Is Greece in the process of divorce?

By Jérôme Creel

The ongoing Greek saga is looking more and more like an old American TV series. JR Ewing returns to the family table feeling upset with Sue Ellen for her failure to keep her promise to stop drinking. Given the way things are going, a divorce seems inevitable, especially if Bobby sides with his brother and refuses to help his sister-in-law any longer.

Just like in Dallas, addiction to a potentially toxic substance, public debt, is plaguing Europe's states and institutions. Analyses on Greece focus mainly on debt-to-GDP ratios. On these terms, Greece's public debt-to-GDP ratio rose from 2011 to 2014: European public opinion can therefore legitimately question the ability of the Greek people (really the Greek state) to curb spending and raise taxes. A divorce is inevitable. But if we look at the amounts involved, the situation seems somewhat different.

Between 2011 and 2014, Greece's public debt decreased by 39 billion euros according to Eurostat. Seen in this light, the Greek state is making a real effort. But this obscures the aid of the creditors. The Greek state has in fact benefited from the restructuring of its debt, including a partial but important default on its public debt to its private creditors. According to Jeromin Zettelmeyer, Christoph Trebesch and Mitu Gulati, the amount of debt for which the Greek state was forgiven was on the order of 100 billion euros. Without this aid, the amount of Greece's debt would have increased between 2011 and 2014 by 61 billion euros (100 billion minus the aforementioned 39 billion). This is not nothing for a country like Greece. However, note that Greek debt accounts for only 3.5% of the euro zone's total public debt.

Furthermore, how were the other EU countries faring at the same time? No better! The addiction to public debt, if we can indeed speak of addiction, is general. The public debt of the EU and the euro zone rose by 6 GDP points, or by 1400 billion and 800 billion respectively. By comparison, the increase in the Greek debt is a drop in the ocean. Germany's public debt rose by 68 billion euros, Italy's by 227 billion, Spain's and France's by 285 billion respectively, and the United Kingdom's by 277 billion pounds, or 470 billion euros, again according to Eurostat. Relative to their respective GDPs, Spain's debt increased by almost 30 points, Italy's by more than 15 points, France's by 10 points, and the UK's by nearly 8 points. Only Germany has seen its debt ratio go down, thanks to stronger economic growth.

Paul de Grauwe recently insisted on the fact that Greece's debt is sustainable: given the various debt restructurings already undertaken, the public debt-to-GDP ratio of 180% would be roughly 90% in present value, i.e. after having accounted for future interest payments and scheduled repayments, some of which are in a very distant future[1].

Economists, including in this case Paul de Grauwe, use the state's intertemporal budget constraint to understand the sustainability of public debt. Rather than using a retrospective approach, the public debt can be analysed from a prospective approach. If the following year's debt depends on the present debt, then by symmetry, the present debt depends on the following year's debt. But next year's debt will depend on the following year's debt, by iteration. Ultimately, the present debt depends on the debt of the following year and on and on until the end of time: it depends on future debts. But these future debts also depend on future public deficits. The intertemporal budget constraint thus expresses the fact that today's public debt is equal to the sequence of future public deficits and to the final debt (that at the end of time), all expressed in present values.

In contrast to businesses and households, the state is supposed to have an infinite time horizon, which makes it possible to reset the present value of the debt at the "end of time" to zero. We can then say that the public debt is sustainable if future governments provide adequate public surpluses to pay off that debt. This is possible after periods of high public deficits, provided that these periods are followed by others during which governments accumulate budget surpluses. Given the extension of the maturity of Greek debt and the low level of future interest payments, the budget surplus required to repay the current debt is low. Paul de Grauwe concludes that Greece is subject to a liquidity crisis rather than a sovereign default crisis. So, again according to Paul de Grauwe, what is needed is to adjust the fiscal austerity plans and forthcoming reforms to the actual level of the public debt, which is substantially lower than the level being used as the basis for negotiations between the Greek state and the "institutions" (ECB, Commission, IMF). In other words, the "institutions" can loosen their grip.

The "Greek case" can thus be relativized and the divorce put off. Sue Ellen's addiction is less exceptional than it seems at first glance.

---

[1] After 2015 and 2019, which will involve substantial repayments from the Greek state, the "difficult" years will then be situated beyond 2035 (see the amortization profile of Greece's debt in Antonin *et al.*, 2015).

