A Requiem for the End of Great Narratives in the Era of the 'Crisis': Greece Under the Microscope

Polina-Theopoula Chrysochou

Anglia Ruskin University, Chelmsford, UK and National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

> ''Greece is the black sheep of Europe. That's its virtue. Good thing there are black sheep like Greece to mix things up, to refuse a certain Germano-French standardisation, etc. So, continue being black sheep and we'll get along just fine […]''. (Guattari, 1992, in an Interview on Greek television)

Abstract

This article, placed in the general framework of a global attempt to reform education by making it comply with neoconservative and neoliberal directions, discusses the particular case of Greece, and investigates the possibility of an international educational paradigm seeking to impose a market reasoning on school culture and create a disciplined privatised educational sector in pursuit of profit (Siani-Davies, 2017). It contests the disaster approaches preaching the 'end of labour', examines the role of teachers in the new, exceptionally adverse circumstances and reflects on the role that 'revolutionary' intellectuals are called to play in inciting resistance and change.

Approaching the issue of the Greek financial crisis as a 'Trojan Horse' for a technocratic turn in education, the Critical Pedagogy Approach is applied and thus, Marxist analytical tools are used (Rotenstreich, 1965; Mepham and Ruben (eds.), 1979a;1979b; Matthews, 1980; Harris, 1982;

Krapivin, 1985; Allman, 2001; Molyneux, 2012; Agostinone-Wilson, 2013; Malott and Ford, 2015; Grollios and Gounari, 2016), placing therefore the whole thinking within the philosophical framework of dialectical materialism.

The application of the aforementioned approach is an attempt to fully understand and interpret the causes and nature of the crisis, along with its impact, while the endeavour to reform the educational process in Greece is perceived as one with global dimensions, correlated with the need to manage the capitalist reform and to shape a new type of worker in accordance with the requirements of the capital for human resources. For this reason, a holistic perspective is attempted, based on both empirical evidence and a coherent theoretical and philosophical framework, that examines schools and education in an economic, social, political and ideological context.

Keywords: *Greece; Economic Crisis of Capitalism; Educational Reforms; Teachers; Revolutionary Intellectuals; Dialectical Materialism; Labour; Class*

Introduction

In view of the global capitalist crisis, it seems necessary to re-evaluate the directions, expectations, and prospects of pedagogical theory. In the name of reform and rationalisation and following directives issued by the European Union (EU), the World Bank (WB), the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and other international organisations and agencies, the corporatisation of education has become a capitalist priority at a global level.

The neoconservative and neoliberal storm which has been raging, though unequally, through the educational sphere in both developed and developing countries for over three decades, aims to further subjugate education to the capitalist interests, transforming thus the post-war educational settlement (Robertson, 2007). In other words, this tectonic shift, similar to shifting continents as Bourdieu characterises it (1998, p.1), daily forges the school of the new status quo: a 'class-based', fragmented, cheap and flexible school (Grollios and Gounari, 2016, pp. 9-14).

The plans for restructuring, imposed under the pretence of the inevitability of neoliberal management, but also the attempt to apply education policies aiming to quantify and mechanise the education process have changed the conditions of knowledge production, the frame encompassing the education process and functions, as well as the spaces and positions from which pedagogical theoretical thought is expressed (Robertson, 2007; Grollios and Gounari, 2016).

As a result, in predictable or unpredictable ways, we are led to conditions of "educational necrophilia" (Grollios and Gounari, 2016, p. 10) and mechanisms of governance of the educational sector, which are part of a larger class capitalist plan. The ways in which the latter political plan manifests itself, "rooted locally, but extending globally" (Santos, 2004; Robertson, 2007), aiming to produce flexible, effective future workers, adaptable to the needs of businesses and the global competitive economy, are located, among others, in the following: abandoning physical infrastructure; underfunding education and introducing private-sector logic; returning to Medieval working conditions for teachers; and equating the educational process with a mechanistic transmission of fragmentary knowledge and skills measured by national and international tests (i.e. PISA).

The 'Manufactured' Crisis and Educational Reforms in the Era of a Market-Driven Society: The Case of Greece

Ten years after its outbreak, the economic crisis of capitalism that started with the 2007 banking crisis in the United States, with the so-called real estate bubble and the Lehman Brothers' bankruptcy, continues to leave its mark on a global scale. Bringing radical changes in all domains of human activity, it caused a limitless social and humanitarian crisis. With Greece as a typical example (Gounari, 2014, p. 298), it created a chain reaction of consequences that, dramatic as they may be, soon become outdated by new data (Theodorikakou, Alamanou and Katsadoros, 2013, p. 208).

This direction is nothing new since it is the 'Chile recipe', well-known since the 70s[i]. The dominant rhetoric flourishing unchallenged since the 80s, and still echoing today, is that of a 'diseased' society. However, in this particular instance a matter of great political importance emerges: it is the first time that these policies are applied with such intensity in a country of the first world and specifically in a Eurozone country. While there has been almost a year since celebrating the 60th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome in 1957 and the party thrown by member-states, an assortment of problems casts a shadow on the European structure (Marxist Papers (Antitetradia tis Ekpaidefsis), 2017, p. 5).

The European Union (EU), in the midst of its worst existential crisis after the ongoing crisis of 2008[ii], can no longer base itself on the deceptive narratives of prosperity, democracy and common European market. Perhaps it has always had its neoliberal foundations, but these currently incarnate the commitment to austerity. Moreover, the relatively latent policies and pre-crisis economic relations have now become clear in form. As Ken Jones (2017, p. 16) aptly observes in an interview for the Greek educational journal *Selidodeiktis* (*Bookmark*):

> The EU is a disproportionate system […] which intends to impose budgetary austerity and structural reforms throughout the continent. Europeanisation in this context is indelibly marked by relations of dominance/subordination […]. Particularly in the European South, economies have been put in a perpetual depression. (Jones, 2017, pp. 16-17)

Hence, it seems that the working of the system has been given priority over people's lives (McNally, 2011; Gindin, 2014). Specifically in Greece, after eight consecutive years of applying policies of internal devaluation and controlled bankruptcy, and with the crisis unhindered to this day, there is a new 'status quo' which comprises the catastrophic characteristics of policies of intensive and expansionary austerity that have been applied. In other words, what we are witnessing in Greece today can be described as the "downsizing of a country" (Sotiris, 2012) that brings fundamental transformations to its economic and social tissue, state apparatus, and human and material resources.

Naturally, in a generalised war on the public good, public education could not possibly evade the neoliberal storm. Without exception, the governments of the period 2010-2018, in close collaboration with international imperialist powers and the local bourgeoisie, have set clear and definite prospects for education as a whole (Grollios and Gounari, 2016).These prospects intend to bring inter alia not only the degradation, marketisation, commodification, managerialisation and privatisation /preprivatisation of public services (Giroux, 2004; Harvey, 2005; Hill and Kumar, 2009; Hill and Rosskam, 2009; Hill, Lewis, Maisuria, Yanker and Carr, 2015), but also a regression into neo-conservatism. In doing so, neoliberalism eliminates all fundamental achievements of the workers in the era of industrial capitalism, sweeping away labour relations, incomes, and democratic rights (Polychroniou, 2013).

At the same time, along with the changes that are altering the core public mission, goals and meaning of education, sacrificed at the altar of a market-driven society (Gounari and Grollios, 2013, p. 303), the hardship and deprivation of people involved in the educational process are daily becoming greater and greater. Adverse living conditions become more prevalent, lifestyle is subverted and child poverty increases. Combined with the number of the employed poor, unemployment reaches a record high, taxation becomes exhausting and national depression emerges at an alarming rate. Along these lines, the educational landscape in Greece, as it emerges from reforms in all levels of education, is being radically transformed and constructed upon changes that remorselessly espouse the neoliberal dogma.

