

Who will pay the bill in Sicily?

by [Augusto Hasman](#) and Maurizio Iacopetta

Rumors of a Sicily's possible default are in the air again. The employees of the Sicilian parliament did not receive their checks at the end of September. Another possible default of Sicily made already the international headlines in July (see the [New York Times 22/07/12](#)) due to the contagion effects it could have had on other regions. But in that occasion, the central Italian government prevented Sicily's default by providing an immediate injection of liquidity in the order of 400 million euros.

Other Italian regions are in trouble. In recent months the provision of basic health care services has deteriorated; regions are renegotiating contracts with their creditors to obtain deadline extensions. The [figures](#) reported by Pierre de Gasquet in *Les Echos* of 02/10/2012, give a good idea of the deterioration of the Italian regional public finance over the last decade.

It will take a good deal of imagination for regional governments to come out of the impending budget crisis, not only in Italy but also in other European countries that have difficulties in managing their public debts, such as Spain, Ireland and Greece.

In recent weeks we learned that some local politicians are endowed with a good deal of creativeness, but they hardly use it to find a solution to the budget crises. The governor of the region Lazio –where Rome is located – resigned a few days ago in the midst of a political scandal due to revelations that members of the regional parliament funneled electoral

funds to pay extravagant personal expenses, including car upgrades and luxury vacations.

Why don't regional governments issue their own money to finance public expenditures? It may seem absurd that now that European countries have finally accepted a common currency, regional and possibly local governments might be tempted to create some sort of fiat money. But historically it would not be the first time that local monies emerge when the central government has its hands tight.

Argentina in the early 1990s (convertibility law n° 23.928, 27/03/1991) pegged the currency on a one-to-one basis with the U.S. dollar (See Anne-Laure Delatte's [article](#) on this blog for a parallel between the Argentinean events and hypothetical scenarios for Greece.). For most of the decade, things seemed to be working well; the economy was growing at the impressive annual rate of almost 5.7%, notwithstanding (or perhaps thanks to) the fact that Argentina, in practice, gave up the monetary policy instrument. But by 1998, the load of public debt started to become unbearable. Financing it by printing money was out of question. The IMF was called for help to prevent the panic of Argentinean savers. It granted a loan of 40 thousands million dollars but it also asked the government to impose a severe austerity plan, which had, among many effects, that of depriving provinces under financial difficulties from the prospect of being rescued by the central government.

It was at this point, in 2001, that a number of provinces began to print their own money in order to pay wages and current expenses. (Krugman's open editorial of ten years ago at the New York Times – [Crying with Argentina](#), 01.01. 2002 – gives a fresh reading on the unfolding of the events). Fifteen out of twenty-two provinces ended up using newly issued interest-bearing notes, which earned the name of 'quasi-money'. At the beginning, thanks to an agreement between provinces and large stores, quasi-money had a high level of acceptability. Indeed, competition led more and more stores to

accept the quasi-money. Local trade seemed to resuscitate. In August 2002, 5 thousands million pesos of quasi-money circulated side-by-side with 12 thousands million of (real) Argentinean pesos.

Interesting, although the case of Argentina seems very surprising, the academic literature has always been puzzled of why it does not happen more often. The question is why government non-interest bearing banknotes circulate side-by-side with government bonds that promise an interest. In principle the phenomenon defies an elementary no-arbitrage principle.

One of the first to pose the puzzle was Hicks in 1935 in a famous article by the title of 'A suggestion for simplifying the theory of money'. An answer to Hicks' puzzle was offered by [Bryant and Wallace](#) (1980). Their argument is based on observation that private banks are not allowed to slice large denomination government bonds in small denomination banknotes. If banks could issue their own small denomination notes that are fully backed by large denomination government bonds, then, competition among banks would presumably drive the return on private banknotes in line with the return on bonds. If interest rates on bonds are positive, the argument goes, the demand for non-interest bearing money should then fall to zero. For Bryant and Wallace only the legal restriction on intermediation would prevent this from happening.