Greece: an agreement, again and again

By Céline Antonin, Raul Sampognaro, Xavier Timbeau, Sébastien Villemot

… La même nuit que la nuit d'avant […The same night as the night before
Les mêmes endroits deux fois trop grands The same places, twice too big
T'avances comme dans des couloirs You walk through the corridors
Tu t'arranges pour éviter les miroirs You try to avoid the mirrors
Mais ça continue encore et encore … But it just goes on and on…]

Francis Cabrel, Encore et encore, 1985.

Just hours before an exceptional EU summit on Greece, an agreement could be signed that would lead to a deal on the second bail-out package for Greece, releasing the final tranche of 7.2 billion euros. Greece could then meet its deadlines in late June with the IMF (1.6 billion euros) as well as those in July and August with the ECB (6.6 billion euros) and again with the IMF (0.45 billion euros). At the end of August, Greece's debt to the IMF could rise by almost 1.5 billion euros, as the IMF is contributing 3.5 billion euros to the 7.2 billion euro tranche.

Greece has to repay a total of 8.6 billion euros by September, and nearly 12 billion by the end of the year, which means funding needs that exceed the 7.2 billion euros covered by the negotiations with the Brussels Group (i.e. the ex-Troika). To deal with this, the Hellenic Financial Stability Fund (HFSF) could be used, to the tune of about 10 billion euros, but it will no longer be available for recapitalizing the banks.

If an agreement is reached, it will almost certainly be difficult to stick to it. First, Greece will have to face the current bank run (despite the apparent calm in front of the bank branches, more than 6 billion euros were withdrawn last week according to the *Financial Times*). Moreover, even if an agreement can put off for a time the scenario of a Greek exit from the euro zone, the prospect of exceptional taxes or a tax reform could deter the return of funds to the country's banks. Furthermore, the agreement is likely to include a primary surplus of 1% of GDP by the end of 2015. But the information on the execution of the state budget up to May 2015 (published 18 June 2015) showed that revenue continues to be below the initial forecast (- 1 billion euros), reflecting the country's very poor economic situation since the start of 2015. It is true that the lower tax revenues were more than offset by lower spending (down almost 2 billion). But this is cash basis accounting. The monthly bulletin for April 2015, published on 8 June 2015, shows that the central government payment arrears have increased by 1.1 billion euros since the beginning of 2015. It seems impossible that, even with an excellent tourist season, the Greek government could make up this lag in six months and generate a primary surplus of 1.8 billion euros calculated on an accrual basis.

A new round of fiscal tightening would penalize activity that is already at half-mast, and it could be even more inefficient in that this would create strong incentives to underreport taxes in a context where access to liquidity will be particularly difficult. The Greek government could try to play with tax collection, but introducing a new austerity plan would be suicidal politically and economically. Discussion needs to get started on a third aid package, including in particular negotiations on the reduction of Greece's debt and with the counterparties to this relief.

Any agreement reached in the coming days risks being very fragile. Reviving some growth in Greece would require that financing for the economy is functioning once again, and that some confidence was restored. It would also require addressing Greece's problems in depth and finding an agreement that was sustainable over several years, with short-term steps that need to be adapted to the country's current situation. In our study, "Greece on the tightrope [in French, or the English-language post describing the study at http://www.ofce.sciences-po.fr/blog/greece-tightrope/]," we analysed the macroeconomic conditions for the sustainability of the Greek debt. More than ever before, Greece is on the tightrope. And the euro zone with it.

The spirit of the letter of the law … to avoid a "Graccident"

Raul Sampognaro and Xavier Timbeau

The noose, in the words of Alexis Tsipras, is getting tighter and tighter around the Greek government. The last tranche of the aid program (7.2 billion euros) has still not been released as the Brussels Group (the ex-Troika) has not accepted the conditions on the aid plan. The Greek state is therefore on the brink of default. It might be thought that this is simply one more episode in the drama that Greece has been acting out with its creditors and that, once again, at the last moment the money needed will be found. But if Greece has managed to meet its deadlines up to now, it has been at the price of expedients that it is not at all certain can be used again.

