
World Economics Association

“Greece and austerity policies: where next for its economy and society?”

October 20th- December 21st 2014

**Greek economy as a failure of capitalist patriarchy
and the choice of dystopia**

Irene Sotiropoulou

irene.sotiropoulou@gmail.com

There will be updated drafts after the Conference, please contact the author before quoting

September 2014

Abstract

The paper uses feminist theory to analyse the political economic phenomenon which has been termed "crisis" since fall 2008 onwards. The purpose of the paper is to investigate if and how the "crisis" is a response to either conscious and organised (or sometimes collectively disorganised but never without an agenda), efforts of producers, men and women, to effectively address the exploitative and hierarchical structures imposed on them by the political economic system in which they live.

Therefore, the concept of capitalist patriarchy is linked to the concept of social reproduction, which in recent decades has been in jeopardy, because of both environmental degradation and of the social changes that have put basic tasks necessary for the survival of society at the lower value position. This, of course, affects not only the living, social status and political claims of people who undertake those tasks, but also the survival of society as a whole.

In the paper, the Greek economy is an example, where the demands of capitalist patriarchy, although they seemed up to a particular historical point that they were met, they suddenly proved stale and not guaranteed. Thus, the "crisis" is not the problem and the result, but the conscious choice of specific social groups to impose living conditions and political circumstances of such particular hue, that resistance would end up to be inconceivable contrary to the resistance which has been possible one way or another in previous decades.

The question, of course, is whether the dystopia, which did not break out suddenly but it has been designed so, contains elements or "promises" that broad groups of the population have chosen or may choose, in an effort to maintain a political-economic system that gave them some privileges and now promises or directly provides, the same and/or other privileges. That is, if capitalist patriarchy is a complex hierarchical system of people and production relationships, we look at what point and to what extent, the social groups who did not applaud this system have achieved changes that challenge that very same system. And then we investigate whether and by which mechanisms capitalist patriarchy tries to ensure its own survival, at the expense of which social groups and by concluding which alliances or compromises.

Keywords: Greece, capitalist patriarchy, social reproduction.

Greek economy as a failure of capitalist patriarchy and the choice of dystopia

1. Introduction

The paper is a description of a research question that emerged from the analysis of the economic situation in Greece, as formulated the last five (5) years, from October 2008 onwards, but especially since May 2010, when Greece entered the so-called Support Mechanism¹. The question we face is whether the concept of crisis is a description of the problem or of a particular policy choice, and if the latter, whose this choice is and what its objectives are. I focus my analysis in Greece because not only I have better information about conditions here than in other countries, but also because the Greek space is being described nowadays as the most problematic in the entire eurozone. If an economy is problematic, don't we need to analyse this "problematic" concept as defined by various political economic axes, for example, the economic and social class structure?

For my analysis, I used ideas from feminist and post-colonial theory. On this basis, I examine if and how the "crisis" is a class-based top-down answer to the efforts by the producers, men and women, to deal effectively with the exploitative and hierarchical structures imposed on them by the political economic system in which they live. In other words, I analyse the economic situation in Greece as an organized attack of the dominant political and economic system and of course by the social groups who control that system against most of the population. The case of Greece therefore, is not unique or separated from other capitalist policies imposed on other countries, particularly outside Europe.

The central concept of my analysis is social reproduction, which I understand as the individual and collective actions and ideas which every day re-create society as such. It seems that the political and economic choices of the last years are not only indifferent to but hit directly the entire society and its ability to maintain the survival and social coexistence of its members at decent levels. What makes the political-economic system prefer to endanger the reproduction of society which it sucks instead of changing policies?

For the purposes of this paper, I consider that the main conditions of nowadays Greece are known. Unemployment rates are the highest in the European Union (27% and depending on the month it might be a bit over this percentage) (Eurostat 2014). Poverty has risen sharply with more than half the population of the country living under or around the poverty line (Zikakou 2014). Income in Greece has fallen for about 23% the last six years (Labour Institute 2014: 63), which is unprecedented for the country in times of peace.

¹ "Support mechanism" is the term used in public discourse in Greece referring to the set of Memoranda, Loan Agreements and Adjustment Programmes adopted by the Greek Government <http://www.minfin.gr/portal/en/resource/contentObject/contentTypes/genericContentResourceObject,fileResourceObject.arrayOfFileResourceTypeObject/topicNames/economicPolicyProgram/resourceRepresentationTemplate/contentObjectListAlternativeTemplate>

The purpose of the paper is to discuss a hypothesis with possible explanatory powers concerning the situation in Greece, which needs to be researched and examined in detail in the future. In the next section (2) I present my theoretical arguments which I use to understand the economic situation in Greece. The third (3) section presents the successes and failures of capitalist patriarchy in the different communities in the country and the fourth (4) section is the presentation of the recent neoliberal policies as dystopian policies, which are a deliberate choice by the ruling classes at the expense of producers. Section five (5) is a brief presentation of the political conditions of this dystopia and the last section (6) contains the conclusions of the entire discussion.

