

[NOTE: This is an abridged version of a longer original text. We have chosen representative paragraphs under subheads #1, #3, and #4, which are here placed in brackets to indicate that they are only extracts, intended to illustrate the general thrust of these sections. The same is true of the first paragraph under subhead #2. Other portions of the resolution have been less dramatically edited, or are presented here in their entirety. Translator's notes are also enclosed in brackets.]

Text Adopted by the Conference of OKDE-Spartacus (December 2010)

[This text was approved at the conference by a vote of 26 (plus one observer) for, with 20 votes for an amended version of the same document, 8 white votes and 3 abstentions.]

A. World situation

1. The international financial crisis

[We must distinguish between the specific triggers for this particular crisis and the root causes which relate to the internal logic of the capitalist mode of production. The crisis is a manifestation of the decline in the average rate of profit, while simultaneously revealing the overproduction of goods. The decline in the average rate of profit simply means that, compared with the total social capital, the total surplus generated is not sufficient to maintain the old average profit rate. When only one part of the accumulated capital can be invested productively, there is a drive toward increasingly speculative, and therefore risky, activities. The absolute volume of investment may increase. But investment in areas that create employment and output of real goods and services does not grow enough to sustain the expansion of financial markets, which continues in a way that is completely disconnected with anything at the level of actual consumers.]

[Under these conditions a capitalist recovery will require considerable intervention by non-economic methods and a historic shift in the relationship of forces against the working class. There is no room for a "progressive" or Keynesian approach under the domination of the bourgeoisie.]

2. The worsening socio-political conflicts in the U.S. and Western Europe

[Although the U.S. economy continues to fall as a share of the world economy, the U.S. remains relevant despite the decline since its market is still huge and its military power cannot even be compared with that of major competitors.]

The "European social model" is under attack. At stake during this social war is the overall class correlation of forces on a social and political level. The European working class, which maintains elements of its rich tradition despite the historic defeats of the recent past, is under a renewed attack.

Left-wing political parties in Europe (The "Left Party" in Germany, the French Communist Party, and the Left Front, the SYN / SYRIZA in Greece, etc.) confine their opposition to parliamentary/governmental solutions within the existing socio-political system, especially the institutions of the EU. The Stalinist Communist Parties in Portugal and Greece distance themselves in words from the dominant capitalist politics, but prevent the mass movement from gaining unity and strength. They assert, as always, the same "popular front"-style proposals which do not offer any transitional or socialist perspective.

The trade union bureaucracy generally supports initiatives by the ruling classes, accepts cuts in real wages and deteriorating working conditions in order to "save jobs."

Social polarization, however, continues to develop. During the last decades, dominant center-right, social democratic, and green parties have all had difficulty maintaining their parliamentary representation as well as in developing national and international policy. With the worsening crisis there are increased opportunities for right-wing and fascist parties to disseminate racist and chauvinistic propaganda. This year's election results in Hungary, Sweden and the Netherlands indicate that this danger is likely to become more serious as the crisis deepens.

The socio-political situation is becoming more explosive. The Europe-wide protest by workers in Brussels, the strikes in Spain, Italy and other countries, and especially the general strike in Greece—despite the difficult situation of the labor movement in our country—along with the huge protests in France against the reactionary "reform" of the pension system attempted by Sarkozy, give a foretaste of what might develop in a more unified and determined way once the labor movement has gained increased strength and confidence.

The role of European internationalist, revolutionary left should be to advocate the need for radical forms of struggle, moving in a socialist direction and designed to support a consistent self-organization of workers and the oppressed, combined with a convincing set of transitional demands and a renewed transitional program. The reformist policies become increasingly irrelevant, confronted as they are with a steam-roller of organized attack by big business and government. Even the concept of defending recent gains of the working class seems increasingly remote. The policy of revolutionary recomposition, to create an "other," a subversive left in competition with the reformist organizations, while simultaneously based on a clear policy of the united front to repel the attacks of capital, is needed more than ever.

3. The U.S., Middle East, China and the inter-imperialist contradictions

[On one level, the evolution of the crisis is bound to intensify the conflict with smaller capitalist and imperialist forces. It has only been 20 years since the U.S. emerged as "the world's only superpower," after the collapse of the Soviet Union. And it is only 9 and 7 years respectively since the U.S. and its allies invaded Afghanistan and Iraq to establish undeniable world domination through control of the massive resources in the Gulf region and Central Asia (Afghanistan and the southern former Soviet republics).

[The U.S. ruling class, and more generally the ruling elite of the NATO countries, perceive both Russia and China as dangerous opponents in the battle for world domination. Lately it seems that Washington is putting pressure on Beijing to revalue its currency, the yuan, in order to increase U.S. exports. It appears that the ruling classes of most major countries are trying to solve their problems at the expense of others, a policy that will likely lead to a worsening of the global crisis, including monetary and trade disputes.]

4. Latin America

[Latin America remains the continent with the highest level of class conflict, albeit with wide variations between different countries and regions.]

5. First conclusions

In this text we cannot present a comprehensive analysis of the global situation, which would also have to include South Asia and the Far East (from Pakistan to Japan and Indonesia), Africa and Eastern Europe—confined, perhaps, to the most significant recent developments in the international economy and politics. However it should be noted that the potential for workers' struggles in many parts of the world—from the imperialist metropolises (NATO countries) to Asia (Pakistan, India, China, South Korea, Indonesia)—seems to be on the rise. In addition, popular mass resistance and rebellion has also increased against corrupt and dictatorial regimes in many countries (Iran, Thailand, Kyrgyzstan, etc.), though the labor movement in most of these countries remains weak at the moment and cannot offer much prospect of massive protests. The same is true for nations which have been oppressed for decades, such as Palestine, Chechnya, and Kurdistan. The consequences of the crisis are likely to give impetus to such explosive situations.

What is needed is the fight for mass anti-capitalist and trade union demands at a political level, based directly on a program that bases itself on the needs of the exploited and oppressed: rejection of layoffs, reduction in working hours without a reduction in pay, massive creation of public jobs in areas required to meet the needs of the majority of society and of the environment, nationalization of banks under workers control, drastic reduction of armaments, etc. It is obvious and inevitable that these demands, developing a transitional logic, are incompatible with the economy of exploitation and profits, ultimately with the existence of the capitalist mode of production. The issue of workers' power is now posed.

Transitional demands today are not only something we need in order to maintain our own revolutionary tradition. They are the only coherent response by the movement as a whole to the attack of capital—even though the level of class consciousness remains low. The problem is to become a force which is not external to the working class, able to help it integrate such demands organically through the mass experience which is rapidly unfolding.

This is true in a number of countries which have experienced profound upheavals—such as Venezuela and Argentina—where those who occupied factories continued production under the direct control of the workers themselves. Such experiences should be expanded. Forms of collective property such as this can play a crucial role in the struggles in Latin America, Africa and Asia, and become strategically important in the imperial cities of North America and Western Europe as well.

To promote an ecosocialist vision, a direct anti-capitalist program must seek radical changes in transport policy, transformation of the energy sector, etc., along with a fundamental restructuring of other entire sectors of the economy. This is not compatible with an economy of profit and competition—that is, under capitalist production. There must be a structure for democratic decision-making and the establishment of a planned economy under workers' and popular control. This raises the question of public and social distribution of production according to the needs of local populations (as demonstrated by the dynamic of indigenous and native peoples when they mobilize in self-defence).

This programmatic perspective far exceeds the "Keynesian" efforts of a revival in demand and a reform of the functioning of financial markets. It creates a set of tasks that can be solved only by a working class government that is in total conflict with the bourgeois state. It is undeniable that in the dependent/underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America issues of national independence and sovereignty, which can lead the fight for a Constituent Assembly, cannot be fully resolved unless they are combined with an anti-capitalist struggle and the formation of

governments based on labor, on popular self-organization and power. This is, clearly, the dynamic of permanent revolution, a concept that remains timely and will unfold repeatedly.