While tax revenues since the start of the year have been almost one billion euros behind the anticipated targets, the expenses for wages and pensions still have to be paid each month. This time the wall is getting closer, and an agreement is needed if the game is to continue. In June, Greece must pay 1.6 billion euros to the IMF in four tranches (5, 12, 16 and 19 June). On 28 May an IMF spokesperson confirmed the existence of a rule that would make it possible to group these payments on the last day of the month (a rule last used by Zambia in the 1980s). Since it would then take six weeks for the IMF to consider Greece in default, the country could still gain a few days after 30 June before the deadline with the ECB (with 2 tranches for a total 3.5 billion euros by 20 July 2015).

Historically very few countries have failed to honour their payments to the IMF (currently only Somalia, Sudan and Zimbabwe are in arrears to the IMF, for a few hundred million dollars). As the IMF is the last resort in case of a crisis in liquidity or the balance of payments, it has, as such, the status of preferred creditor, so defaulting on its debt may trigger cross defaults on other securities, in particular, in the Greek case, those held by the European Financial Stability Facility (EFSF). This could make them due immediately. A Greek default with the IMF could well jeopardize Greece's entire public debt and force the ECB to reject Greek bonds as collateral in the Emergency Liquidity Assistance (ELA) operations, the only firewall remaining against the collapse of the Greek banking system.

The legal consequences of such a default are difficult to grasp (which says a lot about the modern financial system). An article published by the Bank for International Settlements, dated July 2013, whose author, Antonio Sainz de Vicuña, was then Director General of ECB Legal Services, is very informative about this issue in the context of the Monetary

Union.

In presenting the legal framework, Sainz de Vicuña focuses on Article 123 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), a pillar of the Monetary Union, which prohibits the ECB or the national central banks from financing government[1]. In a footnote, the author concedes that there are two exceptions to this rule:

– “Credit institutions controlled by the public sector, which may obtain central bank liquidity on terms identical to private credit institutions.” This exception appears explicitly in paragraph 2 of Article 123 of the TFEU[2].

– “The financing of state obligations vis-à-vis the IMF.”

This second aspect has attracted our attention because it is little known to the general public, it does not appear explicitly in the Treaty and it could be a solution, at least in the short term, to avoid Greece being put in default by the IMF .

In searching the corpus of European law, this exception is defined more precisely in Council Regulation no. 3603/93, which clarifies the terms of Article 123 of the TFEU, which it is authorized to do under paragraph 2 of Article 125 of the TFEU[3]. More specifically, in Article 7:

The financing by the European Central Bank or the national central banks of obligations falling upon the public sector vis-à-vis the International Monetary Fund or resulting from the implementation of the medium-term financial assistance facility set up by Regulation (EEC) No 1969/88 (4) shall not be regarded as a credit facility within the meaning of Article 104 of the Treaty[4].

The justification for this article is that: during quota increases in the IMF, the financing by the central bank was accepted because It had as a counterpart an asset comparable to international reserves. In the spirit of the law, financing Greek borrowing from the IMF by a credit from the central bank (the ECB or the Bank of Greece) should not be permitted. The obligations falling upon the Greek state probably only concern, according to the spirit of the text, the contribution to the IMF quotas. Nevertheless, the spirit of the law is not the law, and the proper interpretation of the phrase "obligations falling upon the public sector *vis-à-vis* the International Monetary Fund" could open another door for Greece. Given the consequences of a default with the IMF – in particular the continuity of the ELA – invoking this could be justified as preserving the functioning of the Greek payment system, a role falling within the mission of the ECB.

Beyond the legal possibility of a central bank financing Greece's debt to the IMF, which would certainly be challenged by some governments, this action would open up a political conflict. A MemberState could be accused of violating (the spirit of) the Treaties, even though that is not a reason to exclude it (according to the ECB's Legal Services). But is this really an obstacle in view of the importance a default on Greece's debt would have for the sustainability of the single currency?

Greece's cash flow problems are not new. Since January, the government has been financing its expenditure through accounting transactions that allowed it to offset tax losses. In particular, on 12 May, the Greek government was able to repay an IMF loan tranche by drawing on an emergency fund that was essentially international reserves. The Eurosystem was able to use this exception to give Greece extra time in order to continue the negotiations and avoid the accident.