2. Theoretical approaches

2.1 Feminist theory

In contrast to the dominant analysis for productive labour in the market, i.e. the economic space where transactions and work are valued in money and their value is determined by whether they are integrated into a monetary relationship or not, feminist theory in economics, although it comes from the Marxist school, begins its analysis focusing on the labour done by women. In particular, the work that women do in households and is not paid in cash (and for the dominant theory it is "extra-economic" production), is considered the basis of productive relations (Federici 2013, Frazer 2013, Dallacosta & James 1975):

First, because this labour is basic for the biological and social survival and reproduction of the household members, of the household as a production unit and ultimately of society, perceived both as an economic space and as a cultural construct. Without the unpaid work done by women within the households in a patriarchal society, the rest of the economy, let alone capitalism, cannot function. Therefore, although it does not appear in GDP statistics or in economic analyses of unemployment or productivity, it is the material basis of production.

Secondly, because those basic reproductive tasks have been imposed on women through a hierarchical system of values based on the sexist, patriarchal, heteronormative ideology. In other words, the hierarchical superiors, men, and bourgeois men and women, see and determine the conduct of these tasks as a pejorative for themselves. They very often bring the highly capitalist argument "if I could utilise my time more productively why do a job that a woman who hasn't my education, interests and abilities can make?". In fact, the woman who does the housework, even for a salary, is not necessarily less educated, with less interests and abilities. She just has less money and certainly lower social status – a condition which obliges her to undertake work which is remunerated less and no else with more economic power wants to do it.

Thirdly, because those tasks are absolutely necessary for any other work to be performed, no matter how productive (i.e. profitable in a capitalist context) this other work might be. Even if those same reproductive tasks are so necessary, there is the paradox of devaluing the tasks and the workers which a society and economy need to survive and then to be able to deal with the improvement of living standards of everyone. Therefore, we are talking about a reversal of the concepts of production and value, since what primarily

produces value and supports production is valued the least. And the people who provide it are not only undervalued, but they are obliged either systemically/economically or by direct violence, to provide it, often for free or under poor working conditions.

Consequently, in a patriarchal economy the work of biological reproduction of society, such as child-bearing, the production of food, cleanliness and hygiene, parenting, education and continued socialisation of young people and adults, the treatment of patients, care of the elderly, are the most despised sectors of the economy, and on economic and political level they belong to the minor topics of political dialogue. Moreover, since the entire political economy ignores this work, especially the work done within the households, those same sectors who are indispensable to the survival of society, also become privileged areas for capitalism for grabbing economic value and surplus in the first level, and by different groups of social hierarchy, even if their members can also belong to what might be called working class. So, the rapture that is against women, or men performing housework, goes hidden by the same economic analyses who deal only with the work and wealth (which is seems to be) produced behind the cash flows of the economy.

Briefly, capitalism is not perceived as a system separate from patriarchy. Capitalism not only could not exist without patriarchy, but is a form of very intense patriarchy, both in terms of exploiting women and of its policy facet, with opacity in political systems and violent repression of protests.

2.2. Post-colonial approaches

Although Greece as a state since 1830 has not been found under typical colonial regime (even if we consider the occupation by Nazi Germany from 1941 to 1944 as colonial), is an example of internal colonisation, both economic as well as political and cultural. The construction of a nation-state is also a tool of capitalist patriarchy which has been used in Western Europe first and then in other regions of the planet, and it adopted colonial policies and tactics against its own population, which is the "nation" for the sake of which the state is created. Particular emphasis was given to the destruction or even the abandonment and contempt of indiscriminately all practices which are inconsistent with the capitalist agenda, under an ideology of national economy. According to this ideology, all citizens will benefit from national economy if it finally finds no obstacles because of old unproductive practices and of conservatism attributed by propaganda to anyone who does not want or can not participate in a capitalised economy.

This is how communities and their political-economic structures which do not support capitalism, became a target. Even more there have been a target or concealed, or covered by the official patriarchal and Western-European-origin legislative framework, any community practices which do not belong to the patriarchal value system. With a general accusation of obscurantism and exploitation, any practice or community method for redistribution, for smoothing inequalities or for women's emancipation, was considered as equally devastating to the national economy as the feudal practices and practices for exploiting the poor people. Greece has been an example of this division and prioritisation of the progressive centralised state and the "primitive" regions (Hechter 1974, Peckham R.S. 2004).

In this context of internal colonisation, producers, men and women, are not considered to be passive beings. Rather, they are people who have individually and collectively their own

agenda, but also ideas and expertise which they attempt to maintain, develop and expand, regardless of what the policy of colonisation wants to achieve (Eduards 1994).

In contrast to classical revolutionary theory, the post-colonial approaches examine the resistance not only through organised action of people and communities. They also accept that there may be resistance without formal organisation either with horizontal actions, adapted to the living but also to colonial repression conditions; or with spreading and adopting of practices that aim to achieve the demands of people who suffer from the national or transnational colonial policies (Bayat 2000).

Therefore, my analysis does not seek a revolutionary subject who is no-matter-what aware of themselves as such, and is also self-presented as revolutionary. It seeks antipatriarchal and anticapitalist practices that adhere to the basic rule of resistance, which is to prevent social strife between producers, whether they proceed in direct and clear acts of resistance or in everyday practices that facilitate or increase the survival chances of social groups placed at the societal margin or under the capitalist blackmail policy of poverty. This is exactly the tool to judge what is resistance and what is not, because it certainly prevents producers from turning the poor against one another and because it does not accept hierarchical and exploitative practices among working class (eg the female workers work double shifts at the factory and at home and this to be seen as fitting and fair to their husbands who do not work at home). It is also the starting point for claiming public funds expropriated by the nation state in benefit of capitalist agents, namely the powerful of the political-economic system. The claim may not be done directly, but in reality, even re-connecting electricity lines or collectivising abandoned public lands to become playgrounds are serious resistance and grievances which allow both social survival and shift of social struggle against true perpetrators (Bayat 2000).

