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1. Introduction

It has repeatedly been stated that a Greek exit from the Eurozone will lead to a vicious circle of drachma devaluation, inflation, lack of capital inflows, monetary financing of deficits, and recession. Thus, the application of internal devaluation policies, such as reduction in government expenditures and cuts in unit labour costs in the private sector, seems to be the only available solution to the so-called Greek crisis.

In a recent paper, using simple dynamic input-output price models and data from the most recent (2005) Symmetric Input-Output Table of the Greek economy, it has been estimated that the short-run elasticity of the gross value of domestic production with respect to the nominal exchange rate is no greater than 0.186. Thus, a drachma devaluation of, say, 50% does not imply great inflationary ‘pressures’, as is commonly believed; rather it could increase the competitiveness of the economy (as measured by the real exchange rate) by about 37% and decrease the deficit of
the balance of goods and services by about 89% (Katsinos and Mariolis, 2012). The purpose of the present paper is to estimate the short-run relationships between currency devaluation, external finance and growth for the Greek economy. In this effort, the basic price model of the aforementioned paper is combined with Thirlwall’s extended model of balance of payments constrained growth (which includes both capital inflows and interest payments on external debt).

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents the combined model. Section 3 applies the model using the available data of the Greek economy. Section 4 concludes.

2. The model

Thirlwall’s extended model can be stated as follows:

\[ PX - PI + PF = EP^* M \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)
\[ X = Q^h Y^n \eta_1, \quad Q \equiv (EP^*)^{-1}, \quad \eta_1 > 0, \quad \eta_2 > 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (2)
\[ M = Q^h Y^n \eta_3, \quad \eta_3 < 0, \quad \eta_4 > 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where \( X \) denotes the volume of exports, \( M \) the volume of imports, \( P \) the domestic prices of exports, \( P^* \) the foreign prices of imports, \( E \) the nominal exchange rate (measured as the domestic price of foreign currency), \( I \) (\( > 0 \)) the real net interest payments, \( PF \) (\( > 0 \)) the nominal net capital inflows, \( Q \) the real exchange rate, \( Y^* \) the real foreign income, \( Y \) the real domestic income, \( \eta_1 \) the price elasticity of demand for exports, \( \eta_2 \) the income elasticity of demand for exports, \( \eta_3 \) the price elasticity of demand for imports, and \( \eta_4 \) the income elasticity of demand for imports. Equation (1) expresses the balance of payments constraint, and equations (2), (3) express the demand for real exports and imports, respectively.

Now, assume that (i) the production period is uniform across all industries; (ii) the input-output coefficients are fixed; (iii) there are no non-competitive imports; (iv) at least one commodity enters directly into its own production; and (v) the system is viable, i.e. the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of the irreducible and primitive \( n \times n \) matrix of total input-output coefficients, \( A \), is less than 1. On the basis of these assumptions we can write

\[ P = PA + v \]  \hspace{1cm} (4)

or

\[ P = PD + EP^* G + v \]  \hspace{1cm} (4a)

where \( P \equiv [P_i] \) (\( > 0 \)) denotes the stationary price vector of domestically produced commodities, \( D \), \( G \) the irreducible and primitive matrices of domestic and imported input-output coefficients, respectively, \( A \equiv D + G \), \( P^* \) the given vector of foreign currency prices of the imported commodities, \( P = EP^* \), and \( v \) (\( > 0 \)) the vector of gross values added per unit activity level. By solving equations (4)-(4a) for \( P \) we obtain

\[ P = v[I_n - A]^{-1} = (Eg + v)[I_n - D]^{-1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where \( g = PG \) and \( I_n \) denotes the \( n \times n \) identity matrix. In order to analyze the effects of nominal exchange rate changes on prices we use the following well-known dynamic version of system (4a) (see, e.g. De Clementi et al., 1988):

\[ P_{t+1} = PD + Eg + v, \quad t = 0, 1, \ldots \]  \hspace{1cm} (6)
where \( E_t = (1 + e)E_{0t}, \) \( e \) denotes the rate of devaluation, and \( P_0 = (E_0 g + v)[I_n - D]^{-1} \) (see equation (5)). When, e.g. \( v_t = v \), the solution of equation (6) is

\[
P_t = P_0D^t + (E_t g + v)[D]_{t-1}^{-1}
\]

(7)

where \([D]_{t-1} = [D^{-1} + D^{-2} + \ldots + I_n] \), and \( P_t \) tends to \( (E_t g + v)[I_n - D]^{-1} \) \( < (1 + e)P_0 \) as \( t \) tends to infinity, since the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of \( D \) is necessarily less than 1. Thus, the elasticity of \( P_t \) with respect to the nominal exchange rate can be determined from equation (7) (for alternative assumptions about the response of sectoral gross value added to currency devaluation, see Katsinos and Mariolis, 2012, pp. 165-166).