---

[1] Paragraph 1 of the article stipulates that, "Overdraft

facilities or any other type of credit facility with the European Central Bank or with the central banks of the Member States (hereinafter referred to as "national central banks") in favour of Union institutions, bodies, offices or agencies, central governments, regional, local or other public authorities, other bodies governed by public law, or public undertakings of Member States shall be prohibited, as shall the purchase directly from them by the European Central Bank or national central banks of debt instruments."

[2] Which stipulates that, "Paragraph 1 shall not apply to publicly owned credit institutions which, in the context of the supply of reserves by central banks, shall be given the same treatment by national central banks and the European Central Bank as private credit institutions."

[3] Which stipulates that, "The Council, on a proposal from the Commission and after consulting the European Parliament, may, as required, specify definitions for the application of the prohibitions referred to in Articles 123 and 124 and in this Article."

[4] Article 104 became Article 123 in the TFEU.

Greece on a tightrope

By Céline Antonin, Raul Sampognaro, Xavier Timbeau and Sébastien Villemot

This text summarizes the special study, "Greece on a tightrope"

Since early 2015, Greece's new government has been facing intense pressure. At the very time that it is negotiating to restructure its debt, it is also facing a series of repayment deadlines. On 12 May 2015, 750 million euros was paid to the IMF by drawing on the country's international reserves, a sign that liquidity constraints are becoming more and more pressing, as is evidenced by the letter sent by Alex Tsipras to Christine Lagarde a few days before the deadline. The respite will be short: in June, the country has to make another payment to the IMF for 1.5 billion euros. These first two deadlines are only a prelude to the "wall of debt" that the government must deal with in the summer when it faces repayments of 6.5 billion euros to the ECB.

Up to now, Greece has made its payments despite its difficulties and the suspension of the bailout program negotiated with the "ex-Troika". Thus, 7.2 billion euros in remaining disbursements have been blocked since February 2015; Greece has to come to an agreement with the former Troika before June 30 if it is to benefit from this financial windfall, otherwise it will fail to meet its payment deadlines to the ECB and IMF and thus default.

Besides Greece's external repayments, the country must also meet its current expenses (civil servant salaries, retirement pensions). But the news on the fiscal front is not very encouraging (see State Budget Execution Monthly Bulletin, March 2015): for the first three months of the year, current revenue was nearly 600 million euros below projections. Only the use of its European holding funds, combined with an accounting reduction in expenditures (1.5 billion euros less than forecast) allowed the Greek government to generate a surplus of 1.7 billion euros and to meet its deadlines. So by using bookkeeping operations, the Greek government was able to transfer its debt either to public bodies or to its providers, thus confirming the tight liquidity constraints facing the State. Preliminary data at the end of April (to be taken with caution because they are neither definitive nor consolidated for all government departments) seem nevertheless to qualify this observation. At end April, tax revenues had returned to their expected level; however, the government's ability to generate cash to avoid a payment default is due to its holding down public spending through the accounting operations described above. These accounting manipulations are simply emergency measures, and it is high time, six years after the onset of the Greek crisis, to put an end to this psychodrama and finally find a lasting solution to Greece's fiscal difficulties.

Our study, "Greece on a tightrope", considers what would be the best way to resolve the Greek debt crisis over the long term and the potential consequences of a Greek exit from the euro zone. We conclude that the most reasonable scenario would be to restructure the country's debt, with a significant reduction in its present value (cutting it to 100% of Greek GDP). This is the only way to significantly reduce the likelihood of a Grexit, and is in the interest not only of Greece but also of the euro zone as a whole. Furthermore, this scenario would reduce the scale of the internal devaluation needed to stabilize Greece's external position.

If the Eurogroup were to refuse to restructure Greece's debt, a new assistance program would then be needed in order to deal with the current crisis of confidence and to ensure funding for the cash needs of the Greek State over the coming years. According to our calculations, this solution would require a third bailout plan of around 95 billion euros, and its success would depend on Greece being able to generate major primary budget surpluses (of around 4% to 5% of Greek GDP) over the coming decades. Historical experience shows that, due to political constraints, there is no guarantee of being able to run a surplus of this magnitude for such a long time, so this commitment is not very credible. A new assistance program would not therefore eliminate the risk that the Greek State would face yet another financial crisis in the coming years.