This perception of people resisting in many ways is exactly the opposite to the non-flexible human model as presented by colonial capitalist patriarchy, which cannot but be male, white, of European descent, middle class, with no social connections and definitely owner of property (Agathangelou & Ling 2006, Bhandar 2011, Richardson 2010). I will discuss this model again in section 3.1.

2.3. Social reproduction as minor priority of the system (feminist theory again!)

It is a fundamental feature of any exploitative system to seek by all means its reproduction. However, talking about patriarchy in general and in particular about capitalist patriarchy, it is clear that the expansion of this political-economic system is inherently in conflict with the reproduction of society as a viable construct, where all members can freely survive, develop their personalities and improve their lives for themselves and their communities.

The expansion of patriarchy through private property on bodies (women, children, slaves, serfs, workers, citizens, protesters etc.) and land (privatisation of commons, enclosures, ecosystem fragmentation, environmental degradation, etc.) showed from the beginning that the reproduction of society is of interest only in the background, and to the extent that it is absolutely necessary for the survival of the patriarchal system. Any other claim that would bring balance between nature and human society is considered to be not only strange, absurd, non-existent or sinful, against the will of god who gave the land (or women) to exploit it; but also completely opposite to the need of patriarchy to deprive its slaves of

production means so that it can blackmail them to produce for the system under the terms that patriarchy wants.

Already mentioned, patriarchy and, even more, capitalism devalue everything related to the reproduction of society, to the point of denying the value produced by work without pay and of imposing very low wages and appalling working conditions to those working for the reproduction of society. At the same time, it overvalues what is related to the reproduction of the dominant political-economic system. Thus, the accumulation of wealth in a palace or in an offshore company is considered good, productive and is reinforced by institutions, either directly, by legislative guarantee, or indirectly, by not applying supposedly strict laws or by general indifference to the exploitation concealed under a specific accumulation.

What makes capitalism a historically very special case is that in comparison with other forms of patriarchy, capitalism is the first case which has no economic and cultural limits to the destruction of nature and the destruction of people and communities. That does not mean that in previous historical times there existed no powerful people who decided to destroy a forest or massacre entire villages and towns. However, this has never been the dominant practice or ideology covered with ethical-moral elements, such as development (or productive capabilities), economy growth (for the benefit of all) and “civilising” domestic and foreign producers either within the same European countries, or in formal colonies outside Europe. The expansionary practice of capitalism, therefore, has been unprecedented and the geometric progression of growth inherent in this political economic system has already led to dead ends. The environmental stalemate has become an undisputed problem, even by devotees of the modern method of economic management. Now, we experience undoubtedly the full deployment of social reproduction crisis (Peterson 1997, 2010).

3. The greek societies and capitalist patriarchy

I use the term “societies” instead of its singular form, because greek society is quite a generalisation which does not represent the different social and economic structures among communities and regions in the country. Greece might be more homogenised now that 150 years ago, but this does not make the homogenisation final and perfect, quite the opposite. I do not mean to analyse capitalism in Greece as an economic system that has been introduced by the greek state only; greek people had quite a good picture of capitalism, even of early capitalism, under Venitian and then under Ottoman rule. However, for the purposes of this paper, my analysis will focus to changes and policies which have been adopted after 1830, when the greek state has been established and started expanding in geographical but mostly in institutional and political terms.

3.1. Capitalist patriarchal successes in Greece

Given that Greece has been an area with mostly patriarchal structures prevailing, capitalist patriarchy found enforcement fields that were already available in several communities and strengthened them. Patriarchal structures of local communities were very useful in disciplining the population for the new regime who aspired to capitalise the

economy, because it was not only women and children who were “objects” of the system, but also all men who for any reasons (f.ex. they were born after the firstborn boy of the family) were not self-sufficient or had no means to produce for themselves. In many cases, those patriarchal structures were also combined with local feudal and clientelist relations, which apart from being patriarchal, exploitative and suppressive, gave the powerful of each community the first (accumulation) tools to adapt themselves to capitalist intensification (Sakellaropoulos 2010).

Institutional and economic tools to turn society into a capitalised economy have been more than explicit and are impossible to ignore. The legal system of Greece has been a copy of Western and Central European legal systems, which had already been in an advanced industrial capitalist phase. It is not a coincidence that the modern greek Civil Code has been introduced in 1946, actually in times of undeclared civil war. The introduction of the modern Civil Code included the banishment of all old forms of private property, particularly on agricultural lands, which permitted more balanced distribution of land use among people than the absolute perception of modern private property, or at least permitted some space of contestation over property.

The introduction of new production processes was a priority of the greek state, although it did not become very successful but the last decades and of course after WWII, particularly after the civil war (1949). Apart from external and internal immigration and the proletarianisation of the population as a consequence of those both wars (1940-44, 1947-49), we have not any clear picture on their impact on production modes (Sakellaropoulos 2010). Even worse, we have no information about the effects of wars and their giving the greek state more tools with devastated countrysides, loss of population, poverty and increased international debt, to impose new production modes that had not been adopted during previous eras. Unfortunately, the disdain to rural production modes was also part of the marxist tradition (Hammen 1972: 700, Szporluk 1988: 45, 65, 190, Todorova 1994: 470) and has had negative results for understanding everyday resistances by peasants or for conducting research with this scope.