The open outbreak of the global crisis reveals, more clearly than ever, the historical boundaries of the capitalist system. At the same time, however, this system continues to extract an enormous social, human and ecological toll. The starting point of social struggles is the inability of capitalism to meet the needs of the vast majority of the population. Politically and socially the contest evolves on three levels: a) class unity against the domination of finance capital, neo-liberal austerity, wars, etc., b) anticapitalist regroupment, which seeks the unification of working-class vanguard and the strengthening of the revolutionary Marxist forces against reformism, c) building organizations that are internationalist and revolutionary Marxist, in particular the 4th International, with the prospect of building mass revolutionary parties that are capable of providing leadership during future battles, up to and including the revolutionary crisis which we expect to result in victory: the imposition of social solutions that rely on the independent power of the working class and its allies.

6. The evolution of the class struggle internationally in this historical juncture

The period of global capitalist crisis marks a major offensive against the working classes around the world. It marks the end of a historic “social contract” which was initiated after the Second World War. Such a situation is likely to generate a leap in radical consciousness among the masses, which in turn contributes dramatically to the universal crisis of political representation. This affects not only the bourgeois parties, who advocate a mode of production and society that have nothing whatsoever to provide the majority of humanity, but also the traditional workers' parties that have secured a place for themselves (even if a more “progressive” one) in the geography of the same system and offer no real alternative. Even important parts of what is called the “radical left” have become accustomed to playing the role merely of advocates for Keynesian conquests. But these gains have been rolled back at such a rate that it becomes extremely doubtful such a left can still play any significant role.

Integrated with the sharp crisis of political representation comes a rapidly deepening authoritarianism of the state and of state violence in all its forms. The more the social shocks of the crisis have intensified, the less they can be managed as they have for an entire historical epoch—through normal channels of bourgeois democracy. Further, the political crisis in the camp of the bourgeoisie makes it increasingly difficult to generate a social consensus and to build alliances with intermediate strata. Thus, the class domination of the capitalists themselves is revealed in all its naked power.

The crisis situation significantly strengthens the already-significant role of transnational imperialist institutions (IMF, World Bank, NATO, EU etc.). This corresponds to the massive internationalization of capital and the capitalist division of labor, making it even more imperative to pose the necessity of proletarian internationalism as a tool to enhance each national working class, but also as a practical revolutionary answer on a global scale.

Despite the historic defeats suffered by the working classes, despite (or because of) the unprecedented attack by capital, there has been a notable rise in social struggles worldwide. The strike wave in France is the most prominent and recent example. The importance of events which have recently developed in countries where workers' resistance was paralyzed for a long time should also be noted. Such events have taken place in Eastern Europe (Poland, Czech Republic, Slovenia) and China.

These social struggles have shown features of acute social conflict, even open rebellion—not only in the Third World but also in the advanced capitalist countries (such as Greece in December). The upheavals, which typically involve questions of democratic rights, are of great importance to the morale of the oppressed and have a destabilizing effect on a major portion of the bourgeoisie. They have not generally, however, been led by or developed at the initiative of the working class, and this sets a limit to their political effectiveness and inspirational capacity.

While the objective conditions, and in some cases the spontaneous motion of the masses, favor radical and revolutionary solutions, the subjective reality of the working class poses a serious obstacle to them. The lack of reliable mass revolutionary parties stands as both cause and effect in this regard. The experience of class-collaborationist projects that nevertheless gained considerable strength and offered hope to masses of people (Workers' Party in Brazil, Communist Refoundation in Italy, and Communist Party of Nepal - Maoist) has certainly contributed to this situation.

B. The situation in Greece

1. The evolution of the crisis

The subsidy and stimulus program of the government, combined with the Memorandum [translator's note: "Memorandum" is the term used for the contract signed last Spring by the Greek government in order to qualify for the loan from the Troika (IMF, EU, ECB)] is completely insufficient to secure a capitalist development policy. The PASOK government chooses above all else to act as the guarantor of the debt for Greek, French and German banks. So it is hardly surprising that the international press and governments hail Papandreu and Papaknostantinou as "reliable" and "effective."

There is no easy way out of this capitalist crisis. The debt is still there and government borrowing will increase, as the interest on debt service is higher than the growth-rate of the economy.

The Greek economy is distinguished by deep inequalities in income and high unemployment (12% in July 2010, with 587,000 unemployed). Real unemployment is estimated at least 5 points higher, since after a few part-time hours even those with casual employment are counted among the "employed." And those who have given up looking for work out of frustration are not counted in the statistics at all.

The PASOK government has, in accord with the demands of the ruling class, completely deregulated industrial relations.

It is clear that these measures are not technical or economic necessities. They reflect a class strategy at the expense of workers. No sacrifice should therefore be accepted in the name of "national economy" and "recovery."

There can be no exit from this crisis by means of debt management (monetary policy, fiscal consolidation, etc.) without crushing the working class. Any shift that will benefit the workers requires that we break with the rules of capitalism.

2. Greece-EU-IMF

At the present moment, the debate about the role and nature of the European Union (EU) and the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU), have a special importance—in particular when considering

what demands the left and labor movement should raise against them. These are central institutions for managing the crisis by imposing the strategy of the transnational capitalist class in all their member countries. Any response to the "excess" of the crisis, from the most liberal and bourgeois to the most revolutionary and working-class, will quickly have to confront the question of the EU and EMU.

The left remains trapped by two conceptions rooted in the past. They are equally reformist and managerial, with little to offer the workers. This is especially true since the crisis of capitalism requires "big solutions" and, therefore, bold revolutionary/transitional demands. Reformism is exposed as utopian—not only useless for the majority of society in terms of any future perspective, unable to solve the crisis in the interests of the masses, but actually a threat to current standards of living.

The first pattern, which characterizes the left of the Communist Party but also the Stalinist left more generally including other organizations of Stalinist origin, along with a piece of SYN (Left Current, Alavanos etc.), is the proposal to leave the EU, which comes in many varieties. This demand, though it seems militant and is accompanied by much genuinely anti-EU rhetoric, is actually deeply reformist for two fundamental reasons. First, leaving the EU and EMU is presented as an independent and immediate step, a necessary precondition for other changes, rather than something that would be accompanied by and flow from other changes. It can be assumed, therefore, that this will not reflect a social revolution or even a radical change in the relationship of forces, generating conflict within the country as a result of capitalist policy. It would simply create another kind of capitalist government. Clearly, this proposal merely envisions managing the crisis in a more progressive way and is far from revolutionary. In addition, the approach of leaving the EU as an immediate step is based on nationalist illusions, either open or hidden: the 'new patriotism', which sometimes openly declares, but always at least assumes, that Greece is a dependent capitalist country, a national slave, an economic colony of the EU and the euro system. (Even the most half-hearted version of the exit demand, the so-called "anticapitalist alternative" which is the point of departure for ANTARSYA, still assumes that Greece is the captive of foreign economic and political forces). It is true that the extortion of the public debt, the pressure of transnational organizations and Western European ruling classes on the Greek government has intensified. But this pressure does not alter the production and social structure of the country. It does not make the Greek bourgeoisie less dominant in Greece. It does not negate the fact that the restoration of capitalist normality in the country will benefit mostly the domestic capitalists nor does it negate the reality that what is being imposed is a class strategy. The memorandum does not contradict the goals of the Greek bourgeoisie (otherwise they themselves might well seek to exit from the EU). In short, these things do not make Greece a dependent country.

At the same time, if the anti-EU rhetoric is not necessarily anti-capitalist it remains true that there can be no revolutionary rupture with the system without breaking with the EU. A second conception on the left is of eurocommunist origin. This is expressed primarily at the present moment by the parties SYN and the Democratic Left of F. Kouvelis [translator's note: a recent split of the party of SYN] in the form of a "European strategy" to overcome the crisis. This proposal is obviously not a revolutionary project (and the voices calling for it do not assert that it is). It is limited to alternative management policies of existing national and transnational capitalist institutions. In short, the class struggle stops where it begins to threaten the stability of the EU and the euro. Unfortunately, this view does not leave the far left untouched, including our current. Organizations which adapt to it tend to confuse theoretically correct internationalist demands on a strategic level, such as the call for a Constituent Assembly of the peoples of Europe, with an immediate reform strategy for the EU based on changing political affiliations in favor of the

workers. By contrast to the prevailing patriotic reflexes they tend to sometimes accept the integration of the European working classes into the EU as "objectively progressive," despite the bourgeois class nature and undemocratic structure of the EU. This section of the extreme left finds itself trapped far from a revolutionary perspective. It forgets that the goal of the revolutionary left is not the conquest of capitalist institutions (either national or international) and their control by society, but their radical overthrow. Also, this viewpoint virtually ignores the fact that while the revolution is a global process—which will certainly be definitively achieved only on a global, or at least an international level—the class struggle nevertheless follows the law of uneven and combined development. It is therefore a destructive utopia to think that the revolution can occur simultaneously in all countries of the EMU or EU.