These changes consider knowledge important only if it is ‘useful’, in terms of skills and abilities closely connected with the needs of industry and employers. In this light, quality, efficiency and excellence are only excuses for the commercialisation of knowledge, the redefinition of students as clients, the transformation of educational institutions into standardised, corporate entities, the mighty push towards the application of more business-like strategies and privatisation of educational processes, projects and responsibilities. Even more, they serve as an excuse for the redefinition of the concept of education itself.

However, it is no coincidence that the educational reform in Greece, concerning the primary, secondary and tertiary education in equal measure, is wrapped up in the language of ‘improvement’, ‘reorganisation’, ‘restructuring’, ‘streamlining’ and ‘cleaning up’ of a dysfunctional system. These are terms routinely cited in many official statements on education in recent years as a conscious attempt on the part of international agencies, world bodies and organisations to package educational reforms that have been built on a neoliberal political philosophy so as to hide the fact that the mobilisation of

neoliberal ideas in education is a class project with specific aims. Let me note here, that along the same lines, the same terminology is taken up strategically by any discourse, and, at the same time, given strong endorsement by any government that espouses the neoliberal dogma, in order to legitimise the destruction and privatisation of a given national economy (Gounari and Grollios, 2013).

Restructuring Education as a Consequence of the Crisis or the Crisis as an Excuse for Restructuring Education?

Applying this reasoning more extensively, it can be supported that this neoliberal and neoconservative restructuring of education is not an unprecedented historical phenomenon. Education policy is not a deterministic, neutral or objective process, but a process marked by class characteristics that needs to be analysed in light of the class struggle. Educational reforms are class reforms through which the political authority attempts to overcome the crisis. Whether they will be applied or not is not 'predetermined', but it depends on the correlations between social and political powers, the general political and ideological framework, and the level of development of social movements (Katsikas and Kavvadias, 1998).

In this line, it should be emphasised that, for three decades, a central feature of global educational policy has been the application and etching of a neoconservative system of values subjected to the control and the influence of ruling parts of capitalist authority. In this way, even before the financial crisis became decisively entrenched in the equation, education could hardly be understood without recognising a large part of implemented educational policies, practices and programmes as responses shaped by an increasingly integrated international economy aiming to maximise the profits of the capital (Grollios, Liambas and Pavlidis, 2015).

Even in Greece, the unapologetic and radical turn to neoliberal policies, corresponding with an 'international educational paradigm', has been one of the main concerns of governing political parties since the 90s (Chrysochou, Katsiampoura and Skordoulis, 2014). However, this had only partially been achieved until the emergence of the crisis and the decision to opt for the memorandums; researching the causes of this is of vital importance in the current circumstances.

To put it differently, what is extremely important, at least to those who do not limit their views and actions to the horizon of neoliberal, neoconservative and technocratic dogmas, is comprehending the reasons for, and ways in which, the economic crisis in Greece has served, among others, as a platform for the much anticipated technocratic turn in education and all its by-products. I believe that our first step in that direction should be the realisation that neoliberalism was not born in a vacuum.

The Dark Tradition of the 'Good-Old Recipe': Neoliberalism

Neoliberalism and its economic, social and political formulas did not arise unexpectedly from the darkest depths of history, nor have they prevailed as a result of the subjective intentions of some 'apprentice magicians' and a single cast of politicians. On the contrary, a review of recent history, taking us back to the bloody experiment of Chile and the election of Margaret Thatcher in Great Britain in 1979 and Ronald Reagan in the USA in 1980, easily reveals that neoliberalism is something much more than that (Grollios, Liampas and Pavlidis, 2015).

During the late 1980s, and while the neoliberal reform had already affected powerful European unions (i.e. British coal miners, Italian Fiat, German IG Metalli), we witnessed the climax of neoliberalism as an ideology and as a

political agenda. The dissolution of the Soviet Union, the end of the Cold War period and the German Unification were the peak, while the Maastricht Treaty[iii], on 7th February 1992, can be said to have been the first clear turn to neoliberalism in Europe; the first complete alignment of European policies with the principles of the Washington Consensus[iv] (Krugman, 2012). However, the latter does not mean to imply that the neoliberal reforms, as a political and social process, did progress linearly. On the contrary, there were doubts, tensions, even direct clashes, mostly coming from the labour forces, but also from institutions of the capital itself in conditions of intense competition, imposing thus what George Grollios (2004, p. 33) calls "rifts in the continuum" of neoliberal perceptions.

It has become clear from the above that, neoliberalism in this paper is perceived as a full-scale attack of the global forces of the capital, aiming to radically transform power relations and turn them against forces of labour (Ioakeimoglou, 1986; Grollios, 2004). Having said that, the crisis and neoliberal restructuring are perceived as inseparably linked. As John Milios, professor of economic theory, aptly points out:

> … Behind the crisis of the extensive production of capital (behind the overaccumulation of capital) lies more than a 'simple' systematically acting cause; it is the evolving class correlation of power, the totality of conflicts and internal causal relationships that pervade the capitalist production. This is the reason why the remedy for the crisis promoted by capitalists and governments (…) is not limited to the depreciation of inadequately exploited individual capital but takes the form of an overt social war on forces of labour. (Milios, 1997b, pp. 197-198)

Naturally, this is not a single-natured transformation, but on the contrary, one which presents differences in every social formation, depending on the forms it takes in each case. The latter ones cannot in any case remain unaffected by the

particular characteristics displayed by any given crisis (which triggered the neoliberal reforms) in any social formation, nor by the national particularities in terms of political system as well as cultural tradition.

In light of the above, in the course of the current global economic crisis, those domains not as yet privatised, such as public education, become ideal targets for the overaccumulation of capital which remains stagnant in international markets and cannot be reinvested profitably (Gounari, 2014). In this framework, the Greek case proves particularly relevant and illuminating in terms of a methodical and generalised attack against, those domains not as yet privatised, such as public education.

In particular, the Greek governments, having signed the memorandum and in line with the directives and 'good practices' of the EU, as well as international organisations, are following the typical neoliberal strategy of what David Harvey calls "creative destruction" (Harvey, 2005). By the latter, I mean allowing for the degradation of public services in order to prove that the market and private business know best.

As a result, on a daily basis, on the pretext of the crisis and the memorandum, of reducing public deficit, serving public financial benefit and 'saving the country', Greek governments and creditors methodically launch a generalised attack. They take advantage of unemployment, social automatism, the fragmentation of the workforce, the fear of bankruptcy and collective accountability for leverage in order to attack the welfare state, the public good and the working world, sweeping away labour relations, rights and incomes.

Can we Speak of an International Educational Paradigm?

Historical eras, local particularities of policy making and policy enactment, domestic state capacities, national systems, the social and educational movements and the generated struggles cast the processes of globalisation in education in different lights. However, general patterns and convergences of educational policies across localities can be traced throughout the world (c.f. Weiss, 1997; Ball, 1998; Whitty and Edwards, 1998). Thus, bearing in mind what Harvey (1996) called "globaloney"[v], we shall return to commonalities that are clearly evident within and between borrowed educational policies.

These similarities, led by the same neoliberal, neoconservative and managerial logic, cut across geographical borders (Apple, 2010), concern all levels of education and lead to international educational policies which favour "choice, competition, performance management, individual accountability and risk management" (Apple, Ball and Gandin, 2010). Education now becomes an internationally traded commodity on the basis of supply and demand, cost and profit, while at the same time, its function, organisation and educational result and quality is only measured in money (Grollios, Liambas and Pavlidis, 2015, p. viii).

Differently put, without attributing all the educational reforms that are to be applied, or have already been applied, to an 'international educational paradigm' and with no intention of disregarding the complexity of responses to globalisation made by different countries, as well as the complexity of the relations between state and education, we cannot, however, ignore the international prevalence of a political discourse on education.