From equations (2) and (3), taking time rates of change of the variables, we obtain

\[
x = (1 + q)\eta^h (1 + y^s)\eta^h - 1 \quad (8)
\]

\[
q = (1 - \eta_p)(e^{-1} + \eta_p)^{-1} \quad (9)
\]

\[
m = (1 + q)\eta^h (1 + y^s)\eta^h - 1 \quad (10)
\]

where lower-case letters denote proportional rates of change of variables, and \( \eta_p \), the short-run, i.e. for \( t = 1 \), elasticity of \( P \) with respect to \( E \), which is estimated on the basis of equation (7). Substituting equations (8), (9) and (10) into equation (1) in growth rate form, and solving for the change rate of domestic income, yields:

\[
y = H(e, c, y^s), \quad e > -1 \quad (11)
\]

where \( H(\bullet) = [(1 + A)B^{-\eta_6}]\eta_6^h - 1, \quad \eta_6 = \eta_4^{-1}, \quad B = (e^{-1} + 1)(e^{-1} + \eta_p)^{-1}, \)

\[A = (1 + e)^{-1}\{-e - \theta_1 + [\eta_p e(1 + c) + c]\theta_2 + (1 + \eta_p e)\theta_1[(e^{-1} + 1)(e^{-1} + \eta_p)^{-1}]^h(1 + y^s)^\eta_6\}
\]

\[\theta_1 = PX(EP^s M)^{-1}, \quad \theta_2 = PC(EP^s M)^{-1}, \quad \theta_1 + \theta_2 = 1, \quad C \equiv -I + F.
\]

Equation (11) gives the balance of payments constrained change rate of domestic income.

### 3. Application

In the year 2011, (i) the exports of goods and services of the Greek economy were approximately equal to 48.8 billion Euros, whereas the imports were approximately equal to 61.4 billion Euros, i.e. \( PX \approx 48.8, \quad EP^s M \approx 61.4 \), respectively, and, therefore, \( \theta_1 \approx 0.795 \) and \( \theta_2 \approx 0.205 \); and (ii) \( PI \approx 8.8 \), where the interest payments on external debt equal 10.8 billion Euros, and \( PF \approx 21.4 \) (Bank of Greece, 2012, pp. 91 and 103-110). Furthermore, (i) \( \eta_1 \) is in the range of 0.60 to 0.71, and \( \eta_3 \), is in the range of – 0.90 to – 0.92 (in accordance with estimates of the IMF and the Bank of Greece; see, e.g. Malliaropoulos and Anastasatos, 2011, p. 10); (ii) \( \eta_2 \) should be considered as no greater than 1.16 (since the short-run income elasticity of demand for tourism is around that value; see Economou et al., 2010, pp. 36 and 217-218); (iii) \( \eta_4 \) is around 1.80 (Papazoglu, 2010, p. 230); and (iv) \( \eta_p \) is in the range of 0.106 to 0.186 (depending on the response of \( v \) to currency devaluation; Katsinos and Mariolis, 2012, pp. 167-168).

Figure 1 is constructed on the basis of those alternative estimates, and graphically displays equation (11), with \( \eta_2 = 1.16, \quad \eta_p = 0.186 \) and \( y^s = 2\% \). Figure 2 also incorporates the assump-
tion that, as a result of a Greek exit from the Eurozone, both the interest payments on external debt and the net capital inflows fall to zero, i.e. \( c \approx -84.4\% \). It then follows that:

(i) For \( e = 0\% \), \( y \) is almost \(-8.91\%\).

(ii) For \( y = 0\% \), \( e \) is in the range of 42.34\% to 56.97\%. By reducing \( y^* \) to 1\% (or \( \eta_2 \) to 0.90, i.e. \( \eta_2 \eta_4 = 0.5 \)), these values change to 45.83\% (43.90\%) and 61.97\% (59.20\%), respectively.

(iii) For, say, \( y = 5\% \), \( e \) is in the range of 73.17\% to 102.83\%. These values imply a cost-push inflation rate (as measured by the gross value of domestic production) of 13.61\% or 19.13\%, and that the competitiveness of the economy (as measured by the real exchange rate) increases by 52.42\% or 70.26\%, respectively.

**Figure 1.** The balance of payments constrained change rate of domestic income as a function of the nominal devaluation rate (–30\%b e b 100\%) and the change rate of external finance (–100\%b c b 20\%)

**Figure 2.** The balance of payments constrained change rate of domestic income as a function of the nominal devaluation rate, for \( c = -84.4\% \)
4. Concluding remarks

In terms of Thirwall's extended model, this paper dealt with the Greek trade-off between growth and sovereign debt default. The findings of this (hypothetical) exercise, based on not completely unrealistic assumptions, lend support to the view that a possible return to national currency not only does not necessarily deepen the recession but also a well-coordinated devaluation in excess of 57%-60% is a necessary condition for the recovery.

This exercise would seem most useful when it is compared to the avowedly painful (and questionable) process of internal devaluation, which so far has led to unprecedented unemployment rates (of almost 27%). Future work should search for more detailed, reliable data and build on the multi-sector/country versions of Thirlwall’s model.
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Notes

1. All those models have the same structure, which is imposed by the available Symmetric Input-Output Table of the Greek economy (it provides no data on fixed capital stocks, non-competitive imports and sectoral employment), but they are based on different assumptions about the response of sectoral gross value added to currency devaluation.
2. For a recent overview of the extended versions of Thirlwall’s (1979) model, see Thirlwall (2011).
3. McCombie and Thirlwall (1999, p. 49) note: “Estimates of and to a lesser extent of , show considerable variation between countries and these disparities largely reflect differences in non-price competitiveness. […] Estimates of for the early post-war period for the advanced countries vary from 3.55 for Japan to 0.86 for the UK”.
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