The perspective of revolutionary Marxism should be free from both the patriotism of stalinist origin and from Eurocommunist cosmopolitanism. For us it is clear that the struggle is, of necessity, first against capitalism and then against the EU, not vice versa. The imperative we face, therefore, in the EU is to raise the same kinds of transitional demands which are, in fact, incompatible with the existence of capitalism in both Greece and in the rest of Europe. We understand very well that a rebel country—which would have implemented such transitional demands on its own, which has stopped paying the debt, nationalized the banking system, nationalized companies without compensation under workers' control, etc.—will not have a place in the EU. The exit from the EU is, therefore, an effect of a revolutionary strategy, not a precondition for it.

The EU has recently undergone a huge break. Even in the central countries, where the impact of policy and the effects of the Euro is so obviously destructive, more and larger segments of workers and oppressed have begun to realize the reactionary and brutal class war that is being waged against them. We do not and should not be inclined to accommodate such a reality. As revolutionary Marxists we believe that the EU and the Euro system is a mechanism—institutionalized in reality and thus completely uncontrollable—for austerity. The disastrous policies of the EU, with national governments participating equally and therefore co-responsible, is evident based on what is before our eyes (Common Agricultural Policy, the Treaty of Bologna, Dublin, Maastricht, Lisbon, anticommunist memorandum). It is therefore our duty to fight for the overthrow of capitalist national and European policies and to bring about a disruption of what has come to be "normal" at both a national and a transnational level. In this struggle, we feel that a break with the EU can only be achieved with the model of Greece as the "weak link" in the EU. We must make it clear that the stability of the euro and the EU cannot be allowed to determine the limits of the process. On the contrary, our objectives are incompatible with these mechanisms.

At the same time we feel that we have an extremely important material political solidarity and cooperation with other parts of the European proletariat on a tactical and strategic level. In short, the concerted struggle of the European working classes is important not only in order to challenge the bourgeois classes today. If any country actually makes a revolutionary break with capitalism, international solidarity is the only force that can prevent its destruction by other capitalist states. Thus, we understand that both the political and social processes are international, that the class struggle in our country is supported and supplemented by the pan-European struggle and vice versa.

3. Political situation

Since last April 23, when "the support mechanism" was set up by the troika (IMF, EU, ECB) for the "rescue" of the Greek economy, the political landscape has changed dramatically. The main feature of this new period is that leaders of the reformist working class parties are completely

discredited. The hypocrisy of bourgeois municipal leaders is fully revealed and the usual misleading maneuvers of bourgeois urban politics have become ineffective. They are met with cynicism as the masses suffer more and more brutal attacks on their living standards.

The government is trying, on the one hand, to paint a rosy picture and create a climate of optimism based on assertions that the economic targets of the Memorandum have been met thanks to the "sacrifices of the Greek people." In reality, however, the ongoing economic downturn increasingly squeezes the workers. What seems likely, and this is what the government fears in the foreseeable future, is a violent uprising as desperate and socially marginalized human beings are squeezed by the surge in unemployment and the dismantling of the welfare state, thrust into unprecedented misery.

However, despite the accumulation of popular indignation, the fact that the measures of the memorandum were eventually enforced highlights the failure of the trade union movement to put forward a strong, universal, robust and effective resistance which might define the defense of the workers in bottom-line terms.

Despite the general disrepute of the representatives of bourgeois parties, and despite the suffering of the working classes, capitalism continues to be seen as sovereign today in the minds of the workers, the only possible and viable social system. Despite the widespread skepticism/pessimism about the state of the economy and the ominous outcome of the crisis that everyone expects, socialism has not yet appeared on the horizon as a realistic alternative in the minds of the masses. It should also be evident that the onset of the capitalist crisis found the working class in a state of political frustration and disorientation, without the necessary confidence to promote its own policy.

The results of the first round of local elections in November revealed the sharp decline in support for PASOK—both in percentage terms and in absolute number of votes. There was an enormous and rapid deterioration on the electoral level within six months from the enforcement of the Memorandum. The government of Papandreou has seen its room for maneuver shrink dramatically. It is so weak that he is forced to seek support from the right (Democratic Alliance - Dora Bakoyiannis) and left (Democratic Left - F. Kouvelis).

Then we saw the results of the second round, with a sharp drop in the Attica region and the loss of municipalities in Athens and Thessaloniki. This highlighted the failure of the Samaras leadership to get back on track after last year's national electoral defeat of ND [translator's note: "New Democracy, the main party of the right] its inability to restore the credibility of the party as a meaningful governmental alternative. The failure occurs despite demagogic populist rhetoric in the pre-election period, supposedly in opposition to the policy of the memorandum.

The high rate of abstinence confirmed the general feeling of disdain and contempt for the bourgeois political system at the grass roots. However, this phenomenon may also reflect the troubling possibility that masses have begun to become depoliticized and dangerously disconnected, searching for individual (petty-bourgeois) solutions. We must seriously consider the ways in which any such development might contribute to an intensification of the crisis.

The electoral lists of SYN/SYRIZA in the last municipal elections received a vote that remained the same, or in some caases was even lower, than in the previous national elections. This has increased its internal contradictions and highlights the complete lack of any real alternative coming from the reformists.

The electoral rise of the Communist Party and ANTARSYA—as both a percentage of the vote and in absolute numbers—proves beyond any doubt that large sections of the working class are actively seeking a pole of political resistance and something to rally around. The Communist Party was systematically presented in the media as the only consistent voice opposed to the policy of the memorandum. But there can be no doubt that the Communist Party is incapable of fulfilling this role and that its possible political empowerment will guarantee a new round of defeats for the working class. The increased electoral impact of ANTARSYA, which was virtually ignored by the media and by the mainstream politicians, is solely due to its own direct campaign efforts: +the presence of hundreds of activists of the far left who participate with continuity and consistency in social struggles.

The duty falls almost exclusively on ANTARSYA, therefore, to immediately undertake the necessary political and organizational initiatives. The embarrassment of the media in the face of ANTARSYA's dramatic rise during the municipal elections, its systematic exclusion from the mainstream political scene, its status as the target of bourgeois propaganda as well as of sneak attacks on behalf of the reformist leaderships of DL, SYN, and KKE, demonstrates that the organic development of ANTARSYA poses a real danger to the system.

The right is in decay. The situation in the ND most clearly reflects the confusion and panic of the entire bourgeoisie as it is confronted with the crisis. The leading group of Samara is trying desperately to convince both itself and the ruling class that they remain a viable policy option, something to hold in reserve against the coming, inevitable, rapid deterioration of the PASOK government in the coming months. Simultaneously, following the populist and paternalistic tradition of the Greek right, it tries to present itself as interested in the peoples' needs. It postures as a progressive alternative which allegedly opposes the measures of the Memorandum—without, of course, rejecting the political class that created the Memorandum. It has espoused an alternative development path with the help of a purely wishful and rather indistinct mix of economic measures. So far it is obvious that it has failed to win support from either constituency. This is even more true since the first depends largely on the second.

Moreover, patriotic appeals to "major national issues" (Macedonia, Cyprus), which have always been part of the banner raised by the traditional right, have become relatively ineffective for the moment. The financial crisis is relentless as it raises the question of survival for the working classes. This does not leave much room for concern about the conflict of names between the Greek province of Macedonia and the neighboring country. There is a risk that such appeals could become effective if the issues could be combined, propagandistically, with direct concern about the economic situation. But, at least so far, bourgeois propaganda has found no way to engineer this, not even to attempt it. Moreover, the xenophobia/racism card, that can be more directly and more easily linked with the daily plight of the working classes, is played regularly by the right wing LAOS party. For a number of reasons, the traditional right of Samara wants to maintain a distance from this milieu.

