government%E2%80%99s-betrayal-of-greece-to-the-foreign-occupational-forces-of-the-troika>>

²³ IMF World Economic Outlook, April 2011.

<<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2011/01/pdf/tblpartb.pdf>>

Political implications

In purely economic terms, therefore, the immediate outcomes of the “rescue-cum-retrenchment” program will not differ greatly from those anticipated in the “bankruptcy-cum-devaluation” scenario. In both cases, creditors cannot expect to be fully repaid, and in both cases, international economic viability can only be re-achieved by a fall of wages in the traded sector that will real correct the gap in real effective exchange rates (Figure 17). But the political implications and distributional consequences would be quite different.

“Bankruptcy-cum-devaluation” would be experienced as a sudden shock that hits the country as a whole and which, by dramatically increasing the price of imports, reduces all domestic real incomes at the same time. Beyond that, however, all cruelties would have been inflicted by the devaluation itself, and national policy and politics could be about damage control, burden sharing and reconstruction.

The opposite is true under the “rescue-cum-retrenchment” program that is presently being enacted. Here, all cruelties must be proposed, defended, adopted and implemented over an extended period by the national government. In fact, the program amounts to a greatly radicalized version of the supply-side reforms adopted in Germany during its (much milder) recession before 2005 – which destroyed the political support of the Schröder’s Red-Green government. But whereas Schröder had the chance of developing and defending self-chosen reforms, governments in Greece, Ireland and Portugal must implement policies which are likely to be seen as dictates of Commission bureaucrats and of self-interested foreign governments trying to protect their own banks, investors and export industries.

If these are extremely difficult political conditions, they will be exacerbated by the distributional implications. In both scenarios it is clear that the non-traded sector will lose, and that export-oriented industries and services ought to gain. Beyond that, however, the higher profitability of investments in export-oriented production will have been achieved by the devaluation itself, whereas in the “rescue-cum-retrenchment” program it must be created by governments adopting and

implementing policies that must massively and visibly hurt workers and welfare clients while favoring profits and capital owners. As was true in Germany, the inevitable result will be a rise of social inequality²⁴ and social protest. From the political perspective of GIPS governments, therefore, “bankruptcy-cum-devaluation” might by now indeed appear as the lesser of two evils.

From rescue operations to EMU reform

But the fate of the economies and governments of GIPS countries is only part of a larger process of EMU reforms that are presently under way. In this regard, it is indeed unfortunate that worries about the Euro were triggered by the Greek solvency crisis – which initially was seen as the self-inflicted result of fiscal profligacy: If Greek governments had not engaged in reckless borrowing,²⁵ so it is now widely argued, the Euro crisis would not have arisen, and if the Commission had not been duped by faked records, the rigorous enforcement of the Stability Pact would have prevented it. So even though the more “virtuous” member states cannot refuse to help the “sinners” now, such conditions should never be allowed to occur again. And even though this understanding of the problem was only partly correct for Greece, and totally wrong for Ireland and Spain, it still dominates discussions of the crisis in the “rescuer” countries, and it does frame the approach to reforming the EMU regime.

The “Excessive Deficit Procedure” (EDP) that is to be put into place under Article 126 TFEU amounts to a toughened version of the Stability Pact – with greater emphasis on the rapid and continuous reduction of total public-sector debt, on the preventive supervision of national budgeting processes, on earlier interventions and sanctions and “reverse majority” rules for the adoption of more severe sanctions by the

²⁴ In fact, Germany was one of the OECD countries where social inequality increased the most between the mid 1990s and the mid 2000s – whereas inequality had decreased in Greece, Spain and Ireland (OECD 2008).

²⁵ A major factor seems to have been a particularly pronounced inability or unwillingness to collect taxes. According to OECD figures, Greek tax revenue declined from 37.8 percent of GDP in 2000 to 32.6 percent in 2008.

Council (Commission 2010b).²⁶ But at least the Commission also seems to have realized that mere budgetary discipline alone, no matter how rigidly enforced, would not have prevented the crises of Ireland and Spain – where the steep rise of public-sector deficits clearly was a consequence, rather than the cause, of the financial and economic crisis.