This discourse displays homogenised theoretical and ideological characteristics and common goals. These goals, as expressed in the neoliberal and

neoconservative educational policies, are none other than regrouping the whole of school culture based on market reasoning, downgrading the work of educators and shaping the personalities of pupils, students and educators along the lines of corporate logic and values. To be more specific, these are policies that: promote the mechanisation of the educational process and the fragmentation and quantification of knowledge; impose management and accountability with the sole objectives of efficiency, success and discipline; reinforce the separation of teaching into perception and execution, thus deepening and systematising a performative and procedural role of educators; and finally promote the competition between institutions, educators and students (Grollios, Liambas and Pavlidis, 2015, pp. ix-xi).

In Greece Today: A Nation at Risk and a Suffering Educational System

Concerning public education in Greece, in particular, it takes little more than one look at legislation regulating education and at the official public discourse, as illustrated in government documentation and public announcements, in order to see there is pressure for a different kind of education in all levels.

In this new framework, education is no longer considered a social right; its democratic and critical characteristics have shrunk, and it looks more and more like a market commodity on the basis of supply and demand, cost and profit. At the same time, a ‘new’ type of school emerges, characterised by a series of overt or covert privatisations that touch on its every aspect. This school is staffed by teachers largely trapped in flexible forms of work, whose work becomes clearly executive and performative.

At the same time, the ongoing economic crisis, depression, austerity and drastic cuts in government spending have had dramatic repercussions in the field of education. Viewed holistically, a new condition has formed in Greek education

that could be summed up in the following points: shrinking budgets; grossly underpaid teachers; bankrupt school committees; donations replacing state funding; schools merging or closing; inability to staff supportive structures; dismissals and suspensions in secondary education; virtually no hiring; transfers of educational staff members; apprenticeship in technical education; decaying physical infrastructure; modified labour relations; and aggressive propaganda against educators by government officials and systemic media.

All the above reveal that the continuing economic crisis has delivered a hard blow to the institution of education as well as the people involved in the educational process, whose hardships and deprivation are growing daily to gigantic proportions (Gounari, 2014). Eight years after the financial markets' assault in late 2009, and while the threat to global economy is far from eliminated Greece is still experiencing the "biggest structural crisis in its recent history" (Karamessini, 2015, p. 239).

In its course, the applied policies of internal devaluation and controlled bankruptcy and the application of austerity measures have kept the country at a low level of production, investments, national demand and work productivity. At the same time, in proportion to the universal blow administered to the function of the economy, the country's social tissue, state apparatus and human and material resources have been undergoing radical transformations. Salaries and pensions have been cut up to forty per cent and taxation has become exhausting, especially for lower and middle classes, widening thus the existing pre-crisis inequalities. Let us note here that the Greek society is not one of petit-bourgeois households with limited social inequalities and intense forms of social rising mobility. In the past, but more so since the emergence of the crisis, Greece has always been a country of deep inequalities (Sakellaropoulos, 2014).

All this has contributed to a socially unprecedented increase of phenomena of food insecurity, deprivation, poverty, from moderate to extreme, and social exclusion. There has also been a notable rise in depression, mental disorders and of course, suicides (Economou, et al., 2012; Simou and Koutsogeorgou, 2014). Children are the tragic victims in this situation with daily news reports revealing the impact the crisis has had on them, reporting malnutrition and fainting in schools, phobias, anxiety and cutting down on extracurricular activities (Fatourou, 2010; Magaliou and Chaniotakis, 2014).

What About the Teachers' Role?

Teachers, themselves affected by the crisis professionally, personally and emotionally, have to pedagogically deal with all the social and familial crises their students experience, and they have to do so under the most adverse circumstances. Their work is, without a doubt, exceptionally challenging. Contrary to the popular belief that teaching is a vocation that can be performed by devoted teachers under any circumstances whatsoever, it seems unarguable[vi] that only educators that are happy with their work and their personal development in it can effectively contribute to their students' self-development (Pavlidis, 2013; Grollios, 2015).

However, despite the adversities, teachers, whose role, at least in terms of critical pedagogy, is "inherently and by definition interventionist" (Gounari, 2014), cannot ignore the impact of the crisis or turn a blind eye to the reality experienced by their students. Students ask questions and express their concerns and teachers must heed their voice, especially in the current economic, social and political circumstance. Defying dominant pedagogy, teachers need to encourage the development of their students' critical thinking, so as to enable them to approach their experiences, as well as the causes, the nature, the various aspects and the multiple consequences of the crisis, with a critical eye. This is

essential, since, as Gounari observes (2014, pp. 309-310) for a nation to be able to recognise that there are ways to change the situation, it is not enough to experience its tragedy intensely. On the contrary, it should properly and wholly understand the causes. And sadly, she notes, the sombre reality, combined with the official bourgeois interpretations, have deprived Greeks of this exact capability: the ability to try to understand. Taking this into consideration, it is easy to comprehend why, in conditions of intense economic, social and political crises, the role of educators is tested to a far greater extent (Gounari, 2014, pp. 299-300): their role is not limited to the classroom.

Educators, as historical subjects, belong in their eras and are led to actions and choices defined by the concrete, existential and objective conditions of their time. These conditions, combined with the whole of teachers' personalities, conscience and levels of critical reflection, as well as the overall conditions of the class struggle, will ultimately define what can be practiced and achieved (Harris, 1982, p. 153).

Making Teachers the Enemy: Where Does it Lead in the Era of their Proletarianisation?

Our basic conviction regarding education is that, in capitalism, it is shaped by the material relations of power between society and state and the socio-political structure and function that serve the interests of ruling classes. But this shaping is not only realised through the passive acceptance of ruling ideology, it is also historic and contradictory. In that sense, even if we accept that educational institutions are indeed the most fertile ground for the reproduction of dominant ideology, it is unreasonable to assume that the fault lies with teachers instead of systemic institutions. To put it differently, it seems more likely that the textbooks, the curricula and the general orientation of education carry the blame. From all the above, it must have become evident that in our conceptual

framework the pedagogical process is not perceived as neutral, but an issue surrounded by conflicting and socially defined political opinions and practices (Katsikas and Kavvadias, 1998). In such a reference system, the conflict between social classes becomes a dominant tool for both interpreting educational - social transformations and for defining the limits of pedagogical and political action in any given circumstance.

Having said that, I want to stress that there is nothing "Marxist" in views that set the working class against teachers, who are viewed overall as carriers of reactionary ideas, even though a significant part of those belong in the working class. According to Liosis (2014), these notions are nothing but "a linear, one-sided, blunt and non-dialectical view of society". Undoubtedly, there are teachers who are bearers of the dominant ideology, some of whom indeed perform their "duties" with ardour. However, this phenomenon can also be encountered within the working class, and certainly in a segment that has nothing to do with the intellectuals; there can never be a 'one-to-one' correlation between class and ideology.

Following the above line of thinking and if we choose to perceive teachers as the enemies of the working class, which ally the working class will be able to find, so as to help shape the consciousness of the young? Who else could be persuaded, inside schools and universities, to subvert all the bourgeois ideological constructions? As a consequence, if we target teachers as "battering rams" of the bourgeois class (Liosis, 2014), then we just hand them over to the opposing class.

Unfortunately, the above anti-intellectual thesis can also be found in the Marxist tradition, with probably Poulantzas' thinking as one of the most noticeable examples:

> [...] a social class is defined by its place in the ensemble of social practices, i.e. by its place in the social division of labour as a whole. This includes political and ideological relations. (Poulantzas, 1975, p.14)

Despite Poulantzas' best intentions, it is our strong belief that the above thesis, dramatically shrinks the working class, places ideological criteria for its definition and, consequently, sets a vast majority of labourers against a very small minority of pioneers.