The emergence of the party of Dora Bakoyannis ("Democratic Alliance")—which is presented as a "responsible" voice of the bourgeois political system that avoids populism and speaks of things as they really are—is based precisely on the failure of the old-fashioned populist Samaras leadership. Certainly Dora always represented the most dynamic and aggressive portion of Greek capital. A policy that favors companies that have an international orientation, along with the Greek banking system, requires the liberal "modernization" of the state machine, privatization of the public sector, and the normalization of relations with neighboring countries—a policy that is very close to if not identical with that of the "Memorandum." Unfortunately Dora faces two difficulties. On the one hand the PASOK government has signed on to carry out such a policy and does so with relative

success. On the other, we have the ongoing global crisis itself which, every day, demonstrates the failure of this neo-liberal approach. Further, the individuals who have come forward to staff the new party represent merely a recycling of some of the already-discredited politicians of the unified ND.

The threat of extreme right should not be underestimated.

LAOS has identified with the policy of the Memorandum and given open support to all of the employers' efforts. This has resulted in a reduced electoral influence among the masses in recent months. Thus we see that LAOS will, in critical moments, back the essential position of the bourgeoisie, whatever the electoral cost to itself might be. This was also reflected in the results of the district and municipal elections, in which LAOS saw its vote decline for the first time in recent years. LAOS tries to cover its basic approach by raising secondary differences with government policy. There is also a continuous effort by its leader, Karatzaferis, to be seen—with aid from the media—as the voice of “common sense.” LAOS will continue its effort to emerge as a central player in parliamentary politics, with obvious intentions to participate in a possible coalition government.

Further, there is always a danger when the deepening social anger at the crisis and signs of radicalization are combined with the maintenance of a strong extreme right (such as the rise of the Golden Dawn) plus a long-standing weakness of the left. This parallels the general and continuous rise of right-wing, neo-racist or ultra-conservative parties in many European countries. The appearance of the “indignant citizens’ committees” in neighborhoods of Athens embolden the neo-Nazis. They escalate their attacks, killing and injuring people. These are phenomena of social cannibalism which make the fight against racism a key priority for the movement.

The unprecedented electoral results of the Golden Dawn in the Municipality of Athens (more than 5%) clearly shows that there is no guarantee a sudden political upheaval, resulting from the crisis, will exclusively aid the left. It establishes this organization as a neo-Nazi political power, with an elected alderman and enhanced ability to influence political discourse. This is definitely not reflected in a corresponding increase of organized fascist forces. But it reflects a significant political appeal to petty-bourgeois layers at this particular moment based on the issue of immigrants. That appeal must be combatted immediately through a united front for mass action, coherent political campaigns, and organizing self-defense against the Nazi attacks.

PASOK is in unstable equilibrium. From April 23 onwards, the PASOK government is openly and most solemnly committed to act strictly within the framework imposed by the memorandum. Since the anger of the working classes remained largely unexpressed, simply part of the political background, the leadership of Papandreou continues to maintain a precarious balance at the top. The September government reshuffle was an attempt to improve/update this balance, slightly redistributing the pie and thus softening some friction between warring factions in the party bureaucracy. The organizational dissolution of the party base, and its transformation into a purely electoral mechanism, has relieved any direct pressure from the popular masses on the party leadership, allowing the bureaucracy to remain relatively united around the leadership.

So for now PASOK has proved to be the most reliable transmission-belt for the power of the bourgeoisie, completely free of its 'socialist' origins and “unrealistic” policies of the 1980s. Any internal party opposition remains extremely marginal and occasional. However, as austerity measures continue to be implemented, as new and more brutal measures against workers and pensioners are announced, the pressure from the trade union bureaucracy in the public sector will

certainly increase. Cracks will proliferate and expand. The forgotten Keynesian policies, that today are advocated mainly by individuals, are likely to once again find a significant political expression.

The impact of the district and municipal elections in November is also likely to play a role in accelerating intraparty friction.

The reformist left in general remains trapped in the parliamentary system. However, the conditions of the crisis reveal a cleavage that crosses party boundaries. A dividing line has emerged over strategic proposals with some leftist professors and politicians offering a more-or-less-profound economic critique that goes beyond the usual anti-neoliberal rhetoric, even challenging capitalism itself. A compelling strategic debate is emerging.

The reformist left in general remains trapped in the parliamentary system. However, the conditions of the crisis reveal a cleavage that crosses party boundaries. A dividing line has emerged over strategic proposals with some leftist professors and politicians offering a more or less profound economic critique that goes beyond the usual anti-neoliberal rhetoric, even challenging capitalism itself, with a strategic debate emerging in a compelling way.

On the one hand, the right-reformist "pro-European" features of the Synaspismos (SYN) leadership were clearly removed. A. Tsipras (SYN president), along with the former right-wing renovators current (which now has formed the independent "Democratic Left" party) along with a majority of the party apparatus, were particularly anxious about the "dangers" to the "European institutions" during the previous months, and the prospect of Greek development within them—dangers created by the possible participation of the IMF, an institution controlled by Washington, in affairs of the euro-zone! The persistent adherence to the concept of some alleged class-neutral European democratic institutions proves once again the actual characteristics of a submissive right reformist left. The class and authoritarian nature of the EU institutions is clear beyond any doubt in the midst of the crisis. The influence of SYN on the masses will remain stagnant, or decline. Its only consolation is that after the riots of December 2008, and after the isolation of its former president, A. Alavanos, it finally restored its "credibility." Thus the SYN is recognized again as a "responsible" political force by the media. In this context it appears that the choice of A. Mitropoulos (a former PASOK politician) as SYN candidate of the Attica region in the November elections represents a central political shift towards "the PASOK space".

The crisis of SYRIZA (the alliance of the left reformist SYN party with a number of small political organizations and groups of the radical and anticapitalist left) started with the uprising of December 2008 and culminated last September. SYRIZA had to figure out how it would respond to the most severe economic crisis of contemporary capitalism. One of the primary contradictions of the SYRIZA project was the coexistence of reformist and anti-capitalist elements in a common alliance. This contradiction finally exploded. The choice of the Social Democrat A. Mitropoulos (who also made a number of reactionary anti-immigrant statements) as the head of the regional SYRIZA ballot for the Attica region (which includes the capital, Athens) marks the complete failure of the so-called left shift of SYN. In a very painful procedure, thousands of militants, who had joined SYRIZA, with the illusion that it would create a large and modern left, finally turned their back on the alliance after the collapse of this expectation. Actually divided into 4 parts ("Democratic Left", "Front of Resistance and Solidarity" [translator's note: a coordination of some radical organizations and a current inside SYN around its former president A. Alavanos], "ANASA" [translator's note: a coordination of far left groups that demand the transformation of SYRIZA into a united party] and the "Left Current" [translator's note: the main current inside SYN around ex-members of the CPG]), it is now impossible to talk about SYRIZA, but merely about a "SYRIZA space".

The directions of these rifts, however, are contradictory. ANASA basically fails to exert any pressure on the SYN leadership. The only substantial break to the left is the "Front of Solidarity and Resistance" (FSR). Despite its obvious political and programmatic limits, despite its extreme focus on the personality of A. Alavanos, this development is not negligible. The ideas of patriotism and nationalism and of national dependence (a perception of Stalinist origin about the dependent nature of the Greek state and the need for

the creation of a "national liberation front") that characterize the FSR reveal another underlying contradiction. It is the duty of revolutionary Marxists to sharpen this contradiction. It is one of the main reasons for the existence and necessity of the ANTARSYA project: to achieve and to suggest a reliable anti-capitalist alternative through an open political debate, but mainly through joint action with different parts of the SYRIZA space.