Another pillar of attacking communities in Greece has been the education system. Of course, no-one says that having a population which is mostly illiterate is a good thing. Yet, the promotion of how people would perceive language, art, culture, science, and even their relationship to the state and to the capitalists with which they would deal, was about to be constructed through the education system. Women for example, were conditioned in such a way, so that they were receptive of their new national role, as nurturers and workers (Madytinis ____). Another example is the suppression of local dialects and even other languages which existed (and even exist) in the greek space, as non-fitting in the national-language project¹.

The most important axis, though, concerning the capitalisation of the greek economy, has been the evaluation of the work and tasks that before 1830 were performed within a completely different context. The devaluation of domestic labour and all labour performed

¹ A language and a dialect, contain, apart from many other things, political and economic knowledge and history that is developed and transmitted through the use of the language parallel and sometimes in opposition to many official knowledge sources.

without pay for other household members and for the community has been detrimental for those who perform it. The domestic labour has been further feminised, while even generations 70 or 100 years ago, considered normal that a man took care of children, educated them, or took care of himself and his household at least in times of emergency and he was ready, i.e. trained to do this (Dunaway 2001, Kalantaridis et al 1999).

To this direction, major contribution (or disaster) brought the colonial ideology as translated through the national idea in the case of Greece. Just like in the colonised world, the model of human creature has not multiple expressions or examples nor is it at least inclusive. To the contrary, it serves the capitalist patriarchal agenda: the human is male, white, middle class, able to make things and people around him to be productive for his own purposes, he has no social commitments nor liabilities but he is an individual more than anything else, quite similar to mainstream economic theory's agent, aka homo oeconomicus (Agathangelou & Ling 2006, Bhandar 2011, Mayes 2003, Pateman 1988, Richardson 2010).

Moreover, this model has been enhanced in Greece and promoted vastly since the 1970s, which has been a decade coinciding with a dictatorship and with solidifying capitalist democracy in the country and stabilising economic relations with western European economy. Capitalist patriarchy and its misogynistic heteronormative axes have been strengthened the last decades despite the change in family law in 1983. The model of the ruthless and profit-seeking-at-all-costs man has been supported institutionally and systemically by both the elite and the mass media as the model of personal achievement and success.

3.2. Capitalist patriarchal failures in Greece

Despite the dismal picture, the people who lived in the country were not passive receivers of all those policies, although theory and even movements, have not recognised resistances that have been undertaken against the capitalisation of the economy and the enhancement of patriarchy.

First of all, women exploited the internal contradictions of capitalist patriarchy trying to game the system as well as they could. This has been quite easier for women of the middle classes who case by case might have more chances to access land, capital and education. However, all women reduced reproductive work which is depreciated in capitalist patriarchy by reducing the number of children and by delaying marriage (Technological Institute of Athens___, Left.gr 2014). Moreover, women would turn to education as much as possible, which is a completely rational choice by people who seek some property title and have not any capital, therefore, the easiest investment for them is education. Here property has no literal meaning but only the meaning of "professional rights" understood as the possibility to access a better paid job and better living conditions by taking advantage of one's higher education degree. Although women's wages are lower than men's, the less education a woman has the more the wage gap with men (but also educated women) increases (OECD 2013, 2014a, 2014b: 57, 61, 67).

The industrialisation of food production has not been complete. First of all, small property and small landlots, wherever available or accessible were used for food production, at least "for the kids". That means, even peasants who undertook industrial agriculture for trade, also kept the previous production modes, particularly if they wanted to provide good quality food to the kids of the family. Second, industrial agriculture demands capital in order to be performed and this has not been available or available at reasonable terms for the poor

rural workers. Many traditional plants for agriculture, cultivation methods and traditional know-how have been preserved because poor people kept the old ways of cultivation as the new ones were too expensive for them to afford. Third, people are conscious of the environmental degradation industrial agriculture brings, and this is how they tried to preserve the old cultivation modes as much as they could. The geography of the country, the dispersion of small properties and micro-climate variety probably helped that industrial agriculture, which needs very big fields, not to be really easy to be implemented, i.e. it facilitated resistance (Chatzikiriakou et al. 2011). No research equivalent for example to the one done by Taussig (2010) for Latin America, has been done in Greece on how those non-capitalist production modes really function in the economy.

Small property in particular was not only an institution which supported the capitalisation of the economy only. Actually, small property in Greece has functioned in many ways depending on the community in which it exists. For example, communities in Greece where women's social position is better have different distribution of land property and land management than communities where women's position is suppressed. Small property in general, is very common in Greece and this has been criticised by people who belong to the so called modernisation or neoliberal side as a very bad feature of the economy, which did not permit the creation of proletarians who would sustain capitalist growth (Doxiadis 2010).

Despite private property being the basic patriarchal institution, within certain contexts it did not aggravate the proletarianisation of the population but to the contrary, it worked as a means of resistance to that same proletarianisation. Of course, this did not happen without constant effort by peasant everyday practices but also movements who had to face at the same time, the land concentration propensity of the rich, the national and international trade terms and the policies of the greek state, who wanted to industrialise the economy (Chatzikiriakou et al 2011, Seferiadis 1999). Moreover, in several communities in Greece, particularly in the islands, private property rights are absolute against the state, but among the community members there are other rules for common use of what is registered as private property, for common cultivation and for sharing produce.

