

Save Greece by Democracy!

By [Maxime Parodi](#) @MaximeParodi, Thomas Piketty (Director of research at the EHESS and professor at Paris School of Economics), and [Xavier Timbeau](#) @XTimbeau

The newspapers have been full of the Greek drama since Syriza's election to power on 25 January 2015. Caught in the noose of its loans, Greece's government is defending its position by threatening to leave the euro zone. The situation today is at an impasse, and the country's economy is collapsing. As bank deposits flee and uncertainty mounts about the times ahead and the measures to come, no-one is really able to think about the future.

Europeans, for their part, are wondering what has led to this state of affairs. There has been a diagnosis of Institutional incompleteness, with proposals to reinforce the construction of the euro zone. But what is emerging is not up to the challenges facing Europe.

So let's take the problem by the other end of the stick and give European democracy a chance to evolve. Let's entrust the resolution of the Greek debt crisis to a body of representatives of the euro zone's national parliaments, that is to say, an embryo of a true parliamentary assembly for the euro zone.

Such an Assembly would arbitrate the conflict between the creditors and the Greek government, shifting the debate and decision-making to the big questions: what responsibility should the younger generation bear for the debt of their elders? What about the creditors' rights? How have other large public debts been resolved historically, and what lessons can we draw for the future?

As any agreement reached would be legitimated by a formal assembly that would also act as its guardian, it would no

longer be in danger of being denounced – once again – on the morrow. Since what's at stake is to resolve a debt and to not reach an agreement through force, the first step would be to suspend Greece's debt for the time needed. This step is a matter of common sense and the ordinary practice during the resolution of private debt in nearly all the world's countries.

A lasting agreement

This would require leaving the IMF out of the discussion by letting Greece reimburse this institution. It would be necessary at the same time to eliminate the possibility of Athens leaving the euro zone. By accepting the principle of negotiations, Greece and the other European countries would take this option off the agenda and pledge to accept the agreement reached. This embryonic Assembly would periodically review the situation and monitor the contingencies of the Greek economy. This is in effect what is already being done today, but now this would be explained and legitimated.

The technical institutions (the Commission, the European Central Bank) would continue to assess and support the reforms envisaged. They would inform the Assembly and answer to it. The Assembly would be a body set up to arbitrate, whenever necessary, any conflicts. Nor would there be any reason not to involve the European Council and the European Parliament. But clarifying the issue of legitimacy would open the door to a solution that was both more constructive for Greece and the other heavily indebted countries and fairer to the taxpayers of the euro zone.

We would be experimenting with a scheme for the resolution of sovereign defaults within the euro zone by building a political union – while remembering one thing: that Europe was reconstructed starting back in the 1950s by investing in the future and forgetting the debts of the past, in particular Germany's.

Finally, this Assembly would be competent to establish a common fund for euro zone debt, to undertake its global restructuring and to establish democratic rules governing the choice of a common level of public deficits and investments – which would help to overcome today's Do-It-Yourself approach to our euro zone.

On Thomas Piketty's *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*

Presentation by [Gérard Cornilleau](#)

In 2014, the world of social science publications was marked by the appearance of Thomas Piketty's book, *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. The book's global success, which is rare for a rather difficult work originally published in French, led to renewed debate on the distribution of wealth and income. Contrary to the widespread view that economic growth diminishes inequality and sooner or later leads to a balanced society with a large middle class (Kuznets' hypothesis), Thomas Piketty uses long-term historical data, some of it new, to show that the norm is instead a widening gap between the rich and everyone else. Periods of falling inequality appear conversely to be related to accidents of political and social history (war, ideological upheaval, etc.). Therefore, and unless another countervailing accident were to occur, Western society seems doomed to suffer an increasingly severe imbalance in the distribution of wealth. Piketty believes that structural changes in taxation could contain this tendency, which is unsustainable in the long-term.

It is hardly surprising that this analysis has upset the applecart of the received wisdom and occasionally provoked strong reactions, and even denial that inequality is real – in other words, criticism that Piketty's analysis is overly pessimistic. It was obvious that the OFCE needed to participate in this public debate. Several OFCE researchers have contributed by offering additional insights to Piketty's arguments or critical analysis. These contributions can be found in a special dossier in [issue 137 of the *Revue de l'OFCE on Le capital au XXI^e siècle*](#) [in French]. Jean-Luc Gaffard's observations focus on issues related to the nature of capital and the relationship between its productive component, its remuneration and the regulation of the system as a whole, which could affect pessimistic conclusions about the long-term difference between the rate of profit and the rate of growth in output. Guillaume Allègre and Xavier Timbeau seek to deepen the analysis of the nature of capital, focussing on the rise in the compensation of property rights, which has led to the emergence of a new type of technological *rentier*. They also analyse the contribution of housing wealth before concluding, as does Piketty himself, that it is a key factor in inequality.

Thomas Piketty agreed to participate in this discussion by writing a response for the [Revue de l'OFCE](#), in which he clarifies his thinking about a number of issues, such as the hybrid nature of capital, which mixes productive capital, housing wealth and intellectual property rights, whose yield has more to do with a process of social construction than with a simple technical relationship between capital and production.

[This dossier](#) also reflects the OFCE's commitment to promote scientific debate around key issues in economics. Our thanks go to the authors who contributed to this discussion, and to Thomas Piketty who has engaged in this process of constructive criticism. Finally, we hope that this dossier will help give

readers a better understanding of the importance of the issue of inequality and the role it plays in long-term social cohesion.