On the other hand, the patriotic anti-Europeanism of the Communist Party, along with one part of the Left Current of SYN and a substantial part of the anticapitalist left, aims in one way or the other at the chimera of a national "people's economy" outside of the EU. But this anti-European orientation does not find support among broader layers, only among the party's supporters in a very narrow sense. The idea of a popular front with an alleged "progressive anti-European" wing of the bourgeoisie is not only politically wrong but also unrealistic. The Greek bourgeoisie as a whole is completely integrated into the single EU market. Neither the financial sector nor those engaged in "production" are looking for an exit strategy. So those who, at least in theory, advocate such a strategy will not find the allies they need among those who could, conceivably, take the lead in such a project of "national liberation".

The isolated mobilizations of PAME [translator's note: a coordination of trade unions controlled by the CPG], its refusal to coordinate and struggle with all other workers, its policy of substituting party organizations for the unions and for the working class, have repeatedly proven to be obstacles which get in the way of forging a united struggle. Thus the PAME orientation has tragic consequences for the responsiveness and resistance of the entire working class. The root of the problem is that PAME substitutes the stability of the party leadership and its aspirations—particularly the profound and irreversible bureaucratization of the CPG—for the interests of the working class. This sometimes even leads to open ruptures with the movement itself (for example during the strikes of municipal workers and an abstention from recent student conferences at the universities).

The CPG remains dedicated to the nostalgia of "socialism" as it existed in the Stalinist states. In the last years this nostalgia has increased, which means an ideological shift to a pre-1958 Stalinist perspective as approved at the last party conference. This is another serious obstacle not only for the development of Marxism in relation to the modern world, but to winning young people to the idea of Communist liberation.

Among the forces of the anti-capitalist left the most important and hopeful development in the last two years at the political level was the creation of the ANTARSYA alliance and the emergence of the Coordination of Primary Unions [translator's note: CPU, an initiative for the cooperation of trade unions and unionists who identify with the anticapitalist left]. These two initiatives, with their combined and dynamic presence in general strikes, is a first important step, offering hope for the revival of a militant labor movement.

Promoting a transitional program, with well considered and timely demands—which can give impetus to demonstrations, promote the internationalist dimension of labor solidarity and a coordinated struggle with other European workers as well as aid the transition to a new and higher level of political consciousness among the workers—now shows itself to be both possible and necessary.

The political rearmament of the working class, the return of the prospect of socialism as the only realistic option for an exit from the crisis, should be the goal of ANTARSYA. For this purpose OKDE-Spartacus should act within this formation to promote such an approach in a structured and coordinated manner.

4. Assessing the last year of workers' struggles—prospects:

Recent political developments have sparked an unprecedented attack and escalation of class conflict. It is more than certain that at the end of this long conflict nothing will remain the same—not for the ruling classes and not for the workers, youth and the oppressed more generally.

On a political level this generates big changes and opportunities for both warring sides of Greek society.

In the first period we are forced to conclude that the government came out victorious. But the backers of the present system are weak. The protests brought no results so far, but things are unlikely to stop here.

The union bureaucracy organized 7 general strikes, along with many smaller work stoppages and mid-afternoon rallies, only months after the elections gave PASOK a huge percentage compared with those of ND and the left. Certainly the first response that one might offer is that this is in response to the ferocity and unprecedented nature of the attack given crisis and the fiscal deficit. Nothing is secure in terms of social rights and labor conflicts. Everything is called into question: collective bargaining agreements, industry contracts, salaries, bonuses, tenure, pensions, working time, redundancy rates, working conditions, rights of women workers, dismantling public services, closing kindergartens, effective dismantling of any social protections that remains, unilateral refusal to pay salaries by government and employers, criminalization of trade unionism, strikes by immigrants, cutbacks in hospital care, violent attacks by employers, attacks by cops and goons against workers and unionists, all of course combined with a constant, 24-hour-a-day Goebbels-like propaganda barrage by the newspapers, media, and dominant institutions. (It's all our fault. We ate and drank together and bankrupted the state and no one would pay, so the state fund is bankrupt and the state has to sell bonds cheaply, etc.)

Of course, this alone does not explain anything about the demonstrations. If there was not a growing anger from January until today—especially in the workplaces and at the base of the movements—these conditions by themselves would hardly be sufficient to move the trade union bureaucracy, especially PASKE [translator's note: the coordination of trade unions controlled by PASOK], which is almost completely dominant among organized workers. Remember in this context that there was a fairly long period at the outset, 3 to 4 months, when PASKE appeared to be a monolithic bloc from top to bottom, completely opposed to any kind of action. The meetings of the Coordination of the Primary Unions in both private and public sectors—along with the renewal of their functioning after the October elections and of their organized efforts, especially where there were already anticapitalist forces in some workplaces—were of great importance. It was actually the initial preparation and impetus from below which forced the union bureaucracy to call for the first strike mobilization on December 17 '09 (SYRIZA on December 16). The leadership of the GSEE, remained a strong ally of the government and struck on February 24 only after disapproval of its president, Panagopoulos, was expressed in many workplaces. ADEDY took a more militant stance because the public sector felt the first wave of the attack, also because of the presence of strong unions (Municipalities, Hospitals, Education) in which there is a significant presence for the anti-capitalist left—the AKS (militant movement clusters). It has even gained secondary leadership positions and 4 seats on the ADEDY council.

The ferocity of the police, who attacked the demonstrations intending to break them up, was unprecedented for workers' mobilizations. People in these actions responded properly by attempting to repel the police attack, and often succeeded.

The increasing scale of state violence against the strikes shows how profoundly significant the class attack is, how acutely aware the bourgeoisie and the state are that if they make even a single concession on any issue it could begin a chain reaction. On the other hand, the extreme repression reveals the relative state of panic when confronted with constant and increasing anger/protest. In

this sense, the attacks of the police are often disjointed, with limited results. This could boomerang during the next round.

The forces of SYRIZA are used to operating in the empty spaces between the GSEE and the AKS (clusters). They have built their own fractions and their own leadership, but with markedly less dynamism than the clusters. Being a captive of its contradictions, SYRIZA was unable to take significant initiatives for the intensification or spread of the resistance. The Communist Party, remaining faithful to its broad perspectives, organizes its own separate gatherings completely controlled by the party, usually in the Constitution Square, earlier than other rallies and taking care not to meet up with other street demonstrations.

Despite significant tactical errors, the anticapitalist left found itself capable of taking significant initiatives. It was on the front lines of the mobilizations and solidarity actions during this first round of protest. It worked with ordinary workers to learn from their experiences and develop itself politically. In an effort to politicize the trade union movement, the anticapitalist left has helped to organize debates about stopping payment of the debt and the economic crisis in unions where it plays a meaningful role

So far there has been considerable resistance from below, small but significant advance experiences that can be inspirational. They also demonstrate that the working class has not suffered a historical defeat.

The element of spontaneity was dominant in the general strike of May 5 (following the statement by Papandreou that Greece had agreed to the bail-out proposal of the IMF and EU). Mobilization was the hallmark of the movement, including a political strike, which sent a messages of resistance to all corners of the world. All eyes were turned to Greece.

We must learn from the events at Marfin—the death of 3 bank employees—beyond simply the anger against those responsible for the killing, along with the despicable human being named Vgenopoulos, who locked in his employees by threatening them with dismissal if they went on strike. It must be clear to us that the logic of holding violent demonstrations, just to make a show of militancy but having nothing in common with self-defense, needs to come to an end. It is just a matter of luck that something of a similar nature did not happen before this moment, given previous displays of irresponsible and chaotic violence.

In the days to come it is paramount to defend the protests against any kind of haphazard or uncontrolled actions, because these may result in more than merely the mourning for lost lives. They could well impose defeat on the movement. Of course this does not imply the banning of differing ideological views, associations, or trends—in the style of political strangulation imposed by the Communist Party—but the self-protection of the movement from antisocial acts and violence against the movement itself.

By the summer, the next round of workers' mobilizations were weaker. Still, it remains important to note that people engaged in these demonstrations were, instinctively, more organized and careful because of the fear that something like MARFIN could happen again.

We must avoid two mistaken perceptions. The first is that nothing can be changed. This idea is promoted by the government and media propaganda on a daily basis. Worse, it is repeated even by parts of the movement vanguard. After the first strikes against the SRS (the Stability and Growth Pact) and before May 5, the media told us that the struggle is a mismatch, attacks on the

government are futile because the overwhelming majority of the population understands the difficulties of the situation and will not strongly protest what the government is doing. There may be a grain of truth in this claim, but parts of the left swallow it wholesale. They therefore propose alternative forms of struggle (for example, the referendum called for by A Alvanos).