But Makinen and Woodward (1986) report that, during the period from 1915 to 1927, French government treasury bonds circulated at a relatively small denomination of 100 Francs (roughly 50-60 euros of today). The bonds were issued with terms of 1 month, 3 months, 6 months, and 1 year. These bonds were continuously available to all banks (including branches of the Bank of France), post offices, and numerous local offices of the Finance Ministry. This historical episode casts some doubts on the legal hypothesis, for the Bank of France kept issuing Francs.

Why then in Argentina bonds emerged as money – albeit for a limited period? It seems to us that the key was the promise offered by the issuer to accept the regional bonds in settling a debt – typically a tax obligation. The rules on what the regions can and cannot do in Europe are different from country to country. In Italy for instance regions, provinces, and municipalities have been authorized to issue bonds by the law of ‘rationalization of public finance’, introduced in the first half of the 1990s (art. 32 of the law of 8.6.1990 n.142, for municipalities and provinces, and art.35, law 23.12.1994 n. 724). The law set several conditions for an administration to qualify to issue bonds. First, bonds can be issued only to finance investment projects. The law explicitly forbids the issue of bonds to finance current expenditures. Second, the issuer has to demonstrate a good history of balanced budgets. Third, the maturity of the bonds cannot be shorter than five years. Fourth, the bonds cannot go in direct competition with the central government bonds, namely cannot be offered a real return above the one offered by the central government for bonds with similar maturities. Fifth, the central government is not allowed to back-up bonds of the regions who, in turn, cannot take responsibility for the bonds issued by provinces or municipalities

Is it desirable to relax these conditions? Perhaps it is useful to see the end of the story in Argentina –not particularly that of a Hollywood movie. The acceptability of quasi-money outside the region that issued it was very low. More importantly, the central government did not allow tax payers to use quasi-money for their federal taxes. Consequently, in a few months the de-facto exchange rate between the quasi-money and the national currency dropped from 1 to around 0.7 – it was somewhat higher for Buenos Aires quasi-money, for this was accepted in many other provinces.

At the beginning of 2002, a new government, presided by Eduardo Duhalde, decided to abandon the convertibility law.

As a result, the exchange rate of the pesos vis-à-vis the U.S. dollar dropped from one to four. During that year, the GDP declined 10.9%.

Having gained the power of printing money again, the central government allowed quasi-monies holders to convert them into the devalued national peso. The short run benefits evaporated soon. The recession along with the depreciation slashed the purchasing power of the working class. At the end of the crisis, the national product was about a quarter lower than its 1998 level, and the rate of unemployment shot up to 24%. It appears that issuing of local money delayed the collapse of the financial system, but it is unclear whether the temporary breath gained by local administrators that issued bonds made the subsequent recession less severe. The case of Argentina suggests, nevertheless, that a major relaxation of the current constraints of regional and municipal entities is not going to help solve how to guarantee the provision of health care service in the long run. Nonetheless, the current policy of cutting basic public services indiscriminately is the least imaginative of the solutions. Alesina and Giavazzi in an [open editorial](#) published on Corriere della Sera on Sept 27, suggested that hospitals could charge health care users directly instead of being reimbursed by the regional authorities. By doing so, they argued, not only the quality of the service would improve, but regions would need fewer resources. Although this is food for thought, in the U.S. such a system generated a colossal profit making machine that contributed to the explosion of the health care costs. Similarly, Fitoussi and Saraceno (2008) argue that the spectacular gain in income of the last three decades in China did not go hand-in-hand with similar gains in life expectancy and quality of health care, because the government opted for a health care system based on out-of-pocket expenses.

The Argentinean experience tells us that local administrators in distressed regions of Europe are going to lobby the

government to give more freedom in managing their budget intertemporally – something that is already happening in Spain, and is summarized in the London School of Economics [blog by K. Basta](#) . They are also probably going to make more intensive use of ‘creative accounting’, so as to prolong their serving time in office. But this will not be the solution. A major reassessment of the national government’s priorities in combination with a sensible monetary policy at the European level is the only way out. We badly need to free up resources to revitalize the public educational system and to maintain the overall good standard of public health care services.