Finally, Greece, despite being in Europe, had no witch hunt at all, let alone that women are still today considered normal to know, educate each other and use traditional medicine, although of course conventional medicine prevails and is provided in most cases as the appropriate treatment method. Even medicine in Greece has a different mentality with doctors of both sexes being somehow respectful to traditional medicine. If we add to this the different property systems that existed in Greece till quite recently (let's say at least till WWII) and the different property practices in various communities which go beyond or against the official legal system, we have an economy and society which cannot be so easily dissected into the disciplined proletariat one would hope to have for a typical capitalist economy.

4. The choice of dystopia

The conditions in Greece were never good in terms of economics and finance, both on government level and on level of living conditions for the majority. Through field research I have encountered several people who narrated dark working conditions even in decades like 1980s which are described as prosperous in the mainstream political narration about Greece. No historical research has been done concerning deregulation of working legislation but from my own findings, it seems that this has started quite earlier than 2008 or 2000 (actually, in early 1980s) and it was gendered too much to be noticed by the mainstream male-centred political discourse, whether this was neoliberal or anticapitalist.

4.1. Dystopian policies before 2010

However, even if we look at Greece for example, the last decades, we find the same pattern: deregulation of labour relations at the expense of women, whose poor wages and precarious jobs served the patriarchal household in two ways. First, women were bringing cash income the household but without subverting really the hierarchy of the provider male. Second, they were providing unpaid domestic labour which assisted the household and male workers to make ends meet without salary raise or during salary cuts. The lower-paid and precarious jobs for women also forced them either to opt for a job only if this was absolutely necessary or to accept part-time positions, given that they were already overworked at home. So, capitalist patriarchy paid women as little as possible by maintaining women's wages lower than men's, particularly if women had not higher education, and kept the male workers happy that they would have their free labourer at home secured as she would not be able to find a better full-time job far from household (Kalantaridis et al 1999, OECD 2013, 2014a).

To this deregulation one should add migration and trafficking, because Greece has been a country to receive immigrants or to function as their middle stop in their effort to reach Western European countries. In other words, capitalist patriarchy needs producers to be as poor and de-connected from their communities as possible. Local producers in Greece could not be submitted to absolute poverty as easily as needed, because of the structures described in the previous section. Then, capitalist patriarchy "imports" producers, men and women, in order to exercise pressures on them which cannot be exercised on local population, and to achieve the corresponding profits and wealth transfer in favour of the few rich. The almost lethal attack with acid on Konstantina Kuneva, cleaner in Athens metro station and trade unionist, in December 2008 (Walsh 2013) marked all those policies at the expense of the working class and showed in a very clear way what the aim of the capitalist system is: reproductive work must be very cheap and women workers have to do this otherwise their life is in danger.

Unfortunately, patriarchal attitudes within the movements did not allow (with some very few exceptions) the analysis of highly gendered neoliberal policies in Greece as central for the attack on the class of producers in general. In this context producers are overt working class like workers in a factory, or covert working class, like petty professionals and free lancers who depend on their work without having any employees for production of their everyday income.

4.2. Dystopian policies after 2010

The above has been a major political and strategic mistake of the part of producers, movements and even activists and theorists of anticapitalist struggle. The adoption of the austerity policies led to full deregulation of labor relations for all working class and to the "feminisation" of work exactly because the established lower position of women in the job market worked and works to the detriment of working conditions of everyone (Barker & Feiner 2010).

I keep the term "feminisation" here because no matter how I would like that women are not the part of working class where neoliberal policies have by priority been imposed on, I cannot disregard the gendered choices of neoliberalism to attack the most vulnerable part of producers first. And women are vulnerable all the time because patriarchy assigns to them certain tasks and then devalues both the tasks and women. In practical terms, capitalist patriarchy makes the working conditions of women a general pattern for all workers, irrespective of gender.

The conditions under which migration and trafficking take place have deteriorated even further. Unemployment in Greece and a proliferating nationalist mentality, promoted further by a nazist party who attacks immigrants even in plain daylight, brought most immigrants into very bad situation. Moreover, if they have not a certain amount of social security contributions per year, they lose their work permits, so many immigrants work for free just to receive their social security stamps who assure their liberty. Many have left the country and many others are in slavery status, sometimes even formally. Detention camps for migrants are just the places where any migrant arrested without residence permit is jailed for indefinite time without access to adequate food or healthcare. At the end, the detention camps, named informally "concentration camps" in Greece, are spaces of incarcerating unemployed people (Smith 2014). For the moment, the unemployed people are citizens from Asia and Africa, i.e. citizens of the global South and their detention marks the inherent colonial aspect of neoliberalism.

There is sharp increase of violence of against women of all classes (ThePressProject 2013). Violence in household is paired with systemic violence against women. An example is the various implications for women's health due to the general decrease in healthcare provision by public services. Deprivation of health care covering, even for serious illnesses such as cancer or heart illnesses and for many preventive medical tests and reduction of extent and quality of social services affect women in various ways, particularly because their health faces serious dangers due to their reproductive activity (Venizelos 2014).

The attack in spring 2012 on HIV-positive poor women who have been presented as "a hygiene bomb at the basement of greek family" and they have been falsely accused of illegal prostitution and of transmitting HIV to their clients marks the intensified policies against the working class. The women were acquitted as they have been proved not to be prostitutes and not to be committing any illegal act apart from being poor living with a serious illness. Nevertheless, their story (they were subjected to obligatory medical tests, their photos, names, addresses and family details were published online) worked as terrorisation of poor people who might be ill or might be actually working in sex industry and now cannot seek medical care because they are afraid of being subjected to the same criminalisation and humiliation process (EnetEnglish 2014).