The second mistake is to conclude that it is now or never (or: “We have a workers’ December”) [translator’s note: a reference to the uprising known as the “December of youth” in 2008]. We must occupy the Parliament or all else will be in vain. This view is based on the implicit assumption that the working class cannot accumulate experience over time, build thereby a more organized resistance movement. We must pin all of our hopes in an immediate explosion. In other words, it is looking for a quick and easy substitute for the difficult task of organizing.

In the present circumstances the task, at least in places where activity is taking place, must be to build all of the strikes and to help those who are advocating that they become stronger and last longer. Often this has the effect of pulling the nominal leadership along. It is incorrect to argue that any strike in a particular industry will inevitably be isolated or that, as in the case of the teachers in the IEA, they are demoralized because their magnificent strike of 2006 failed due to insufficient support from other sectors. In the present circumstances, when the workers in a specific industry begin to take action ahead of others it can become an inspiration for others to mobilize.

While it is generally true that the conflict with the Memorandum cannot be engaged separately or won in a single industry, we also do not expect that the GSEE and ADEDY will declare an open-ended general strike. To have them call for one of 24 hours, even more for a 48-hour strike, requires pressure on the leadership from below.

As a result of the daily and multiple fronts being opened by the government and the bosses, the ordinary worker perceives that a protracted battle will be needed in order to win—which is why participation rates in the protests are rising. The tactics of the union bureaucracy only strike piecemeal, without a plan, disappointing and tiring out the workers who reasonably see these 24 hour strikes as completely ineffective. Yet even the fact that such strikes are called at all signifies something.

One task should definitely be stressed. In our workplaces we are not only union members and not only the organizers of struggles. We must, in addition, be constantly engaged in politicizing the environment. This, of course, means winning the trust of our colleagues on issues ranging from the smallest to the largest. Then our voices will be heard, even if our viewpoint is, today, a minority within the class. Such ideas as the need to support foreign workers, to battle against racism and nationalism, will emerge only if those who support them are part of collective struggles. They cannot be preached from the sidelines. It is absolutely urgent to create united fronts in the workplace against the racists and fascists of LAOS. We must attempt to disrupt their functioning. We do not engage them in debate and we do not recognize their democratic rights. This cannot, however, be seen as a conflict being engaged by two or three determined individuals practiced in the martial arts, but as a collective task, with everyone involved who has an interest in ejecting the fascists from social spaces and from neighborhoods.

We are always in favor of affirmative action in the labor movement towards women. The slashing of women’s rights has resulted in an objective deterioration in living standards for all. Gender equality is not gained by reducing everyone to the lowest level. Working women suffer daily discrimination and sexist attacks because of their gender, and a response to this must come not only from the women comrades, but from the men as well, protesting against the bosses and the sexists.

C. For a revolutionary response

1. Transitional demands.

The logic of the transitional program is to link the experiences of militant working class struggles in a specific social context with the historical task: that is, socialist revolution. This approach has gained ground in recent years. The pressure created by the crisis, combined with the widespread attack by capital and the specific anticapitalist response, has led to significant shifts. The need for transitional formulas has been accepted by a large part of the alternative left, including by unions that were, until recently, reluctant or hostile to this idea.

The development of an anti-capitalist transitional program is often approached from a purely empirical perspective. Thus, its logic can be and often is seriously abused in various ways:

- * Specific demands, when detached from the program as a whole, can be stripped of their revolutionary potential. In this way the transitional program can degenerate into a series of isolated proposals which can be coopted by the system because there is a failure to raise the issue of power.
- * Instead of being addressed to the working class and social movements as a program around which to unify and struggle, it is conceived as an alternative plan for a left government. This is the way it is treated not only by organizations that are unfamiliar with the concept of transition, but even for many Trotskyist organizations which have begun to define their politics exclusively in relationship to reformism.
- * In some organizations, the transition program is viewed as a dogmatic prescription unchanged over time, regardless of the historical context.

A transitional program should aim to break with the basic productive and social relations of capitalism and thus to highlight the issue of power, posing this in terms of class alternatives.

Faced with the risk of presenting a set of demands that might be easily coopted, some organizations of the extreme left—mainly Marxist-Leninists of a Maoist origin, along with sectors of the autonomist movement—generally deny the necessity of specific demands at all, except those which are immediate, in defense of past gains. Such an approach, however, either limits the struggles of the working class to defending former conquests, or raises the question of power in a way that is purely abstract and therefore disconnected from the actual experiences of struggle.

In the current context the issue of the debt is undoubtedly at the heart of the class struggle from a political point of view. In this sense, the demand to stop the payment of the debt begins to take on a transitional character. Several observations in this regard:

- * The suspension of payments could in certain circumstances be a political choice made by the bourgeoisie as part of a classic social-democratic or Peronist strategy. For this reason the revolutionary left must rely on a clear class perspective and present its call in an overall anti-capitalist context.
- * The demand for the complete cancellation of the debt should not be substituted for a cessation of payments. As a slogan this is more universal, but less radical than the cessation of payments which implies a unilateral break with the current rules of capitalist trade.

* The cessation of payments should serve not only as a general propaganda slogan, but should have tangible effects on labor struggles at all levels (for example, freezing of funds of municipalities to meet the needs of the workers rather than the creditors). The most active layers of the working class also have similar experiences blocking some of the system's central functions (Bank of Greece, municipal funds, refineries, transportation, education, government buildings, units of the Public Power Corporation).

Based on these observations the transitional program in the current context should include as key demands:

- Stop payment of debt. Cancel all debt to Greek and foreign banks. Elimination of third world debt.
- Prohibition of layoffs. Nationalization without compensation of all enterprises that move to dismiss workers or to close their doors—along with strategic sectors of the economy. Their renewed operation under workers' control.
- Elimination of central banks. An end to banking and commercial secrecy. Nationalisation of the banks without compensation to the bankers. Centralization of the whole banking system into a public bank under workers' control.
- No to privatization of public enterprises and services. Re-nationalization, under workers' control, without compensation to the capitalists, of all public enterprises and utilities that have been privatized.
- 1400 euros minimum wage. Unemployment benefit equal to the minimum wage for the duration of unemployment and pensions equal to the last salary before retirement.
- Establishment of a labor cost of living index with the unions having control and veto power. Creation of a procedure for automatic escalation of wages in accord with this price index.
- Shift the burden of taxation so the rich pay more and the poor less.
- Recording of all property to prevent capital flight and tax evasion.
- A decisive reduction of working time. 35 hour week (5 7-hour days) with a 30 hour maximum for heavy and unhealthy work (5 6-hour days). Retirement after working for 30 years, with no minimum age requirement.
- A sliding scale of working hours without loss of pay so that the required working time can be equitably shared by the entire productive population.
- Prohibition of flexible working relations and the repeal of all laws that promote them.
- No repeal of favorable provisions for women. No woman should be left uninsured. Retirement provision for homemakers. Expansion of the social-welfare infrastructure to save women from exclusive responsibility for care of the household.
- Increase funding and recruitment for public health, education, social services.