Hence the Commission now also considers “macroeconomic imbalances” as proximate causes of the present crises, and it has proposed to strengthen the Treaty commitment to coordinated economic policy (Art. 121 TFEU) by an “Excessive Imbalance Procedure” (Commission 2010c). Its focus will be on current account balances, unit labor costs, real effective exchange rates total (public *and* private) indebtedness and other potentially critical aspects of national economic performance. Its central instrument will be a “scoreboard” with a limited (but expandable) list of performance indicators, complete with upper and lower “alert thresholds”. On this basis, “complemented by economic judgment and national expertise”, the Commission will then identify member states “deemed at risk of imbalance”, followed by “country-specific in-depth reviews”, “preventive recommendations” and in the case of “excessive imbalances”, Council recommendations of corrective action, with deadlines attached and with compliance to be monitored by the Commission. If governments fail to comply, the Commission may again propose fines that the Council could only oppose by qualified majority vote.²⁷

This ambitious program, which had the support of the Van-Rompuy Committee, was approved by the ECOFIN Council on March 15, 2011,²⁸ and it is supposed to be adopted in June through a series of regulations. It appears remarkable for a number of reasons. First, it replaces the rule-based approach of the Maastricht Treaty and the original Stability Pact with a highly discretionary regime of supranational economic

²⁶ At the same time, however, the proposed Regulation (7843/11) seems to soften some of the rigidities of the original Stability Pact by relating its deficit rules to the “medium-term rate of potential GDP growth” – which obviously place much trust on the reliability of economic forecasts or give much room to discretionary judgments of the Commission.

²⁷ In none of the legislative proposals, either for the EDP or the EIP, is there any suggestion that the adoption of “reverse majority” rules might require amendments of the Treaty. But see: <<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/danielhannan/100056867/herman-van-rompuy-announces-a-new-reverse-majority-rule-to-get-around-the-national-veto>>

²⁸ <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ecofin/119888.pdf>

management. Even the new EDP will now refer to projections of “potential growth” for its assessment of national budgets. And the EIP must depend on disputable hypotheses regarding the causal relevance of specific indicators and the critical significance of upper and lower thresholds (quite apart from the politically unresolved issue of whether symmetrical controls should be imposed on surplus and deficit economies). Moreover, practically all the indicators discussed refer to phenomena which, unlike public-sector budgets, are not under the direct control of national governments. Since the capacities of governments to exercise indirect influences over such variables as nominal wages, private saving and spending, consumer credit, etc. may either not exist or differ enormously among member states, compliance with the “recommendations” issued by the Commission may well be impossible.

The worst of three worlds

Remarkably, moreover, there is no acknowledgment in any of the supporting documents of the role that uniform ECB interest rates played in causing macroeconomic imbalances among the heterogeneous member economies of a “non-optimal currency area”. Nor is there any recognition of the ECB’s reluctant but constructive role in supporting GIPS banks after 2008, or any discussion of how ECB monetary policy could, in the future, avoid monetary impulses that have the effect of generating imbalances among EMU economies.²⁹ In other words, EMU member states cannot expect any help from the European level in managing the macroeconomic imbalances that are induced by European monetary impulses that do not fit the specific conditions of the national economy. Instead, they are expected to deal with potential imbalances through the use of their remaining policy instruments – but in doing so, they will be constrained by the rules of the Excessive Deficit

²⁹ The omission seems particularly surprising since real interest rates are now lower in Germany than in all of the GIPS economies (Figure 6), and since public discussions of recent ECB decisions were quite aware of the fact that the rise of interest rates that would be justified by reference to Germany might destroy all hopes of recovery in countries like Spain.

Procedure and they will be controlled by the Commission's discretionary interventions under the Excessive Imbalance Procedure.

These conditions contrast unfavorable with those that were faced by member states of the former European Monetary System. Though politically committed to pegged exchange rates, their governments had retained autonomous control over all instruments of macroeconomic policy – which they were able to employ with a view to their own economy, its external environment, their own political priorities and constraints. At the same time, however, the governments of EMS member states were fully accountable to their own constituents for all outcomes that could be attributed to failures of macroeconomic management.