In other words, the full repayment of the Greek debt is based on the fiction of running a budget surplus for several decades. Accepting a Greek exit from the euro zone would imply a significant loss of claims that the world (mainly Europe) holds both on the Greek public sector (250 billion euros) and on the private sector (also on the order of 250 billion). To this easily quantifiable loss would be added the financial, economic, political and geopolitical impact of Greece's departure from the euro zone and possibly the European Union. This might look like an easy choice, since writing off 200 billion euros in loans to the Greek State would make it possible to end this psychodrama for once and for all. But the political situation is deadlocked, and it is difficult to give up 200 billion euros without very strong counterparties and without dealing with the issue of moral hazard, in particular the possibility that this could induce other euro zone countries to demand large-scale restructurings of their own public debt.

The Greek debt – a European story …

By Catherine Mathieu and Henri Sterdyniak

At end 2014, Greece's debt was 317 billion euros, or 176% of its GDP, up from 103% in 2007, despite debt relief of 107 billion in 2012[1]. This debt is the result of a triple blindness, on the part of: the financial markets, which lent to Greece until 2009, heedless of the unsustainable level of its public deficit (6.7% of GDP in 2007) and its trade deficit

(10.4% of GDP in 2007); the Greek government and ruling elite who, thanks to the low interest rates permitted by its membership in the euro zone, allowed unbalanced growth, based on financial and real estate bubbles, corruption, poor governance, fraud and tax evasion; and Europe's institutions, which after the laxism of 2001-2007, imposed crushing, humiliating austerity programmes on the country, with the oversight of the troika, a strange threesome consisting of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the European Central Bank (ECB) and the European Commission (EC). In the eyes of the troika, the austerity programmes were needed to cut the public deficit and debt and put the Greek economy on a path to growth. While the programmes did indeed help to reduce the public deficit (which was only about 2.5% of GDP in 2014, i.e. after excluding interest expenses, a surplus of around 0.5% of GDP), they have pushed up the ratio of debt to GDP, due to the collapse in the country's GDP, which is now 25% less than in 2008. Austerity has above all plunged Greece into economic and social distress, as is sadly illustrated in an unemployment rate of over 25% and a poverty rate of 36%.

The tree of Greek debt must not, however, hide the forest: from 2007 to 2014, the public debt of the OECD countries as a whole increased from 73% of GDP to 112%, reflecting profound imbalances in the global economy. Due to financial globalization, the victory of capital over labour and growing inequality, the developed countries need large public debts; these debts are generally not reimbursable, since reimbursement assumes that agents with a surplus agree to run deficits.

Take the example of Germany. It wants to maintain a large external surplus (7% of GDP), which weighs down its European partners and has contributed to an excessively strong euro. In order for Greece and other European countries to repay their public debts, they need to be able to export, especially to Germany; Germany would in turn have to accept an external deficit and thus greatly increase public spending and wages, which it does not want to do. The contradictory demands of the surplus countries (to maintain a surplus but be repaid) are leading the entire euro zone into depression. Fortunately for the European economy, neither France nor Italy is adhering strictly to its European commitments, while the UK is not subject to them.

Can we require Greece to continue to meet its European commitments, which have led to a deep depression? To reduce its debt to 60% of GDP within 20 years? The effort needed to do this depends on the difference between the interest rate paid on debt (1.9% in 2014) and the nominal rate of GDP growth (-1.2% in 2014). Even if Greece managed to accelerate its growth so that the growth rate equalled the interest rate for its loans, it would still have to turn over 6% of its GDP every year; this drain would unbalance the economy and put the brakes on growth. The Greek people cannot be asked to make further economic and social sacrifices.

If Greece were an emerging country, the solution would be obvious: a strong devaluation and default on the debt. The euro zone, on the contrary, cannot be maintained without solidarity between its members and without a turnabout in its economic policies. Europe cannot ask Greece’s new government to maintain an austerity programme that has no prospects or to abandon its electoral programme and implement the failed policy negotiated by the previous government. A refusal to compromise would lead to the worst result: a showdown, a financial freeze on Greece, and then its withdrawal from the euro zone and perhaps the EU. The people would rightly feel that Europe is a straitjacket and that democratic votes don’t count. On the other hand, it will be difficult for the northern European countries and the Commission to give up their demands: tight control of national fiscal policies, a reduction in public debts and deficits, conditionalities on aid, privatization policies and structural reforms.