To all this, one should add the heavy privatisation programme which is an essential axis of the Support Mechanism. Natural resources and public infrastructure are being swiftly

privatised, usually at very low price, so that the government appears to have some income. Privatisations of course deprive all people but mostly the poorest among the population from their ultimate means of (re)production, which is the commons (Baland & Francois 2005).

Finally, the sharp decrease in public expenditures led to the reduction of social services and benefits that covered a lot of the reproduction work needed for households and society to survive. The shrinking of public services obliges the producers (mainly women in a patriarchal society, as they are considered the “naturals” of domestic work) to produce themselves anything that the retreating welfare state does not provide anymore. Poverty has increased sharply, which means that household members have to work more and satisfy needs with less means while receiving much less income than what they received five years ago. In other words, the reproduction of society has been transferred to a greater extent on the shoulders of the poorest, particularly women, and the reproduction of those same people is done with much less expenses by capitalists and the state.

5. Dystopia is choice. Now what?

As if the conditions described in the previous sections were not enough already, the dystopian policies chosen have to reinforce themselves in order to make sure that there is no effective resistance or even if there is some, this is not able to substitute main axes of thought and action in the place of the existing political economic system. Greece has not ever been a feminist anti-nationalist paradise but during the last four years sexism, patriarchy and nationalism have been promoted as dominant and most favoured ideology by the elites, the government and the mass media. Actually, sexism, patriarchy and nationalism are not only intertwined but they are the easy solution for maintaining the capitalist hierarchy and exploitation regardless of any organised resistance that might emerge in the future. We have already pointed out that patriarchal and sexist attitudes prevented the theoretical and practical resistance against deregulation of women’s working conditions and this led to the easy deregulation of everybody’s working conditions. The same mentalities give theoretical and practical tools to anyone or any group who wants to reproduce the system, to do so by gaining privileges, at least the privilege of transferring their own disenfranchisement onto a person more disadvantaged than they are.

Restructuring the economy in a way that attacks the majority and transfers wealth from them to the few, cannot happen without an institutional and political drift where institutions and political life just turn into serving the neoliberal agenda and this only. There are continuous constitutional violations by non-constitutional legislation adopted in non-constitutional ways. In Greek legal terminology this is called *parasynthagma* (παρασύνταγμα), para-constitution. This is a term initially used to describe the non-constitutional legislation adopted by the greek state during turbulent, usually non-democratic times, where communists and leftists were persecuted and capitalists needed more guarantees to assure their profits (D.M. 2014). In other words, political oppression has become the new official normality.

Depriving the population of basic goods, such as energy, water, food, heating, health care, education is also a tool in itself to permit more neoliberal policies to be implemented. People have to keep occupied with covering basic needs and have no time, means and stamina

to think in a more global way or to organise resistance practices. The majority is trapped in this basic defense exactly because without it they cannot survive. So, the policy is to keep them occupied with everyday survival- a practice that has been quite effective in the entire post-colonial world.

Nevertheless, are there no other options? I am not able to state any solutions, as this is and should be a collective project. However, from the above it is obvious that we need to revisit theory, in particular the questions related to who produces what, whether displayed in GDP or not, and to recognise resistances or creative practices that made the capitalist attack be more aggressive here than in other parts of Europe. We also need to discuss the policy stance of movements that do not address the intertwining of patriarchal and capitalist structures and how capitalism used this disregard for the rights of women against the working class as a whole. Revisiting theory would be practical in that respect, and it would be even more effective if we reconsidered the racist element of capitalist patriarchy which usually goes forgotten (Peterson 2012).

Finally, we need to re-assess non-capitalist knowledge and structures which survive or emerge one or another way in the country and see which of them and under which conditions can be adopted, modified or improved in order to construct any possible alternatives. Even during my PhD research, I had to face data which revealed that there exist economic practices or structures which are mistakenly stereotyped or not taken into account so that capitalist advancement is facilitated. I have also found by the occasion of my research on non-mainstream transaction modes that we ignore vast part of economic and social knowledge exactly because we are trained to see and understand only what we are allowed to, unless a shock, like the so-called crisis, makes people, even academics, reconsider their views (Sotiropoulou 2012). Movements and subversive everyday collective practices, despite their weaknesses, are the only we have to fight back but also to learn beyond the provided mainstream knowledge (Icaza & Vazquez 2013).

6. Conclusion

Apart from political economic question, the discussion of the hypothesis whether the economic conditions in Greece are a deliberate choice against the producers who already were resisting capitalist patriarchy, there are several implications in terms of theory and research. First, we saw that we cannot anymore ignore the gendered structure of capitalism. If an analysis needs to be anticapitalist, it will also need to be antisexist and antipatriarchal. And this means that we cannot ignore anymore the experience of all social groups who even in anticapitalist movements are working hard but their voice is not listened to or is silenced as “fragmenting the movement”: women, homosexuals, immigrants, children, the elderly, people with disabilities.

Second, we need to turn to the people and the movements outside Europe and to the theory and practice they produce¹ to understand better the policies imposed in Europe

¹ I call it in brief post-colonial in this paper, but it is more than that. At the end, we cannot still define creative work outside Europe with colonialism as its marking sign.