References:

Alesina, A. and Giavazzi, F. “C’era una volta lo stato sociale”,

<http://www.pierferdinandocasini.it/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/Cera-una-volta-lo-Stato-sociale.-Alberto-Alesina-Francesco-Giavazzi-Corriere-della-Sera.pdf>

Basta, K., “Reducing Catalonia’s autonomy as a reaction to the fiscal crisis would only provide more fuel for secession-minded nationalists”

<http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/europpblog/2012/09/26/catalonia-autonomy-karlo-basta/>

[Bryant, J. and Wallace](#), N., 1980. “A Suggestion for Further Simplifying the Theory of Money”, Federal Reserve Bank Research Staff Report n. 62.

Delatte, A. L., “[Quels sont les risques du retour à la drachme encourus par les Grecs ?](#)”

<http://www.ofce.sciences-po.fr/blog/?p=2032>

Donadio, R. “Sicily’s Fiscal Problems Threaten to Swamp Italy”,

http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/23/world/europe/sicilys-fiscal-problems-threaten-to-swamp-italy.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0

Fitoussi, J. P. and Saraceno, F., 2008, "[The Intergenerational Content of Social Spending: Health Care and Sustainable Growth in China](#)", [Documents de Travail de l'OFCE](#) 2008-27, Observatoire Francais des Conjonctures Economiques (OFCE).

Pierre de Gusquet, "Alerte rouge sur la crise des finances régionales en Italie", Les Echos, 02/10/2010.

Hicks, J. 1935, "A Suggestion for Simplifying the Theory of Money", *Economica*, New Series, Vol. 2, No. 5, pp. 1-19.

Krugman, P., "[Crying with Argentina](#)", <http://www.nytimes.com/2002/01/01/opinion/crying-with-argentina.html>

Makinen, G. E. and Woodward, G. T., 1986. « Some Anecdotal Evidence Relating to the Legal Restrictions Theory of the Demand for Money", [Journal of Political Economy](#), vol. 94, issue 2, pages 260-65.

What risks face the Greeks if they return to the drachma?

By Anne-Laure Delatte (associate researcher of the Forecasting Department)

The debate about whether the Greeks will stay in the euro zone is intensifying. Christine Lagarde, head of the IMF, has lambasted the Greek government. The German Finance Minister, Wolfgang Schäuble, believes that the euro zone can now deal with a Greek exit, and that the Greeks no longer have a choice. What would be the risks for the Greeks of a return to

the drachma? Would this inevitably plunge the country into chaos? Argentina's experience with returning to the peso in 2002 provides some insight.

In Argentina, the peso/dollar parity was set at one peso per dollar by law in 1991. The dollar could be used freely in domestic exchange. The result was that dollars began to be used for everyday transactions, including the denomination of financial assets. In practice, in the 1990s, on average more than 70% of bank deposits and two-thirds of private sector lending were denominated in dollars. These figures peaked in the last quarter of 2001, just before the system was abandoned, when 75% of private deposits and 80% of all loans were denominated in dollars.

The average Argentinean's strong commitment to the dollar was propped up during the 1990s by the promises of all the presidential candidates to continue the system. Moreover, the abandon of the dollar in January 2002 took place in an especially dramatic context, after five presidents in a row had resigned and amidst a period of popular revolt that was felt beyond the country's borders. The peso was devalued by more than 70% against the dollar, and a massive amount of domestic savings fled the country into foreign banks. While the barter economy remained marginal, the provinces and the central State began to issue their own currency to pay civil servants and government suppliers. According to the country's central bank, in 2002 these parallel currencies accounted for an average of 30% of all bills in circulation.

The context in which Argentina returned to its national currency in 2002 therefore bears some resemblance to the current situation in Greece: widespread political confusion, a serious recession, and above all a national currency with no credibility.

Against all expectations, despite the serious crisis, the social and political disorder and monetary disintegration,

which led to predictions that it would take 10 years for Argentina's GDP to return to its pre-crisis level, an economic recovery began to take hold by the second half of 2002. With nominal annual growth of 9% and controlled inflation, Argentina ultimately restored its pre-crisis level by 2004. How did the country manage to leave the dollar with such results?

The default on 90 billion dollars in public debt, followed by a fiscal pact between the provinces and the central State, along with budget controls, led to a recovery in public finances. But the unique feature of Argentina's experience was the monetary reform carried out in January 2002.