- Free access to all levels of education. Universal public and university education at no cost.
- Cancellation of the arms program. Termination of all military contracts. Bring all Greek troops home from abroad
- Legalization of all immigrants. Citizenship to second generation immigrants. Granting of citizenship to all those who apply. Civil and social rights for all. Asylum and shelter to refugees. Open borders.
- Recognition of the Republic of Macedonia with its constitutional name
- Right to self determination of the Turkish minority in Thrace. Remove the 3% electoral law against the election of minority representatives in the Greek parliament. [translator's note: In order to gain members of Parliament, a party in Greece must gain at least 3% of the vote in national elections, which is a barrier for the representation not only of smaller left parties but also of the Turkish national minority, concentrated in the region of Thrace, where they are a relative majority but do not reach 3% of the national population.] Termination of state intervention in the religious and political affairs of minorities.
- Recognition of the ethnic Macedonians with minority cultural and linguistic rights.
- Eliminate legal discrimination against same-sex couples. Recognition of equal rights including the right to marriage
- Disarm the police, abolition of all special units, elimination of MAT [translator's note: MAT are the specialized police units equipped to confront demonstrations] ban the use of tear gas and chemicals.
- For a workers' government which will organize the rupture with capitalism and with the bourgeois state, as well as with the EU and all imperialist supranational groupings—based on self-organized mass institutions and the dual power of the workers and their social allies

2. Transitional demands or defensive slogans

A significant segment of the labor movement, (both political and trade union) approach the problem from a purely defensive point of view based on the magnitude of the present attack. Positive demands seem completely utopian in this context. But such an approach is theoretically and politically incorrect. In the context of the crisis what is actually utopian is to limit ourselves to defensive demands, since unless there is a challenge to the basic rules of capitalism, unless the superiority of the bourgeoisie in the overall relationship of class forces is threatened, nothing whatsoever can be achieved. A moderate stance against the memorandum is completely incapable even of defending elementary labor rights. Explicitly anti-capitalist demands and a revolutionary project are now essential. These things cannot be postponed for a period after the storm has passed.

3. Neighborhood Committees

It is necessary to form public committees in neighborhoods to combat the Stability Program and the Memorandum. But this process stubs its toe on the chronic weaknesses of local organization: obsessive rigidity, factionalism, suspicion and rivalry among small groups. Furthermore, such

formations are subject to common reformist practices—using the structures of the movement in an opportunist way to strengthen and deepen an electoral base. (This is what happened, to a large extent, with the Greek Social Forum under the political stranglehold of the PLUS synapsismos.)

Despite such difficulties, the revolutionary left must take the lead in setting up committees which will hold open meetings to organize the struggle against the government's measures, as well as solidarity and mutual assistance on a local level. These committees should be actual structures of self-organization, attempting to unite workers, unemployed, and activists from all affected groups, not another version of left party or a coalition of leftist groups. Simultaneously, it should be the basic matrix of the united front that is necessary to repel the attack of the capital. The struggle for political hegemony in these structures of self-organization must take place within the structures themselves, and simultaneously with their construction, rather than through sectarian political preconditions established from the outside. For the great mass of the oppressed, the revolutionary solution is not something they agree to as a precondition. It is an approach they will be won to as a result of their experiences—as they begin to struggle.

It is a strategic necessity for the revolutionary left to help build such structures of self-organization by the workers and broad popular masses. The only effective way to move in the direction of revolutionary crisis is through the establishment of forms of dual power outside of and counterposed to the bourgeois state—even if currently these can only be embryonic, attempting to set an example. This is ultimately the dividing line between militant reformism and revolutionary Marxism.

4. Revolutionary Party and the alternative reconstruction

This international crisis of historic proportions, the attack by capital, finds the working class in a state of fragmentation—for historical reasons that are both objective and subjective. On the one hand post-fordist neoliberal restructuring of productive relations and the capitalist organization of work have significantly undermined those factors which, directly and visibly, spurred the unification of the working class in the past. On the other hand, the crisis of the labor bureaucracy, politicians, and trade unions, the hegemony of bourgeois ideology and low self-esteem resulting from successive defeats at the international level from the 1980's onwards, have left the working class in a defeatist and de-radicalized mood—at least the older generations. Workers are unable at present to act as a “class for themselves.”

The process of unifying the working class and raising its revolutionary consciousness is a political question, just as the class struggle is also politics in the final analysis. Such a process is not linear, but entails forward leaps, periods of stagnation, regression, and other abrupt changes. These become much sharper in times of crisis and political instability in the camp of the bourgeoisie. That's why, contrary to the perception of anarchists and sponteneist currents, it is more necessary now than ever before to develop a party structure that can cohere a portion of the class leadership as a conscious political subject (without suggesting a specific organizational blueprint for the party, predetermined and appropriate for all occasions). In addition, contrary to the viewpoint of traditional or newer variants of reformism, a revolutionary strategic orientation for the working-class party is more relevant in the midst of the crisis, more compelling than ever.

The need to build revolutionary parties does not in any way negate the role and importance of other organizations of working-class defense (unions) or fight-back (forms of self-organization, committees that develop in the work place or communities). The left must definitively reject the tradition of substitution for or political strangulation of spontaneous forms of organization. The task

of a revolutionary party is to become part of the experience of class struggle, along with the natural vanguard of the working class and the oppressed, not to act on behalf of them or outside of them. The widespread conception (even on the far left) which identifies workers' power with the power of a single party is essentially counterrevolutionary.

The revolutionary party is still, in our analysis, the only form of organization capable of leading the overthrow of capitalism through a change in the existing relations of production. The exact road to its construction, however, can vary widely from country to country.

The prospects, in the present historical period, for building a mass revolutionary party by direct individual recruitment are quite limited, at least in a large portion of the so-called western world. This contributes to the fragmentation and isolation of groups that exist to the left of reformism, making it impossible for them to play the necessary political role. In these conditions it is appropriate, in our judgment, to develop an alternative reconstruction, designed to focus on the creation of broader anti-capitalist formations (political parties, fronts, or hybrid structures) as an intermediate stage in the process of building a mass revolutionary party. The term "anti-capitalist" can encompass several different kinds of formations, arising out of, or tending to emerge during, this historical period. According to a strict Marxist terminology these could be described generally as "centrist" parties or formations with a generally left potential or orientation. It is conceivable that they might be transformed into revolutionary formations, but do not start out that way.

This alternative-reconstruction aims to bring together a broad layer of more conscious activists from the working class and social movements while, at the same time and inextricably, to change the political relationships within the labor movement and the revolutionary left. This means a process that is intertwined with the struggle for political hegemony in the broader anti-capitalist formations.

The alternative-reconstruction is not a strategy. It is a means to an end: the creation of mass revolutionary parties. This should be the measure of its success or failure. In addition to opportunities such a process involves risks: that we will adapt to a centrist strategy, to parliamentarism, or contribute to the demobilization of fighters who become frustrated, etc. Indeed, there have been such experiences internationally: the Workers' Party (PT) of Brazil, the Communist Refoundation in Italy, the road taken by the Left Bloc in Portugal - not to mention the SYRIZA, which some saw as an anti-capitalist regroupment process.

The process of creating a mass revolutionary party must go through the new generation of workers as well as the vanguard of social movements which have not been beaten down by the historic defeats of the 1980s and '90s. This is our target audience, not the old left leaders who have largely been coopted or bureaucratized.

D. ANTARSYA / Recreate

After the eruption of December a substantial part of the far left in Greece understood the imperative: to create a political force with a minimum weight in the working class, attempting to influence and provide a level of leadership for the labor movement nationwide. OKDE-SPARTACUS believes that in the present conjuncture, the establishment and operation of ANTARSYA is a step in this direction.

Over the past 20 years there have been several efforts to develop forces of the anti-capitalist left (AL). The most important experience was in the student movement during 2006-2007, along with

the strike of teachers, in which AL currents played a pioneering role. Following this, the December events created improved conditions for the development of ANTARSYA. The nationwide scope of this organization, its relative size and implantation in the working class, combined with its bringing together a majority of organizations and activists of the revolutionary communist and anti-capitalist left, indicate both a quantitative and qualitative development of the potential.

During its approximately two years of life ANTARSYA has played a leading role in the establishment and development of social resistance—though in important respects this has been less than what was objectively needed. It has played a politically significant role in the leadership of the Labor Movement and become a rival to the bureaucratic-reformist left SYN/SYRIZA, along with the Communists. It has raised the banner of independence from bourgeois institutions and reformist organizations. Today it is, clearly, the only vehicle that can lead future struggles for the left of the labor movement, along with representing these forces in the political arena. Because of this, the OKDE Spartacus reaffirms its participation in the effort to build ANTARSA.

Nevertheless there are weaknesses and problems of this formation that must be noted—on a political, organizational, and "moral" level. Empiricism plus with the remnants of a traditional stalinist/eurocommunist ideology pose serious obstacles to the adoption of a genuinely revolutionary program.