(Beverley 2004). Colonial ideology did a good job in persuading European people that they are somehow different or better ideologically equipped than the rest people of this planet – which is wrong in terms of reality and racist in terms of politics. We need therefore, to de-orientalise and de-eurocentricise anticapitalist thought, not only because anticapitalism means that Europe is just a minority but also because only in that way our anticapitalist struggle might become effective.

Third, we need to conduct research, whether in academia or within the movements, having all the above in mind. Historical research is an emergency as we miss important information about the capitalisation process in all countries as a gendered, colonial and racist procedure of creating and grabbing wealth for the sake of the few who belong to specific social groups. But, it seems that it is urgent to conduct research in various disciplines, not only the social ones, searching for what alternatives have been destroyed through the capitalisation process and what alternatives are still available. At the end, if dystopia is a choice so is a collective project which is not dystopian.

Acknowledgements:

I am grateful to Dr Ferda Dönmez Atbaşı (Ass.Prof. at University of Ankara) for this paper has vastly benefited from ideas and discussions concerning neoliberal policies in both Turkey and Greece the last years. I am also grateful to the participants of the 3rd Conference of the Political Economy Scientific Society (EEPO) themed “Greek economy and the Memoranda policy: Situation and perspectives” (Patras, January 14-15th 2014), for their comments and questions on a previous version of this paper.

References

- 1) Agathangelou, A. M. and Ling, L. H. M. (2006). Fear and property: why a liberal social ontology fails postcolonial states. *International Affairs Working Paper 2006–07*. Paper for a panel on ‘Contesting modern state: stateness in the postcolonial world’, International Studies Association, 22–26 March 2006, San Diego, Calif.
- 2) Baland, J.M. & Francois, P. (2005). Commons as insurance and the welfare impact of privatization, *Journal of Public Economics*, vol. 89, pp. 211-231.
- 3) Barker, D.K. & Feiner, S.F. (2010). As the World Turns: Globalization, Consumption, and the Feminization of Work. *Rethinking Marxism: A Journal of Economics, Culture & Society*, 22(2), 246-252.
- 4) Bayat, A. (2000). From “dangerous classes” to “quiet rebels” – Politics of the urban subaltern in the Global South, *International Sociology*, vol. 15, no 3, pp. 533-557.
- 5) Beverley, J. 2004. El subalterno y los limites del saber academico. *Revista Aktual Marx*, 2 (August), trans. M. Beiza and S. Villalobos-Ruminott.
- 6) Bhandar, B. (2011). Plasticity and post-colonial recognition: ‘owning, knowing and being’. *Law Critique*, 22: 227–49.
- 7) Chatzikiriakou, C., Dimitriou, D., Kizos, T. & Vasdeki, M. (2011). “For my children”: Different functions of the agricultural landscape and attitudes of farmers on different areas of Greece towards small scale landscape change, *Geografisk Tidsskrift-Danish Journal of Geography*, vol. 111, no. 2, pp. 117-130.

- 8) D.M. (2014). Κατρούγκαλος: Ζούμε σε ένα παρα-Σύνταγμα [Katrougkalos: “We live in a para-syntagma”], Ελευθεροτυπία-Enet.gr, 14.09.2014, accessible at <http://www.enet.gr/?i=news.el.article&id=435191>
- 9) Dallacosta, M. & James, S. (1975). *Women and the subversion of the community*, Falling Wall Press & individuals from Women’s Movement in England and Italy, Bristol, UK.
- 10) Doxiadis, A. (2010). Νοικοκυραίοι, ραντιέρηδες, καιροσκόποι [House-owner-keepers, Rentiers, Adventurers], *Athens Review of Books*, vol. 8, also accessible at <http://anamorfosis.net/?p=147>
- 11) Dunaway, WA. (2001). The double register of history: Situating the forgotten woman and her household in capitalist commodity chains. *Journal of World Systems Research*, 7 (1-spring): 2-29.
- 12) Eduards, M.L. (1994). Women’s agency and collective action. *Women’s Studies International Forum*, 17 (2/3), 181-186.
- 13) EnetEnglish (2014). Court awards HIV-positive women compensation for unjust imprisonment, 07.04.2014, accessible at <http://www.enetenglish.gr/?i=news.en.article&id=1844>
- 14) Eurostat (2014). Euroarea unemployment rate at 11,4%, *News release – Euroindicators*, 146/2014, 30.09.2014, accessible at http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_PUBLIC/3-30092014-BP/EN/3-30092014-BP-EN.PDF
- 15) Federici, S. (2013): *Revolucion en punto cero: Trabajo domestico, reproduccion y luchas feministas* [Revolution at point zero: Domestic labour, reproduction and feminist struggles], Traficantes de Suenos-Mapas, traduccion: Scriptorium (Fernandez-Cuervos, C. & Martin-Ponz, P.).
- 16) Frazer, N. (2013). *Fortunes of feminism – From state-managed capitalism to neoliberal crisis*, Verso, London & New York.
- 17) Hammen, O.J. (1972): “Marx and the Agrarian Question”, *The American Historical Review*. Vol. 77(3 – June) pp. 679-704.
- 18) Hechter, M. (1974). *Internal colonialism – The Celtic fringe in Celtic national development, 1536-1966* (Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press)
- 19) Icaza, R. & Vazquez, R. (2013). Social struggles as epistemic struggles, *Development & Change*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 683-704.
- 20) Ινστιτούτο Εργασίας - Labour Institute (2014): *Η ελληνική οικονομία & η απασχόληση – Ετήσια Έκθεση* [Greek economy & employment – Annual Report], Report 16, Athens: Labour Institute.
- 21) Kabeer, N. (1999). Resources, agency, achievements: Reflections on the measurement of women’s empowerment. *Development & Change*, 30, 435-464.
- 22) Kalantaridis, C. & Labrianidis, L. (1999): Family production and the global market: Rural industrial growth in Greece, *Sociologia Ruralis*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 146-164.
- 23) Left.gr (2014): Δραματική αύξηση της παιδικής θνησιμότητας – Μείωση των γεννήσεων κατά 6,21% [Dramatic increase of child mortality – Decrease in births by 6,21%], 30.09.2014 accessible at <http://left.gr/news/dramatiki-ayxisi-tis-vrefikis-thnisimotitas-meiosi-ton-genniseon-kata-621>
- 24) Madytinis, E. (____): Η εκπαίδευση των γυναικών στην Ελλάδα τον 19^ο-αρχές 20ού αιώνα, electronic source accessible at <http://epas-mytil.les.sch.gr/oldpage/images/23.pdf>
- 25) Mayes, E. 2005. Private property, the private subject and women – can women truly be owners of capital? in: M. Albertson Fineman and T. Dougherty (eds), *Feminism Confronts Homo Economicus – Gender, Law and Society*. Ithaca, N.Y. and London: Cornell University Press, pp. 117–128.