What About the Role of the Intellectuals?

As Vasilis Liosis (2014) points out, intellectuals did not maintain a constant form through social evolution. During the pre-capitalist period and the non-monopoly stage of capitalism, it had a different form and played a different role than in the following monopoly stage. More precisely, in the evolution of capitalism, we could detect three types of workers and intellectuals in succession.

During the first capitalist period, we find a type of worker who still maintains elements of the professional manual worker, thus a worker who still has intellectual functions, while the intellectuals are still outside production. In the second period of mass mechanisation, we find the mass-worker who performs unskilled labour, while a section of the intellectuals joins the production. During the third period, the era of "general intellect" (Rousis, 2005, pp. 84-88) and generalised commercialisation, an important part of the working class becomes specialised, performs less manual and more mental labour, while a large portion of the intellectuals become integrated in production, not as complete scientists, but as "specialised technocrats" (Rousis, 2005, pp. 84-88). Thus, while it started as a stratum representative of the ideology of the dominant class, it could be said that through the rapid capitalisation of the economy, the intellectuals turned

into a cross-class stratum with bourgeois, middleclass and proletarian components.

But what about today? At a time when the intellectuals do not function exclusively at the level of superstructure and ideology, but at the level of the base as well, while a big portion borders on, if not belong in, the working class? In this light, reasonably someone could wonder on the role the, so called, 'revolutionary' intellectuals, who do not identify class-wise, with the dominant bourgeois class, are called to play (Roussis, 2005). Before I move forward though, an important question must be answered: What do I mean by the term 'revolutionary' intellectuals and in what aspect do the latter differ from generally progressive ones?

Characteristics of the 'Revolutionary' Intellectual

Following Giorgos Rousis' (2005) reflections on the role of 'revolutionary' intellectuals in our time, in his book *Modern Revolutionary Intellectuals*, I will go on to present five important points that this group share.

The first important element of a revolutionary intellectual is his/her nonconformist, unconventional thinking, his/her questioning of the dominant ideology and values. A revolutionary intellectual can never fall back to believing that the current situation should be taken for granted without attempting to bring change. In this direction I will quote Bertolt Brecht in his play *The Life of Galileo*, known also as *Galileo*:

> "[...] science's sole aim must be to lighten the burden of human existence. If the scientists, brought to heel by self-interested rulers, limit themselves to piling up knowledge for knowledge's sake, then science can be crippled and your new machines will need to nothing but new impositions. You may in due course discover

> all that there is to discover, and your progress will nonetheless be nothing but a progress away from mankind. The gap between you and it may one day become so wide that your cry of triumph at some new achievement will be echoed by a universal cry of horror [...]. As things are, the best that can be hoped for is a race of inventive dwarfs who can be hired for any purpose". (Brecht, 1939, *socialiststories.com*, Scene 14, pp. 108-109)

A second defining element of a 'revolutionary' intellectual is his/her battle against stereotypes. She/he must be a visionary, a dreamer of a dream that is directly connected to life, a dream that can be brought to life. Moreover, a 'revolutionary' intellectual cannot be isolated, absorbed in his/her specialised knowledge. Then again, he/she cannot remain neutral in front of great or less important conflicts of his time, in the name of a so-called "universality", which under present circumstances equals non-interference and thus complicity with the dominant status quo. The 'revolutionary' intellectual's position is not in theorising, away from any particular engagement, nor in practicism of the type of non-governmental organisations, which try to soften the wounds of the system without questioning the system itself, resorting to charity and taking inequality for granted (Rousis, 2005, p. 343).

A fourth point that should be made is the intellectual's constant struggle for a society with no violence and no exploitation. But when this violence is massively inflicted by the rulers, as it is today, when state terrorism is the foundation of their imposition, then the revolutionary intellectual cannot condemn violence vaguely and equate the offender with the victim.

Last but not least, the 'revolutionary' intellectual should discard any intellectualistic narcissism. He /she should not think of himself/herself as the saviour of those in need. The intellectual who is engaged in the working class' struggles should feed himself/herself on the past and present struggles of the

labour movement, on its valuable experience and on the spontaneity of the masses. We should not forget what Marx and Engels pointed out in *German Ideology*: "The existence of revolutionary ideas in a particular period presupposes the existence of a revolutionary class" (Marx and Engels, [1888] 1998, p.68).

Hence, the role of the 'revolutionary' intellectual is to contribute in the revolutionising process; to uplift the insufficient spontaneous labour consciousness to the level of revolutionary consciousness and to transform the working class from a potential to an actual revolutionary force. Experience alone cannot lead the masses to revolt. However, this does not mean that it should be replaced by the elitism of the intellectuals. As wrong as it may be to consider the objective misery as the only revolutionary motive, it is equally wrong to believe that the intellectual sensitivity is the only way to realise the need for a revolutionary transformation.

Therefore, in accordance with Rousis (2005, pp. 345-346), I believe that the modern 'revolutionary' intellectual should primarily function as a practical theoretician, attempting to comprehend modern 'reality' in order to change it. A practical theoretician must take active part in the grassroots movement. Only through the unification of experience and theory, of the reflecting humanity that is in distress and the repressed humanity that reflects, of the working class and the intellectuals can the revolutionary consciousness, necessary for the radical transformation of society, emerge.

In conclusion, the 'revolutionary' intellectual must engage in all conflicts of their time, against the dominant class and ideology. As Antonio Tabucchi replied to Giuliano Ferrara, the editor of Berlusconi's daily centre-right newspaper *Il Foglio*, which began a violent attack against him in 2003:

> I speak, because I exist. When my mouth is filled with dirt, I will cease to speak. So, silence will exist. An eternity of silence awaits. But before the eternal silence arrives, I want to use my voice. My speech. (Grangeray, 2006)

Reflecting on the Distinction Between Manual and Mental Labour: Not Merely a Philosophical Debate but a Necessity in the 'Actual' Class Struggle

In recent years, when scientific knowledge has almost replaced direct manual labour under the form of a "general intellect" and material labour is complemented by immaterial (Roussis, 2005, pp. 21-22), one of the most popular bourgeois ideologisms is the following: Could it be that the prime importance we assign to mental labour "dematerialises" labour and marks the end of the working class? Even more, would it be possible to claim that, with the end of the working class, a large part of the intellectuals is not ultimately included in it?

If I continue down this path, I could suggest that, nowadays, the intellectuals are assigned a double role. The first one derives from their class position, since the majority belong in the working class. The second one infers from Lenin's proposition how to import the revolutionary consciousness "from outside the class", which still hangs heavily over the heads of the intellectuals. This line of thinking not only does not subvert Lenin's observation, but makes it even stronger, because the role of the "importer" of consciousness is not attributed to an external factor, but someone inside the working class. At the same time, and in order to avoid embellishments of any kind, we should not forget that parts of the intellectuals, bourgeois or petit bourgeois, can and do play the above described role.

Marx himself, in his *11th thesis on Feuerbach*, mentions: "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world in various ways; the point however is to *change* it" (Marx, [1888 first publication], 1998, p. 574). At this point, Marx, and history itself, shakes the deeply conservative argument of theorists such as Friedrich Hayek (c.f. *The Intellectuals and Socialism*, [1949], 2010), who claim that no revolution ever derived from the people, and that it has always been a product of the intellectuals (Rousis, 2005, p. 91). At the same time, it is a view which opposes subjectivity and the individualistic approach to empowerment, while it recognizes the active role of human beings in making their own history. To put it differently, the individual is perceived as historically specific, the product of the dialectical interaction between social circumstances and collective meaningful activity, co-authoring itself and the social circumstances[vii].