But the proposed EMU regime contrasts also with the conditions faced by the member governments of a federal nation state with economically heterogeneous regions. These will be deprived of all instruments of macroeconomic management, and they may also suffer from the negative impulses of uniform monetary policies of the national central bank that will not fit economic conditions in the region. But if the monetary policy of the central government may be as much part of the problem as is true in the EMU, its fiscal policy will be very much a part of the solution. Generally, the budget of the central government is large, its revenues are based on taxes that have a major impact on economic activity, and its expenditures include the programs that are most affected by the rise and decline of economic activity. Hence the national budget will raise most of its revenue in high-growth regions, and it will spend most in depressed regions. Quite apart from any intergovernmental transfer programs, therefore, national taxation and national social policy will have powerful inter-regional equalization effects. Moreover, and perhaps even more important, the democratic accountability of the central government will be as strong or stronger than that of lower-level governments – and so will be its motivation to employ its policy instruments with a view to the potential political responses of voters in depressed regions.

Compared to both of these regimes, therefore, member states in the reformed Monetary Union will indeed find themselves in the worst of three worlds. Like the

provinces or cantons in a federal state, they lose control over the instruments of macroeconomic management, and they are likely to suffer from uniform national policies that do not fit their regional economy. At the same time, however, the EU budget is miniscule in comparison to the budget of federal states, there are no European taxes and there is no European social policy to alleviate interregional imbalances. Instead, member states are expected to cope with all economic problems by relying entirely on their own policy resources. In contrast to members of the earlier EMS, however, EMU member states cannot use these policies autonomously, but are subject to the intrusive supervision and potential punishment imposed by supranational authorities – which are not themselves democratically accountable and have no reason to be politically responsive to the citizens affected by their policies. In fact, no democratically accountable national government in a federal state has ever claimed such control over the fiscal, economic and social policy choices of its constituent provinces, states, *Länder* or cantons.

Is there a hidden agenda of EMU reforms?

Assuming that the new regime could be installed as it is designed, its *economic* success would seem to depend on the capacity of the Commission to prevent macroeconomic imbalances by issuing precise policy instructions (named “recommendations”) to member-state governments. In order to succeed on these terms, moreover, such instructions would have to fit the economic conditions and trends in seventeen heterogeneous member economies. And they would need to work under the specific conditions and constraints of industrial organizations, labor-market institutions, administrative capabilities, and political structures in each of these countries. Considering the dismal record of economic forecasts and the lack of empirically grounded theory representing the complex linkages among heterogeneous economic, social and political structures and processes, that seems to imply a staggering research agenda. In this light, the Excessive Imbalance Procedure might well be seen as an extreme manifestation of the “pretense of knowledge” of

which Friedrich August von *Hayek*, in his Nobel lecture of 1974 had accused the economic policy makers of the Keynesian era.

Conceivably, however, what the Commission has in mind is something that is intellectually much less demanding. It should be remembered that EMU-friendly economists have always downplayed the fact that the Eurozone was not an “optimal currency area” (Jonung/Drea 2010). In the words of the ECB’s former Chief Economist, it was sufficient that member economies should respond to asymmetric shocks

“with a high degree of flexibility in the markets for goods and services.... This flexibility is needed above all in the labor market, that is, wages must adjust to changing market conditions ... The more the price system (in the widest sense) bears the burden of adjustment, the less important is the loss of the national exchange rate and monetary policy instruments, and the greater the benefit of using a single currency...”

And moreover: “Conditions such as the necessary market flexibility can also be created after entry into monetary union.” (Issing 2009, 48-50).

If this should be the underlying theory of the present EMU reforms,³⁰ it also makes sense that many of the requirements imposed by the “Memoranda of Understanding” for Greece and Ireland appear unlikely to reduce public-sector deficits over the short or medium term. Instead, they will impose a wide range of market-making “structural reforms” that will weaken union power, privatize public services, liberalize the professions and open public health care and education to commercial service providers.

Obviously, instructions of this type will not have to overcome prohibitive empirical and theoretical difficulties. All they need for guidance are the relatively simple supply-side presumptions that are derived from the abstract models of neoclassical

³⁰ I am not here trying to assess its economic plausibility. Would greater market flexibility have prevented the credit financed housing booms in Ireland and Spain (or in the USA)? And would decentralized wage negotiations have allowed better responses to the German recession than the economically sophisticated bargaining strategy of powerful *IG-Metall*?

micro-economics. In that perspective, then, the intended practice of the Excessive Imbalance Procedure would become another instrument for promoting market-liberalism in the European Union. This tendency has characterized European legislation and decisions of the European Court of Justice since the early 1980s – and it is in the process of transforming the “social market economies” of some EU member states into “liberal market economies (Jabko 2006; Scharpf 2010).