Syriza's programme includes the restoration of social welfare and the public services as well as a decent standard of living for retirees and employees, but also, very clearly, tax reform, the fight against corruption and bad governance, and the search for a new development model based on the renovation of production and re-industrialization, driven by the State and a restored banking sector, based on public and private investment. This is an ambitious path that presupposes a fight against greed and the inertia of the dominant classes by mobilizing the whole of society, but it is the only future with promise.

The only solution is a compromise that would open the door to a new policy in Europe. Let's distinguish the Greek question from the European question. Europe's institutions must agree to negotiate a restructuring of Greek debt. This 317 billion euro debt is now held as follows: 32 billion by the IMF, and 223 billion by the ECB, the European Financial Stability Facility, and the other Member States, i.e. 80% by public institutions. This enabled the private sector to shed Greek debt, but it has not helped the Greek economy. Greece already benefits from low interest rates and lengthy repayment deadlines [2]. Given the low level of current interest rates and the hunger of financial investors for the risk-free sovereign debt of most Member States, there is no reason for a default on Greek debt; it simply needs to be restructured and secured. We must avoid a situation where every year Greece is in the position of having to repay and refinance an excessive amount of debt, and thus finds itself at the mercy of the capital markets or new negotiations with the troika. Greece needs a long-term agreement based on mutual trust.

Europe should give the Greek people time for their economy to recover. Greece's debt needs to be made sustainable by converting it into very long-term secured debt, possibly confined within the European Stability Mechanism, so that it is sheltered from speculation. This debt could be financed by

Eurobonds with very low rates (0.5% at 10 years, or even slightly negative rates by issuing securities indexed to inflation). European taxpayers would thus not be saddled with the burden, and the Greek debt load would be acceptable. It is Greek economic growth that will make it possible to cut the ratio of debt to GDP. The reimbursement should be limited and, as proposed by Greece, depend on growth (e.g. be zero when the volume of growth is less than 2%, and then 0.25 GDP point per additional point of growth). The agreements with Greece should be reviewed to allow the new government to implement its programme for social and production renewal. Two key points must guide the negotiations: that responsibility for the situation is shared between Greece and Europe, that each must bear its share of the burden (the banks have already undergone a partial default); and that Greece must be helped to recover from its deep depression, which means support for consumption in the short term, and in the medium term stimulating and financing the country's productive renewal.

France should support Syriza's proposal for a European conference on debt, because the problem is not just Greek. The Greek experience merely exemplifies the structural problems with Europe's economic governance and the challenges facing all the Member States. This governance needs to be overhauled in order to overcome the economic, social and political crisis gripping the euro zone. The turning point represented by the Juncker Plan must be given resolute support (investment support of 315 billion euros in three years), as must the ECB's quantitative easing programme (1140 billion in 18 months).

The public debts of the euro zone countries must be guaranteed by the ECB and all the Member States. To absorb them, the ECB must keep long-term rates well below the rate of growth, which will require taxing financial activities and controlling the orientation of bank loans to prevent the rise of speculative bubbles. Instead of cutting public and social welfare spending, Europe must coordinate the fight against tax competition and tax evasion by the wealthy and by multinational firms. The unsustainable fiscal straitjacket imposed by the Stability Pact and the European fiscal treaty must be replaced by the coordination of economic policies aimed at full employment and resolving imbalances between euro zone countries. Finally, Europe must propose a strategy for recovery from the crisis based on boosting domestic demand in the surplus countries, coordinating wage policies, and supporting investments that prepare the ecological and social transition. The challenge here is crucial. We need to rethink the way economic policies are organized in Europe in order to allow countries to conduct policies that are different and autonomous, but coordinated. This is the only way the euro zone can survive and prosper.

---

[1] More than half of which was used by the Greek state to secure the country's banking system.

[2] Moreover, the ECB Member states are repaying it any gains that they make on Greek bonds.

The Greek Sisyphus and its

public debt: towards an end to the ordeal?

By Céline Antonin

After its failure to elect a new President by a qualified majority vote, the Greek Parliament was dissolved, with early elections to be held on 25 January 2015. The radical left party Syriza is leading the opinion polls on the election, ahead of the "New Democracy" party of the outgoing Prime Minister, Anthony Samaras. While Syriza's economic programme has met with enthusiasm from the population, it has aroused concern from the Troika of creditors (IMF, ECB and EU), particularly on three issues: the country's potential withdrawal from the euro zone, the implementation of a fiscal stimulus, and a partial sovereign default. This last topic will be the main issue after the elections.