- 26) OECD (2013). “Greece” in *Education at a Glance 2013: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing.
- 27) OECD (2014a). “Greece” in *Education at a Glance 2014: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing.
- 28) OECD (2014b). *Education at a Glance 2014: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing
- 29) Pateman, C. (1988). *The Sexual Contract*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- 30) Peckham, R.S. (2004). Internal colonialism – Nation and region in 19th century. In Todorova, M. (Ed.) *Balkan identities-Nation and memory* (London: Hurst & Company) pp. 41-58.
- 31) Peterson, V.S. (1997). Whose crisis and post-modern masculinity, in Gill S. & Mittelman J.H. (eds): *Innovation and transformation in International Studies*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York-Melbourne, pp. 185-202.
- 32) Peterson, V. Spike (2010). A Long View of Globalization and Crisis. *Globalizations*, 7(1-2), 187-202.
- 33) Peterson, V. Spike (2012). Rethinking Theory. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 14(1), 5-35.
- 34) Richardson, J. 2010. Feminism, property in the person and concepts of self. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 12: 56–71.
- 35) Sakellaropoulos, T. (2010). Ένα περίγραμμα για την κατανόηση της οικονομικής και κοινωνικής ιστορίας της Ελλάδας του 19ου αιώνα [An outline for understanding economic and social history of 19th century Greece], in Moysidis A., Sakellaropoulos S. (eds) *Η Ελλάδα στον 19ο και 20ο αιώνα : Εισαγωγή στην ελληνική κοινωνία [Greece in 19th and 20th century: Introduction to the Greek society]*, Athens: Topos Publishers.
- 36) Seferiadis, S. (1999). Small rural ownership, subsistence agriculture and peasant protest in interwar Greece: The Agrarian Question recast, *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, vol. 17, pp. 277-323.
- 37) Smith, H. (2014). Migrants face “living hell” in Greek detention, *The Guardian*, 01.04.2014, accessible at <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/apr/01/migrants-living-hell-greek-detention-medecins-sans-frontieres-scabies-tb>
- 38) Sotiropoulou, Irene (2012). Economic activity without official currency in Greece: The * hypothesis, *International Journal of Community Currency Research*, vol. 16, Special Issue: 30 years of Community & Complementary Currencies, pp. D70-79.
- 39) Szporluk, R. (1988). *Communism and Nationalism – Karl Marx versus Friedrich List* (New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- 40) Taussig, M. (2010). *The devil and commodity fetishism in Latin America*, 30th anniversary edition with a new chapter by the author (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press).
- 41) Technological Institute of Athens-Department of Social Work (TEI Αθήνας-Τμήμα Κοινωνικής Εργασίας) (____). Γεννήσεις στην Ελλάδα [Birth giving in Greece] 1931-2008, accessible at <http://users.teiath.gr/angtsal/Birth.htm>
- 42) ThePressProject (2013). Ραγδαία αύξηση της βίας κατά των γυναικών [Sharp increase of violence against women], 01.11.2013, accessible at <http://www.thepressproject.gr/article/50064/Ragdaia-auksisi-tis-bias-kata-gunaikon>
- 43) Todorova, M. (1994). “The Balkans: From Discovery to Invention” *Slavic Review*. Vol. 52 (2-Summer) pp. 453-482.
- 44) Venizelos, V. (2014). Οι γιατροί αντίθετοι με την κατάργηση των προληπτικών εξετάσεων [Doctors oppose the ban of preventive tests], Η Αυγή, 11.09.2014, accessible at <http://www.avgi.gr/article/3973327/oi-giatroi-antithetoi-me-tin-katargisi-ton-proliptikon-exetaseon>

- 45) Walsh, C (2013). Women on the Left - Konstantina Kuneva, International Socialist Group website, 12.02.2013, accessible at <http://internationalsocialist.org.uk/index.php/2013/02/women-on-the-left-konstantina-kuneva/>.
- 46) Zikakou, I.(2014): 6,3 million Greeks threatened by poverty, *Greek Reporter*, 25.09.2014, accessible at <http://greece.greekreporter.com/2014/09/25/6-3-million-greeks-threatened-by-poverty/>