In his *1st thesis on Feuerbach*, Marx discusses the limits of idealism, which does incorporate the "active side", but only "abstractly", as a mental activity. On the contrary, Marx treats "the active side" as a "revolutionary, practical-critical activity", by tearing down the boundary between the tangible and the imaginary, between experience and knowledge (Marx, [1888], 1998, p. 574). Thus, Marx not only rejects the classic distinction between the undervalued, "dirty" practice and the "higher", "clean" theoretical inspection, but he also goes one step further; by upgrading the first and by dethroning the latter from the skies of "true intellect", of the "Idea", of "God", he dialectically unifies them, by introducing a new relation between theoretical knowledge and practical experience (Rousis, 2005, p. 93).

Subsequently, we face the following question: is the upgraded practical knowledge adequate? Or, to put it differently, does the practical experience of the working class suffice for the construction of a clear image of 'reality'? Marx

answers that question negatively because the working class, by being obliged to look at the capitalist reality through the warped lens that capitalist production itself creates and places between itself and reality, only gets a distorted image of reality. Thus, Marx writes in *Capital,* Volume 1:

> The advance of capitalist production develops a working class which by education tradition and habit looks upon the requirements of that mode of production as self-evident natural laws […]. The silent compulsion of economic relations sets the seal on the domination of the capitalist over the worker. Direct extra-economic force is still of course used, but only in exceptional cases. In the ordinary run of things, the worker can be left to the "natural laws of production" […]. (Marx, [1867] 1976, p. 899)

In other words, Marx supports that the working class has the natural tendency to accept the existing line of things as natural, without attempting to discover its real content and to subvert it. Marx explains the main reason behind this as follows:

> Reflection on the forms of human life, hence also scientific analysis of those forms, takes a course directly opposite to their real development. Reflection begins *post festum,* and therefore with the results of the process of development ready to hand. The forms which stamp products as commodities and which are therefore the preliminary requirements for the circulation of commodities, already possess the fixed quality of natural forms of social life before man seeks to give an account, not of their historical character, for in his eyes they are immutable, but of their content and meaning. (Marx, [1867] 1976, p. 168)

Hence, Marx supports that both empirical knowledge and the resulting social consciousness are not enough to convey the essence of things on their own. If we stop at this level, we will only have a reproduction of dominant ideology. The labour movement makes its way through practical experience: "it is the task of theory to clear this way, to see to it that the movement does not bog down or

commit costly errors" (Lefebvre, *The Sociology of Marx,* 1968, p.122). But this is a revolutionary theory "[…] in no way based on ideas or principles that have been invented, or discovered, by this or that would-be universal reformer". It involves "[…] in general terms, actual relations springing from an existing class struggle, from a historical movement going on under our very eyes" (Marx and Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party,* [1848] 2008, p. 24).

Uniting Theory and Practice

This should be the foundation of the unity of practice and theory, of working class and intellectuals. And that is exactly where the need for their unification stems from. According to Marx, the role of the intellectuals is to assist in the creation of a higher type of knowledge, on the basis of the social practice of the working class and in collaboration with it. A theoretical knowledge that will allow the conception of 'reality' as it truly is, not in its distorted version; a knowledge that, after its assimilation by the masses, will be transformed in material power. Quoting Marx and Engels from their book *Collected works,* Volume 3 (March 1843- August 1844):

> The weapon of criticism cannot, of course replace criticism by weapons, material force must be overthrown by material force; but theory also becomes a material force as soon as it has gripped the masses. Theory is capable of gripping the masses as soon as it demonstrates *ad hominem*, and it demonstrates *ad hominem* as soon as it becomes radical. To be radical is to grasp the root of the matter. But for man the root is man himself. (Marx and Engels, [1927] 2010, p.182)

Already, in his doctoral thesis (1902, *The Difference Between the Democritean and Epicurean Philosophy of Nature),* Marx introduces the issue of intellectuals and proletariat, and then returns to it in the *Introduction* of the *Contribution to Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law:*

> As philosophy finds its material weapons in the proletariat, so the proletariat finds its spiritual weapon in philosophy […]. The head of this emancipation is philosophy, its heart is the proletariat. Philosophy cannot be made a reality without the abolition of the proletariat; the proletariat cannot be abolished without philosophy being made a reality. (Marx and Engels, [1927] 2010, p.187 – emphasis in the original)

What is made clear from the above quotation is the need for interdependence, for cooperation and for "organic unity" between the intellectuals and the working class in order for the revolutionary change of society to happen. The realisation of this social revolutionary change will mean the end of the proletariat as such and the practical implementation of the revolutionary theory. The one separated from the other cannot attain this goal which can only come from their unity.

As Krapivin (1985, p.10) notes:

> Marx and Engels turned philosophy into a science, into a highly effective method of the revolutionary transformation of the world in general and the society in particular. Hence the new social role of philosophy.

Therefore, Marxism accepts and demands the notion of practice as a fundamental component of theoretical knowledge, which, in turn, becomes meaningful only to the extent it aims at a practical intervention. In assessing the historic importance of dialectical and historical materialism created by Marx and Engels, Lenin wrote: "Marx's philosophy is a consummate philosophical materialism which has provided mankind, and especially the working class, with powerful instruments of knowledge" (Lenin, *Collected Works: Volume 19 (March-December 1913)* [1913] 1963, p.25).

As John Molyneux (2012) puts it, one certainly needs not be a connoisseur of philosophy to be able to take part in a demonstration, a strike or a revolutionary

uprising. But the constant battle for a better world is not confined to moments of "direct confrontation". There is a daily battle of ideas, a constant ideological struggle against the ruling class and their world view and, more than that, the work needed to organise, to form a political party, to establish and maintain a union. And that is where philosophy enters the picture, as a "world outlook" (Krapivin, 1985, p. 17), defined as "the totality of principles, views and convictions which determine man's attitude to reality and to himself, the direction of the activity of every individual, social group, class or the society as a whole".

In our time, the process of proletarisation of intellectuals grants the possibility to broaden this circle of intellectuals originating from the working class. In any case, however, we cannot expect this broadening to be in proportion with the number of intellectuals joining the working class (Roussis, 2005, p. 316). Therefore, in our time, these intellectuals bearing theoretical revolutionary knowledge are as necessary to the revolutionary movement as they were in its first steps.

Even though 'revolutionary' intellectuals have always held a crucial role in the exposure of distorted consciousness and in the revolutionary awakening of the masses, nowadays, at a time when alienation and bourgeois ideological hegemony are the pillars that support and reproduce barbarity, they have an even more significant role to play. Capitalism's modernisation leads to a new age of darkness and this makes the need for 'revolutionary' intellectuals even more imperative. Their presence is even more vital, because, in our time, despite the intensified class conflict, the spontaneous movement of the traditional working class, when not lured towards the extreme right by populist saviours[viii], seems "numb". Detached and paralysed, the working class limits its

goal setting to the preservation -not even conquering new- bourgeois democratic acquired rights.

On the other hand, the relatively new spontaneous movement of the modern working class, although viewed as 'cultured', is still in the process of creation without clear, subverting, anticapitalist goals and the organised, political, revolutionary subjects are either absent or marginalised.

It goes without saying that revolutionary theory needs to be renewed in order to meet the needs of the new era. Given the new world order, the level of the working movement, the absence of revolutionary parties in most developed countries and the organisational and ideological regression of the working class, we come before a new situation on a global level; a situation where many theoretical issues need to be re-examined under the light of this new reality and the historical experience acquired so far.

But even if we were at a time when the mass movement was flourishing, which is not the case, then again, the role of the theory and the intellectuals would not be limited. As Lenin stresses: "Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement" (Lenin [1902] 1996, p. 6), and a few pages further on: "The mass movement places before us new theoretical, political and organisational tasks, far more complicated than those that might have satisfied us in the period before the rise of the mass movement" (Lenin [1902] 1996, p. 27).