But the reach of “hard” European law is still limited, and the Commission’s use of the “soft” methods of the “Lisbon Process” have not been very successful in promoting “flexibility” in areas where EU member states were still defending their own competences. The “Excessive Imbalance Procedure”, however, might now allow the Commission to pursue its liberalizing agenda much more widely and effectively. Its “recommendations” merely need to be justified by reference to a list of indicators of “economic imbalance” – but there is no constraint on the policy changes that may be required. As long as it is alleged that they may somehow have an effect on imbalances, the requirements may specify policy changes in a completely undefined range of national competences – including areas like labor relations, education or health care that have been explicitly protected against European legislation in successive versions of the Treaties. And to prevent intergovernmental bargaining from softening the sanctions against non-complying governments, the fines proposed by the Commission would be adopted by “reverse qualified-majority” voting in the Council. So it all seems to fit neatly.

VI: Democratic Legitimacy in a Reformed Monetary Union

Instead of continuing on the slippery slope toward politico-economic conspiracy theories, however, I will now turn to issues of democratic legitimacy. From the perspective of citizens in Greece, Ireland and Portugal, the European and international agencies imposing the “rescue-cum-retrenchment” program are not, themselves, supported by democratic legitimacy. What matters, therefore, is the relationship between citizens and the national governments that are accountable to

them. But, as I said in the introduction, accountability has an input-oriented and an output-oriented dimension.

“Output-oriented legitimacy” reflects popular responses to *outcomes* that may be attributed to the policy output of the government whose performance is in issue. Here, the first general observation is that voters cannot be required to be fair, and that governments may be punished for outcomes they did not control. The second general point is that electoral responses will reflect relative judgments: Three million unemployed in Germany may be a political disaster or a celebrated success depending on the figures in recent years. With that in mind, the “rescue-cum-retrenchment” regime that is presently imposed on GIPS countries can only be considered a political disaster. Two-digit and still rising rates of unemployment, wage cuts, and rising social inequality will surely not generate outcome satisfaction. Under such conditions, GIPS governments cannot hope to benefit from output-oriented legitimacy.

But that does not, by itself, rule out the possibility of *input-oriented legitimation*. Democracy is about collective self-determination, rather than about wish fulfillment. It is compatible with the need to respect external constraints, and it may also support hard choices and painful sacrifices – provided that these can be justified in public discourses as being effective and normatively appropriate in dealing with common problems or achieving the collective purposes of the polity (Schmidt 2002; 2006). At the same time, however, input-oriented democratic legitimacy does presuppose the possibility of politically meaningful choices, and it is not at all compatible with a situation where choices are pre-empted by external domination (Pettit 1997).

Margaret Thatcher, for example, was able to gain political support for extremely painful retrenchment and structural reforms in Britain after the “Winter of Discontent” of 1979. But in comparison to GIPS governments, Thatcher could appeal to traditional British values to justify sacrifices that she found to be economically necessary and normatively appropriate (Schmidt 2000, 238-242). Moreover, all relevant policy parameters were under the control of her (unitary) national government. And most importantly, her program was entirely self-chosen,

hammered out over several years in intra-party battles, publicly defended in a successful electoral campaign, and supported by a considerable part of public opinion.

Like Thatcher, the present Greek and Irish governments may, at least for a while, benefit from blaming present hardships on their political predecessors. But they must still struggle with the perception that the “understandings” they had to sign in order to obtain the guarantees of the Financial Stability Fund read less like self-chosen programs than like protocols of an unconditional surrender. Thus in order to be able to hang on, they may desperately need to negotiate for politically visible European “concessions” and for permission to adopt at least some “non-liberal” policies to alleviate the worst plight of their constituents. If they should fail, and if changes of governments would not seem to make a difference, the legitimacy of the democratic regime itself may be in danger – especially in polities where democratic government is itself a relatively recent achievement.