The devaluation of the peso rocked the country's financial equilibrium. With 80% of lending contracted in dollars, most consumers and businesses saw the value of their debt virtually quadrupled! After the devaluation, in 2002 the amount of private debt came to 120 billion dollars, whereas the country's GDP was only 106 billion dollars. To avoid bankrupting the entire private sector, the national authorities came up with a rule for the reimbursement of debt.

The logic was that, to avoid bankruptcy, business revenue should be denominated in the same currency as the debt. Hence on 4 February 2002, the government issued decree 214/02, which imposed the "peso-fication" of the entire economy: all prices and all contracts in the real and financial sectors, all salaries and debts, were converted into pesos at a rate of one peso per dollar, whereas the market rate was almost four pesos per dollar. Contracts in the financial sector were also converted: deposits that did not exceed thirty-thousand dollars were converted at a rate of 1.4 pesos for 1 dollar [1]. How could such a rule be imposed in light of the disastrous wealth effects on creditors?

The conversion at a rate of one for one (or 1.4 for 1) imposed by the authorities resulted in a settlement of conflicts over

debt in favour of debtors, and to the detriment of national and foreign creditors. However, the main debtor in the economy is the productive sector, that is, businesses. By offering them a protected way out of the crisis, the new monetary rules neutralized balance sheet effects and permitted the devaluation to have the expansionary impact one would conventionally expect. In effect, trade began to run a surplus and the country's economy was able to benefit from the booming global economy in the early 2000s. Exports rose from 10% to 25% of GDP, and by 2004 GDP was 2% higher than the average for the 1990s. In short, the government's monetary rule led to a return to growth and employment, which explains why it won the support of the majority of the population.

In actuality, the Argentines, like the Greeks today, were caught in a trap: with contracts denominated in dollars, the return to the peso, following the devaluation, was leading towards a generalized bankruptcy of the private sector. If the Greeks were to leave the euro right now, the entire country would go bankrupt. If the drachma were devalued by 50%, as certain forecasts currently predict, private debt would double. With revenue denominated in drachmas and debt in euros, businesses and consumers would be incapable of repaying their lenders. This was the same kind of trap that paralyzed Argentina's leaders before 2002.

Argentina's experience thus provides several lessons. First, the main risk for Greece of leaving the euro is that the entire private sector would go bankrupt. Given that the public sector has already restructured 50% of its debt, all else being equal, a return to the drachma would lead to financial conflicts between private creditors and debtors that would paralyze the entire system of payments. Secondly, the State has to play a key role as arbitrator in order to resolve the crisis. In conditions like these, the nature of the rules adopted is not neutral. A number of solutions exist, and these reflect different policy orientations and have different

economic consequences. In Argentina, the decision to favour national debtors ran counter to the interests of the holders of capital and foreign investors. Furthermore, contrary to the assertions of Wolfgang Schäuble, the Greek government does have choices. This is the third lesson. The resolution of the Greek crisis is not simply an economic matter, and the options being offered to the Greek people involve political choices. The choice made will have a more favourable result for some economic groups (such as European creditors, Greek employees, holders of capital, etc.).

Depending on the nature of the political order, the State could seek to maintain the existing balance of forces, or, on the contrary, disrupt them. A reform could lead to a rupture, and provide an opportunity to establish a new balance of forces. The option pursued up to now has consisted of spreading the cost of resolving the Greek crisis over creditors, on the one hand, by restructuring the public debt, and over debtors, on the other hand, by means of structural efforts (cuts in wages \and social transfers), along with an increase in the tax burden. In contrast, a withdrawal from the euro zone accompanied by an Argentina-style restructuring of private and public debt would place the burden of the crisis resolution more on the shoulders of creditors, mainly the rest of Europe. This explains the renewed pressure seen in the discourse of some European creditor countries with respect to Greece, as well as the confusion that typifies the debate in Europe today: in the absence of an optimal solution with a neutral impact, each party is defending its own interests – at the risk of destroying the euro.

[1] Deposits of greater amounts could be either converted under the same conditions or transformed into dollar-denominated Treasury bonds.