Under these circumstances I find that Marx's previous quote "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world in various ways; the point however is to *change* it" is always valid, but I have to add that before we change the world, it is imperative that we have previously understood it and that we have realised the

need for this change (Rousis, 2005). Lenin himself had stressed that the revolutionary movement presupposes the revolutionary theory, but this theory and revolutionary consciousness cannot spontaneously derive from the oppressed.

On the other hand, he pointed out that "[...] revolutionary theory, which in its turn is not a dogma [...] assumes final shape only in close connection with the practical activity of a truly mass and truly revolutionary movement" (Lenin, *Collected Works, Volume 31: April-December 1920),* [1920], 1966, p. 25). And this vicious circle can only break through the organic unity of practice and theory, of labour movement and 'revolutionary' intellectuals and through intellectuals consciously accepting the role of the working class and vice the versa (Rousis, 2005, pp. 385-386).

What Needs to Be Done?

In light of the above, it goes without saying that the international economic, social and political crisis of capitalism and its particular manifestation in Greece affect the roles that both education and pedagogy are called to play, since it readjusts the features of state pedagogy and redefines the role of school and educators in relation to the institutional framework (Magaliou and Chaniotakis, 2014; Grollios, Liampas and Pavlidis, 2015).

In this sense, education is the issue at stake in the global class struggle, which is ever-present in every educational institution, in every classroom, shaping, to some or other degree, both the school knowledge and the pedagogical practices used (Grollios and Kaskaris, 1997; Grollios and Gounari, 2016).

Given the above, it is of vital importance today that all those who oppose the dominant pedagogy and seek alternative pedagogies and emancipating prospects

for education carefully consider the crisis (Grollios, Liampas and Pavlidis, 2015). At a time when the two poles of neoliberalism and neo-conservatism are promoted as the only alternative on a global scale, making use of empirical international movements targeted at educational and social reform can and should contribute in the development of a new internationalism, in theory and in practice, with the primary goal of radically transforming society, educators and pedagogical practices. In this direction, the case of Greece could provide valuable insights about the ongoing assault and the radical changes in public education and in teacher labour market. These changes should be seen in the framework of "developing a market society in a country where the public good was left to deteriorate beyond repair so it can be easily transferred to the hands of the private sector" (Gounari and Grollios, 2013, p. 305).

At the same time, as George Grollios and Panagiota Gounari (2016, p.14) very aptly point out, the work on critical and liberating critical education in a country where applied policies have completely eradicated the social, political and educational rights of the exploited and oppressed social classes, the need to combine "the expansion and deepening of the debate with the formation, organisation and systematic operation of a strong liberating movement" is more evident than ever. As the two critical educators underline, this movement has to be "the business" of a large enough number of teachers so that it could contribute to multifaceted and effectual struggles ultimately aiming to radically transform education and society itself.

We should keep in mind that every capitalist crisis, serving as a ground for new conflicts, apart from negative repercussions, also paves the way to question and subvert capitalism. It is more imperative than ever, therefore, that all critical educators and the whole movement of critical pedagogy re-evaluate their positions, practice and propositions in light of this crisis. For this to happen,

however, we all need to deeply comprehend the causes and nature of the crisis, as well as the ways in which it affects education and the impact it has.

Reclaiming a Research Educational Agenda in Times of Crisis

Concluding this article, I suggest that in current circumstances a critical and radical view of the crisis is more necessary than ever. Such view would inevitably transcend the dominant austerity narrative and, bypassing the politics of the mainstream media and bourgeois ideology, would kaleidoscopically approach the crisis, its roots and consequently its causes, and its repercussions, while also considering alternative ways of overcoming it. To put it more aptly, I strongly believe that we have a responsibility as critical educators to take research a step further than merely recording the direct consequences of the crisis or reviewing the changes in educational landscape individually. What really needs to be done is understanding them on the basis of socio-political circumstances that boil down their essence.

Therefore, what is proposed here is the need for a twofold understanding, which on the one hand, will use empirical evidence from research studies as a means to determine the significance of changes in education "over and against and in relation to" the financial crisis (Ball, 2011, p. x; Cole, 2011, p. xii), and, on the other hand, place schooling in its economic, social, political and cultural context. Focusing on these conditions, to which education has a dialectical and significantly perplexing set of relations (Anyon, 2005), is a definitive step in the direction of mapping the economic, social and political landscape over which the potential struggle of educational and social movements will take place (Ball, 2011).

As already indicated above, though indirectly, the relationship between society and education is not mechanical. It is historical, dialectical and controversial,

the product of social, political and ideological conflicts, within and outside education (Shor and Freire, 1987; Giroux and McLaren, 1994; Grollios, 2015). Therefore, neither future developments should be treated as predetermined, nor human nature as a constant essence, but both as the variable results of historical evolution.; as the product of social relations in the framework of a specific mode of production which are subject to transformations and reversals within the class struggle[ix] (Milios, 1997a, p. 16).

In the course of the above discussion, class struggle is perceived as the primary problem when it comes to interpreting each different social 'reality'; as the driving force behind the historical formation of societies, which shapes power relations, transforms, or even subverts, social relations, bring developments, and changes the world (Milios, 1997a; Grollios and Gounari, 2016)[x]. This process though, is not abstract and extratemporal, but on the contrary, one developed on the grounds of particular historic-economic and political conditions, rendering thus a historical inspection necessary (Katsikas and Kavvadias, 1998).

Completing the line of thought outlined in this paper, I want to reiterate that any discussion and analysis of the effects the capitalist crisis has had on education should be approached holistically, providing a clearer picture of its economic, social and political dimensions, along with its causes and its immense diversity of aspects. Only such an approach can demonstrate its real depth and extent, and ultimately contribute in a direction of a revolutionary confrontation of a current and multifaceted social phenomenon – a phenomenon I consider to be not only inextricably connected to schooling and the educational processes developed in its frame, but also a formative element of modern societies and definitive for the lives of students, scholars and educators (Grollios, 2013; 2015).

