

- [What has changed since the open outbreak of the global financial crisis in 2007/08, and why this is the case?](#)

In a few words, everything has changed. Given that in Greece, the GDP has decreased more than 26% (something that has never happened again during peace period) and is going to decrease even more during 2016, the crisis has been proven to be the most significant turning point in the postwar period.

In a social level, the unemployment rate has increased to 27%, unpaid work has become a usual phenomenon, salaries keep decreasing all the time and more than 500.000 people have migrated, mainly to North Europe, Middle East and the United States. The ability of the working class to struggle is in a serious doubt.

When it comes to the political life of the country; the social democratic party of PASOK that had been dominating in political life after the military regime (1967-1974) up to 2010 when it started losing popularity due to applying harsh austerity measures. The political party of SYRIZA although it won the two past elections (January and September of 2015) leading an anti-austerity coalition with an overwhelming majority of the society and the Parliament, it signed an agreement with the creditors on July 12, accepting many humiliating terms (privatizations of ports and airports, increases on taxes, liberalization of markets according to OECD "toolkit", etc.) the same terms that had been rejected in referendum of July the 5th.

The economic crisis was the beginning of all these since the ruling class suggested and implemented all these measures as a response to the crisis, as the most adequate "recipe" to overcome the crisis. Its arguments were that the roots of the fiscal crisis were the excessive expenditures of the social sector and therefore health and educational bills were stigmatized as "guilty" for the crisis.

- [Which have been the actual consequences of these developments for the issue/for a country/for the EU/for Europe/for the world?](#)

For Greece, all these dramatic developments meant a blow to the labor movement and the labor class interests because the capital's force is measured, in every historical period, with the criterion of the relation of profits versus salaries and not from the influence of the left parties. When salaries are decreased, the capital's influence and its material power against the working class is improved.

EU's role in the implementation of this policy has been proved crucial. The EU has changed but, unfortunately for the people, it has changed to a reactionary direction. Fiscal Stability, Six Pack, Two Pack and more recently the Five Presidents' proposal constitute a radical transformation of the EU. In this context, budget deficits are forbidden and have been penalized whereas balanced budgets are becoming the new "fiscal standard".

Into a broader context EU's message was that the epoch of an advanced welfare state has passed irreversibly. When the other countries of Europe from the Balkan Peninsula and the Eastern Europe see EU countries to reduce social spending or privatize their health system, they follow this example rejecting any alternative.

The changes through all over the world weren't similar, neither comparable. Of course there were many similarities, for example nowhere else had we any successful working struggles or a counterattack of labor movement. From the United States (in automobile industry for example) to the rest of Europe, the governments

removed working rights as a precondition for bail-outs. In a global base capital improved its dominance, without eliminating its intrinsic competitions.

- [Did other possibilities exist in or for the EU and why haven't they been realized?](#)

I believe that there were no other options. It was impossible for the EU to turn left. Initially, it was a mechanism to regulate the imperialistic contradictions into the European continent. This new arrangement was directing outwards trying to compete other imperialist centers (USA and Japan, at that time) and inwards: against the working majority in North and South and weakest states, like those that belong to the periphery of Europe.

It is no accidental that over the past decades there have been a lot of non-elected mechanisms like the edifice of the common currency. During the first semester of 2015 we learned for example that the Eurogroup (which decides the most important things about the terms of lending to crisis-hit countries) has no legitimacy! The totalitarian character of the EU is becoming more apparent if we see that elected bodies, like the European Parliament, do not have real powers. It's very striking that neither the EMP have been informed about the content of TTIP. The negotiations are kept secret from the elected representatives while the most crucial decisions have been transferred to the mandarins of Commission.

In this frame even the most welcomed government changes in countries are not going to alter the political balance in the EU.

- [Which scenarios are possible and shall emerge, and with which consequences for the next 10-15 years, and what are the conditions for the actual realization of such trends?](#)

There are two scenarios. The first scenario is a linear projection of nowadays' developments, in draft lines. The capital will become much more aggressive, cancelling working rights (working time, day-off of Sunday) and collective political liberties (the right to strike, to concentrate, to do anti-capitalistic struggle which will be identified with terrorism). It's a route that cannot be predicted in its every detail, but at the end of the day it is a pure dystopia of the capital.

The other scenario is the awakening of the peoples. This prospect is the most unpredictable, due to the uneven character of the class struggle in every country, the historical differences, etc. Their common elements will be the conflict with bourgeois class and its mechanisms into the country (state) and abroad (EU, NATO, TTIP, etc.). Strict preconditions for this perspective are the struggles of working movement with governments, capital and EU which in nowadays must be unfolded in a very difficult environment: the fear of unemployment, the indebtedness of the households, the fragmentation of working class (between educated and not, members of trade unions and not, immigrants and not, etc), the stigmatization of trade unions due to their bureaucratization and many other emerge tremendous impediments.

Despite all these very pragmatic situations, we can be optimistic because in every epoch the class struggles never depended on historical subject's readiness. The attack of the capital will feed new forms of struggle against the impoverishment