To a lesser degree, the same problems may also arise in consequence of measures required and sanctioned by the Excessive Deficit or Imbalance Procedures. In some countries, of course, market-liberal discourses may be highly persuasive, and governments would have no difficulty in presenting “structural reforms” as autonomous and justifiable national policy choices. But where the Commission’s requirements would violate the politically salient interests, preferences and values of national constituencies, compliance may again undermine democratic legitimacy. That is not meant to suggest that we will soon see more banks burning and blood in the streets of Athens, Dublin or Madrid, or of Helsinki and Berlin for that matter. In general, citizens in European countries have less to gain and more to lose from open rebellion than was true in Tunisia, Egypt or Libya. And the most vulnerable victims of retrenchment and liberalization policies may lack the capabilities and resources for effective political action.

But political resignation, alienation and cynicism, combined with growing hostility against “Frankfurt” and “Brussels”, and a growing perception of zero-sum conflict between the donors and the recipients of the “rescue-cum-retrenchment” programs,

may create the conditions for anti-European political mobilization from the extremes of the political spectrum. In the worst case, therefore, the attempts to save the Euro through the policies presently enacted may either fail on their own terms, or they may not only undermine democracy in EU member states but endanger European integration itself.

References

- Baccaro, Lucio/Marco Simoni, 2010: Organizational Determinants of Wage Moderation. In: *World Politics* 62(4), 594–635.
- Commission 2010a: The Economic Adjustment Programme for Greece. Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs. Occasional Papers 61. May 2010.
- Commission, 2010b: *Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the Effective Enforcement of Budgetary Surveillance in the Euro Area*. Nr. 524, 29 September 2010. Brussels: European Commission.
- Commission, 2010c: *Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Enforcement Measures to Correct Excessive Macroeconomic Imbalances in the Euro Area*. Nr. 525, 29 September 2010. Brussels: European Commission.
- De Grauwe, Paul, 2009: *Economics of Monetary Union*. Eighth Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- De Grauw2 2011: The Governance of a Fragile Eurozone. Md. University of Leuven.
http://www.econ.kuleuven.be/ew/academic/intecon/Degrauwe/PDG-papers/Discussion_papers/Governance-fragile-eurozone_s.pdf
- Delors, Jacques, 1989: *Report on Economic and Monetary Union in the European Community*. Brussels: Committee for the Study of Economic and Monetary Union.
- Der SPIEGEL, 2011: Währungspolitik: Agenda für Europa. In: *Der Spiegel* 5/2011, 19–22.
- Dyson, Kenneth/Kevin Featherstone, 1999: *The Road to Maastricht: Negotiating Economic and Monetary Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Easton, David, 1965: *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*. New York: John Wiley.
- Eichengreen, Barry, 1990: *Is Europe an Optimum Currency Area?* CEPR Discussion Paper 478. London: Centre for Economic Policy Research.
- Eichengreen, Barry/Jeffrey Frieden (eds.), 1994: *The Political Economy of European Monetary Unification*. Boulder: Westview.
- Eichengreen, Barry 2010: The Euro: Love It or Leave It? NBER Working Paper 13393.
<http://www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/729>.
- Enderlein, Henrik, 2004: *Nationale Wirtschaftspolitik in der europäischen Währungsunion*. Frankfurt a.M.: Campus.
- Flassbeck, Heiner, 2010: *Die Marktwirtschaft des 21. Jahrhunderts*. Frankfurt a.M.: Westend.
- Habermas, Jürgen, 1973: *Legitimationsprobleme im Spätkapitalismus*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- Hayek, Friedrich August von, 1974: The Pretence of Knowledge. Prize Lecture.
http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/economics/laureates/1974/hayek-lecture.html
- Heipertz, Martin/Amy Verdun, 2010: *Ruling Europe: The Politics of the Stability and Growth Pact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hennis, Wilhem/Peter Graf Kielmansegg/Ulrich Matz (eds.), 1978: *Regierbarkeit: Studien zu ihrer Problematisierung*. Vol. 2. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.