The persistence within the majority of ANTARSYA of a left-patriotism distracts it from the necessary course of development. Talk of the "triple occupation of Greece" in particular underestimates the role and responsibilities of the government of PASOK and of the Greek bourgeoisie. It is wrong to assert that the Greek government has relinquished sovereignty to another imperialist state. Rather, a supranational mechanism has imposed itself which is, at the same time, a strategic ally of the Greek bourgeoisie. There has also been programmatic confusion on issues such as the stage and the truck drivers' strike, during which parts of ANTARSYA showed a wrong class orientation (opposing the legitimate demands of the stage hands and one-sided support for the truck drivers—ignoring their class position as owners who also exploit drivers who are merely employees. The issue of immigration also poses a challenge, with a large portion of ANTARSYA strongly influenced by the political agenda and ideology of the bourgeoisie. This leads to a serious disorientation—such as the rejection of a slogan for open borders, the idea that the presence of immigrants in central Athens is a genuine problem to which we must provide an "answer," and empty rhetoric like "The Greek people are not racist."

A sectarian approach is expressed on a range of issues (immigration, prisons, special gatherings and marches during the International Exposition of Thessaloniki and elsewhere), as well as when considering the expansion of the project by bringing in new forces. The majority of ANTARSYA does not want to approach militants who are breaking away from SYRIZA on equal terms, and this undermines an attempt to extend the formation.

Facing local and regional elections ANTARSYA showed alarming symptoms of electoralism. In some cases electoral lists were created that do not correspond to either the need for creating genuine anti-capitalist organization or to mobilizing some significant action that can move in an anticapitalist direction. During the election period ANTARSYA took no significant initiatives for mobilization. Sometimes, indeed, it significantly underestimated such possibilities, as with the mobilization against the meeting of the deans of Greek universities in Rethymnon. The positive result of the elections do not invalidate this criticism.

There continues to be a devaluation of important movements such as feminist, internationalist, antiracist, anti-fascist, the movement for the liberation of LGBT people, ecology, etc.—despite the progress achieved in certain cases (sometimes as a result of our pressure and political influence). Most of these battles, which for us are an integral part of a revolutionary perspective and of our collective vision for the liberation of the working class and all oppressed communities, continue to be seen largely as Trotskyist fetishes or obsessions.

In some cases ANTARSYA worked against real anti-capitalist initiatives in universities, workplaces and neighborhoods. The main responsibility for this rests with SEK [translator's note: Socialist Workers Party, Greek section of IS] which often fails to coordinate its actions with the rest of ANTARSYA, and with NAR [translator's note: New Left Current, which comes from a split of the youth organization of the Communist Party in 1989-90] which tends to insist on agreement with its abstract program as a precondition for joint activities.

The point is not to admonish our ANTARSYA comrades, nor are we interested in simply tacking something on to the program in a superficial way. We must stand up and fight for our view on a consistent basis, thereby enhancing the weight of this perspective which we consider an essential element in genuinely revolutionary approach.

Finally, we should note the strong local variation in ANTARSYA's composition.

ANTARSYA is a vehicle (essentially the only political vehicle we have at the moment) for the alternative-reconstruction. But it should certainly not be identified with that process. The task of reconstruction represents the rehabilitation of the natural vanguard of the working class as a step toward building a revolutionary party, together with promoting a shift in the relationship of forces between reformists and revolutionaries. This project makes no sense if we limited ourselves to disputes between current left-wing leaders. It must also, and primarily, be posed in social terms, directed at the movement. We therefore believe that anti-capitalist formations in the workplace (clusters/job actions/movements), along with the student movement (EAAK) and neighborhood initiatives, have played a decisive role in the alternative reconstruction and will continue to do so. This is the real power, and these are the layers which can make a substantial contribution to ANTARSYA.

We must acknowledge that the perspective of OKDE SPARTAKOS for the evolution of an anti-capitalist party through ANTARSYA has proven to be unrealistic. We have not seen a sentiment for this among unaffiliated members, nor rifts, debates, and shifts in the other organizations. Mostly, however, the failure of this approach lies in the fact that we assessed the level of discussion and understanding within the ANTARSYA incorrectly. It is obvious that the level of political and organizational consciousness and, what's even more important, the low level of democratic culture in most of the participant organizations, makes it impossible, for the moment, to speak of converting ANTARSYA into a party.

The structure of ANTARSYA was not up to the challenge posed by the downturn. The organizational conception of "a social space," combined with a warped notion of joint fractions, undermined the functioning of the organization. The introduction of membership, but without specifying the rights and obligations of each member and without any possibility for the members themselves to develop policy, made it merely symbolic. For this reason we propose the establishment of a federal ANTARSYA, so that unorganized militants will all be able to participate equally in structures that will give them a decisive voice. This does not mean that any organization or political tendency will lose its independence.

With this in mind we suggest the following immediate steps to developing ANTARSYA as an organization:

- Definition of obligations and rights of members of local assemblies. The official bodies of ANTARSYA are elected only from assemblies of the local committees, to which all members belong. The assemblies of the working sectors should run in parallel, without participating in these elections since each of their members is simultaneously also the member of a local committee. Members of ANTARSYA who are also members of political organizations (i.e., OKDE) maintain a dual membership in both ANTARSYA and in their political organization.
- Local assemblies should have a political character, not just an administrative function. They should try to work based on a synthesis of the different views that coexist within them—at least in terms of tactical (non-strategic) matters.
- Create a unified newspaper for ANTARSYA in which there is equal right of representation of all views that exist within the group.
- Any collective reference to historical or ideological questions requires unanimity. Decisions on key policy questions require a broad consensus. Free expression of views by any organization or fighters inside and outside of ANTARSYA.
- Create a mixed body as a central coordinating committee for ANTARSYA, which will consist of party representatives distributed equally between all organizations, with other delegates elected periodically and with the right of recall by local assemblies.
- When possible joint intervention in social and political fronts. But this is a goal to be worked for, not something to be achieved through administrative means.
- Creation of municipal committees in areas where there were municipal election lists without such committees in the past (Athens, Piraeus, etc.). Municipal committees must take collective decisions and control the actions of those elected to municipal or regional boards. Elected members on municipal or regional boards should be changed periodically.
- Organisation of intervention by ANTARSYA in workplaces, schools and neighborhoods through anti-capitalist projects that seek to unify broader forces, rather than to function as party fractions.

The main task of ANTARSYA is, of course, political. ANTARSYA will need to take policy initiatives in the future:

- Coherent campaigns to organize successful general strikes. This includes: unified mobilization of organizations moving in such a direction which can provide their own leadership, organized pressure on the union bureaucracy to call strikes, and prolonged work on the organization of strikes and protests from the bottom up (even in places where our forces are very small). The experience of preparing strikes in France is instructive.
- Participation in a broad ANTARSYA anti-fascist front and anti-racist initiative, without finding pretexts for self-isolation.

- Initiative for the construction and building of real local forms of self-organization and solidarity which will operate through local assemblies. Support for such structures where they already exist.
- A policy initiative which can reinforce the political relationship with a broader layer of militants which seemed to emerge in local and regional elections. These fighters have not yet joined ANTARSYA as a political project. They are unlikely to do so if we do not show that we are open to their political viewpoint and initiatives through an open and frank discussion.
- Organization of a debate on deepening the program and our approach to sector interventions. Despite the good overall program, ANTARSYA lacks political positions on specific issues.

E. Conclusion

The capitalist crisis is exacerbating social conflicts and driving down the living conditions of workers to such an extent that it makes the demand for the revolutionary overthrow of the system seem more and more reasonable. The widespread popular anger is pregnant with a great potential pushing in this direction, as are important social and labor struggles.

The morale of the working class as a whole, however, continues to be low and political consciousness disconnected. Our conclusion may not seem original, but it is indisputable: the objective conditions favor a revolutionary situation, while the subjective reality constitutes an obstacle. The development of a resistance movement that can win some victories is the prerequisite to reversing this situation, to the the creation of a revolutionary party with a strategic orientation, one that is national in scope and with a significant implantation in the working class, among radical youth, struggling women and the vanguard of social movements.

Greece is a weak link in the international structure of the capitalist mode of production. The dual problem is, therefore, posed for us here and now. OKDE-Spartacus will devote all its forces to resolving that problem.