

Dr. Daniela Schwarzer  
Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik (SWP)

# **Economic governance in the Eurozone in and after the crisis**

CRIS Hearing, March 18th, 2010

- ▶ **Fiscal stimulus:** insufficient co-ordination
  - ▶ Shows lack of reflection on EMU-wide fiscal stance
  - ▶ Revealed weak role of Commission and very limited flexibility of EU budget
  - ▶ Past experience raises questions for managing exit strategies
  
- ▶ **Sovereign debt crisis:** Wrong incentive structures and insufficient tools to manage liquidity and solvency problems
  - ▶ Market discipline's effect is insufficient
  - ▶ No orderly sovereign default procedure
  - ▶ No lender of last resort

Supervision & Surveillance

- ▶ Financial market supervision and regulation
- ▶ Fiscal policy surveillance and co-ordination
  - ▶ Loss of credibility of Stability and Growth Pact
  - ▶ Unsustainable fiscal positions, lack of commitment to mid-term consolidation
- ▶ Economic policy surveillance and co-ordination
  - ▶ Too little action against divergences in competitiveness and current account balances, impact of crisis has been aggravated
  - ▶ Underlying structural problem remain resolved

Legitimacy

- ▶ Problems of acceptability
  - ▶ Of interference with „domestic affairs“
  - ▶ Of policy outcome on EMU aggregate level

- ▶ Incomplete institutional and regulatory framework only moderately reformed since Maastricht (reforms include Stability and Growth Pact, creation Eurogroup incl. President, first Eurozone summit)
- ▶ Underdeveloped perception of EMU reality (as “sitting in one boat”)
- ▶ National policy makers naturally have other incentives than being “good EMU governors” (moral hazard problems) – even if a cooperative game would be a win-win situation for every EMU member
- ▶ Role of supranational actors in pushing EMU logic: potential not fully used or insufficient formal competencies

## EU level developments

- ▶ A window of opportunity: The crisis and 'Greece' correlate with the EU2020 and EU budget debate
- ▶ Focus on risk management/prevention, low ambition to improve joint economic policy making
- ▶ Increased interest of the European Council in economic/fiscal policy issues. But this may weaken attention paid to EMU-specific problems

## Governments

- ▶ Reluctance to accept policy interference from EU level (cp. positions on EU2020/Financial Market Supervision). Little appetite for truly strengthened policy coordination even if EMU underperforms as a whole
- ▶ Risk that previous assumptions on necessary solidarity and cohesion in the E(M)U are revised to the bottom

- ▶ Competitive pressure / need for real devaluation may cause political backlash in some countries
- ▶ Political fragmentation / rising populism may weaken governments' appetite for long-term integration projects
- ▶ Constitutional limits to further integration (Germany)
- ▶ Concerns about public opinion
  - ▶ High unemployment/low growth rates historically correlate with a decline of support for European integration. With real economic effects further hitting in 2010, support is likely to fall.
  - ▶ Meanwhile data shows rising expectations of the citizens towards the EU's problem-solving capacity in economic and social policy → increased risk of frustration with the EU and national politics
  - ▶ Rising importance of active communication / opinion leadership on benefits of EU and Euro

- ▶ Strengthen policy surveillance and coordination
  - ▶ Improve SGP to ensure a return to sustainable public finances
  - ▶ Regular reviews with recommendations to cope with current account imbalances
  - ▶ Involve national stakeholders more strongly (e.g. nat. Parliaments)
- ▶ In parallel to emergency aid for Greece: create EMF, default procedure and EMU exit option for coming cases
- ▶ Develop EMU institutionally within EU (Eurozone summit, Eurogroup for other Council formations, ext. represent.)
- ▶ Treat EU2020 and the EU budget in a coherent approach
- ▶ Publicly address policy divergence between the larger EMU countries in particular France and Germany

- ▶ Beyond crisis management: Further improve macro-economic governance (e.g. €-macro-economic dialogue)
- ▶ Introduce tools for macro-economic stabilisation in order to support convergence
  - ▶ Income side of the EU budget: an EU corporate tax would react counter-cyclically
  - ▶ Expenditure side: Exclude pro-cyclical effects of EU programmes and in the long-term introduce a stabilising function
- ▶ Tackle legitimacy and accountability problems that arise in the EMU
  - ▶ Overcome the situation in which voters' preferences hardly influence the direction taken in economic policy-making
  - ▶ Give the EMU economic governance that is accountable for its (in-)actions