- Issing, Otmar, 2002: On Macroeconomic Policy Co-ordination in EMU. In: *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40(2), 345–358.
- Issing, Otmar 2009: *The Birth of the Euro*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jabko, Nicolas 2006: *Playing the Market. A political Strategy for Uniting Europe, 1985-2005*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Johnson, Harry G., 1971: The Keynesian Revolution and the Monetarist Counter Revolution. In: *American Economic Review* 61(2), 91–106.
- Jones, Erik, 2002: *The Politics of Economic and Monetary Union: Integration and Idiosyncrasy*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Jones, Erik, 2009: The Euro and the Financial Crisis. In: *Survival* 51(2), 41–54.
- Junung, Lars and Eoin Drea 2010: It Can't Happen, It's a Bad Idea, It Won't Last: US Economists on the EMU and the Euro, 1989-2002. In: *Econ Journal Watch* 7 (1), 4-52.
- Klenk, Tanja/Frank Nullmeier, 2010: Politische Krisentheorien und die Renaissance von Konjunkturprogrammen. In: *Der Moderne Staat* 3(2), 273–294.
- Lindahl, Erik, 1930, *Penningpolitikens Medel* (The Means of Monetary Policy). Lund: Förlagsaktiebolaget i Malmö.
- McKinnon, Ronald I., 1963: Optimum Currency Areas. In: *American Economic Review* 53(4), 717–725.
- McNamara, Kathleen R., 1998: *The Currency of Ideas: Monetary Politics in the European Union*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Memorandum 2010: Greece. Memorandum of Understanding on Specific Policy Conditionality". May 2, 2010. <http://peter.fleissner.org/Transform/MoU.pdf>.
- Mundell, Robert A., 1961: A Theory of Optimal Currency Areas. In: *American Economic Review* 51(4), 657–665.
- OECD, 2008: *Growing Unequal? Income Distribution and Poverty in OECD Countries*. Paris: OECD.
- Offe, Claus, 1972: *Strukturprobleme des kapitalistischen Staates*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- Pettit, Philip, 1997: *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Schäfer, Armin, 2009: Krisentheorien der Demokratie: Unregierbarkeit, Spätkapitalismus und Postdemokratie. In: *Der Moderne Staat* 2(1), 159–183.
- Schäfer, Armin, 2010: Consequences of Social Inequality for Democracy in Western Europe. In: *Zeitschrift für vergleichenden Politikwissenschaft* 4 (online).
<<http://www.springerlink.com/content/q0u7654pk74k2635/fulltext.pdf>>
- Scharpf, Fritz W., 1970: *Demokratiethorie zwischen Utopie und Anpassung*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag.
- Scharpf, Fritz W., 1991: *Crisis and Choice in European Social Democracy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Scharpf, Fritz W., 1999: *Governing in Europe: Effective and Democratic?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Monetary Union, Fiscal Crisis and the Preemption of Democracy

- Scharpf, Fritz W. 2010: The Asymmetry of European Integration. Or why the EU Cannot Be a "Social Market Economy". In: *Socio-Economic Review* 8 (2), 211-250.
- Schmidt, Vivien A., 2000: Values and Discourse in the Politics of Adjustment. In: Fritz W. Scharpf/Vivien A. Schmidt (eds.), *Welfare and Work in the Open Economy*, Vol. 1: *From Vulnerability to Competitiveness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 229–309.
- Schmidt, Vivien A., 2002: Does Discourse Matter in the Politics of Welfare State Adjustment? In: *Comparative Political Studies* 35(2), 168–193
- Schmidt, Vivien A., 2006: *Democracy in Europe: The EU and National Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Selgin, George 2010: The Secret of the Euro's Success. In: *Econ Journal Watch* 7 (1), 78-81.
- Sinn, Hans-Werner, Mika Widgrén and Köthenbürger (eds.) 2004: *European Monetary Integration*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Sinn, Hans-Werner 2011: Die riskante Kreditsatzpolitik der EZB. In: *FAZ* 4. Mai 2011, 10.
- Spethmann, Dieter/Otto Steiger, 2005: Deutschlands Wirtschaft, seine Schulden und die Unzulänglichkeiten der einheitlichen Geldpolitik im Eurosystem. In: Detlev Ehrig/Uwe Staroske (eds.), *Dimensionen angewandter Wirtschaftsforschung: Methoden, Regionen, Sektoren. Festschrift für Heinz Schäfer zum 65. Geburtstag*. Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovac, 255–285.
- Trampusch, Christine, 2009: *Der erschöpfte Sozialstaat: Transformation eines Politikfeldes*. Frankfurt a.M.: Campus.
- Trichet, Jean-Claude, 2005: *Asset Price Bubbles and Monetary Policy*. Lecture by the President of the European Central Bank at the Monetary Authority of Singapore, 8 June 2005. <http://www.bis.org/review/r050614d.pdf>
- Vaubel, Roland 2010: The Euro and the German Veto. In: *Econ Journal Watch* 7 (1), 82-90.
- Willett, Thomas D./Orawan Permpoon/Clas Wihlborg, 2010: Endogenous OCA Analysis and the Early Euro Experience. In: *The World Economy* 33(7), 851–872.