The election's real stakes: restructuring Greece's public debt

Fears about Greece's potential exit from the euro zone (the infamous "Grexit") need to be nuanced. The situation is different from what it was at the time of the sovereign debt crisis, when bond rate differentials were fuelling worry about contagion and the breakup of the euro zone. Furthermore, Syriza is not in favour of leaving the euro, and no-one can force the country's hand, given that there is no provision for this in any text. Finally, the consequences of such a decision on the other members could be severe, so that a Greek withdrawal from the euro zone would come only as a last resort.

Syriza is calling for an end to austerity and for a fiscal stimulus of 11 billion euros along with restoring the minimum wage to its previous level, better pensions, rehiring civil servants and increased public spending. Can a compromise be reached with the Troika? Nothing is less sure, and it is virtually certain that Syriza will have to revise its ambitions downwards. The Greek deficit has of course shrunk. The country ran a small primary surplus in 2014 and is expected to continue its fiscal consolidation policy in 2015-2016. But Greece must continue to borrow to finance the interest on the debt, to repay or renew the debt reaching maturity and to repay the loans from the IMF. To do this, Greece must rely largely on external aid. From the second half of 2015, the country will face a financing gap of 12.5 billion euros (19.6 billion euros if it does not get IMF assistance). Moreover, Greece's still fragile banks[1] are very dependent on access to the ECB's Emergency Liquidity Assistance Program (ELA), which allows them to obtain emergency liquidity from the Bank of Greece. If Greece rejects the reforms, a showdown with the Troika is likely. The ECB has already threatened to cut off the country's access to liquidity. In addition, the Troika is the main creditor of Greece, which however has a new bargaining point: to the extent that Greece borrows only what it needs to repay its debt, and not to fund its budget deficit, it could threaten its creditors with a unilateral default on payments, even if this is a dangerous game that could deprive it of access to market financing for many years to come.

It is precisely this issue of restructuring Greece's debt and a partial default that is being emphasized by Syriza and which will likely be one of the main post-election issues. Alexis Tsipras wants to cancel a portion of the public debt, to put a moratorium on interest payments, and to condition repayments on the country's economic performance. According to forecasts by the EU Commission and the IMF, Greece's public debt ratio is expected to fall from 175% of GDP in 2013 to 128% in 2020. However, the assumptions underlying this scenario are not realistic, *i.e.* nominal growth of more than 3% in 2015, a primary surplus of 4.5% of GDP between 2016 and 2019, etc. Given the size of Greece's public debt in 2013 and its amortization profile (with reimbursements amounting to 13 billion euros in 2019 and up to 18 billion euros in 2039[2]), a new restructuring seems inevitable.

A public debt that is essentially held by euro zone countries

Since the onset of the Greek crisis in autumn 2009, the composition of the country's public debt has changed substantially. While in 2010, the debt was held by financial investors, the picture in early 2015 is very different [3]. After two assistance plans (in 2010 and 2012) and a restructuring of the public debt held by the private sector in March 2012 (Private Sector Involvement Plan), 75% of the public debt now consists of loans (**Table 1)**. Together the IMF, the ECB, the national central banks and the countries of the Eurozone hold 80% of Greece's public debt.

Table 1. Breakdown of Greece's public debt, by holder, september 2014

In billion euros

	September 2014	As % of total debt
Total	**321,7**	**100**
Debt securities	**79,8**	**25**
Commercial paper (Short-term)	13,4	4
Treasury bills (Long-term)	66,4	21
By ECB and national central banks	*25,0*	8
By private sector	*41,4*	13
Loans	**241,8**	**75**
IMF	32,1	10
Greek central bank + domestic loans	4,4	1
Euro zone countries	194,8	61
From 1st assistance plan (Greek Loan Facility)	*52,9*	*16*
From 2nd assistance plan (EFSF)	*141,9*	*44*
Other loans and repos	10,5	3

Sources: Debt Management Agency, IMF, ECFIN, author's calculations.

Conversely, since the March 2012 restructuring plan, Europe's banks have sharply reduced their exposure to Greece's public debt (**Table 2**). Moreover, their capital levels have risen since 2010, especially with the gradual implementation of the Basel 3 reform. The banks thus have a safety margin in the case of a partial default by Greece.