[1] The 'Chile recipe' can be summed up in the following three axes: salary compression and deregulation of labour legislation, with the intention of maximising private profit; mass transfer of resources from the public to the private sector, through privatising public companies and publicising bank losses; and finally, the monetarist policy of austerity, focusing on the dramatic reduction of public expenses, particularly social ones.
[2] For a number of reasons, increasingly serious since the beginning of 2017 when the global environment changed radically. In 2016, the United Kingdom had voted to leave the EU and the United States had elected Donald J. Trump, who had publicly signalled his reluctance to intervene in any resumption of the Greek debt crisis, while he was also not particularly warm to the idea of the EU itself, greatly differentiating from the Cold War period. In the meantime, the influx of immigrants is steadily rising as well as the trends of reinforcement of the Nationalist Right (Siani-Davies, 2017, p. 334).
[3] A treaty for the European Union (E.U.) which stipulated the creation of an Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) and the political unification of E.U. through the establishment of a European federal political system that would implement common policies in matters of foreign relations and security.
[4] At this point, I am referring to the term first coined in 1989 by the American economist and World Bank executive John Williamson, when he suggested that the basic theses of neoliberal economists be summarised and coded in a ten-point list which would constitute the minimum requirement to ensure economic health (c.f. Klein, 2010). This happened immediately afterwards when all the reforms suggested by Williamson were instituted as preconditions that every government had to comply with in order for them to be accepted into the international community. The basic principles of the Washington Consensus can be summed up in the following ten: 1) fiscal discipline; 2) redefinition of the priorities of public expenditure; 3) tax reform; 4) liberalisation of interest rates and financial liberalisation; 5) exchange rate; 6) liberalisation of international trade; 7) foreign direct investment; 8) privatisation; 9) deregulation; 10) property rights (Williamson, 1990).
[5] The term "globaloney" (or the equivalent terms 'global babble' and 'glob-blah-blah', c.f. Rosenberg, 2001; Scholte, 2002) is used at this point to show the tendency to generalise results/examples which may not necessarily be representative of overall trends. That is, the tendency to use 'globalisation' as a buzzword in order to explain almost everything and anything that is vaguely associated with it. For a general review of whether globalisation actually exists, one could refer, among others, to the studies of Weiss, 1998; Hirt and Thompson, 2000; Sakellaropoulos, 2004.
[6] To clarify, I am referring to the idea of teacher-intellectual which emerged from the movement of critical pedagogy. I will indicatively mention here that the idea of the intellectual teacher works in conjunction with the need of education employees to achieve self-realisation within their educational work and is founded on the perception that teaching must be linked with the struggle to reform schools and society itself. In other words, I am referring to the particularity of educational work in this context, which, in order to be creative and effective, requires teachers who bear a high intellectual culture that they can fully and variously activate in their work. It is exclusively teachers with a highly developed social consciousness, a deep understanding of the importance of their social work and a relentless attitude towards those who manipulate and distort it, who can offer knowledge to their students necessary for the latter to be able to function as critical subjects contributing to the emancipation of the whole of society (Pavlidis, 2012, pp. 237-242).
[7] Here, I mean that subject that was referred to by Marx in 1852, when he wrote in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* "Men make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past" (Marx, [1852] 1995).
[8] Namely Umberto Bossi (Italy), Marine Le Pen (France), Nigel Paul Farage (UK), Geert Wilders (Holland), Heinz-Christian Strache (Austria), Jörg Meuthen (Germany) and recently Josep Anglada (Catalonia).
[9] In his *6th thesis on Feuerbach*, in 1845, Marx wrote: "But the essence of man is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In reality, it is the ensemble of the social relations" (Marx, [1845] 1976, p.63).
[10] In *The Communist Manifesto*, in 1848, K. Marx and F. Engels wrote: "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles" (Marx and Engels, [1848] 1998, p.34).

References

Agostinone-Wilson, F., 2013.*Dialectical Research Methods in the Classical Marxist Tradition.* New York: Peter Lang.

Allman, P., 2001. *Revolutionary Social Transformation: Democratic Hopes, Political Possibilities and Critical Education*. 2nd ed. Westport, CT and London: Bergin and Garvey.

Marxist Papers (Antitetradia tis Ekpaidefsis), 2017. *EU in the Whirlpool of the Crisis on its 60th Anniversary*, 116. (in Greek)

Anyon, J., 2005. *Radical Possibilities: Public Policy, Urban Education, and a New Social Movement*. New York: Routledge.

Apple, M., 2010. *Global Crisis, Social Justice, and Education*. New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W., Ball, S. and Gandin, L. A. eds. 2010. *The Routledge International Handbook of Sociology of Education*. London: Routledge.

Ball, S. J., 1998. Big Policies/Small World: An Introduction to International Perspectives in Education Policy. *Comparative Education*, 34(2), pp. 119–130. Available through: National and Kapodistrian University of Athens Library website <http://www.lib.uoa.gr> [Accessed 01 October 2014].

Ball, S. J., 2011. Crisis and Attentiveness. In: D. R. Cole, ed. *Surviving Economic Crises Through Education*. New York, USA: Peter Lang. pp. ix-x.

Bourdieu, P., 1998. Utopia of Endless Exploitation: The essence of Neoliberalism. *Le Monde Diplomatique*, December. Translated from French by J. M. Shapiro. Available at: http://www.homme-moderne.org/societe/socio/bourdieu/varia/essneoUK.html [Accessed 7 August 2017].

Brecht, B., 1939. *Life of Galileo*. Digitalised by RevSocialist for SocialistStories.

Chrysochou, P., Katsiampoura, G., and Skordoulis, K. 2014. The Effect of the Economic Crisis on the Professional Lives of Primary School Teachers: The Social Context. In: K. Skordoulis and D. Hill, eds. *Critical Education at the Crossroads*, Selected Papers of the 2nd International Conference on Critical Education, 10-14 July 2012, Athens, Greece, pp. 285-295. Athens: Nissos.

Cole, D. R., 2011. Preface. In D. R. Cole ed. *Surviving Economic Crises through Education*. New York, USA: Peter Lang. pp. xi-xii.

Economou, M., Peppou, L.E., Louki, E., Komporozos A., Mellou A. and Stefanis C., 2012. Depression Telephone Helpline: Help Seeking During the Financial Crisis. *Psychiatriki*, 23 (1), pp. 17-28.

Fatourou, M., 2010. Job and Unemployment: Psychological Consequences. *Encephalos*, 47 (4), pp. 176-180.

Gindin, S. 2014. Clarifying the Crisis: How Should We Assess the 2008 Economic Crash and the Political Possibilities Beyond It? *Jacobin*, [online] January 2. Available at: <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2014/01/clarifying-the-crisis/>.

Giroux, A. H., and McLaren, P. 1994. *Paulo Freire on Higher Education. A Dialogue at the National University of Mexico*. New York, USA: State University of New York Press.

Giroux, H., 2004. *The Terror of Neoliberalism: Authoritarianism and the Eclipse of Democracy*. Boulder, USA: Paradigm Publishers.

Gounari, P. and Grollios, G., 2013. Educational Reform in Greece: Central Concepts and a Critique. *Journal of Pedagogy*, 3 (2), pp. 303-318.

Gounari, P., 2014. Neoliberalism as Social Necrophilia: Erich Fromm and The Politics of Hopelessness in Greece. In: S. Miri, R. Lake and T. Kress, eds. *Reclaiming the Same Society: Essays on Erich Fromm's Thought*. Boston, USA: Sense Publishers. pp. 187-201.

Grangeray, E., 2006. Antonio Tabucchi: "Je Parle Car Je Suis". *Le Monde*, 10 November. Available at: < http://www.lemonde.fr/livres/article/2006/11/10/je-parle-car-je-suis_1675436_3260.html> [Accessed March 2014].

Grollios, G. and Gounari, P., 2016. *Liberating and Critical Pedagogy in Greece.* Athens: Gutenberg.

Grollios, G. and Kaskaris, G., 1997. Educational Policy, 'Postmodern' and 'Critical Pedagogy': The Dead Ends of a Relationship and the 'Weapons of Critique'. *Utopia*, 25, pp. 101-118.

Grollios, G., 2004. *Ideology, Pedagogy and Educational Politics.* Athens: Gutenberg.

Grollios, G., 2013. Crisis and the Role of Pedagogy. *Paremvaseis*, [online] December 17. Available at: <http://www.paremvasis.gr/?p=2632> (in Greek)

Grollios, G., 2015. Crisis and Critical Educators. In G. Grollios, A. Liambas and P. Pavlidis, eds. *Proceedings of the IV International Conference on Critical Education*, 23-26 June 2014, Thessaloniki, Greece, pp. 312-332. Advance online publication. <http://www.eled.auth.gr/documents/praktika_iv_icce_volume_1_gr.pdf> (in Greek)

Grollios G., Liambas, A. and Pavlidis, P. eds., 2015. *Proceedings of the IV International Conference on Critical Education*, 23-26 June 2014, Thessaloniki, Greece. Advance online publication. <http://www.eled.auth.gr/documents/praktika_iv_icce_volume_1_gr.pdf> (in Greek)

Harris, K., 1982. *Teachers and Classes: A Marxist Analysis*. London, Boston and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Harvey, D. 2005. *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford, USA: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, D., 1996. *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. Oxford: Basil Blakwell.

Hill, D. and Kumar, R. eds., 2009.*Global Neoliberalism and Education and its Consequences*. New York: Routledge.