Appendix

Figure 1



Source: OECD

Figure 2



Source: OECD

Figure 3






Figure 4




Source: OECD

Figure 5




Source: OECD

Figure 6




Source: Own Calculation by OECD Data

Figure 7



Source: OECD


Figure 8



Deflator Private Consumption. Source: Ameco Database

Figure 9


Strictness of Employment Protection (Temporary Employment)



Index scale of 0 – 6 from weakest to strongest protection. Source: OECD


Figure 10

Current Account as % of GDP




Source: OECD

Figure 11




Source: Own Calculation by OECD Data

Figure 12




Source: Ameco Database

Figure 13




Ratio of compensation per employee to real GDP per person employed. Source: Ameco Database

Figure 14




Source: OECD

Figure 15




Source: Ameco Database

Figure 16




Source: Ameco Database

Figure 17



Based on Unit Labour Costs (Total Economy). Source: Ameco Database

Figure 18



Source: OECD

Figure 19





Figure 20



Recent LEQS papers

Zigante, Valentina. 'Assessing Welfare Effects of the European Choice Agenda: The case of health care in the United Kingdom.' LEQS Paper No. 35, May 2011

Hobolth, Mogens. 'European visa cooperation: interest politics and regional imagined communities.' LEQS Paper No. 34, May 2011

Monastiriotes, Vassilis. 'Regional Growth Dynamics in Central and Eastern Europe.' LEQS Paper No. 33, April 2011

Johnston, Alison. 'The Revenge of Baumol's Cost Disease?: Monetary Union and the Rise of Public Sector Wage Inflation.' LEQS Paper No. 32, March 2011

Glendinning, Simon. 'Europe, for example.' LEQS Paper No. 31, March 2011

Winkler, Heinrich August. 'Greatness and Limits of the West. The History of an Unfinished Project.' LEQS Paper No. 30, February 2011

Dani, Marco. 'Assembling the fractured European consumer.' LEQS Paper No. 29, January 2011

Joerges, Christian. 'Unity in Diversity as Europe's Vocation and Conflict's Law as Europe's Constitutional Form.' LEQS Paper No. 28, December 2010

Kylstad, Ingrid. 'Turkey and the EU: A 'new' European identity in the making?' LEQS Paper No. 27, November 2010

Costa-i-Font, Joan. 'Regional Single Currency Effects on Bilateral Trade with the European Union.' LEQS Paper No. 26, October 2010

Erkan, Ozgur. 'Spain's Referendum on the European Constitutional Treaty: A Quantitative Analysis Within the Conceptual Framework of First and Second Order Elections.' LEQS Paper No. 25, June 2010

White, Jonathan. 'Left, Right and Beyond: The Pragmatics of Political Mapping.' LEQS Paper No. 24, June 2010

Monastiriotes, Vassilis & **Zartaloudis**, Sotirios. 'Beyond the crisis: EMU and labour market reform pressures in good and bad times.' LEQS Paper No. 23, June 2010

Lütz, Susanne & **Kranke**, Matthias. 'The European Rescue of the Washington Consensus? EU and IMF Lending to Central and Eastern European Countries.' LEQS Paper No. 22, May 2010

Hartlapp, Miriam; **Metz**, Julia & **Rauh**, Christian. 'The agenda set by the EU Commission: the result of balanced or biased aggregation of positions?' LEQS Paper No. 21, April 2010

Costa-i-Font, Joan. 'Unveiling Vertical State Downscaling: Identity and/or the Economy?' LEQS Paper No. 20, March 2010

Delanty, Gerard. 'The European Heritage from a Critical Cosmopolitan Perspective.' LEQS Paper No. 19, February 2010

Outhwaite, William. 'Europe at 21: Transitions and Transformations since 1989'. LEQS Paper No. 18, January 2010

LEQS

European Institute
London School of Economics
Houghton Street
WC2A 2AE London
Email: euroinst.LEQS@lse.ac.uk

<http://www2.lse.ac.uk/europeanInstitute/LEQS/Home.aspx>