Table 2. Exposure of banks to Greek debt (public and total)

In billions of euros

	Total Greek debt (public + private)			Greek public debt		
	Q3 2009	Q1 2012	Q2 2014	Q4 2010	Q1 2012	Q2 2014
Total banks	430,5	105,6	73,8	62,9	9,0	3,5
European banks	389,2	99,1	47,8	60,2	8,3	2,2
France	*112,4*	*54,7*	*3,0*	*20,3*	*2,5*	*0,1*
Germany	*61,8*	*8,3*	*18,9*	*20,0*	*1,0*	*0,2*
United Kingdom	*17,9*	*11,1*	*18,1*	*4,6*	*0,3*	*0,8*
Non-European banks	NA	6,5	26,1	2,6	0,7	1,3
United States	*27,8*	*5,1*	*24,6*	*2,0*	*0,6*	*1,3*

Sources: BIS, ECB, author's calculations.

Since more than half of Greece's public debt is held by members of the euro zone, no renegotiations can take place without their involvement.

So what are the possibilities for restructuring the debt?

The European countries have already made several concessions to help Greece service its debt:

– The maturity of the loans has been increased and the interest rate on loans granted by the EFSF has been reduced. For the first assistance program (bilateral loans), the initial maturity was 2026 (with a grace period until 2019) and the interest rate was indexed to the 3-month Euribor plus a risk premium of 300 basis points. In 2012, this risk premium was cut to 50 basis points and the maturity was extended by 15 years to 2041;

– Any profits made by the ECB and the national central banks on the bonds they hold were returned to Greece;

– Interest payments on the EFSF loans were deferred by 10 years.

Solutions like some used in the past could be implemented. The debt could be rescheduled. Indeed, the rate charged on the loans in the first assistance package (3-month Euribor + 50 basis points) is generally higher than the financing costs of the European countries, and could be lowered. And the term of the loans in the first and second assistance packages could be extended by another 10 years, until 2051. According to the Bruegel think-tank, these two measures combined would reduce Greece's total repayments by 31.7 billion euros.

These measures nevertheless seem limited for resolving the issue of Greek debt: they only postpone the problem. Other measures are needed to relieve Greece of its public debt burden. As the euro zone countries are the main ones exposed to Greece's debt, they have an interest in finding a compromise: if there is a unilateral default, it is taxpayers throughout Europe who will wind up paying.

As for the IMF, there's no point waiting for debt forgiveness. The institution is indeed the senior creditor in case of a country's default, and lender of last resort. Since its founding, it has never cancelled a debt. It is therefore with the members of the euro zone, Greece's main creditors, that a partial default needs to be negotiated. On the one hand, Greece can threaten an uncoordinated unilateral default, causing losses for its creditors. But on the other, it has no interest in alienating euro zone members and the ECB, which have been its main supporters during the crisis. A sudden default would deprive it of access to market financing for many years; even if Greece has achieved a primary surplus, the situation is unstable and it still needs external financing, even if only to honour its repayments to the IMF. One solution would be for the euro zone countries to accept a discount on the face value of the government debt they hold, as was done with private investors in March 2012.

In conclusion, Greece is facing a series of challenges. In the short term, the priority is to find sources of financing to get through 2015. To do this, the country will have to deal with the Troika, in particular the ECB, whose action will be crucial. The Bank has warned Greece that if negotiations fail, it could cut off the country's access to liquidity.

Furthermore, on 22 January 2015, the ECB must reach its long-awaited decision on quantitative easing; the issue is whether the ECB will accept the redemption of Greek government bonds. In the longer term, the issue of restructuring the debt will inevitably arise, regardless of who wins the polls. However, the restructuring is likely to be easier with public creditors than with the private banks, if, that is, Greece has in turn won the trust of its European partners.

---

[1] See the results of the stress tests published by the ECB on 26 October 2014.

[2]See the Hellenic Republic Public Debt Bulletin, no. 75, September 2014, Table 6.

[3] For a comparison with the situation in June 2012, see Céline Antonin, "Retour à la drachme: un drame insurmontable?", [Return to the drachma: an insurmountable drama?], *Note de l'OFCE* no. 20, June 2012.