Hill, D. and Rosskam, E. eds., 2009.*The Developing World and State Education: Neoliberal Depredation and Egalitarian Alternatives*. New York: Routledge.

Hill, D., Lewis, C., Maisuria, A., Yanker, P. and Carr, J. 2015. Neoliberal and Neoconservative Immiseration Capitalism in England: Policies and Impacts on Society and on Education. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies* 13(2), pp. 38-82.

Ioakimoglou, E., 1986. For the Anticapitalist End to the Crisis: A Few Deductions. *Theses*, 15, pp. 35-47. (in Greek)

Karamessini, M., 2015. The Greek Social Model: Towards a Deregulated Labour Market and Residual Social Protection. In: D. V. Whitehead, ed. 2015. *The European Social Model in Crisis: Is Europe Losing its Soul?* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited. pp. 230-288.

Katsikas, C., and Kavadias, G.K., 1998. *School Crisis and Educational Policy. A Critique of Educational Changes (1990-1997).* Athens: Gutenberg.

Krapivin, V., 1985. *What is Dialectical Materialism*? Translated from the Russian by G. Sdobnikova. Moscow: Progress Publishers

Krugman, P., 2012. *End This Depression Now!* New York and London: W.W Norton & Company.

Lenin, [1902] 1996. What is to Be Done? Burning Questions of our Movement. New York: International Publishers.

Lenin, V.I., [1913] 1963. *Collected Works: Volume 19 (March-December 1913).* Translated by G. Hanna. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House.

Lenin, V.I., [1920] 1966. *Collected Works: Volume 31(April – December 1920)*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Liosis, V., 2014. Intellectuals from a Marxist point of view and its role today. *Giannis Kordatos Association*. Available at: <http://kordatos.org/%CE%99%CE%B4%CE%B5%CE%BF%CE%BB%CE%BF%CE%B3%CE%AF%CE%B1/tabid/4426/Post/14538/%CE%97-

%CE%B4%CE%B9%CE%B1%CE%BD%CF%8C%CE%B7%CF%83%CE%B7-%CF%85%CF%80%CF%8C-%CF%84%CE%B7-%CE%BC%CE%B1%CF%81%CE%BE%CE%B9%CF%83%CF%84%CE%B9%CE%BA%CE%AE-%CE%BF%CF%80%CF%84%CE%B9%CE%BA%CE%AE-%CE%BA%CE%B1%CE%B9-%CE%BF-%CF%81%CF%8C%CE%BB%CE%BF%CF%82-%CF%84%CE%B7%CF%82-%CF%83%CE%AE%CE%BC%CE%B5%CF%81%CE%B1-%CE%9C%CE%95%CE%A1%CE%9F%CE%A3-%CE%99> [Accessed 30 May 2015]

Magaliou and Chaniotakis., 2014. The Economic Crisis and the School. In: Proceedings of TEPAE Conference: *Reflection on Childhood.* Thessaloniki, 30-31 October 2014.

Marx, K. and Engels, F., 1888. *The German Ideology*. In: R. M. Baird and S. E. Rosenbaum, eds. 1998. *The German Ideology: Including Theses on Feuerbach and Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy*. Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books.

Marx, K. and Engels, F., [1927] 2010, *Collected Works Volume 3 (March 1843 – August 1844)*. Soviet Union: Institute of Marxism-Leninism.

Marx, K. and Engels, F., [1848] 2008. *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. Utrecht: Open Source Socialist Publishing.

Marx, K., [1867] 1976. *Capital Volume I*. Translated by B. Fowkes. Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Matthews, M. R., 1980. *The Marxist Theory of Schooling: A study of Epistemology and Education. Brighton*: Harvester Press.

McNally, D. 2011. Slump, Austerity, and Resistance. In L. Panitch, G. Albo and V. Chibber (eds), *Socialist Register 2012: The Crisis and the Left*. London, UK: Merlin Publishers. pp. 36–63.

Mepham, J. and Ruben, D. H. eds., 1979a. *Issues in Marxist Philosophy. Volume Two: Materialism*. Brighton: Harvester Press.

Mepham, J. and Ruben, D. H. eds., 1979b. *Issues in Marxist Philosophy. Volume Three: Epistemology, Science, Ideology*. Brighton: Harvester Press.

Milios, I., 1997a. Declining Profit and Decadence of the Welfare State. *Theses*, 61.

Milios, I., 1997b. *Modes of Production and the Marxist Analysis*. Athens: Ellinika Grammata Publishing.

Molyneux, J., 2012. *The Point Is to Change It: An Introduction to Marxist Philosophy.* London: Bookmarks.

Pavlidis, P., 2013. The Social Significance of Education. *Prin*, [online] September 16. Available at: <http://prin.gr/?p=1887> (in Greek)

Polychroniou, C. J., 2013. The Specter of Authoritarianism and the Future of the Left: An Interview with Henry A. Giroux. *Truthout* .[online] June 8. Available at:<http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/24121-the-specter-of-authoritarianism-and-the-future-of-the-left-an-interview-with-henry-a-giroux>.

Poulantzas, N. 1975. *Political Power and Social Classes*: *Volume I.* Athens: Themelio. Translated from French by Kostas Filinis. (in Greek)

Robertson, S.L., 2007. "Teachers Matter…Don't They?": Placing Teachers and Their Work in the Global Knowledge Economy, a paper prepared for Universidade Federal da Paraiba, Centro De Educacao Programme, De Pos-Garduacao, Joao Pessoa, Brazil, 11-14th November.

Rotenstreich, N., 1965. Basic Problems of Marx's Philosophy. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

Rousis, G., 2005. *Modern Revolutionary Intellectuals*. Athens: Govostis Publications. (in Greek)

Sakellaropoulos, S., 2014. *Crisis and Social Stratification in 21st Century Greece*. Athens: Topos Publishers. (in Greek)

Santos, B. d. S., 2004. *The world Social Forum: Toward a Counter-Hegemonic Globalisation (Part I)*. [online] Available at: <http://www.boaventuradesousasantos.pt/media/wsf_JaiSenPart1.pdf > [Accessed 06 November 2015]

Shor, I. and Freire, P. 1987. *A Pedagogy for Liberation. Dialogues on Transforming Education.* Westport, USA: Bergin & Garvey.

Siani-Davies, P., 2017. *Crisis in Greece*. London: Hurst & Company.

Simou, E. and Koutsogeorgou, E., 2014. Effects of the Economic Crisis on Health and Healthcare in Greece in the Literature from 2009 to 2013: A Systematic Review. *Health Policy*, 115 (2), pp. 111-119.

Sotiris, P., 2012. The Downsizing of a Country. *Greek Left Review*, [online]September 17 Available at: <https://Greekleftreview.wordpress.com/2012/09/17/greece-the-downsizing-of-a-country/>

Malott, C. S. and Ford, D., 2015. *Marx, Capital and Education: Towards a Critical Pedagogy of Becoming*. New York: Peter Lang.

Theodorikakou, O., Alamanou, A., and Katsadoros, K. 2013. "Neo-homelessness" and the Greek Crisis. *European Journal of Homelessness*, 7(2), pp. 203-210.

Weiss, L., 1997. Globalisation and the Myth of the Powerless State. *New Left Review*, 225, pp. 2-27.
Whitty, G. and Edwards, T., 1998. School Choice Policies in England and the United States: An Exploration of their Origins and Significance. *Comparative Education*, 34 (2), pp. 211-227.

Author Details

Dr. Polina – Theopoula Chrysochou is a Research Associate in the Department of Education at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens and Visiting Lecturer. This paper is based on of her Doctoral Thesis, titled: *The Impact of the Economic Crisis in Greece on the Professional Lives and Teaching Practices of Primary School Teachers: A Critical Pedagogy Approach*.

E-mail: chr.polina@gmail.com